

COMMUNITY POLICING AND COMMUNITY ISSUES

“I CAN’T BREATHE.”

The death of a black man at the hands of a white police officer is in the news again, the names have changed but the story has been told many times. At approximately 8:00 pm on May 25th, 2020, police responded to a call involving a man passing a counterfeit bill at a grocery store. The man identified as George Floyd, a 46-year-old African American, had purchased a pack of cigarettes with a twenty-dollar bill. Employees believed the bill was counterfeit. They followed Floyd out of the store and confronted him as he was getting into the driver’s seat of his SUV across the street, demanding the pack of cigarettes be returned. Floyd refused. Another employee of the store called police to report that a very drunk and out-of-control man was fighting with employees and had passed a phony bill. After police arrived and contacted Floyd, he was placed under arrest. What ensued next was captured by various cameras including bystander’s cell phones. Although the entire scenario has yet to be completely pieced together, it appears that Floyd was experiencing problems of breathing and claimed to be claustrophobic after initially being put in the back seat of a police unit. It was when Officer Derick Chauvin arrived and took over the scene that things started to fall apart. Chauvin removed Floyd from the back of the unit. When Floyd was extricated from the vehicle, he fell to the pavement, face down. Officer Chauvin, in what is now a well-publicized photo snapshot, is seen kneeling on the man’s neck, although Floyd is clearly in custody, handcuffed, and does not appear to be resisting. In the videos and photos, two additional officers are sitting on Floyd’s back and legs, while a fourth officer is keeping worried and vocal bystanders at bay. Over a dozen times, Floyd can be heard saying, “I can’t breathe.”¹ Bystanders were begging the cops to let him up. For eight long minutes and 46 seconds, Chauvin kneeled on Floyd’s neck. An ambulance was called and then expedited when Floyd appeared to go unconscious. After Floyd was

Learning Objectives

1. Identify the three cornerstones of traditional policing.
2. Explain the difference between traditional policing and community policing.
3. Explain the core principles of community policing.
4. Identify community issues that broaden the police mandate.

loaded in the ambulance, attendants called the fire department to respond because they believed Floyd was going into cardiac arrest. Firefighters arrived and found Floyd to be unresponsive. He was transported to Hennepin County Medical Center where he was pronounced dead, just over an hour and a half from the initial call to police.² Since that time, protests, rioting, looting, property damage, injuries, and death are erupting in cities across America. Officer Chauvin and the three other officers have been fired, charged with murder, and remain in custody.³

Racial bias and police brutality are frequently at the root of demands for police reform. The tragic killing of George Floyd, as illustrated above, has resulted in unrelenting anger and vociferous demands for police reform, which include radical notions to **defund** police or to eliminate them completely. Defunding the police refers to taking away funds allocated to policing and redistributing those funds to other social services, such as mental health care, drug rehabilitation, domestic violence, and homelessness.⁴ Public outrage and emotions are running high, and police and city officials are scrambling to respond to the various demands. Some cities, for example New York, Los Angeles, and Minneapolis, have already announced defunding plans.⁵ Activists in Seattle, WA, boarded up the city's East Precinct police building when police fled and have set up a "police no-go zone" where there is no police presence. The area was deemed a safe zone for protestors but has morphed into a community of anarchists by erecting barriers against outsiders.⁶ Other cities are taking conservative steps by being more strategic about what to do going forward. There has been immediate response by members of Congress to propose a Justice in Policing Act, which will increase oversight and accountability of police including a move to eliminate legal protections for police, form a national database of excessive-force incidents, boost requirements for body cameras, and increase subpoena power of the Justice Department to conduct investigations. While this bill is in the early stages, many are proclaiming such an act would lead to transformative changes in policing.⁷

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, we compare traditional and community policing models, outlining features of each. Second, we examine the failure of traditional policing to effectively solve crime or heal inimical relations with the public. Third, we explore the definition and key components of community policing. The transformation from traditional to community policing involves sweeping changes in the way police view their role and relationships with the community; comprehensive organizational changes in structure and management; and the adoption of new technology and information systems to find fresh ways of addressing crime and disorder.

Throughout this text, we consider the claim that community policing might be a viable solution to violence, crime, and hostile relations with the public more so than traditional methods. There are many issues facing our communities today. In this chapter and throughout the text, we identify community issues and highlight the advantages of community policing to address problems and find long-term solutions. For example, community problems include the ravages of the opioid epidemic, homelessness, illegal immigration, poverty, unemployment, single-parent households, increasing signs of disorder, fear of crime, quality of life issues, and social disorganization. Under the traditional police model, such concerns were not considered to be the purview of police. Decades of scholarly

research into the causes of crime do show, however, that these issues have a correlation to crime and, therefore should be of concern to police. After all, police have marketed their services to the public as the experts in crime fighting. The public are encouraged to call 911 to initiate the response and then get out of the way so that police can handle the situation. Unfortunately, much of what police do is ineffective at addressing crime and other community problems. Following a brief comparison of traditional and community policing, we identify where traditional policing has failed and why community policing may be the answer to problems associated with traditional policing. Let us first take a look at another example of the challenges police face in communities across America.

POLICE AND VIOLENCE

On September 5, 2018, just before 7:30 p.m., 19-year-old Delmonte Johnson was brutally gunned down on a South Side Chicago sidewalk outside his brother's basketball practice. The drive-by shooting that claimed the life of Johnson added to Chicago's death toll of 381 and 2,074 people shot so far that year.⁸ According to Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) in 2017, approximately 29,737 violent crimes and 653 homicides occurred in Chicago.⁹ Johnson was not an ordinary teen; he volunteered his time and effort to fight gun violence in Chicago as part of a group called GoodKids MadCity. It was with sad irony that Johnson had dedicated a good portion of his young life to encourage others to move away from violence. The death of Delmonte Johnson is yet another statistic in a larger story of rampant, unrestrained violence on the streets of Chicago. Each death represents a community of grieving friends and families. Families of those who died and residents who want to protect their own families are begging for help. Community leaders are calling for stricter gun laws and a declaration of martial law to take over the city's law enforcement.¹⁰ Despite pervasive antipolice sentiment among residents impacted by violence, their willingness to have outside military intervention is evidence of their desperation for change. Although martial law has not yet been declared, residents and community leaders continue to ask the Trump administration for federal intervention in the form of boots on the ground.¹¹ In a highly controversial response, President Trump called for increased stop-and-frisk, an aggressive and invasive law enforcement practice similar to liberal stop-and-frisk practices in New York City.¹²

Mayor Rahm Emanuel said yes to federal help but no to the National Guard. In July 2018, Illinois's attorney general, the city of Chicago, and the Chicago Police Department drafted a **consent decree** agreement that would grant independent federal oversight of the Chicago Police Department. Consent decrees are mutually binding agreements between two or more parties, which allow federal courts to require oversight and enforcement of the agreement. For the most part, we hear of consent decrees when police officers have egregiously crossed the line in terms of serious police misconduct, abuse of force, and civil rights violations. The Chicago decree agreement, following the death of Delmonte Johnson, included federal oversight in cases involving use of force as well as outlining recommendations for police officer supervision, promotions, accountability, and oversight; implementation of community policing, impartial policing, crisis intervention, officer assistance and support, data management, and guidelines for the role of the independent federal monitor.¹³ Considering that the public was calling for military response, it

is surprising that community policing was one of the recommendations. We might wonder why community policing would be effective in what is essentially a war zone. The sad truth is that whatever the police are doing is not stopping the flow of blood in Chicago and many other communities across America.

The claim that community policing might be a viable solution to the violence illustrated in the Delmonte Johnson killing more so than traditional methods is an important assertion to consider. Violence is just one of many issues facing our communities today. In this chapter and throughout the text, we identify community issues and highlight the advantages of community policing to address problems and find long-term solutions. For example, community problems include the ravages of the opioid epidemic, homelessness, illegal immigration, poverty, unemployment, single-parent households, increasing signs of disorder, fear of crime, quality of life issues, and social disorganization. Under the traditional police model, such concerns were not considered to be the purview of police. Decades of scholarly research into the causes of crime do show, however, that these issues have a correlation to crime and, therefore, should be of concern to police. After all, police have marketed their services to the public as the experts in crime fighting. The public are encouraged to call 911 to initiate the response and then get out of the way so that police can handle the situation. Unfortunately, much of what police do is ineffective at addressing crime and other community problems. Following a brief comparison of traditional and community policing, we identify where traditional policing has failed and why community policing may be the answer to problems associated with traditional policing.

TRADITIONAL VERSUS COMMUNITY POLICING

To appreciate the extent of differences between community policing and traditional policing, we must first understand strategies and philosophies of traditional policing. Traditional aspects of policing continue to persist, both good and bad. Traditional values and practices have contributed to the dissonance between citizens and their police—something community policing was specifically designed to address. In both traditional and community policing models, police fight crime, make arrests, and use lethal force when necessary; however, community police officers do so with intentionality, and specifically, with long-term solutions in mind. Community policing, while still using traditional tactics, is smarter law enforcement.¹⁴

It could be argued that the death of Delmonte Johnson and the continuing carnage in Chicago demonstrate the failure of police to prevent crime, respond to crime, and solve crime. In the blame game, it is easy to point fingers at police, thus removing any responsibility of citizens and others to address social disorder, dysfunction, violence, and crime. Many believe that crime is the purview of law enforcement and not of the community. Both the police and the public believe that crime is solely a police matter. For many decades, the belief that police alone can resolve all community issues has been challenged. Under the community policing model, police and the public share the responsibility for resolving community issues and must do so in collaboration.

While aspects of traditional policing will likely be forever engrained in policing, the same could be said about community policing. Once community policing was introduced, it is unlikely that there will be a return to the former model without at least some inclusion

of community policing principles. Traditional policing, however, does remain the standard of the profession both in organization and operation. Certain crimes and situations require full law enforcement response and that is not likely to change.

The community policing movement is touted as the most comprehensive police reformation in police history. While rising crime rates were worrisome, the most significant and urgent concern was the animus between police and the public, especially in minority communities. Rebuilding trust and promoting police legitimacy were central tenets of police reform. In this chapter, we explore the definition of community policing and outline some of the key principles. What is community policing and how does it differ from traditional policing? One important difference between traditional and community policing involves the establishment of police and community partnerships, very much absent from traditional policing. Let us now look at traditional policing and outline some of its key attributes and limitations.

Traditional Policing

The traditional policing model followed on the heels of the political era of policing, which witnessed a rift with the corrupting influences of politics and the public. Police had become puppets for politicians' special interests, often accepting bribes and doing their bidding, even campaigning for them. Addressing corrupt practices in local, state, and federal government paved the way for police reform. The professionalization of policing began in earnest, including greater standardization of hiring and training, formalized policies and practices, and the advent of motorized patrol. To a great extent, the police became a respected and professional organization following the reform from the political era, which is why the traditional model is often referred to as the professional model. The downside of the transition, however, was the separation of police from the public they served. That separation formed the impetus for the community policing model.

Despite the move to community policing, public perceptions of policing reflect the traditional model. Moreover, police officers hold similar views. Traditional policing is the model that is depicted in the media, both in entertainment and the news, fortifying the view that police are gun-wielding, badge-heavy, action figures who fight crime and arrest bad guys all day long. Two important and recognizable features of traditional policing are, first, its organizational structure, and second, the crime-fighting cornerstones of policing: preventive patrol, rapid response, and investigations.

Organizational Structure of Traditional Policing. The organizational structure of traditional policing is very rigid and well defined. Policing is paramilitary, hierarchical, and shift-based. What does it mean to say the policing is paramilitary? A **paramilitary** organization is a semimilitarized force whose organizational structure, tactics, training, subculture, and function are similar to those of a professional military but which is not included as part of a state's formal armed forces. There are clearly defined lines of communication, policies, authority, and responsibilities. Similar to a military force, police use the designation of ranks—for example, captain, lieutenant, sergeant, and corporal—and wear recognizable uniforms with badge and gun. A distinct **chain-of-command**, whereby power and authority reside at the top and delegate downward, marks the organizational structure. The patrol officer is at the bottom of the hierarchy and would be expected to report only to the rank



► What other aspects of policing could be considered paramilitary?

directly above him or her. Accordingly, it is against protocol for an officer to walk into the chief's office and complain about a shift, a fellow officer, or other matters. That officer must initially report to his or her sergeant, who, in turn, may then take the matter to a higher level. The hierarchy is characterized by a **unity of command** whereby an officer only has one boss, one commander. For example, a police officer assigned to a specialized unit such as SWAT (Specialized Weapons and Tactics) would not answer to a commander of the traffic division during an incident involving a SWAT response. Discussed later in the book, we will see that the strict hierarchical management model is not conducive or ideal to a community policing model, which calls for greater involvement and decision making at the police officer rank, asking officers to take risks and be innovative. The paramilitary organizational structure is an enduring aspect of policing that is unlikely to change significantly because it provides control, discipline, uniformity, accountability, loyalty, and a certain amount of predictability in outcome.

Crime-Fighting Focus of Traditional Policing. In addition to the hierarchal and rigid organizational structure as a recognizable feature of traditional policing, the second attribute is the focus on crime fighting. While crime fighting is an important part of their job, police officers under the traditional model tend to devalue other duties. The strategies police promote are based on three foundational pieces of policing called cornerstones. In this next section, we will discuss how those cornerstones reinforce traditional policing. Despite

research that challenges the value and efficacy of these cornerstones, they are considered indispensable and fundamental to policing.

Cornerstones of Traditional Policing. The three cornerstones of traditional policing are preventive patrol, rapid response, and investigations. Police have three opportunities to impact crime. First, they can prevent it from happening through deterrence, usually by their mere presence in a neighborhood. Second, when they respond to a call of a crime in progress, they can intervene and stop the criminal activity, such as in a case of domestic violence. Lastly, the police can solve the crime after it has occurred through investigations. Therefore, if the police were neither effective at preventing the occurrence of a crime nor successful in its intervention, what do you think the chances are that police will be able to solve crimes at a later time, sometimes decades later?

The first cornerstone involves the ability of police to deter crime before it happens or discover criminal activity when it is happening. Preventive patrol involves walking or driving around an area with the goal of discovering and/or deterring criminal activity by increasing police presence. Preventive patrol, also known also as random patrol, occurs in geographical areas in the city or county called a beat. The beat is a geographic area with set boundaries such as streets or buildings. The number and/or size of beat areas in a law enforcement agency's jurisdiction are subject to change due to factors such as population growth, recession, and demographic shifts. For example, in Southern California, unrestrained population growth contributed to the housing boom of the 1990s, thus increasing the demands placed on policing services. Police officials divide the city into beat areas, determining deployment needs based on population density and crime rates. Officers, then, are assigned to beats with specific jurisdictional boundaries and authority. Officer Smith, for example, is assigned to Beat 3 during the day, and Officer Brown is assigned to Beat 3 for the swing shift (or afternoon-to-night shift). Several officers may be assigned to a specific beat and shift depending on the needs of the community. Officers will have partner officers within the beat area who respond together when the situation warrants additional units. At the start of their shift, after briefing, police officers leave the station and proceed to their beat area where they will patrol and await calls for service.

The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Study examined the effectiveness of preventive patrol. Law enforcement communities consider patrol the backbone of policing. Billions of dollars are spent on the deployment of uniformed officers in marked patrol vehicles with the objective of deterring crime. Until 1972, that assumption had never been challenged. The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment was launched in October 1972 and was conducted till 1973. In this study, 15 beat areas were divided into three groups. The first group of five beat areas responded to calls but did not patrol. The second group of five was *normal* patrol with no changes. Finally, the third group of five beat areas was *proactive* where patrol was intensified by two to three times the normal rate. Data collected included: victimization surveys, reported crime rates, surveys of residents and business in the areas, arrest data, and trained observers. The research questions posed by researchers were:

- Would citizens notice changes in the level of patrol?
- Would different levels of visible patrol impact crime and victim surveys?

- Would citizens' fear of crime and change of behavior be apparent?
- Would citizens' degree of satisfaction with police change within the areas?

The findings revealed that citizens did not notice the difference in patrol level, there was no visible impact on increasing or decreasing crime, and citizen satisfaction with police did not vary in the three groups. Trained observers on ride-alongs noted that police spent a considerable amount of time waiting on calls for service rather than interacting with citizens or patrolling.¹⁵ Interestingly, these findings did not motivate change by the police administration. The perceived positive value of patrol, despite the lack of evidence of its success to reduce crime, prevent crime, or increase citizen satisfaction, means there is little incentive to revamp or divest themselves from this practice. Surprisingly, both wide acceptance of the findings and equally fervid criticisms of its methodology can be found. The experiment has not been replicated; However, it is both valued and hotly debated since its publication in 1974.¹⁶ It would take years before the law enforcement community would reassess its commitment to this practice, reevaluate it, and include aspects of community engagement into new and alternative patrol strategies (e.g., bicycle patrol, foot patrol, and mounted patrol).

The second cornerstone of policing is **rapid response**. An obvious symbol of traditional policing—the patrol car—revolutionized policing, allowing officers to respond quickly to the crime location. Over the years, that notion became the “quicker the better.” It was believed that rapid response to 911 calls was the mark of effective policing. Research revealed, however, that less than 5% of the time, rapid response resulted in an arrest. The Kansas City Experiment in 1974 showed that there was no significant impact on crime deterrence, citizen fear of crime, community attitudes toward the police, or police response time.¹⁷ No evidence supported the notion that rapid response either increased apprehension rates or decreased crime.¹⁸ Findings suggest that delay between the crime and a reporting party's call to police was the problem, not when the police got to the scene. Delays in reporting a crime may result from a number of reasons. For example, the affected person may not be sure that a crime has been committed; they may call a friend instead of the police; they may be unable or unwilling to call; or they may not discover the crime at or near the time it was committed. Under the traditional policing model, the public insists on a timely response regardless of the nature of the call, and when police take too long, the public understandably is dissatisfied. In addition to dissatisfaction of citizens when response times are long, responding to every call quickly could mean that police would have little time to spend on each call; thus, the quality of service would suffer as well.

The use of rapid response coincided with the reliance on the 911 system. The connection between 911 and rapid response comes from the expectation and belief by both the public and police that 911 calls are inherently urgent. Since the first 911 call in Haleyville, Alabama, in 1968, 99% of people in the United States have access to the 911 system. People call 911 instead of calling the police on another phone line, even when the matter is not imminent or immediate, thus initiating rapid response. It is estimated that 80% of the calls to 911 are nonemergency requests for service.¹⁹ Dispatchers must sort calls and prioritize them before giving them to police officers in the field. Most agencies prioritize calls for service by using a number system as a kind of shorthand to officers for the type of response needed. For example, Priority Three calls require that officers respond when they are able, Priority Two calls require that officers respond quickly but not urgently, and Priority One

indicates great urgency, necessitating use of lights and siren by responding officers. When calls stack up, officers take high-priority calls first, pushing Priority Two and Three calls to the back of the line. In some situations, an officer may request additional help on a call. When fellow officers hear that request, they respond quickly even when the original call does not warrant the high priority and despite not being dispatched to assist. Of course, police officers do follow departmental policy; however, they will often break policy if necessary due to the unwritten code of solidarity among police officers.

Rapid response has been sold to both the police and the public as something police should do; however, the price of such a practice may be too high. A concerning downside to rapid response is officer and public safety. Are fatalities and serious injuries of police and members of the public worth the off chance of catching the bad guy? Evidence, both anecdotal and empirical, challenge that assumption. Rapid response in cases where there is imminent threat would be warranted; however, the possibility of creating additional threat or bodily harm must be carefully assessed. Stories of the horrific consequences of officers involved in traffic accidents while responding to or chasing bad guys make the news too often. Since the initiation of patrol in marked police cars, traffic-related deaths have continued to climb. Data from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and the national nonprofit that tracks police deaths in real time show that traffic-related incidents are the leading cause of death among police officers.²⁰ Interestingly, most police officers who died in automobile crashes were going too fast for the conditions and nearly 60% were not driving with lights and siren.²¹ In the past 10 years, more than one officer per week has been killed in crashes (2006–2016 = 64 deaths per year). Some of the causes for the fatalities included not wearing a seat belt, speeding, being distracted while using the mobile data terminal (MBT), and/or experiencing tunnel vision from increased stress.²²

Public safety is also at risk for those same reasons. In one tragic example, a Somerset, Massachusetts, police officer killed 20-year-old Hailey Allard in a traffic collision while responding to a call of a car burglary. Despite his own injuries, the officer rendered aid to Hailey before they were both transported to the hospital where Allard succumbed to her injuries.²³ In another case, the police chief of the South Bend, Indiana, Police Department, said an officer should be fired for killing 22-year-old Erica Flores, when he drove through a red light while responding to a reckless driver call.²⁴

We will learn that community policing practices do not negate the need for rapid response; however, one major difference is the way police services are evaluated. For traditional policing, rapid response has been the mark of effective policing; however, for many reasons, the reliance on and importance of rapid response may need to be reassessed and downplayed.

The third cornerstone of traditional policing is investigations. The third opportunity for police to impact crime is by solving the crime after it occurs. All law enforcement agencies have investigative units. The effectiveness of traditional policing services are measured on how many crimes are solved. This method measures investigative effectiveness. **Clearance rates** are all the crimes solved by an arrest. For example, if 30 bicycles are stolen, and an arrest is made, that solves all those thefts, and the police will record that 30 crimes were solved. One can see the incentive to have good clearance rates, because it makes the police department look as though it is doing a great job. To be sure, we do expect that police will solve crimes. However, let's take a look at the problem with reliance on investigative clearance rates as a measure of police effectiveness overall.



► **Photo 1.2** Five police cars were involved in a road accident during a vehicle pursuit in Chicago, Illinois.

The Rand Study (1973) examined investigative units, how they were organized and managed, in order to assess the contributions to overall police effectiveness. Most studies focus on police activity in the field, police officers, police practices, and policies, but no studies had examined investigative units. Among the objectives of the study, researchers wanted to assess the contributions of police investigations to crime, arrest, and clearance rates. Another objective of the study was to examine staffing and productivity of investigative units. Data were gathered from all municipal or county agencies that had more than 150 officers employed and where the jurisdiction's population was over 100,000. Additionally, interviews and observations were conducted on more than 25 departments. Researchers looked at samples of case outcomes from the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) compiled by the FBI. The findings of the study suggested that investigative units were not effective in solving crime. Stated as one of the major findings about investigative effectiveness, differences in investigative training, staffing, workload, and procedures appear to have no appreciable effect on crime, arrest, or clearance rates (p. vi). In fact, study recommendations included a reduction of half of the investigative efforts and a reassignment to more productive uses. While an overly simplistic summary of the findings is presented here, there should be greater scrutiny on investigations and the role they play in measuring the effectiveness of police services.²⁶ The study and policy implications were not well received by police officials due to heavy reliance on investigative units.

The three cornerstones of traditional policing—rapid response, preventive patrol, and investigations—have been challenged; however, they persist as attributes of policing

THINK ABOUT IT: DO OFFICERS NEED TO RESPOND TO CALLS RAPIDLY?

Police officers may be authorized to respond with emergency lights and siren; however, they have an obligation to use due care for public safety. Due care is conduct that a reasonable person will exercise in a particular situation, in looking out for the safety of others.²⁵ In a case currently being adjudicated in the courts, the officer responding to a call with lights and siren had a responsibility to ensure public safety of the people at the call and in route to the scene. In this example, a police officer is suing the mother of a six-year-old boy he killed while responding to a call, which many people find offensive that the officer would add insult to injury to the family. Albuquerque police officer Jonathan McDonnell claims Antoinette Suina turned in front of him and failed to yield to an emergency vehicle. Suina's son died and her daughter was seriously injured; however, the officer claims that he too was harmed and is currently on disability. In his nine years as a police officer, McDonnell has been disciplined for six prior

driving-related incidents, including one unauthorized pursuit. He was responding at 80 mph and entered the intersection where he hit Suina's vehicle, even though the call had been downgraded from a Priority One to a Priority Two call. The original call reported that a man was threatening people at a supermarket with a machete. An accident reconstructionist found that the officer was going too fast for the conditions and hit Suina's vehicle at a calculated 67 mph, in a 40-mph zone.

What do you think?

1. Did the officer have the right-of-way and the legal authorization to speed?
2. Did this officer exercise due care for public safety?
3. When would responding rapidly be worth the risks to public safety?

today. Traditional policing is marked by insular, siloed communication and command, meaning that police officers work independently with little or no supervision. They are call-answerers, responding to incidents, writing reports, and waiting for the next call. A single call, especially one that involves an arrest, can take an officer out of service for four hours or more. The incentive is for officers to handle the call and go "10-8" (back in service) so that they are available for the next call. In the traditional model, police are adept at assessing the situation, determining if it is a police matter, and resolving problems quickly and efficiently. A police matter is one that entails criminal activity; nothing else is police business according to traditional model thinking.

Traditional policing is about "crook-catching" and locking up "the bad guy." It is about fighting crime with limited focus on long-term problem solving. That image of catching the bad guy, good versus evil, the excitement and danger, featured in media portrayals of police, draws people to a career in police department and perpetuates traditional perceptions. The reality is that police do fight crime, and they do catch bad guys. However, police spend a lot less of their time on law enforcement-related activities than on other calls for service.²⁷ Moreover, when they do make arrests, they usually arrest for property crimes rather than violent crimes.²⁸ Therefore, the notion that traditional policing is only about catching bad guys is false because it precludes a majority of police activities. Ironically, what police do in the traditional model resembles much of what police do in the community policing model—they solve problems in the community. What the traditional model does not do, however, is to recognize and honor the full capacity of the job. What the

community policing model effectively does is give more credit to the majority of duties that do not necessarily include crook-catching.

Community Policing

Now that we have a better understanding of traditional policing, we are ready to explore community policing. What is community policing? Some might argue that community policing is whatever a particular agency says it is. In a series of articles about community policing, Public Safety Director Tom Casady of the Lincoln Police Department remarked:

When an agency claims to have “implemented” community policing last week, that’s a pretty good indication that it has not. Individual programs or projects that form part of this change may be implemented, but community policing is not implemented. You don’t start it at the beginning of the fiscal year. It is a process that evolves, develops, takes root and grows, until it is an integral part of the formal and informal value system of both the police and the community as a whole. It is a gradual change from a style of policing which emphasizes crime control and “crook catching,” to a style of policing which emphasizes citizen interaction and participation in problem solving.²⁹

It may be true that some agencies do claim to have community policing but do not, while others are fully engaged in community policing. However, over the past few decades, a clearer definition of community policing has emerged. Additionally, there is greater detailed and organized protocol, including the notion that not every innovation constitutes community policing.

While some police experts focus on understanding what community policing is, others focus on dispelling the myths associated with community policing—that is, that it is not soft on crime, it is not a program, it’s not a panacea, nor is it a Band-Aid for all problems.³⁰ Myths come about from a lack of understanding or exposure to community policing and those myths generate resistance, especially among the rank-and-file officers who are essentially the purveyors of community service ideals. One officer, when asked about community policing, remarked, “We don’t have time for that crap” (conversation with officer by author). It is easy to dismiss something when it is not clearly articulated and when you do not have the buy-in of critical players, especially the police officers.

As community policing programs and concepts have evolved, each development brought excitement and discoveries, and in some cases, new directions. Greater knowledge led to more intentional and systematic integrations and implementations of community policing. In part, the community policing movement included the creation of a federal unit to support the police reform. The U.S. Department of Justice Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) was formed in 1994 to advance community policing. The objectives of COPS include funding and resources, such as training, to assist agencies in the implementation process as well as providing evaluation feedback of existing community policing programs. In fact, in order to obtain and continue to receive funding, law enforcement departments must comply with all requirements of COPS, which include periodic

progress reports. Foremost, COPS has had played a large role in tailoring the definition of community policing into operational components.

COPS Definition of Community Policing. The definition of **community policing**, according to COPS, involves a detailed overview and identification of key components. Community policing is

... a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies that support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime.³¹

The three key components of community policing are community partnerships, organizational transformation, and problem solving. **Community partnerships** include collaboration among law enforcement agencies, individuals, and organizations they serve to develop solutions to problems and increase trust. **Organizational transformation** is the alignment of organizational management, structure, personnel, and information systems to support community partnerships and proactive problem solving. **Problem solving** is the process of engaging in the proactive and systematic examination of identified problems to develop and evaluate effective responses.³² Let's take a closer look at these components and discover how they work in the community policing model.

Community Partnerships. Partnerships refer to consultation and cooperation between the residents and the police. It also includes collaboration with all stakeholders in the community. Partnerships include legislative bodies, prosecutors, probation and parole, public works departments, neighboring law enforcement agencies, health and human services, child support services, city or county ordinance code enforcement, local business, churches, and schools. The media is also an important partner. In a later chapter, media relations and role will be discussed in depth. Police rarely solve crimes or facilitate solutions to community problems without the help of others.

Partnerships between police and the community mean that communication must work both ways, where police share information with the public and the public share information with the police. Early iterations of community policing began as a public relations campaign to inform the public about what police wanted them to know. True community policing is about a dialogue between key stakeholders and police. Input from the community helps police respond to problems more effectively. Additionally, the residents are accountable and responsible for their role in public safety. Under the traditional model, the public were considered passive receivers of police services and were viewed as a source of information when needed. Often police officers considered citizens as obstacles to important police work. Community policing is an opportunity to mobilize community support and assistance. Partnerships are formed through face-to-face contact and through Neighborhood Watch and other programs. More than ever, police departments use social media and other media sources to engage and inform residents and businesses about problems pertinent to their neighborhoods.

Under the community policing model, police are expected to build relationships and trust with the public, especially in areas where historic animosity existed. Under the

traditional model, police legitimacy was something bestowed upon the police as a legitimate arm of government. Today, police have to earn the respect of the public and are quick to lose it when there is a controversial incident like an officer-involved shooting. Now, policing has become more responsive, more sophisticated, and the organization has had to make changes. Later in the text, creative alliances with special populations are presented. For example, police are now promoting positive relations with juveniles through teen police academies, where teens engage with police officers and learn about policing. Such programs would not be possible without empowering officers to think creatively and to work closer with people in the community. In order to empower officers in the field and bring about a higher level of commitment to the communities they serve, there must be an emphasis on internal changes within the police organization.

Organizational Transformation. Any organizational change, whether large or small, is challenging, but especially when much of the values, policies, practices, and norms are institutionalized. Because community policing involves a different type of response to crime as well as a different relationship with the public, the organization must be transformed to support new objectives. COPS defines organizational transformation as the alignment of management, structure, personnel, and information systems to promote community partnerships and proactive problem solving.³³ The restructuring comprises a shift in philosophy for the entire agency, encompassing climate and cultural transformation of the leadership and personnel. Another important aspect is decentralized decision making and accountability, which allows officers to take ownership and to form relations with members of the community, and to feel empowered to be creative and take risks in finding solutions for crime and disorder. Organizational transformation requires clear strategic planning, policies that articulate the community policing values, measures of police performance that include community satisfaction, address fear of crime, and focus on quality of life of citizens, and establishing greater transparency with the public.

Organizational transformation includes geographic assignment of officers to establish strong relationships, enhanced customer service, and mutual accountability. Some of the original iterations of community policing efforts involved specialized units; however, this was found to create a competitive atmosphere as well as dual police services that were at cross purposes. For example, while community policing officers were trying to form relationships with at-risk youth, traditional officers applied aggressive tactics to gain compliance through fear. Newer implementations of community policing are department wide and not limited to specialized units.

Recruitment of community-minded individuals to serve as police officers is another objective that needed change for the organization. Decades ago, police officers were recruited and hired with traditional practices emphasizing law and order, command and control, and crime fighting. Today, as officers hired with those traditional perspectives are retiring or promoted to administration, new officers are hired in the era of community and problem-solving policing. Organizational transformation promotes the concept that officers should be selected with community policing values in mind, encouraging the hiring of individuals who come to policing with a “spirit of service” rather than a “spirit of adventure.”³⁴

Organizational transformation embraces new technologies to enhance problem solving. Information systems technology enhances data-driven decision making and problem solving. Today, computer-aided dispatch, MDTs in police units, reverse 911,

online reports, interactive mapping, email alerts, and other new technology facilitate problem solving in the field. In recent years, police have adopted new technologies and are in use today—license plate readers, iris and face recognition, body-worn cameras, DNA, biometrics, robots, drones, thermal imaging, and artificial intelligence.³⁵ To address the backlash by the public regarding fatalities by police, much effort is being put into less-than-lethal weapon development. All these innovative technologies, including nonlethal and less than lethal weapons, are tools police currently use, making law enforcement safer and smarter. Along with their tools, police are also using problem-solving methods that look for long-term solutions to community problems.

Problem Solving. The third key component, problem solving, is the new way of thinking about crime and disorder, not just reacting and responding to apply a Band-Aid for the short term but also for prevention, deterrence, and long-term resolution. Problem solving is the process of engaging in the proactive and systematic examination of identified problems to develop and evaluate effective responses. The problem-solving aspect of community policing is proactive rather than reactive. The emphasis on proactive problem solving encourages agencies to develop solutions to the immediate underlying conditions contributing to problems and issues in the community. The attention to the underlying conditions is what makes the difference over time, with the goal of reducing or eliminating the threat or crime altogether. Problem-solving methodologies guide decision making and support innovative solutions. While arrest is not ruled out, it becomes one of the many tools available to police rather than a solution to a problem. A popular, widely used problem-solving tool employed by police is the SARA (scanning, analysis, response, and assessment) problem-solving model. This model, more than others, has been the one most recognized and implemented by countless agencies. SARA is discussed in detail in the Chapter 3.

The definition and description of community policing's key components give us a sense of how different this model is from traditional policing. For example, community policing encompasses the formation of community partnerships, transformative changes in organizational structure, management, personnel, information and technology, as well as the implementation of problem-solving strategies. However, the definition tells us little about what it is that police do differently and why there is a need to do things differently. In later chapters, concrete examples will be presented to showcase innovative programs and why these programs were important to the community. For now, we will examine principles of community policing that serve as the foundational underpinnings of successful programs.

PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNITY POLICING

Thus far, we have defined community policing and identified its key components. In this section, we lay out the core principles of community policing. One of the most prominent proponents and pioneers of the community policing movement, author Robert Trojanowicz, and co-author Bonnie Bucqueroux, set forth 10 principles of community policing. Throughout the past 30 years, these principles have remained applicable despite changes in technology and information systems and kept pace with the evolution of policies and practices in policing. Below is a summary of these principles:

1. Community policing is a philosophy and organizational strategy that emphasizes new ways to solve community problems of crime, fear of crime, and disorder. Law-abiding citizens should have input into police decisions.
2. Everyone in the department, both sworn and nonsworn personnel, must be committed to operationalizing the philosophy into practice. Enlisting the help of the public in their role in policing themselves and by using creative means to solve community problems.
3. Assigning an officer to serve as a Community Policing Officer (CPO) who works directly with the public, through face-to-face contact and who is not held to the isolation of the patrol vehicle.
4. Giving the CPO more time to commit to sustained contact with citizens in the community in a cooperative way to explore creative means to solve community issues. CPOs act as the ombudsman for the community, connecting people to services in the community.
5. Community policing will imply a new contract with the public, promoting greater public participation, less apathy, and less impulse for vigilantism. It also ramps down response time to noncritical incidents, giving police more free time to find long-term solutions.
6. Community policing promotes a proactive component whereby police officers will work to prevent problems rather than just respond to them, although responding to immediate concerns will remain a priority. Community policing expands the police mandate from a hyperfocus on crime toward addressing smaller issues. The intent is to have a greater impact on the quality of life issues facing communities.
7. Community policing stresses the importance of working with vulnerable populations, for example, juveniles, minorities, elderly, poor, homeless, and disabled persons with the goal of enhancing outreach efforts to these groups.
8. Although technology is important, community policing demands that it not get in the way of human contact and collaboration. It promotes people working together to find new approaches to community issues.
9. Sharing information about the community and its important issues should be understood by every member of the police department. Everyone in the police department should be onboard and supporting community policing objectives.
10. Community policing is a new way of thinking about the police and what they do. The public should see the police as a resource to be used to help solve problems in the community. This new way of viewing the police should not be thought of as a tactic to be abandoned for the next new approach, but it should be incorporated into the organizational matrix of the

department. Police should also be able to modify responses and strategies as needed. (pp. xiii–xv)³⁶

These principles demonstrate the unique philosophy of community policing. The entire organization must be committed to the objectives to make it successful. There were problems associated with the establishment of separate units of CPOs to perform specialized tasks and to serve as liaisons between “traditional” officers and the community. This divided force resulted in officers working at cross-purposes. For example, officers were trying to establish relationships with the community, while traditional officers continued to view the members of the community as potential threats. The problems associated with two different types of officers on the same force drove home the principle that everyone in the department needed to be on board with community policing. Today, many departments do employ nonsworn CPOs to extend the services of the police; however, CPOs do not work in the same capacity as the officers themselves.

CONTRAST OF TRADITIONAL AND COMMUNITY POLICING MODELS

Traditional policing is not undone by community policing but is enhanced by allowing officers to be innovative, to use their talents, to collaborate and form relationships with the community and with key stakeholders, not feel less powerful but more supported, and ultimately, more fulfilled in their role as police officers. Three particular aspects separate traditional from community policing models. For one, under the community policing model, police have a very different relationship with the community. Second, police have a broader mission than just crime fighting. And third, community policing involves new ways of solving problems with a focus on long-term solutions.

Police and Community Relations

How does community policing succeed in areas where traditional methods have failed? Above all else, it is the formation of a productive relationship between the police and the public. Traditionally, police are not good at sharing power and authority, especially with civilians. They are trained to take control, be powerful, issue orders, and expect compliance. Collaboration between police and citizens was neither expected nor desired in traditional policing. Under the community policing model, working with citizens in identifying, prioritizing, and solving problems is necessary and expected. It was the lack of collaboration, consultation, and communication that contributed to serious dissention, distrust, and dissonance between the police and the public. In fact, it was the animus between the police and the public that led to this reform movement in the first place. Today, police recognize the importance of gathering insider knowledge of situations, people, and idiosyncrasies in the communities. They understand that the lack of information makes their jobs more difficult.

Expanding the Police Mandate. They have the expertise to handle matters that, in many circumstances, the average citizen is not prepared to solve on his or her own. Under the

traditional model of policing, police preferred to circumvent noncriminal issues by referring people to civil avenues of problem solving. For police, at that time, crime fighting was their primary mandate. How does a community policing model change that approach? Community policing broadens the mandate to include handling other community problems, signs of disorder, fear of crime, quality of life issues, and crime in a partnership with the community.³⁷ **Fear of crime**, a fear of being a victim rather than the actual likelihood of being victimized, was not viewed as a legitimate police concern. In the past, police did not believe that fear of crime was a tangible, solvable problem. Under the traditional model of policing, officers would say to a citizen: “If something is stolen, call us. If you are afraid of it being stolen, don’t call us.” The Flint, Michigan, Foot Patrol Study, conducted in the early 1980s, was one of the first studies that examined the impact that fear of crime has on people and the detriment to the quality of life. This study had a huge influence on the move toward community policing and will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 2. Under the community policing model, police believe fear of crime is a legitimate concern, and they provide a sense of safety and security to the community by validating those concerns with empathy and action.

Contrasting Problem Solving, Information Systems, and New Technologies

Differences between the two models involve some aspects that are not necessarily due to different philosophies but have more to do with modernization of equipment and information systems. Police using problem-solving strategies can tap into highly sophisticated data collections and analytics as well as innovations that were not even imagined in earlier policing eras. For example, DNA, drones, body cams, voice and face recognition, and license plate readers were all developed during the community policing era. There is some concern with the possibilities of overreach, widening the net, invasion of privacy, big brother oversight, and perhaps, even social distancing—all problems community policing hoped to address with improved relations.

Improvements in Problem Solving. Community policing encourages officers to come up with creative solutions to address a vast array of problems, from disorder to murder. For example, innovative solutions for the handling of domestic violence may include follow-up visits and home checks (see Case Study 1.1). Community policing pushes a more intentional and focused approach to problem solving, which includes targeting particular crimes, social disorder, and fear of crime as well as looking for long-term solutions. Problem-solving strategies are aimed at both urgent and critical incidents, such as robberies, assaults, mass shootings, as well as persistent circumstances, such as drugs and homelessness. In future chapters, we will present some of these programs aimed to tackle endemic community problems.

Predictive Policing and Information Systems. Problem solving is not new; however, police departments are employing information systems, data collection, and analysis to make fully informed strategic decisions for long-term solutions. Predictive policing is a method of data collection and analytics to target current and future crime trends.³⁹ Police can work smarter. Even under the traditional model, departments collected huge amounts of data, but such data were not effectively used and applied. Even crime mapping systems have become so sophisticated, and they are able to provide instantaneous updated information

CASE STUDY 1.1: CHULA VISTA POLICE DEPARTMENT RECEIVES INTERNATIONAL AWARD FOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE REDUCTION PROGRAM

One Southern California agency, Chula Vista Police Department, won top recognition at the 28th Annual Problem-Oriented Policing Conference, where it received the 2018 Herman Goldstein Award for Excellence in Problem-Oriented Policing for its study on domestic violence prevention and enforcement strategies. The police department, in partnership with South Bay Community Services, the San Diego County Probation Department, the District Attorney, Child Welfare Services, Adult Protective Services, crime analysts, and research partners, designed and implemented proactive strategies. The undertaking was a huge task to the small but busy department. After the first year, “the results were impressive,” said Police Chief Roxana Kennedy. Rates of domestic violence in the research area dropped by 25%. Additionally, victims reported greater satisfaction of police handling and 92% said they feel confident to call police in the future if they needed help. As the chief noted:

Domestic violence is one of the most common, dangerous, and frustrating problems facing our officers. Officers often find themselves

dispatched to the same addresses again and again. It can be difficult for victims to escape these types of situations. There is a sense of futility and helplessness among both victims and police.

Traditional police strategies require mandated arrest of physical abusers and a list of resources to be supplied to the victim. The victims, often overwhelmed by their circumstances and fearful of their abuser, are unlikely to take action even with the list of helpful resources. The Chula Vista project focused on the offenders, giving them written warnings and continued follow-up at the residence with the offender and victim. The follow-up, repeated warnings to the offender put the offender on notice that the police were coming back. The officers checked on the victim and left notices for the offender if not present. This strategy gave victims more support and prevented further violence in most cases. Police Chief Kennedy stated, “I am very proud of the innovative work of our officers. This is just another example of the commitment our personnel make to keep our community safe.”³⁸

for operations and deployment. Larger law enforcement agencies employ specialized units of crime analysts to assist them with data collection and analysis to inform decision making.

New Technologies and Policing. Certainly, one of the most significant differences between traditional and community policing eras has to do with technological developments and less to do with philosophical transformations. Throughout history, police have adopted new technologies, sometimes with great reluctance and even resistance from the troops. Traditional policing was marked by the innovation of motorized patrol, and ironically, police departments in the community policing era reverted to foot patrol in an attempt to renew closeness to the community. Originally, police officers resisted things like body cams and dash cams because they provided a record of their encounters with the public. They believed the recorded data could be used against them. Later, they realized that this technology also protected them against false accusations. Such technologies fit into the need for greater

transparency of police and citizen interactions. Innovations of DNA, facial recognition, and the like provide better accuracy in convictions.

COMMUNITY ISSUES AND COMMUNITY POLICING

The nature of policing is such that officers do have to sort through problems and help facilitate resolutions, regardless of whether the situation is serious or minor, criminal, or noncriminal. Police officers, under the community policing model, partner with members of the community to identify problems, prioritize, and resolve them. Some issues are serious and may involve strategic, long-term problem solving, such as gangs, drugs, or homelessness. Other problems may involve immediate resolution, such as those involving domestic disputes. No issue is beyond the purview of community police officers, including problems of gangs, drugs, at-risk juveniles, violence, civil disturbances, homelessness, terrorist activity, active shooter situations, domestic violence, prostitution, sex trafficking, and serial killers. Ultimately, police using the community policing proactive model are looking for long-term solutions versus the traditional reactive model where police resolve the issue over and over again.

Unfortunately, because community policing it is thought to be “soft on crime,” many departments abandon it during times of serious crime, such as the 1980s crack epidemic.⁴⁵ Community policing is often viewed as a luxury and not a necessity. Serious crime calls for serious measures. Currently, the move toward the militarization of police is in direct response to incidents of terrorism, mass shootings, and other serious attacks on our communities. This is not a time for community policing, some might argue. Surprisingly, this is exactly the time for community policing. Embracing community policing does not negate military tactics but incorporates military-type weapons and tactics into the toolbox officers have available to them. Throughout this text, we will discover the reason why community policing works, why it is the ideal response to serious crime, and why it is here to stay, as well as understand the challenges and obstacles going forward.

SUMMARY

We have learned that traditional policing is the default model of policing with its rigid paramilitary, hierarchical organizational structure, highly developed chain-of-command, and a focus on reactive, call-answering policing. Community policing is proactive, with the goal of preventing crime and disorder. Under the traditional model, people are labeled as victims, witnesses, or suspects. Under the community policing model, the community members are full-fledged partners with police, and they too have responsibilities to participate in addressing issues in their own neighborhoods. The community policing model softens the organizational structure allowing greater discretion at the patrol officer level, encouraging creative and innovative thinking. It empowers police and the public to form a bond of trust and resiliency to share information and work together. Community policing is proactive, whereby police address issues before they manifest into unmanageable problems.

A little bit of irony exists here in the fact that police, even under a traditional model, do handle a multitude of situations, both criminal and noncriminal. One might argue that community policing does not broaden the role, it broadens the understanding of all that

THINK ABOUT IT: NEW GADGETS FOR POLICE, AND THE FUTURE HAS ARRIVED

Customers wait in long lines for release of new cell phones, often willing to pay big money for all the bells and whistles with new features and capabilities. Sometimes less than a year later, another product hits the market with even better features. It is difficult to keep up with technology and police agencies are no different. Although hindered by limited operational budgets, law enforcement agencies adopt technologies that make their job smarter and safer. Some of the new gadgets police employ today were nothing but science fiction back in the day when community policing was first introduced. The future is here, and in many ways, police can work smarter, safer, and quicker with less chance of wrongful arrests, convictions, or harm to others or themselves. The following are some of the newest developments in technology.

- *Drones:* Police are using drones as first responders to enter dangerous situations, to monitor emergency scenes, for example, a mass shooter or traffic accident. The drones can be used in search-and-rescue efforts to help find missing persons. Drones are used to surveil and map out highly trafficked areas where drugs or other criminal activity occur. They can also be deployed to assess bomb threats or hazardous material spills. And finally, they provide documentation for later use in court.⁴⁰
- *Social media:* Social media is used in many ways and especially effective in the community policing era where relationships and partnerships are key to police effectiveness. Social media increases transparency, and disseminates information widely and quickly, and provides a venue for the public to ask questions. Police can use social media to provide tips for safety, road closures, and announce upcoming community events. Social media is employed to prevent or investigate criminal activity by seeking and

receiving information about suspects and their whereabouts.⁴¹

- *Automated license plate readers (ALPR):* This system has had international adoption, making vehicle license plate comparisons easy and efficient. They utilize high-speed cameras either attached to police patrol vehicles or mounted in strategic areas to capture all plates that come into view. The data captured includes license plates, vehicles, and in many cases, people.⁴² ALPR has successfully identified stolen vehicles and has led to the identification and capture of criminals.⁴³
- *Biometrics:* Fingerprints and blood typing seem rather archaic when compared to the advances that have been made in the area of biometrics. Facial and voice recognition can instantly identify subjects in the field. DNA has improved to the point where even the smallest amount can render impressive information. Everyday there are advancements in the area of biometrics.
- *Domain Awareness System (the Dashboard):* This system, developed by Microsoft Corporation and the New York City Police Department, connects officers out in the field with real-time information and offers pictures and videos of calls in progress as well as providing instantaneous analysis. Officers can make informed decisions prior to arriving at a call.⁴⁴

There are several new technologies currently being developed, too many to list here. For example, voice-activated systems for the siren and other devices make it easier and less dangerous for officers to perform simple tasks. Body cameras and eye wear that record police/citizen encounters are currently being used. It should be noted that some of these inventions are being challenged for privacy issues. Much of our lives are no longer private, however, as our use of computers and social media increases, and law enforcement can take

Continued

advantage of information that comes through social media and other computer technologies.
What do you think?

1. What privacy issues do you see arising out of some of these new technologies?
2. What are some of the advantages and disadvantages of new technology and community relations?

police do. Moreover, the value of police and policing to the public is increased under the community policing model. For the most part, there is little difference in what police did in prior times and what they do now. In the past, police did handle all calls for service; however, only the calls involving crime gave them the status they desired. Handling calls involving crime fulfilled the expectations of the public as well.

In the next chapter, we will elaborate on the lessons learned from the implementation of experimental programs of police–community relations (PCR), team policing, foot patrol, and application of broken windows theory. We will also show how community policing incorporates the principles of Sir Robert Peel in 1829 London by proscribing police function and accountability to the public it serves. Reflecting back to the beginning of this chapter, regarding Delmonte Johnson’s death in Chicago, we wonder what could have prevented the tragedy. The consent decree in Chicago recommended the implementation and expansion of community policing. It did not recommend the deployment of the National Guard. Both community and police need to work together to resolve the rampant violence in Chicago and across America. Police did fail to prevent Johnson’s death, but the community failed as well. What can community policing do differently? The overarching objective of this textbook is to examine the claim that community policing is an effective model to address and resolve most community issues using smarter and more sophisticated strategies.

KEY TERMS

Chain-of-command 5
Clearance rates 9

Fear of crime 18
Preventive patrol 7

Rapid response 8
Unity of command 6

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Discuss the concept of defunding the police. How would it benefit or harm the community and/or the police?
2. Identify and discuss the cornerstones of traditional policing? Why are they important to policing?
3. Define community policing. What are some of the key differences of community policing and traditional policing?
4. What are the principles of community policing? What principle do you think is most important? Which, if any, principle may be problematic and why?
5. What are examples of community issues and problems? How would traditional policing and community policing respond similarly or differently to these problems?