

A Framework for Community Policing in Cleveland

Community policing involves the police and the community working as partners to “co-produce” public safety and neighborhood well-being. The core idea behind community policing is that the police and the community share jointly in the responsibility for promoting public safety, and that each has an important role to play. A division-wide commitment to community policing is an essential step toward promoting trust and legitimacy, improving the quality of police-citizen encounters, and addressing persistent public safety issues in Cleveland communities.

Although “community policing” often is associated with specific programs or strategies—such as athletic leagues or foot patrol—community policing cannot be implemented effectively unless it is embraced by the organization as a whole. As countless law enforcement professionals have recognized, community policing principles should inform decisionmaking at all levels of the agency, including decisions about hiring, deployment, and evaluation.¹ Many traditional approaches to agency management and organization are incompatible with community policing. Officers who spend their days rushing between calls for service, for example, will not have time to get to know residents or address community concerns. Many of the problems that residents identify require cooperation from others within the agency—or from other municipal agencies. So long as officers are evaluated primarily on the basis of metrics like stops and arrests, they are unlikely to invest the time and energy into working with residents or developing alternative strategies for addressing public safety issues.

The Consent Decree requires the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) to “develop and implement a comprehensive and integrated community and problem-oriented policing model” to “promote and strengthen partnerships with the community ... and increase community confidence in the CDP.” The decree also requires that the Monitoring Team, the Community Police Commission (CPC), and the CDP engage the community in identifying the strategies and approaches to community policing that will best address the needs of Cleveland residents and facilitate close partnership between the community and the CDP.

This document provides a framework for the CDP’s community and problem-oriented policing work plan required by the Consent Decree. It identifies the core components of community policing—such as collaborative problem-solving, community partnerships, and broad-based engagement—as well as related areas of division management and organization that the CDP will need to address in order to implement the plan effectively. These include staffing and deployment, equipment and resources, recruitment and hiring, officer training, and officer and supervisor evaluation.

¹ See, e.g. POLICE EXECUTIVE RESEARCH FORUM (PERF), COMMUNITY POLICING: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE at 4 (2004); PRESIDENTIAL TASK FORCE ON 21ST CENTURY POLICING, FINAL REPORT at 43 (2015) (hereinafter “21ST CENTURY TASK FORCE REPORT”).

For each component, we describe generally what it entails and the ways in which it contributes to the overall community policing plan. We then highlight some of the questions on which it would be beneficial to seek community input.

I. Community and Problem-Oriented Policing

Although “community policing” has come to mean many things, and has been associated with a variety of specific programs and strategies, there is wide agreement within the law enforcement community on its three critical components:

- Meaningful opportunities for community input on policing policies and practices;
- Police-community collaboration in identifying and addressing community problems and concerns;
- Opportunities for officers to get to know the community.

Each of the three components is necessary to ensure that the CDP and the community work as partners to “co-produce” public safety. This Section describes the essential features of each of these components, and highlights the range of approaches for the CDP to consider in developing its community policing plan.

A. Collaborative Problem-Solving

Collaborative problem-solving—sometimes referred to as “problem-oriented policing”—is based on the idea that public safety issues often reflect broad underlying problems. These problems can include systemic issues like infrastructure and public health, as well as small but significant concerns like abandoned vehicles and empty lots. Addressing the conditions that contribute to crime and disorder can create more lasting benefits than traditional enforcement activity.

The Consent Decree specifically requires the CDP to ensure that officers “engage in problem identification and solving activities.” To ensure that these problem-solving efforts are successful, the Decree also requires that “all levels of CDP ... engage with and maintain community partnerships across all neighborhoods in the City of Cleveland” and that officers “engage with these partnerships in a way that facilitates collaborative, community-based crime prevention.”

Models and Best Practices

Agencies can use problem-oriented policing to address a variety of public safety concerns, ranging from traffic congestion to burglaries and petty theft. In Plano, Texas, for example, residents had complained about “congestion, speeding, red light running, illegal parking, and crashes” near a local elementary school during drop-off and pick-up hours. Officers developed a comprehensive strategy to address the problem, including parent education, stepped up traffic enforcement, and working with the city to install new carpool lanes and traffic control

devices to re-direct traffic.² In Concord, CA, review of crime data showed that repeat offenders accounted for approximately half of all domestic violence incidents. To address the problem, the Concord police department “partnered with the district attorney’s office, a local battered women’s shelter, the chamber of commerce, and probation and parole” to develop a plan that included a combination of stepped up enforcement and victim assistance.³

Although the success of problem-oriented policing models depends on a variety of factors, two things are essential:

- **Use of systematic processes** to identify and address problems;
- **Collaboration with community partners** at all stages of the process.

Each of these is briefly discussed in turn.

Systematic Processes

Successful problem-oriented policing models are organized around systematic processes that all officers can use to identify problems and develop potential responses. Studies suggest that without formal processes to guide and evaluate problem-solving efforts, agency problem-solving initiatives can quickly lose focus, or be applied inconsistently throughout the agency.⁴

A number of agencies train officers to use the four-step “SARA” model. Under the model, officers are instructed to:

- **Scan** for underlying problems that may require police attention;
- **Analyze** each problem to determine its root causes and contributing factors;
- **Respond** to the problem using a combination of traditional enforcement tactics and non-enforcement approaches;
- **Assess** the extent to which the response addressed the problem at issue.

Although there are of course a number of variants to this approach, what is important is that officers take time to thoroughly work through each of these steps. Agencies can encourage officers to complete these steps by requiring officers to document their efforts and discuss their progress with supervisors or district commanders. For example, in Concord, CA, officers are “required to document problems within their sub-beats, to enact plans for resolving the problems,

² UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICE SERVICES (COPS OFFICE), PROBLEM-SOLVING TIPS: A GUIDE TO REDUCING CRIME AND DISORDER THROUGH PROBLEM-SOLVING PARTNERSHIPS (2011).

³ UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, COPS OFFICE, IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING: LESSONS FROM 12 AGENCIES 113 (2009).

⁴ See, e.g. IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING at 15 (summarizing studies).

and to assess the outcomes.”⁵ In Newport News, VA, officers submit “monthly narratives of community policing and problem-solving activities.”⁶

Community Partnerships

The other essential component of collaborative problem-solving is community partnership. Potential partners for problem-solving efforts include residents, local businesses, non-profit organizations, community and faith-based leaders, and other government agencies. Community partners can:

- alert police officers to quality of life issues or underlying conditions that may not be apparent from crime statistics;
- assist officers in prioritizing the problems that are of greatest concern;
- identify the approaches that are likely to work best in their neighborhoods;
- participate in neighborhood watch and other community-based public safety programs;
- assist the CDP in identifying and implementing non-enforcement strategies to address neighborhood concerns.

One strategy for identifying partners is called “asset mapping.” Asset mapping involves creating an “inventory of a community’s resources” and identifying potential partners with whom to collaborate on police community initiatives or help bridge ties.⁷ Assets include both formal organizations (e.g., faith-based and community organizations, social service providers, and other government agencies) and informal community groups (e.g., quilting circles and online community networks).⁸

Another potential approach is to use more formal structures—such as neighborhood advisory groups—to encourage community participation in problem-solving activities. In Reno, for example, the City funds neighborhood advisory groups in each of the City’s five wards. Police officers attend these monthly meetings to solicit community input and develop strategies to address quality of life issues, “such as graffiti abatement, disorderly behavior, and street-level drug sales.”⁹ In other jurisdictions, police departments have set up their own advisory boards to collaborate on problem-solving efforts.¹⁰

⁵ IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING at 42.

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ VERA INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE, *How to Increase Cultural Understanding*, in POLICE PERSPECTIVES: BUILDING TRUST IN A DIVERSE NATION 37 (2016) (hereinafter “*Cultural Understanding*”); see also CTR. FOR COURT INNOVATION, INTRODUCTION TO COMMUNITY ASSET MAPPING, http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/documents/asset_mapping.pdf.

⁸ See *Cultural Understanding*.

⁹ IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING at 169.

¹⁰ See, e.g. Spokane City, Police Advisory Committee, <https://my.spokanecity.org/bcc/committees/police-advisory-committee/> (last visited Nov. 21, 2016).

For these formal structures to be effective, however, they must be representative of the community as a whole. As one report from the U.S. Department of Justice’s Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) notes, “a significant segment of the community may not participate and their concerns may not be represented by such groups. Police personnel must bear in mind that information obtained from organized sources may or may not accurately reflect the perspectives of the larger community.”¹¹

As part of the reform process, the CDP already has established District Policing Committees (DPCs, formerly called District Community Relations Committees) in each of the City’s five districts “to facilitate regular communication and cooperation between CDP and community leaders at the local level.” The Consent Decree requires that the CDP, in partnership with other stakeholders, “develop a mechanism to recruit and expand the membership of the [DPCs], each of which should include a representative cross-section of community members.” The Decree also requires that the CDP “work closely with the [DPCs] to identify strategies to address crime and safety issues in their District.”

Community Engagement Plan

Community input can inform the CDP’s problem-oriented policing plan in several ways. Community members can:

- identify local groups and organizations that the CDP could collaborate with in problem-solving efforts;
- help the CDP identify potential obstacles to collaboration and suggest ways to address them;
- provide input on how best to ensure that DPC members are representative of the community at large.

B. Community Engagement around Policing Policy and Practice

A community policing plan also should include opportunities for organized, routine police-community engagement around policing policies and practices. This will allow the community to have a say in how it is policed, which in turn helps create a sense of trust and legitimacy that is essential to effective policing. Over time, these efforts strengthen police-community relations and promote public safety and constitutional policing.¹²

The Consent Decree mandates that CDP ensure that residents provide input on substantive policing issues, and that CDP responds to that input. To support these efforts, the Decree requires the City of Cleveland to establish a 13-member Community Police Commission (CPC) to “work with the many communities that make up Cleveland for the purpose of developing recommendations for police practices that reflect an understanding of the values and

¹¹ IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING at 83.

¹² See Cleveland Consent Decree, ¶ 14.

priorities of Cleveland residents.”¹³ As part of the reform process, the CPC and Monitoring Team have solicited the community’s views on various issues including body-worn cameras, use of force, and now community policing. In designing its community policing plan, the CDP will need to develop a strategy for conducting this sort of public engagement around policy on an ongoing basis.

Models and Best Practices

Although agencies have taken a variety of approaches to community engagement around policy and practice, successful efforts typically involve:

- Broad-based participation from a variety of communities and stakeholder groups;
- Efforts to educate community members about policy choices and tradeoffs to ensure informed discussion;
- Meaningful opportunities for members of the public to provide substantive input;
- Serious consideration by the agency of the input it receives;
- Communication back to the community of the decisions made and the steps the agency plans to take to address community concerns.

Agencies have used a variety of mechanisms to solicit community input on policies and practices, including online surveys, community forums, and focus groups. Often times agencies have used a combination of different engagement strategies to ensure that all are able to participate. In Portland, OR, for example, the department created an online portal to solicit comments, and also held community forums to give residents an opportunity to provide feedback in person. In Cleveland, the Monitoring Team and the CPC have likewise used a variety of outreach and engagement strategies, including forums, online and paper questionnaires, and study groups to reach different communities.

When dealing with particularly complex or thorny issues, some agencies have built upon initial forums or engagement efforts by setting up a task force made up of police officials and community members to develop recommendations for tackling the problems identified. Following a high-profile officer-involved shooting in Dane County, WI, community leaders and police officials formed a Law Enforcement and Leaders of Color Collaboration (LELCC) to develop recommendations for reform. LELCC members included command staff and officers from both the city and county police departments, representatives from a variety of city agencies, and community members. Over a period of several months, members worked together to develop a list of recommendations on issues ranging from recruitment to use of force policies. Members also held listening sessions throughout the community to solicit input from a broader cross-section of residents.

Whatever the approach, the public should play an actual and meaningful role in addressing the content of particular policies or practices that affect them. This means that an

¹³ *Id.*

agency should both seriously consider the input it receives, and communicate its decision back to the community. Departments have done this in a variety of ways. For example, after holding five three-hour community listening sessions held in different areas of the city, the Tacoma (WA) Police Department incorporated public suggestions into its strategic plan for 2016 and then held an event to go over these recommendations with the public. In Camden, N.J., the police department used forums, an online questionnaire, and a written comment portal to solicit input on its body-worn camera policy, and then published a report summarizing the feedback it received and the changes it made in response.

Community Engagement Plan

Community members can provide valuable insights regarding the outreach and engagement strategies that will best meet the needs of Cleveland residents. Residents can:

- Identify obstacles to broad-based engagement and participation;
- Suggest strategies for reaching out to communities that do not routinely engage with either the CPC or CDP;
- Suggest ways to make community forums and town halls more effective in ensuring meaningful, substantive engagement.

C. Opportunities for Officers to Get to Know Their Communities

Community policing requires that officers have regular opportunities to get to know residents and become familiar with local problems and concerns. Officers who spend their days in patrol cars will not be able to form the sorts of meaningful partnerships with residents that are necessary to facilitate collaborative problem solving and engagement. Encouraging officers to interact with residents in a non-enforcement capacity can:

- Promote trust and mutual understanding between officers and community members;
- Encourage officers to identify and take responsibility for problems in their communities;
- Make residents more likely to report crimes or bring public safety concerns to the attention of the police.¹⁴

There are a number of strategies and approaches that the CDP can take to ensuring consistent and meaningful interaction between officers and residents. These include:

- **Alternatives to motorized patrol**, such as bicycle or foot patrols, or mini-stations;
- **Opportunities for social engagement**, such as Athletic Leagues, “Coffee with a Cop,” and participation in community events.

¹⁴ PERF, COMMUNITY POLICING: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE at 45.

In choosing the appropriate mix of programs and strategies, the CDP should tailor its approach to the specific needs of different neighborhoods and communities, and ensure that officers have opportunities to engage with a broad cross-section of Cleveland residents.

Models and Best Practices: Alternatives to Motorized Patrol

Foot Patrol

Foot patrol is an important alternative to motorized patrol. Officers who patrol on foot typically are more connected to the community they serve, and are better able to quickly and effectively identify and address a variety of quality-of-life issues. Studies suggest that foot patrol has the potential to improve police-community relations; reduce crime; improve citizens' perceptions of neighborhood safety; and increase officer satisfaction.¹⁵

However, studies also make clear that the effectiveness of a foot patrol program depends on its implementation. Agencies that rely on foot patrol officers primarily to engage in traditional enforcement activities, or that fail to allocate sufficient resources to support foot patrol on a consistent and ongoing basis, may see few of these benefits.

A recent Police Foundation survey of foot patrol studies and existing programs suggests that the primary goal of a foot patrol program should be to promote police-community interaction. In Cambridge, MA, for example, patrol officers are expected to attend community events, play sports with kids, and introduce themselves to residents and business owners. Officers also are expected to allot time to addressing the problems that residents identify.¹⁶ In Portland, OR, foot patrol officers are instructed to respond to minor quality of life offenses by speaking with individuals and asking them “to cease the behavior at issue,” and only to “utilize enforcement actions—such as arrests and citations—as a last resort.”¹⁷

One of the principal obstacles to foot patrol is cost: officers on foot are able to cover a much smaller area than officers in cars, and typically are not involved in responding to calls for service. Agencies have used a variety of strategies to reduce these costs:

- Focusing foot patrols only in specific areas—such as business districts, or higher-crime neighborhoods where routine engagement is particularly important. Portland, Oregon, for example, only deploys officers on foot in its central business district, which has a large homeless and transient population.¹⁸

¹⁵ See Police Foundation, *Engaging Communities One Step at a Time* (2016); Ratcliffe et. al., “The Philadelphia Foot Patrol Experiment: A Randomized Control Trial,” 49 *Criminology* 795 (2011); UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, COPS OFFICE, *REDUCING FEAR OF CRIME: STRATEGIES FOR POLICE* (2010); Trojanowicz & Baldwin, *An Evaluation of the neighborhood foot patrol program in Flint, Michigan* (1982).

¹⁶ Police Foundation, *One Step at a Time* at 10.

¹⁷ *Id.* at 17.

¹⁸ *Id.* at 17.

- Limiting foot patrol to afternoon and evening hours when residents are more likely to be home, and when most community meetings and events take place.¹⁹

Bicycle Patrols

Bicycle patrols are another potential alternative to motorized patrols—one that the CDP already has deployed with some success. Bicycle patrol units generally “are more approachable for pedestrians and for those in motor vehicles” than are officers who patrol by car.²⁰ One study found that officers on bicycles had twice as many police-citizen interactions as motorized patrol officers.²¹ Officers on bicycles also can typically cover a much larger area than officers on foot, and can more easily respond to a call for service when additional units are needed.

The CDP’s experience with bicycle patrols during the Republican National Convention is consistent with these observations. The CDP bought 300 bicycles to help with crowd control during the convention, and has announced plans for a permanent bicycle unit. Officers who patrolled on bicycles reported that residents were much more willing to engage, and that interactions generally were more positive: “Being on a bicycle makes you more approachable ... The police officers are seemingly less of a threat, and the interaction with the public is much more personable.”²²

Mini-Stations

Mini-stations also can make officers more accessible to the community. Departments typically set up mini-stations in shopping malls or other existing retail spaces, or in dedicated trailers in more residential neighborhoods. Although research is limited, existing studies suggest that like foot and bicycle patrols, mini-stations give residents an opportunity to interact with officers in a more informal capacity, and to bring crimes and other public safety issues directly to the attention of officers who work in their neighborhoods.²³ Mini-stations also can improve residents’ perception of safety through increased officer presence and visibility.²⁴

The CDP previously operated a number of mini-stations in Cleveland neighborhoods, but closed the stations in 2005 citing cost concerns. In recent years, a number of residents and city

¹⁹ *Id.* at 10–17 (describing foot patrol schedules in Cambridge, MA; Evanston, IL; and New Haven CT).

²⁰ Menton, Chris, “Bicycle patrols: an underutilized resource” (2008). SCHOOL OF JUSTICE STUDIES FACULTY PAPERS. Paper 9. http://docs.rwu.edu/sjs_fp/9.

²¹ *Id.*

²² Daniel J. McGraw, “Cleveland Police Aren’t Stowing Their Bikes After the RNC,” NEXT CITY (Aug. 8, 2016), <https://nextcity.org/daily/entry/rnc-police-bike-unit-trump>.

²³ *See, e.g.* NICK LARSEN, ED., THE CANADIAN CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM: AN ISSUES APPROACH TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE AT 41 (1995) (citing a number of studies of mini-stations in different Canadian cities, which found that use of mini stations increased community satisfaction).

²⁴ *See, e.g.* Andrew D. Blechman, *Communities Buy Into Storefront Police Sites*, LOS ANGELES TIMES (July 23, 1995).

officials have urged the CDP to reopen its mini-stations.²⁵ According to the *Columbus Dispatch*, more than 1,500 people signed an online petition in support of their return.²⁶

In formulating its community policing plan, the CDP will need to evaluate the costs and benefits of each of these alternative patrol strategies, and determine the appropriate mix of foot patrols, bicycle patrols, and mini-stations that will best promote police-community interaction.

Models and Best Practices: Opportunities for Social Engagement

Social engagements—through athletic leagues, community meetings, block parties, and the like—also offer important opportunities for officers and residents to get to know one another in a non-enforcement setting. These sorts of programs are particularly important in high-crime areas that typically experience high levels of enforcement activity.²⁷ Agencies with comprehensive engagement programs and initiatives have found that “communities often are more willing to assist law enforcement” and that “when critical incidents occur, those agencies have key allies who can help with information messaging and mitigating challenges.”²⁸

However, for programs like these to have a meaningful impact on police-community relations, they need to involve all officers, not just a select few. A COPS Office survey found that in agencies that assigned community policing tasks to a small number of officers, regular patrol officers often treated residents in ways that undermined the effectiveness of these programs and were “likely to harm police-community relations”²⁹

The CDP already has a number of programs and events, including Night Out Against Crime, Harvest for Hunger, and the Law Enforcement Breakfast. Officers also participate in a variety of parades, special events, and block parties throughout the community. The Division also has programs specifically for youth, like Bigs in Blue, the Cleveland Muni Football League, and the Cops for Kids Fishing Outing. However, many residents have observed that only a small number of officers participate in these programs—and that these often are not the same officers they see on routine patrol.³⁰ In developing its community policing plan, the CDP should consider strategies for ensuring that all officers participate in these various programs and activities.

Community Engagement Plan

²⁵ Peggy Gallek, “Cleveland city officials fight over mini police stations,” FOX 8 CLEVELAND (June 6, 2016), <http://fox8.com/2016/06/06/cleveland-city-officials-fight-over-mini-police-stations/>.

²⁶ “Hundreds ask Cleveland to reopen police mini-stations” COLUMBUS DISPATCH (Feb. 27, 2015), <http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/local/2015/02/27/0227-cleveland-police-mini-stations.html>.

²⁷ 21ST CENTURY POLICING TASK FORCE REPORT at 14.

²⁸ *Id.* at 15.

²⁹ IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING at 50. *See also* Constance Rice and Susan K. Lee, *Relationship-Based Policing: Achieving Safety in Watts Los Angeles: The Advancement Project 7* (February 2015) (noting significant improvement in police-community relations when all officers assigned to Watts Housing Projects embraced community and relationship-based policing as part of their mission).

³⁰ Monitoring team members have heard this sentiment from discussions with many Cleveland residents.

Community members can provide valuable input on the combination of strategies and approaches that can best facilitate more positive interaction between officers and residents. Community members also can suggest ways to tailor these approaches to best meet the needs of specific neighborhoods. In particular, community input can:

- Inform the allocation of resources among various alternatives to motorized patrol, including foot patrols, bicycle patrols, and mini-stations;
- Help to identify locations where mini-stations or foot patrols are likely to be most effective at promoting consistent engagement with residents;
- Help the CDP prioritize among the range of possible social and community engagement programs.

II. Staffing and Deployment

As part of its community and problem-oriented policing plan, the CDP will need to ensure that its staffing and deployment models facilitate long-term police-community familiarity and relationship-building.³¹ Community policing can be resource intensive. Officers must have sufficient time in their schedules to engage with the community and address community problems—without undermining the division’s ability to respond to calls for service. Community policing also requires that the agency structure its deployment infrastructure—including district and patrol sector boundaries—in ways that facilitate long-term partnerships and collaboration with community-based organizations.

The Consent Decree requires that the “CDP complete a comprehensive staffing study to assess the appropriate number of sworn and civilian personnel to perform the functions necessary for CDP to fulfill its mission.” The CDP will then need to develop a comprehensive Staffing Plan “to ensure effective community and problem-oriented policing.”

Models and Best Practices

Successful community policing plans structure their staffing and deployment with the goal of facilitating long-term police-community relationships. This begins with a staffing model that requires “officers to devote considerable time and effort ... to building community capacity and solving problems”—and ensures that officers in fact have the time in their day to engage in these sorts of activities.³²

Agencies have used a variety of approaches to free up officer time to engage in non-enforcement activities. One approach is to take on more officers, or redirect officers from

³¹ Lisa M. Graziano, Dennis P. Rosenbaum and Amie M. Schuck, *Building group capacity for problem solving and police-community partnerships through survey feedback and training: a randomized control trial within Chicago’s community policing program*, 10 J EXP. CRIMINOL. 80 (2014).

³² Jeremy M. Wilson and Alexander Weiss, “A Performance-Based Approach to Police Staffing and Allocation.” *Community Oriented Police Office and Michigan State University* 61 (2012).

specialized units to generalized patrol.³³ Although specialized units within the division can perform a variety of important functions, some “continue to exist long after the exigency [that led to their creation] has passed.”³⁴ “Abolishing the units and reassigning personnel to generalized patrol” can “lighten the workload, thereby creating more uncommitted time that can be used for problem-solving.”³⁵

Another approach is to make greater use of civilian personnel. Civilian employees cost less to train, equip, and pay, and can replace sworn officers in assignments like dispatch and record-keeping so that officers can be redeployed to policing tasks on the street. For example, in Newport News, VA civilians at information desks were taking forty percent of all reports.³⁶ Unsworn “community service officers” also can assist with parking enforcement, respond to traffic incidents to take initial statements, help preserve crime scenes, and help officers investigate minor quality-of-life offenses such as vandalism.³⁷

The Division’s deployment infrastructure also should be developed with an eye toward community policing. In a community-oriented deployment model, officers are given long-term assignments to a particular patrol area at a consistent time. This allows them to become familiar fixtures in their community, but also to acquaint themselves with residents and with daily life in the neighborhood.³⁸ For example, in Billings, MT, the police department implemented a community policing deployment model in which officers were assigned to the same beat on the same watch for at least one year. This provided an opportunity for beat officers to get to know community members on their beat and effectively accomplish community policing goals.³⁹

To further facilitate community partnerships, patrol area boundaries should be drawn in a way that preserves “the unique geographical and social characteristics of neighborhoods while still allowing efficient [police] services.”⁴⁰ In transitioning toward a community-oriented policing model, a number of agencies have found it necessary to reorganize patrol districts to better reflect natural community boundaries.⁴¹ Residents can help define neighborhood boundaries by identifying the locations they visit on a regular basis, as well as the key partners and organizations that they view as being part of their particular community.⁴²

Community Engagement Plan

³³ *Id.*

³⁴ CENTER FOR PROBLEM-ORIENTED POLICING, *Implementing POP: Leading, Structuring, and Managing a Problem-Oriented Policing Agency* at 53 (2012).

³⁵ *Id.*

³⁶ IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING at 62.

³⁷ DEV DAVIS ET. AL., *An Analysis of the City of San Jose’s Community Service Officer Program* at 18 (2016) (surveying CSO programs across California).

³⁸ UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, BUREAU OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE, *UNDERSTANDING COMMUNITY POLICING* at 14 (1994) (hereinafter “UNDERSTANDING COMMUNITY POLICING”).

³⁹ IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING at 102.

⁴⁰ UNDERSTANDING COMMUNITY POLICING, at 13.

⁴¹ *See, e.g.* IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING at 80, 114, 164 (describing experience in several jurisdictions).

⁴² *University Launches Neighborhood Mapping Project*, U CHICAGO NEWS, <https://news.uchicago.edu/article/2009/07/07/university-launches-neighborhood-mapping-project>.

Community members can help inform the CDP’s staffing and deployment model by:

- Suggesting tasks that residents would feel comfortable having performed by civilian personnel;
- Identifying natural neighborhood boundaries to delineate beats or sub-beats for routine patrol.

The CDP can also educate community members about the resources it would require to divert some portion of officer time to discretionary police-community interactions—and solicit community input on the portion of officer time that residents would like to see spent on engagement activities.

III. Equipment and Resources

In order to implement community policing in a meaningful way, departments should ensure that officers have ample equipment and resources to carry out these efforts. A department that lacks adequate equipment and resources may find that its community policing suffers as a result. Officers without adequate technology may spend too much time inputting information by hand, or returning to the precinct to complete certain duties. In turn, this limits the time officers have to interact with the community. Over time this can contribute to the officers’ belief that community policing is outside of their day-to-day job description, or not “real” police work.⁴³

The Consent Decree requires the CDP to make a number of investments in equipment and officer resources, including:

- An adequate number of operable vehicles;
- Reliable, functioning in-vehicle computers with access to a computer-aided dispatch system, the CDP’s records management system, and other law enforcement databases.⁴⁴

The Monitoring Team recently reviewed the CDP’s current equipment and resources and made thirty-one recommendations involving technologies such as in-vehicle computers, computer-aided dispatch, officer cell phones, and record-management systems.⁴⁵

Models and Best Practices

Agencies have used a variety of strategies to optimize technology and processes to free up additional officer time to engage with the community. For example, the Hillsborough County

⁴³ See, e.g., IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING at 52 (“Concord’s police officers were so convinced that community policing constituted extra work that they had demanded overtime pay for participating in community policing projects... For them, community policing was not ‘real’ police work; it was an added responsibility that had been tacked onto an already busy agenda.”).

⁴⁴ Cleveland Consent Decree, ¶ 293.

⁴⁵ Cleveland Monitoring Team Equipment Study Powerpoint.

Police Department replaced daily roll call direct deployment and daily messaging with a computer-aided dispatch (CAD) system. The agency also acquired in-car laptops, enabling officers to enter field notes from their vehicles.⁴⁶ A number of cities have developed comprehensive 311 systems to handle not only quality of life complaints but also non-emergency police calls for service.⁴⁷

Mobile technology allows officers to access data and resources without having to return to a police station—or even the vehicle. Currently, few CDP officers have in-vehicle computers. Existing computers do not provide officers with access to email, or to a computerized dispatch system. As a result, officers spend considerable time at the station reviewing email-communications. Dispatchers and officers communicate entirely over the radio—which requires officers to then use hand-written notes to log the information received.⁴⁸ Officers also currently do not receive division phones, and thus routinely use personal cell phones to perform various police functions.

Agencies can also optimize officer time by developing a tiered response system for handling 911 calls that distinguishes between calls that require an immediate response and those that can be handled at a later time or through referral to another agency. Nonemergency calls can then be handled by delayed officer response, by phone, by mail, or by having the caller come to the station.⁴⁹ Agencies also can set up online or 311 reporting systems and encourage community members to direct non-emergency requests to these other channels. The CDP currently utilizes an online crime reporting system for property crimes and minor theft.⁵⁰ In developing its equipment and resources plan, the CDP should evaluate the extent to which the system is effective, or if there are changes that the CDP could make to encourage more residents to take advantage of this alternative.

Community Engagement Plan

Engaging the community around equipment and resource needs can help inform residents about the costs associated with adopting new technologies, and the importance of doing so. Community members can also provide specific input on:

- Ways to improve the online reporting system to maximize its utility;
- Categories of crimes or public safety issues for which residents would feel comfortable leaving a message and/or not receiving an immediate response.

⁴⁶ IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING at 62.

⁴⁷ See, e.g. UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE COPS OFFICE, BUILDING A 311 SYSTEM: A CASE STUDY OF THE CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS (2008).

⁴⁸ Cleveland Monitoring Team Equipment Study Powerpoint 21-22.

⁴⁹ UNDERSTANDING COMMUNITY POLICING at 38. The public will not insist on an immediate response to a nonemergency service request if the alternative response is both appropriate and performed as described.

⁵⁰City of Cleveland Ohio, *Online Crime Reporting System*, <http://www.city.cleveland.oh.us/CityofCleveland/Home/Government/CityAgencies/PublicSafety/Police/OnlineReports>.

IV. Recruitment and Hiring

Community policing requires departments to recruit and hire candidates who are service-minded and committed to working in partnership with residents to promote public safety. Officers should be broadly representative of the community, and be familiar with the culture and tradition of the different neighborhoods they will serve. Officers should also possess strategic thinking and problem-solving skills, emotional maturity, interpersonal skills, and the ability to collaborate with a diverse cross-section of the community.⁵¹

The Consent Decree requires the Division “to integrate community and problem-oriented policing principles” into its recruitment practices, and to develop a recruitment plan that includes specific strategies “for attracting qualified applicants from a broad cross-section of the community.”⁵²

Models and Best Practices

The first step in developing a recruitment plan is to identify the skills that officers will need to perform their jobs effectively. Studies have identified five personality characteristics that departments should generally look for: extroversion, emotional stability, agreeability, conscientiousness, and openness to experience.⁵³ In addition to these characteristics, agencies typically look for additional traits that fit the unique “needs and culture of the police department” where officers will work.⁵⁴ These additional characteristics can include factors like diversity or willingness to work in a high-crime area.⁵⁵ Cleveland Police Chief Calvin Williams recently announced the division “is seeking young, energetic, intelligent and compassionate people to join their division.”⁵⁶ In formulating its hiring and recruitment plan, the Division should consider what additional characteristics it is looking for in candidates.

The next step is to create a comprehensive recruiting plan. The plan should consider all the possible avenues for recruiting individuals who possess the necessary traits, including non-traditional avenues through which individuals may enter the profession. For example, a captain from the Montgomery County, MD, Police Department suggested advertising opportunities to individuals currently working in social work, sales, or as servers in restaurants as a way to recruit candidates with strong communication skills.⁵⁷

⁵¹ Cleveland Consent Decree ¶ 304.

⁵² Cleveland Consent Decree ¶ 18, 302.

⁵³ “Problem Officer Variables and Early-warning Systems.” *The Police Chief*, (Oct. 2007), http://policechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display_arch&article_id=1313&issue_id=102007.

⁵⁴ UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, COPS OFFICE AND THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE, *BUILDING TRUST BETWEEN THE POLICE AND CITIZENS THEY SERVE* 9 (2007).

⁵⁵ *Id.*

⁵⁶ *Cleveland police recruiting hundreds of new officers*, 3WKYC.COM,

<http://www.wkyc.com/news/local/cleveland/cleveland-police-recruiting-hundreds-of-new-officers/329237688>

⁵⁷ See Dave Anderson, *Hiring for More Successful and Diverse Community Engagement* in *ENGAGEMENT-BASED POLICING: THE WHAT, HOW, AND WHY OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT* 39 (2015).

The plan should also address strategies for attracting a diverse pool of applicants.⁵⁸ Law enforcement professionals increasingly recognize the importance of creating a workforce that is diverse across a variety of dimensions, including race, gender, language, life experience, and cultural background. Hiring candidates with diverse backgrounds can improve officer effectiveness in dealing with different communities, and can help address implicit or explicit biases.⁵⁹ Local residents, businesses, and community organizations can support these efforts by helping the division get the word out, and suggesting additional outreach strategies for attracting hard-to-reach populations.⁶⁰ For example, the Multicultural Advisory Committee in the Minneapolis area worked with the local police agencies as they developed their recruiting plan. The members of the advisory committee reviewed the police departments' personnel recruitment notices and provided feedback with how best the agencies can communicate with the diverse communities.⁶¹ Additionally, the division can use a variety of strategies to engage directly with community members who may be interested in joining the police force. For example, in Sacramento, CA the "Run with a Recruiter" program provides an opportunity for potential applicants to meet other people interested in law enforcement careers, ask current officers questions, and test their physical readiness before applying to the Sacramento Police Department.⁶²

Community Engagement Plan

Community members can assist the CDP in developing its recruitment plan by identifying:

- Traits and characteristics that community members believe to be important;
- Obstacles or impediments that discourage individuals from applying to the CDP;
- Strategies for attracting applicants from a cross-section of Cleveland's neighborhoods;
- Neighborhood leaders who could help suggest potential candidates.

V. Officer Training and Education

Community policing requires officers to possess a variety of skills, including teamwork, leadership, interpersonal, and problem-solving skills. Community policing also requires officers to become familiar with the history, culture, and traditions of their communities. Ensuring that officers are equipped with these necessary skills and knowledge is an important component of any community policing plan.

⁵⁸ Cleveland Consent Decree ¶ 305.

⁵⁹ 21ST CENTURY POLICING TASK FORCE REPORT at 16; Lorie Fridell, "Racially Biased Policing: The Law Enforcement Response to the Implicit Black-Crime Association," in RACIAL DIVIDE: RACIAL AND ETHNIC BIAS IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM, eds. Michael J. Lynch, E. Britt Patterson, and Kristina K. Childs (Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press, 2008), 51.

⁶⁰ 21ST CENTURY POLICING TASK FORCE REPORT at 17.

⁶¹ Saint-Fort, Yasson, & Shah, *Engaging Police in Immigrant Communities: Promising Practices from the Field*, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, COPS OFFICE AND VERA INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE 10 (2012).

⁶² City of Sacramento, Police Department <http://www.cityofsacramento.org/Police/Join-SPD/Recruiting-Programs> (last visited Dec. 1, 2016).

Studies show that the success of community policing programs depends in large part on whether officers receive adequate training.⁶³ Officers who receive training on community-oriented policing are more likely to incorporate principles of community policing into their day-to-day work.⁶⁴

For this reason, the consent decree specifically requires that officers receive training on:

- community engagement and problem-solving strategies;
- leadership, ethics, and effective communication;
- forming community partnerships;
- procedural justice;
- conflict resolution;
- cultural competency.⁶⁵

Models and Best Practices

Successful training programs incorporate principles of community policing into all aspects of the curriculum. For example the New York Police Department's community policing training program is integrated into in-service training, the Police Academy, and field training.⁶⁶ Training programs also focus on a variety of specific community policing skills, including:

- identifying and working with partners within their community;
- communicating effectively with a diverse citizenry;
- conflict-resolution, including strategies for helping citizens resolve disputes peacefully rather than resorting to violence or self-help;
- familiarity with other city departments, social service providers, and other resources to which to refer residents.⁶⁷

In addition to training on specific skills, officers should receive training on cultural competency, tailored to the specific history, traditions, demographics, and quality of life challenges of the various communities in which officers will work. Cultural competency training can help to ensure that officers are sensitive to the particular needs and vulnerabilities of different populations, and avoid unnecessary tension. For example, officers in San Diego recently received training on customs and traditions within the Muslim and Arab-American community, including on how most respectfully to search a Muslim woman. Such training also can expose recruits to the history of policing in the United States, and help officers to better

⁶³ Sutham Cheurprakobkit, "Community policing: Training, definitions and policy implications" 25 *Policing* 709, 710 (2002).

⁶⁴ *Id.* at 720.

⁶⁵ Cleveland Consent Decree ¶ 30.

⁶⁶ "Training: Bringing the NYPD into the 21st Century." NYPD. <http://www.nyc.gov/html/nypd/html/home/POA/pdf/Training.pdf> (last visited Nov. 23, 2016).

⁶⁷ Edwin Meese, "Community Policing and the Police Officer," NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE 6-7. (1993).

understand why some communities may be mistrustful of the police.⁶⁸ Many jurisdictions have involved community members in these training programs—both to help shape the curriculum and to participate in the training program.

Community Engagement Plan

Community members can help the CDP to identify the specific skills and local knowledge that would best serve officers working in their neighborhoods, including:

- Specific aspects of Cleveland history that should be incorporated into officer training;
- The unique cultures, characteristics, and challenges of Cleveland’s many communities;
- Strategies for involving residents in developing and implementing training curricula.

VI. Officer and Supervisor Evaluation

Officer and supervisor evaluations are essential to the success and sustainability of a community policing program. Evaluations provide supervisors, division leadership, and the community with information about whether officers are following community policing practices. Evaluations also incentivize officers and supervisors to pursue positive community relationships and engage residents in problem-solving efforts. As law enforcement professionals have long recognized, “what you measure is what you get.”⁶⁹

For these reasons, the Consent Decree requires the CDP to incorporate principles of community and problem-oriented policing into officer and supervisor evaluation, and adopt performance measures that:

- Measure and monitor officer outreach to the community;
- Document community engagement and communication with the public;
- Track the use of community and problem-oriented policing strategies, including de-escalation techniques and methods for engaging with individuals in crisis.⁷⁰

Models and Best Practices

Officer and supervisor evaluation metrics have historically focused on easily quantified enforcement actions, such as numbers of arrests or citations. However, as departments have moved toward community policing, research has identified three metrics that can be used to develop community policing-oriented evaluations.

⁶⁸ See, e.g., Charles H. Ramsey, *The Challenge of Policing in a Democratic Society: A Personal Journey Towards Understanding*, Harvard Kennedy School Executive Session on Policing and Public Safety

<https://www.hks.harvard.edu/content/download/67512/1242858/version/1/file/PolicinginaDemocraticSociety.pdf>.

⁶⁹ UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, COPS OFFICE, REDUCING FEAR OF CRIME: STRATEGIES FOR POLICE xi.

⁷⁰ See Cleveland Consent Decree, ¶¶ 33, 42-44, 314, 317.

First, departments with community policing programs regularly measure community trust and perceptions of law enforcement. This can be done through resident surveys, focus groups, surveys of specific constituencies, or engagement with a group of community representatives. In addition to conducting citywide surveys, an agency may wish to survey specific neighborhoods to get more particularized information about specific community problems and the department's success in addressing them.⁷¹ Agencies also can create representative networks of "individuals who have detailed knowledge of communal life in [the neighborhood] and are in a position to provide a meaningful assessment of how policing there has improved or worsened."⁷²

Second, community policing-oriented departments evaluate officer problem-solving efforts by tracking officer progress in identifying neighborhood problems, soliciting community input, and crafting effective solutions.⁷³ The goal of evaluation should be to identify areas for further training and improvement, and should rarely be grounds for discipline.⁷⁴ Involving communities in the evaluation process can both provide supervisors with important information about the effectiveness of problem-solving efforts, and make clear the division's commitment to collaboration and change.⁷⁵

Finally, departments monitor officer outreach and contacts with the community. For example, evaluations can ask officers to track their community partnerships and how they develop and use them in problem-solving efforts.⁷⁶ Evaluations may also ask officers to document their efforts to organize or attend a wide range of community events.⁷⁷

Community Engagement Plan

Community input can help the CDP to identify:

- The sorts of behaviors or interactions that residents most want to encourage (and thus the division to measure);
- Effective strategies for measuring community sentiment;
- Community representatives that the CDP could turn to when seeking community feedback.

⁷¹ Nigel Fielding & Martin Innes, *Reassurance Policing, Community Policing and Measuring Police Performance*, 16 POLICING AND SOCIETY 130 (2007).

⁷² *Id.* at 135.

⁷³ IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING at 76.

⁷⁴ UNDERSTANDING COMMUNITY POLICING, *supra* note 37 at 37.

⁷⁵ KAREN BULLOCK, CITIZENS, COMMUNITY, AND CRIME CONTROL 112 (Palgrave Macmillan UK 2014).

⁷⁶ *Id.*; IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING at IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING at 72-73.

⁷⁷ *Id.*