



SEATTLE  
POLICE  
MONITOR

# Third Systemic Assessment: Community Confidence

January 2016

# Table of Contents

<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>A Note on Methodology</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Part 1. Community Confidence</b> .....	<b>9</b>
A. Visibility of Police .....	9
B. Quality of Police Encounters.....	10
C. Neighborhood/Socio-Economic Factors.....	14
D. Community Cooperation with Law Enforcement .....	15
E. “Vicarious” Experiences & Media Influences.....	17
<b>Part 2. Community Policing &amp; Engagement</b> .....	<b>19</b>
A. Institutional Considerations.....	21
1. Mission Statement & Strategic Plans Reflecting Community Policing Emphasis.....	21
2. Department-Wide Geographic and Problem-Solving Focus, Including Neighborhood Variation .....	22
3. Adequacy of Resources Devoted to Community Policing .....	24
4. Indicia of Community Policing as Central to Organizational Structure and Operations.....	25
5. Whether The Department Uses Performance Measures that Reflect Community Policing Principles.....	26
6. Whether Training Incorporates Community Policing Values and Objectives .....	27
7. Whether The Department Has Successfully Implemented Alternatives to Motorized Patrol.....	27
8. Whether The Department Actively Promotes the Visibility of Officers and Its Activities in a Transparent Manner .....	28
B. Officers & Personnel .....	29
1. Officer Assignment to Specific, Appropriately-Sized Sectors or “Beats” Impacts Officer-Community Relationships...29	
2. Officers Need to Spend Sufficient Time Doing Community Engagement.....	30
3. Officers and Supervisors Using Information and Data.....	30
4. A Decentralized Command Structure Permits Officer Autonomy in Developing Community Relationships .....	31
C. Community Cooperation & Collaboration .....	33
1. Whether The Department Maintains and Optimizes a Range of Community Partnerships .....	33
2. Whether Citizens Provide Input, and the Department Responds to Such Input.....	33
3. Whether Citizens Are Involved with Law Enforcement and Crime Prevention .....	34
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>35</b>
<b>Appendix A. Methodological Framework &amp; Approach for Qualitative Assessment of Public Confidence</b> .....	<b>36</b>
<b>Appendix B. Summary of Areas for Future Inquiry</b> .....	<b>55</b>
<b>Appendix C. Anzalone Liszt Grove Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>56</b>

## Executive Summary

The Consent Decree (also referred to as the “Settlement Agreement”) makes clear that one of the primary, overriding benefits that will flow from reform of the Seattle Police Department (“SPD”) is a stronger, more trusting relationship with the Seattle community. Indeed, ensuring that policing “complies with the Constitution . . . , effectively ensures public and officer safety, and promotes public confidence in the [SPD] and its officers” is the tri-partite goal articulated in the Decree’s very first sentence.<sup>1</sup>

Likewise, the first sentence of the July 2012 Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) between the United States and Seattle states that the goal of the MOU is to ensure delivery of police services in a manner that “promotes public confidence in SPD and the services that it delivers.”<sup>2</sup> In describing the primary charge of the Community Police Commission (“CPC”), the MOU notes that the “SPD needs strong community relationships and sustainable dialogue with Seattle’s diverse communities to ensure constitutional and bias-free policing, to closely interact with the community to resolve neighborhood problems, and to increase community confidence in the Department.”<sup>3</sup>

Over the course of several months, the Monitoring Team has engaged in an assessment of public trust in the Seattle Police Department. This has included two elements. The first was a scientific survey of public confidence in the SPD and its officers. That *quantitative* survey, conducted by the national survey research firm Anzalone Liszt Grove, was previously filed with the Court in September 2015.<sup>4</sup>

The second element has been a *qualitative* assessment of SPD’s efforts to build public confidence with the community. This review included conducting interviews over several months with SPD personnel; reviewing numerous documents and reports created by the SPD, CPC, and other governmental and community organizations; and interviewing community members from across Seattle.

To structure the review, the Monitoring Team used a framework based upon academic research, the documented experiences of police agencies and practitioners in the real world, and established frameworks from the Police Foundation, the U.S. Department of Justice’s (“DOJ”) Community Oriented Policing Services (“COPS”) Office, and other national thought leaders in the area of community policing. The methodology the Monitoring Team used is described in greater detail in Appendix A. The Team was looking not just to catalogue SPD efforts or programs but, instead, to ensure these are aligned with recognized best practices in the field of policing today.

This qualitative assessment is necessarily limited in scope. It seeks to evaluate the efforts that SPD has taken towards promoting community trust and whether those efforts are consistent with SPD’s obligations under the Consent Decree. It is not, nor is it intended to be, an exhaustive study of the effectiveness of those efforts and/or the contributions of those efforts to community perceptions of the police. Nor is it an exhaustive guidebook of how to further strengthen the relationship between the community and police. These are important issues deserving of attention. However, others are better situated or have been expressly charged with that task, such as the CPC. For instance, following sustained study and community outreach, the CPC recently released a report on SPD’s recruitment, hiring, and training practices in terms of how well they promote engagement with

---

<sup>1</sup> Dkt. 3-1 at 5; Dkt. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Memorandum of Understanding ¶ 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* ¶ 12.

<sup>4</sup> Dkt. 235.

members of the city’s diverse racial, ethnic, immigrant, and refugee communities.<sup>5</sup> This was the first of two reports the CPC was charged in the Consent Decree to complete. The CPC expects to release an additional report in the spring of 2016 that will examine the formal and informal channels of communication between the SPD and these same communities.

The purpose of this assessment is, relatedly, not to definitively determine compliance with specific requirements under the Consent Decree. Most assessments are for such purposes,<sup>6</sup> while some are not.<sup>7</sup> Stated differently, and more appropriately to our role, this evaluation looks for the presence of indicators that would tend to establish whether the SPD is strengthening community trust.

Consequently, this assessment, and the present report, can best be viewed as a survey of the many areas, initiatives, programs, and general characteristics that are commonly associated with community policing and public confidence in law enforcement – and an evaluation of how SPD is doing with respect to each of them. Any one of the areas that we cover here could, and likely should, be the subject of further inquiry going forward by Department, City, or community stakeholders.

To that end, this assessment and report benefitted significantly from early and sustained feedback from a variety of organizations, entities, and individuals. Conversations with such entities provided the Monitoring Team with a sense of where some of this report’s initial coverage or analysis would ideally be supplemented by a more focused and in-depth treatment going forward. Those areas are identified in Appendix B.

With respect to the task at hand – assessing what measures SPD has taken towards ensuring community trust and engagement – the Monitoring Team finds that, since the start of the Consent Decree, the SPD has engaged in important and appropriate efforts to recalibrate and reset its relationship with Seattle’s diverse communities. Indeed, many best practices in community policing are being addressed and implemented by the SPD and its command staff. We find that Chief O’Toole and her command staff are definitively shifting the focus of the Department to a more community-oriented policing approach. Rather than believing that isolated initiatives or scattered community meetings are sufficient engagement with the community, the Chief is driving – in words and action – the SPD to conduct policing in dynamic partnership with the community in all of its forms. These efforts are deservedly receiving national attention and praise.<sup>8</sup>

Even more importantly, the Department’s efforts are driving changes in perceptions of the police among Seattle residents and community members. As we have previously reported:

[O]pinions of police provided in the Monitor’s recent survey of community attitudes, a follow-up to a similar survey conducted in 2013, have substantially improved since 2013. Furthermore, the percentage of people who disapprove of SPD (25 percent) is substantially down from 2013 (when disapproval was 34 percent) . . .

<sup>5</sup> Dkt. 255.

<sup>6</sup> See e.g., Dkt. Nos. 231 (First Systemic Assessment) and 244 (Second Systemic Assessment).

<sup>7</sup> See e.g., Dkt. No. 195 at 27 (explaining that the Use of Force Data Assessment “is a necessary component of conducting a sufficiently rigorous and focused assessment of individual force incidents, even if various quantitative results or analyses might not directly or by themselves establish partial or full compliance”).

<sup>8</sup> See, e.g., Linda Byron, “Seattle PD Chief ‘Shocked’ Over State of the Union Invite,” KING5.com (Jan. 11, 2016), <http://www.king5.com/story/news/local/seattle/2016/01/11/seattle-pd-chief-shocked-over-state-union-invite/78632642/>.

Likewise, those anonymous surveyed reported fewer troubling interactions between officers and Seattle residents, particularly among African Americans and Latinos.<sup>9</sup>

Approval of SPD increased by 11 percentage points among Latinos, 17 percent among LGBT residents, 3 percentage points among Asian Americans, and 6 percentage points among white Seattleites.<sup>10</sup> Especially given the current focus in many communities and in public dialogue about policing issues, it is noteworthy that confidence and trust in SPD was identified as having improved in several areas of the community over the past two years. More details on the results of that survey, previously filed with the Court in September 2015 and summarized again in the Monitor's Sixth Semiannual Report in December 2015, are included in Appendix C.<sup>11</sup> Chief O'Toole's prioritization of community policing is apparent in tangible and operational ways. All precincts have been required to develop and are implementing micro-community or neighborhood policing plans; training around bias-free policing and de-escalation tactics is being provided to lay the ground work for more respectful front-line encounters; and new or strengthened structures and systems are in place to improve partnerships with the community and other governmental organizations to promote an organizational commitment to a culture of collaboration and problem-solving.

SPD has also advanced another basic strategy for fostering trust and improving collaboration: having officers directly engaged with community members to address ongoing neighborhood concerns. Specifically, SPD made precinct commanders and their staff responsible for engaging the community on an ongoing basis around identifying and addressing the problems prioritized by the community, and have assigned specific officers to engage with targeted parts of the community to address specific issues (such as officers who are dedicated to LGBTQ issues, youth engagement, and so on).

Thus, it appears that overall structural reforms and efforts of the Department with respect to improving community perception of the SPD are on the right track. Again, Chief O'Toole and her command staff should be credited with re-focusing SPD's efforts on partnering closely with the community – and advancing programs that situate community policing not as a separate or add-on program but as a core means by which the SPD conducts primary law enforcement functions on a daily and shift-by-shift basis.

Despite this notable progress, the SPD efforts to date are just a beginning to the steps necessary to establishing an organizational culture capable of building and sustaining trust with the community. For one thing, SPD readily admits that its community policing strategies remain an active area of focus and effort. Numerous members of the Department with whom we have spoken readily admit that the Department still has much work to do to realize the full potential of its community policing strategies and programs.

Perhaps most critically, it appears that SPD has not yet benefitted from an overall strategy to engage certain individuals within some historically under-represented portions of the Seattle community – including those who are isolated from governmental organizations and systems; who do not attend meetings; or who are often involved in police contacts on the street and feel disrespected or victimized by the police. Although it is an imperfect term, we refer to these under-represented groups as “isolated communities.” According to at least some individuals and community representatives, this may include (but is not limited to), individuals within some portions of the African, African-American, Hispanic and Latino, Native American, Asian-American,

---

<sup>9</sup> Sixth Semiannual Report at 2.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* at 2–3; Dkt. 235.

refugee, and immigrant communities – as well as some who are young, experiencing mental illness or substance abuse challenges, veterans, navigating re-entry from prison or the correctional system, and others.

We were told by some community members that little has changed over the past few years with respect to officers gaining the trust of portions of these isolated communities. In particular, we heard from some that harassment and disrespect are still viewed as a common occurrence; that officers show a lack of cultural understanding; and, perhaps most importantly, that there is no mechanism in place for these isolated communities to voice their concerns or see the SPD attempt to address them. We have heard the concerns of individuals with movements such as Black Lives Matter who believe that SPD, like police agencies across the country, continue a history of violence, disrespect, or apathy against individuals in some communities.

The Monitor’s quantitative survey did find some evidence that “there is more hard work to be done in improving the ongoing relationship between SPD and . . . the African-American community”<sup>12</sup>:

The most notable group that has not seen confidence in SPD grow is African-Americans. A small plurality approved of SPD in 2013 (48 percent approv[ing], 40 percent disapprov[ing]), and that[ i]s still true today (49 percent approv[ing], 42 percent disapprov[ing]). African-Americans are also the only group more likely to strongly disapprove of Seattle PD (27 percent) than they are to strongly approve (13 percent).<sup>13</sup>

In our interviews with SPD members, officers had the impression that community relations were generally solid and positive. We did not see or hear sustained awareness on the part of many in the SPD that certain portions of the community have in fact felt that little has changed. At higher levels, the SPD recently has begun to attempt to articulate a more comprehensive strategy, to coordinate all of its myriad community outreach efforts, and to include efforts to reach all parts of the community. It indicates that it has been, and will continue, to reach out to communities and community organizations that feel excluded, victimized, injured, or or aggrieved by SPD – even when those groups may, at times and in a good number of instances understandably, be skeptical, uncomfortable, or resistant to doing so. The Monitoring Team endorses and appreciates SPD’s recognition that SPD most continually redouble its efforts toward partnering with community groups to identify mechanisms for interacting specifically with individuals who are not engaging as fully and comprehensively as necessary in SPD’s current outreach efforts.

It is a fact of democratic participation and community governance that no single organization, commission, or group can always perfectly reflect the views, opinions, concerns, values, and experiences of all individuals that they purport to represent. Likewise, SPD cannot presume, or expect, that those individuals who do routinely attend community meetings, participate in stakeholder groups, or otherwise affirmatively become involved necessarily speak for everyone in the community. The solution, then, is to make continual efforts to find new forums and tools for outreach that will engage citizens who have an interest in how they are policed but who may not traditionally be involved in more formal outreach processes.

Crucially, SPD and the City of Seattle must always commit to seeking out, listening to, and engaging with those who may not attend community meetings, may not be part of formal community or advocacy organizations, and who may know little about the day-to-day activities of the Department or the police reform process. The Department and other stakeholders must ensure that it has mechanisms in place for incorporating the values,

---

<sup>12</sup> Sixth Semiannual Report at 3.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* at 2–3.

experiences, interests, and histories not just of those who have the ability, resources, or inclination to be formally involved in police reform and accountability issues but also of those who, in the midst of living their lives and focusing on day-to-day concerns, are directly impacted by how policing is conducted in the City of Seattle.

Finally, “[i]t is important for the community to know that feedback they provide . . . is being used to create positive change.”<sup>14</sup> The Monitoring Team recommends that SPD expand its community engagement strategies to ensure inclusion, across Seattle’s diverse communities, of those more isolated populations, provide a feedback loop for their input, and demonstrate that the diverse voices of the community are being heard. This may take a substantial amount of time. It will likely not be easy. However, such outreach is necessary to ensure that the Consent Decree delivers a renewed and responsive relationship between SPD and the entire Seattle community.

---

<sup>14</sup> 2014 Community Engagement Letter at 4.

## A Note on Methodology

As this report makes clear throughout, the present assessment is a survey of SPD's current community policing efforts and initiatives. It discusses a host of factors, characteristics, initiatives, and features of strong community policing and trusting relationships between the police and the community. Any one area could be the subject of a detailed, standalone inquiry and report. In many instances, we flag for SPD, CPC, other community organizations, the Seattle media, and other stakeholders the areas that may benefit from additional study, scrutiny, and focus going forward.

Put differently, this assessment is a survey – addressing a host of important topics and issue areas. The treatment of any one area is constrained to at least some extent. The Monitor intends to explore some areas more closely in the coming months. In other areas, the Team invites other stakeholders to provide additional information or views going forward.

This report summarizes and describes comment and input that the Monitoring Team received from various members of the community. This report does not name or provide specific identifying characteristics of those who participated in the interviews and discussions undertaken during the assessment. However, we understand that readers of this report – like early reviewers of drafts of – may want to know more about the individuals, organizations, and community representatives with whom we spoke.

A primary issue that we confronted was some wariness and unwillingness by some to talk with us – out of fear that their comments would be connected with them later and that they would face repercussions for their candor or willingness to participate in the first instance. To obtain the participants' informed consent, the Monitoring Team told all participants that, although the substance of their comments might be summarized in a written, public report, their names would not be used and their identities obscured to avoid direct identification.<sup>15</sup>

Preserving the confidentiality of participants, and participant responses, is consistent with best practice for focus group and respondent-based qualitative research. Indeed, “the default position should be to mask specific identities unless a compelling reason not to is put forward”<sup>16</sup>:

Confidentiality arises from respect for the right to privacy, and functions as a 'precautionary principle.' Research interactions . . . are based on respondents' choice to disclose information to the researchers, some of which may be sensitive. In most cases, this disclosure happens in confidence; that is, on the basis of researchers' assurance that the connection between the individual respondent and the

<sup>15</sup> See, e.g., Steinar Kvale & Svend Brinkmann, *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing* 70-72 (2d ed., 2009) (describing issues of informed consent in interview-based qualitative research); Robert K. Yin, *Qualitative Research from Start to Finish* 45-48 (2010) (summarizing concerns related to informed consent of study participants).

<sup>16</sup> Accord Tim May, *Qualitative Research in Action* 153 (2002) (“Even in those cases where the subjects say they don't care about either, or request that their names be made public in the report, both anonymity and confidentiality must not be compromised.”); Carol A. Bailey, *A Guide to Qualitative Field Research* 24 (2d Ed. 2007) (“A great deal of fieldwork is done under conditions of confidentiality . . .”); George Kamberelis & Greg Dimitriadis, “Focus Group Research: Retrospect and Prospect,” in *Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Patricia Leavy, ed.) 315, 332 (observing that a central concern of Institutional Review Boards is “insuring ‘anonymity’ or protecting the rights of participants to be anonymous in formal or informal public presentations of research”); see generally Gretchen B. Grossman & Sharon F. Rallis, *Learning in the Field: An Introduction to Qualitative Research* 73 (2011) (noting that confidentiality “has two elements: protecting the privacy of participants (identities, names, and specific roles) and holding in confidence what they share with you (not sharing it with others using their names)”).

information disclosed will not be made known to third parties by the researcher, nor will it be able to be inferred from the research report.<sup>17</sup>

“For qualitative researchers, maintaining respondent confidentiality while presenting rich, detailed accounts of social life presents unique challenges”<sup>18</sup>:

Participants need to be assured of the confidentiality and anonymity of their comments. Typically these assurances are given when seeking informed consent for participation and in the introduction to the group discussion. Researchers must then implement measures to ensure confidentiality and anonymity throughout the research process . . . . There may be other details which link . . . information to a specific individual. These details should be removed to ensure participant’s anonymity.<sup>19</sup>

The use of “pseudonyms and eliminating all identity markers . . . are the typical ways the identities of research subjects are protected.”<sup>20</sup> Indeed, describing the views, experiences, and opinions of participants in generalized or aggregated ways – free of specific identifying markers or characteristics and without inventorying every individual who provided feedback and insight – is consistent with reports produced by CPC<sup>21</sup> and other Consent Decree stakeholders.<sup>22</sup> Accordingly, this report declines to specifically identify the names, identities, or affiliations of individuals who we interviewed during this assessment period.

Monitoring Team researchers used a semi-structured interview technique in which the nature and scope of inquiry were standardized but interviewers could probe and follow up in a manner consistent with the responses of interviewers.<sup>23</sup> The Team asked interviewees about the SPD’s efforts in the areas discussed in this report and outlined in Appendix A.

<sup>17</sup> Keith F. Punch, *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches* 47 (2013); accord Marlene de Laine, *Fieldwork, Participation and Practice: Ethics and Dilemmas in Qualitative Research* 80 (2000) (“The study of sensitive topics which provoke the disclosure of highly personal and confidential information requires strategies be imported into the interview encounter to protect the respondent and interviewer alike.”); Rose Wiles, Graham Crow, Sue Heath & Vikki Charles, “The Management of Confidentiality and Anonymity in Social Research,” 11 *Int. J. Social Research Methodology* 417, 417 (2008) (“The notion of confidentiality is underpinned by the principle of respect for autonomy and is taken to mean that identifiable information about individuals collected during the process of research will not be disclosed without permission.”)

<sup>18</sup> Karen Kaiser, “Protecting Respondent Confidentiality in Qualitative Research,” 19 *Qual. Health Res.* 1632, 1632 (2009); Wendy Hollway & Tony Jefferson, *Doing Qualitative Research Differently: Free Association, Narrative, and the Interview Method* 90 (2000) (“Confidentiality can be one of the least problematic of the ethical issues [in qualitative interview research]. If information is treated and used in such a way as to be secure and to ensure the anonymity of participants, the ethical responsibility usually ends there. This should be the case whether or not an explicit pledge of confidentiality has been given.”).

<sup>19</sup> Monique M. Hennink, *International Focus Group Research: A Handbook for the Health and Social Sciences* 38–41 (2007).

<sup>20</sup> *Id.*

<sup>21</sup> Seattle Community Police Commission, “Community Outreach Report” at 6–8 (Jan. 2014), available at [http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/CommunityPoliceCommission/Outreach%20Report%2001-24-14\(0\).pdf](http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/CommunityPoliceCommission/Outreach%20Report%2001-24-14(0).pdf) (summarizing “key themes from community meetings” by offering, for instance, that “[t]hose who attended the meetings believed police demonstrate bias”; “[m]any cited personal experience or knowledge of the [use of force problem] problem in their own communities”; “[m]any commented that SPD’s proposed policy was cumbersome”; and “[m]any favored very limited officer discretion . . .”).

<sup>22</sup> United States Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division and U.S. Atty’s Office, W.D. Wash., Investigation of Seattle Police Department (Dec. 16, 2011) at 24, available at [http://static.squarespace.com/static/5425b9f0e4b0d66352331e0e/t/5436d96ee4b087e24b9d38a1/1412880750546/spd\\_fin\\_dletter\\_12-16-11.pdf](http://static.squarespace.com/static/5425b9f0e4b0d66352331e0e/t/5436d96ee4b087e24b9d38a1/1412880750546/spd_fin_dletter_12-16-11.pdf) (“Many community members we spoke to also emphasized that they believe SPD officers should be doing much more to de-escalate confrontations.”).

<sup>23</sup> See, e.g., Margaret C. Harrell & Melissa A. Bradley, RAND Corporation, *Data Collection Methods: Semi-Structured Interviews & Focus Groups* 27 (2009); accord Emily Adler & Roger Clark, *An Invitation to Social Research: How It’s Done* 255 (2014)

The Team interviewed officers, community leaders, residents, SPD command staff, and others throughout the Seattle community. Particular effort was made toward trying to engage with members of historically underrepresented or marginalized groups. The Monitor notes, however, that – without question – the Team could have and wanted to conduct further interviews to greater ensure a true representation of all views across Seattle. Although the Team did its best to solicit diverse viewpoints, this report declines to make any representations as to the scientific validity or representation of the individuals sampled for the qualitative interviews and discussions. Indeed, the Team is certain that any report on the broad area of public confidence and trust in law enforcement could always benefit from yet more views, input, and participation from community members with further experience, history, concerns, and values relating to how policing is conducted in Seattle. Nonetheless, our approach – which attempted to get a get a cross-section of community input and public opinion but does not make any representations as to whether all conceivable strains of opinions or views were incorporated – is consistent with prior work in the area of community input and views from other stakeholders involved in the Consent Decree process.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Seattle Community Police Commission, “Community Outreach Report” at 5 (Jan. 2014) (“The CPC survey was designed to facilitate broader participation; it was not designed or administered in a way that would result in a statistical representation of community views of all who live or work in Seattle.”).

# Part 1.

## Community Confidence

Academic research, real-world investigations, and the experience of other law enforcement agencies – including those like Los Angeles and Cincinnati which have successfully implemented Department of Justice or other consent decrees – suggest several general drivers of public trust and confidence in police agencies. The factors that influence confidence in law enforcement are diverse. “Perceptions of [police] misconduct are more influenced by media consumption, community factors – be they ethnic/racial or geographical – and experiences (direct or vicarious) of police-initiated contacts, than are attitudes towards effectiveness and responsiveness.”<sup>25</sup>

We turn our attention here to five areas that literature and real-world experience have identified as drivers of public trust – and what role, if any, they are currently playing on the streets of Seattle’s diverse communities: the visibility of police, quality of police encounters, neighborhood and socio-economic factors, community cooperation with law enforcement, “vicarious experiences” and media influences involving the police. The sixth, major area – the quality of a law enforcement agency’s community policing and community engagement efforts – is addressed in Part 2.

### A. Visibility of Police

“[T]he extent of visible local policing . . . affect[s] concern about crime *and* confidence . . .”<sup>26</sup> Some research has indicated that “[r]espondents who recalled spotting police on patrol in their neighborhood recently grew less worried about crime” and, at the same time, had “increased confidence in the police.”<sup>27</sup> In fact, some research suggests that the visibility of police in residents’ neighborhoods positively may even influence opinions of the police to the same extent or more than the quality of interactions between residents and the police.<sup>28</sup>

During our assessment, we found that the SPD is making a coordinated effort to make officers more visible:

- The micro-community policing plans require officers to engage with community members to learn about their priorities and to engage with them in problem-solving;
- Neighborhood response teams help implement this policy by working on quality of life issues in neighborhoods;
- Liaisons interact with specific communities, such as the LGBTQ and youth communities; and
- Numerous other specialized programs, such as advisory council meetings, community walks, doughnut dialogues, find it-fix it surveys, neighborhood watch, and the Safe at Home program that recruited over 600 businesses to engage around LGBTQ issues, all communicate an intention to get officers out of their cars and dealing with the public in an effort to be more visible and proactively engaged.

<sup>25</sup> Joel Miller & Robert C. Davis, “Unpacking public attitudes to the police: Contrasting perceptions of misconduct with traditional measures of satisfaction,” 10 *Int’l J. Police Sci. & Mgmt.* 9, 11–12 (2008).

<sup>26</sup> Wesley G. Skogan, “Concern About Crime and Confidence in the Police,” 12 *Police Quarterly* 301, 312 (2009).

<sup>27</sup> *Id.*

<sup>28</sup> James Hawdon & John Ryan, “Police-Resident Interactions and Satisfaction with Police: An Empirical Test of Community Policing Assertions,” 14 *Crim. Justice Pol’y Rev.* 1, 1 (2003).

It should also be noted that the Downtown Seattle Association spends around \$325,000 per year to hire off-duty police, in uniform, to help patrol downtown – in large part to increase police visibility in the downtown corridor.

We found no clear evidence, however, about whether the strategy to make officers visible is working, in the sense that more people interacting with officers and those interactions leading to greater trust. In the Monitoring Team’s scientific survey, 56 percent of those surveyed agreed that SPD is generally present in their neighborhood and patrolling it regularly. It seems, then, that public perception of SPD’s visibility depends on whom you ask and what neighborhood they live or work in.

Other community members and SPD personnel noted that members of certain neighborhoods, such as the International District, frequently communicate that they do not have enough officers stationed in their area and, as a result, are not as visible as they would like in the community there.

Another leader of a minority community stated that some people run when they see the police because of a lack of trust– a sign that increased visibility, in itself, is an incomplete strategy to build a strong relationship with groups who have a deep mistrust of the police.

We commend the SPD for multiple efforts to increase the visibility of their officers, and believe these efforts should continue. However, such efforts alone are insufficient; they must continue to be in concert with many other initiatives discussed in this assessment below to strengthen the relationship between SPD and all of the Seattle community.

## B. Quality of Police Encounters

“Probably the most common explanation for variations in public confidence is that more frequent and more negative encounters with the police generate greater antipathy toward the police . . . .”<sup>29</sup> Somewhat problematically for police departments, research in some communities has found that any type of contact, whether positive or negative, can reduce trust and confidence in police:

[Although] recent contacts of any kind with the police—both positive and negative—reduced confidence in them, . . . having a negatively rated experience with police had three times the impact [on overall confidence in the police] of a positively rated experience . . . [T]he effect of a negatively rated encounter on confidence in the police was the most powerful [research predictor].<sup>30</sup>

On the other hand, other research suggests that at least some types of police-community interactions can drive confidence. For example, in one study, “victimization experiences and traffic tickets tended to reduce confidence in the police, while voluntary contacts with the police would increase confidence in the police.”<sup>31</sup> This view is supported by academic research on procedural justice models. Per that line of research:

<sup>29</sup> Joel Miller & Robert C. Davis, “Unpacking public attitudes to the police: Contrasting perceptions of misconduct with traditional measures of satisfaction,” 10 *Int’l J. of Police Sci. & Mgmt.* 9, 11–12 (2008).

<sup>30</sup> Wesley G. Skogan, “Concern About Crime and Confidence in the Police,” 12 *Police Quarterly* 301, 312–13 (2009).

<sup>31</sup> Ling Ren, et al, “Linking confidence in the police with the performance of the police: Community policing can make a difference,” 33 *J. Crim. Sci.* 62 (2005).

[T]reatment perceived by the public to be fair and equitable is most likely to result in improved trust and confidence. Judgments among the public about everyday policing appear to place less emphasis on concrete outcomes . . . and more emphasis on the quality of personal encounters. This suggests that public opinions can be enhanced by those aspects of encounters over which officers have most control – the ways in which they treat people and communicate their decisions.<sup>32</sup>

Accordingly, “by using fair procedures, the police can increase their legitimacy, even if their policing activities involve restricting or sanctioning the people with whom they are dealing.”<sup>33</sup> What matters most in the area of public confidence is not what happens as a result of an interaction with the police – the fact of being pulled over, stopped, detained, cited, or arrested, for instance – but what happens during the interaction with the police – or how the individual believes he or she was treated.

In many ways, then, this factor is the most foundational one which this report addresses. Regardless of the intent of the Chief, the Department’s structure, officer training, SPD’s resources, or how transparent the organization’s culture is, SPD will not retain the trust of the community if officers are not viewed as treating citizens with respect, skill, and understanding. Further, in many historically underrepresented or vulnerable communities, poor treatment by one officer can trigger a belief that nothing has changed. As some community members have noted, “a single ‘bad’ officer can taint the reputation of the whole Department.”<sup>34</sup>

A general view of how SPD is doing with respect to the quality of its encounters and interactions with the Seattle population is captured in our survey on public confidence. That survey painted a mixed review of the status of trust between the SPD and community.

On the positive side, it appears that, at least overall, there are good signs of improvement. For example, people are now more pleased with the job the SPD is doing (64 percent approve and 25 percent disapprove, compared to 60 percent approving and 34 percent disapproving two years prior). Some of the groups more supportive of Seattle police this year include:

	2015	2013
<b>Latinos</b>	65 % approve / 23 % disapprove	54 % approve / 39 % disapprove
<b>LGBT</b>	72 % approve / 27 % disapprove	55 % approve / 44 % disapprove
<b>Asian Americans</b>	70 % approve / 17 % disapprove	67 % approve / 27 % disapprove

<sup>32</sup> Ben Bradford, et al, “Contact and confidence: Revisiting the impact of public encounters with the police,” 19 *Policing & Society* 20 (2009).

<sup>33</sup> Tom Tyler & Jeffrey Fagan, “Legitimacy and Cooperation: Why Do People Help the Police Fight Crime in Their Communities?” 6 *Ohio State J. Crim. Law* 231, 241 (2008).

<sup>34</sup> 2014 Community Outreach Report at 27.

**White**

66 % approve / 25 % disapprove	60 % approve / 35 % disapprove
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Significantly fewer people, including African Americans and Latinos, stated that they, themselves, have been victims of excessive force (1 percent overall, and 1 percent for African Americans and Latinos, compared with 5 percent and 9 percent respectively two years prior). Likewise, there was an across-the-board improvement in perceptions of how SPD was handling non-traffic stops (65 percent approve, compared to 47 percent in 2013). Fewer people complained about poor treatment by police in 2015 than 2013.

On the other hand, there are still significant concerns about and issues with trust, especially among African American and Latino populations. African Americans report that they still are far more likely to be stopped by police in their cars (28 percent compared to 13 percent for whites).<sup>35</sup> Most Seattleites (54 percent) still think the SPD treats people differently according to their race. Almost three-quarters (73 percent) of African Americans say they aren't treated as well as other groups; only 49 percent of African-Americans approve of the SPD, which essentially is unchanged from 2013. Perceptions since 2013 have not changed in terms of the belief that SPD commits excessive force (46 percent in 2015 versus 45 percent in 2013, even though less than 1 percent of Seattleites report being victims of excessive force).

The survey also asked those who had been stopped by the SPD about the quality of their interaction. On the positive side, fewer people of all races reported problems with their personal experiences. For example, 65 percent of all of those who had been stopped approved of their experience, compared with 47 percent in 2013 - a significant increase. In addition, African-Americans and Latinos showed a significant increase in their overall approval of personal experiences (57 percent and 52 percent approval, compared with 36 percent and 39 percent in 2013).

However, significant racial disparities still persist. For example, 23 percent of Latinos stopped by the police, and 20 percent of African-Americans, felt that the SPD engaged in verbally abusive language, while only 7 percent of white respondents stopped by police felt the same way. Twenty-two percent of African-Americans stopped, including for traffic violations, felt like officers threatened to use physical force other than handcuffing, compared to 12 percent for white respondents.

In our interviews with members of SPD and some community members we heard sentiments consistent with the survey. Although SPD may be improving in building relationships with the community as a whole, there are perceptions among individuals within the community who feel like nothing has changed.

In our interviews with various community members, a number believed that, for certain populations, the level of mistreatment, perceived or real, at the hands of the police remains unchanged since those surveys and community meetings were held. For example, one community leader tasked with listening to the Latino community said that he believes that the relationship between your "average Latino" and the SPD is not good, that there is a problem with the "systemic relationship." Several leaders of the Native American community stated that they believe that Native Americans are still harassed on a regular basis and that there is

<sup>35</sup> The Monitoring Team's upcoming assessment on stops and detentions will seek to independently evaluate, with SPD data, whether the data does or does not tend to support this view. Nonetheless, the fact that these groups believe it to be the case is something that SPD will need to continue to address going forward.

insufficient understanding of their culture. Similarly, a leader tasked with listening to the African-American community said that many community members, especially young people, continue to feel harassed and, consistent with the Monitoring Team's survey, most people do not file complaints because they feel like it will not make a difference or they have been turned away from making complaints in the past.

Our discussion with SPD personnel tends to support the view that SPD officers may still have a distance to travel toward being able to police with a full understanding of the unique challenges, backgrounds, and experiences of the many communities that they serve. A number of officers in fact indicated to us that an understanding by their peers, of how to engage with diverse parts of the community, is inconsistent in the Department.

SPD is not, by any means, alone on these challenging issues. Police agencies across the country have encountered difficulties in mending relationships with the community. Officers and command staff alike may lack the background, training, or knowledge of best practices that might enable them to improve their skills in addressing such difficult relationships.

As noted above, although we acknowledge that the term is imperfect, for simplicity, we refer to all community members who – for reasons related to race, ethnicity, religion, socio-economic status, country or community of origin, immigration or refugee status, gender identity, physical limitations or challenges, sexual orientation, veteran status, experience of mental health or substance abuse issues, homelessness, language, or other cultural statuses or affiliation – have historically felt marginalized, victimized, or ignored by the police when we use the term “isolated communities.” Each of these sub-groups, and sub-groups within each sub-group, often have distinct concerns, histories, experiences, and values relating to SPD. However, a common refrain that we identified among these diverse sub-groups was the sense that, in the past and in a number of instances continuing to today, their voices were not heard and their interests not fully taken into account by SPD.

There is much that SPD must incorporate within its own structure to engrain community outreach and engagement as a core function of the Department. For example, there do not appear to be sufficient structures or efforts in place to attempt to take on these most challenging community relationships. In interviewing most SPD personnel, for example, we did not hear any mention of efforts to engage the hard-to-reach as an issue on their radar. The advisory councils, micro-community policing strategies, neighborhood watch groups, and other outreach efforts are not necessarily designed to reach people who feel harassed by, or fear, the police. Experience shows it is unlikely they will show up to meetings and, even if they do, a few meetings with them will not alter a level of mistrust that took decades to develop.

There is no clearly established playbook or cookie-cutter approach for building trust with what we are referring to here as isolated communities. There is no single formula for success. However, a review of existing literature, promising practices, and successful work done in communities around the nation make clear that certain elements must be in place for us to judge the process to be on the right track.

First, as referenced above, SPD must institutionalize its outreach to the harder-to-reach members of Seattle's communities. We were encouraged to hear that some plans and efforts have begun to be formulated to address this issue. For example, an effort is being designed to have advisory councils come up with community policing plans that focus on various identity-based communities, as opposed to just geographic considerations. This idea has real potential to create a structured, thoughtful approach to reaching and engaging with specific populations that have been missed in the past.

In addition, the Department has just begun to attempt to bring together its many community outreach efforts into a comprehensive, coordinated strategy. And, it should be mentioned, that the Department's list of community outreach efforts is long. By way of example only, the SPD community relations unit engaged 19 youth of color to help create dialogue and training around youth issues; a summit was held in the East African Community to attempt to reach isolated community members; approximately 60 officers have volunteered to be liaisons to various communities, the Department is looking to identify other community liaisons to help; and the SPD is working with community colleges to provide classes in community policing, with a focus on the how this can broaden their hiring efforts.

There is no shortage of energy and effort in terms of the SPD trying to engage the community, and such efforts and the intent behind them, are promising. However, the Department is just getting started on creating a structured approach designed to reach those who have been mistrustful and felt more isolated. We hope that these new steps are continued with the sense of urgency and importance they deserve.

Second, once isolated populations are reached, there must be some process in place to create some reconciliation with respect to past conduct, dialogue, and mutual understanding and respect moving forward. We know from years of study and experience in the area of conflict resolution that simply bringing together people with deep mistrust will not alone solve the problem. A thoughtful, tested strategy must be used to get people to hear and then understand each other. Such a process can be time consuming and messy.<sup>36</sup>

### C. Neighborhood/Socio-Economic Factors

Several studies emphasize “how people’s neighborhood context can determine their attitudes: people who reside in the same community (often) share norms and values that affect their view of the world.”<sup>37</sup>

As noted in other sections of this report, the SPD has taken positive steps to tailor its policing strategies to match the characteristics of specific Seattle neighborhoods. The SPD’s micro-community policing plans divided the City into 55 neighborhoods, with an attempt to draw the boundaries as close as possible to those created by organic differences and natural boundaries in the area, as opposed to political boundaries. The plans have officers engaging with community members to listen to and better understand their priorities, and then attempt to shape their policing strategy around those priorities. As noted elsewhere in this report, while the Department has a lot of work to do to reach its greatest potential in implementing this strategy, we believe the effort complies with this best practice of tailoring the provision of law enforcement services neighborhood by neighborhood.

<sup>36</sup> See, e.g., David Kennedy, “Drugs, Race and Common Ground: Reflections on the High Point Intervention”, *NIJ Journal*, Issue No. 262 (March 2009) (structured conversations to deal with drug issues created a fundamentally new understanding between police and the community); Zoe Mentel, “Racial Reconciliation, Truth-Telling, and Police Legitimacy,” U.S. Department of Justice (Aug. 2012) (engaging in process of racial reconciliation can increase police legitimacy and goodwill with community); Frabutt, J.M., M.K., Harvey, L.K., Di Luca, K.L., & Shelton, T.L. (2009), “Key Community Stakeholders In a Police Community Partnership To Eliminate Street Drug Markets: Roles, Engagement, and Assessment of the Strategy,” *Crime, Punishment and the Law: An International Journal* 2 (1-2), 55-70 (reconciliation process creates conversations that create common ground with law enforcement); Levine Bertram, *Resolving Racial Conflict: The Community Relations Service and Civil Rights, 1964-1989* (2005); Portilla, J., “What Exists Is Possible: Stories from Conflict Resolution Professional,” *24 Conflict Resolution Quarterly* (2006) (lessons learned from interviews of conflict resolution efforts, including the need for a formal structure to communicate).

<sup>37</sup> Joel Miller & Robert C. Davis, “Unpacking public attitudes to the police: Contrasting perceptions of misconduct with traditional measures of satisfaction,” *10 Int’l J. of Police Sci. & Mgmt.* 9, 11–12 (2008) (collecting studies).

Also, as noted throughout this report, the variations in public perception of the SPD reinforce the idea that building and assessing trust is a task that is different from community to community. As made clear by the survey as well as our interviews, many who engage with the police in order to partner with them have a positive view of the SPD, while communities with historical mistrust continue to have negative perceptions of the police. For example, a significant majority of people who have been to a community meeting with police approve of the SPD (68 percent). This approval rate increases to 75 percent for those who have participated in a neighborhood/block captain watch program or living room conversation.

As another example, variations in survey results can be found in looking at the police job ratings by precinct. For example, the job approval rating for the North Precinct was at 67 percent in the 2015 survey, while the West precinct received a 73 percent approval rating. The East and South precincts came in significantly lower, at 52 percent and 56 percent. Clearly, then, SPD may need to undertake different strategies or do additional things in the East and South precincts than in the other precincts

The SPD's micro-community policing plans provide an excellent opportunity to tailor their policing strategies and programs to better meet neighborhood needs and promote greater trust, and we believe it is a structural change that was needed and in line with best practices. However, the SPD should strengthen this structure and further refine its implementation in order to improve their opportunities for achieving greater success in working with those communities and neighborhoods most mistrustful of its officers.

## D. Community Cooperation with Law Enforcement

“Community cooperation may be the most critical factor for the successful implementation of a community policing program.”<sup>38</sup> Indeed, “[t]o be effective in lowering crime and creating secure communities, the police must be able to elicit cooperation from community residents.”<sup>39</sup> This “cooperation potentially involves, on the part of the public, both obeying the law and working with the police or others in the community to help combat crime in the community.”<sup>40</sup>

Another possible measure of civilian comfort with cooperating with law enforcement is the willingness of the public to make formal complaints about alleged misconduct or mistreatment. Accordingly, we looked at the numbers of externally-generated (i.e. public) complaints filed with OPA during the six-month time period of May through October of 2014 through the same May through October period in 2015.

As Table 1 summarizes, 2015 has seen more complaints filed with OPA by civilians than the analogous period the year prior. There are, of course, several potential reasons for the increase. One could be that SPD officers are engaged in more misconduct, or complaint-causing behaviors, now than they did a year ago. Alternatively, the increase in such complaints could also be the result of normal fluctuations and anomalies in data, or even attributable to improved public perceptions that the SPD will treat such complaints seriously. It is beyond the purview of this particular assessment to explore and explain whether the increase in complaints is or is not due to any of these possible factors.

<sup>38</sup> James Hawdon & John Ryan, “Police-Resident Interactions and Satisfaction with Police: An Empirical Test of Community Policing Assertions,” 14 *Crim. Justice Pol’y Rev.* 1, 1 (2003) (collecting authority).

<sup>39</sup> Tom Tyler & Jeffrey Fagan, “Legitimacy and Cooperation: Why Do People Help the Police Fight Crime in Their Communities?,” 6 *Ohio State J. Crim. Law* 231, 232 (2008).

<sup>40</sup> *Id.*

Regardless of whether the civilian complaints have merit or not, what is clear is that complainants are filing more formal complaints about police performance to the OPA now than they were even just one year ago. Seemingly, the public is at the very least, no less comfortable in complaining about the police now than they were in the past and with OPA as a body that will fairly receive and address such complaints.

**Table 1: Number of Civilian Complaints to OPA**

	External		Contact Log	
	2014	2015	2014	2015
May	45	36	48	54
June	30	47	44	46
July	40	45	54	71
August	32	40	36	69
September	33	39	48	40
October	27	25	58	60
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>340</b>

The Monitoring Team cannot say with certainty at this time why OPA complaints are up in a 6-month period of 2015 as compared to the analogous period of 2014. What does seem clear is that the public is continuing to take their complaints about the police to OPA. This is a sign that at least some members of the community believe fair, thorough internal investigations of officer misconduct will be conducted and that there is some merit to cooperating with what is essentially a civilian-led and civilian-supervised administrative investigation of their claims.

A separate, additional metric that reveals something about public confidence in the police is a department's homicide clearance rate. Although it is not a perfect measure, it is to be expected that when members of the public have greater trust in the police, they will be less reluctant to provide information to the police. In turn, this cooperation is essential and thereby enables the department to solve more crimes. Although many factors outside a department's control influence the homicide clearance rate, trends over time reveal something about the quality and breadth of information that a department receives from members of the public who witness, know about, or are victims of crime. It has been well established that the ability of the police to solve homicides, much as is the case with other criminal investigations, is overwhelmingly dependent upon the level of cooperation and assistance they receive from the public.

Department records indicate that in 2012 – immediately following the DOJ investigation and while the Consent Decree was being negotiated between the United States and City of Seattle – SPD cleared barely one-third (35 percent) of homicides, either by arrest or for some other reason (including the death of an offender, a prosecutor declining to file charges, an originally-investigated homicide ultimately turns out to be suicide or self-defense, and the like). The clearance rate improved to 57 percent in 2013 and 68 percent in 2014. The year-to-date clearance rate for 2015 is 59 percent, although the current rate could ultimately prove to be higher given that more recent homicide incidents are likely to still be under investigation and not yet closed.

**Table 2: Homicide Clearance Data, 2012 – 2015 (through Dec. 4)**

	2015 (through Dec. 4)	2014	2013	2012
Cleared by Arrest	10	13	10	5
Cleared by Exception	3	2	2	3
Total Cases	22	22	21	23
<b>Clearance Rate</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>35%</b>

SPD's clearance rates have, then, substantially improved during the pendency of the Consent Decree. The improved clearance rates might suggest that the public is more willing, at least in some instances, to cooperate with the Department and provide information material for identifying the perpetrators of crime. This expanded cooperation could appear to represent tangible and important progress – emphasizing the extent to which a renewed relationship between SPD and the community can drive greater public safety.

On the other hand, the aggregate information presented in Table 2 does not provide information about the nature of the cases cleared or not cleared. It might be, for instance, that, in those cases where public cooperation is most crucial, the same relative percentage are going unsolved now as several years ago. It was beyond the ability of the Monitoring Team, in this report, to systematically review all homicide case files. As such, the aggregate data presented and discussed here is inconclusive. However, these clearance rates, if analyzed properly and over time, can be an indicator of public trust. We recommend that the SPD and/or other stakeholders track and analyze data of this nature on an ongoing basis to help assess community trust.

## E. “Vicarious” Experiences & Media Influences

Generally, hearing about a negative interaction that someone else had with the police tends to reduce public confidence in law enforcement.<sup>41</sup> Accordingly, some portion of gauging public trust and confidence in the SPD, as with any police department, can be imprecise and constantly changing.

“[W]ord of mouth is still a serious factor in negative opinions of SPD.”<sup>42</sup> Specifically, the quantitative survey of community confidence found:

49% of African Americans say they get much of their information through word of mouth. We conclude based on the data that bad police interactions have a multiplier effect that flows through the community as people tell their family, friends, and neighbors about their experiences. The bad news still travels faster than the good

<sup>41</sup> Joel Miller & Robert C. Davis, “Unpacking public attitudes to the police: Contrasting perceptions of misconduct with traditional measures of satisfaction,” 10 *Int'l J. of Police Sci. & Mgmt.* 9, 13 (2008) (summarizing literature).

<sup>42</sup> Brian Stryker, Anzalone Liszt Grove, Seattle Police Community Survey Findings (Sep. 10, 2015) at 2, available at <http://static1.squarespace.com/static/5425b9f0e4b0d66352331e0e/t/562ce664e4b022641dac5c59/1445783140680/ALG+SUMMARY+-+SEATTLE+POLICE+SURVEY+2015.pdf>.

when it comes to community-police interactions: people are much more likely to disapprove of how the police treated someone they know who interacted with the police (31% disapprove) than they are to disapprove of how they were treated (23% disapprove). We fully expect to see a 'data lag' here due to fundamentals of word of mouth communication and of human psychology.<sup>43</sup>

SPD must continually recognize that every encounter on the street matters, with change institutionalized throughout the Department and across every unit. We heard numerous stories of the great work of extraordinary officers who excel at community policing – but the corresponding sense that such work is quickly undone by the poor performance or inferior treatment by other officers in other instances. We also heard numerous SPD officers and supervisors state that, in just about every unit, there are some officers who are very skilled at community engagement and others who are very poor at it. This inconsistency is concerning given the impact a single officer can make on an entire communities' perceptions and trust.

There have been several positive encounters between Seattle police officers and community members that have been the focus of prominent media attention.<sup>44</sup> As with nearly any organization, there will always be both positive and negative stories to write or run about the Seattle Police Department. It should be expected that the media report on problematic performance of SPD officers or instances where the Department may have fallen short of its ideals. However, if local media coverage does not or cannot fairly reflect the day-to-day realities of the Department, or does not describe troubling or problematic cases with the necessary context, it is entirely possible that community sentiment will understandably lag behind where the Department may really be with respect to sustained and authentic community engagement.

SPD has been creative and forward-thinking with respect to using social media, such as Twitter and Next Door, to communicate specific information among Seattle's many sub-communities and distinct groups. These affirmative efforts help to disseminate important messages to specifically affected communities and give those communities the sense that they are interacting directly with the Department on the issues that matter to them.

It should be noted that, as the survey research firm stated in its summary of the 2015 survey, "citizens nationwide have soured on police regarding race. In August 2014 Pew found that only 30 percent of Americans have "a great deal of confidence in police to treat whites and blacks equally. . . . Seattle PD are swimming against the tide of national popular opinion in trying to improve community perceptions regarding racial profiling."<sup>45</sup> It is notable that, in the current climate – where police performance has been significantly scrutinized in public discourse and the media, both nationally and locally – SPD has made strides in strengthening trust with the Seattle community. While "vicarious" experiences and media influences certainly do help to shape the perception of SPD among many in the community, SPD is, to at least some extent, defying national trends through their own, affirmative efforts toward reestablishing a closer, collaborative relationship with the community going forward.

<sup>43</sup> *Id.* at 2–3.

<sup>44</sup> CBS News, "Seattle police officer pulls car over, helps deliver baby" (Aug. 18, 2015), <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/seattle-police-officer-pulls-car-over-helps-deliver-baby/>; Kirk Johnson, "How Seattle Police and Social Media Solved Mystery of Stolen Camera," *N.Y. Times* (Oct. 31, 2015), <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/01/us/how-seattle-police-and-social-media-solved-mystery-of-stolen-camera.html?smprod=nytcore-iphone&smid=nytcore-iphone-share&r=0>.

<sup>45</sup> Dkt. 235-1 at 2.

## Part 2. Community Policing & Engagement

Generally, “strategies most likely to be effective in improving confidence are initiatives aimed at increasing community engagement.”<sup>46</sup> Indeed, experiences in many communities have demonstrated that departmental efforts at community policing and engagement contribute toward increased confidence and trust in the police.<sup>47</sup>

The issue of what constitutes community policing has long “suffered from conceptual confusion in both research and practice.”<sup>48</sup> Indeed, “[s]o many analysts have commented on the difficulties of defining community policing that it is now a cliché among the cognoscenti . . . . The ‘conceptual fuzziness’ of community policing has not really changed.”<sup>49</sup>

Part of the “fuzziness” stems from the need for community policing to reflect the concerns, desires, attitudes, and interests of the communities that a law enforcement agency serves. The implementation of all community policing efforts “occur in the context of local history and political culture, and these can be highly idiosyncratic.”<sup>50</sup> Ultimately, “strategies associated with the community policing philosophy should be tailored to the local community.”<sup>51</sup>

Because the term “community policing” can “mean different things to different people,”<sup>52</sup> it can be difficult to identify what specific measures a law enforcement agency undertakes which do, in fact, constitute “community policing” and to evaluate what “community policing” approaches work best in enhancing public confidence and public safety. Indeed, “[q]uantitative research on the dimensions of community policing is rare.”<sup>53</sup> Consequently, local decision makers sometimes struggle to translate support for the concept of community policing into substantive policy measures.<sup>54</sup>

Regardless of some conceptual indeterminacy, it can generally be defined as “a collaboration between the police and the community that identifies and solves problems.”<sup>55</sup> It constitutes “a policy and a strategy aimed at achieving more effective and efficient crime control, reduced fear of crime, improved quality of life, improved

<sup>46</sup> Andrew Rix, et al, “Improving public confidence in the police: a review of the evidence,” U.K. Research, Development and Statistics Directorate (2009) (summarizing research).

<sup>47</sup> Wesley G. Skogan, “Concern About Crime and Confidence in the Police,” 12 *Police Quarterly* 301, 313 (2009) (individuals in late 2000s “living in Houston’s three experimental [community] policing areas grew more confidence in the police” than those who lived in non-community policing areas).

<sup>48</sup> A. Gerasimos Gianakis, et al, “Reinventing or repackaging public services? The case of community-oriented policing,” 58 *Pub. Administration Rev.* 485 (1998).

<sup>49</sup> Edward R. Maguire & Stephen D. Mastrofski, “Patterns of Community Policing in the United States,” 3 *Police Quarterly* 4, 5 (2000).

<sup>50</sup> A. Gerasimos Gianakis, et al, “Reinventing or repackaging public services? The case of community-oriented policing,” 58 *Pub. Administration Rev.* 485 (1998).

<sup>51</sup> Allison T. Chappell, “The Philosophical Versus Actual Adoption of Community Policing: A Case Study,” 34 *Crim. Justice Rev.* 5, 22 (2009) (citing D. Weisburd & J.D. McElroy, “Enacting the CPO role: Findings from the New York City pilot program in community policing,” in J.R. Greene & S.D. Mastrofski (Eds.), *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?* 89–102 (1988)).

<sup>52</sup> Sutham Cheurprakobkit, “Community policing: Training, definitions and policy implications,” 25 *Policing* 709, 712 (2002).

<sup>53</sup> Edward R. Maguire & Stephen D. Mastrofski, “Patterns of Community Policing in the United States,” 3 *Police Quarterly* 4, 5 (2000).

<sup>54</sup> See *id.* (“Community policing has enormous symbolic appeal for local governments. It is likely that some local decision makers might want to enlist in the community policing movement for its message rather than its substance.”).

<sup>55</sup> Bureau of Justice Assistance, *Understanding Community Policing: A Framework in Action* xii (1994), available at <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/commp.pdf>.

services and police legitimacy, through a proactive reliance on community resources that seeks to change crime-causing conditions.”<sup>56</sup>

The COPS Office of the Department of Justice currently defines community policing as:

[A] philosophy that promotes organizational strategies that support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime.<sup>57</sup>

The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), and other organizations have adopted that definitional framework. According to that conception, community policing encompasses “three key components”: community partnerships, organizational transformation, and problem solving.<sup>58</sup>

Core features of community policing include the following:

It should be the standard operating method of policing, not an occasional special project; (2) it should be practiced by personnel throughout the ranks . . . ; (3) it should be empirical, in the sense that decisions are made on the basis of information that is gathered systematically; (4) it should involve, whenever possible, collaboration between police and other agencies and institutions; and (5) it should incorporate, wherever possible, community input and participation, so that it is the community's problems that are addressed (not just the police department's) and so that the community shares in the responsibility for its own protection.<sup>59</sup>

A number of programs, strategies, tactics, and approaches have come to fall under the “community policing” concept.<sup>60</sup> However, “[a]t its core, community policing is not a set of tactics, but instead is an organizational strategy for running a department.”<sup>61</sup>

In evaluating SPD's current community policing initiatives, the global inquiry was whether the various programs and initiatives that are viewed as being representative of community policing or community engagement are becoming woven into the fabric of both the Department and the community. In Seattle, efforts in the late 1990s and early 2000s to implement “community policing” at SPD “did not result in change in the core functions of policing; the organization's goals and structural arrangements remained largely intact.”<sup>62</sup>

The more specific inquiry was whether SPD is doing enough in a sufficient number of areas important to the Seattle community to set the foundation for a police-community relationship grounded in collaboration, mutual respect, and trust.

<sup>56</sup> R.R. Friedmann, *Community Policing: Comparative Perspectives & Prospects* (1992).

<sup>57</sup> COPS Office, U.S. Dept. of Justice, “Community Policing Defined” at 1 (2014), available at <http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/vets-to-cops/e030917193-CP-Defined.pdf>.

<sup>58</sup> *Id.*

<sup>59</sup> Gary W. Cordner, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 *Police Forum* 1, 5 (1995).

<sup>60</sup> See James Forman, Jr., “Community Policing and Youth as Assets,” 95 *J. Crim. L. & Criminology* 7 1, 8 (2004) (“Community policing . . . has come to refer to a wide variety of police tactics.”)

<sup>61</sup> *Id.*

<sup>62</sup> J.S. Zhao et al, “Community Policing: Did It Change the Basic Functions of Policing in the 1990s? A National Follow-Up Study,” 20 *Justice Quarterly* 697, 701 (2003) (discussing William Lyons, *The Politics of Community Policing: Rearranging the Power to Punish* (1999)).

The Monitoring Team evaluated how the Department is doing along an array of more general objectives, initiatives, attributes, or features. These were all derived from the following sources:

- COPS Office, U.S. Department of Justice, “Community Policing Self-Assessment Tool (2014);
- Police Foundation, Community Policing Activity Data (1993);
- COPS Office, Funding Accelerated for Small Towns (FAST) Survey (1994);
- COPS Office, Community Policing Information Worksheets (1994–1997); and
- *Understanding Community Policing: A Framework in Action* xii (1994), available at <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/commpp.pdf>.

Thus, the specific manifestations of SPD fulfilling or not fulfilling various factors associated with successful community policing and engagement come from a compilation of longstanding, widely available resources made available by the Department of Justice, the Police Foundation, and other widely respected groups to jurisdictions for evaluating their own community efforts.

## A. Institutional Considerations

### 1. Mission Statement & Strategic Plans Reflecting Community Policing Emphasis

Community policing relies on a clear commitment on the part of the organization performing it. Accordingly, “[s]uccessful institutionalization of community policing is likely only if it is included as part of the adopting organization’s mission,” perhaps especially if accompanied by a “set of core values.”<sup>63</sup> Thus, in most departments that successfully implement community policing, the organization’s mission statement and strategic plans “embrace[] a broad view of the police function rather than a narrow focus on crime fighting or law enforcement.”<sup>64</sup> Such mission statements and plans often “take[] more of a social welfare orientation” where the department’s officers “are asked to support and augment the efforts of families, churches, schools, and other social service agencies.”<sup>65</sup>

The Monitoring Team interviewed SPD personnel and reviewed documentation to assess whether or not the SPD is reforming its organizational structure and management to improve community trust. In speaking with personnel and observing efforts over the past few years, we found that the Department has initiated efforts to advance such reforms.

The Department stated that it is in the process of creating a formal, strategic plan related to community trust, and we look forward to reviewing it in the near future. We believe this **is** an important step to help institutionalize and bring clarity to the Department’s mission, vision and implementation plan for building community trust.

<sup>63</sup> E.J. Williams, “Structuring in Community Policing: Institutionalizing Innovative Change,” 4 *Police Practice & Research* 119, 124 (2003).

<sup>64</sup> Gary W. Cordner, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 *Police Forum* 1, 2 (1995).

<sup>65</sup> *Id.* at 3–4.

Despite not having a comprehensive, written plan in place, we believe the micro-community policing plans have helped drive the Department in a manner consistent with the Chief's mission and vision around building community trust. The process helps advance the philosophy of community policing by moving it from a concept to a focused action plan, with written guidance. Each precinct maintains a notebook dedicated to tracking its micro-community policing plans, and the forms used do help personnel organize their strategies. These writings include a neighborhood community policing plan Summary Sheet, which lists key partners, top priorities and key strategies to address neighborhood problems. They also include a log of events that track efforts made on the front lines in reference to each specific strategy (i.e. met with citizen Jones about narcotics by her property, which relates to strategy 2, use specialized teams to get rid of drug trafficking). These tracking devices are then used to help precincts report to the command staff at the bimonthly SeaStat meeting, at which Command staff hold personnel accountable to stick to the priorities they developed with the community. This process helps drive home the importance of, and agency commitment to these efforts.

Similarly, each precinct captain we spoke with stated that the Chief has made clear that building community trust is a top priority for the Department.

Thus, while the Department still has work to do to formalize their strategic planning in this issue, we believe it is on the right track in taking that strategy to heart.

## 2. Department-Wide Geographic and Problem-Solving Focus, Including Neighborhood Variation

One key indicator of successful community engagement is the existence of a department-wide focus on community engagement, coupled with the tailoring of policing strategies to fit the needs of specific neighborhoods.<sup>66</sup> Over the years, many departments have tried to create stand-alone units to engage in community policing, but this strategy has consistently failed. A community member cannot establish a great relationship with a dedicated community policing officer, only to routinely have negative interactions with patrol officers or gang detectives, and end up trusting a department as a whole. As one SPD captain told us, community policing teams in the SPD used to be distinct, and it created a culture within the Department of different missions and cultures for distinct units. He said it became "us versus them," referring to the way in which regular patrol officers viewed their role and mission versus that of community policing officers.

The SPD has taken a number of steps to stress community engagement as a department-wide focus and responsibility rather than limiting this to specialty units – and to tailor their efforts to specific neighborhoods. It takes significant effort to accomplish these changes and the agency is still in the early stages of implementation. Consequently, it is too early in the process to assess these efforts as being a success or failure. Much work remains to be done to fully institutionalize this mindset and gain feedback as to the effectiveness of the plans being implemented. However, we commend the Department for their efforts to date and undertaking this organizational shift.

The Chief has established community trust as being one of her top priorities and made clear that it should be a key focus of all personnel. Each of the Captains who run the precincts noted the Chief's emphasis on building

---

<sup>66</sup> See, e.g., *id.* at 2–3 (1995) ("Community policing emphasizes the geographic basis of assignment and responsibility by shifting the fundamental unit of patrol accountability from time of day to place."); Wesley G. Skogan, "Representing the Community in Community Policing," in *Community Policing: Can It Work* 58 (2003) (noting Chicago Police Department's "adopt[ion] of a decentralized turf orientation by reorganizing patrol work around small geographical areas . . .").

trust and believed that it is a concept truly being pushed throughout the Department, as opposed to merely giving this lip service. She is also working on developing a strategic plan to further flesh out her expectations with respect to concrete steps to be taken to foster and promote community trust.

We note that, while some leaders in the Department feel that the Chief's vision has established very clear expectations about how to build trust, others have said they want more clarity. This is an area that will undoubtedly require further, ongoing attention in order to create a clear, unified understanding throughout the ranks as to what is required to successfully build trust.

In the summer of 2014, the Department reshaped how it expects to carry out community policing by requiring each precinct to create the micro-community policing plans. Under this structure, each precinct is required to engage the community to listen to their voice and pick their top priorities for the police. For example, in the West Precinct in August 2014, the top 3 priorities identified by the community members who engaged in the process were: (1) sit and lie; (2) narcotics use and sales; and (3) illegal street vending.

SPD has partnered with Seattle University to help with this process of creating the micro-community plans. Currently, the Department is provided with research assistants. To attempt to tailor strategies to the specific needs of unique communities, neighborhoods within precincts have been defined, to the best of their ability, along natural boundaries, and SPD then grouped areas together with common issues. For example, in the West Precinct, the Department determined that there were approximately 18-19 neighborhoods within their boundaries, and these were grouped into 8 to organize the micro-community policing plan. At the same time, Seattle University formed a criminal justice advisory committee to help give input to the process. SPD participates in the committee. Community councils also were created in each precinct to help represent the voice of the community.

To help ensure that officers are held accountable for staying focused on community concerns, the precinct commanders are required to create monthly reports detailing progress related to the policing plans. As noted above, each report details activity (i.e. "met with community member Jane Jones regarding the formation of a homeless camp at Main and Elm Streets"). Additionally, during each Sea-Stat meeting – the bimonthly accountability meeting hosted by a Deputy Chief – a briefing is done with respect to one neighborhood's community policing and engagement efforts. Each precinct is incentivized to measure success in terms of addressing the problems identified by the community.

In our interviews, a number of SPD leaders, including the Chief, noted that there is significant work to do to institutionalize this way of policing and to perfect it. We agree. There has certainly been, at the least, some inconsistency in the implementation of the new micro-community policing approach:

- A number of personnel noted that, because there have been so many changes over the past few years, it will take some time to solidify this approach. As one example, based on the shifting around of senior command staff, a number of captains have only recently taken over their command of their precinct – and are unsure about how well the process went previously in terms of working with the community to establish priorities. They plan to re-do the priority-setting process each year. One SPD manager indicated to us that many of the front line officers are not yet familiar with or trained in community engagement.
- Likewise, many personnel believe that because the Department is understaffed, officers are having difficulty juggling traditional police work with community

policing or community engagement work. Several employees noted that answering 9-1-1 calls, filling out paperwork, dealing with SPD meetings, and inadequate staffing make it difficult to free up staff to engage with community members. The issue here is not whether these claims are accurate but, instead, that some personnel believe that this accurately describes the environment in which the Department is operating – and that would affect the ability of the Department to effectively and comprehensively implement the micro-community policing paradigm.

- It is also unclear if other units, such as the gang unit or the community outreach unit, are truly woven into a unified community policing approach with the precincts – which calls into question whether the shift is truly “department-wide.” The gang unit was discussed by SPD leaders mainly in terms of focusing on enforcement actions and making arrests to deal with the gang problem and there appears to be a lack of clarity about how such units can or do fit into community-trust-building.
- A number of SPD leaders were not sure what the “community outreach unit” does, making clear that, at the least, the unit is not yet integrated into the micro-community plan implementation as extensively or closely as it should be.

Achieving a structural shift in how the SPD does business and moving from a philosophy where resources are primarily focused on call response to one where proactive community policing efforts are focused on the needs and expectations that exist at the neighborhood level is a significant and difficult undertaking which will require considerable time. Despite the challenges, this structural shift is a necessary one, and it puts the Department on track toward greater success in building trust with the community. We credit Chief O’Toole and her leadership team with pursuing community engagement and policing in a sustained, focused way that several of her immediate predecessors did not.

### 3. Adequacy of Resources Devoted to Community Policing

Funding, as well as the effective use of resources, are important issues in the successful adoption of community-oriented policing.<sup>67</sup>

By introducing micro-community policing plans and requiring all patrol operations to participate in community policing efforts, SPD is shifting its approach to more efficiently deploy and manage their resources. The shift in resource deployment and tactics is not dependent on expensive stand-alone units to act or serve as the primary connection to the community. Rather, every patrol officer is expected to engage in trust building and problem solving. Precinct captains reported adequate support being provided in terms of other agency resources to support some of their problem-solving efforts (i.e. a temporary narcotics detail).

However, the formalized community outreach unit, the prior hub of community policing activity, appears underfunded if it will be expected to continue serving in a similar or greater capacity. Community advisory

<sup>67</sup> See, e.g., A. Gerasimos Gianakis, et al, “Reinventing or repackaging public services? The case of community-oriented policing,” 58 *Pub. Administration Rev.* 485 (1998) (funding was highest ranked operational problem associated with adoption of community-oriented policing); Allison T. Chappell, “The Philosophical Versus Actual Adoption of Community Policing: A Case Study,” 34 *Crim. Justice Rev.* 5, 17 (2009) (most important measure may not be about the overall monetary commitment so much as the effective use of resources).

groups, who rely on SPD personnel to engage with the community and who seemingly serve as a primary voice from the community, note that financial support from the SPD has appeared to dwindle over the past year. One community leader said she took it upon herself to pick up the slack, but still believed the SPD needed to hire more people to help make the advisory group structure robust.

SPD, and the City, will need to decide if this structure is important to their strategy and, if so, find a way to increase or commit the resources needed to make it viable. In doing so, SPD will need to ensure that the presence of a specializing unit focused on community policing issues does not contribute to an internal (or external) perception that community policing is not a primary responsibility and obligation of all personnel throughout the Department. All personnel should clearly understand community-oriented and problem-solving responsibilities are core to the Department's mission and their own duties.

Given all of the moving parts and obligations of the SPD in carrying out their current reform efforts, we found the commitment shown to institutionalizing community policing, in the form of staff time and attention, is consistent with the expectations the Chief has expressed. However, the evolving community policing reforms discussed here must be properly supported in the long run. Additionally, and as discussed more below, in order to reach and engage more isolated segments of the community, we believe SPD will likely need to dedicate additional resources to this endeavor in the future – and that the ability to do so will be critical to their overall success in building community trust with the entire community. When the SPD completes its strategic plan, we would hope to see more discussion relating to the resources and strategies needed to accomplish this.

#### 4. Indicia of Community Policing as Central to Organizational Structure and Operations

“One issue” in any organization attempting to adopt community policing “is whether . . . attitudinal and behavioral changes at the police officer level will be supported by structural changes in the police organization.”<sup>68</sup> This is in contrast to “police agencies [that would] implement tangential and symbolic elements of community policing at the fringes of the organization, without actually producing changes in the technical core (where the primary work is accomplished).”<sup>69</sup>

As noted elsewhere, the intent of the command staff, and the structural changes made to date, indicated to us that the Department is designing its efforts to be a core part of its mission rather than a compendium of programs. However, the SPD has a significant amount of work to make those changes consistent throughout the Department. For example, it is unclear if all units are fully integrated with and committed to a community policing philosophy. As noted below, the Department must create clear incentives so that officers are recognized and rewarded for their community policing skills; and their efforts must be monitored to determine whether a tipping point is reached, where a large majority of officers throughout all units embrace community policing as their core approach.

One area of law enforcement operations that has received significant attention in the community relates to crowd and demonstration management. Among those who participated protests, demonstrations, and other crowd mobilization events addressing police issues in Seattle and around the country, we have heard and are aware of concerns about the performance of particular officers and of the Department generally in responding

<sup>68</sup> A. Gerasimos Gianakis, et al, “Reinventing or repackaging public services? The case of community-oriented policing,” 58 *Pub. Administration Rev.* 485 (1998).

<sup>69</sup> Edward R. Maguire & Stephen D. Mastrofski, “Patterns of Community Policing in the United States,” 3 *Police Quarterly* 4, 5 (2000).

to such situations. Issues related to crowd management tactics and the use of force during demonstrations related to issues of police use of force and law enforcement tactics can be especially upsetting or dispiriting for participants in those events – as the participants often are those who are among the isolated communities who believe that SPD does not listen, engage, or treat them in the manner that they should.

The Monitor is pleased that Chief O’Toole has engaged an outside entity to evaluate SPD’s crowd management response and demonstration operations. Addressing the concerns of the public, to the extent possible, in the area of SPD response to protests and demonstrations will go a long way toward emphasizing that community policing is not a generalized mission or a series of programs or initiatives – but, rather, is a core part of how the Department organizes itself and effectuates its duties.

## 5. Whether The Department Uses Performance Measures that Reflect Community Policing Principles

Historically, “[w]ithin both formal and informal police cultures, crime solving and criminal apprehension are more valued than crime prevention,” with an officer “more likely to be commended for arresting a bank robber than for initiating actions that prevent such robberies.”<sup>70</sup>

Because “catching bad guys” has historically been valued by police departments over all other activity, literature and the experience of other communities supports the idea that creating clarity about what success looks like, in terms of clear metrics associated with community engagement, is critical for officers to achieve that success. Indeed, “[b]ecause they send a message about what is valued in an organization, appropriate performance evaluation criteria are essential if we expect officers to change their behavior.”<sup>71</sup>

As noted above, significant strides have been made in emphasizing the importance of community engagement in the Department. The micro-community policing plans create a structure that requires all officers on patrol to be engaged in listening to the community and working on issues with them. Regular tracking of statistics related to the community’s priorities and accountability meetings at Sea-Stat incentivize precincts to achieve success with problem solving goals created with input from the community. For example, each SPD precinct captain now has relatively easy access to statistics that help them track criminal activity, service demands from the community and other categories of services provided that are relevant to particular neighborhoods in their precinct. We expect this ability to access data to only improve over the coming year with the roll out of an improved “dashboard” used to create reports. These critical reforms lay a foundation upon which community-trust efforts can be expanded in the future.

The Monitor recommends that, going forward, the SPD make an effort over the coming year to strengthen its plan to create meaningful performance measures and take other steps to promote an organizational culture committed to community trust-building. In our interviews with SPD, we did not find clear evidence that officers are recognized, rewarded or promoted on the basis of a demonstrated commitment to, and their competency in, community policing and problem-solving. Nor did we see any clear use of community policing-based metrics to gauge officer productivity and effectiveness. Thus, our concern is that the front line officers may hear that community policing is important to the Department, but lack clarity about what that means to

<sup>70</sup> Gary W. Cordner, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 *Police Forum* 1, 3(1995).

<sup>71</sup> Allison T. Chappell, “The Philosophical Versus Actual Adoption of Community Policing: A Case Study,” 34 *Crim. Justice Rev.* 5, 10 (2009).

them on a personal level in terms of changing policing tactics, and in terms of what he or she will be judged on to advance their career.

## 6. Whether Training Incorporates Community Policing Values and Objectives

“Training and education is an essential element if the implementation of [community-oriented policing] activities is to be successful because [community-oriented policing] philosophy implies fundamental changes in many areas of policing.”<sup>72</sup> In agencies that have successfully adopted comprehensive community policing, robust training and education was seen as a primary facilitator to such implementation.<sup>73</sup> Studies have found that, “[c]ompared to those who did not receive training, officers who attended the [community-oriented policing] training strongly and significantly agree[d] to adopt and practice” such policing.<sup>74</sup> Indeed, the practice of community policing *without* sufficient training can be problematic and counter-productive.<sup>75</sup>

In Seattle, over the past two years, the SPD has implemented a significant amount of training or planning for training that can provide officers additional tools with which to engage in community policing. For example, in 2014 and 2015, the SPD committed to providing de-escalation training, crisis intervention training and bias free policing training for all sworn officers. The tools and skills developed are intended to help officers de-escalate conflict situations, reduce the need to use force when possible and engage with Seattleites in a thoughtful, measured manner to promote better outcomes.<sup>76</sup> The Department also is focusing on improving training for supervisors and above, so that their increased skill in leadership skills and problem solving can turn them into daily trainers in the precincts.

Reshaping the manner in which all sworn engage with communities is time consuming and resource intensive. It is too early to determine how such training has impacted the day to day interactions between the SPD and community. One SPD leader recommended that the SPD create training that specifically focuses on community-oriented and problem-solving policing. This leader believed that too many young officers have not been exposed enough to these policing philosophies. We recommend that the SPD continue to review its training to find ways to incorporate the concerns expressed in this report about reaching more isolated Seattleites and helping officers understand the perspectives, values and norms of those from many cultures and backgrounds. We also recommend that the SPD utilize community members in the development and implementation of their training, to tailor exercises to the specific concerns of the community.

## 7. Whether The Department Has Successfully Implemented Alternatives to Motorized Patrol

One of the most important indicators of good community policing is the successful implementation of alternatives to motorized patrol.<sup>77</sup> Examples adopted by other agencies include bike patrols, store front or neighborhood-based offices or stations, mobile offices or stations, school resource officers, and foot patrols.

<sup>72</sup> Sutham Cheurprakobkit, “Community policing: Training, definitions and policy implications,” 25 *Policing* 709, 709–710 (2002).

<sup>73</sup> Z. Zhao, et al, “Community-oriented policing across the US: Facilitators and impediments to implementation,” 14 *American Journal of Police* 11 (1995).

<sup>74</sup> Sutham Cheurprakobkit, “Community policing: Training, definitions and policy implications,” 25 *Policing* 709, 720 (2002).

<sup>75</sup> P.C. Kratcoski & S.B. Noonan, “An assessment of police officers’ acceptance of community policing,” in P.C. Kratcoski & D. Dukes (eds.), *Issues in Community Policing* 169 (1995).

<sup>76</sup> See, e.g., Dkt. 191.

<sup>77</sup> Gary W. Corder, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 *Police Forum* 1, 4 (1995).

The SPD has generally displayed a strong history and willingness to have its officers get out of their cars and engage with the community. This includes having officers patrol on bike, with SPD widely regarded across the country as an innovator in using bikes to effectively police urban environments. SPD also maintains three store-front stations, and has foot patrols downtown. In addition, officers are encouraged to engage with the community in a manner consistent with their micro-community policing plans, and these efforts are tracked for reporting and discussion at Sea-Stat meetings. Relatedly, having officers engaged in a large number of special events, programs or projects, such as those mentioned previously (i.e. advisory council meetings, living room conversations, various task forces and so on) helps instill a culture and practice of policing in person, as opposed to patrolling in a car and at a distance.

As we noted earlier, this assessment is not intended as an in-depth analysis of the extent and success of each individual effort. Thus, this study does not measure the number of officers engaged in alternatives to motorized patrol, the percentage of time spent on foot or bike, or the nature and quality of encounters that these non-motorized-patrol officers have with civilians. Rather, this assessment looks for an institutionalized culture and practice that is compatible with, and which promotes and encourages, officers engaging in person with the people they serve. To this end, we believe the SPD has shown a willingness to adopt contemporary policing methods and practices which support greater personal engagement by officers in the field.

## 8. Whether The Department Actively Promotes the Visibility of Officers and Its Activities in a Transparent Manner

“Keeping the accomplishments of the police in the public eye” drives confidence, with “the visibility of policing in the neighborhoods” being a primary driver.<sup>78</sup> Visibility can also apply, however, to “investigative efforts, the adoption of new technologies, modernizing management practices, the increasing sophistication and training of police leaders, data-driven crime strategizing, and rational resource allocation.”<sup>79</sup> Several studies in the United Kingdom have found that “local-level communication” matters – or communications that “[t]ell people clearly what the local agencies in a neighbourhood are doing” and that are “a) area-specific; b) gives detail on what is being delivered, including agency responses to problems; c) provides information on actions that are planned; and d) includes contact details of how to access services.”<sup>80</sup>

We have been generally impressed with the SPD’s city-wide communication strategy. The SPD public affairs staff appeared thoughtful as they described their efforts to establish a communications strategy that fosters transparency and trust. Indeed, the group somewhat recently changed their name from “Media Response” to “Public Affairs” to help create a primary mission and culture around building improved relationships instead of merely responding to crises and managing individual incidents. They have spent significant time and resources engaging in social media, including the use of Twitter and Next Door, to provide information, such as near real-time police dispatch information. In 2014, there were more than 1.5 million page views of the news blog and the agency has over 130,000 followers on Twitter. The Department estimates that it engages over 100,000 Seattleites through Next Door. They proactively engaged in the campaign to educate the community about the legalization of marijuana instead of choosing to disengage or respond in a reactive manner.

<sup>78</sup> Wesley G. Skogan, “Concern About Crime and Confidence in the Police,” 12 *Police Quarterly* 301, 312 (2009).

<sup>79</sup> *Id.*

<sup>80</sup> Andrew Rix, et al, “Improving public confidence in the police: a review of the evidence,” U.K. Research, Development and Statistics Directorate 2 (2009).

The Monitoring Team has also been impressed with how quickly information is disseminated in relation to controversial uses of force and how the Chief announces her decisions related to disciplinary actions. Available video of high-profile incidents is often being released within hours of the incident occurring. These steps suggest an increased and sustained commitment toward institutionalizing transparency across the Department.

## B. Officers & Personnel

### 1. Officer Assignment to Specific, Appropriately-Sized Sectors or “Beats” Impacts Officer-Community Relationships

Another key indicator of success relates to officers being assigned to geographic areas so that they get to know the community in the areas that they serve. Researchers have generally found that patrol officers should be assigned to the same areas for extended periods of time to increase their familiarity with the community – and the community’s familiarity with them.<sup>81</sup> Indeed, with respect to community policing, “[a]gencies that assign fixed shifts and beats generally enjoy a higher success rate. Long-term and/or permanent shift assignment—the ultimate forms of decentralization—allow officers to learn more about people, places, issues, and problems within neighborhoods.”<sup>82</sup> These fixed beats should be “organized along natural neighborhood boundaries” and “defined by the common characteristics and interests of the populace, such as race or ethnicity, language, culture, and socio-economic status.”<sup>83</sup>

Our interviews of community members and SPD personnel revealed that the strategy of officers working defined and fixed beats is not yet fully developed at the SPD. A number of precinct captains believed that officers enjoyed working in their geographic areas and that internal movement or changes in assignments does not impact, one way or another, the SPD’s efforts to build community relationships and trust. Others believe that officers move around too much, due to transfers and promotions, and that this constant state of flux negatively impacts the ability of SPD officers to develop authentic, meaningful relationships with community members. At the very least, it is clear that there is not yet a policy or standard operational procedure that places a premium on ensuring that officers work a beat for a sufficiently significant duration to have established productive and meaningful relationships with community members in the geographic area to which they are assigned.

Additionally, there have been significant personnel changes at the Captain and Commander levels that have taken place since Chief O’Toole arrived in Seattle. For instance, in the South Precinct, some community members were told that a recent Captain would be there for 5 years to create stability. Instead, he moved on to another assignment after 6 months. A number of the current precinct captains are new to their positions or their precincts, making it difficult to assess a track record of leadership remaining in one place long enough to truly get to know the local community they serve.

In the upcoming year, the SPD should assess and track whether officers, supervisors, and command staff alike are provided with sufficient time within their assignments to cultivate meaningful relationships with community members in their area.

<sup>81</sup> Gary W. Corder, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 *Police Forum* 1, 2–3 (1995).

<sup>82</sup> Sparrow, M. K., National Institute of Justice, *Implementing Community Policing. Research in Brief* (1988).

<sup>83</sup> Allison T. Chappell, “The Philosophical Versus Actual Adoption of Community Policing: A Case Study,” 34 *Crim. Justice Rev.* 5, 16 (2009) (summarizing Greene, J. R., “The road to community policing in Los Angeles: A case study,” in G. P. Alpert & A. R. Piquero (Eds.), *Community Policing: Contemporary Readings* (2000) (2nd ed., pp. 123-158)).

## 2. Officers Need to Spend Sufficient Time Doing Community Engagement

For community policing to work, officers must be provided with sufficient time to conduct community engagement. Departments often must face the belief “that responding to calls for service leaves them with too little time to practice community policing”<sup>84</sup>:

In many police departments, patrol officers’ time not committed to handling calls is either spent simply waiting for the next call or randomly driving around. Under community policing, this substantial resource of free patrol time is devoted to directed enforcement activities, specific crime prevention efforts, problem solving, community engagement, citizen interaction, or similar kinds of activities.<sup>85</sup>

In our review, we did not see any clear metrics established to determine whether officers are spending their time primarily responding to calls for service versus engaging in proactive problem solving activities. The Department’s philosophy is that all officers, during every interaction, have an opportunity to implement the teachings of community policing. In addition, through tracking of the micro-community policing plans, general officer activity is tracked to determine if the community’s policing priorities are being given the proper attention.

As noted above, a number of personnel assert that their units were not engaging in sufficient community policing because officers were too busy responding to 9-1-1 calls or going through learning curves related to the current reform efforts. Regardless of whether such claims stem from fact or perception, we recommend that the Department develop a mechanism that will provide more clarity for captains to monitor and report on the ability, and practice, of officers being able to spend a reasonable amount of time engaging in proactive community or problem-oriented policing.

## 3. Officers and Supervisors Using Information and Data

“Unlike traditional policing, [community-oriented policing] uses information innovatively to put emphasis on quality policing.”<sup>86</sup> The appropriate use of objective data and information “helps police identify and analyze community problems” while also “assist[ing] them in police program assessment.”<sup>87</sup> For instance, in police departments where officers and supervisors alike use information to inform their delivery of service, computer systems collect and analyze problem-solving information. Repeat calls for service, repeat offenders and repeat victims are closely monitored and the subject of organizational focus. Crime prevention is emphasized with much attention devoted to analyzing data and evaluating crime trends, especially with respect to neighborhood-by-neighborhood trends. Non-law enforcement information – including input from community partners or community surveys – is used to identify and prioritize problems.

We believe the SPD has made progress in using data to help guide its policing efforts. As discussed above, micro-community policing plans are created to identify priorities for communities, and Captains are able to track

<sup>84</sup> Allison T. Chappell, “The Philosophical Versus Actual Adoption of Community Policing: A Case Study,” 34 *Crim. Justice Rev.* 17–18 (summarizing Glensor, R. W., & Peak, K., “Implementing change: Community-oriented policing and problem solving,” *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin* 65(7) at 14–21 (1995)).

<sup>85</sup> Gary W. Cordner, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 *Police Forum* 1, 3 (1995); accord Wesley G. Skogan, “Representing the Community in Community Policing,” in *Community Policing: Can It Work* 58 (2003).

<sup>86</sup> Sutham Cheurprakobkit, “Community policing: Training, definitions and policy implications,” 25 *Policing* 709, 712 (2002).

<sup>87</sup> *Id.*

crime data from their communities to help monitor progress. A map is developed and personnel can quickly identify the call types that are the most prevalent in the area. As just one example, if thefts are a key priority, the current data collection allows a precinct to track thefts, and develop maps showing the “hot spots” for where such thefts are occurring (though there have been some concerns expressed about this concept). This information then can be presented at Sea-Stat meetings, so that precincts can be held accountable for staying on task, and so that leaders from around the Department can collaboratively and creatively team up to solve problems.

In addition, the SPD continues to work on improving its technology systems. Over the next year, we expect to see increased sophistication in the use and analysis of such data through new “dashboard” technologies, which will enable the agency to cull information from disparate systems or platforms and better integrate and analyze this data.

In speaking with some representatives of isolated communities, they noted that information about what is going on in the streets can change more quickly than traditional law enforcement data systems are set up to track and report upon. For example, a “hot spot” that is identified through the collection of data over a month may not be a hot spot by the end of that month. We hasten to add that this deficiency is also well recognized by SPD. Indeed, SPD’s Real-Time Crime Center, which was implemented in 2015, appears to be a significant operational step toward addressing crime patterns as they emerge through the centralization and correlation of intelligence analysis. No system, however, can consistently beat the speed of word of mouth, and we note the recommendation of one representative of the LGBTQ community, for instance, who recommended better communication with the SPD so that officers can be more nimble in responding to trends in the streets. We concur with the concerns expressed by both the community members and SPD staff.

#### 4. A Decentralized Command Structure Permits Officer Autonomy in Developing Community Relationships

“Researchers have identified decentralization of the command structure as an essential element of community policing.”<sup>88</sup> Decentralized decision-making authority gives patrol officers and line supervisors the ability to develop responses to community problems based on the facts and circumstances of particular problems that they encounter during a shift.

Those who have studied successful community policing note that a focus on problem-solving is a key indicator of success. In most conceptions of community policing, officers use a problem-solving approach that “seeks tailored solutions to specific community problems”<sup>89</sup>:

The common sense notion of choosing the tool that best fits the problem, instead of grabbing the most convenient or familiar tool in the tool box, lies close to the heart of the problem solving method.<sup>90</sup>

A problem solving mentality can represent a cultural shift – from focusing exclusively on law enforcement and arrest activity, without regard to whether such actions create safer and healthier communities or address the

<sup>88</sup> A. Gerasimos Gianakis, et al, “Reinventing or repackaging public services? The case of community-oriented policing,” 58 *Pub. Administration Rev.* 485 (1998) (collecting literature).

<sup>89</sup> See Gary W. Cordner, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 *Police Forum* 1, 5 (1995).

<sup>90</sup> *Id.*

community's priorities, to truly partnering with the community to solve the problems that concern them.<sup>91</sup> This cultural shift often manifests in officers being clearly incentivized to use free, or dedicated, time for direct community engagement.<sup>92</sup>

The Monitoring Team in this assessment was interested in whether officers are given shift time to engage in the problem-solving process; whether the Department keeps historical records (lessons learned, after-action reports) of problem-solving for future reference; if problem-solving efforts are across the agency; and to what extent strategies are based on community concerns.

The Department gave itself mixed reviews on whether officers are incentivized and empowered to use a problem-solving approach in their community interactions. On the one hand, the concept of problem-solving is being promoted and emphasized consistently by leadership, including at the precinct level and from the Chief and her command staff. For instance, the SPD's micro-community policing plans indicate a notable structural shift in this regard – and constitute a significant step toward institutionalization of the idea that the community is a partner in determining how officers should be spending their shifts in the field. Likewise, one captain noted that a rise in non-residential burglaries was solved by working with a business owner to create a security plan, and partnering with another agency to obtain better information, with burglaries decreasing by some 24 percent. This approach engaged others, outside of the SPD, as opposed to simply responding to 911 burglary calls. Further, SPD leadership also reported an effort to reward officers for their community engagement and problem solving. This came in the form of personnel performance reviews, recommendations for promotion, and awards.

On the other hand, SPD leadership also reported that more training and guidance is needed to institutionalize a problem-solving mentality. A majority of leaders with whom we spoke indicated that many officers were not accustomed to the problem-solving approach and that there were no formal systems in place to crystallize precisely what behavior was expected and would be rewarded. Likewise, it is not clear if problem-solving is integrated into typical responses for service – or if, instead, it is seen as an “extra” or “value added” function that is perceived as distinct and apart from core operational concerns.

The large amount of work done by the SPD to re-structure the organization and place a focus on community engagement is commendable; nonetheless, we recommend that the SPD commit additional effort to clarify its focus on problem solving, and to internally assess how it is doing, over the coming year. We would place particular emphasis on clarifying how officers are being freed up to engage with the community, because it is a difficult logistical challenge that needs attention. And, as we suggested earlier, we would encourage placing particular emphasis on how officers are evaluated in terms of their job performance and rewarded for community engagement efforts.

---

<sup>91</sup> See Allison T. Chappell, “The Philosophical Versus Actual Adoption of Community Policing: A Case Study,” 34 *Crim. Justice Rev.* 17–18; Glensor, R. W., & Peak, K., “Implementing change: Community-oriented policing and problem solving,” *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin* 65(7) at 14–21 (1995) (departments must face the reality or belief that responding to calls for service leaves them with too little time to practice community policing).

<sup>92</sup> Famega, C. N., Frank, J., & Mazerolle, L. (2005), “Managing police patrol time: The role of supervisor directives,” 22 *Justice Quarterly*, 540 (2005) (officers should be incentivized to use free time for direct community engagement).

## C. Community Cooperation & Collaboration

### 1. Whether The Department Maintains and Optimizes a Range of Community Partnerships

A basic step toward building strong relationships with the community is to engage with a wide range of partners, including, for example, other law enforcement agencies, other components of the criminal justice system, other government agencies, non-profits that serve the community, the local media, and individuals in the community. We see successful partnerships also created when a department participates in, organizes or promotes community-based crime prevention and social service initiatives.<sup>93</sup>

In our review of SPD, it appears that the agency is making a reasonable effort to create community partnerships. We have seen the SPD work well with a range of organizations in a collaborative manner. Some examples that we have seen include: (1) the Crisis Intervention Committee working openly and collaboratively with a broad range of partners who work with those in crisis, such as non-profits, courts and hospitals; (2) the training unit working collaboratively with the State's training institute to provide a broader range of opportunities and information sharing for its officers; (3) the range of advisory groups organized or attended by SPD officers, including in relation to their micro-community policing efforts; (4) partnerships with the business community in addressing homeless and narcotics issues; (5) partnerships with the LGBTQ and business community to help reduce anti-LGBTQ crimes and its Safe Place initiative; (6) partnerships with the Mayor's office in identifying and addressing quality of life issues; (7) block watch efforts; and (8) partnerships with schools and the Youth Violence Prevention Initiative to work on youth issues, to name just a few.

While the quality and consistency of those relationships will be a constant challenge for any organization, including the SPD, for purposes of our review, we were looking primarily to see that the relationships exist, that an effort is being made to foster them, and that a culture is being created to embrace the importance of partnerships. Our observations over the past two years are that, in general, the SPD is on the right track in this area.

In addition, it should be noted that the 2015 community survey supports the idea that SPD's partnership culture and strategy are paying off. The survey found that 75 percent of people who participated in a neighborhood/block watch program or living room conversations are very supportive of the police. Similarly, a telephone survey, paid for by the Seattle Police Department, of community members who called 9-1-1 from the Yesler Terrace area and had an officer dispatched to provide assistance, shows similar results.<sup>94</sup> In 2015, 71 percent of those surveyed were satisfied with their experience with the Department. And 94 percent said that the officer responding to the 9-1-1 call was professional and courteous. Some 88 percent said that, overall, the Department's personnel are professional and courteous. These survey results were consistent with our interviews of people who interact with the SPD in relation to their efforts to create partnerships, who generally see the SPD in a favorable light.

### 2. Whether Citizens Provide Input, and the Department Responds to Such Input

<sup>93</sup> See, e.g., COPS Office, Community Policing Self-Assessment Tool 6 (2001).

<sup>94</sup> Seattle Police Department, Yesler Terrace Area Customer Satisfaction Surveys, Key Findings – 2015, October 9, 2015.

“Consultation with community groups regarding their security needs” is a “basic element[] of community policing.”<sup>95</sup> The mechanisms are “varied” but may include “systematic and periodic community surveys to elicit citizen input,” “open forums, town meetings, radio and television call-in programs,” and “meet[ing] regularly with citizen advisory boards, ministry alliances, minority group representatives, business leaders, and other formal groups.”<sup>96</sup>

As noted throughout our assessment, while the Department has a variety of mechanisms to receive community input, its micro-community policing structure is the most robust example. The idea of listening to the community’s top priorities has been institutionalized into a structure.

However, as noted throughout, it remains to be seen how deeply and quickly these changes are absorbed, or how well they are vetted (for example at SeaStat). Also, as noted above, the SPD has work to do to learn how to listen to and engage isolated communities – and to demonstrate that the input of those communities is understood and incorporated into policing reforms.

### 3. Whether Citizens Are Involved with Law Enforcement and Crime Prevention

For a department and community to forge a true partnership, which will lead to effective community policing, citizens need to be involved in a department’s core law enforcement and crime prevention functions. This can manifest in citizen education programs, involving citizens participating in information programs or enrolling them in citizen police academies that give them greater knowledge and understanding of law enforcement.”<sup>97</sup> It might be manifested in direct appeals or initiatives by the Department for citizens to actively assist the police, “usually by being their ‘eyes and ears’ and reporting crimes promptly when they occur.”<sup>98</sup> Similarly, citizens may be given increased opportunities to coproduce safety, such as “when [residents] partner with the police in crime prevention projects or walk in officially sanctioned neighborhood patrol groups.”<sup>99</sup>

As noted above, we believe that the SPD is making reasonable and sustained efforts to create opportunities for citizens to engage in crime prevention and partner with the SPD. The efforts we mentioned, such as micro-community policing plans, advisory councils, neighborhood watches, living room conversations, doughnut dialogues, are only a portion of the programs or projects that have been implemented over the past several years to engage the community. Also as noted above, these efforts have not necessarily yet found a way to engage isolated communities so that they feel themselves to be a part of the process. Thus, SPD has more work to do to make these efforts go beyond “feel good” exercises with people who support them, and make them meaningful to a broader range of Seattleites.

<sup>95</sup> Gerasimos Gianakis, et al, “Reinventing or repackaging public services? The case of community-oriented policing,” 58 *Pub. Administration Rev.* 485 (1998).

<sup>96</sup> Gary W. Corder, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 *Police Forum* 1, 2 (1995).

<sup>97</sup> Wesley G. Skogan, “Representing the Community in Community Policing,” in Wesley G. Skogan (Ed.), *Community Policing: Can It Work?* 57 (2003).

<sup>98</sup> *Id.*

<sup>99</sup> *Id.*

## Conclusion

The SPD has engaged in significant efforts to put itself on a solid path toward building stronger relationships with the Seattle community. In particular, the Chief's emphasis on the issue, the re-structuring of policing efforts through the micro-community policing plans, the agency's training strategies, and the overall willingness to engage in and embrace the reform effort with the community are clear signs that the SPD understands where it needs to go and is willing to undertake the difficult changes associated with this.

However, there remains a great deal of work to do to fully institutionalize community-oriented policing strategies into all aspects of and corners of the organization. Specifically, we would like to see:

- Clearer and more precise indicators that community policing is central to all units;
- The philosophy being pushed from command staff woven more fully into training and being absorbed consistently throughout the Department; and
- Concrete and formalized strategies in place to incentivize and reward officers in their career development for excelling with community policing strategies.

Additionally, SPD must create some additional structures and strategies to heal old wounds, and build new and lasting relationships with many diverse, isolated segments of the community who have yet to be reached. This will require a persistent and long-term effort. Just as the sense among some communities that SPD cannot be trusted did not develop overnight, a renewed and reset relationship between the Department and those communities will not develop overnight.

The Monitoring Team will look forward to partnering closely with the community and the SPD to instill a continuing sense of urgency with respect to building relationships with these portions of the Seattle community as the Monitor continues to assess the core areas of reform in the future.

# Appendix A.

## Methodological Framework & Approach for Qualitative Assessment of Public Confidence

This Appendix sets forth the general framework and strategy by which the Monitoring Team conducted the qualitative assessment of public confidence.

The framework seeks to adhere at all times to established conclusions in academic research and the documented experiences of police agencies and practitioners in the real world. As presented here, the framework is not necessarily exhaustive, and additional dimensions may be added. Nonetheless, it does provide the core dimensions by which the Monitoring Team will attempt to determine how SPD is doing with respect to public trust, community confidence, and community engagement.

Furthermore, this framework may incorporate some dimensions that are not readily applicable to Seattle or are less, or more, important in Seattle than for other communities. The Monitoring Team’s appreciation of the ways that some dimensions may be more important or relevant in Seattle informed the nature of its analysis.

Because the framework necessarily drove much of the foregoing analysis, some language and citations in the body are identical or highly similar.

### I. COMMUNITY CONFIDENCE

Academic research, real-world investigations, and the experience of other law enforcement agencies – including those, like Los Angeles and Cincinnati, that have successfully implemented consent Department of Justice consent decrees – suggest several general drivers or public trust and confidence in police agencies. Indeed, the factors that influence confidence in law enforcement are diverse – in part because “[p]erceptions of [police] misconduct are more influenced by media consumption, community factors – be they ethnic/racial or geographical – and experiences (direct or vicarious) of police-initiated contacts, than are attitudes towards effectiveness and responsiveness.”<sup>100</sup>

Some of the primary drivers or predictors of community confidence that we will be evaluating are the following, with sample metrics and literature support for the primacy of the predictor identified for each:

#### A. Visibility of Police

<p><u>Example metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community trust survey</li> <li>• Focus group review (CPC) and community outreach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “[T]he extent of visible local policing . . . affect[s] concern about crime <i>and</i> confidence . . . Respondents who recalled spotting police on patrol in their neighborhood recently grew less worried about crime . . . At the same time—and more strongly as the coefficient is much larger—recent police visibility led to increased confidence in the police.” Wesley G. Skogan, “Concern About Crime and Confidence in the Police,” 12 <i>Police Quarterly</i> 301, 312 (2009).</li> </ul>
--	---

<sup>100</sup> Joel Miller & Robert C. Davis, “Unpacking public attitudes to the police: Contrasting perceptions of misconduct with traditional measures of satisfaction,” 10 *Int’l Journal of Police Sci. & Mgmt.* 9, 11–12 (2008).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The visibility of police in residents' neighborhoods positively influences opinions of the police more than the quality of interactions between residents and the police. James Hawdon &amp; John Ryan, "Police-Resident Interactions and Satisfaction with Police: An Empirical Test of Community Policing Assertions," 14 <i>Crim. Justice Pol'y Rev.</i> 1, 1 (2003).</li> </ul>
--	--

## B. Quality of Police Encounters

<p><u>Example metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community trust survey</li> <li>Focus group review and follow-up</li> <li>OPA investigation review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Probably the most common explanation for variations in public confidence is that more frequent and more negative encounters with the police generate greater antipathy toward the police among some Americans. Numerous studies reported a negative association on opinions of the police of traffic stops, pedestrian stops and arrests." Joel Miller &amp; Robert C. Davis, "Unpacking public attitudes to the police: Contrasting perceptions of misconduct with traditional measures of satisfaction," 10 <i>Int'l Journal of Police Science &amp; Management</i> 9, 11-12 (2008).</li> <li>"[T]he overall effect of [personal] contact on confidence appears to be negative; trust and confidence in the police is lower among those who have recent contact." Ben Bradford, et al, "Contact and confidence: Revisiting the impact of public encounters with the police," 19 <i>Policing &amp; Society</i> 20 (2009). "[W]ell-received contacts do not appear to have a commensurate positive effect."</li> <li>Although "recent contacts with the police of <i>any</i> kind—both positive and negative—reduced confidence in them," "having a negatively rated experience with police had three times the impact [on overall confidence in the police] of a positively rated experience . . . [T]he effect of a negatively rated encounter on confidence in the police was the most powerful in the model." (Wesley G. Skogan, "Concern About Crime and Confidence in the Police," 12 <i>Police Quarterly</i> 301, 312-13 (2009)).</li> <li>Likewise, per procedural justice models, "treatment perceived by the public to be fair and equitable is most likely to result in improved trust and confidence. Judgments among the public about everyday policing appear to place less emphasis on concrete outcomes . . . and more emphasis on the quality of personal encounters. This suggests that public opinions can be enhanced by those aspects of encounters over which officers have most control – the ways in which they treat people and communicate their decisions." Ben Bradford, et al, "Contact and confidence: Revisiting the impact of public encounters with the police,"</li> </ul>
---	--

	<p>19 <i>Policing &amp; Society</i> 20 (2009). “[W]ell-received contacts do not appear to have a commensurate positive effect.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “[V]ictimization experiences and traffic tickets tended to reduce confidence in the police, while voluntary contacts with the police would increase confidence in the police.” Ling Ren, et al, “Linking confidence in the police with the performance of the police: Community policing can make a difference,” 33 <i>Journal of Criminal Science</i> 62 (2005).</li> </ul>
--	---

### C. Neighborhood/Socio-Economic Factors

<p><u>Example metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structured discussions with neighborhood police councils, other community organizations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several studies emphasize “how people’s neighbourhood context can determine their attitudes: people who reside in the same community share norms and values that affect their view of the world.” Joel Miller &amp; Robert C. Davis, “Unpacking public attitudes to the police: Contrasting perceptions of misconduct with traditional measures of satisfaction,” 10 <i>Int’l Journal of Police Science &amp; Management</i> 9, 11–12 (2008) (collecting studies).</li> </ul>
--	--

### D. Individual/Citizen Cooperation with Law Enforcement

<p><u>Example metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage of crimes solved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Community cooperation may be the most critical factor for the successful implementation of a community policy program.” James Hawdon &amp; John Ryan, “Police-Resident Interactions and Satisfaction with Police: An Empirical Test of Community Policing Assertions,” 14 <i>Crim. Justice Pol’y Rev.</i> 1, 1 (2003). (collecting authority)</li> <li>• “To be effective in lowering crime and creating secure communities, the police must be able to elicit cooperation from community residents . . . Such cooperation potentially involves, on the part of the public, both obeying the law and working with the police or others in the community to help combat crime in the community.” Tom Tyler &amp; Jeffrey Fagan, “Legitimacy and Cooperation: Why Do People Help the Police Fight Crime in Their Communities?,” 6 <i>Ohio State J. Crim. Law</i> 231, 232 (2008).</li> </ul>
--	--

### E. “Vicarious” Experiences & Media Influences

<p><u>Example metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community survey</li> <li>• Focus group review and follow-up</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hearing about an interaction that someone else had with the police produces reductions in public confidence in law enforcement, especially when the experience was negative. Joel Miller &amp; Robert C. Davis, “Unpacking public attitudes to the police: Contrasting perceptions of misconduct with traditional measures of satisfaction,” 10 <i>Int’l Journal of Police Science &amp; Management</i> 9, 13 (2008) (summarizing literature).</li> </ul>
---	--

### F. Departmental Community Policing & Engagement Efforts

<p><u>Example metrics:</u> See Part II, below.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “[S]trategies most likely to be effective in improving confidence are initiatives aimed at increasing community engagement.” Andrew Rix, et al, “Improving public confidence in the police: a review of the evidence,” U.K. Research, Development and Statistics Directorate (2009) (summarizing research).</li> <li>• Individuals in the late 2000s “living in Houston’s three experimental [community] policing areas grew more confidence in the police” than those who lived in non-community policing areas. Wesley G. Skogan, “Concern About Crime and Confidence in the Police,” <i>12 Police Quarterly</i> 301, 313 (2009).</li> </ul>
--	---

## II. COMMUNITY POLICING & ENGAGEMENT

The issue of what constitutes community policing has long “suffered from conceptual confusion in both research and practice.”<sup>101</sup> Indeed, “[s]o many analysts have commented on the difficulties of defining community policing that it is now a cliché among the cognoscenti . . . . The ‘conceptual fuzziness’ of community policing has not really changed.”<sup>102</sup>

Part of the “fuzziness” stems from the need for community policing to reflect the concerns, desires, attitudes, and interests of the communities that a law enforcement agency serves. The implementation of any community policing efforts “occur[] in the context of local history and political culture, and these can be highly idiosyncratic.”<sup>103</sup> Ultimately, “strategies associated with the community policing philosophy should be tailored to the local community.”<sup>104</sup>

Because the term “community policing” can “mean different things to different people,”<sup>105</sup> it can be difficult to identify what specific measures that a law enforcement department takes in fact constitute “community policing” and to evaluate what “community policing” approaches work in enhancing public confidence and public safety. Indeed, “[q]uantitative research on the dimensions of community policing is rare.”<sup>106</sup>

Consequently, local decision makers sometimes struggle to translate support for the concept of community policing into substantive policy measures.<sup>107</sup>

<sup>101</sup> A. Gerasimos Gianakis, et al, “Reinventing or repackaging public services? The case of community-oriented policing,” 58 Pub. Administration Review 485 (1998).

<sup>102</sup> Edward R. Maguire & Stephen D. Mastrofski, “Patterns of Community Policing in the United States,” 3 *Police Quarterly* 4, 5 (2000).

<sup>103</sup> Gianakis, supra note 2.

<sup>104</sup> Allison T. Chappell, “The Philosophical Versus Actual Adoption of Community Policing: A Case Study,” 34 *Crim. Justice Rev.* 5, 22 (2009) (citing D. Weisburd & J.D. McElroy, “Enacting the CPO role: Findings from the New York City pilot program in community policing,” in J.R. Greene & S.D. Mastrofski (Eds.), *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?* 89–102 (1988)); accord (“Community policing strategies vary depending on the needs and responses of the communities involved . . . .”)

<sup>105</sup> Sutham Cheurprakobkit, “Community policing: Training, definitions and policy implications,” 25 *Policing* 709, 712 (2002).

<sup>106</sup> Edward R. Maguire & Stephen D. Mastrofski, “Patterns of Community Policing in the United States,” 3 *Police Quarterly* 4, 5 (2000).

<sup>107</sup> See id. (“Community policing has enormous symbolic appeal for local governments. It is likely that some local decision makers might want to enlist in the community policing movement for its message rather than its substance.”)

Regardless of some conceptual indeterminacy can generally be defined as “a collaboration between the police and the community that identifies and solves problems.”<sup>108</sup> It constitutes “a policy and a strategy aimed at achieving more effective and efficient crime control, reduced fear of crime, improved quality of life, improved services and police legitimacy, through a proactive reliance on community resources that seeks to change crime-causing conditions.”<sup>109</sup>

The Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Office of the Department of Justice currently defines community policing as:

[A] philosophy that promotes organizational strategies that support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime.<sup>110</sup>

The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), and other organizations have adopted that definitional framework. According to that conception, community policing encompasses “three key components”: community partnerships, organizational transformation, and problem solving.<sup>111</sup>

Core features of community policing include the following:

It should be the standard operating method of policing, not an occasional special project; (2) it should be practiced by personnel throughout the ranks . . . ; (3) it should be empirical, in the sense that decisions are made on the basis of information that is gathered systematically; (4) it should involve, whenever possible, collaboration between police and other agencies and institutions; and (5) it should incorporate, wherever possible, community input and participation, so that it is the community’s problems that are addressed (not just the police department’s) and so that the community shares in the responsibility for its own protection.<sup>112</sup>

A number of programs, strategies, tactics, and approaches have come to fall under the “community policing” concept.<sup>113</sup> However, “[a]t its core, community policing is not a set of tactics, but instead is an organizational strategy for running a department.”<sup>114</sup>

In evaluating SPD’s current community policing initiatives, the global inquiry will be whether the various programs and initiatives that can be classified as community policing or community engagement are becoming woven into the fabric of both the Department and the community. In Seattle, efforts in the late 1990s and early

<sup>108</sup> Bureau of Justice Assistance, *Understanding Community Policing: A Framework in Action* xii (1994), available at <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/commp.pdf>.

<sup>109</sup> R.R. Friedmann, *Community Policing: Comparative Perspectives & Prospects* (1992).

<sup>110</sup> COPS Office, U.S. Dept. of Justice, “Community Policing Defined” at 1 (2014), available at <http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/vets-to-cops/e030917193-CP-Defined.pdf>.

<sup>111</sup> *Id.*

<sup>112</sup> Gary W. Cordner, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 *Police Forum* 1, 5 (1995).

<sup>113</sup> See James Forman, Jr., “Community Policing and Youth as Assets,” 95 *J. Crim. L. & Criminology* 7 1, 8 (2004) (“Community policing . . . has come to refer to a wide variety of police tactics.”)<sup>113</sup>

<sup>114</sup> *Id.*

2000s to implement “community policing” at SPD “did not result in change in the core functions of policing; the organization’s goals and structural arrangements remained largely intact.”<sup>115</sup>

The more specific inquiry will be whether SPD is doing enough in a sufficient number of areas important to the Seattle community to set the foundation for a police-community relationship grounded in collaboration, mutual respect, and trust.

The Monitoring Team will evaluate how the Department is doing along an array of more general objectives, initiatives, attributes, or features. The academic or empirical support for each general area of inquiry is included in the right column of the chart underneath each numbered area. The left column of the chart, labeled “examples,” provides more specific features, programs, or initiatives that tend to be indicative of or associated with a Department operating in a manner consistent with the general community policing objective listed above it. These specific programs, initiatives, or features are derived nearly exclusively from the following sources:

- Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Office, U.S. Department of Justice, “Community Policing Self-Assessment Tool (2014);
- Police Foundation, Community Policing Activity Data (1993);
- COPS Office, Funding Accelerated for Small Towns (FAST) Survey (1994);
- COPS Office, Community Policing Information Worksheets (1994–1997); and
- *Understanding Community Policing: A Framework in Action* xii (1994), available at <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/commp.pdf>.

Accordingly, the specific measures and features described as “examples” for each community policing area are not new. In many instances, they are efforts identified as community policing tactics for more than twenty (20) years. Thus, the specific manifestations of SPD fulfilling or not fulfilling various factors associated with successful community policing and engagement come from a compilation of longstanding, widely available resources made available by the Department of Justice and the Police Foundation to jurisdictions for evaluating their own community efforts.

**A. Department Mission, Organization, and Strategy**

**1. Mission Statement & Strategic Plans Reflecting Community Policing Emphasis**

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community policing concepts have been integrated into agency’s mission statement</li> <li>• Written strategic plan for community policing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See generally Allison T. Chappell, “The Philosophical Versus Actual Adoption of Community Policing: A Case Study,” 34 <i>Crim. Justice Rev.</i> 5, 10 (2009).</li> <li>○ “Successful institutionalization of community policing is likely only if it is included as part of the adopting organization’s mission,” perhaps especially if accompanied by a “set of core values.” E.J. Williams, “Structuring in Community Policing: Institutionalizing Innovative Change,” 4 <i>Police Practice &amp; Research</i> 119, 124 (2003).</li> </ul>
---	---

<sup>115</sup> J.S. Zhao et al, “Community Policing: Did It Change the Basic Functions of Policing in the 1990s? A National Follow-Up Study,” 20 *Justice Quarterly* 697, 701 (2003) (discussing William Lyons, *The Politics of Community Policing: Rearranging the Power to Punish* (1999)).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department promotes an agency-wide approach to community policing</li> <li>• Community policing concepts, mission statement, and strategy have been integrated into departmental policies and procedures</li> <li>• Department focuses on preventing crime by focusing on conditions, social problems, and community concerns that lead to or impact crime</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The mission statement and/or SPD strategic plan typically “embraces a broad view of the police function rather than a narrow focus on crime fighting or law enforcement.” Gary W. Cordner, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 <i>Police Forum</i> 1, 2 (1995)).</li> <li>○ Mission statement and strategic plans should focus on prevention. <i>Id.</i> at 3 (1995).</li> <li>○ Good strategies and mission statements “take[] more of a social welfare orientation” such that “police are asked to support and augment the efforts of families, churches, schools, and other social service agencies.” <i>Id.</i> at 3-4 (1995).</li> </ul>
--	--

**2. Department-Wide Geographic Focus**

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel are given responsibility for geographic areas</li> <li>• Geographic, beat, and sector assignments last long enough to allow officers in agency to form strong community relationships</li> <li>• Patrol officers map crime problems</li> <li>• Citizen advisory groups/neighborhood watch programs</li> <li>• Department and officers work with citizens to identify and address neighborhood crime problems</li> <li>• Officers use computer systems to collect and analyze information,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Community policing strategy emphasizes the geographic basis of assignment and responsibility by shifting the fundamental unit of patrol accountability from time of day to place . . . .” Gary W. Cordner, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 <i>Police Forum</i> 1, 2-3 (1995).</li> <li>• “Decentralized turf orientation.” Wesley G. Skogan, “Representing the Community in Community Policing,” in <i>Community Policing: Can It Work</i> 58 (2003) “decentralized turf orientation” (noting Chicago Police Department’s “adopt[ion of] a decentralized turf orientation by reorganizing patrol work around small geographical areas, the city’s 279 police beats”).</li> </ul>
---	--

<p>particularly repeat calls for service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department and officers map crime problems</li> <li>• Beat/patrol boundaries coincide with or are otherwise consistent with neighborhood and/or community boundaries</li> </ul>	
---	--

**3. Department-Wide Problem-Solving Focus.**

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers given shift time to engage in problem-solving process</li> <li>• Department keeps historical records (lessons learned, after-action reports) of problem-solving for future reference?</li> <li>• Agency coordinates problem-solving efforts across the agency (e.g., separate police divisions and shifts)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Community policing supports differential enforcement and tailored policing based on local norms and values.” Gary W. Cordner, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 <i>Police Forum</i> 1, 2 (1995).</li> </ul>
---	---

**4. Neighborhood Variation**

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development and implementation of neighborhood-specific policing plans or strategies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Community policing supports differential enforcement and tailored policing based on local norms and values.” Gary W. Cordner, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 <i>Police Forum</i> 1, 2 (1995).</li> </ul>
--	---

**5. Adequacy of Resources Devoted to Community Policing**

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritization of community policing vis-à-vis competing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Funding problems was [sic] the highest ranked operational problem associated with adoption [of community-oriented policing], and increasing resources was ranked higher as a goal than providing better supervision, lessening controls on sworn officers, changing department’s culture,</li> </ul>
--	--

<p>demands and expectations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding provided to community policing initiatives</li> <li>• Officers whose duties involve some express community policing component or element</li> </ul>	<p>decentralization of operational decision making, and shortening the chain of command, and almost as high as empowering patrol personnel and developing patrol officer job skills.” (A. Gerasimos Gianakis, et al, “Reinventing or repackaging public services? The case of community-oriented policing,” 58 <i>Pub. Administration Review</i> 485 (1998).)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research has reached different conclusions about whether a “lack of resources presents a significant barrier to community policing implementation.” Allison T. Chappell, “The Philosophical Versus Actual Adoption of Community Policing: A Case Study,” 34 <i>Crim. Justice Rev.</i> 5, 10 (2009) (<i>comparing</i> Sadd, S., &amp; Grinc, R. M. (1994). Innovative neighborhood-oriented policing: Descriptions of programs in eight cities. New York: Vera Institute of Justice <i>with</i> He, N. P., Zhao, J. S., &amp; Lovrich, N. P. (2005). Community policing: A preliminary assessment of environmental impact with panel data on program implementation in U.S. cities. <i>Crime &amp; Delinquency</i>, 51, 295-317.)</li> <li>○ <i>Accord</i> A. Gerasimos Gianakis, et al, “Reinventing or repackaging public services? The case of community-oriented policing,” 58 <i>Pub. Administration Review</i> 485 (1998) (finding that “maximal implementers” of community-oriented policing strategies “reported more problems with funding than minimal implementers”).</li> <li>○ The most important measure may not be about the overall monetary commitment so much as the effective use of resources. Allison T. Chappell, “The Philosophical Versus Actual Adoption of Community Policing: A Case Study,” 34 <i>Crim. Justice Rev.</i> 5, 17 (2009).</li> </ul>
--	---

## 6. Indicia of Community Policing as Central to Organizational Structure and Operations

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritization of community policing vis-à-vis competing demands and expectations</li> <li>• Funding provided to community policing initiatives</li> <li>• Officers whose duties involve some express community policing component or element</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “One issue” in any organization attempting to adopt community policing “is whether . . . attitudinal and behavioral changes at the police officer level will be supported by structural changes in the police organization.” (A. Gerasimos Gianakis, et al, “Reinventing or repackaging public services? The case of community-oriented policing,” 58 <i>Pub. Administration Review</i> 485 (1998).)</li> <li>○ “In order to successfully implement their community policing programs, most researchers contend that police organizations must adopt an ‘organic’ organizational structure, a participatory management style, new reward structures, new training programs and selection criteria, and new control systems.” A. Gerasimos Gianakis, et al, “Reinventing or repackaging public services? The case of</li> </ul>
---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective use of community policing resources</li> </ul>	<p>community-oriented policing,” 58 <i>Pub. Administration Review</i> 485 (1998) (collecting studies).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This is contrast to “police agencies [that would] implement tangential and symbolic elements of community policing at the fringes of the organization, without actually producing changes in the technical core (where the primary work is accomplished).” Edward R. Maguire &amp; Stephen D. Mastrofski, 3 <i>Police Quarterly</i> 4, 5 (2000).</li> </ul>
---	---

#### 7. Department Uses Performance Measures that Reflect Community Policing Principles

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers are promoted on basis of demonstrated commitment to and competency in community policing and/or successful community problem-solving</li> <li>• Use of community policing-based metrics to gauge officer productivity and effectiveness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adoption and ongoing “updating [of] performance measures to reflect the principles of community policing.” “Because they send a message about what is valued in an organization, appropriate performance evaluation criteria are essential if we expect officers to change their behavior.” Allison T. Chappell, “The Philosophical Versus Actual Adoption of Community Policing: A Case Study,” 34 <i>Crim. Justice Rev.</i> 5, 10 (2009).</li> <li>• “[W]ithin both informal and formal police cultures, crime solving and criminal apprehension are usually more valued than crime prevention. An individual officer is more likely to be commended for arresting a bank robber than for initiating actions that prevent such robberies.” (Gary W. Cordner, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 <i>Police Forum</i> 1, 3(1995)).</li> <li>• “Maximal implementers” of community-oriented policing “reported dramatically more frequent impacts on . . . promotional criteria, and selection criteria than the minimal implementers.” A. Gerasimos Gianakis, et al, “Reinventing or repackaging public services? The case of community-oriented policing,” 58 <i>Pub. Administration Review</i> 485 (1998).</li> <li>• <i>See generally</i> Alpert, G. P., Flynn, D., &amp; Piquero, A. R. “Effective community policing performance measures,” 3 <i>Justice Research and Policy</i> 79-94 (2001).</li> </ul>
--	--

#### 8. Training Incorporating Community Policing Values & Objectives

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community policing training for officers</li> <li>• Community policing training for citizens</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>See generally</i> Allison T. Chappell, “The Philosophical Versus Actual Adoption of Community Policing: A Case Study,” 34 <i>Crim. Justice Rev.</i> 5, 10 (2009); Alpert, G. P., &amp; Dunham, R. G. (1997). <i>Policing Urban America</i> (1997); King, W. R., &amp; Lab, S. P. “Crime prevention, community policing, and training: Old wine in new bottles,” 0); Sadd, S., &amp; Grinc, R. M., Vera Institute of Justice, <i>Innovative neighborhood-oriented policing: Descriptions of programs in eight cities</i> (1994).</li> <li>• “Training and education is an essential element if the implementation of [community-oriented policing] activities</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>is to be successful because [community-oriented policing] philosophy implies fundamental changes in many areas of policing.” Sutham Cheurprakobkit, “Community policing: Training, definitions and policy implications,” 25 <i>Policing</i> 709, 709–710 (2002).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 1995 survey of police executives “found that police departments viewed training and education as facilitators to [community-oriented policing] implementation.” Sutham Cheurprakobkit, “Community policing: Training, definitions and policy implications,” 25 <i>Policing</i> 709, 709–710 (2002) (citing Z. Zhao, et al, “Community-oriented policing across the US: Facilitators and impediments to implementation,” 14 <i>American Journal of Police</i> 11 (1995)).</li> <li>• “Components of COP training take into account specific community needs and the likelihood of success in meeting those needs, therefore requiring updated public input and innovative and proactive thinking on the part of police planners.” Sutham Cheurprakobkit, “Community policing: Training, definitions and policy implications,” 25 <i>Policing</i> 709, 709–710 (2002) (summarizing V. McLaghlin &amp; M.E. Donahue, “Training for community-oriented policing,” in P.C. Kratcoski &amp; D. Dukes (eds.), <i>Issues in Community Policing</i> 125 (1995)).</li> <li>• The practice of community policing without sufficient training can be problematic and counter-productive. (P.C. Kratcoski &amp; S.B. Noonan, “An assessment of police officers’ acceptance of community policing,” in P.C. Kratcoski &amp; D. Dukes (eds.), <i>Issues in Community Policing</i> 169 (1995).</li> <li>• Training on community policing has been found to be effective.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ “It appears that training on [community-oriented policing] does persuade officers to accept this new philosophy of policing. Compared to those who did not receive training, officers who attended the training strongly and significantly agree to adopt and practice [community-oriented policing].” Sutham Cheurprakobkit, “Community policing: Training, definitions and policy implications,” 25 <i>Policing</i> 709, 720 (2002).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--

**9. The Department Has Successfully Implemented Alternatives to Motorized Patrol**

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bike patrols</li> <li>• Storefront or neighborhood-based offices or stations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the most important indicators of good community policing is the successful implementation of alternatives to “motorized patrol, immediate response to all calls for service, and follow-up by detectives.” (Gary W. Cordner, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 <i>Police Forum</i> 1, 4 (1995)).</li> </ul>
--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mobile offices or stations</li> <li>• School resource officers</li> <li>• Foot patrols (especially as a specific assignment or periodic expectation for officers otherwise assigned to cars)</li> </ul>	
--	--

**10. The Department Actively Promotes the Visibility of Officers and Its Activities in a Transparent Manner**

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department communicates to the public about the Department’s successes and failures</li> <li>• Department attempts to make information about its activities and the performance of its officers available, open, and transparent</li> <li>• Chief and command staff promote community policing and problem-solving commitments</li> <li>• Regular TV, radio, Internet, and/or social media messaging to inform community about crime, criminals, police activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Keeping the accomplishments of the police in the public eye” drives confidence, with “the visibility of policing in the neighborhoods” being a primary driver. Visibility can also apply, however, to “investigative efforts, the adoption of new technologies, modernizing management practices, the increasing sophistication and training of police leaders, data-driven crime strategizing, and rational resource allocation.” Wesley G. Skogan, “Concern About Crime and Confidence in the Police,” <i>12 Police Quarterly</i> 301, 312 (2009).</li> <li>• Several studies in UK have found that “local-level communication” matters → these are communications that “[t]ell people clearly what the local agencies in a neighbourhood are doing” and ensuring ‘communication is a) area-specific; b) gives detail on what is being delivered, including agency responses to problems; c) provides information on actions that are planned; and d) includes contact details of how to access services.’ Andrew Rix, et al, “Improving public confidence in the police: a review of the evidence,” U.K. Research, Development and Statistics Directorate 2 (2009).</li> </ul>
--	---

**B. Officers & Personnel**

**1. Officer Assignment to Specific, Appropriately-Sized Beat Enabling Officer-Community Relationships**

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel are given responsibility for geographic areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Community policing recommends that patrol officers be assigned to the same areas for extended periods of time, to increase their familiarity with the community and the community’s familiarity with them. Ideally, this familiarity will build trust, confidence, and cooperation on both sides of the police-citizen interaction. Also, officers will simply</li> </ul>
---	---

	<p>become more knowledgeable about the community and its residents, aiding early intervention and timely problem identification . . .” (Gary W. Cordner, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 <i>Police Forum</i> 1, 2–3 (1995)).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Agencies that assign fixed shifts and beats generally enjoy a higher success rate. Long-term and/or permanent shift assignment—the ultimate forms of decentralization—allow officers to learn more about people, places, issues, and problems within neighborhoods.” Sparrow, M. K., National Institute of Justice <i>Implementing community policing. Research in brief.</i> (1988).</li> <li>• Beats “organized along natural neighborhood boundaries” and “defined by the common characteristics and interests of the populace, such as race or ethnicity, language, culture, and socio-economic status.” Allison T. Chappell, “The Philosophical Versus Actual Adoption of Community Policing: A Case Study,” 34 <i>Crim. Justice Rev.</i> 5, 16 (2009) (summarizing Greene, J. R., “The road to community policing in Los Angeles: A case study,” in G. P. Alpert &amp; A. R. Piquero (Eds.), <i>Community Policing: Contemporary Readings</i> (2000) (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 123-158)).</li> </ul>
--	--

## 2. Officers Spend Sufficient Time Doing Community Engagement

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Patrol officers and supervisors utilize sufficient time in community engagement functions</li> <li>• Calls are classified/prioritized to increase officer time for other activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers must be provided with sufficient time to conduct community engagement. <i>See generally</i> Allison T. Chappell, “The Philosophical Versus Actual Adoption of Community Policing: A Case Study,” 34 <i>Crim. Justice Rev.</i> 17–18.</li> <li>○ Departments must face the reality or belief “that responding to calls for service leaves them with too little time to practice community policing.” <i>Id.</i> (summarizing Glensor, R. W., &amp; Peak, K., “Implementing change: Community-oriented policing and problem solving,” FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin 65(7) at 14-21 (1995)).</li> <li>• Officers should be incentivized to use free time for direct community engagement. Famega, C. N., Frank, J., &amp; Mazerolle, L. (2005), “Managing police patrol time: The role of supervisor directives,” 22 <i>Justice Quarterly</i>, 540 (2005).</li> <li>○ “In many police departments, patrol officers’ time not committed to handling calls is either spent simply waiting for the next call or randomly driving around. Under community policing, this substantial resource of free patrol time is devoted to directed enforcement activities, specific crime prevention efforts, problem solving, community engagement, citizen interaction, or similar kinds of activities.” Gary W. Cordner, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 <i>Police Forum</i> 1, 3 (1995).</li> </ul>
---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In community policing, officers do more than respond to calls. “Officers are to move beyond responding in traditional fashion to individual calls and to adopt, instead, a proactive, prevention-oriented stance toward a wide range of neighborhood problems . . . [T]hese do not have to be crime problems.” Wesley G. Skogan, “Representing the Community in Community Policing,” in <i>Community Policing: Can It Work</i> 58 (2003).</li> </ul>
--	---

### 3. Officers and Supervisors Police Using Information and Data

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers use computer systems to collect and analyze problem-solving information</li> <li>• Identifying top problems by analyzing repeat calls for service</li> <li>• Preventing crime by focusing on conditions that lead to crime (e.g., abandoned buildings and cars, referrals to other civil agencies)</li> <li>• Identifying crime problems by looking at crime trends</li> <li>• Use of computer systems to collect and analyze problem-solving information</li> <li>• Department builds on information systems to enhance crime analysis capabilities</li> <li>• Geographically-based crime analysis is made available to officers at the beat level</li> <li>• Non-law enforcement information (community surveys, input from community partners)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ “Unlike traditional policing, [community-oriented policing] uses information innovatively to put emphasis on quality policing. Proper use of information not only helps police identify and analyze community problems but assists them in police program assessment.” Sutham Cheurprakobkit, “Community policing: Training, definitions and policy implications,” 25 <i>Policing</i> 709, 712 (2002).</li> </ul>
--	--

<p>is used to identify and prioritize problems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department is readily able to access relevant and accurate information to engage in effective problem-solving</li> </ul>	
--	--

**4. Officers Treat Citizens Fairly, Justly, and with Respect**

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community perception of Department performance (surveys)</li> <li>• Trends in citizen complaints about officer performance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “People are <i>more satisfied</i> with police initiated stops than they are with contacts they initiate themselves . . . Perhaps the efforts police now take to explain to people why they have been stopped is one element in this . . . Such care and attention to stop and search demonstrates to people that the police are not taking stops for granted.” Ben Bradford, et al, “Contact and confidence: Revisiting the impact of public encounters with the police,” 19 <i>Policing &amp; Society</i> 20 (2009).</li> <li>• “The procedural justice model of policing argues that the police can build general legitimacy among the public by treating people justly during personal encounters. This argument is based upon two empirical arguments. The first is that people evaluate personal experiences with the police by evaluating the fairness of police procedures. The second is that this means that by using fair procedures the police can increase their legitimacy, even if their policing activities involve restricting or sanctioning the people with whom they are dealing.” Tom Tyler &amp; Jeffrey Fagan, “Legitimacy and Cooperation: Why Do People Help the Police Fight Crime in Their Communities?” 6 <i>Ohio State J. Crim. Law</i> 231, 241 (2008).</li> <li>• COPS Community Survey on Public Safety and Law Enforcement asks about whether participating individuals believe that their agency:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Treats people fairly</li> <li>○ Is responsive to the concerns of community members</li> <li>○ Are respectful</li> <li>○ Show concern for community members. <i>Id.</i> at 3.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--

**5. Decentralized Command Structure Permits Officer Autonomy in Developing Community Relationships**

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision-making authority has been decentralized</li> <li>• Superfluous or redundant management positions have been eliminated</li> <li>• Physical decentralization of field services, investigations</li> <li>• Department gives patrol officers decision-making authority to develop responses to community problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Includes “decentralization of the command structure needed to grant line officers autonomy to solve problems.” Allison T. Chappell, “The Philosophical Versus Actual Adoption of Community Policing: A Case Study,” 34 <i>Crim. Justice Rev.</i> 5, 10 (2009).</li> <li>○ “Researchers have identified decentralization of the command structure as an essential element of community policing.” A. Gerasimos Gianakis, et al, “Reinventing or repackaging public services? The case of community-oriented policing,” 58 <i>Pub. Administration Review</i> 485 (1998).</li> </ul>
--	---

#### 6. Officers Use, and are Incentivized to Use, a Problem-Solving Approach Tailored to Specific Community Problems

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Patrol officers coordinate specific problem-solving projects to address problems on their beat</li> <li>• Detectives have been integrated into community policing efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In community policing, officers use a problem-solving approach that “seeks tailored solutions to specific community problems . . . The common sense notion of choosing the tool that best fits the problem, instead of grabbing the most convenient or familiar tool in the tool box, lies close to the heart of the problem solving method.” (Gary W. Corder, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 <i>Police Forum</i> 1, 5 (1995)).</li> </ul>
---	--

### C. Community Cooperation, Collaboration and Input

#### 1. Citizens Provide Input, and the Department Responds to Such Input

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citizens have open access to police organizations</li> <li>• Citizens have input on police policies and decisions</li> <li>• Department regularly surveys community members to assist in identifying and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Consultation with community groups regarding their security needs” is a “basic element of community policing.” Gerasimos Gianakis, et al, “Reinventing or repackaging public services? The case of community-oriented policing,” 58 <i>Pub. Administration Review</i> 485 (1998) (summarizing Bayley, David H. (1994a). “International Differences in Community Policing.” In Dennis P. Rosenbaum, ed., <i>The Challenge of Community Policing</i>. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 278- 281.)</li> <li>○ “[R]esidents may be called on to <i>represent the community</i> by serving on advisory boards or decision-making committees.”</li> </ul>
--	---

<p>prioritizing crime problems and to evaluate police service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department meets with community members to learn more about the nature, source, and possible solutions to specific community problems</li> <li>• Department includes community members in selecting responses to problems and determining measures of success</li> </ul>	<p>(Wesley G. Skogan, “Representing the Community in Community Policing,” in Wesley G. Skogan (Ed.), <i>Community Policing: Can It Work?</i> 57 (2003)).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Individual neighborhoods and communities should have the opportunity to influence how they are policed and legitimate interest groups in the community should be able to discuss their views and concerns.” (Gary W. Cordner, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 <i>Police Forum</i> 1, 2 (1995)).</li> <li>○ Mechanisms are “varied” but include “systematic and periodic community surveys to elicit citizen input,” “open forums, town meetings, radio and television call-in programs,” “meet[ing] regularly with citizen advisory boards, ministry alliances, minority group representatives, business leaders, and other formal groups.” ((Gary W. Cordner, “Community Policing: Elements and Effects,” 5 <i>Police Forum</i> 1, 2 (1995)).</li> </ul>
---	--

## 2. Citizens are Involved with Law Enforcement and Crime Prevention

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citizens have open access to police organizations</li> <li>• Citizens have input on police policies and decisions</li> <li>• Police hold regular meetings with community groups to discuss crime</li> <li>• Community helps identify crime problems</li> <li>• Citizens are able to and do volunteer with the law enforcement agency</li> <li>• Citizen patrols organized by the Department within community</li> <li>• Citizens participate in the selection process for new officers</li> <li>• Citizens participate in promotional process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “[R]esident involvement (along with organizational decentralization and the adoption of a problem-solving orientation by police) is among the core components of most community policing programs.” (Wesley G. Skogan, “Representing the Community in Community Policing,” in Wesley G. Skogan (Ed.), <i>Community Policing: Can It Work?</i> 57 (2003)).</li> <li>○ Citizen education: involving citizens “in information programs or enrolling them in citizen police academies that give them in-depth knowledge of law enforcement,” <i>id.</i></li> <li>○ Assisting the police: residents “asked to assist the police, usually by being their ‘eyes and ears’ and reporting crimes promptly when they occur,” <i>id.</i></li> <li>○ Coproduction of safety: “when [residents] partner with the police in crime prevention projects or walk in officially sanctioned neighborhood patrol groups,” <i>id.</i></li> </ul>
---	--

### 3. The Department Maintains and Optimizes a Range of Community Partnerships

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citizens have open access to police organizations</li> <li>• Citizens have input on police policies and decisions</li> <li>• Police identify crime problems with other government agencies (prosecutors, courts, social services, probation officers)</li> <li>• Existence of partnerships with: governmental agencies, civic groups, neighborhood associations, tenants' associations, police employee organizations, business groups, religious groups, schools</li> <li>• Department meets regularly, at regularly-scheduled meetings, with community leaders/groups to explain activities and crime trends</li> <li>• Department staff routinely collaborate with other municipal agencies to address problems</li> <li>• Department consults with civic groups, neighborhood associations, and the like to address crime and disorder</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Community partnerships are defined as collaborative partnerships between the law enforcement agency and the individuals and organizations they serve to develop solutions to problems and increase trust in police.” COPS Office, Community Policing Self Assessment Tool 6 (2001).</li> <li>○ <u>Engagement with a wide range of partners</u>, with potential partners including “other law enforcement agencies other components of the criminal justice system, other government agencies, non-profits that serve the community, the local media, and individuals in the community.” <i>Id.</i></li> <li>▪ “The Black church possesses unrivaled moral authority in the African American community—in no small part because of its historic opposition to police brutality. Accordingly, no institution occupies a better position to help the police regain legitimacy in predominantly African American inner-city neighborhoods.” Dan M. Kahan, “Reciprocity, Collective Action, and Community Policing,” 90 Cal. L. Rev. 1513, 1531 (2002) (footnotes omitted)</li> <li>○ <u>Government partnerships (non-law enforcement)</u> including “parks, public works, traffic engineering, code enforcement, and/or the school system”</li> <li>○ <u>Local business partnerships</u>. “[N]on-government partners include block watch groups, faith-based organizations, neighborhood associations, non-profit service providers, media, local businesses, and youth clubs.”</li> <li>○ <u>General engagement with the community</u>.</li> </ul>
--	---

4. Department Participates in, Organizes, and/or Promotes Community-Based Crime Prevention and Social Service Initiatives

<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department is involved in, supports, or organizes: youth programs, antidrug programs, antiviolen- ce programs, Neighborhood Watch, citizen patrols, cross- agency partnerships, drug education programs, tip hotline/Crime Stoppers program, police/youth programs (PAL program, mentoring program)</li> </ul>	<p><i>See generally</i> COPS Fast Community Policing Data, Community Policing Information Worksheets.</p>
---	---

## Appendix B.

# Summary of Areas for Future Inquiry

**Homicide Clearance Rates.** Changes in homicide clearance rates may, or may not be, tied to an increase in community confidence in SPD. The data should be interpreted in light of additional information about the nature of the cases.

**Community Advisory Councils.** There are mixed views about the current status and efficacy of SPD's community advisory councils. This should be explored further.

**Isolated Communities.** The Monitoring Team did not have the ability to systematically identify similarities and differences in the experiences of individuals of varying groups that we refer to as "isolated communities" in this report. These isolated communities are in many instances most affected by police interactions. Follow-up studies should reflect in greater detail the issues and concerns that impact these communities.

**Micro-Community Policing Plans.** This report frequently refers to the micro-community policing plan initiative. Subsequent studies should address the early implementation of these plans – and evaluate how the community feels about such plans.

**Strategic Outreach Plan.** SPD's comprehensive community engagement plan will need to be reviewed and evaluated to ensure that it is consistent with the values of Seattle's diverse communities.

**Spending on Community Engagement.** This report does not exhaustively inventory spending on the area of "community policing." Other interested groups may find an analysis of SPD's spending on core community policing and engagement areas to be useful.

**SPD's Response to Community Input.** A more focused and sustained treatment of how SPD does, or does not, respond to specific community input would be valuable to ensure that policing in Seattle adequately reflects principles of democratic participation.

**OPA Complaints.** This report notes that the number of OPA complaints has recently increased. Future inquiries should address why complaints have gone up – and if an increased willingness to file a complaint indicates greater confidence simply in OPA or in SPD as a whole.

**Demonstration Policing.** Although this report references concerns that some members of the public have expressed with regard to the policing of protests, demonstrations, and other crowd management situations, additional focus should be given to ensuring that law enforcement in such contexts is effectuated in a manner consistent with the values of the Seattle community.

# **Appendix C. Anzalone Liszt Grove Executive Summary**

September 10, 2015

To: Interested Parties

Fr: Brian Stryker

Re: Seattle Police Community Survey Findings

---

## **Purpose Statement + Key Findings**

This research was commissioned by the federal monitoring team to assess community perceptions of the Seattle police, gauge the prevalence of community interactions with the police, and understand the nature of those interactions. This is the second survey of its kind commissioned by the monitoring team, and it follows a similar survey conducted in August 2013 that asked many of the same questions to a similar audience.

Of particular note, the monitoring team set out to measure how often Seattle residents say they are the victims of racial profiling, excessive force, and verbally abusive language. In this survey we set out to measure any changes in attitudes on these issues from the 2013 research we conducted. Like in 2013, we didn't just look at the incidence of specific events. We looked at changes in perceptions of how often these events happen, and how Seattleites perceive the police treat people in various racial, socioeconomic, and demographic groups.

Further, in 2015 we slightly changed the sample design of the survey to interview more people in the communities who gave the Seattle PD lower marks on these areas. Specifically, that means we conducted an oversample of Latinos—in English and Spanish—and an oversample of African Americans. This allowed us to analyze these communities not just as a monolithic bloc, but to look for differences in perceptions among these groups by key demographics and experiences (age, gender, interactions with police, etc.). We weighted the full survey results to be representative of Seattle's population

Some of the key findings of the survey include:

- **The Seattle Police Department's overall ratings improved, with disapproval of the department down sharply.** People are more pleased with the job SPD is doing this year (64% approve / 25% disapprove) than they were in 2013 (60% approve / 34% disapprove). Especially encouraging is that Latinos have grown more positive towards SPD (as have whites). African Americans remain a little more skeptical of SPD (48% approve / 40% disapprove) than residents overall.
- **Fewer people are reporting problems with SPD from their personal interactions.** People who are stopped by SPD are more likely to approve of the way that stop is handled (70% approve) than they were in 2013 (65%). In particular, African Americans and Latinos (55% approve 2015 / 44% approve 2013) and people who have been stopped for something besides a traffic issue (65% approve 2015 / 47% approve 2013)

Anzalone Liszt Grove Research conducted n=692 live cellphone and landline telephone interviews with adults 18 and older in Seattle, with an additional 67 interviews among Latinos and 141 interviews among African Americans. General-population respondents were selected at random, with interviews apportioned geographically, by police precinct, based on Census information. Care was taken to get a representative number of interviews via cellphone to insure a survey that was representative of the city's population by race, age, and income. Oversamples among Latinos and African Americans were conducted using listed sample with predictive modeling of race, and with random-digit dialing of areas with high concentrations of each population according to Census information. The survey was then weighted to accurately reflect the distribution of the population by various demographic characteristics. The expected margin of sampling error is + 3.7% at the 95% confidence level for all adults and higher for subgroups. The monitor engaged the Department of Justice and the City of Seattle, during the survey drafting process, who all provided valuable guidance on questionnaire design and methodology.

have given SPD much better marks. Those same groups were the most likely to disapprove of SPD's handling of their interaction in 2013.

- **Very few people report personally being victims of excessive force from SPD in the last year.** Less than 1% of people say they have been victims of excessive force in the past year. That includes 1% of African Americans and 1% of Latinos, who in 2013 reported much higher rates of experiencing excessive force (5% and 9% respectively).
- **Four percent of Seattleites say they were victims of SPD racial profiling in the past year, identical to 2013.** This includes 10% of Asian Americans, 9% of African Americans, and 6% of Latinos who said they were treated differently because of their race—all within the margin of error of last year or down.
  - *Citizens nationwide have soured on police regarding race.* In August 2014 Pew found that only 30% of Americans have “a great deal of confidence in police to treat whites and blacks equally”; lower than 2009 (33%) and 2007% (37%). The Washington Post/ABC found in December 2014 that 54% of Americans think “blacks and other minorities do not receive equal treatment to whites in the criminal justice system”, up from 50% in July 2013. Seattle PD are swimming against the tide of national popular opinion in trying to improve community perceptions regarding racial profiling.
- **At the same time, people are not less likely to say that SPD is keeping them safe.** There's no evidence that people think Seattle PD is less able to do its core job at the same time that people are reporting more positive interactions with police.
- **Overall public perception isn't changing as quickly as people's personal interactions.** Just as many people today say they believe SPD uses excessive force very or somewhat often (46%) as said the same in 2013 (45%). The same goes for racial profiling: 55% of people say that police engage in it today very or somewhat often, compared with 53% who said so in 2013.
- **Latinos' and African Americans' experiences still back up the public's perception that SPD treats them worse than others.** African Americans' and Latinos' experiences have gotten better in the last two years, but they are still not the same as whites or Asian Americans. They are more likely than whites to disapprove of how police treat them, they are more likely than whites to say police used force in an interaction, and they are less likely than whites to say police engaged in a wide range of positive behaviors such as treated them respectfully and listened to them. And they are more likely than whites to report being stopped in the first place by SPD. Most Seattleites also think that SPD treats Latinos and African Americans worse than others in the city.
- **Word of mouth is still a serious factor in negative opinions of SPD.** Word of mouth is one of the most popular ways for communities to spread news about the police: among African Americans, it is second only to TV, as 49% of African Americans say they get much of their information about the police through word of mouth. We conclude based on the data that bad police interactions have a multiplier effect that flows through the community as people tell their family, friends, and neighbors about their experiences.

The bad news still travels faster than the good when it comes to community-police interactions: people are much more likely to disapprove of how the police treated someone they know who interacted with the police (31% disapprove) than they are to disapprove of how they were treated (23% disapprove). We fully expect to see a “data lag” here due to fundamentals of word of mouth communication and of human

psychology. It's very likely that perceptions of police are a trailing indicator, and that there has to be a lot of years of good policing to negate perceptions in some communities. Given the positive trend in SPD approval overall and in the SPD's treatment of people they stop, there's reason to be hopeful that this process is beginning to occur.

- **On the flip side, Seattle PD community engagement makes people like the department more.** These personal meetings and interactions such as neighborhood/block watch programs make a big difference. Thirty-nine percent of people have been to one of these type of meetings, and those people are more likely to give SPD a positive job rating (68% approve / 25% disapprove) than Seattleites overall. People who have participated in a neighborhood/block watch program (75% approve) or a living room conversation (75% approve) are especially supportive of the police.

### **Overall Attitudes Towards Seattle Police**

Opinions of police have substantially improved since 2013—the amount of people who disapprove of the police (25%) is significantly down from 2013 in particular (34%). Some of the notable groups who are more supportive of Seattle police this year include:

- Latinos: 65% approve / 23% disapprove 2015, 54% approve / 39% disapprove 2013
- LGBT Seattleites: 72% app / 27% dis 2015, 55% app / 44% dis 2013
- Asian Americans: 70% app / 17% dis 2015, 67% app / 27% dis 2013
- Whites: 66% app / 25% dis 2015, 60% app / 35% dis 2013

Given that Washington State Patrol's approval rating hasn't changed (73% approve now / 74% 2013) nor have Seattle FD (90% approve now / 92% 2013) or Seattle schools (53% approve now / 52% 2013), it's likely this change is about SPD more than a general positivity towards local and state institutions. Chief Kathleen O'Toole is also popular with Seattleites (61% approve / 11% disapprove), and her job approval rating is similar among racial lines (63% with whites / 59% with African Americans / 53% with Latinos / 62% with Asian Americans).

The most notable group that has not warmed towards SPD statistically is African Americans. A small plurality approved of SPD in 2013 (49% approve / 42% disapprove), and that's still true today (48% approve / 40% disapprove). However, outside of this group all movement is positive. African Americans are also the only group more likely to strongly disapprove of Seattle PD (27%) than they are to strongly approve (13%)—Latinos had a similar dynamic in 2013, but now they are more likely to strongly approve of SPD (29%) than strongly disapprove (11%).

There are also regional changes in SPD's job rating. In particular, approval of the police has gone up sharply in the West precinct at the same time disapproval has dropped. In all regions but the East, the police's disapproval rating has dropped, and the East and South precincts continue to have worse ratings for the police than the rest of Seattle.

Police job rating by precinct (% approve / % disapprove)

<b>Precinct</b>	<b>Job rating, 2015</b>	<b>Job rating, 2013</b>
<b>North</b>	67 / 23	63 / 30
<b>West</b>	73 / 22	61 / 36
<b>East</b>	52 / 34	49 / 45
<b>South</b>	56 / 31	59 / 31
<b>Southwest</b>	68 / 19	63 / 35

## **Police Public Safety Ratings**

People still think Seattle PD is doing a good job keeping them safe: 71% of people agree the SPD keeps people safe, statistically unchanged from 74% who thought so in 2013. People also broadly agree they do a good job of “serving my neighborhood” (68% agree they do so today / 72% in 2013). Asked whether the police quickly solve crimes and arrest criminals very or somewhat often, the same amount of people say they do so now (65%) as said so in 2013 (63%). None of these public-safety ratings differ significantly by race, geography, age, or gender—the police have majority support on each area across the city.

## **Who is Getting Stopped by Police?**

Much of the city interacts with the police in an involuntary manner every year<sup>1</sup>. Twenty nine percent of people did so in the past year (up from 23% in 2015), and 28% know a friend who has done so (these groups are not mutually exclusive). Combined, 42% of people have either had a personal interaction with police in the past year or know someone who has—that number is slightly up from 39% in 2013. Just like in 2013, most of these stops were traffic related<sup>2</sup>.

Race is a significant factor in whether people are stopped or not (traffic or non-traffic), as it was in 2013. African Americans are far more likely to be stopped in their car (28% in the last year) than whites (13%), Asian Americans (19%), or Latinos (18%) That’s doubly telling since this question does not account for the time people spend in a car. The Census shows that Latinos and African Americans in Seattle are far less likely to own a car and far less likely to drive cars as often as whites, so the per-mile rate that African Americans and Latinos are stopped is likely even higher than these results suggest on their face.

The pattern persists for non-traffic interactions: African Americans have experienced far more of these per person in the last year (20%) than Whites (10%). Again Latinos (19%) and Asian Americans (14%) are stopped more than whites. Age is a factor as well: African Americans under 40 are most likely to experience these interactions (21%).

## **Experiences of Those Who Were Stopped**

People had better experiences with police stops in 2015 than in 2013. They were more likely to approve of how they were treated during stops overall (traffic or non-traffic). Most importantly, many of those gains came among some of the groups who say they were treated the most problematically in the past.

One of the key stories in the data in 2015 is how much better interactions between the police and African Americans/Latinos have gone, and how much better in general interactions with police have gone in non-traffic stops. A sizable 13% of people had a non-traffic related interaction<sup>3</sup>, and 25% of Seattleites either had this type of interaction themselves or know someone who has. We focus more on these non-traffic incidents for two reasons: 1) they are often the more serious category of interaction, such as being arrested or detained, and 2) in 2013 people who had a non-traffic interaction with SPD had much more negative experiences than those with traffic interactions. We also focus on stops with African-Americans and Latinos

---

<sup>1</sup> Defined as being stopped by SPD while in your car, being stopped by SPD while walking or standing in a public place or street, being involved in a traffic accident that was reported to police, or being involuntarily questioned by SPD at home

<sup>2</sup> Defined as being stopped by SPD while in your car or being involved in a traffic accident that was reported to Police.

<sup>3</sup> Defined as being stopped by SPD while walking or standing in a public place or street, or being involuntarily questioned by SPD at home.

because these groups were most likely to report a negative interaction with police in 2013 (traffic or non-traffic stop).

Approve – disapprove of police handling of stops, 2015 v 2013

	<b>2015</b>	<b>2013</b>
<b>Overall</b>	70 – 23	65 – 34
<b>African American</b>	57 – 36	(sample size too small)
<b>Latino</b>	52 – 39	(sample size too small)
<b>African American + Latino</b>	55 – 38	44 – 42
<b>White</b>	75 – 19	77 – 22
<b>Non-traffic stop</b>	65 – 26	47 – 53

Simply, people are reporting much more equal treatment from police than in the past.

There still are serious racial differences in how people are interacting with police. African Americans and Latinos report being treated better by police than they were in 2013, but by no means are they reporting the same satisfaction as whites with personal police interactions. We unfortunately can't speak to Asian Americans' experience due to their relatively small population combined with the relative infrequency with which they interact with police.

When we dive deeper than just overall approve/disapprove ratings, we also see African Americans and Latinos more likely than whites to report specific problems with their interactions. They are more likely than whites to say police engaged in the following during their most serious interaction with the police in the past year:

- Use verbally abusive language (Latino 23 / African American 20 / White 7)
- Threatened to use physical force other than handcuffing (African American 22 / Latino 11 / White 12)
- Used physical force other than handcuffing (African American 18 / Latino 13 / White 8)

And they are less likely than whites to report the police conducting the following positive items happen during their interaction:

- Treated them respectfully (White 79 / Latino 73 / African American 60)
- Had a valid reason for stopping me (White 64 / Latino 52 / African American 43)
- Explained the reason you were stopped in a clear way (White 73 / Latino 65 / African American 61)
- Stopped them for a reasonable amount of time (White 74 / Latino 59 / African American 56)
- Answered all of their questions (White 74 / African American 60 / Latino 52)
- Listened to what I had to say (White 75 / Latino 61 / African American 57)
- Kept them informed of what was going to happen next (White 66 / Latino 53 / African American 49)

Trend from 2013

These numbers show the same trends as the overall interaction ratings: improvement across the board, with even more substantial improvements within the African American and Latino communities. On many specific areas, Latinos and African Americans today had similar interactions as the overall population did in 2013. So we aren't yet at parity, but there's broad improvement going on both generally in overall police interactions and specifically in interactions among groups we identified as the biggest worries two years ago.

Note: we didn't interview enough African Americans and Latinos in 2013 to speak to their individual experiences with police—that's why we oversampled them in 2015—so these results are presented with those two groups combined in order to obtain sufficient sample sizes for comparisons.

**Frequency of event reporting during interaction with police**

	<b>2015 – 2013 (overall)</b>	<b>2015 – 2013 (AA + Latino)</b>
<b>Verbally abusive language</b>	13 – 18	22 – 36
<b>Threatened with force</b>	12 – 12	17 – 30
<b>Used physical force</b>	11 – 11	16 – 25
<b>Treated respectfully</b>	72 – 72	67 – 54
<b>Valid reason for stop</b>	58 – 60	48 – 48
<b>Explained reason of stop</b>	69 – 71	63 – 45
<b>Stopped reasonable time</b>	69 – 67	58 – 48
<b>Answered all questions</b>	69 – 69	56 – 56
<b>Listened to me</b>	68 – N/A	59 – N/A
<b>Kept me informed</b>	62 – N/A	51 – N/A

Overall, specific negative and positive events within interactions happened at a similar rate in 2015 and 2013. However, we did see substantial movement among African Americans and Latinos in a positive direction. Those two groups were much less likely to report having forced used on them, and they were less likely to report being verbally threatened with force or verbally abused. They also were more likely to say their stops were reasonable, their stops were explained, and they were treated with respect.

**Public perception of police treatment**

Even though people have been having better interactions with police, it has not at this point filtered up to changes in broader public perception. Most Seattleites (55%) believe that SPD engages in racial profiling very or somewhat often, statistically unchanged from 2013 (53%). The same is true on whether SPD treats people differently because of their race (54% 2015 / 52% 2013). These perceptions are still far more common among African Americans (71%) and Latinos (61%), but whites (53%) and Asian Americans (51%) also see this as a problem<sup>4</sup>.

When we drill down deeper, most Seattleites still think that Latinos and African Americans are being mistreated by police. That's also true for homeless people.

**Perceived treatment of groups by police (% treated the same as others / % treated not as well)**

	<b>2015</b>	<b>2013</b>
<b>Homeless people</b>	27 / 58	25 / 59
<b>African Americans</b>	31 / 57	32 / 54
<b>Latinos</b>	35 / 51	33 / 49
<b>Native Americans</b>	35 / 48	33 / 48
<b>Young people</b>	45 / 41	45 / 39
<b>Asian and Pacific Islanders</b>	62 / 21	56 / 24

None of these changes are statistically meaningful, so it's hard to claim any progress or backsliding on this perception. We also see that African Americans think they are being treated worse than the public does—73% say they aren't treated as well as other groups. That's not

<sup>4</sup> For subgroup analysis on this question we combined two split-sampled questions: “Seattle Police engage in racial profiling” (55% very/somewhat often) and “Seattle Police treat people differently because of their race” (54% very/somewhat often)

true among Asian Americans (17% think they are treated not as well). Latinos (53% not as well) also have similar perceptions of their treatment as non-Latinos do. Last year more Latinos thought they were mistreated (59%) than did the city overall. Similarly, people 18-24 years old (46% not as well) view their own treatment about as the public does.

### **Perceived Harassment/Excessive Force Frequency**

Again, there haven't been any big changes in here—perceptions of individual SPD bad actions have been relatively stagnant. Forty-six percent of Seattleites believe the police commit excessive force very or somewhat often, unchanged from 45% saying the same in 2013. African Americans are more likely to believe the police engages in many different bad behaviors today than the general public. Below is a chart showing the static nature of general bad-behavior perceptions:

% saying the Seattle Police does each item often (very + somewhat often 2015 / very + somewhat often 2013)

	<b>All Adults</b>	<b>African Americans</b>	<b>Latinos</b>	<b>Whites</b>	<b>Asian-Americans</b>
<b>Uses excessive physical force</b>	46 / 45	69 / 70	43 / 62	44 / 43	39 / 31
<b>Use verbally abusive language</b>	33 / 33	49 / 50	38 / 48	29 / 32	34 / 22
<b>Use racial slurs towards minorities</b>	26 / 26	46 / 49	31 / 45	21 / 23	33 / 22

There were some overall positive trends among Latinos on these measures, matched by some overall negative trends among Asian Americans. Note that this measured perceptions of excessive force, abusive language, and use of slurs towards everyone, not just towards one's specific racial group.

### **Community Engagement Ratings**

The SPD receives slightly improved ratings on whether it takes the time to meet members of your community (44% agree / 38% disagree) compared with 2013 (40% agree / 42% disagree). SPD receives strong marks from Asian Americans on this (55%) as they did in 2013, and they get high marks the West precinct (56%). They are weakest in the East (34%) and among Latinos under 35 (31%).

### **Formal Complaint Filings Low, Compared to Negative Interactions**

Most people who had a bad interaction with police still aren't filing complaints. In 2013, only 28% of people who had a bad interaction filed a complaint. That is 23% in 2015, statistically no different than 2013. Based on the data and information provided by respondents discussed below, we do not believe complaints are a valid measure of overall opinions relation to police-community interactions.

This year we dove deeper into why people aren't filing complaints. We allowed people who had a bad experience and didn't file a complaint to give more than one reason for not doing so.

Many reasons fell into the category of cynicism or even fear that their complaint would produce no positive outcome:

- I didn't think it would make any changes in the department (81%, top response)
- I have heard about others filing a complaint and not having a good experience (40%)
- I was worried about being harassed by the police if I filed a complaint (24%)

At the same time, many people weren't dissatisfied enough to file a complaint, or their problems were resolved without the process:

- The incident was so minor it didn't seem worth the trouble (51%)
- The police addressed my issues without me having to file a formal complaint (22%)

An additional group (46%) didn't know the process for filing a formal complaint. So ignorance certainly play a role in the low ratio of complaints to actual bad interactions with police. Given that, there's work to be done educating people on the complaint process and showing them positive results from that process. But one can't take that 23% who filed a complaint and assume that for every complaint there are three people who had just as bad of a problem and didn't file a complaint. Many who don't file a complaint either had less serious problems or had those problems resolved outside the formal process.

### **Experiences of racial profiling + excessive force**

Two things are true at the same time here that follow the thread of the rest of the survey:

1. **Many, many fewer people feel they are the victim of these two behaviors.** Less than 1% of Seattleites report being a victim of excessive force in the past year, and even among groups who reported higher levels in 2013 there's virtually nobody experiencing this. The same with racially different treatment: the amount of African-Americans and Latinos who report this has been cut in half.
2. **People are still reporting that someone they know experienced one of these at high rates.** We can't answer why this number isn't going down in tandem with personal experience. Perhaps people are conflating timelines, and they heard a story recently that actually happened long ago. Perhaps the stories are shifting to more distant and distant acquaintances, making the "magnifier effect" of each story larger as the actual population incidence goes down. And perhaps the increased national stories around police shootings have prompted people to tell their own stories more than in the past. Regardless of the reason(s), it is clear that these stories are still echoing around the community in a way that is harmful to community perceptions of police. Because the data doesn't say why this is happening, it also can't point to potential solutions. This does, however, help explain why individual events are going way down yet community perception isn't changing.

It's also worth noting the (small) uptick of Asian Americans feeling differently because of their race. This is a minor change and barely outside the margin of error, but if we conduct this survey again we think it's important to make sure we're monitoring that group for any changes. I also could see a benefit to conducting qualitative research among Asian Americans, especially with people from different countries of ancestral origin. That would be a useful tool in gauging perceptions among that community which has a lot of diversity within itself.

2013 vs 2015 reporting of racially different treatment and excessive force (2015% / 2013%)

	<b>All Adults</b>	<b>African Americans</b>	<b>Latinos</b>	<b>Whites</b>	<b>Asian Americans</b>
<b>Experienced racially different treatment (self)</b>	4 / 4	9 / 16	6 / 17	1 / 1	10 / 5
<b>Experienced racially different treatment (someone you know)</b>	23 / 21	44 / 36	34 / 41	18 / 17	24 / 16
<b>Experienced excessive force (self)</b>	0 / 1	1 / 5	1 / 9	0 / 0	0 / 0
<b>Experienced excessive force (someone you know)</b>	7 / 8	14 / 17	10 / 28	5 / 5	3 / 5

**Body cameras**

Seattleites overwhelmingly want to see body cameras on their officers. This is almost universally popular (89% support / 7% oppose), and it's not possible to find a statistically significant population in the city who supports this by any less than 80%. This is similar to the 87% of people who think it's a good idea nationally, according to Pew Research's December 2014 poll.



## Monitoring Team Staff

**Merrick Bobb**  
Monitor

**Matthew Barge**  
Deputy Director

**Peter Ehrlichman**  
Deputy Monitor

**Ronald Ward**  
Assistant Monitor

**Chief Joseph Brann (ret.)**  
Senior Police Expert

**Robert Saltzman**  
**Julio Thompson**  
**Marnie Carlin MacDiarmid**  
Esq.

**Joseph Doherty**  
**Ellen Scrivner**  
Ph.D.

**Brian Center**  
Senior Consultant

**Jeffrey Yamson**  
**Luis Perez**  
Executive Assistants