



CITY OF RICHMOND

REPORT TO COMMITTEE

TO: Community Services Committee

To Community Services - July 25, 2000
DATE: July 18, 2000

FROM: Hilda Ward
Assistant to the Mayor

FILE: 5355-01
XR: 0100-20-LACP1-01

RE: **Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing**
"Year 2000 Review of Community Policing in Richmond"

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. That the report entitled "Year 2000 Review of Community Policing in Richmond" from the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing be received for information; and
2. That the 14 Recommendations listed below, as outlined on page 23 of the attached report "Year 2000 Review of Community Policing in Richmond," be referred to staff for prioritization, financial analysis and review; and
3. That staff report back to Council through the Community Services Committee on the outcome of their review of the recommendations, by the end of October, 2000.

Hilda T. Ward

Hilda Ward
Assistant to the Mayor
Staff Liaison to the Advisory Committee on Policing

Att. 1

ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

- (i) THAT, for Richmond's current purposes, the definition of community policing established by the RCMP be accepted, and that such definition be circulated to interested parties for comments and any suggestions as to possible changes.
- (ii) THAT the philosophy of community policing be recognized by City Council as an international movement in policing matters, and that City Council be asked to publicly endorse (or repeat the endorsement of) the concept of community policing. In doing so, it is understood that City Council will retain at all times the right to maintain budgetary control in the usual manner.
- (iii) THAT the internal level of commitment to the concept within the Richmond detachment and any problems relating to recruitment to Community Police Stations be determined.
- (iv) THAT investigation be made as to the cost and availability of a "library" concerning community policing be made by the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing, to be kept at either the Richmond Public Library, the main Police station or at City Hall.
- (v) THAT the establishment and maintenance of a Richmond community policing website be investigated.
- (vi) THAT the structure and implementation of community policing in Richmond be reviewed by the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing in comparison to other communities.
- (vii) THAT certain functions to be conducted by the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing on a regular basis be identified and formalized, including an ongoing evaluation process for the status of community policing in Richmond, and that subcommittees be established to deal with such functions, including, for example, a "Priorities" subcommittee, a "Public Relations" subcommittee and an "Evaluations" subcommittee.
- (viii) THAT, as part of a current evaluation process, the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing determine the extent to which community policing has been effectively implemented in Richmond.
- (ix) THAT the role of the Community Consultative Groups be reviewed by the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing, with a view to clarify their respective functions in relation to the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing and to provide a new energy and direction for their activities.
- (x) THAT the Mayor direct City staff to contact the City of Seattle to follow up the results of the internal study referred to in the Seattle Times, and if it is available to provide it to the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing.

- (xi) THAT an educational plan be prepared, ensuring education on an ongoing basis to the public, police, City Council members and members of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing, which must include ongoing evaluation of the concept in Richmond.
- (xii) THAT a public relations plan be prepared and implemented, ensuring public relations on an ongoing basis to the public concerning community policing, which must involve the Superintendent, the Mayor and Council members and which must provide for community feedback.
- (xiii) THAT the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing be educated as to the CAPRA model of the RCMP and its role in community policing.
- (xiv) THAT the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing be informed as to the statistics available to the local RCMP detachment concerning community policing and crime, particularly in comparison to similarly-sized communities in Canada, and that consideration be given to requesting Statistics Canada to compile statistics with a separate category for cities the size of Richmond.

STAFF REPORT

ORIGIN

At the Council Meeting of July 12, 1999, Council approved the revised Terms of Reference and Work Plan for the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing. One of the projects undertaken by the Committee was an Evaluation of Community Policing.

ANALYSIS

Members of the Advisory Committee on Policing, especially the Community Policing sub-committee chaired by Rick Henderson, have worked diligently and produced a comprehensive report on Community Policing, which includes the concepts, definitions, history, and general parameters for review in Richmond. The Report also assesses the continued implementation of community policing in Richmond, along with the impact of the many volunteer networks involved with the operation of Community Police stations in Richmond.

Attached to the Report are Appendices 1 through 4, in which are documented the theory of community policing, the development of the concept of "problem-oriented policing" (POP), and finally, a collaborative study of Community Policing across the United States by the staff of the National Centre for Community Policing and the Behavioural Sciences Unit at the FBI Academy.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

If approved by Council, a source of funds for a number of the projects outlined in the recommendations will need to be identified.

CONCLUSION

Community Policing has been the topic of numerous discussions among the members of the Advisory Committee on Policing. The attached report represents a comprehensive review of this topic, both from an academic perspective by a review of the literature, as well as its application in Richmond. The members of the Advisory Committee invite Council's review and comments on their recommendations.

Hilda Ward
Assistant to the Mayor
Staff Liaison to the Advisory Committee on Policing

YEAR 2000 REVIEW OF COMMUNITY POLICING IN RICHMOND

1. OUR PROJECT

This is a committee report of the Community Advisory Committee on Policing for Richmond, British Columbia, pursuant to a mandate to review the status of community policing in Richmond. The report attempts to simplify as much as possible the concept of community policing and the information available, to assist the reader in acquiring relatively quickly an understanding of the relevant issues. Hopefully, the report can be then used as a basis of information for new members of the Community Advisory Committee from time to time, supplementing studies that have already been prepared for Richmond concerning community policing.¹

2. THE RESOURCES

Venturing into cyberspace, one is somewhat overwhelmed with the abundance of material concerning "**community policing**". These two words, standing alone, provide some immediate level of comfort to the common citizen, and since they suggest both security and belonging any reader would probably assume that the term reflects usual police work. Such is not the case. The concept is much more complex, and a review of the available research material indicates that these two words are highly charged and garner extensive debate. Like two familiar chemicals which are combined and have a separate effect, the result becomes something quite different from that which might have been expected.

Titles of web articles explode onto the computer screen and into the senses, as the following sampling indicates:

- "Community Policing Pages"
- "National Centre for Community Policing"
- "Community Policing Consortium"
- "RCMP/GRC Welcome to CCAPS"
- "Human Diversity/Community Policing Partnerships"
- "The Philosophy and Role of Community Policing"
- "Police Foundations: Community Policing"
- "Study of Community Policing in the United States"
- "Eyeing the Doughnut: Community Policing and Progressive Reform"

The resources are prolific. Numerous textbooks and handbooks exist as well, since the concept is one which is currently in vogue and has had the benefit of theoretical and practical experience over the last generation in particular.

¹ Refer to Cpl. Rob Sundell and Cst. Dan Painter's report (November 15, 1995), which was used as the basis for the implementation of the model currently in effect in Richmond.

3. **THE CONCEPT: SCIENCE, DEFINITIONS AND HISTORY**

The Science

The scientific basis for the concept of community policing is one of critical social theory, encompassing “enlightenment”, “empowerment” and “emancipation”. Robert and Susan Trojanowicz are well-known authors in this area, and a quote from their work, “***Theory of Community Policing***”², is set out in Appendix 1 to this Report.

Without diminishing in any way the highly developed scientific theory, the message is that we are all involved with policing in one way or another and agree upon the benefits of the underlying security of effective and efficient policing, and that we have a ***need to be informed***, a ***motivation to participate***, and a ***sense of well-being and accomplishment*** in assisting with the process.

To place the science in a traditional context, Sir Robert Peel, when he established the London Metropolitan Police Force, set out Nine Principles of Modern Policing³, which included the statement that: “***Police at all times should maintain a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historic tradition; the Police are the public and the public are the Police...the Police being only full time individuals charged with the duties that are incumbent on all of the citizens.***”

The motivation for the concept clearly arises from the lifeboat aspect of policing security, that we are all in this together, that we will benefit by the participation, and that we must work together to succeed.

However, the apparent simplicity of the concept becomes lost a bit in the hunt for a definition.

The Definition

Robert Trojanowicz offered a definition. Community policing, to him, is:

*“a philosophy of full service personalized policing where the same officer patrols and works in the same area on a permanent basis, from a decentralized place, working in a proactive partnership with citizens to identify and solve problems.”*⁴

This was expanded to the following:

² Trojanowicz, Susan and Robert (1998): “***Theory of Community Policing***”
http://msnhomepages.talkcity.com/LibraryLawn/devere_woods/theory.htm

³ See <http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Atlantis/7253/Community.html> for the Nine.

⁴ Woods, DeVere and Ziembo-Vogl, Joanne (1998): “***Organizational Commitment to Community Policing*** (from Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux 1994:3)
http://msnhomepages.talkcity.com/LibraryLawn/devere_woods/commit.htm

“Community policing is defined as any method of policing that includes a police officer assigned to the same area, meeting and working with the residents and business people who live and work in the beat area. The citizens and police work together to identify the problems of the area and to collaborate in workable resolutions of the problems. The police officer is a catalyst, moving neighborhoods and communities toward solving their own problems, and encouraging citizens to help and look out for each other.

To be successful, community policing requires the total commitment of the big five; the police, citizens and subgroups like business, media, political leaders and social service agencies and other institutions of the community. It is proactive, decentralized and personalized; it is full-service and works toward the goal of removing predators from the streets and solving long-term problems by dealing with the causes, not just reacting to the symptoms.

Community policing is based on the joint effort of citizens and police toward solving neighborhood problems which in turn satisfies the expressed needs of citizens and enhance the residents' quality of life. The role of the community police officer is equivalent to the role of the critical social scientist, the facilitator and catalyst of problem solving activities. Through self-education and educating the residents, the officer plays both the expert and educator role without forcing the expert opinion upon the residents. The community policing officer assists the residents by meeting with them individually and in groups in hopes that communication will lead to some consensus of accepted action will be agreed upon and implemented by the residents. The major considerations in community policing are: citizen input into defining problems to be solved, citizen involvement in planning and implementing problem solving activities, and citizens determining if their felt needs have been met. Community policing is critical social science in action and is based on the assumptions of normative sponsorship theory.⁵

Others have made their attempts at definitions, as examples:

“We can also define community policing in a way that reflects its management aspects. Community policing is a philosophy of client-oriented service delivery aimed at improving accountability and effectiveness by focusing on problem solving.”⁶

“Community policing is a collaborative effort between the police and the community that identifies problems of crime and disorder and involves all elements of the community in the search for solutions to these problems. It is founded on close, mutually beneficial ties between police and community

⁵ Trojanowicz, Susan and Robert (1998). *“Theory of Community Policing”*

⁶ See http://msnhomepages.talkcity.com/LibraryLawn/devere_woods/faq.htm

members.”⁷

“Community policing is, in essence, a collaboration between the police and the community that identifies and solves community problems. With the police no longer the sole guardians of law and order, all members of the community become active allies in the effort to enhance the safety and quality of neighborhoods.”⁸

“The foundations of a successful community policing strategy are the close, mutually beneficial ties between police and community members. Community policing consists of two complementary core components, community partnership and problem solving.”⁹

“At the center of community policing are three essential and complementary core components: community partnership, problem solving and change management.”

Finding a definition to collect around is essential for our purposes, since the concept is one which is endorsed and applied by our policing force, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. From the RCMP website, we know that:

“In 1989, the RCMP adopted the philosophy and principles of community policing as its model of service delivery in order to provide more collaborative, responsive and effective policing services to Canadians...” Also, in doing so: *“...the RCMP made a commitment to provide a more client-centered model of service delivery. Police values such as integrity, honesty and professionalism were preserved from the old model, while the values of community problem-solving, partnership, openness and accountability were added. Community policing is the multi-dimensional philosophy essential to the future of the RCMP. Thus, with community policing at its core, the transition began to reunite the police and the community.”*

Although the general idea can be gleaned from the above definitions and descriptions, some of the essential differences of the concept do not become readily apparent. Community policing is clearly something different from what we what we might term traditional policing, for want of a better term, and it may or may not merely be a resurrection of certain basic policing elements which have a traditional basis. It does

⁷ See <http://www.communitypolicing.org/about2.html>

⁸ See <http://www.communitypolicing.org/chap1fw.html>

⁹ See <http://www.communitypolicing.org/chap3fw.html>

seem clear that cooperation and collaboration between police and citizen are necessary for the concept to work, that there is a substantial difference in how the individual police officer works, and that the police themselves must buy into the concept and organize themselves accordingly.

The history involved with community policing indicates the interesting progress to the concept, and a short summary serves to explain why the concept is now in vogue.

The History (Short Version)

Appendix 2¹⁰ provides a short description of the changes which occurred in policing over the last two centuries, the highlights of which are:

- As previously stated, Sir Robert Peel's original concept was that everyone was involved in policing, and the police were only those members of society involved on a full-time basis with policing.
- This "central organizing concept" changed by the early 1900's, when the reform era of government (meaning bureaucratization) and a move to professionalization in policing resulted in a separation (somewhat naturally it would seem), of the police from the community.
- Technological development caused further distancing. Automobile use affected foot patrolling, telephone systems allowed dispatching systems and an increased expectation of response, and computers and use of statistics in crime prevention acted further to promote a separation of the professional policeman from the citizen.
- At a time when this isolation was highest, other social occurrences (such as the unrest of the 60's and 70's) exacerbated the situation, clearly establishing the different "camps" into which the police and the citizens had been driven, and issues of police corruption in big cities of the United States also highlighted the need for change in methods of policing.

¹⁰ From "**Understanding Community Policing: A Framework for Action**", Chapter 2 "Tracing the Roots of Community Policing"; <http://www.communitypolicing.org/chap2fw.html>

- Various Presidential commissions in the United States, as well as various studies, promoted the search for different and dynamic ways to deal with policing. By the end of the 1970's, a new philosophy of "**problem-oriented policing**" had developed, causing the police to think differently about their purpose. It involved the identification of root causes of problems that led to repeated calls for service, and called for the development of strategies to reduce those calls. The shift from reactive, incident-oriented policing to problem-oriented policing was designed to end the continual drain on police resources.
- Studies indicated that patrol officers were more involved in the acquisition of information leading to the solving of crimes than were detectives, causing a reassessment of the involvement of patrol officers in criminal investigations. Also, foot patrol work was confirmed as having a positive effect on community attitudes toward police and a more secure community feeling.
- Eventually, all of this led to the development of the concept of community policing, which now has widespread universal support.

The current theory of community policing was the ultimate result of all of this, and the resources available to us expand upon areas including the following:

- the goal of the theory (reduction of crime and solving community problems)
- the strategies of implementation, administration, and procedures for assessment,
- tips on community relations,
- what is required to make the process effective,
- the required emphasis on the patrol officer,
- building trust and effective problem solving (including particularly the RCMP "CAPRA" problem solving model),
- successes and horror stories (the latter mostly characterizing events which might have been handled differently through community policing, or which occurred because of improper community policing procedures), and
- the organizations created to promote or implement community

policing,

together with other practical elements which will not be expanded upon here.

Some things are worthy of note in support of community policing, other than the common sense which accompanies the concept. They also serve to support the idea of community policing, based upon the massive level of information now available to us:

- The role of the officer in performing police work is the **critical difference** between community policing and other concepts. Not only does the community policing officer patrol and work a localized area from a decentralized location, hopefully for a long time, but she or he is much more independent in attempting to deal with problem-solving. There is a resulting demand for qualified and talented individuals as police officers performing community policing work.
- Sixty (60%) per cent of calls for service to police departments are usually generated from ten (10%) per cent of the residences.¹¹
- In South Africa, for example, where community policing has been the operational philosophy since 1993, ninety (90%) per cent of the serious crime known to police are reported to them by the community, whereas only ten (10%) per cent or less are detected by the police themselves.¹²
- The tidal shift to community policing can truly be said to be a **movement**, which is an element which cannot be ignored. The power of momentum in a democratic society can be an end in itself, and the fact that other democratic societies seem to have endorsed the concept only provides it with further strength, and makes available to all the participants further information which is useful in dealing with local criminal activity.

Partnership or Collaboration?

Many of the references indicate community policing to be a “*partnership*”. This is

¹¹ Trojanowicz, Robert (1996), “***Community Policing Guidelines for Police Chiefs***”
http://msnhomepages.talkcity.com/LibraryLawn/devere_woods/guide.htm

¹² See http://www.saps.co.za/6_commpol/6_mcp2.htm

probably intended to be a simple statement of the involvement of both the police and the citizenry in their common goal, but the word is somewhat deceptive, as it suggests enfranchisement or empowerment to the citizenry in areas of enforcement.

Community policing cannot really be a “partnership”, not in the true meaning of the word, since citizens are not, and cannot be, equally empowered to enforce the law. Nor should they be. Nor is it suggested that they would want to be. The police officer must always be different than the citizen (with the consent of the citizenry), and it is hoped that the uniform will always identify that difference. What the people really want is **security**, and most of us wish to honour and respect the women and men to whom they have entrusted one of the most critical and important duties a democratic society can delegate: the attempted security of one and all and the enforcement of our laws. It would be more accurate to cite the community policing relationship as a “collaboration”, as some writers have done, but in the spirit of continuity and consistency, and in light of the use of the misnomer by the RCMP, any correction may be counterproductive.

Richmond should therefore continue to refer to the relationship as one of a “partnership” in its promotional material.

The Critical Elements of Community Policing

For our purposes, then, we should consider the important elements of community policing:

- a **working relationship** between the police and the community;
- assignment of officers on a **long-term basis** to a local community policing area, **working on patrol from a decentralized location**;
- **identification and solving of problems** in addition to routine responses to calls, and
- a **common goal to reduce and prevent criminal activity and social disorder**, without the responsibility to do “social work”.

4. IMPEDIMENTS AND REQUIREMENTS: AREAS FOR REVIEW

Having established the concept, and before citing some of the statistics, it is useful to note the problems associated with community policing and its implementation...those areas which impede the success of the concept. A review of these items will give us some guidance in reviewing the success of the implementation of community policing in Richmond.

The National Institute of Justice (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs\Office of Communication and Research Utilization) published a series of articles on community policing in the 1980's, before the concept was endorsed by the R.C.M.P. In one of those publications¹³, the authors listed the "**Potential Obstacles to Community Policing**" as being:

- **The Traditional Culture of Policing:** Natural elements of danger, suspicion, solidarity and brotherhood place police apart from citizens, and pull away from open participation with the community in policing efforts.
- **The Youth of Police:** The machismo qualities of police training and athleticism coupled with familiarity with deadly weapons are inconsistent with development of a "capacity to envision the world through the eyes of others". A broader perspective is required, which comes with emotional maturity.
- **Street vs. Management Cops:** The former are more likely to throw their weight around and cut corners, while the latter tend to be more legalistic, rule-oriented and rational, more willing to try new ideas such as community policing. Since all police start off on the street, there is a natural pull against community policing, and it takes a "mature vision of the police executive" to succeed.
- **The Responsibility to Respond:** The pressure to react in an atmosphere of perceived crime and danger, to maintain responsive ability, acts as an additional constraint in the innovation of relationship with citizens in policing.
- **Limitations of Resources:** In some cases, commitment to the community policing concept is constrained by complaints that it can only work if police resources are expanded.
- **The Inertia of Police Unions:** Although not critical for our review, the point is that the power of police unions and the view by some union leaders that community policing may be a threat to the perceived proper role of police can be a constraint on promotion of the concept. The idea that, somehow, community policing (or

¹³ Skolnick, Jerome and Bayley, David H. (May 1988): "Community Policing: Issues and Practices Around the World"

civilianization) would reduce the need for (or replace the need for) police would be opposed by unions.

- **The Two-Officer Car:** This issue is another side to the previous one, although it is interesting to note the comment that a two-officer car may detract from community policing, as it further generates a sense of remoteness from the population being policed. The requirement for two-officer cars, say the authors, may prove to be the single most important resource constraint upon the development of community policing.
- **Command Accountability:** Community policing, to a certain extent, implies a degree of decentralization of authority. Therefore, tensions would exist in departments which have strong centralized orientation. The authors note that it is important to stress that community policing does not necessarily imply either a loss of centralized policy-making authority or of centralized accountability. Also, since community policing is an intelligence gathering tactic, it implies that community police will provide central station police with information, and it therefore a possible adjunct to criminal investigation.
- **The Reward Structure:** The nature of community policing makes it harder to assess the contribution of a community police officer. It is almost impossible to measure the amount of crime a particular police officer contributes to preventing. A community police officer's success involves initiating subtle changes in community behaviour and attitudes. The authors note that community policing therefore "exaggerates the ambiguity of police performance, and, by implication, of measures of evaluation and reward", and that ambiguity is a factor in inhibiting the development of the concept.
- **Public Expectations of Police:** There is a danger that some members of the public, particularly those who appreciate and support traditional styles of policing, may come to believe that community policing may actually interfere with standard crime-fighting capabilities. If community policing is viewed within the department as the element responsible for reductions in patrol forces, response time, etc., that attitude will find its way into the public. As a result, community policing is easily maligned by traditional police who do not support the concept.
- **Failure to Integrate With Crime Detection:** Since community police officers "do their own thing", they run the danger of not being

integrated into traditional patrol or criminal investigation activities. Turf battles and compartmentalization might result.

- **The Ambiguity of Community:** Community itself is an ambiguous and elusive idea, and there is a real challenge in expanding the notion of mutuality of interest to a large group. There must be a general bonding of interests between the police and the public, and there must be a distinguishing of the *process* of crime prevention and the concept of the appropriate *territory* to be considered (particularly since neighbourhoods within community policing districts can have different synergies and community aspirations).

In addition to the list of potential impediments to successful implementation, the resources¹⁴ indicate a number of important requirements as well, namely:

- **Commitment Required:** To be successful, community policing requires the total commitment of the **big five** (the police, citizens and subgroups like business, media, political leaders and social service agencies and other institutions of the community). As for the police, the concept should permeate the entire department.
- **Time Required:** Since community policing is a profound and revolutionary change, it should be cautioned that in most communities it would take ten (10) to twelve (12) years to fully implement and realize the impact. **Long term commitment to the concept is required; it is not a quick fix.**
- **Realize the Limits:** A shift to community policing does not exist in a vacuum. It alone cannot undo the root causes of crime, although it can contribute to solving those problems.
- **Understand the Concept:** Many administrators of cities claim to be engaged in community policing when they are not. The problem

¹⁴ The resources drawn upon are primarily Trojanowicz, Susan and Robert: **"Theory of Community Policing"**; Trojanowicz, Robert C.: **"Community Policing Guidelines for Police Chiefs"**; **"Understanding Community Policing: A Framework for Action"**: <http://www.communitypolicing.org>; **"Canadian Police Research Centre"**: <http://www.cprc.org/cgi-bin/main.cfm?SID=2>; **"About Community Policing"**: <http://www.communitypolicing.org/about2.html> and **"Community Policing: A Survey of Police Departments in the United States (1997)"**: http://msnhomepages.talkcity.com/LibraryLawn/devere_woods/study/htm

arises from a basic misunderstanding of how the concept differs from traditional policing concepts.

- **Development of Research:** The chief should develop research on the percentage of calls that are life threatening, the typical officer workload profile, and the analysis of crime patterns within the jurisdiction.
- **Different Role of Police Officer:** Support must be given to expanding the role of a community police officer to a **generalist** rather than a specialist, and giving them due professional recognition. This is substantially different from more broadly understood policing concepts such as “Team Policing” or “Strategic Policing”, which focus more upon the improvement of the efficiency and technical capabilities of the police, and such expertise of the police results in a paternalistic relationship with the public. In community policing, there is an attempt to optimize contact between patrol officers and community members so that the officer develops an intimate knowledge of the day-to-day workings of the community and becomes a familiar figure to community members. Since the concept of community policing rests on the realization that it is more important to solve the problem than to rely exclusively on finding and arresting the “bad guys”, there must be recruitment of bright and imaginative community police officers and allowing them the freedom to explore various solutions.
- **Education of the Public:** A plan must be developed to educate the public about the virtues and trade-offs in community policing, including active involvement by politicians, the use of press releases, newspaper articles, regular community meetings and forums, and ongoing surveys and performance evaluations, as well as the active participation of the chief. **Chiefs** should embark on a **plan to provide ongoing information** at every opportunity, and should also **become ardent spokespersons** for change. The people must know that their participation is crucial, and feedback is essential.
- **Education of Politicians:** The politicians must be educated about both the political pitfalls and promise of community policing. It is **not a panacea**, and the concept should not be oversold.
- **It is not “Social Work”:** The perception that community policing involves do-good “social working” must be countered.
- **Training:** Community policing skills should be integrated into the

training curricula, and not treated as a separate component of the training program.

- **Evaluation:** Officers should be evaluated on how well they know their beats (which is a prerequisite for identification of problems), and how effectively they and their supervisors have adopted problem-solving techniques.
- **Theme or Slogan:** A theme or slogan to be used by a community concerning the concept can be useful, e.g. Chicago's "Together We Can" slogan.
- **Program Assessment:** Ongoing assessment of the program must be implemented, in order for management to focus on the most productive and efficient practices. This should include a reevaluation of the assessment measures themselves.
- **Intangible Benefits:** It must be understood that the success of community policing is qualitative as well as quantitative, since many indications of the success of the concept are intangible (e.g. absence of fear, quality of interaction with community members).
- **Budgets:** Budgets must reflect the goals of community policing by allocating money and resources in proportion to the results achieved.
- **Committee Recommended:** A community policing committee is recommended. It acts as an information collector and provides recommendations, leaving implementation to the police. It also serves as a liaison between the police and the community.

The foregoing comments provide a framework for review of the progress of community policing in Richmond. First, a review of what has occurred with respect to the concept elsewhere is in order, followed by a quick review of what has occurred in Richmond.

5. **THE EXPERIENCE TO DATE**

Outside North America

Website and other references indicate the concept is in active practice in many international communities, for example in certain Scandinavian countries, Australia, New Zealand, Singapore and South Africa. The material is not clear about the United Kingdom, although many programs usually conducted in concert with a community policing regime (e.g. "Neighbourhood watch") seem to be in effect. As one might expect, the websites are informative about the concept and positive about its impact.

United States

The practice is widespread in the United States, one resource indicating that 50% to 70% of the U.S. Police Departments are practicing community policing.¹⁵

The results of general statistical studies have been very positive. One major study from the United States is available, namely: "**Community Policing: A Survey of Police Departments in the United States**" (by Robert C. Trojanowicz with DeVere Woods, Joseph Harpold, Roland Roboussin and Susan Trojanowicz), attached as Appendix 3, is published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice, (C) 1997. It is a national study of community policing implementation. The survey results show a favourable performance by community policing, and high levels of satisfaction by the public and the police.

Another study can be found in "**Organizational Commitment to Community Policing**" by DeVere Woods and Joanne Ziembo-Vogl (1998), attached as Appendix 4. It contains interesting comments about the types of police department structures where community policing has had more acceptance.

American Criticism

Any reasonable debate, or management review process, must have a critical component. As noted above, there are some natural "pulls" against community policing. They seem to come down to three main identifiable areas of contrariness, one resting in empirical analysis of statistics, another a more fundamental one involving the effect upon traditional police work, and the last being negative results from incorrect application of the concept (the "horror stories" listed on one website, for example). As to the first, note a May 24, 1999 editorial in the Seattle Times¹⁶:

¹⁵ Woods, DeVere and Ziembo-Vogl, "**Organizational Commitment to Community Policing**"
http://msnhomepages.talkcity.com/LibraryLawn/devere_woods/commit.htm

¹⁶ See "seattletimes.com"

"ACROSS America, mayors are boasting about how their policies are driving down crime rates. But the exercise brings to mind the gag about the man snapping his fingers on a downtown street. How come you're snapping your fingers? a passerby asks. To keep away elephants, he says. What do elephants have to do with finger snapping? Do you see any elephants around here? he replies. There's a gap in the logic. In Seattle, community policing gets some of the credit for a decline in the city's overall crime rate. "If you look at the bottom line of reduced crime," says Mayor Paul Schell, "there is a reason for that." But that's hardly the complete story when crime is down in different cities with varying approaches to crime. For starters, demographics and incarceration rates also play a role. Community policing is a vague term for a philosophy that means training police officers to be problem solvers as well as law enforcers who arrive after trouble begins. Oldtimers in the SPD say it's a fancy term for old-style beat walking. Others describe it as an innovation. New or old, community policing as policy draws dollars that could go for other uses, such as equipment or other training. That may be the smart choice, but it's always a good idea to test assumptions about policy after several years of changed practice. Can the benefits of community policing be measured? What about important intangibles, such as strengthening links between the public and police? In Seattle, the city spends about \$5 million a year on its Community Policing Bureau, about 4 percent of the department's budget. The overall impact on the department is much greater, however, because the department diverts street officers from regular duties into community-policing roles. Some question that choice because of a chronic shortage of patrol officers. Prodded by city Councilwoman Tina Podlodowski, the city auditor's office will undertake an evaluation of community policing in the city. "There really isn't a baseline to find out if community policing has fulfilled its mission," Podlodowski says. There's potential for trouble here. Studies can be done poorly, may be incomplete or can be misused for political purposes. Those are hazards to avoid. But, doing cost-benefit analysis of major city policies makes sense."

The aspect of funding applied by governments to community policing in the United States, is, it must be noted, an issue which comes up time and again in the research, stemming from the availability of additional funding due to Presidential commitments to increase policing levels. But the issues raised by the article are useful in Canada as well, for the purpose of discussion.

As to the aspect of acceptance by the police generally, it must be understood that many of the women and men who become officers do so upon the expectation that the job will be interesting. Chasing down the crooks is certainly much more exciting than the "proactive" (another "newspeak word", still awaiting an invitation from Oxford Dictionary) community involvement in avoiding crime. There are not many television shows which highlight the relative drabness of effective beat work, or of preventative policing. Consider this: if all the police in Richmond had the collective power to sit in a room and wish away crime, they would all be tremendously successful in doing exactly what the public wishes them to do...and they would all most likely be miserable. What is required is moderation...an understanding that community policing is a movement as noted, a tide which cannot be avoided, and that there will always be some events of excitement in

addition to the pride of accomplishment which ought to be achieved, and recognized, through the community policing concept. We all benefit from supporting the concept.

Canada

The Ontario Provincial Police, the Edmonton Police Service, and various detachments of the R.C.M.P. have websites extolling the virtues of their community policing programs, including the particular operational programs that exist in their respective areas. The R.C.M.P. officially adopted the philosophy and principles of community policing as its model of service delivery in 1989, commencing implementation in 1990, and it can therefore be assumed that there is organizational support for the concept from the top down in that organization.

Vancouver has also implemented a system of Community Policing Centres in its four police districts, and the status of community policing in that city, and proposals for change, can be found in the study "***Neighbourhood Policing in Vancouver: The Challenges for Tomorrow, A Proposal for Community Policing Centres***"¹⁷, and therefore will not be repeated in detail here. The report covers issues concerning the naming and location of centres, volunteers, sustainability, commitment, Boards of directors/Police Advisory Committees and evaluations. Again, the report is positive as to the concept.

Richmond

The continued implementation of community policing in Richmond involves a number of organizations in addition to the R.C.M.P. and City Council, including the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing, Community Consultative Groups and the volunteer networks involved with the operation of Community Police Stations in Richmond. It is necessary to provide some background for these groups in order to understand their respective roles and make any recommendations for improvement.

Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing

The Richmond R.C.M.P. detachment set up a Community Policing Implementation Committee in 1994, and it undertook a study of other community policing programs in Western Canada, followed by the assignment of Cst. Dan Painter and Cst. Rob Sundell (now Cpl.) to the coordination of Community-based policing in Richmond. Representatives of the City participated in the process, and the City was formally in

¹⁷ Contact the Vancouver City Police: warren_lemcke@city.vancouver.bc.ca

support. In 1997, the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing was established by the City of Richmond, supported by the Superintendent, and operates with a membership which is appointed by City Council. The Committee's purpose was to act in an **advisory capacity** relating to police services on behalf of the community, to act as a **liaison** between the community and the R.C.M.P., to **promote** the philosophy and benefits of community policing and to **prepare an annual report** to City Council. It meets monthly for such purposes, and subcommittee work proceeds continually. These subcommittees are usually struck to deal with a particular task or assignment, and do not have clearly defined regular duties.

The original objectives of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing included the provision of public input into the development of community policing priorities and initiatives, the identification of community safety issues and concerns, advocacy for the concept, the initiation and participation in strategies that address community safety, the assistance to residents to become involved with community policing, the support and assistance with resource development programs, and the evaluation of community satisfaction with community safety and police service.

There is a bit of uncertainty concerning the continuing mandate of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing. The RCMP is required to have a "consultative group" as part of a local community policing organization, and it is understood that this "advisory committee" fulfils that function. The Superintendent has confirmed that feedback from members of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing, given during its regular meetings and during informal conversations, has been of use to senior officers in determining issues of importance to the inhabitants of Richmond. However, there may be some different limits to consultation as opposed to advice, and the viewpoint of each of the RCMP and the City should be clarified in that regard. Although there has certainly been no lack of respect at all shown to the advisory committee by either the RCMP or City Council representatives, it is clear that each of those "sides" has different realities which affect them with respect to policing issues. Also, certain of the responsibilities that ought to be performed by the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing on a regular basis according to the research available, such as identification of community priorities ("hot topics") for policing work or the evaluation of effectiveness, have not been formalized. Work done by it to date has been conducted in response to requests for information or advice, which is a usual course of reference based upon the resources available. It is probably time for the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing to become more active in pursuing its original objectives, and the first step is to be fully informed about the concept itself.

Studies have been conducted by the committee, including an "**Opinion Survey of Volunteers**" and "**Block Watch Program**" in October of 1999, providing information relevant to implementation of community policing programs and operations, and intended to assist in City Council awareness and decisions. They will not be repeated here, but are available upon request. Another economic study was prepared in November of 1998 which supported the economic basis for community police stations, the purpose for such study providing some credence to the position noted above that the value of the concept is difficult to assess given the intangibles involved.

It is notable that the **essential difference** in community policing, that is, the redefined **role of the community policing officer**, was not known to most or all of the members of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing until recently, the emphasis having been made upon the structures associated with the concept and the location of patrol officers in neighborhood areas. It may be that members of City Council are also not clear on this point, and **the unique role of the officer in community policing ought to be emphasized** for the purposes of their deliberation on budget and police staffing matters.

R.C.M.P.

The support for the concept can be assumed given the policy decisions of the R.C.M.P., but it is also fair to say that senior policing staff in Richmond have shown a genuine support for the concept. Also, it is well known to the members of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing that officers involved with the Community Police Stations are dedicated to the task and support the concepts of community policing in their work. However, it is also known that tensions still exist within the detachment as a whole concerning assignment to Community Police stations, and there has been some turnover at the station level. These tensions, based upon the impediments to the concept noted above, are probably to be expected, but it is not known to the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing the extent to which such tensions inhibit the development of the concept in Richmond. It is also not known the extent to which discussion and debate is undertaken among the ranks concerning implementation of the community policing concept when they are posted to Richmond, or if problems within the ranks are large impediments to successful implementation.

Anecdotal evidence suggests different styles of policing exist on Richmond's streets, the differences being seen more clearly in police work with youth, that is, some officers respond in the traditional authoritative style and some in the community policing mode. Perhaps the difference is warranted in many circumstances. The comment is not intended to question decisions of police made in certain circumstances: a difficult task. It is merely meant to underscore the fact that the dichotomy between community policing and traditional policing styles continues to exist in Richmond, notwithstanding the acceptance by the R.C.M.P. of the concept as their service delivery model.

It is known that recent staffing difficulties have hampered the implementation of the concept. The greatest effect of a community policing officer is a factor of the availability of time to undertake those functions which are preventative or problem-solving, and if there is, for example, only one officer on duty at a time in a community policing station, much of that time is taken by that officer in administrative matters such as file administration. By definition, the concept requires sufficient time for the unique role of the community policing officer to have the greatest impact, and staffing problems inhibit a successful community policing program by reducing the effective time.

None of the prime participants in the community policing process: the

Superintendent, Mayor, City Council or members of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing, have undertaken a serious plan of action to educate the public on an ongoing basis, the current work having been organizational in nature and either being channeled to the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing or related to the opening of Community Police Stations.

The Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing is also not actively and regularly involved, other than in a potential way, in any matters relating to complaints concerning specific policing conduct in the community. It is apprised of events involving the police within the community, by way of both written reporting and oral reports by senior officers. Access to those officers is open, and welcomed, but perhaps is not availed as much as it should. It must be noted, however, that it is not the function of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing to discipline, and there is an existing central complaint process in effect for the R.C.M.P. which deals with matters involving complaints concerning police conduct.

Although there was some talk of incorporation of a society for fund-raising purposes, that has not been followed up (see later comments under "CCG's").

Community Consultative Groups ("CCG's")

CCG's exist for both the Steveston and South Arm Community Police Stations, and they meet irregularly. Their purpose was to be a source of local consultation, and to provide a representative to the Committee. The success to date has been below what should be expected, but it is expected the situation is a factor of their function and the confusion that exists as to the role of the CCG in relation to the work of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing.

Within the existing organizational framework for Richmond, the continued existence of CCG's is somewhat threatened. This is in no way a result of the lack of desire or communication on the part of the police liaisons, but is instead a **crisis of purpose**. The viability of the CCG structure must be viewed in light of the time taken for the commitment to serve in relation to the purpose behind the structure itself. Volunteers wish to accomplish something, and will move away from participating in processes which they feel have little impact.

The initial intent was simple: to have separate local consultative groups which could provide some recommendations to the local community stations on policing matters within the specific cachement area. From the outset, however, it was clear that some overall consultative matters were to be undertaken by the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing and therefore some general consultation issues were available to be handled at a higher level. Fund-raising for the local station, except on a basic level, was prohibited to enable the umbrella group to be available for fund-raising for all cachement areas generally, to avoid competition for the donation dollar. Enforcement

issues continue to be handled by the police, of course, and the excellent volunteer network separately handled the operational assistance without consultation assistance. Programs continue to operate effectively without direct input from a CCG.

What is left is a sort of round table discussion of a minimum number of local issues, and the members of the CCG becoming apprised of events in the cachement area. The former does not provide enough ammunition for regular meetings, and the latter can be handled by reading a newsletter. Purpose becomes unclear, and commitment naturally suffers as a result. Turnover for various normal reasons was experienced with the Steveston CCG, and membership was revived in the last year, upon the experimental process of having the CCG meet for specific topical debate and discussion. Two meetings have been held on issues involving youth, which have been spirited, and further meetings are hoped to be held once some answers have been obtained from the station concerning specific questions.

Community Police Stations

Three stations exist at the present time, including one at the Airport, and each have a solid core of volunteers who help with the operations. City Counsel is considering the timing and location of other stations.

Resources

Although many resources are available, no bibliographical listing or library has been developed in Richmond concerning community policing. The National Centre for Community Policing at Michigan State University has a series of materials, as does the Justice Institute and the Police Foundations program, and texts such as "**Community-Oriented Policing: A Systemic Approach to Policing, 1/e**" (Willard M. Oliver, 1997), "**Community Policing**" (Heather Hodgson, 1998), "**Strategies for Community Policing, 1/e**" (Elizabeth M. Watson, 1998), "**Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality**" (Jack R. Greene and Stephen D. Mastrofski, 1991), and the video "**Community Policing - The Citizen's Role**" are available to be acquired.

6. A SUMMARY

- **Awareness of the Concept** It is believed that the essential differences of the concept are not fully appreciated by those who are responsible for its implementation. The important elements of community policing are:

- a ***working relationship*** between the police and the community;
- assignment of officers on a ***long-term basis*** to a local community policing area, ***working on patrol from a decentralized location***;
- ***identification and solving of problems*** in addition to routine responses to calls, and
- a ***common goal to reduce and prevent criminal activity and social disorder***, without the responsibility to do “social work”.

The unique role of the community police officer, incorporating problem-oriented policing in addition to routine policing, is a critical component of the concept and must be understood by all involved in its implementation and support. Community policing is not just the opening of community policing stations or increasing car patrols in local areas.

- **Implementation:** Although Richmond is certainly a “community policing” community, it is believed that the full beneficial effect of the concept has not had a chance to be appreciated, due to staffing restrictions. The file numbers of those officers conducting community policing out of the stations is anticipated to be high, and the numbers assigned to the stations to be low, and the workload adversely affects proper implementation. A limited number of officers doing community policing work means that such officers are, by necessity, “reacting” (i.e. performing traditional policing functions), rather than the preventative and problem-solving work which is at the core of the concept. The upgrading of community police station complements should be the subject of further review, to ascertain the satisfactory file levels which allow the greatest effect of community policing.
- **Comparative Review:** Without altering the model chosen for Richmond, a review of community policing structures and performance in other areas should be undertaken, with an emphasis on our Lower Mainland neighbours. Problems which they have identified should be reviewed to ascertain how they can be dealt with in Richmond.
- **Commitment:** A review of the level of commitment for the concept should be made with the City and with the RCMP. It is understood that the RCMP endorse the concept as their mode of service-delivery, but the level of internal support should be gauged. As for the City, it is understood it supports the concept, but a full understanding of the elements of the concept is necessary for a council member to understand the import of support.

- **Committee Functions:** The role of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing should be clarified, and certain of its "regular" functions should be formalized, such as an annual review and report on "hot topics", issues of regular evaluation, education and public relations. The purpose and functions of the CCG's should also be reviewed.
- **Education:** An educational process for members of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing and for the public concerning community policing should be determined and implemented. It should be designed to provide basic information concerning the concept, and to outline all the "positives" and indicate how the "negatives" are addressed.
- **Resources:** A resource base for community policing should be established and maintained, including a sufficient level of tapes and books on the subject, and statistics concerning Richmond and elsewhere.
- **Public Relations:** The establishment and implementation of an ongoing public relations program, involving senior RCMP and City representatives, is essential.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- (i) THAT, for Richmond's current purposes, the definition of community policing established by the RCMP be accepted, and that such definition be circulated to interested parties for comments and any suggestions as to possible changes.**

- (ii) THAT the philosophy of community policing be recognized by City Council as an international movement in policing matters, and that City Council be asked to publicly endorse (or repeat the endorsement of) the concept of community policing. In doing so, it is understood that City Council will retain at all times the right to maintain budgetary control in the usual manner.**

- (iii) THAT the internal level of commitment to the concept within the Richmond detachment and any problems relating to recruitment to Community Police Stations be determined.**

- (iv) THAT investigation be made as to the cost and availability of a "library" concerning community policing be made by the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing, to be kept at either the Richmond Public Library, the main Police station or at City Hall.**

- (v) THAT the establishment and maintenance of a Richmond community policing website be investigated.**

- (vi) THAT the structure and implementation of community policing in Richmond be reviewed by the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing in comparison to other communities.**

- (vii) THAT certain functions to be conducted by the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing on a regular basis be identified and formalized, including an ongoing evaluation process for the status of community policing in Richmond, and that subcommittees be established to deal with such functions, including, for example, a "Priorities" subcommittee, a "Public Relations" subcommittee and an "Evaluations" subcommittee.**

- (viii) THAT, as part of a current evaluation process, the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing determine the extent to which community policing has been effectively implemented in Richmond.**

- (ix) THAT the role of the Community Consultative Groups be reviewed by the**

Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing, with a view to clarify their respective functions in relation to the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing and to provide a new energy and direction for their activities.

- (x) THAT the Mayor direct City staff to contact the City of Seattle to follow up the results of the internal study referred to in the Seattle Times, and if it is available to provide it to the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing.**
- (xi) THAT an educational plan be prepared, ensuring education on an ongoing basis to the public, police, City Council members and members of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing, which must include ongoing evaluation of the concept in Richmond.**
- (xii) THAT a public relations plan be prepared and implemented, ensuring public relations on an ongoing basis to the public concerning community policing, which must involve the Superintendent, the Mayor and Council members and which must provide for community feedback.**
- (xiii) THAT the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing be educated as to the CAPRA model of the RCMP and its role in community policing.**
- (xiv) THAT the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing be informed as to the statistics available to the local RCMP detachment concerning community policing and crime, particularly in comparison to similarly-sized communities in Canada, and that consideration be given to requesting Statistics Canada to compile statistics with a separate category for cities the size of Richmond.**

APPENDIX 1

"The theory of community policing is based on normative sponsorship and critical social theory. Normative sponsorship theory declares most people are of good will and willing to cooperate with others to satisfy their needs (Sower, 1957). It proposes that a community effort will only be sponsored if it is normative (within the limits of established standards) to all persons and interest groups involved. One of the major considerations when attempting to initiate community development is to understand how two or more interest groups can have sufficient convergence of interest or consensus on common goals to bring about the implementation.

Each group involved and interested in program implementation must be able to justify and, hence, legitimize the common group goal within its own patterns of values, norms, and goals. The more congruent the values, beliefs, and goals of all participating groups, the easier it will be for them to agree on common goals. The participating groups, however, do not necessarily have to justify their involvement or acceptance of a group goal for the same reason.

In community policing, critical social science is practiced and it assists police and citizens to gain an understanding of the *quasi-causes* of their problematic situation, which aid citizens to solve their own problems.

Core Ideas of Critical Social Science

Critical social science is defined by Fay as practical social science that inspires people to become socially active to correct their socio-economic and political circumstances that they might have their expressed unmet needs satisfied. Fay discusses three core ideas of critical social science: enlightenment, empowerment and emancipation.

Enlightenment educates people about their particular problematic situation and their potential capacity to change their situation in order to satisfy their unmet needs. Enlightenment is achieved through reflection, discussion (communication) and determination of the "quasi-causes" of their problematic social condition.

Aristotle's view of politics is relevant to enlightenment. In the Aristotelean view, the process by which policy decisions are made is emphasized as of primary importance. This refers to the deliberate efforts of people to order and direct their affairs and activities, to establish goals for their society, to implement plans towards these goals, and to evaluate the achievement of the goals. What is most significant in this form of politics is citizens involvement in establishing and administering the laws of their community. In other words, a people can only be free if they participate in decision making in the matters that affect them; one is free if one is self-determining. This type of political life

reveals to people who they themselves are and who others are.

Political decisions made by a group of technically trained experts are an enigma to the classical, Aristotlean view of politics. According to Fay, to turn over political decisions to the "experts" is to lose an important and essential part of freedom, and it most often results in the rule of autocrats with the "correct" solutions.

The Socratic model emphasizes self-reflection toward self-knowledge. As stated by Bernstein, it is through a process of dialogue that participants achieve self-knowledge and self-reflection, which are not only therapeutic, but effect a cognitive, affective, and practical transformation toward autonomy and responsibility. It must be noted, however, that it is necessary to have "true" dialogue towards this purpose; that is, unrestrained communication must be allowed and fostered by the social and political institutions of the society. There must also be an agreement among participants of the dialogue on the meaning of the words, gestures and symbols used in the dialogue and communications process. True communication is based on a shared understanding of the language used to convey messages.

Empowerment is considered by Fay as "a practical force" which stimulates a people to take action which is meant to improve their social condition. The social actions taken by the recipients of the expected positive results. It is not the "expert" who decides the action to be taken to improve others' quality of life. It is the recipient of the service that makes the determination.

Emancipation is liberation resulting from social action. That is, a people become emancipated, through their reflection and their own social action, from an oppressive, problematic, social situation. As a group, they rationally and freely determine the direction of their own lives by changing and improving their situation. Bernstein interprets Habermas as stating that the experience of emancipation is the result of critical insight, through self-reflection, into the relationships of power, so that "quasi-causes" can be determined and remedied.

The Three Primary Phases of the Practice of Critical Social Science

Discourse, enlightenment and theory-induced praxis (practice-as distinguished from theory of an art or science) are the three phases of critical social science, as listed by Bernstein. Communicative action, both verbal and non-verbal, is based on a consensus that is taken for granted. Discourse is communication that results from this consensus being disturbed or disputed. Discourse, or the sharing of differences of opinions and beliefs, assists in testing the various claims of truth. Discourse produces arguments and it is in argumentation that claims are examined and challenged. The goal of discourse is an "accepted" consensus, something most people can live with and work towards.

Enlightenment and Theory Induced Practice

The second phase of critique is *enlightenment*, which is initiated by the reflection or discourse of a group of people. Action is the goal of self-reflection and the social action is meant to apply and test theories gained in the enlightenment. Theory induced practice or action is the third phase of critical social science. In other words, people debate about the causes of their problems, gain new information through a sharing of thoughts and opinions, decide as a group on a theory of causation of their problems, which in turn directs them toward social action that is directed toward change of their social and political circumstances. This is all carried out with the expressed goal of solving their problems and meeting their heretofore unmet needs.

Evaluation

Both normative sponsorship theory and critical social science incorporate the concept of evaluation of the results of the social action implemented. This confirms that the goals are met or that new activities are required if the goals are not met. The evaluation also confirms or rejects the critical social "theory" that induced the social action. Critical social science is a dynamic process and requires constant feedback from the social actors to evaluate the results and determine if new or different action should take place.

The Role of the Critical Social Scientist

In the critical method of science, the *educative role* is as important as the *expert role* and, in fact, the *expert role* of the scientist is dependent on the *educative role*. Critical science speaks to the actors which it studies, it allows the subject/object of the study to have input and define their own goals and desired social conditions, and to plan for themselves the social action they deem necessary they must take to solve their problems, achieve their goals and satisfy their needs, as defined by themselves. The critical scientist attempts to facilitate the actors through communication to solve their own problems."

APPENDIX 2

"The burst of ideas, arguments, and protests during the 1960's and 1970's mushroomed into a full-scale social movement. Antiwar protestors, civil rights activists, and other groups began to demonstrate in order to be heard. Overburdened and poorly prepared police came to symbolize what these groups sought to change in their government and society. Focusing attention on police policies and practices became an effective way to draw attention to the need for wider change. Police became the targets of hostility, which ultimately led police leaders to concerned reflection and analysis.

In this era of protest, citizens began to take a stronger hand in the development of policies and practices that affected their lives. The police force's inability to handle urban unrest in an effective and appropriate manner brought demands by civic leaders and politicians for a reexamination of police practices."

"When Sir Robert Peel established the London Metropolitan Police, he set forth a number of principles, one of which could be considered the seed of community policing: ". . . the police are the public and the public are the police." For a number of reasons, the police lost sight of this relationship as the central organizing concept for police service. Researchers have suggested that the reform era in government, which began in the early 1900's, coupled with a nationwide move toward professionalization, resulted in the separation of the police from the community. Police managers assigned officers to rotating shifts and moved them frequently from one geographical location to another to eliminate corruption. Management also instituted a policy of centralized control, designed to ensure compliance with standard operating procedures and to encourage a professional aura of impartiality.

This social distancing was also reinforced by technological developments. The expanding role of automobiles replaced the era of the friendly foot patrol officer. By the 1970's, rapid telephone contact with police through 911 systems allowed them to respond quickly to crimes. Answering the overwhelming number of calls for service, however, left police little time to prevent crimes from occurring. As increasingly sophisticated communications technology made it possible for calls to be transmitted almost instantaneously, officers had to respond to demands for assistance regardless of the urgency of the situation. Answering calls severely limited a broad police interaction with the community. The advent of the computer also contributed to the decrease in police contact with the community. Statistics, rather than the type of service provided or the service recipients, became the focus for officers and managers. As computers generated data on crime patterns and trends, counted the incidence of crimes, increased the efficiency of dispatch, and calculated the rapidity and outcome of police response, rapid response became an end in itself.

Random patrolling also served to further break the link between communities and police. Police were instructed to change routes constantly, in an effort to thwart criminals. However, community members also lost the ability to predict when they might be able to interact with their local police.

The height of police isolation came in an era of growing professionalization, when the prevailing ideology was that the professional knew best and when community involvement in crime control was seen by almost everyone as unnecessary.

The movement to end police corruption, the emphasis on professionalization, and the development of new technology occurred in an era of growing crime and massive social change. Police had trouble communicating with all members of the socially and culturally diverse communities they served. The police and the public had become so separated from one another that in some communities an attitude of "us versus them" prevailed between the police and community members. One observer of the urban scene characterized the deteriorating police-community relationship this way: "For the urban poor the police are those who arrest you."

"In 1979, Herman Goldstein developed and advanced the concept of "**problem-oriented policing**" (POP), which encouraged police to begin thinking differently about their purpose. Goldstein suggested that **problem resolution** constituted the true, substantive work of policing and advocated that police identify and address root causes of problems that lead to repeat calls for service. POP required a move from a reactive, incident-oriented stance to one that actively addressed the problems that continually drained police resources. In a study of POP implementation in Newport News, Virginia, POP was found to be an effective approach to addressing many community problems, and important data about POP design and implementation was gathered. Other research indicated that police could identify the "hot spots" of repeat calls in a community and thereby devise strategies to reduce the number of calls.

While much of the policing research conducted in the 1970's dealt with patrol issues, the Rand Corporation examined the role of detectives. This study concluded that detectives solved only a small percentage of the crimes analyzed and that the bulk of the cases solved hinged on information obtained by patrol officers. This dramatically challenged traditional thinking about the roles of detectives and patrol officers in the handling of investigative functions. The implication was that patrol officers should become more actively involved in criminal investigations. The implementation of appropriate training would allow patrol officers to perform some early investigating that could help in obtaining timely case closures, thereby reducing the tremendous case loads of detectives and allowing them to devote more time to complex investigations.

The Newark Foot Patrol Experiment suggested that police could develop more positive attitudes toward community members and could promote positive attitudes toward police

if they spent time on foot in their neighborhoods. Foot patrol also eased citizen fear of crime, ". . . persons living in areas where foot patrol was created perceived a notable decrease in the severity of crime-related problems." Experimental foot patrols in Flint, Michigan, also elicited citizen approval. Residents said foot patrols made them feel safer and residents ". . . felt especially safe when the foot patrol officer was well known and highly visible." In addition, it is worth noting that in both cities the use of foot patrols increased officer satisfaction with police work.

The fear reduction studies provided empirical data on the effectiveness of key community policing tactics (e.g., community organizing, door-to-door contacts, neighborhood mini-stations, and intensified enforcement coupled with community involvement) in reducing fear among residents, improving community conditions, and enhancing the image of the police. Driving this study was the notion that if fear could be reduced, community residents would be more inclined to take an active role in preserving safety and tranquility within their neighborhoods."

APPENDIX 3

“Community policing is sweeping across the United States. In this flurry of activity, community policing has come to acquire many meanings. Much confusion exists in police departments about what is community policing. To sort through this confusion, the staff of National Center for Community Policing and the Behavioral Sciences Unit at the FBI Academy collaborated to study community policing across the United States.

THE PROBLEM

Despite its popularity, community policing is not a panacea . Community policing faces many obstacles that challenge its viability. Some administrators claim they are engaged in community policing when they are not. To fully implement the philosophy, a department must make a long-term commitment to this manner of policing. Many people are still unable to distinguish between problem solving and community policing. Community policing should permeate the entire department. Some important features of community policing are:

- citizens nominating problems and working with the police
- long-term assignment of officers in defined beats
- full service policing
- community police officers actively working with non-law enforcement teams
- long-term evaluation of problem solving

THE STUDY

Self administered questionnaires were sent to chiefs of police of all law enforcement agencies serving populations of 50,000 or having 100 or more sworn officers. Of the 686 departments included in these parameters, 81% responded to the survey. Forty-two percent said they were engaged in community policing.

When examining the data, it should be remembered that these are the perceptions of police chiefs. The study does not directly measure public perceptions, the perceptions of other organizational members or levels of crime. Interpretation should remain in this context.

THE RESULTS

The first results we report are from the 546 usable surveys returned to us.

- 83.8 %** have written mission statements
- 91.9 %** have implemented some form of civilianization
- 84.9 %** have implemented call management
- 11.1 %** report that social agencies made adjustments to help reduce police workloads

17.4 % report that citizens are doing more to assist the police deal with crime

The following results are from the 229 departments that report they have a community policing program.

PROGRAM DESIGNS

- 54.0 %** state they have made a department-wide commitment to community policing
- 94.1%** say their community policing officers are full service police officers
- 77.7 %** have assigned community officers to defined beats
- 77.3 %** assign community officer to their beats for more than 1 year
- 65.5 %** have decentralized offices in beat areas
- 93.7 %** report that they have adopted a more proactive approach
- 95.0 %** believe their problem-solving ability has improved
- 38.4 %** cover their entire jurisdiction by their community policing program
- 74.3 %** have implemented park and walk programs
- 14.1 %** employ foot patrol

POLICE-CITIZEN RELATIONS

- 93.9 %** report more positive interactions with civilians
- 93.0 %** report that citizens participate in nominating and prioritizing problems to be solved
- 95.8 %** indicate that police-community relations have improved
- 87.3 %** claim improved relations between the police and minority populations

EFFECTS ON OFFICERS

65.6 % say that officer job satisfaction has improved

27.1 % report officers perceive their jobs are safer

EFFECTS ON CRIME

98.0% say their community policing program addresses serious crime, the fear of crime and low-level drug dealing

48.4% report that serious crime has decreased since implementing community policing

59.5% report that less serious crime has decreased since implementing community policing

79.5% report that the fear of crime has decreased since implementing community policing

77.3% report street-level drug dealing has decreased since implementing community policing

73.3% report social disorder has decreased since implementing community policing

82.4% report physical disorder has decreased since implementing community policing

The full study, *Community Policing: A Survey of Police Departments in the United States (1994)* by Robert C. Trojanowicz with DeVere Woods, Joseph Harpold, Roland Roboussin and Susan Trojanowicz, is published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice. It may be obtained from the National Center for Community Policing (800 892-9051) or the Behavioral Sciences Unit of the FBI (800 634-4097).

APPENDIX 4

"There are many aspects of law enforcement that are unclear. This is one of the few certainties in policing. We know there are about 17,000 police departments in the US. The number varies depending on who is doing the counting. The exact number is probably unimportant to most police practitioners and police researchers. If we ask how many of these departments use 9mm hand guns, have detective bureaus or are dispatched by 911 systems, our findings will probably be reasonably accurate. Other factors, though, may be more difficult to measure. One of these issues is community policing. If we ask how many departments practice community policing, how accurate will our result be?"

The research literature reports that 50 to 70 percent of US police departments are practicing community policing. Some community policing advocates cite these studies to support their position that community policing is thriving. But what do statistics like these really mean? We set out to determine the level of organizational support for community policing and the characteristics of organizations that are conducive to community policing.

We analyzed data from a national survey of US police departments. Two hundred twenty-five large police departments from that study were suitable for this investigation. We first developed a scale of organizational commitment to community policing using the writings of Robert Trojanowicz. Trojanowicz defined community policing as:

"a philosophy of full service personalized policing where the same officer patrols and works in the same area on a permanent basis, from a decentralized place, working in a proactive partnership with citizens to identify and solve problems." (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux 1994:3) (See Ziembo-Vogl and Woods 1995 for more on the Trojanowicz Paradigm.)

Trojanowicz's definition is a useful tool for measuring commitment because of its comprehensiveness. It is one of the few attempts to concisely define community policing. The scale we developed measured the degree that departments institutionalized community policing into their procedures and structure.

We made our first significant discovery when examining the distribution of the commitment scores. The aggregated scores composed a normal distribution. Scores cluster around the middle of the scale and decline as they approached the extreme. In other words, most departments exhibit a mid-range of commitment to community policing with high and low levels of commitment equally likely. This means that few departments fully integrate all the community policing measures into their organizational procedures and structure.

A second scale was devised to measure departments' propensity for using bureaucratic

structures and techniques in their operating procedures. This variable examined the use of written rules, planning of the work process, training and maintaining the chain of command. The more a department used these traditional management techniques, the higher it scored on the bureaucratic scale.

We next examined the effect of organizational variables on departments' level of commitment to community policing. We found we could identify variables that explained about 40% of a department's level of commitment to community policing. Departments' level of organizational commitment increased the more they used bureaucratic procedures, the more sworn officers they employed, when they received additional funds to implement community policing, and the more they relied upon civilianization. Departments' level of commitment decreased as the square miles of the jurisdiction increased and when the chief/sheriff was promoted from within the organization.

When the analysis was limited to city police departments, the most efficient model for predicting levels of organizational commitment consisted of the variables for the use of bureaucratic procedures, receiving additional funds to implement community policing, the extent of civilianization and whether the chief was promoted from within the department. Departments that promoted their chief from within had lower levels of organizational commitment to community policing.

When examining sheriff's departments, only two variables were necessary to create a predictive model. Sheriff's departments that used bureaucratic procedures and received additional funds to implement community policing had higher levels of organizational commitment.

In summary, police departments in the US demonstrate a wide range of levels of commitment to community policing. Larger departments that use bureaucratic mechanism, receive additional funding and have civilianized portions of their work process are likely to have higher levels of organizational commitment to community policing. Departments that promoted their chief from within and cover large geographic areas have lower levels of organizational commitment to community policing."