COMPLIANCE OFFICER AND COMMUNITY LIAISON

Measuring What Matters to the Community:

A New Performance Evaluation System

for the Portland Police Bureau

Technical Assistance Report

Prepared for the City of Portland by:
Dennis P. Rosenbaum, Ph.D.
Compliance Officer and Community Liaison (COCL)
Rosenbaum & Associates, LLP

February 1, 2023

R & A

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is a technical assistance report provided by the COCL to the Portland Police Bureau (PPB), the City of Portland, and the Portland community, with the goal of improving police services and police legitimacy in the eyes of the public. In my view, the City should go beyond the Settlement Agreement to develop a new system of performance evaluation for its police officers, supported by other organizational changes. To enhance police services and police legitimacy of the PPB, the COCL herein recommends a 4-step strategic intervention.

In this report, I will cover each of these steps. But first, I will provide some context and justification for this proposal ("Background"), including a clear definition of the current problem. I apologize for the numerous citations of research studies, but I want to make a strong case for transforming the Portland Police Bureau. As a researcher, my view is that "best practices" in policing should be defined not by what a few police departments in the United States claim is a best practice, but rather by what has been shown to be an effective practice by rigorous research and evaluation involving thousands of community members across dozens of cities. Thus, I am promoting evidence-based policing – policing based on scientific evidence rather than personal opinion or hearsay.

In terms of Background (Section II), I make the following points:

1. The problem of "police legitimacy" has been with us from the beginning of organized policing in the United States, but we have yet to effectively address it, as efforts to reform the police have been unable to improve public trust in the police among those served;

2. Research clearly shows that police legitimacy and public trust are driven by how the community is treated (or mistreated) by the police, and whether police services are viewed as unbiased, respectful, and compassionate. More specifically, public trust in the police depends heavily on whether the police are acting in a procedurally just manner;

3. Currently, the City of Portland does not have a system in place to measure what matters to the community – procedural justice – especially the treatment of marginalized communities and those who are experiencing a crisis;

4. Community members are frustrated by the lack of clarity about whether current reforms are making a difference in police culture and police actions, and they would like a bigger voice when evaluating police performance;

5. Thus, Portland should commit to developing and implementing a program that will systematically and routinely measure the level of procedural justice exhibited by the PPB.

In Section III, I describe a 4-step strategic plan for moving forward and developing a complete Contact Survey Program that could have a measurable impact on police encounters with the public. These steps are:

1. Identify specific dimensions of police performance that are important to the community, describing the elements of procedural justice.

2. Develop a new methodology (the contact survey) and a set of measures (questions within the contact survey) to capture the level of procedural justice, emotional control, and communication skills exhibited by police officers. Specifically, the contact survey will give voice to those community members who have had a recent contact with a PPB officer.

3. Introduce a policy and plan for collecting the data by requiring that PPB officers distribute business cards with a QR code to give community members access to the online contact survey via their phone.

4. Create a Contact Survey Program, independent of the PPB, that manages the data collection, analysis, and reporting of the survey findings. This program must be supported by changes in policy, training, supervision, and auditing.

In this report, I emphasize that monitoring and reporting contact survey findings is only one component of this program. Essentially, this must be an ongoing, sustainable, multifaceted program with feedback loops that involve supervisor performance evaluations, specialized training for officers and supervisors, supervisory coaching of individual officers who perform below standards and a reward structure for officers who perform above standards. In addition, community members should also be invited to assist in procedural justice training for all officers to improve performance bureau wide. Hence, a close working relationship will be needed between the Contact Survey Program, the PPB, and the Portland community.

I propose that the Contact Survey Program be housed in the Community Safety Division (CSD). The Director is responsible for strategic planning for the City's public safety programs, and has considerable experience utilizing contact surveys for quality assurance programs. The CSD is working to re-envision community safety in Portland through innovative programs, and therefore, could provide a supportive home for the Contact Survey Program.

Also, the Contact Survey Program proposed here has applicability beyond police contacts and could be applied to other public safety programs overseen by the CSD, such as Portland's 911 emergency services and the Portland Street Response program, which assists people experiencing non-life threatening mental health and behavioral health issues. All of these services could be evaluated with contact surveys that give voice to service recipients.

II. Background: History of the Legitimacy and Reform Problems

To define the problem and propose realistic solutions, I will rely not only on my experience as the COCL in Portland, but our accumulated knowledge of policing in other cities over many years. Nationwide, police agencies have faced a "crisis of legitimacy" over the past three decades due to officers mishandling stops, searches, arrests, use of force, crowd management, and other types of contact with members of the public. Although the misuse of force has been a driving force behind consent decrees, Department of Justice investigations have covered a range of unconstitutional policing practices in American cities, including unlawful stops and searches, arrests, racist language, sexist language, officer retaliation, and corruption (e.g. see D'Souza et al., 2019).

In Portland, the focus has been on the treatment of persons with mental illness, but the COCL have also pointed out racial disparities in stops, searches, arrests, and use of force. In recent years, American law enforcement has placed enormous emphasis on "stop and frisk" as a tool for fighting crime, but nationwide, Black drivers are more likely than white drivers to be stopped, and both Black and Hispanic drivers are more likely to be searched and ticketed (e.g. Langton & Durose, 2013).

Unfortunately, "reasonable suspicion" is often lacking before the search (e.g. Skogan, 2023) and hit rates for finding contraband are very low. In fact, after consent searches of vehicles, research has shown that officers are more likely to seize contraband from white drivers than from Black drivers (e.g. Weiss & Rosenbaum, 2009).[1]

Traffic stops, whether justified or not, can easily escalate to use of force and even death, as in the tragic case of Tyre Nichols stopped by the Memphis police special unit on January 7th, 2023. With all involved officers being Black, this case raises questions about race and policing, with some arguing that police culture contributed to an appalling disregard for human dignity and the sanctity of life (McGrady, 2023). Certainly, it raises the question of whether such group actions can be prevented and what reforms are needed to change a police culture that allows such hyper aggressiveness and violence against certain community members.

---

[1] Contraband is typically defined as illegal drugs, drug paraphernalia, illegal weapons, or stolen property.

For most traffic stops, the consequences are not as severe as the Nichols case, but the impact on those stopped is significant and scary, especially if you are a person of color. As a psychologist, I would like to underscore the fact that investigatory stops are embarrassing and upsetting for the drivers, who are often searched in front of family members and observers nearby. As Epp and his colleagues (2014) document, drivers are often asked where they are going, why they need to go there, and what they are carrying in their glove compartment or trunk. Flashlights run through the windows in every conceivable section; people are asked to get out; personal items are strewn on the ground nearby. The psychological impact can be enormous, resulting in resentment, loss of trust and growing anger toward the police, especially in communities of color. In fact, national data show that Black and Hispanic drivers are less likely than whites to believe that the reason for the stop was legitimate (Langton & Durose, 2013). As a result, police legitimacy has declined, which in turn, places an upper limit on the level of cooperation and compliance that can be expected from the public, which, in turn, has serious consequences for public safety.

The police must be legitimate in the eyes of the public to do their job effectively. As Tyler (2014) notes, this involves three judgments by the public:

> *"The first is public trust and confidence in the police. Such confidence involves the belief that the police are honest, that they try to do their jobs well, and that they are trying to protect the community against crime and violence. Second, legitimacy reflects the willingness of residents to defer to the law and to police authority, i.e. their sense of obligation and responsibility to accept police authority. Finally, legitimacy involves the belief that police actions are morally justified and appropriate to the circumstances." (p. 9).*

The problem with police authority is that it can be easily abused. Police-public interactions have an inherent power imbalance, and too often, this differential power can be exploited by skipping over the social etiquette and respectful exchanges that characterize normal human interactions. This exploitation of power, which can even escalate into police violence, undermines police legitimacy.

Police legitimacy has been repeatedly questioned in the United States and corrective actions have been taken many times with mixed results. In fact, legitimacy problems have occurred repeatedly over the past century, as political leaders and activists have sought to reform and professionalize American policing, beginning with the Wickersham Commission in 1929. As I have noted previously, "American policing progressed from an unregulated politicized entity that eventually enforced 'Jim Crow' laws to an organized, quasi-military bureaucracy focused on law enforcement" (Rosenbaum & McCarthy, 2017). Many of the reform efforts were designed to insulate the police from long-standing corruption and improve effectiveness in fighting crime (see Walker, 1998). This "professional" detached model of policing, however, did little to build

police legitimacy with the public or fight crime, and in fact, reduced police legitimacy when responding to public unrest, whether it was the civil rights movement in the 1960s, the L.A. riots in 1992, the unrest in Ferguson in 2014, or protests following the murder of George Floyd in 2020.

Over the past three decades, American policing has been in a continual state of change and innovation. Community policing and problem solving emerged as substantial reform models in the 1980s and 1990s to improve relations with the community (Goldstein, 1990; Greene & Mastrofski, 1988; Rosenbaum, 1994), including in Portland, but the obstacles to full-scale implementation have been numerous (see Fridell & Wycoff, 2004; Rosenbaum, 2004; Skogan, 2003). Too often, these programs and strategies were siloed and, as a result, were unable to change the police services delivered by most officers or the police culture that influenced these services.

Other police innovations have since competed for dominance, including Broken Windows policing, Hot Spots policing, Compstat, Pulling-levers policing, and Specialty unit policing, all aided by advances in information technology to target crime and disorder hotspots (see Weisburd & Braga, 2006). Critics have argued, however, that this latest wave of targeted policing strategies tends to be aggressive and inequitable in practice, and consequently, runs the risk of undermining civil rights and public trust in the police, especially in minority and marginalized communities (Rosenbaum, 1993; 2007; 2019; Tyler, 2005; Walker & Katz, 2008). These concerns suggest that new systems of measurement are needed to monitor the impact of these policing practices and mitigate the potential adverse impact on community members, especially the most vulnerable.

The proposed program here -- tentatively called the Contact Survey Program -- is based on the premise that, while much has been done under the community policing model, progress in reforming police organizations has been restricted by failure to explore new measures of success and new methods of accountability that are grounded in the community and grounded in social science research. Community residents want safer streets and less violence, but research indicates they also want a police force that is fair and sensitive to their needs (Rosenbaum et al, 2005; Skogan & Frydl, 2004; Tyler, 2005; Weitzer & Tuch, 2005). Community policing has fostered a new information imperative and calls upon police executives and police researchers to "measure what matters" in the 21st century (see Dunworth et al., 2000; Langworthy, 1999; Masterson and Stevens 2002; Mastrofski, 1999; Mirzer 1996, Rosenbaum, 2004). Particularly important (and often neglected) is information about community concerns and their views of the police. Police researchers have argued that measuring the police–community interface is critical for achieving strong police–community relations and for stimulating community involvement in public safety (Cordner, 1997; Rosenbaum, 2002; 2004; Schuck & Rosenbaum, 2006). As I have emphasized for years, stronger police-community

partnerships are essential not only for building trust but for fighting crime and improving public safety, as the community plays a critical role in preventing crime (see Rosenbaum, 1986;1988).

Police Performance Systems and Accountability

Traditionally, "police accountability" has been an internal or legal process, focusing on the control of officers through punitive enforcement of rules, regulations, and laws (Chan, 2001). These systems have received considerable push-back from employees and their union representatives, who are powerful and largely successful in avoiding serious consequences. These systems and legal interventions are back-end accountability systems that are activated after a problem has occurred rather than preventative in nature. And the community has little influence over these types of accountability systems.

Beyond police misconduct, one area where police organizations have been under pressure from communities and politicians is to solve the crime problem. To achieve crime reduction goals, computer-driven systems, such as Compstat, have been widely adopted to measure performance using traditional crime indicators. Unfortunately, the creation of aggressive specialty units to improve crime fighting performance, under limited supervision, has created huge problems again and again for urban police departments. Also, Compstat accountability systems do not attempt to gauge in a meaningful way the quality of policing.

To achieve marked improvements in public satisfaction with police performance, it has been argued that performance systems must be expanded to incorporate non-punitive measures of the quality of policing as defined by the community (Langworthy, 1999; Mastrofski, 1999; McCarthy & Rosenbaum, 2015; Rosenbaum, 2004). Over many years, the limitations of traditional measures of performance are well documented in the scholarly literature (Alpert & Moore, 1993; Blumstein, 1999; Goldstein, 1990; Grant & Terry, 2005; Maguire, 2004; Masterson & Stevens, 2002; Moore & Poethig, 1999; Moore et al., 2002; Reisig, 1999; Skolnick & Fyfe, 1993; White, 2007). Official statistics, such as crime rates and clearance rates, not only suffer from inaccuracy, but more importantly, they provide a very incomplete picture of police work, as they fail to capture the day-to-day process of policing or the quality of police-community encounters, including equity. More recently, the focus on use of force statistics suffers from these same limitations and measures only a tiny segment of police encounters with the public.

Beyond organizational measures, internal systems to assess individual police officers are severely flawed. In most agencies, the traditional performance evaluation process lacks credibility and is unrelated to daily performance. Researchers and police executives have offered many suggestions for improving internal evaluation systems (e.g. Oettmeier & Wycoff,

1997; Skolnick & Fyfe, 1993; Walker, 2005), but the fact remains that an officer's work is largely unsupervised by their boss and difficult to measure.

To improve police-public encounters, some departments have sought to integrate their internal and external monitoring systems involving citizen complaints (see Walker, 2005). Arguably, this is a step forward in police accountability, but too often these systems, such as early intervention programs, are driven by complaints or policy violations, are reactive and incident driven, lack a thorough analysis of existing data about the officer, and result in weak interventions (e.g. a simple request that the supervisor talk to the officer). Most importantly, they lack critical data about daily police-public interactions that matter so much to the public.

The important organizational question is how to enhance police-community interactions and encourage officers to engage in a desired set of behaviors? Some gains have been achieved by introducing new mission statements, rules and regulations, and officer training, but critics have argued that external oversight is necessary to achieve sizable and lasting change in police organizations. For decades, researchers have proposed independent "auditing bureaus" to collect data on how residents are treated by the police and vice versa (Mastrofski, 1999; Reiss, 1971). The model proposed here calls for an independent agency outside the PPB to manage this Contact Survey Program and provide feedback on community assessments of police performance. However, the Program should be a partnership with the PPB, as described later.

Some of these policing problems have resulted in consent decrees or settlement agreements, such as in Portland, because they include a "pattern or practice" of unconstitutional policing against protected groups, including race, gender, individuals with mental illness, or disability populations. These legal agreements typically seek to improve the definition, reporting, early warning, supervision, and investigation of use of force, with attention to policy changes, accountability, and training to achieve these goals. Indeed, these agreements can improve police organizations and offer preventative guidance to other agencies (U.S. Department of Justice, 2017; Lawrence & Cole, 2019; Walker, 2017), but I maintain that additional attention is needed to other factors to enhance the organizational change process, as outlined here.

To a large extent, slow progress in organizational change can be explained by the old saying, "Organizational culture eats policy for lunch." In policing, where officers often work independently with limited supervision, the culture of policing and the influence of peers is more important than rules and regulations. Also, accountability is defined as a punitive process that police administrators and police unions want to minimize to avoid morale problems and restrictions of police freedom. As our research shows, "organizational justice" – how employees feel they are being treated -- is very important to employees in police organizations nationwide (See Rosenbaum & McCarty, 2017).

To achieve significant community-oriented reforms, police organizations will need to rethink the role of supervisors. Anyone who studies police organizations understands that first-line supervisors hold the key to organizational change – they communicate the norms and values of the administration, and they protect their employees from harm. Today, with increased pressure to hold everyone accountable, supervisors spend considerable time reviewing force reports and official complaints or responding to on-scene crises. Ultimately, to achieve organizational change on the streets, supervisors will need to spend more time reviewing other aspects of individual performance, including the day-to-day interactions with the community. Along these lines, supervisors need to become experts on <u>coaching</u> to help their team members do their best work, develop skills, and meet career development needs. Thus, supervisors will need to be retrained, as discussed later in this report.

Within the Portland Police Bureau, supervisors conduct an Annual Performance Evaluation of each officer. On a positive note, this evaluation system includes a number of metrics that are community oriented and address procedurally just behaviors toward the public, but after looking at the actual data, COCL discovered that supervisors almost never give a rating of "Needs Improvement." (COCL, 2023). In policing, like many fields, supervisors are unwilling to give what is perceived as a negative review, fearing it might hurt someone's career. That fear needs to be challenged in this context, as discussed later. There are two distinct definitions of "having your back." One focuses on covering up deficiencies, and the other focuses on eliminating deficiencies to help improve future performance. The latter definition serves everyone better.

Also, supervisors are unlikely to have the data they need to confidently evaluate their officers on the many dimensions listed on the performance evaluation form. Thus, without the new system of measurement proposed here, internal evaluations of officers will not be based on reliable or comprehensive information about the street-level behavior of the officers under their review.

Another fundamental problem that inhibits cultural change is the reward structure. As a social and organizational psychologist, I can say, with confidence, that human behavior is heavily influenced by incentives and disincentives. At present, I do not see a reward structure in place to change the police culture from the crime-fighting "warriors" to "public servants" or "guardians" who seek to protect and help people in need (Rohr & Rice, 2015). Current policies and procedures call upon police officers to be better public servants, but where are the systems to support or require such behavior? For most police agencies, reward systems for officers give attention to increasing productivity and aggressiveness in terms of the number of citations written, arrests made, contraband recovered, crimes investigated, etc., with little attention to improving the manner in which community members are treated. Similarly, the success of the police departments in the United States has been defined largely by crime rates, clearance

rates, response times, and enforcement activities, which have not proven to be useful indicators of effectiveness (Eck & Rosenbaum, 1994). Simply stated, equity and procedural justice have not been prioritized.

Another factor that limits reform is that many police agencies have not evolved into fully-functioning "learning organizations." Learning organizations are data-driven and continuously monitor their internal and external environments for changes and make appropriate adjustments. Thus, true learning organizations routinely collect and analyze data on their activities and outcomes to determine what is working well and what needs improvement. This information is used to make changes in policies, standard operating processes, training, supervision and messaging to customers. Modern police agencies tend to have a few analysts onboard, but never enough, and the reports they produce are not always given high priority by management. Most importantly, because agencies typically do not "measure what matters" to the public, analytics and police managers are limited in their ability to create fully functioning learning organizations that are effective at building public trust and confidence in the police.

In summary, progress in police organizations has been restricted by failure to explore new measures of performance and new methods of accountability that are grounded in social science knowledge and give attention to the community's voice when evaluating police services. Despite a wave of innovation in policing strategies over several decades (see Rosenbaum, 2007), in general, law enforcement organizations have yet to institutionalize a data system that routinely "measures what matters" to the public and introduces supervision and reward structures based on the quality of street-level police work. Consequently, management too often faces a crisis of public confidence and is unable to monitor or shape the performance of its officers on the street. Employees are much more likely to follow management's direction for behaviors that are measured (and for which supervisors and officers are held accountable) than behaviors that are not measured. Thus, the time has come to measure police behavior that is important to the public. So, in this report, I will address several questions –What matters to the public? How should what matters be measured? and How should this new information be utilized?

Relevance to Settlement Agreement

Throughout the course of the Settlement Agreement the COCL has maintained that these new data systems are essential tools for police reform. In fact, I have argued that the City of Portland could be a model for other large cities to emulate if they were to follow this guidance.

While some may want to debate whether a contact survey, per se, is required by the Settlement Agreement, the proposed reforms are clearly linked to the Settlement Agreement. One of the main goals of the Settlement Agreement is to "increase public confidence in the

PPB" (page 2). The Settlement Agreement also "identifies measures...that will assist the Parties and the community in determining whether...community trust in the PPB has increased" (Page 2). The required measures include community surveys (Par. 146). In addition, Paragraph 149 states that the COCL, DOJ, and PPB will "develop metrics to evaluate community engagement and outreach" and the Portland Committee on Community Engaged-Policing (PCCEP) "may review these metrics and may suggest additional metrics to DOJ and PPB." This task was completed, and the first major indicator of community engagement and outreach, as agreed upon by the parties, was stated as follows:

> *"Interactions with the public and general service delivery. PPB is expected to engage with diverse community members in a manner that is fair (unbiased), respectful, and helpful. Public perceptions of the PPB and the performance of its officers are considered important metrics, as they affect public trust and confidence in the police. These can be measured through community and/or contact surveys."* (Metrics report for Par. 149).

Responding to the COCL's prior recommendations, PPB's Training Advisory Council (TAC) and PCCEP, both community-led organizations with Settlement Agreement responsibilities, have recommended contact surveys. TAC is currently discussing community surveys to expand community engagement regarding PPB's performance. On May 11, 2022, the TAC officially recommended that PPB "Institute contact surveys to assess procedural justice, quality of service." (TAC, 2022). They pointed out that contact surveys will help PPB "...ensure that police services are meeting customer expectations and needs" and "over time, survey results will help the [Training Division] identify trends and tailor trainings to address unmet needs that are undetectable through use of force reporting."

On July 7, 2022, Chief Chuck Lovell responded to TAC's recommendation, stating that "The importance of procedural justice and customer service are essential in maintaining and improving perceptions of police legitimacy within Portland communities. I will direct the Strategic Services and Professional Standards Divisions to jointly explore the viability of instituting this type of customer service feedback for individual Police Bureau members."

In terms of the Settlement Agreement, the COCL has stressed that the PPB is required to evaluate the effectiveness of police training, not only at the Training Division, but on the streets. In particular, Paragraph 80 requires the PPB to evaluate "the extent to which program graduates are applying the knowledge and skills acquired in training to their jobs" (Par. 80). The Training Division is working on this task using existing data, such as force reports and complaints, but these are rare data points and will not provide a full, representative picture of the day-to-day interactions that officers are having with the public – interactions that may be used to prevent escalation to the use of force or formal complaints from the community. As the Captain of the Training Division stated when responding to TAC's recommendation for contact surveys, "...instituting this type of program may provide useful information and potentially

avert future problems that could be preventatively addressed by supervisors or the Employee Assistance Program (EAP)…"

Data from both contact surveys and the forthcoming body-worn cameras (BWC) can help achieve this goal of establishing on-the-job outcome measures of police responses to the public in general and to persons who are having, or are perceived to be having, a mental health crisis. These yet-to-be-implemented measurement systems can also shed light on force incidents and formal complaints by offering additional data from the community member's perspective.

In terms of training relevant to on-the-job outcomes, Par. 84 (vi.) states that PPB must "continue to train officers to avoid using profanity, prohibit using derogatory/demeaning labels, and also avoiding terms not currently appropriate for person-centered communication, such as the term "mentals," in all work-related settings and communications, as well as when interacting with the public." Whether officers use such language or exhibit such stereotypes will remain unknown unless the public is allowed to describe their encounters.

Below I outline the four key steps to implementing a sustainable and effective Contact Survey Program that is expected to improve the quality of service provided by the Portland Police Bureau.

III. FOUR-STEP STRATEGIC PLAN TO IMPLEMENT CONTACT SURVEY PROGRAM

1. **Identify Key Dimensions of Police Performance**

What changes in police behavior in Portland are needed to increase public trust and cooperation in the interest of public safety? As suggested above, to significantly improve the quality of police services, the City of Portland must begin to "measure what matters" to the public. The proposed Contact Survey Program is based on the premise that, while much has been done under the community policing model, progress in reforming police organizations has been restricted by failure to explore new measures of success and new methods of accountability that are grounded in the community. What dimensions of police performance are worthy of consistent measurement?

In a framework of policing in a democratic society, police scholars and practitioners have called for greater attention to policing processes rather than policing outcomes (Moore et al., 2002; Mastrofski, 1999). For example, public satisfaction with the police is affected by outcomes (e.g. whether or not you received a traffic ticket), but is more influenced by whether the officer was respectful and listened to you before and after writing the ticket. Consistent with this emphasis, the focus of the current proposal is experience-based assessments of the police and procedural justice during these encounters.

Police interactions with the community residents – whether voluntary, public-initiated (e.g. calls to report a crime) or involuntary, police-initiated (i.e. traffic stops) – are at the heart of police work. Hence, the Contact Survey Program falls within a "customer service" model. Much like the private sector, and increasingly the public sector, customer satisfaction surveys are integral to evaluating and adapting operating procedures and giving the consumer a voice in service delivery. Policing should be about customer service, since the vast majority of calls for service have no direct connection to crime fighting per se, and even when law enforcement functions are activated, they, too, involve interacting with members of the community.

Vulnerable populations

Our society is calling for fairer and more respectful treatment of constitutionally protected classes defined by race, color, sex, gender identity, age, religion, mental health, disability, national origin, sexual orientation, and other vulnerable groups. Police mistreatment of these groups has been highlighted recently in our national dialogue, so we must understand better how they are being treated. We also know that race bias during enforcement, has resulted in

the mass incarceration of Black people since the 1980s (Alexander, 2011), with critics reporting that the criminal justice system reinforces a caste system of racial control that produces second-class citizens with fewer rights (Alexander, 2011; Lerman & Weaver, 2014).

In general, we now know from research that police contact can have adverse mental health consequences, especially for people of color, youth, and transgender populations (DeVylder et al., 2017). We also know that police enforcement actions with youth can have a range of adverse effects, including school absenteeism (Geller & Mark, 2022), increased recidivism (Klein, 1986), and reduced options for gainful employment (Bushway, 1996). These effects are especially large for young Black males, as they tend to be heavily policed (Geller, 2021; Independent Monitoring Team, 2020).[2] As a result, this group holds very negative views of the police and do not trust them (Independent Monitoring Team, 2022). The same is true for the Black/African American community at large (Schuck & Rosenbaum, 2005). Thus, to better understand the needs of all vulnerable and constitutionally protected classes, we need to consistently create space for them to voice concerns and be prepared to hear about their interactions with the police. Currently, police directives seek to restrict bias, including prohibitions against denigrating language, use of stereotypes, and biased decision making. However, the community wants evidence that demonstrates that progress is being made to reduce these problems, as too much ambiguity remains about how to measure progress. Thus, in the interest of impartial policing and transparency, the City should collect and publicize data on community evaluations of police services by the demographic characteristics of the community member and other defining features of protected classes.

Procedural Justice

The most studied and least debated set of police processes involves procedural justice.[3] Here, past research provides a very clear direction. Surveys clearly indicate that while community residents in many cities want safer streets and less violence, most importantly, they want a

---

[2] Another way of summarizing these results is that enforcement actions with minors is often criminogenic rather than preventative – it increases, rather than decreases, the probability of future offending against society's norms and laws.

[3] There are other community-oriented processes in police work that also deserve attention and have been documented by researchers (See Mastrofski, 1999; Moore et al., 2002; Rosenbaum, 2002; Rosenbaum et al., 2007; Schuck & Rosenbaum, 2005; Skogan & Hartnett, 1997), but here we focus on what holds the greatest promise for police reform.

police force that is fair and sensitive to their needs (Rosenbaum et al, 2005; Tyler, 2005; Weitzer & Tuch, 2005). The PPB has a policy on procedural justice (directive 25.00) and some training on this subject, but much more is possible.

Critically important is a large body of research on procedural justice that documents the benefits of this approach to policing. The pioneering work of Tyler and his colleagues (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler, 1990) has provided a theoretical pathway for hundreds of studies across many countries showing that people's judgments about the police are heavily influenced by their sense of whether the process is fair and the officer's behavior is appropriate.

First, I want to define procedural justice and related theoretical constructs for those who are unfamiliar with this scientific literature. (For details, read Rosenbaum et al., 2017; Also, see the Yale Law School Justice Collaboratory, 2023, or the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015, Pillar 1, "Building Trust and Legitimacy"). Essentially, procedural Justice research shows that the public's perceptions of police are strongly influenced by the quality of their encounter with the police (i.e., the process of how they are treated) and not only by the outcome (i.e. whether they received a ticket or were arrested). More specifically, there are four key components of procedural justice when interacting with the police or other legal authorities:

1. Dignity and respect: Are community members treated with dignity and respect by the officer?

2. Voice: Are community members given a voice or chance to express their concerns? Are they allowed to participate in the decision-making process by telling their side of the story?

3. Neutrality: Is the officer neutral or unbiased in their decisions, guided by consistent and transparent reasons? In other words, are decisions based on the facts and legal procedures, rather than personal biases about race/ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, mental health, or other factors that are not legally relevant?

4. Trustworthiness: Is the officer conveying trustworthy motives and showing concern about the well-being of those who are affected by their decisions?

Our research has identified another core communication skill that is linked to voice and trustworthiness, namely, empathy. Specifically, "People respond positively when others can understand their point of view, feelings, and circumstances, and respond with compassion, reassurance, and comfort rather than indifference, criticism, or blaming." (Rosenbaum et al., 2017). Empathy is also important when responding to victims of crime. Too often, victims of violence experience negative, unsupportive reactions from professionals, which have been shown to inhibit their psychological recovery and reduce the likelihood of future disclosure or reporting to authorities (Ahrens, 2006; Starzynski et al., 2005; Ullman, 1999). No doubt, many

PPB officers respond in a compassionate and empathetic manner and understand how procedural justice should be applied, but others do not and do not view this as central to their role and responsibilities.

When evaluating police-public interactions, I also emphasize conversational etiquette, defined as a set of rules or practices endorsed by society regarding appropriate behavior in interpersonal settings (e.g. opening a conversation with a greeting and identifying yourself).

Research related to procedural justice goes much further to examine the consequences of acting in this matter, and this body of research is extremely important for anyone concerned about police use of force. Specifically, officers who act in a procedurally just manner will not only gain the respect of the community but will achieve much greater cooperation during encounters, and therefore, have less need to use force. Research clearly shows that when the police are viewed as procedurally just – making decisions that are seen as fair and treating people well – the public is more inclined to obey the law and cooperate with them (Rosenbaum et al., 2017; Tyler, 2004; 2006). In contrast, disobedience and resistance are likely when police officers are disrespectful toward them (Terrill and Reisig, 2003). Clearly, cooperation reduces the need to use force. Research clearly indicates that procedural justice is the primary vehicle for enhancing police legitimacy with the community (Tyler, 2004).

The elements of procedural justice are closely linked to one other. Research indicates that a process is more likely to be judged fair when the elements of participation, demeanor, neutrality and trust are present (Skogan & Frydl, 2004, p. 304). In other words, recipients of police service are less likely to feel that the police are being discriminatory or unfair if they feel they have a voice in the process, feel they are treated with dignity and respect, and feel the officer was genuinely concerned for their welfare. After reviewing the scientific literature on police programs seeking to improve police legitimacy, Mazerolle et al (2013) conclude that front-line procedurally just communication with the public "…is important for promoting citizen satisfaction, confidence, compliance and cooperation with the police." In fact, even though police ineffectiveness in fighting crime is widely discussed today as a factor that undermines police legitimacy, research shows that effectiveness is not as important for predicting legitimacy as procedural justice (Tankebe, 2013; Tyler & Fagan, 2006; Bradford et al., 2014). Process is more important than outcome, and therefore, the elements of procedural justice should be measured when we seek to evaluate police performance on the streets or in the classroom.

For victims of crime, these dimensions are critically important. Victims of violence, especially sexual assault and domestic violence, often experience negative, unsupportive reactions from the police. For example, research reveals that the absence of procedural justice when interviewing victims of sexual assault can have a negative effect on the victim's recovery and reduce their likelihood of cooperating further with the criminal justice system (Lorenz, 2017).

Ullman (2000) identifies four key dimensions of negative social reactions to victims (i.e., taking control of the victim's decisions, victim blame, distraction from what happened, and egocentric behavior), and three aspects of positive reactions (i.e., instrumental, emotional, and information support). This underscores the importance of the police giving particular attention to the needs and concerns of crime victims when responding to calls and taking police reports (see Rosenbaum, 1987). Hence, key dimensions of police reactions should be measured to evaluate the quality of police services.

In sum, there is more to police-public encounters than enforcement statistics on traffic citations, arrests, and use of force. Factors such as the officer's demeanor, fairness and impartiality, emotional and informational support, and professional competence all play a role in determining whether community residents are satisfied with their encounter, whether they will work with the police in the future, and whether they will be inclined to obey the law themselves.4 Each deserves to be measured and monitored on a consistent basis.

2. Develop Research Methods and Key Measures

The COCL strongly recommends that the City develop and fund the methodology needed to measure the key dimensions outlined above, namely, the quality of police-public contacts and procedural justice in particular. As such, I am repeating, and adding substance to, my earlier proposal to implement a contact survey that measures public perceptions of their recent police contact.

Merits of the Contact Survey

Beginning in the 1990s, resident surveys became popular in the United States as a way to gauge public satisfaction with the police (Fridell & Wycoff, 2004). However, the major limitations of previous survey research is that: (1) the findings cannot be disaggregated to small geographic areas or to types of police encounters – they are typically citywide or national; (2) they are one-

---

[4] Today, with so much attention on the police, we sometimes forget the critical role that the community plays in preventing crime (See Rosenbaum, 1986; 1988; Rosenbaum et al., 1998). Also, without the community's support, police are unable to solve crime and administer justice. Furthermore, interagency partnerships, with police and community working together, are essential for reducing neighborhood crime and disorder (see Rosenbaum, 2002).

time "snapshots" of community responses rather than ongoing data collection systems; and (3) they are not linked to police officer performance or accountability systems.

Thus, two measurement systems should be developed and sustained in Portland:

1. a system that routinely collects, analyzes and utilizes information gathered from contact surveys of individuals who have experienced a recent contact with a PPB officer, including (but not limited to) individuals who were the subject of a mental health crisis call; and

2. a system that routinely collects, analyzes, and utilizes information gathered from body-worn cameras (BWC) with a similar focus on police-public interactions.

The primary objective of this report is to describe the Contact Survey Program, but as the BWC program is being implemented, Portland should also explore the dimensions and metrics possible with this new database. To assist in the development of a BWC feedback program, I have attached Appendix A, where I described, in Judge Simon's courtroom, the potential usage of BWC data to measure police officer performance, provide coaching, and introduce new training.

Clearly, the Portland community has a strong desire to see a more open and transparent Portland Police Bureau and to have greater input into decisions about police services. Community input is a central component of community policing. Contact surveys offer community members a direct voice in evaluating the quality of police services in all parts of the city. This will also allow the PPB to demonstrate its willingness to partner with the community to evaluate police services, show transparency, and make adjustments in response to community feedback – something that is expected from healthy learning organizations. Furthermore, the City should engage the community in a dialogue about the key dimensions that should be captured on the contact survey.

The merits of a contact survey are numerous, and therefore, I strongly recommend that the City of Portland be the first large city to institutionalize this system of evaluation. Contact surveys have been used in other large cities, but never institutionalized or integrated into systems of officer performance evaluation. The same has been true in Portland, where several contact

surveys have been conducted, but they have been one-time surveys with different methods and metrics.5

By adopting this new model, Portland would be nationally recognized and set the standard for urban agencies with a respected methodology and useful set of metrics.6 The Contact Survey Program would become an integral part of PPB's community engagement and accountability efforts to improve the quality of police services.

Specifically, the direct benefits of an ongoing Contact Survey Program are numerous, including the following:

- Community members who are stopped by the police or call the police for help will be given a voice and empowered in a relationship that has, historically, been perceived as one-sided

- The program will incentivize a new definition of good policing, encouraging the police to "serve and protect" in a procedurally just manner

- The contact survey data will help the Police Training Division identify specific skills where additional training is needed

- The program will identify specific officers who need additional training or coaching to achieve a higher level of procedurally just behaviors, and will reward officers who are performing at a high level

- As a result of focused training, supervision, and upgraded performance evaluations, this program should strengthen officers' communication and de-escalation skills, increase

---

5 In Portland, during the last decade, stand-alone contact surveys have been done by the National Police Research Platform (under the COCL's direction), Portland State University, the National Police Foundation, and DHM Research, Inc. A few larger cities are now trying the MY90 survey by Ax   on, but the survey is very brief and uses an advertisement-based sampling procedure in Facebook that produces an unrepresentative sample of the communities being served. Recently, a couple of very small cities introduced contact surveys to improve performance (see Davies, 2022), but the methods employed will not be very informative for larger agencies.

6 Community-wide surveys are common nationwide, but typically, three out of four people who complete these surveys have not had any contact with the local police in the past year or two, so they have no lived experience and are not knowledgeable about police treatment. Thus, surveys must be directed at the right subpopulation – those with recent police contact.

procedural justice, and result in fewer use of force incidents, fewer complaints, fewer lawsuits, less bias in police decision making,

- Because of these consequences, the program should increase the public's trust and confidence in the police (PPB legitimacy) and their willingness to work with the police in the co-production of public safety.

Before delving deeper into the Contact Survey Program, I want to emphasize that this framework could easily be expanded to evaluate other services in Portland's first response system, such as Portland Street Response (PSR) or Portland's 911 system. PSR's response to persons experiencing mental health and behavioral health issues is critically important and has been evaluated by Portland State University researchers (Townley & Leickly, 2022), but service recipients could benefit from an ongoing voice in the process. Also, 911 emergency response systems need improvement everywhere (Neusteter et al., 2019), and the Contact Survey Program could be expanded down the road to ask callers how well their call was handled by the dispatcher.

Content of the Contact Survey

In a previous life, I directed the National Police Research Platform, funded by the National Institute of Justice, to test new measures of police performance nationwide. We field tested a contact survey, called the Police-Community Interaction Survey, in 53 large cities in 2013 and 2014, including Portland (see Rosenbaum et al., 2015; Rosenbaum et al., 2017). The results were very promising, and this initiative received positive reviews by participating police chiefs and sheriffs (See Bueerman et al., 2017). Also, the Bureau of Justice Statistics has been supporting the national Police-Public Contact Survey since 2005, using a nationally representative sample of households, and this too can be a source of good information for designing a Portland survey (e.g. Harrell & Davis, 2020).

The survey items included in the draft survey below are only suggestive. The City of Portland, with input from the community and PPB, should have the final decision on survey content.

To increase response rates and institutionalize the Contact Survey Program with continuous public support, the survey should be very brief – less than 5 minutes, and probably no more than 10 to 20 questions. Based on the research cited above, I have suggested several relevant topics for the survey. Procedural justice is the main focus, but I also suggest questions on threats and use of force, de-escalation, empathy/compassion, social etiquette, willingness to work with the police, trust in the police, and overall satisfaction with the experience.

The survey items listed below have not been formatted and are being shown for content only. Each question begins by showing the underlying construct being measured in parentheses; I would suggest limiting the number of response options for most questions (2 or 3 choices) to

keep the survey short and amenable to mobile device use. This list may need to be shortened, and some items could be replaced or edited. Also, consider a branching model, where everyone answers a few questions and others are allowed to branch out when appropriate (e.g. explain why they gave a negative rating). The City, in collaboration with the community, should decide on the final content of the contact survey.

1. (Conversational Etiquette): At the start, did the officer greet you by saying hello and stating their name?

   o Yes

   o No

2. (Procedural Justice – Respect): How respectful was the officer to you? (Also, consider – How respectful was the officer to other individuals present?)

   o Very Respectful

   o Somewhat Respectful

   o Somewhat Disrespectful

   o Very Disrespectful

3. (Procedural Justice – Fairness/Neutrality): How fair was the officer with you?

   o Very Fair

   o Somewhat Fair

   o Somewhat Unfair

   o Very Unfair

4. (Procedural Justice – Fairness/Helpfulness): Did the officer explain the reasons for their actions?

   o Yes, definitely

   o Yes, somewhat

   o No, not really

5. (Procedural Justice -Fairness/Discrimination): Do you feel the officer discriminated against you because of your race, gender, age, religion, sexual orientation, mental health, or disability?

   o Yes, definitely

   o Yes, somewhat

   o No, not really

6. (Procedural Justice – Voice): Did the officer take the time to listen to you and understand your situation?

   o Yes, definitely

   o Yes, somewhat

   o No, not really

7. (Trustworthiness/Empathy): Did the officer seem genuinely concerned about you and your feelings?

   o Yes, definitely

   o Yes, somewhat

   o No, not really

8. (Emotional Control – De-escalation of conflict): Did the officer try to calm things down?

   o Yes, definitely

   o Yes, somewhat

   o No, not really

9. (Helpfulness): Did the officer make an effort to be helpful?

   o Yes, definitely

   o Yes, somewhat

   o No, not really

10. (Force/Escalation):

Yes-No responses

During the encounter, did the officer…

a) talk down to you?

b) threaten to use physical force against you?

c) use force against you, such as pushing, grabbing, hitting or kicking you?

d) search you by touching your body in different places?

e) point a weapon at you, such as pepper spray, stun gun or actual gun?

f) Did you resist the officer in any way?

11. (Conversational Etiquette): At the end of your interaction, did the officer thank you for your cooperation or say something like, "have a good day"?

o Yes

o No

12. (Overall satisfaction): Taking the whole experience into account, how satisfied are you with the way you were treated by the officer in your most recent interaction?

o Very Satisfied

o Satisfied

o Dissatisfied

o Very Dissatisfied

13. (Organizational legitimacy/trust): How much do you trust the Portland Police to make decisions that are good for everyone in the City?

o I Trust them a Lot

o I Trust them Somewhat

o I Don't Trust them at all

14. (Willingness to Cooperate with the Police): How likely would you be to work with the police if they asked for your help?

- o Very Likely
- o Somewhat Likely
- o Somewhat Unlikely
- o Very Unlikely

The following demographic questions are included so we can learn how different groups are being treated by the police. Your responses will be kept private and secure and not available to the police or the public. All questions are optional.

Which most closely describes your gender?

- o Woman
- o Man
- o Transgender Woman
- o Transgender Man
- o Non-Binary
- o Agender/I don't identify with any gender
- o Gender not listed. My gender is _____
- o Prefer not to state

Do you describe yourself as Spanish, Hispanic, Latino, or Chicano?

- o Yes
- o No

What is your racial background? (Mark all that apply)

- o Caucasian/White
- o African American/Black
- o Asian/Pacific Islander

- American Indian/Indigenous American

- Other

What is your age?

- Under 30

- 30-44

- 45-59

- 60-74

- Over 74

Portland's 5-digit Zip Codes all start with "972." If you live in Portland, please provide the last two digits of your home Zip Code _____

Finally, the last question - Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the way the officer handled the situation, either good or bad?

_____

Linking the Survey Data to Other Data

To avoid a lengthy survey and to provide more context about the incident, a PPB Records employee will need to routinely download certain data elements connected with police reports and create a separate database that can be linked to the survey responses. These data elements would include the incident number, incident date, characteristics of the incident (traffic stop, traffic accident, crime incident and type), any action taken (e.g. warning, citation, arrest), the location (precinct, district, shift), and the demographics of the community member and primary officer (race/ethnicity, age, gender, unit). Mental health calls would be identified from the Mental Health Template, but no identifying information should be included. After removal of information identifying the community member and the officer (by using codes from a Master ID list), these downloads would be provided to the independent agency on a monthly basis to allow for the generation of reports on PPB's overall performance and to maintain the integrity of the system. The full database will also serve as the basis for more specific internal reports and feedback on specific precincts, districts, units and individual officers, as well as an audit of business card compliance (see below).

3. **Develop and Implement a Sustainable Program of Data Collection**

The City needs to develop, fund, and implement a strong, sustainable Contact Survey Program for the routine collection of data using the survey methods and performance metrics outlined above. The COCL has the experience to recommend the key elements of this program. Over the past 15 years, my colleagues and I have been deeply involved in field testing surveys to measure procedural justice during police-community interactions, as noted above. I have drawn on this knowledge and lessons learned to prepare this proposal for Portland.

The Survey Invitation

I recommend that the public's invitation to participate in the contact survey be linked to the PPB's current policy of requiring officers to distribute their business cards to community members (directive 312.50, Identification).[7] Incorporating the invitation on the business card will save significant time and resources involved in mailing letters to individuals with a recent police contact, including postage and personnel costs. Also, community members will have the opportunity to evaluate the police <u>immediately</u> after the encounter and before their short-term memory is lost or distorted by future events.[8]

To capture the larger picture of police-community interactions in Portland, the PPB's current business card policy would need to be modified to require that cards be routinely distributed in <u>all</u> cases involving traffic stops, traffic accidents, mental health crisis response and crime incidents where a police report is written (in addition, cards could be distributed with street stops and community engagement activities, although they cannot easily be tracked without an accompanying report).

The business card should:

---

[7] The directive reads, "If practical, safe, and tactically feasible, members shall identify themselves by name and offer their Bureau-issued business card (containing their Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST) number) when responding to a call for service, engaging in self-initiated activity, making a traffic or pedestrian stop, or upon request of a member of the public."

[8] Research has shown that the passage of time has an adverse effect on human recall of information (Barrouillet & Camos, 2012). Memory will simply decay over time (Baddeley et al., 2009), or can be biased by what researchers call "retroactive interference," where new information (e.g. a second, more recent contact with the police) interferes with the mental retrieval of old information (Edwards, 2010). Thus, contact surveys should be requested immediately after the police contact.

1. communicate to residents that the City of Portland values their opinions as a consumer of police services;

2. ask residents to report their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with how they were treated by completing a brief customer satisfaction survey online; and

3. promise residents that their responses are confidential and being collected by an independent unit of government, not the PPB, and thus, the PPB will not see their individual survey answers.

The front side of the card would contain the officer's name, DPSST number and report number associated with this encounter, and QR code for gaining access to the online contact survey. The reverse side of the card would include a short encouragement from the Chief to take the survey and promise to protect their identity. Here is some proposed language for the back side of the PPB business card:

How are we doing?

Please take a few minutes to report how

you were treated by the Portland Police today.

Scan the QR Code and take a short survey.

Your answers will not be seen by the Portland Police Bureau.

This survey is managed by an independent organization.

Thank you for helping to improve our services!

Independent Management of the Program

To achieve maximum credibility with the community and strong program implementation, the Contact Survey Program should be managed by a unit of government that is completely independent of the PPB, although the PPB must be allowed access to the data for internal

analyses. Indeed, this independent unit will need to partner with analysts within the PPB to manage this program.[9]

I propose that the Contact Survey Program be housed in the Community Safety Division (CSD). The CSD is deeply engaged in strategic planning and is working to re-envision community safety in Portland through innovative programs. The Community Safety Transition Director is very skilled, understanding public safety organizations, and has experience with contact surveys for quality assurance programs.

I would recommend that the CSD contract with an outside vendor to collect the contact survey data. To be effective, the independent unit would need to release data to the PPB and public on a regular basis. The City must decide on the level of aggregation for public dashboards, but the identity of community members and officers involved in particular encounters must not be ascertainable from these public documents.

Full and effective implementation of the Contact Survey Program will require the CSD and PPB to invest in several components, as outlined below. There is more to the Contact Survey Program than simply handing out business cards. Officers must learn that procedural justice is a priority within the organization and that they are being evaluated by these standards. Also, the City cannot assume that all officers will know how to interact with the public in a procedurally just manner or that they will fully support the Contact Survey Program. In fact, my experience tells me that some officers will be opposed to the program for a variety of reasons. Hence, some key actions must be taken to ensure the success of the program, including the following:

New Policy

The PPB will need to develop a new policy on the Contact Survey Program. This directive will lay out the elements and requirements of the new system. The directive will require that business cards be distributed for all incidents that involve a police report, and if not distributed, the officer must provide a reason for this decision. The directive will need to incorporate these requirements.

---

[9] I give high marks to the PPB analysts who look at training, use of force, and stops data. In general, they are very competent and are not afraid to ask tough questions.

New Training for Officers

Officers will need to be trained on this new policy. During this training, the PPB management must communicate that prior training about "procedural justice principles," although helpful as an introduction, only scrapes the surface. Officers should understand that, beginning soon, the PPB will routinely measure what matters to community members. Consequently, changes have been made to policy, standard operating procedures, training, supervision, and performance measurement. They should understand that their performance will be judged on the basis of this new system of measurement and a new reward structure (as outlined in this report).

Using a cost-benefit analysis, they should learn that the benefits of fully participating in the new program will outweigh the costs, thus making their job easier. In addition to the practical side of distributing cards, officers must receive more detailed training about how to engage in procedurally just words and actions. (See Step 4 below for details).

Public Education and Engagement

As noted above, the City will need a public education campaign to make the community aware of this new program and encourage their participation in the contact survey. As the public becomes more aware of the Contact Survey Program, they are likely to be more appreciative of the City's efforts to engage the community and look forward to participating in the survey themselves. Response rates for online surveys can be relatively low, so the City will need to consider ways of increasing awareness of the survey and encouraging widespread participation.

Thus, the PPB and the City should promote the Contact Survey Program through social media, billboards, and flyers distributed at community meetings. One message could be, "We care about how you are treated by the Portland Police Bureau and want your honest feedback. When a PPB officer gives you a business card, please take a few minutes to tell us how the PPB is doing. We promise to take the results seriously and find ways to improve police services. You deserve it." Also, communicate that "The Contact Survey Program is being managed by an independent unit, so the Police Bureau will never see your answers – only the combined results."

Also, the PPB and the City should encourage community members to contribute to officer training on procedural justice. Officers should listen to diverse community voices and learn to empathize with the fear of police encounters and specific obstacles to gaining trust.

Auditing the Program

The Contact Survey Program, built around the distribution of business cards, will require an audit to ensure that officers distribute their business cards for virtually all contacts that result in a police report. Cards must be distributed to the people receiving police services to achieve reliable and valid survey results.

Based on my own research, I have learned that when officers discover they are being evaluated by the community, some will be disinclined to distribute the cards at all and others will distribute them selectively (e.g. positive encounters only). Any efforts to "beat the system" can be prevented with a good auditing program, thus sending the message that the new program is a job requirement. Also, body-worn camera footage will eventually help to achieve full implementation. Gradually, the Contact Survey Program will become a routine part of police work and community engagement.

The audit should include an analysis of survey response rates by precinct, district, shift, unit, and officers. This will hint at problem areas (e.g. some officers will generate substantially more surveys than others) but will not provide definitive information. More precisely, as part of the audit, telephone calls, text messages or emails can be used to contact a random sample of potential survey respondents to ask whether they were handed a business card by the responding officer. Senior management should encourage compliance with the directive and immediate supervisors, armed with specific data, should give feedback to those who are not consistently engaging in the distribution of business cards or are distributing them selectively.

4. **Develop and Implement a Sustainable Program to Utilize the Data for Behavioral Change**

Having a new system where thousands of community members across the city have a consistent voice in evaluating PPB officers is a good start, but real behavior change within the PPB is unlikely until the contact survey data are put to good use. Hence, a program must be developed to utilize the data in a systematic way, as outlined below.

Create New Data Management System

First, the City will need to contract with an outside vendor to collect the survey data. However, the City should hire a least one full-time analyst to manage the analysis and presentation of the incoming contact survey data on a daily basis. This individual must have the skills to manage active datasets, conduct statistical analyses, and present data in user-friendly figures and tables. The reporting of these findings, both internally and externally, is essential for reform, as outlined below. To reduce the burden on the analysts, over time the City should seek to develop or acquire software that can generate standardized reports on a weekly or monthly basis.(Some vendors are beginning to offer these services, such as Govmetrics or Guardian Score, but Portland will likely need its own tailored system). Finally, I recommend that one full-time person be hired to manage and direct the Contact Survey Program and interface with the PPB, the City, and the community.

Create New Accountability at the Officer Level

To effectively utilize the contact survey data, the analysis must reach far beyond the traditional citywide survey findings. In Portland, past surveys suggest that the public is "satisfied" overall with the officer's performance in roughly three-quarters of their encounters. But what about the one-in-four encounters where community members are not satisfied? Who are these officers and why were community members not satisfied? Also, for the survey respondents who report that they are satisfied overall, they may have concerns with specific aspects of their encounter with a PPB officer that is not reflected in summary statistics. For example, a community member might have felt that the officer was nice but didn't introduce themselves or didn't explain why the community member was pulled over. The contact survey data will allow the analyst and/or software to examine various dimensions of the encounter to give a more complete picture of the interactions that occur.

Thus, the contact survey should be used as a management tool to evaluate individual performance by the PPB officers. The PPB already collects individualized data on employees, including the number of force incidents, citizen complaints, arrests, citations written, etc., for each officer, so adding some new data to their profile should not be a problem. The argument in defense of this practice should be no different than the argument used to justify management's collection of other individualized data about officer performance. Portland can expect some resistance and push back from officers, so the PPB will need to explain and justify the Contact Survey Program through training, and articulate the benefits to them (see below).

With the Contact Survey Program, the PPB can add a metric that is very important to the community, namely, the quality of police service delivered to the community. Each PPB officer should receive an Index score -- for now, call it the Quality of Service (QS) Index – that would reflect an officer's average score across all contacts during a given period (e.g. 6-month period). In addition to an overall QS Index, the City might want to create sub-indices (e.g., De-Escalation Index, Cooperation Index). Thus, the independent unit responsible for managing the contact survey can provide the PPB with data that has been aggregated for each officer, which protects the identity of individual community members who evaluated that officer.

The proper analysis of the survey data is essential. In statistical terms, officers whose Index scores are two or three standard deviations below the average score for similarly situated officers should be given the opportunity for supervisory coaching or refresher training. But a supervisory alert system should be created to hold all officers accountable to certain performance standards. At the other end, officers who are two or three standard deviations above the mean score should be eligible for some type of reward for exceptional performance. Working with the police union, the Community Safety Division should explore a reward structure that involves salary increases.

Create New Accountability at the Supervisory and Management Level

Without a clear role for supervisors and managers, the contact survey system will have limited effectiveness. The system should produce Quality of Service (QI) Index results for each precinct, districts, shift, unit, types of incident/call, demographics of the officer, demographics of the community member, and other factors. The results will likely indicate differences in performance across these variables, begging the question of what is contributing to these differences and what, if anything, can be done to enhance performance in certain areas. The PPB management should strongly encourage internal brainstorming and problem solving around these results. The system should be designed to encourage supervisors to spend time thinking about these differences and propose strategies and tactics for intervention.

At the management level, when officer scores are compiled for each supervisor, the PPB may learn that some supervisors are not doing as well as other similarly situated supervisors.[10] For example, PPB members under Supervisor X may not be distributing business cards or may be receiving lower QS Index scores than Supervisor Y. If necessary, supervisors should then be given coaching and counseling on how to interpret and use the QS Index to enhance officers' performance on the job. They should also be held accountable for ensuring strong compliance with the new policy and thus, implementation of the Contact Survey Program.

Everyone from first-line supervisors to the Chief of Police should have certain performance standards or goals built into a strategic plan for the Contact Survey Program. When they achieve those goals (e.g. 80% of the officers achieved QS Index scores above a certain level), then these supervisors should be acknowledged and rewarded in some way.

Eventually, the contact survey data should be incorporated into officers' Annual Performance Evaluation, and supervisors should be trained in providing useful feedback on their Index scores. As noted earlier, COCL identified some serious flaws in the current Annual Performance Evaluation reviews by PPB supervisors, especially the absence of any "Needs Improvement" ratings. The Contact Survey Program offers another motivation and opportunity for PPB to revise its Annual Performance Evaluation system to incorporate contact survey data linked to individual officers.

---

[10] The PPB must exercise caution when comparing officers or supervisors who are assigned to precincts or shifts with vastly different levels of crime and poverty. But at a minimum, these geographic and organizational units should be compared to themselves and should be expected to show improvement in their Index scores over time.

Also, supervisors must reinforce the desired behaviors throughout the year and not wait for the annual performance evaluation. Since the 1950s, research in the field of psychology has shown how behavior is shaped by different schedules of reinforcement.[11]

Provide Additional Training for Officers and Supervisors

Officer Training: Clearly, the Contact Survey Program will require that both officers and supervisors receive additional training and learn about the requirements of a new directive. Officers should learn not only about the distribution of business cards to community members but also the metrics on which they will be evaluated. Furthermore, officers will need additional training in communication skills that can effectively enhance their QS Index scores. Officers should be reminded of the basic elements of procedural justice and social support that determine residents' satisfaction with police services (based on prior research) -- listening, respecting, being fair/objective, showing concern, providing support, etc.

The implication is that high-quality adult education and role-play scenarios will be needed to acquire and retain procedural justice communication skills – something COCL has been promoting in Portland for many years. This will require substantially more training hours than previously allocated. Also, behavior change is unlikely unless individuals receive feedback about their own performance and not simply the performance of groups. Individuals need to practice repeatedly (the same way they practice firing their weapons or making physical takedowns),and receive immediate feedback.

Data from the new Contact Survey Program, along with data from the new body-worn camera program, will identify patterns of police behavior that are desirable and undesirable during police-public interactions. This work will also identify specific types of interpersonal communication that lead to the escalation of conflict and the use of force and other communication that has the opposite effect, so that negative and noncooperative encounters can be prevented or minimized in the future.[12] Differential power dynamics can also cause

_____

[11] For a 101 introduction to how reinforcement schedules works, see Cherry (2022). https://pressbooks.online.ucf.edu/lumenpsychology/chapter/reading-reinforcement-schedules/

[12] For those who are unfamiliar with police work, I want to be clear about police use of force – There are some situations that develop very rapidly, where force is totally justified, and where time does not allow the officer to engage in procedurally just behaviors. However, these situations are rare, and more often, the officer has sufficient time to verbally engage the individual and attempt to de-escalate the situation. And sometimes, these attempts will be unsuccessful, but should still be required.

officers to skip over some of the social etiquette and procedurally just actions that are normally expected in social exchanges. Many officers are trying to do a good job, but some may be unaware of how their verbal and nonverbal behavior is viewed by the public. Along these lines, community members should be involved every step of the way in the development and execution of this training, especially members of protected classes. As a result, the Training Division should be able to utilize the contact survey data, in partnership with the community, to enhance PPB's Training Needs Assessments and Training Plans.

As part of the officer training, I would encourage the PPB to invite community members from various constitutionally-protected classes to share their experiences with PPB officers. To achieve racial and equity healing in general, the police should engage in conversations with people of color, people who have faced mental health crises, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, youth, and other vulnerable groups to hear their stories about police encounters and learn from their perspectives. Pain and trauma can be shared, not to impose blame for harm, but to yield empathy and compassion for lived experience.[13] Because this is a lot to expect of community members, some of these voices can be expressed in video interview format.

The proposed system is designed to be preventative in nature and to create a police culture where high-quality service is the norm rather than the exception. More serious misconduct problems (that result in discipline, lawsuits, and even termination) can sometimes be prevented by addressing the less serious, but more frequent, problems that emerge during routine encounters with the public (e.g. rudeness, disrespect, and bias). In this regard, the training should be guided by research on procedural justice and victim social support which (as noted earlier) suggests that specific behavioral reactions are likely to influence public satisfaction with the police during police-resident encounters and affect how well victims recover from adverse events. If officers can learn to adopt certain communication skills and interact in a manner that is viewed as "procedurally just," socially neutral, and even emotionally supportive, their overall performance should improve significantly in the eyes of the public.

---

[13] Research on corporate equity and diversity training programs suggests that these internally-facing programs can produce a backlash when they blame white people or threaten their sense of belonging (e.g. Dobbin & Kalev, 2018). Thus, police training should be sensitive to these concerns, and should be combined with new systems of performance evaluation, coaching, and employee engagement.

To achieve officer "buy in," officers must be reassured that this new system and training will make their job easier (See the PowerPoint slide in Appendix B for an example of how I have talked with officers about on-the-job benefits). Also, officers should know that the Contact Survey Program is not intended as a punitive accountability system, but rather as a supportive coaching system. As noted above, this program should be incentivized so that officers who deliver a high quality of service are rewarded in some way.

To ensure that this training program is given a high priority, the Training Division must understand that intensive procedural justice training has been shown to be effective in controlled studies. Recently, researchers have found that such training can yield more procedurally just actions by the police in high-crime locations. Specifically, it can produce more respectful treatment of community members, fewer arrests, fewer perceptions of police harassment and violence, and reductions in crime (Weisburd, et al., 2022). However, this type of procedural justice training requires a substantial commitment of time – this program lasted for five days, not one or two hours.

This new research is consistent with prior rigorous evaluations showing that procedural justice training can change on-the-job behavior, as reflected in higher performance ratings given by mentors (Antrobus, et al., 2019), reduced reliance on arrest and use of force (Wheller, et al., 2013), and increased public satisfaction with the police (Mazerolle, et al., 2012). Such training can also enhance the procedural justice skills of new recruits when interacting with youth (Rosenbaum & Lawrence, 2017). Thus, the PPB should continue to pursue new methods of training and evaluation related to procedural justice and de-escalation so that these interpersonal skills become a natural response for the PPB officers.

Supervisor Training: Supervisors and command-level personnel must first be introduced to the evidence showing how officers' procedurally just behavior during police-community interactions impacts public trust and police legitimacy. Then, they must be trained in methods of supervision and coaching related to these behaviors. Specifically, they must be familiarized with the new policy and internal reports on the Contact Survey Program. This would include learning how to interpret and apply the QS Index scores associated with their employees.

Supervisors must be given the tools needed to supervise, beginning with computer-generated reports that summarize data from contact surveys, body-worn cameras, and PPB's early warning system (EIS). They must be trained in how to identify at-risk employees and those who need additional training and coaching. Again, I want to stress that officer accountability is not simply about discipline and negative consequences for a few individuals. Accountability is also about (1) identifying officers who are not engaging in enough procedurally just interactions with the public and are at risk of causing more harm; (2) confirming that a pattern exists by observing the officer's behavior on the street; and (3) providing additional supervision and

coaching to these individuals. Positive accountability/supervision is also about acknowledging and rewarding those who do an outstanding job.

Supervisors will need specific training in the methods of coaching officers on interpersonal communication. If supervisors do not have experience using procedural justice skills themselves, they will not understand their importance and will not be able to train their employees properly. Modeling these skills when interacting with employees is one of the most effective methods of training.

Thus, PPB will need to rethink the role of supervisors. As a result of the Settlement Agreement, supervisory attention has focused on reviewing police reports on use of force. Ultimately, organizational reform and culture change will require supervisors to spend more time reviewing a wide range of metrics on individual performance, including officers' interpersonal communication skills on the job. But beyond reports and new data, supervisors will need to spend more time observing on-the-job services and providing intermittent reinforcement of the desired behaviors for all officers under their supervision. Meeting with employees once a year for the annual performance evaluation is not sufficient.

Finally, lieutenants and above should be trained in methods of monitoring supervisors and ensuring that they are identifying and properly coaching officers who are scoring low on the QS Index. They should also be trained to identify supervisors whose employees are not performing as well as other supervisors and provide them with assistance. Successful supervisors should also be identified and rewarded. Middle and upper management should be trained in methods of changing the police culture around this subject and making it a higher priority within the organization.

Finally, I have observed that some supervisors, without training, are naturally better at interpersonal communication than others. Thus, when considering organizational decisions such as promotion to supervisor or finding qualified members to teach procedural justice, I would encourage the PPB to look at the vast scholarly literature on emotional intelligence. Clearly, some individuals score higher on emotional intelligence than others, meaning they can perform well in social settings because they are aware of their own and other people's emotions, they understand the complexity of emotions, and are skilled at managing their own and other people's emotions to improve performance and achieve desire goals (Mayer et al., 2000). The field of measurement has evolved significantly (Petrides et al., 2016), so in the absence of careful observations, consider administering an emotional intelligence survey to help with such decisions. In any event, the current scientific knowledge of emotional intelligence should be incorporated into PPB's training.

IV. CONCLUSION

The perceived legitimacy of the Portland Police Bureau, like many law enforcement agencies today, has suffered enormously. In this technical assistance report, the COCL maintains that the City and the PPB can make significant progress in restoring police legitimacy and building public trust by paying particular attention to the day-to-day work of PPB officers and creating a new measurement system that rewards the "Guardian" more than the "Warrior" within every officer. Specifically, I am recommending that the City invest in a new system of performance evaluation for its police officers that is built on the scientific evidence about the factors that influence police legitimacy.

To create a sound and sustainable Contact Survey Program, I have described a four-step process that involves:

1. agreeing on the dimensions of police performance during officers' interactions with community members that should be given more attention (primarily procedural justice);

2. developing the methods needed to measure these dimensions (namely, a contact survey, but supported by new BWC data);

3. funding and developing a sustainable data collection and analysis program (namely, an independent City unit, supported by an outside vendor); and

4. developing a program that will utilize these findings to shape police culture and on-the-job behavior (namely, reports on the quality of policing at the precinct, district, unit, and officer levels, followed by training, supervision, and performance evaluations at all levels that are based on the findings.

As the Compliance Officer who is retiring in 2023, I offer these recommendations as a departing gesture. Portland is my hometown – the place where I grew up – and therefore, I genuinely want to be helpful. I am simply drawing on my four decades of experience evaluating police organizations throughout the United States and trying to apply this knowledge to Portland.

Although these recommendations are not required to achieve compliance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement, I hope that they are taken very seriously. The City and the PPB have focused their attention on the legal requirements of the Settlement Agreement. This is a good start, but additional reforms are needed to change the police culture, improve service delivery, and enhance public safety.

The Contact Survey Program will require a limited commitment of resources by the City and the creation of an independent unit to objectively evaluate the work of the PPB. But the payoff should be enormous. Also, community members should be engaged to ensure that the program is built upon the experiences of those who have interacted with PPB officers.

As I said before Judge Simon in April of 2022, "Portland has a wonderful opportunity to move from the back of the pack to the forefront of American policing if the City is willing to support innovative experimentation with advanced technology, training, and supervision around BWC footage." The same is true for the Contact Survey Program. Portland could become the first large police department in the United States to institute a sustainable system of performance evaluation that is built on the voices of community members. This would be an exceptional form of community engagement and would contribute significantly to the PPB's image and its legitimacy.

V. REFERENCES

Ahrens, C.E. (2006). "Being Silenced: The Impact of Negative Social Reactions on the Disclosure of Rape." *American Journal of Psychology*, *38*: 263-274.

Alexander, M. (2011). *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness.* New York: The New Press.

Alpert, G. P., & Moore, M. H. (1993). "Measuring Police Performance in the New Paradigm of Policing." In G.P. Alpert and A.R. Piquero (eds.) *Community Policing: Contemporary Readings*. (pp. 215–232). Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, Inc.

Antrobus, E., Thompson, I., and Ariel, B. (2019). "Procedural Justice Training for Police Recruits: Results of a Randomized Controlled Trial." *Journal of Experimental Criminology 15*(1), 29–53.

Baddeley, A., Eysenck, M.W. & Anderson, A.C. (2009). *Memory*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Barrouillet, P., & Camos, V. (2012). As time goes by: Temporal constraints in working memory. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 21 (6): 413-419.

Blumstein, A. (1999). "Measuring What Matters in Policing." In R. Langworthy (Ed.), *Measuring what Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Institute Meetings* (pp. 5-10). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice and Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Bradford, B., Murphy, K., & Jackson, J. (2014). "Officers as Mirrors: Policing, Procedural Justice and the (Re) Production of Social Identity." *British Journal of Criminology,* 54 (4): 527-550.

Brown, B., & Benedict, W. R (2002). "Perceptions of the Police: Past Findings, Methodological Issues, Conceptual Issues and Policy Implications." *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 25 (3): 543-580.

Bueermann, J., Escamilla, J., & Hartnett, S. (2017). "Looking Ahead to Platform 2.0: Participant Feedback and Institutionalization." *Policing: International Journal of Police Strategies & Management.* 40 (1): 155-162.

Bushway, S. (1996). *The Impact of a Criminal History Record on Access to Legitimate Employment.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. H. John Heinz School of Public Policy and Management, Carnegie Mellon University.

Chan, J. B.L. (2001). "The Technological Game: How Information Technology is Transforming Police Practice." *Criminal Justice*, 1(2): 139–159.

Compliance Officer and Community Liaison (2023). *Quarterly Report: Quarter 3: Updates and Analysis.* Draft report to the City of Portland. January 23, under the Amended Settlement

Agreement between the City of Portland (the City) and the United States Department of Justice (DOJ), Case No. 3:12-cv-02265-SI.

Cordner, Gary W. (1997). "Community Policing: Elements and Effects." In G.P. Alpert and A.R. Piquero (eds.) *Community Policing: Contemporary Readings*. (pp. 45–62). Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, Inc.

Davies, E. (2022). "In this Small Va. Town, Citizens review Police like Uber Drivers." *The Washington Post*. June 2, 2022. https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-va/2022/06/02/warrenton-virginia-police-reviews/

DeVylder, J. E., Oh, H. Y., Nam, Bl, Sharpe, T.L., Lehmann, M., & Link, B. G. (2017). "Prevalence, Demographic Variation, and Psychological Correlates of Exposure to Police Victimization in Four U.S. Cities." *Epidemiological and Psychiatric Sciences*, 26: 466-477. DOI :10.1017/S245796016000810.

Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2018). "Why Doesn't Diversity Training Work? The Challenge for Industry and Academia." *Anthropology Now*, 10 (2): 48-55. DOI: 10.1080/19428200.2018.1493182

D'Souza, A., Weitzer, R., & Brunson, R. K. (2019). "Federal Investigations of Police Misconduct: A Multi-city Comparison." *Crime, Law and Social Change* (2019) 71: 461–482.

Dunworth, T., Cordner, G., Greene, J., Bynum, T., Decker, S., Rich, T., Ward, S., & Webb, V. (2000). *Police Department Information Systems Technology Enhancement Project ISTEP*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Eck, J. E., & Rosenbaum, D. P. (1994). "The New Police Order: Effectiveness, Equity, and Efficiency in Community Policing." In D. P. Rosenbaum (ed.) *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises*, pp. 3-23. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Edwards, W. H. (2010). *Motor Learning and Control: From Theory to Practice*. Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.

Epp, C. R., Maynard-Moody, S., & Haider-Markel, D. (2014). *Pulled Over: How Police Stops Define Race and Citizenship.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fridell, L. A., & Wycoff, M. A. (2004, eds.) *Community Policing: The Past, Present and Future.* Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Geller, A. "Youth-Police Contact: Burdens and Inequities in an Adverse Childhood Experience, 2014-2017." *American Journal of Public Health*, 111 (7): 1300-1308. http://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2021.306259

Geller, A., & Mark, N. (2022). "Student Absenteeism and the Role of Police Encounters." *Criminology and Public Policy*, 21: 893-914. Doi: 10.1111/1745-9133.12600.

Grant, H. B., & Terry, K. J. (2005). *Law Enforcement in the 21st Century*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

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

Green, J. R., & Mastrofski, S. D. (1988, eds.). *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?* New York: Praeger.

Harrell, E., & Davis, E. (2020). *Contacts Between Police and the Public, 2018 – Statistical Tables*. Washington, C: Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice. NCJ 255730. https://bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/contacts-between-police-and-public-2018-statistical-tables

Independent Monitoring Team (2022). *Special Report: Focus Groups with Black and Latino Men, Ages 18–35.*Chicago Consent Decree.

Klein, M. W. (1986). "Labeling Theory and Delinquency Policy: An Empirical Test." *Criminal Justice and Behavior,* 13: 47-79.

Langton, L., & Durose, M.R. (2013). *Police Behavior during Traffic and Street Stops, 2011*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice. NCJ No. 242938. https://bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/police-behavior-during-traffic-and-street-stops-2011

Langworthy, R. H. (1999, ed.), *Measuring What Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Institute Meetings*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice and the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Lawrence, S., & Cole, C. (2019). *Building Capacity: How Police Departments can Drive Positive changes without Federal Intervention*. Washington, DC: Crime and Justice Institute, Community Resources for Justice.

Lerman, A. E., & Weaver, V. M (2014). *Arresting Citizenship: The Democratic Consequences of American Crime Control*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. New York: Plenum Press.

Lorenz, K. (2017). *Reporting Sexual Assault to Police: Victim Experiences and the Potential for Procedural Justice.* PhD Dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago.

Maguire, E. R. (2004). *Measuring the Performance of Law Enforcement Agencies: Part Two*. Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, 84. http://www.calea.org/newweb/newsletter/No84/maguirepart2.htm

Masterson, M. F., & Stevens, D. J. (2002). "The Value of Measuring Community Policing Performance in Madison, Wisconsin." In D. J. Stevens (ed.) *Policing and Community Partnerships*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Pp. 202–217.

Mastrofski, S. D. (1999). "Policing for People*." Ideas in American Policing*, March issue, Washington, DC: Police Foundation.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2000). "Models of Emotional Intelligence." In R. J. Sternberg (ed.), *Handbook of Intelligence* (pp. 396-420). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Mazerolle, L., Bennett, S., Antrobus, E., and Eggins, E. (2012). "Procedural Justice, Routine Encounters and Citizen Perceptions of Police: Main Findings from the Queensland Community Engagement Trial (QCET)." *Journal of Experimental Criminology 8* (4): 343–367.

Mazerolle, L., Bennett, S., Davis, J., Sargeant, E., & Manning, M. (2013). *Legitimacy in Policing: A Systematic Review*. Campbell Systematic Reviews 2013:1 DOI: 10.4073/ csr.2013.1

McCarthy, G. F., & Rosenbaum, D. P. (2015). "From CompStat to RespectStat: Accountability for Respectful Policing." *The Police Chief,* August*, 76-77.*

McGrady, C. (2023). "Tyre Nichols Beating Opens a Complex Conversation on Race and Policing." New York Times, January 28. https://www.nytimes.com/2023/01/28/us/police-tyre-nichols-beating-race.html?searchResultPosition=1

Mirzer, M.L. (1996). "Policing Supervision in the 21st Century." *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 65: 6–10.

Moore, M. H., & Poethig, M. (1999). "The Police as an Agency of Municipal Government: Implications for Measuring Police Effectiveness." In R. H. Langworthy (ed.), *Measuring What Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Institute Meetings* (pp. 151-168). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice and the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Moore, M., Thacher, D., Dodge, A. & Moore, T. (2002). *Recognizing Value in Policing: The Challenge of Measuring Police Performance*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Neusteter, S. R., Mapolski, M., Khogali, M., & O'Toole, M. (2019). *The 911 Call Processing System: A Review of the Literature as it Relates to Policing*. Washington DC: Vera Institute of Justice.

Oettmeier, T. N., & Wycoff, M. A. (1997). *Personnel Performance Evaluations in the Community Policing Context.* Washington, DC: Community Policing Forum.

Petrides, K. V., Mikolajczak, M., Mavroveli, S., Sanchez-Ruiz, M.-J., Furnham, A., & Pérez-González, J.-C. (2016). "Developments in Trait Emotional Intelligence Research." *Emotion Review*, 8 (4): 335–341. https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073916650493

President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing (2015). *Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Reisig, M. D. (1999). *Measuring Performance in the Era of Community Policing*. Executive Summary Series. East Lansing, MI: Regional Community Policing Institute.

Reiss, A. J., Jr. (1971). *The Police and the Public.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Rahr, S., & Rice, S. K. (2015) "From Warriors to Guardians: Recommitting American police culture to democratic ideals." *New Perspectives in Policing*, Harvard Kennedy School Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, April 2015. https://nij.ojp.gov/library/publications/warriors-guardiansrecommitting-american-police-culture-democratic-ideals

Rosenbaum, D. P. (1986, ed.) *Community Crime Prevention: Does it Work?* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Rosenbaum, D.P. (1987). "Coping With Victimization: The Effects of Police Intervention on Victims' Psychological Readjustment." *Crime and Delinquency,* 33: 502-519.

Rosenbaum, D.P. (1988). "Community Crime Prevention: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature." *Justice Quarterly*, 5: 323-395.

Rosenbaum, D. P. (1993). "Civil Liberties and Aggressive Enforcement: Balancing the Rights of Individuals and Society in the Drug War." In Davis, R. C., Lurigio, A. J., & Rosenbaum, D. P. (eds.). *Drugs and the Community*, pp. 55-82. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Rosenbaum, D. P. (1994, ed.). *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Rosenbaum, D. P. (2002). "Evaluating Multi-Agency Anti-Crime Partnerships: Theory, Design and Measurement Issues." *Crime Prevention Studies*, 14: 171-225.

Rosenbaum, D. P. (2004). "Community Policing and Web-Based Communication: Addressing the New Information Imperative" In L. Fridell & M. A. Wycoff (Eds.) *Community Policing: The Past, Present and Future*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Rosenbaum, D. P. (2007). "Police Innovation Post 1980: Assessing Effectiveness and Equity Concerns in the Information Technology Era." *Institute for the Prevention of Crime Review,* 1: 11-44.

Rosenbaum, D. P. (2018). "Procedural Justice in Law Enforcement: Bridging the gap between Theory and Practice." Invited Speaker, 2018 Psychology Consortium, *Critical Thinking in Law Enforcement: Adapting to a Changing Environment*. Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, Glynco, GA. August 7-8.

Rosenbaum, D. P. (2019). "The Limits of Hot Spots Policing." In D. Weisburd & A. A. Braga (eds.), *Police Innovation: Contrasting Perspectives*. 2nd Edition. pp. 314-344. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenbaum, D. P., & Lawrence, D. S. (2017). "Teaching procedural justice and communication skills during police–community encounters: Results of a randomized control trial with police recruits." *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 13 (3): 293-319.

Rosenbaum, D. P., Lawrence, D. S., Hartnett, S. M., McDevitt, J., & Posick, C. (2015). "Measuring Procedural Justice and Legitimacy at the Local Level: The Police-Community Interaction Survey." *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 11(3): 335-366.

Rosenbaum, D. P., Lurigio, A.J., Davis, R.C. (1998). *The Prevention of Crime: Social and Situational Strategies*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Rosenbaum, D. P., Maskaly, J., Lawrence, D. S., Escamilla, J. H., Enciso, G., Christoff, T. E., & Posick. C. (2017). "The Police-Community Interaction Survey: Measuring Police Performance in New Ways." *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management,* 40 (1): 112-127.

Rosenbaum, D. P., & McCarty, W. P. (2017). "Organizational Justice and Officer 'Buy in' in American Policing." *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management,* 40 (1): 11-25.

Rosenbaum, D. P., Schuck, A. M., Costello, S. K., Hawkins, D. F., & Ring, M. K. (2005). "Attitudes toward the Police: The Effects of Direct and Vicarious Experience." *Police Quarterly,* 8: 343-365.

Scheeler, M. C., Ruhl, K. L., & McAfee, J. K. (2004). "Providing Performance Feedback to Teachers: A Review." *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *27*(4): 396–407. https://doi.org/10.1177/088840640402700407

Schuck, A.M., & Rosenbaum, D.P. (2005). "Global and Neighborhood Attitudes toward the Police: Differentiation by Race, Ethnicity and Type of Contact." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology,* 21: 391-418.

Schuck, A.M., & Rosenbaum, D.P. (2006). "Promoting Safe and Healthy Neighborhoods: What Research tells us about Intervention." In Fulbright-Anderson, K. (ed.), *Community Change: Theories, Practices and Evidence.* Pp. 61-140. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.

Skolnick, J. H., & Fyfe, J. J. (1993). *Above the Law: Police and the excessive use of force*. New York: Free Press.

Skogan, W. G. (2003, ed.). *Community Policing: Can it Work?* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Skogan, W. G. (2023). *Stop and Frisk and the Politics of Crime in Chicago*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Skogan, W., & Frydl, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Fairness and Effectiveness in Policing: The Evidence*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press.

Skogan, W. G., & Hartnett, S. M. (1997). *Community Policing, Chicago Style*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Skogan, W.G., Rosenbaum, D.P, Hartnett, S.M., DuBois, J., Graziano, L., & Stephens, C. (2005). *CLEAR and I-CLEAR: A Status Report on New Information Technology and its Impact on Management, the Organization and Crime Fighting Strategies*. Chicago: The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.

Starzynski, L.S., Ullman, S.E., Filipas, H.H., & Townsend, S.M. (2005). "Correlates of Women's Sexual Assault Disclosure to Informal and Formal Support Sources." *Violence and Victims*, *20*: 417-432.

Tankebe, J. (2013). "Viewing Things Differently: The Dimensions of Public Perceptions of Police Legitimacy: Public Perceptions of Police Legitimacy." *Criminology; an Interdisciplinary Journal,* 51 (1):103-135.

Tanksley, R. C. (2015). "Reply to RespectStat: Good, Now Let's Go One Step Farther." *The Police Chief,* August*, 78.*

Terrill, W., & Reisig, M. D. (2003). "Neighborhood Context and Police Use of Force." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency,* 40 (3): 291-321. DOI: 10.1177/0022427803253800

Townley, G., & Leickly, E. (2022). *Portland Street Response: Year One Evaluation*. Portland State University. https://www.pdx.edu/homelessness/PSR-Evaluation

Training Advisory Council (2022). *Instill Continuous Quality Improvement in the PPB Training Division and the Bureau as a Whole*. Official Recommendation Report submitted to the Portland Police Bureau, May 11, 2022.

Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why People Obey the Law*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Tyler, T.R. (2004). "Enhancing Police Legitimacy." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 593* (1): 84-99.

Tyler, T.R. (2005). "Policing in Black and White: Ethnic Group Differences in Trust and Confidence in the Police." *Police Quarterly, 8* (3): 322-342.

Tyler, T. R. (2014). "What Are Legitimacy and Procedural Justice in Policing? And Why Are They Becoming Key Elements of Police Leadership?" In Fischer, C. (ed.). *Legitimacy and Procedural Justice: A New Element of Police Leadership*. Washington, DC: Report by the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF).

Tyler, T. R. & Fagan, J. A. (2006). "Legitimacy and Cooperation: Why Do People Help the Police Fight Crime in Their Communities?" *SSRN Electronic Journal*. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.887737.

U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division (2017). *The Civil Rights Division's Pattern and Practice Police Reform Work: 1994-Present.* Washington, DC: Department of Justice. https://www.justice.gov/crt/file/922421/download

Ullman, S.E. (1999). "Social Support and Recovery from Sexual Assault: A Review." *Aggression and Violent Behavior: A Review Journal, 4*: 343-358.

Ullman, S.E. (2000). "Psychometric Characteristics of the Social Reactions Questionnaire." *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24: 257-271.

Walker, S. (1998). "'Broken Windows' and Fractured History." In Larry K. Gaines and Gary W. Cordner (eds.), *Policing Perspectives: An Anthology*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.

Walker, S. (2005). *The New World of Police Accountability*. Sage Publications.

Walker, S. (2017). *Twenty Years of DOJ "Pattern or Practice" Investigations of Local Police: Achievements, Limitations, and Questions*. University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Walker, S., & Katz, C.M. (2008). *The Police in America*. Boston: McGraw Hill.

Weisburd, D. W., & Braga, A. A. (2006, eds.). *Prospects and Problems in an Era of Policing Innovation: Contrasting Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weisburd, D., Telep, C.W., Vovak, H., Zastrow, T., Braga, A. A., & Turchan, B. (2022). "Reforming the police through procedural justice training: A multicity randomized trial at crime hot spots." *PSNA*, 119 (14): https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2118780119.

Weiss, A., & Rosenbaum, D. P. (2009). *Illinois Traffic Stop Statistics Study, 2008 Annual Report*. Springfield, IL: Illinois Department of Transportation.

Weitzer, R. & Tuch, S.A. (2005). "Determinants of Public Satisfaction with the Police." *Police Quarterly, 8* (3): 279-297.

Wheller, L., Quinton, P., Fildes, A., and Mills, A. (2013). *The Greater Manchester Police Procedural Justice Training Experiment*. Coventry, UK: College of Policing. Available: https://library.college.police.uk/docs/college-of-policing/Technical-Report.pdf

White, M. D. (2007). *Current Issues and Controversies in Policing*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Yale Law School Justice Collaboratory (2023). https://www.justicehappenshere.yale.edu/

APPENDIX A

Statement by Dr. Dennis Rosenbaum before Judge Simon on Body-Worn Cameras

Compliance Officer/Community Liaison (COCL), Settlement Agreement: United States of America v. City of Portland, Case Number 3:12-cv-02265-SI

This statement is being submitted as part of the Fairness Hearing and Status Conference before Judge Michael H. Simon on April 29, 2022, in connection with the above-referenced Settlement Agreement. *(The information below only covers the portion of Dr. Rosenbaum's presentation where he discusses the value of Body-Worn Cameras)*

The Value of Body-Worn Cameras

As the COCL, for many years I have recommended that members of the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) be required to wear Body-worn cameras (BWCs). In the COCL's first quarterly report of 2021, I articulated some of the reasons for this recommendation:

"Because of concerns about whether PPB can accurately and thoroughly evaluate and document what transpires during force incidents and disparities in treatment, we continue to recommend that the City of Portland introduce body-worn cameras to ensure the collection of better evidence and public transparency. Police accountability in Portland is very difficult to achieve when the facts regarding what actually occurred are in dispute. Furthermore, the best scientific evidence indicates that body-worn cameras result in fewer complaints and fewer uses of force. In light of this research in many cities, we are surprised that PPB is the only remaining larger police department in the United State without body worn cameras. Body-worn cameras are one of the best ways for PPB and the community to be assured that reforms have become institutionalized and that behavioral outcomes have improved." (p. 3).

…However, we are just beginning to see what is possible with BWCs. We should not be content with these impact findings when public trust in the police remains low within certain segments of the population and complaints of misconduct continue to flow in. Also, the original BWC goals of transparency and accountability have only been achieved within a small subset of force cases involving citizen complaints and officer-involved shootings (OIS), where agencies have felt compelled to review BWC footage as part of an investigation. To truly reform the delivery of police services, we must look at the day-to-day interactions between the police and community members and identify the factors that contribute to, or undermine, public trust and feelings of public safety. For examples, Dr. Eberhardt and her colleagues at Stanford University were the

first to code BWC data from police stops and found that officers in the Oakland Police Department used less respectful language when talking with people of color than when talking to whites.[14] From this work, we can begin to understand the complexities of social behavior, and how respectful language has many components (e.g., apologizing, speaking in a soft tone, showing concern or empathy, etc.). But the coding of BWC data by human beings is extremely time consuming and must be supported by computer analytics.

Unfortunately, the thousands of hours of BWC footage that hold the secret to these social dynamics remain untouched in most cities. Agencies cannot afford to do manual reviews of these massive datasets. BWC data on use of force and OIS cases is a good starting point for Portland to collect essential evidence about officers compliance with policy and the law, but these cases make up a tiny fraction of the daily interactions that Portland residents have with members of the PPB. Thus, once PPB has introduced BWCs, the next big step should be to figure out how to exploit the large volume of data that will be collected on the other 99% of police-community interactions to enhance the performance of all PPB officers.

Beginning with the pioneering work at Stanford, software is now being developed and field tested so that police departments can engage in more systematic and proactive reviews of police-community interactions captured with BWCs. Specifically, we need to deconstruct and document what is being said during these encounters and how it is being said (e.g., how often does someone use derogatory language and raise their voice?). I am delighted to report that researchers are making progress by beginning to use natural language processing and computer vision to analyze BWC footage. I encourage you to listen to CNA's 30-minute podcast, "Justice Talks," where my colleagues in the field discuss the use of analytic tools to exploit BWC data and thus enhance our understanding of police-community interactions. [15] I would also

---

[14] https://phys.org/news/2017-06-police-officers-respectfully-black-residents.html

[15] https://justicetalks.libsyn.com/understanding-and-improving-police-community-interactions-by-using-tools-to-evaluate-body-camera-footage

recommend that the PPB reach out to some of my colleagues who have pursued this line of research and training, including Dr. Lawrence at CNA and Dr. Wender at Polis Solutions, Inc.[16]

Putting BWC Data to Use

New technology to exploit BWC data is exciting, but unless it is used properly, it will have limited impact on the organization or its employees. Here I propose several ways that Portland might utilize this rich goldmine of data when it becomes available:

- Data Mining and Auditing: After acquiring the necessary software, the PPB or City should work with researchers and learn to analyze the data and report patterns of behavior that are desirable and undesirable during police-public interactions. This work will also help to identify specific types of interpersonal communication that lead to the escalation of conflict and the use of force, so such encounters can be prevented or minimized in the future. I envision computer-generated monthly reports that are distributed for internal review and annual reports distributed to the public showing these patterns.

- Supervisor Coaching: First-line supervisors should be trained to use BWC data for coaching and feedback to their officers. Monthly reports should be made available to supervisors showing trends in PPB interactions with the public for both individual officers under their supervision and their team as a whole. Supervisors should be trained in how to use these reports for coaching and corrective action.

- Agency Performance: Lieutenants and above should be responsible for changing the PPB's performance metrics and moving PPB further down the path of evidence-based, community-sensitive, constitutional policing. For example, they should examine patterns of "good" and "bad" language used by PPB's units, shifts, beats, districts, and precincts. Just as CompStat has been used since the 1990s to hold police managers accountable for crime statistics in their precincts, new statistics should be used to set

---

[16] Dr. Daniel Lawrence, Research Scientist, Center for Justice Research and Innovation, CNA, lawrenced@cna.org; and Dr. Jonathan Wender, President and CEO, Polis Solutions, Inc., jonathan.wender@polis-solutions.com

new standards of performance for units and individuals (e.g., see McCarthy, Rosenbaum, 2015, and Tanksley, 2015, for this type of work[17]).

- Training: BWC data should be used for In-service training on bias, procedural justice and de-escalation. Officers should be shown disparity patterns in the data and specific language/behaviors that may reflect police bias. With enough data, disparities could be examined by race, ethnicity, age, religion, houseless status, disability, national origin, immigration status, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, socio-economic class, incarceration status, criminal history, and other variables of interest. Most importantly, officers should be trained in the interpersonal communication skills needed to show respect and empathy for all human beings and eliminate expressions of bias (See Rosenbaum & Lawrence, 2017;Rosenbaum, 2018[18]). In Portland, as in other cities, the most frequent compliant filed against the police involves discourtesy, which can increase tensions. Thus, we believe that training based on BWC data should result in a more courteous police force, which may reduce the number and severity of force applications. For example, officers should be training in how to explain to someone why the PPB needs to take them into custody ("Talking someone into handcuffs").

- Community Education: We should expect that the analysis of BWC data will also teach us a great deal about behavior patterns among community members who interact with the PPB. This information can be used to educate the public about ways to avoid conflict with the police and remain safe during a period in American history when many people are afraid of the police. Despite their visible uniforms and weapons, police

---

[17] McCarthy, G. F., Rosenbaum, D. P., & Tanksley, R. (2015). "From CompStat to RespectStat: Accountability for Respectful Policing." *The Police Chief,* August*, 76-77.*

[18] Rosenbaum, D. P., & Lawrence, D. S. (2017). "Teaching procedural justice and communication skills during police–community encounters: Results of a randomized control trial with police recruits." *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *13 (3), 293-319.*

Rosenbaum, D. P. (2018). "Procedural Justice in Law Enforcement: Bridging the gap between Theory and Practice." Invited Speaker, 2018 Psychology Consortium, *Critical Thinking in Law Enforcement: Adapting to a Changing Environment*. Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, Glynco, GA. August 7-8.

officers are also human beings who can become upset or offended by the words and actions of community members.

As I have said for seven years in Portland, I feel strongly that new performance standards for the PPB should focus on procedural justice and the social skills needed to de-escalate conflictual situations. The richness of BWC data is incredible and holds the key to public trust and perceptions of public safety. Hundreds of community surveys have shown that the level of procedural justice exhibited by police officers is directly linked to police legitimacy (Rosenbaum et al. 2017[19]), but agencies have no idea which officers are displaying these verbal behaviors and under what conditions. Considerably more work is needed but the data needed to answer these questions will soon exist in Portland.

In sum, Portland has a wonderful opportunity to move from the back of the pack to the forefront of American policing if the City is willing to support innovative experimentation with advanced technology, training, and supervisor around BWC footage. In addition to the individuals and groups cited earlier, the Bureau of Justice Assistance has funded CNA and Arizona State University to provide a wide range of information about BWCs so that agencies can receive training and technical assistance at all levels.[20] Also, the National Institute of Justice should be credited with funding exciting new research in this area, helping researchers and police agencies automate components of procedural justice found in BWC recordings.

Finally, I would like to emphasize that the Portland community should be engaged in these developments. How they perceive the words and actions of the police are what determines whether community members feel they have been treated in a just and dignified manner and whether they perceive the police as trustworthy.

Along these lines, I will continue to recommend that the PPB institutionalize a contact survey – a brief online survey of community members who have had a recent contact with a PPB officer -- to supplement the BWC data. The observed behaviors and language captured by the BWC can be linked to the public's perceptions of the interaction captured by a 5-item procedural justice

---

[19] Rosenbaum, D. P., Maskaly, J., Lawrence, D. S., Escamilla, J. H., Enciso, G., Christoff, T. E., Posick. C. (2017). "The Police-Community Interaction Survey: Measuring Police Performance in New Ways." *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 40 (1), 112-127.*

[20] https://bwctta.com/

survey. Some BWC vendors are beginning to support contact surveys, and we have successfully introduced contact surveys in more than 50 large cities as part of the National Police Research Platform. Thus, I am happy to provide technical assistance to the City on these outcome metrics.

Thank you, Your Honor.

Dennis P. Rosenbaum, Ph.D.

Pronouns: he/him/his

Compliance Officer/Community Liaison (COCL), Portland Police Bureau Settlement Agreement

President, Rosenbaum & Associates, LLP

Professor Emeritus of Criminology, Law and Justice University of Illinois at Chicago

Attachments:

Compliance Officer/Community Liaison (2022). *Body-Worn Cameras for the Portland Police Bureau: History and Community Engagement Results: A Technical Assistance Report to the City of Portland, Oregon*

McCarthy, G. F., Rosenbaum, D. P., & Tanksley, R. (2015). "From CompStat to RespectStat: Accountability for Respectful Policing." *The Police Chief,* August*, 76-77.*

APPENDIX B

Training Slide: Benefits of Procedurally Just Actions by Officers