Reprinted

TURNING CONCEPT INTO PRACTICE: The Aurora, Colorado Story

Jerry Williams
Chief
Aurora Police Department
Aurora, Colorado

Ron Sloan
Division Chief
Aurora Police Department
Aurora, Colorado

National Center for Community Policing
School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University

MSU is an affirmative/action, equal/opportunity institution.

This publication was made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation to the School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University. The information contained herein represents the views and conclusions of the authors and not necessarily those of the Mott Foundation, its trustees, or officers.

(#) corresponds to footnotes

1. Implementing Change

All organizations resist change, perhaps none as much as a police department. Anyone familiar with police culture knows how difficult it can be to induce change, especially one as dramatic and far reaching as Community Policing. This is why those of us involved in instituting a department wide commitment to the concept and practice of Community Policing in the Aurora (Colorado) Police Department recognized that the first step in the process should be to examine some of the

basic elements of change and change management theory. Based on our experience, we have identified seven issues that police managers who intend to introduce Community Policing should consider.

The need for a viable change agent

In any hierarchy, the person at the top is responsible for setting both the policy and the tone of the organization. Within a police department, it is the chief who has the ultimate power to make change, particularly a change as substantive as Community Policing. The chief must be dedicated to the importance of adopting a Community Policing approach. Unless there is a strong commitment from the top, it is unlikely that there will be any tangible and lasting change. Dedication to the Community Policing approach is only the first requirement, however.

To be a viable agent of change within the department, the chief must be both visible and credible. Even in a paramilitary organization like a police department, which is built upon adherence to the importance of carrying out direct orders, managers soon realize that true leadership requires more than issuing directives.

For meaningful change to occur, there must be a climate conducive to change, and the chief, as the primary agent of change, must be willing and able to capitalize on opportunities to facilitate change. In any organization, the viable change agent acts as a catalyst, marshalling the elements within the organization who can best institute change productively.

Many contemporary police organizations boast talented and creative people. Few, however, have the ability to effect change by themselves. Without strong initial and continued support from the chief executive, the prospects for successfully implementing Community Policing are gloomy.

The desire of the system to remain stable

All organizations cling tightly to those systems that promote stability. As noted by Broskowski, Mermis, and Khajavi (1975), "Respect for structural mechanisms and roles that promote stability must be maintained, even when one is trying to alter radically the existing system."

Police managers who are developing a plan to institute Community Policing must recognize the need to respect the foundations within the department that promote feelings of stability. A frontal attack on issues as basic as officer safety, effective tactical units, seniority, and equipment allocation will hamper acceptance. Though the proposed change may ultimately dictate changes in other systems, you cannot shift an entire organizational philosophy with a shotgun approach.

Many of the fundamental systems within law enforcement agencies will not only support but encourage a shift to Community Policing. It is important to remember that Community Policing is an improvement of the profession, a way to build upon well established systems that are effective and accepted.

For example, many employees who do not fully understand the Community Policing concept confuse it with community relations. Some go so far as to suggest that Community Policing would take away their right to use physical force to defend themselves. Obviously, that's a mistaken interpretation of the concept, but it highlights the importance of staff training and orientation to its principles.

At Aurora, we have tied training in Defensive Tactics and Arrest Control to the overall philosophy of Community Policing, marrying the well established system to the new concept. As a result, training emphasizes the importance of a physical control system based on using humane but effective control techniques in threatening situations. Such training exercises, handled properly, dispel the notion that Community Policing will reduce the officer's personal safety.

The need for a stay agent and supporting system

In the article "Managing the Dynamics of Change and Stability," Broskowski, Mermis, and Khajavi note that "...a critical variable is the leader's ability to stabilize and maintain the setting after the initially exuberant phase of new creation has subsided." In an article titled "Community Policing: A Practical Guide for Police Officers," Chief Lee Brown of the New York Police Department noted that "often these programs had a curious fate. They were begun with great fanfare, they produced important results, and then faded within the department that had initiated them."

Clearly, someone or something (a process or system) must serve as the established "Stay Agent" to "refreeze" the organization once the desired change takes place. Making the switch to Community Policing will not automatically mean the change will be maintained. Without constant maintenance and supervision of the change, the department is likely to revert to traditional policing procedures.

The need to gauge the pace and degree of change

Officers are an impatient lot. Once the chief announces the need for change and begins taking steps to institute that change, the officer on the street wants to see tangible differences. Yet if the change is profound or if it occurs quickly, you also risk hearing "We're getting this shoved down our throats" or "Too much is happening too fast!" Balancing the need to recognize the virtues of existing efforts with the importance of impressing people with the need for change is a crucial and difficult task. Three important guidelines can help.

- Recognize and reinforce existing efforts to practice Community Policing.
- Gauge the pace of all significant changes taking place within the organization and evaluate whether implementation will be viewed as "too much, too fast."
- Attempt to make the effects of the conceptual change "tangible" so that the lowest level of the organization can see actual change as soon as possible after it is announced.

The need to garner "true" participation

To reduce resistance, remember that you garner ownership through participation. All too often, we practice a form of pseudo participation that others recognize as phony. We hold meetings, require people to attend, and discuss issues, yet there is no tangible product tied directly to the input of the participants.

In the *Harvard Business Review*, Paul R. Lawrence wrote that "real participation is based upon respect. And respect is not acquired by just trying; it is acquired when the staff (manager) faces the reality that (he or she) needs the contribution of the operating people." To engender "true" participation, sessions must:

- Make people feel as though their input is important and respected.
- Allow a participatory environment free of an authoritarian hierarchy, defensiveness, and the threat of reprisal.
- Provide a timely turnaround of input and suggestions into tangible products.

The need to understand the nature of resistance

Those who promote any new change often view the resulting resistance as a reaction to the technical aspects of the change. In the case of Community Policing, we see officers express concern and confusion about the mechanics. They wonder "Will I be making as many arrests?" "Will the paperwork be different?" "How will this change my routine?"

While these are legitimate concerns, they are probably not the most important issues. The truth is that the strongest urge to resist change comes from the consequences that a technical change makes in human relationships and interactions. The real but often unexpressed questions are: "If I change my approach to my job, how will my peers view me?" "Will others still see me as a 'real' police officer?" "Is this really the way that I want to treat people?"

Even the most dedicated and creative officers must deal with the challenge that such feelings pose, and police managers must be sensitive to these fears and concerns. These issues must be raised and resolved in input and training sessions.

Airing concerns can constitute a therapeutic "venting," but allaying fears requires showing officers why Community Policing benefits them. For example, most police officers chose a career in police work because of a desire to help people, so it pays to cite examples that show how Community Policing offers the opportunity to exercise greater autonomy in achieving concrete results in the community. You must provide examples of the personal and professional satisfaction that Community Policing offers.

Other considerations

Among other general considerations for implementing change is that it can be misleading to assume that the motivation of the person making the change is the same as that of the person asked to carry it out. In our in service training sessions, it quickly became evident that line officers appreciate Community Policing's ability to improve the flow of information, provide more useful intelligence, improve the officer's safety, and enhance career opportunities. On the other hand, the chief's motivation may stem from a more comprehensive social agenda.

Though the two views are compatible, it doesn't make sense to try to sell the change on the basis of the greater social merits of the approach when those are not the "hooks" that will appeal to the officers who must carry it out. It makes much better sense to market the change in terms of the areas of perceived improvement from the line officer's point of view.

Another common mistake, particularly on the part of law enforcement officials and academics, is to promote change on the basis of logic and rationality, forgetting the importance of emotion. Explaining the merits of Community Policing versus traditional, reactive, incident driven policing might seem undeniably persuasive, but we must also recognize the emotional commitment that others have made in the "old" approach and strive to help people develop an emotional commitment to the new way.

The final issue is the importance of being a good listener. While it is important to sell the concept, "active" or effective listening is equally as important in paving the way for change. Remember to address the questions in people's minds: "How will criticism be accepted?" "How much can we afford to say?" "Do they really get my point?" "Is he playing games?" "Is he sincere?" "Does he really understand the problems?" "Is he committed to the change?"

This is just a sampling of the likely questions that must be considered, and the feelings that employees leave a training session with after a talk from the chief will have a direct effect on how they apply the philosophy. Good listening, active acknowledgement of individual concerns, and resolution can help overcome resistance to change.

2. Resistance to Change in Law Enforcement Agencies

The most commonly cited examples of organizations with rigid and ingrained bureaucracies are the Catholic Church and the military, but law enforcement also belongs on that list. All exhibit a ranked hierarchy, proliferation of rules, centralization, and resistance to change.

For a police chief to expect significant change in the prevailing police culture in any department in a short period of time is unrealistic, because that culture took generations to evolve. No matter how natural it may seem and how it may harken back to values of the past, a shift to Community Policing will take time and perseverance.

Malcolm K. Sparrow summed up the challenge when he wrote, "...the greater the momentum of a ship, the longer it takes to turn. One comforting observation is that a huge ship can nevertheless be turned by a small rudder. It just takes time, and it requires the rudder to be set steadfastly for the turn throughout the whole turning period."

As the rudder, the chief must also deal with being the focus of the turbulence that turning the ship around always causes. Sparrow's analogy is particularly apt because the chief can be tempted to "bail out" if the personal and professional resistance becomes extreme. In Aurora, the chief was berated with comments such as: "He's only doing this for his own selfish reasons, to improve his resume for another job" and "He just wants to take credit for something that's not even his own idea!"

Any chief who makes such a profound change should not be surprised at the vehemence of the resistance. The challenge is for chiefs and their staffs to develop methods to keep the pressure on the rudder and to exhibit patience as the change takes hold. The goal is to change not just behavior, but the organizational mindset. If we succeed in changing how sworn and nonsworn personnel think and feel, their behavior will reflect their new attitudes.

To accomplish this requires that we maintain gentle pressure on the rudder, until we fulfill the prophecy of being a full service police agency that embodies the Community Policing philosophy in everything we do, from support and technical services to first line emergency service. Only then will the organizational values and culture truly reflect Community Policing.

3. Community Commitment

The Aurora Experiment

As a wise man said, "Once you are moving forward, never look back." Though this axiom holds true in many cases, it is poor advice for contemporary police departments. The best future requires looking back at our history.

Community Policing is based on longstanding principles of belonging to and identifying with the communities we police. With this ownership comes concern for solving neighborhood problems, including the need to address conditions that contribute to fear of crime.

Sound familiar? Obviously, this is what modern public policing was designed to do from its inception. But the evolution of the role of the police has been marked by many forks in the road. Improper political influence of foot patrol in the past led to the advent of the modern police professional as the anonymous professional crime fighter.

Yet we have now reached a point where we recognize the importance of doing more to remain a "public" police, police who answer to the needs and the fears of communities that are far more complex than those our forebears face. We see communities today suffering from urban decay, the proliferation of dangerous weapons, and a deluge of illicit drugs. As we become a more mobile and more technologically advanced society, we also see the police standing removed from the fabric of the communities that they are sworn to serve.

Foot patrols, storefront operations, and other special tactics designed to involve officers in neighborhood life abound, but seldom do we find entire police organizations committed to the ideals of problem solving, community identification and ownership, and reduction of disorder and fear of crime. Community Policing provides a two way dialogue. Well meaning crime prevention and community relations programs allow the

department to talk to people in the community, but they lack the opportunity for the department to listen and respond.

Modern urban policing today often measures effectiveness by assessing outputs such as response times and crime and arrest rates. However, these measures have accomplished little more than forcing departments to become reactive and incident driven. Many cities have ignored qualitative assessments, such as whether citizens are satisfied with their police service and the level of fear of crime people suffer, even though they directly relate to the basic mission of the police department.

Our task is to institutionalize the ideals of Community Policing in everything we do. If this subtle but profound redirection of our efforts is to be both real and lasting, it cannot be the mission of a single specialty unit, and it should not be the mission of only sworn personnel. It must be an integral part of how everyone in the department approaches his or her job, from top to bottom. We also hope that the day will come when our Community Policing Project makes the transition to being viewed as just our normal way of doing business. Until we reach that point, maintaining gentle pressure on that rudder will over time help point us in the direction that we must go.

The Early Years

Crime Prevention From the late 1960s to the mid1970s, the Aurora Police Department was part of the national trend toward strong crime prevention programs supported by federal and state funding for education, training, and implementation. Support Services inaugurated Aurora's Crime Prevention Unit in 1975, and it focused on Neighborhood Watch, Operation I.D., home and business security surveys and education on topics such as Target Hardening.

Community Relations Training. During roughly the same time period, Aurora also placed great emphasis on training all sworn officers in community relations. The training was designed to heighten sensitivity to the unique problems that minorities face and to the need to treat people humanely and with compassion and respect. Unfortunately, the positive results achieved were usually short lived once the officers "hit the streets" and faced the harsh reality of an urban environment.

Direct Contact Patrols (DCP). In the late 1970s, the Aurora Police Department started formal Direct Contact Patrols. Put simply, this effort encouraged motor officers to park their patrol vehicles and walk around specified business areas. Frequent rotation was part of the reason that DCP soon stopped being a viable program.

Informal Park and Walk and Bicycle Patrols. In the past 15 to 20 years, Aurora has initiated a number of informal efforts to put officers in closer contact with the community, but they were never formally embraced as strategies for the delivery of regular police service. Programs came and went, and some demonstrated success in addressing specific community problems, such as liquor law violations, groups of idle teens on the street, and even more serious crimes like burglaries and street robberies.

Direct Action Response Team (DART). In 1981, the Aurora Police Department embarked on an ambitious program to:

- Target high profile crimes, such as street robberies, burglaries and armed retail robberies in selected areas.
- Provide a more versatile and flexible quick response to those identified crimes.
- Place officers who had previously been bound to their vehicles back into closer contact with certain high crime communities.

DART was a special program that placed a contingent of five officers on small (400 cc) motorcycles under the supervision of one sergeant. The DART team was deployed primarily in the northwest section of Aurora, on what is called the Colfax Corridor, a deteriorating section of the city that includes businesses and low income residences.

The DART team produced increased arrests for target crimes and a second team was added, but efforts to deploy teams in new sections of the city were often met with citizen resistance. Over the years, DART evolved from its original mission of targeting special crimes into becoming a tactical and special operations team used for solicitation, prostitution operations, park patrols and sweeps, armed robbery stakeouts, shopping mall patrols during the Christmas season, juvenile problems in residential areas and parks, and crack cocaine and other narcotics raids.

Most recently, DART teams were combined with the dispersed, on call Special Weapons and Tactics Team (SWAT) to make up a fulltime, consolidated DART/SWAT Squad. The squad has since been downsized to provide resources to a Gang Intervention Unit directed at recent youth gang problems.

The DART concept embraced a number of Community Policing principles by removing the officers from their patrol cars and putting them into closer contact with the community. Some communities did begin to feel that they "owned" their officers. But DART was not designed as a problem solving force. Although it was not primarily driven by calls for service, targeting specific crimes is a reactive response to crime, and success was measured by the number of arrests made and not whether the problem was solved. DART also differed from Community Policing because its priorities were set solely by Crime Statistics and investigative information on Part I crimes. There was no structure to assess the community's priorities or to address fear of crime.

Police Area Representative Program (PAR). In the late 1970s, the Aurora Police Department Crime Prevention Unit (CPU) was extremely successful in organizing residents and business owners and managers into cooperative groups designed to help make their neighborhoods safer. The proliferation of Neighborhood Watch groups, business associations, and other loose knit groups grew tremendously into the early 1980s.

In 1982, the Aurora CPU included one sergeant, one agent, five officers, and three nonsworn personnel. The first line supervisor, Sgt. Don Black, recognized the contribution that the CPU made, but he also saw that the role of the police had to change, because they could not fulfill their end of the bargain. The police were urging people to get involved, to do something about the root causes of crime and fear of crime, and to care about each other, but the entire department was not part of that process.

Unlike the understanding Crime Prevention officer, the officer who responded to a call for service was the incident driven, "professional crime fighter," a stranger who did little to reduce residents' fears or solve underlying problems. Responding officers had little opportunity to listen and no incentive to help resolve quality of life issues, because the focus was on "real" crimes and making sure that the "bad guys" didn't get away.

Sgt. Black proposed a pilot project in which a single officer would be assigned to a specific community, where he or she could exercise a great deal of discretion concerning police strategies and techniques that would make the area safer. This Police Area Representative (PAR) officer would continue to carry out the CPU's function of organizing groups, but the PAR officer would do far more than just lecture.

The job was designed to emphasize listening to the people in the community and adopting a problem solving approach to work with them on their concerns and their fears. PAR officers would be afforded the flexibility to work in uniform or plain clothes. Their mode of transportation could run the gamut from driving a marked patrol car to riding a bicycle to walking a beat on foot. Hours would also be flexible, to accommodate the need to work nights and weekends, or on special enforcement operations at different times.

In short, the PAR officer was freed of the responsibility of primary response to citizen calls for service, though he or she still served as a full fledged law enforcement officer. And though officers could switch off so that they could be exposed to different roles, PAR officers were, in practice, permanently assigned to specific areas.

The pilot project was launched in 1983, with one sergeant and five patrol officers, as Aurora's first true Community Policing effort. The five officers were assigned to a section of the city divided into five PAR areas.

A follow-up evaluation on the effectiveness of the concept was positive. The citizens were so pleased with the PAR concept that soon other sections issued appeals for their own PAR officers. The officers involved also liked the concept: job satisfaction among PAR officers was extremely high.

In 1990, PAR has expanded to cover the entire city, with 21 officers assigned to 21 PAR areas, under the supervision of two sergeants. Questions still remaining include accountability and control; size, makeup, and appropriateness of areas; decentralization of PAR offices; and philosophical alignment elsewhere in the department.

4. Implementation of Community Commitment

Introduction of Conceptual Change

During the summer of 1987, the Aurora Police Department, in cooperation with the United States Department of Justice, conducted an eight hour training and orientation session that was mandatory for all sworn officers. The presentation was quite informative about contemporary issues, especially community relations, and, in particular, relations with minorities. However, the scope of the presentation was quite narrow, and it did not provide a comprehensive overview of the philosophy and practice of Community Policing.

To learn more, Chief Jerry Williams contacted Robert Trojanowicz, director of the School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University and director of the National Center for Community Policing housed there. Trojanowicz and several members of his staff developed an initial strategy for assisting the department in implementing Community Policing.

The strategy provided a framework for initial training, community and employee pre and post implementation surveying, and an internal mechanism for monitoring the effort while it was under way. The strategy was refined further after an onsite visit from the MSU team, during which it assessed the demographics of the community and held in-depth interviews with the Aurora police staff to determine the direction that technical assistance should take.

The resulting blueprint identified four important elements:

1. Initial training of all police employees (sworn and nonsworn).

2. Preimplementation surveying of all police employees, with the information tabulated by the MSU team.

3. Preimplementation surveying of approximately 2,000 randomly selected residents and businesses within the community, again with the information tabulated by MSU.

4. Development of an internal mechanism to:

- Obtain employee involvement
- Develop programs and process changes that are "community oriented"
- Evaluate employee and community survey results
- Develop recommendations for training
- Monitor progress toward department wide institutionalization of Community Policing
- Serve as an information source internally and externally about the new efforts

- Document the efforts toward Community Policing

In August and September 1988, Trojanowicz, David Carter, and Bruce Benson, all of MSU, presented a series of four hour introductory training seminars for all employees, sworn and nonsworn. These sessions were important for many reasons:

- They offered outside help from knowledgeable and respected scholars and practitioners of Community Policing as a way to introduce the concept.
- From the beginning, all employees were encouraged to "own" the idea that the Community Policing philosophy would become part of the way the entire department would operate.
- The sessions provided early exposure to how Community Policing is already working in other departments nationwide.

As an adjunct to these sessions, Trojanowicz and his colleagues appeared before the Aurora City Council and the City Manager to educate them about the concept and answer questions. This meeting allowed city officials to see how adopting Community Policing would have an impact on them and their constituents.

After that meeting, the concept was again explained at a public meeting that had been heavily promoted to the community and to the media. The poor turnout verified that one of the biggest challenges in launching the new effort would be to arouse public support. Those who did attend seemed to appreciate how the Community Policing philosophy could materially improve their communities, but it showed us the job left to be done.

Surveying

The Aurora police staff and the MSU team worked together on developing the two surveys that would be given at the beginning of the project to gauge the perceptions and feelings of both the community and police personnel. The post implementation survey was planned for 12 to 18 months later, so that the department could assess how effective the effort had been and what future adjustments might be needed. The post implementation survey of police employees has been completed.

The internal survey contained 48 in-depth questions. It was designed to look at how employees felt about their jobs and to allow them to have input on the direction that Community Policing should take.

The external survey took longer to develop and distribute, since representative, random sampling was of utmost concern. Aurora is a diverse city of roughly 250,000 people, and it was important to ensure that the sample would adequately reflect all segments of the community. It was also important that businesses and institutions, such as schools and churches, be included and that those who live in economically deprived neighborhoods be represented.

After rejecting the use of tax rolls and driver's licenses as too restrictive, the decision was made to use voter registrations. Not only did this provide a good cross-section of the community, but it allowed us to use a computer to select the names and print mailing labels at the same time, thereby eliminating hours of manual labor.

To augment the sample, the department's Community Services Bureau identified churches, schools, and social agencies for additional surveying. City tax rolls were also used to select businesses at random, raising the total number of surveys mailed to 2,100, of which 300 were returned and tabulated.

Special consideration was given to preparing and distributing the surveys so that people were assured confidentiality. To ease concerns, the surveys were mailed back directly to MSU, and it was made clear that demographic coding would not identify the sender. We also provided a Korean language version, since many Aurora residents and business owners are of Korean descent.

Results of the surveys will be discussed in a future publication.

In addition to these two surveys, PAR officers conducted an Initial Needs Assessment to determine crime problems and trends, citizen concerns, and possible solutions. These assessments led to six strategies for addressing the problems with a Community Policing approach:

- All PAR officers should develop or redevelop Neighborhood Watch groups in their areas.
- All officers should continue to identify problems and concerns and formulate programs and strategies to remove or control them.
- Visibility of PAR officers should be enhanced, whenever possible. Though the Community Services Bureau has only two marked vehicles, PAR officers should use them whenever possible, as well as magnetic door placards.
- All PAR officers should direct investigative and intelligence efforts to problems and concerns in their areas.
- All PAR officers should maintain open communication among all bureaus, units, and divisions within the department to facilitate a cooperative effort.
- PAR officers should make every effort to develop effective working relationships with patrol officers in their areas.

Core Team

In discussions with the MSU team, suggestions were solicited about how to install a formal mechanism to promote internal participation and representative input into the Community Policing project. The idea for a collaborative task force comprised of representatives from all groups within the department was simply unworkable, so we developed a Core Team with overall responsibility for identifying and meeting with various groups in the department about how to implement Community Policing in their jobs.

In late 1988, the new Core Team was formed, and the initial makeup included a facilitator (division chief); Community Services Bureau commander; Patrol Bureau commander(s); Training Bureau commander; Public Information officer; nonsworn employee representative; supervisor or above from Investigations; and Staff Inspections Bureau commander. They adopted as their mission: "To provide a catalyst for change from traditional policing styles to the institutionalization of the interactive, problem solving approach of Community Oriented Policing, through department wide participation and input, review of surveys, development of proposals, recommendations for training, and evaluation of overall efforts."

Their first project was to identify groups within the department that might have special needs or concerns regarding Community Policing, called Advisory Input Groups. The groups consisting of sworn personnel included the police association, female police officers, minority officers, PAR Teams, Investigations, Traffic, Training, Field Training Officer staff, K9 officers, Special Assignments Bureau officers, and six officers (three from North and three from South).

The groups of nonsworn personnel included Communications, Technical Services (Property, Detention, Records), Clerical, Front Desk (Switchboard), Crime Scene Investigators, Investigations, Minority, NonSworn Supervisory, and NonSworn Professional/Administrative/Technological.

The Core Team scheduled at least an hour for discussion with each group, and the schedule was maintained, even though it soon became obvious that many groups overlapped. The next step was to develop a framework to gather information from each group. The challenge was to structure the mechanism to encourage freedom of expression, yet limit the discussion to productive issues. The Core Team decided that:

- Advisory group participation had to be voluntary.
- Each group's representative would be contacted by a Core Team member, preferably the facilitator, to provide information on the intent and format of the meeting in advance.

- The discussion would be confined to five areas, all related to Community Policing, and the agenda would be monitored by the facilitator.
- Core Team members were urged not to become defensive or combative with Advisory Group input at meetings.
- The Core Team members were never to invoke their rank formally at any time during the meetings.
- Every effort would be made to turn workable Advisory Group suggestions into tangible programs within a reasonable time.

The memo sent to the Advisory Group representatives urged them to limit their comments in discussions to:

- Their understanding of the Community Policing philosophy.
- Specific tactics, strategies, and methods to implement Community Policing in their area or in others that affect them.
- Specific tactics, strategies, and methods already in use that reflect Community Policing.
- Training needs in regard to Community Policing.
- In addition to its mission statement, the Core Team also developed a list of ten goals and responsibilities. The 1989 agenda includes:
- Evaluating the results of the internal and community preimplementation surveys upon receipt.
- Meeting with identified diverse interest groups throughout the department for advisory input.
- Formulating proposals and recommendations regarding Community Policing for executive and command staff review and action.
- Receiving, distributing, and cataloging Community Policing literature.
- Monitoring training needs regarding Community Policing.
- Enhancing both internal and external (public) image of the department regarding Community Policing.
- Providing up-to-date status reports and information to department and city personnel.
- Evaluating the progress of Community Policing proposals and strategies.
- Encouraging direct community involvement in the department's Community Policing efforts.
- Providing constant encouragement and reinforcement toward department wide institutionalization of the Community Policing philosophy.

The adoption of the Core Team itself was a major step in institutionalizing Community Policing. It not only provides a formal mechanism to evaluate processes and programs, but it also serves as a watchdog to maintain momentum.

The Core Team is cognizant of the fact that it is not the only catalyst for producing new Community Policing efforts, but its role is to be the focal point and cornerstone of support. With this in mind, the Core Team continues to be involved in making recommendations, evaluating surveys, directing training needs, and providing support by giving credit to individuals and groups who initiated ideas, suggestions, and projects.

The Core Team also realizes that the PAR program provides the foundation for the entire department's commitment to Community Policing, so many recommendations focus on coordinating the activities of other units and sections to that effort. We hope that by using the strengths of our own "special" program, we will be able to achieve even more success in institutionalizing Community Policing departmentwide.

Core Team Recommendations

Once the Core Team began to meet with the Advisory Groups, we wanted those efforts to have a direct and noticeable impact on operations as soon as possible. Some changes could be effected immediately, while others would obviously require much more time and effort.

The Core Team was never intended to have the organizational authority to dictate change, so it soon became apparent that there was a need for a systematic approach to advocating change. The format requires each proposal developed to address 10 elements.

1. *Divisions Affected*. This section provides notice, up front, of the major areas of impact the recommendation will have so that key personnel affected can be asked to review the proposal and respond.

2. *Core Team Contact*. This identifies the contact person within the Core Team who can be contacted for further information and who will have continuing responsibility for monitoring the proposal.

3. *Recommended By*. This is simply designed to give credit where credit is due. By reflecting the contributions of the Advisory Groups, we hope to generate a sense of true participation.

4. *Proposal*. This section lines out the general idea, with no rigid requirement for specifics and details. The goal is to allow flexibility, so that people feel free to note suggested methods and alternatives without concern that a proposal would be rejected because of details.

5. *Community Policing Objectives*. This assures that all recommendations reinforce the Community Policing commitment. It also serves as a check, because experience shows that many proposals are amended when they are compared to the basic principles of Community Policing that they are designed to promote.

6. *Method of Adoption*. As part of our effort to "refreeze" any changes that result, the method of adoption was viewed as a crucial part of implementation. In most cases, this means developing Departmental Directives or Standard Operating Procedures to lock in the change. In some cases, it requires adapting training guides and manuals to secure the shift in practice.

7. *Negative Impacts*. Though this might seem counterproductive, it is essential to troubleshoot proposals for potential limiting factors. This allows us to deal with problems up front, saving both time and effort in defending the proposal against those who won't like it or who adopt an "it won't work because" approach.

8. *Bureau Responsibility*. This places the responsibility for implementation in the appropriate area, at the appropriate level. Almost always, after review, the proposal is assigned for follow-up and implementation to the commander of the bureau noted in this section.

9. *Adoption Time Period*. This helps move the project along; without performance dates, nothing will happen.

10. *Program Evaluation*. Each proposal is assigned to a Core Team member who is responsible for monitoring its progress and providing a written evaluation within a specific time frame, usually several months after adoption.

The final step in the process requires using the existing command structure to obtain advice and endorsement. The information is first presented to the executive staff (chief, division chiefs, staff lieutenant, and legal advisor) at one of their weekly meetings. If they identify significant problems in content or direction, the proposal goes back to the Core Team for revision. If it passes, it is then presented and discussed at the weekly meeting of the command staff, made up of all bureau commanders and other key departmental staff.

While there is usually a lively discussion of the merits, drawbacks, and limitations of the proposal at these meetings, unless there is outright rejection of the original intent, the proposal is then assigned to a member of the command staff for implementation. In most cases, this process builds a sense of ownership, and the individual assigned the task of making the proposal a reality is usually responsible for formulating a method of implementation.

The entire process achieves several goals:

- It allows fuller exploration and utilization of the expertise within the organization.

- Members everywhere within the organization can experience "true" participation and ownership in the entire process.
- Numerous checks and balances help keep proposals on track with the overall philosophical bent.
- The chief can exercise considerable influence on the implementation of change.
- The executive staff invests its trust and confidence in top level command officers to manage their areas of concern.
- It challenges those who embrace the responsibility to produce tangible results.
- Change can go from thought to action in a readily identifiable and logical process.

5. Training

Training helps make changes real, and it also helps make them stick. We have approached the issue of training from several fronts.

Recruit Officer Classroom Training. The basic recruit officer training curriculum contains four hours dedicated solely to familiarizing trainees with the practice of Community Policing, but the philosophy is expressed throughout the entire curriculum. We do not spend much course time on the philosophy, because we reinforce it through practice in courses such as patrol procedures; handling domestic violence; handling the mentally ill; arrest control and defensive tactics; use of deadly force; and classes in state, local, and juvenile law.

All Training Academy staff are fully trained in the principles of Community Policing, so it is actually part of our entire 800 plus hour curriculum. The staff is becoming more and more adept at reinforcing the ideals of officer community identification, problem solving, community disorder and fear of crime, establishment of two way dialogue with the community, and setting priorities with input from the community.

Recruit Officer Field Training. This intense, 14 week, on-the-job training program requires trained, veteran field officers to evaluate recruits every day. We have made several changes in the existing program to instill Community Policing principles:

- We now devote 10% of the 40 hour in service training of field training officers to Community Policing.
- We have added three new job tasks (for a total of 29) to the list used to evaluate recruits each day:

l. Job Task Category #24 Knowledge and Application of Resources in Daily Work

2. Job Task Category #25 Responsiveness to Quality of Life Issues in Performance

3. Job Task Category #26 Relationship with the Community

Community Policing principles are now reflected through the job task categories and also specifically within the minimum acceptable standards for each category. Examples include:

#6 Situation Control/Communications and Command Bearing. Gains and maintains control of situation acceptably communicates clearly with appropriate voice inflection and body language speaks with authority in a calm, clear voice doesn't over control not authoritarian when it is not necessary.

#7 Control of Conflict/Physical Skill/Appropriate Use. Uses appropriate levels of force maintains control without excessive force acceptable physical condition applies training in techniques and tactics correctly.

#13 Field Performance/Non-Stress Conditions. Properly assesses and handles routine situations sees the whole problem takes appropriate action and completes the tasks.

#24 Knowledge & Application of Resources in Daily Work. Has an acceptable knowledge of commonly used community resources and is improving that knowledge base as reflected in verbal or written tests scores between 70% and 95% on written tests makes appropriate referrals on a daily basis maintains a list of referrals for reference in the field takes the time to explain options and resources makes sure information is correct.

#25 Responsiveness to Quality of Life Issues in Performance. Generally recognizes the importance of quality of life issues in the community and properly addresses them in daily work self initiates activities such as those noted above uses some innovative approaches to problem solving committed to the idea of community service courteous, empathetic, and helpful in daily contacts tries to solve problems rather than avoid them or just take reports.

#26 Relationships with the Community. Generally interacts positively with the community gets out of the car when possible and communicates well with citizens fully explains actions and directions to citizens concerned about community problems and talks to people about alternative solutions helpful follows up on citizen questions works together with the community to solve problems challenges the community.

Employee In Service Training

Because the Aurora Police Department intends to infuse the entire department with the Community Policing approach, we must pay special attention to training nonsworn as well as sworn personnel. We have held several formal and informal sessions on how the concept applies to jobs performed by nonsworn employees. We organized quality circles and work groups within the Technical Services Bureau (Communications, Records, Detention, Property, and Vehicle Impound) to brainstorm how these groups can contribute to the overall shift.

We have discussed future nonsworn in service training sessions with the Technical Services Bureau and Training Bureau commanders, and training needs assessments include adopting formal training in the philosophy at hiring.

In service training of all sworn officers, lieutenants and below, consists of a 40 hour block each calendar year, and four hours of that is dedicated specifically to Community Policing. The block includes a one hour presentation and a question and answer session by Chief Jerry Williams. The next hour is devoted to a practical discussion with a Core Team member, structured around an outline of the principles involved.

The final two hours provide instruction in formulating goals and objectives, with discussion about their relationship to the Departmental Mission Statement. This session concludes with an analysis of a contrived scenario involving a fictional urban police department. The officers read the scenario with the perspective of their current role (patrol officer, detective, traffic officer, etc.) and how it relates to a particular area of the city. Then the students are required to set one Community Policing goal and two supporting objectives relevant to the conditions in that part of the city. The exercise not only reinforces the practical application of Community Policing, but it also offers practice in setting goals and objectives.

Two key concepts are emphasized throughout the training sessions:

Risk Taking. For Community Policing to work, we need to tap the potential of the rank and file, and unless we create a climate conducive to taking risks, the concept will never be fully realized. To lessen the line officer's fear that he will be disciplined for an honest mistake requires developing support for risk taking within command and supervision. We must enhance opportunities for trust from top to bottom in the hierarchy, and this requires that assurances and guarantees emanate from the top, the chief and the division chiefs.

Accountable Creativity. We coined this term to illustrate that Community Policing is not an excuse for discarding the fundamental ethics and responsibilities of the public police. A small fraction of the people in any organization will attempt to exploit change, and it must be understood that the shift to Community Policing does

not mean officers can neglect traffic safety, "schmooze" with people in the community to no purpose, or indulge in corruption. We have invested considerable effort in encouraging risk taking and innovation, and we do not intend to have our public trust threatened by those who would distort the ideals of Community Policing.

The format for yearly in service Community Policing courses will be periodically reevaluated, but whatever the specific courses for each year, the Community Policing philosophy will permeate each class.

Supervisory and Mid-Management Training

Supervisory and mid-management training in the philosophy and practice of Community Policing has taken two forms: Performance Evaluation Training and Community/Problem Oriented Policing Supervision.

The captains initiated the Performance Evaluation meetings, discussions, and training sessions as a way to come to grips with the issue of qualitative versus quantitative performance assessment. We are currently exploring how to restructure the existing performance evaluations so that they will contain goal and objective setting criteria for Community Policing. We are also researching the development of a new sworn and nonsworn qualitative assessment tool.

In a training session on setting performance standards, Dr. Richard Hoerl, a private organizational development consultant, provided valuable information on applying standards. We opened the session with a short presentation on Community Policing principles, to reinforce to sworn and nonsworn supervisors the kinds of goals and objectives that we are striving to achieve.

We require supervisors and mid managers to attend an eight hour in service class on Community/Problem Oriented Policing Supervision offered at the Aurora Police Training Academy. It includes several hours of discussion on the practical application of Community Policing principles, three hours on Problem Oriented Policing, and three hours of a practice exercise designed to test the supervisor's role in coordinating and supervising such efforts.

Command and Executive Staff Team Building and Training

At least twice a year, the command and executive staff are required to attend daylong teambuilding and strategic planning sessions. These workshops include exercises on how to conduct environmental scanning and then apply current enabling and limiting factors to the overall departmental mission. We develop, reevaluate, and update the departmental strategic plan at these sessions, and the 1989 plan required implementing the majority of the program by January 1, 1990.

Outside "Specialty" Training

As discussed above, Trojanowicz and his colleagues from the National Center of Community Policing provided initial training, and Trojanowicz returned to Aurora to provide an update on overall efforts. In addition, the Core Team identified the crucial need to augment these efforts with opportunities to learn from other police departments that have already embraced Community Policing.

As a result, five members of the Aurora Police Department traveled to the Houston (Texas) Police Department, and five went to the Tulsa (Oklahoma) Police Department. Site visits are planned and supervised by a Core Team member and are financed through law enforcement training funds received from local Victim Assistance Surcharges.

Each site visit team is required to prepare a wrapup report, and plans are underway to use rank and file members of the team to provide short presentations for other members of the department. Future efforts will also include inviting inspirational individuals involved in Community Policing in the United States and Canada to share

information.

6. Initial Critical Issues

To formalize and institutionalize the Community Policing effort at Aurora, the department felt that certain fundamental issues had to be addressed. The first order of business was to adopt a formal definition of the Community Policing concept as a Department Directive.

Formal Definition

The formal definition of Community Policing was adopted from the book *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective*, by Trojanowicz and Bonnie Bucqueroux:

> Community Policing: A philosophy and not a specific tactic, Community Policing is a proactive, decentralized approach designed to reduce crime, disorder, and, by extension, fear of crime, by intensely involving the same officer in the same community on a long term basis, so that residents will develop the trust to cooperate with police by providing information and assistance to achieve those three crucial goals. Community Policing employs a variety of tactics, ranging from park and walk to foot patrol, to immerse the officer in the community, to encourage a two way information flow, so that the residents become the officer's eyes and ears on the streets, helping to set departmental priorities and policies...improved police/community relations is a welcome byproduct of this approach, not its primary goal.

It is our intent that this formal message endure as the official statement of departmental philosophy.

Department Mission and Symbols

In strategic planning sessions held in 1986, the Aurora Police Department adopted this mission statement: "To provide quality police service to our community by promoting a safe environment through police and citizen interaction, with an emphasis on integrity, fairness, and professionalism." When we adopted Community Policing as a department wide approach in 1988, the Core Team expressed the desire to identify with the philosophy in a more symbolic way. As a result, the first effort involved developing a new slogan to replace "To Protect and Serve" that could be used with the new logo that we had developed.

We wanted to find two or three words to symbolize the department's ethos, a slogan that we could hold out to the public as a visible sign of what we stand for. After a great deal of discussion, we adopted the slogan "Community Commitment." On the cover of this publication, you can see how we integrated the slogan into our new logo. This is now the official symbol of the department, used on marked police cruisers, as well as all our letterhead, envelopes, business cards, banners, and other promotional items.

The Core Team also developed a definition of the slogan.

> The underlying philosophy or style of providing public police services which embodies the concepts of police employee/community identification, ownership, and trust; two way dialogue between the police organization and the community; a problem solving approach to the delivery of police services; attention to those factors that contribute to deteriorating conditions in neighborhoods and community decay; official recognition and an action oriented approach to those issues which give rise to fear of crime in the community; a skilled utilization of the network of governmental and community resources through the use of specific referrals and coordination; and an orientation toward the facilitation of community self help through involvement, knowledge, and organization.

Department Recruitment and Promotion

The City of Aurora Civil Service Commission has the responsibility for recruitment, entry level testing, and promotional

testing of sworn police officers, and history shows that it has been difficult to encourage them to change their methods. However, because we recognized the importance of hiring and promoting individuals suited to Community Policing, we provided the commissions with a great deal of information on Community Policing toward the goal of persuading them to adapt to our new needs.

As a result, in 1989, several readings in Community Policing were added to the required reading list for promotional examinations. In addition, the assessment centers that evaluate the supervisory and management ranks now note Community Policing as a fundamental issue within the department, including the concept in the assessment process.

The department's direct role in hiring has been limited to having Training Academy staff participate in oral interviews of candidates. So we developed questions designed to gauge a candidate's attitudes toward issues such as community identification, problem solving, and communication for the staff to use in these interviews. We also hope to make further inroads into the personnel process so that present and future employees will embody Community Policing even more.

7. Major Initiatives

From the beginning, we have said that the Aurora Police experiment with Community Policing demands changing every element of the way that we conduct our business. These changes, although sometimes subtle, need to be supported by the processes, systems, and structures that are the underpinnings of the department. What follows are the major areas that need to be modified for Community Policing to become part of the very fabric of all jobs within the department. Though the Core Team is working on a number of proposals, these are the most significant.

Performance Evaluations

How we direct, reward, and reinforce Community Policing is crucial to its success. The old performance evaluations assessed 12 areas, and they were recently anchored to the standards of performance developed by the job task analysis. Yet the evaluations suffered from allowing the raters great latitude in interpreting priorities within categories, and none of the standards were specific to Community Policing. At the same time, the danger in being too specific about the Community Policing aspects of each job risks creating a performance evaluation manual ten feet thick.

Our first effort to include Community Policing in the performance evaluation system was in patrol, through a recommendation called Patrol Objective Setting. The heart of the recommendation was to add new categories, such as:

- Community Surveys
- Community Meetings
- Crime Analysis Information
- Investigative Bulletins
- Command/Supervisory Input
- PAR Officers
- Traffic Bureau Information

The Core Team felt that shifting from traditional objectives based primarily on information received from a "closed" rather than an "open" police system of information assessment would result in a patrol force more responsive to the community's needs, desires, and fears.

The next step was to move toward an evaluation system that rewards those who best reflect this kind of setting of objectives. We wanted to move away from traditional "bean counting" assessments, where the number of

arrests and summonses served as the primary measure of an officer's effectiveness. We also had to balance that goal with the concerns expressed by supervisors and command officers about maintaining productivity and accountability.

As a result, we are trying to blend measuring quality with measuring quantity. We realize that totally abandoning minimum standards for enforcement would work for self disciplined self starters, but that might spell doom for others who are less motivated to engage in self initiated neighborhood problem solving.

The debate over this complex issue continues to rage; however, we have made gains in making the transition to new evaluation standards that reflect Community Policing.

Individualized Goal Setting. As an integral part of the overall annual evaluation process, each patrol employee is now required to set quarterly goals that are unique to the community in which the person works. The goals are developed through assessment of neighborhood priorities and needs.

Performance Evaluation Task Force. The command and supervisory staffs, as noted earlier, are involved in assessing a new performance evaluation system that will not only reflect Community Policing, but which will be perceived as equitable. Again, it must blend collaborative goal setting with minimum quantitative measures.

One Evaluation System. The goal is to adopt a process of evaluation flexible enough to be used with all employees (one that is anchored in certain fundamental principles), but which can be customized to individuals and groups, both sworn and nonsworn.

Qualitative Measures. No matter what system is eventually adopted, measures of quality must take precedence over measures of quantity.

Patrol Beat Restructuring/Interaction with PAR

The PAR program has demonstrated success, especially in generating information and providing understanding about the communities we serve. But ever since its inception in 1982, PAR officers have had an on again/off again relationship with regular patrol officers, and communication has suffered. In addition, the regular patrol officers have not been able to develop the kind of relationship with the community that we desire.

We have had to address these problems in several ways. First, we restructured the patrol beats to coincide with our existing PAR areas, which had already been identified as neighborhoods or communities of interest. Therefore, in January 1989, the 21 PAR areas became the 21 patrol beats.

The next step was a bit more difficult. Because of staffing deficiencies and because of policy direction, patrol officers would traditionally rotate their beats quite often. Seldom was an officer formally assigned to a beat for six months: beats were usually rotated monthly.

Changing policy was no problem, but that didn't solve the problem of staffing deficiencies patrol officers are frequently taken out of beats to fill large vacancies elsewhere. We continue to emphasize that, whenever possible, reassigning and redistributing efforts must focus on trying to retain officers in their primary beat assignments.

The final leg of this initiative was to encourage and enhance cooperation and communication between patrol and PAR officers. The physical reconfiguration has helped, but the most significant improvements have been made by individual officers, both patrol and PAR, who have initiated communication with their opposite counterparts.

Gains have also been made now that we require PAR officers to attend patrol briefings, and we also require patrol officers to attend PAR neighborhood meetings. We have initiated cooperative projects involving patrol, PAR, Investigations, and special units. Having PAR officers periodically provide assistance to patrol officers in handling calls for service is also effective.

We have also restructured the Investigative Bureau to improve community identification and trust, as well as to improve communication with all direct departmental operations in those areas. We are cautious about identifying one detective as a generalist in a Patrol/PAR beat area, but we have been able to improve the communication and coordination between detectives and the patrol and PAR officers in areas in which they are working.

Identifying and Rewarding Community Policing

Feedback indicates that many Community Policing initiatives do not receive adequate recognition, so we decided that we should first identify and measure what we are currently doing. Our computers can analyze the Daily Field Activity Report (DFAR) that patrol officers fill out, so we decided to adjust our software to note activities that relate to Community Policing, while maintaining the integrity of the data that we have always collected.

Yet we still needed something more. We have a quarterly recognition program, but, as in most departments, they focus on acts of heroism or bravery. Rather than dilute that program, we have added a Community Commitment Award, to recognize those who go the extra mile to build trust, solve community problems, and reduce fear of crime in the community.

Internal and External Communication

Within any large organization, there are always problems maintaining effective internal communication. And public institutions, including the police, also have problems communicating with the public. When the Core Team met with various Advisory Groups, we found that many groups felt that poor internal and external communication hampered their ability to fulfill the principles of Community Policing.

They said that communication was the key to effective problem solving, establishing a two way dialogue, and building trust. To confront this problem, we are instituting a number of changes (some of which were discussed earlier).

Now that we have state-of-the-art video equipment, the Training Academy has a powerful tool that it can use to improve communication immediately. Following is a description of projects planned or underway:

Monthly News Video. Since February 1989, we have produced a monthly news video for internal use that focuses on major events, policy changes, and training issues. It now often includes a segment on the status of Community Policing efforts.

Educational Videos. We are currently developing and producing videos on support functions of the department (Communications, Records, Front Desk, Vehicle Impound, Property, and Detention), for presentation to citizen and business groups. We require nonsworn employees to represent the department when these videos are aired at community meetings. We believe that it is vital for the public to have a fuller understanding of these important behind the scenes functions of the department if they are to support Community Policing.

Department Information Videotape. The Core Team is involved in producing a video that depicts the basic process of how calls for service are handled. The tape will show what happens when a person calls the department the call comes in to Police Communications, then patrol officers are dispatched. It will also portray the roles of the other support functions, such as investigators, all the way to case filing and trial.

People need to know how we assess priorities and why a nonemergency call may not receive an immediate response. This video can help them see not only why the shift to Community Policing may increase response time in some cases, but also how the entire community benefits overall.

In addition to efforts involving video, the Core Team has launched other initiatives designed to promote communication and interaction:

- Development of better internal and external reference directories.
- Establishment of a better system of accountability for telephone requests and inquiries from the public.
- Publishing a monthly internal newsletter that highlights department activity and changes.
- Use of computers, electronic bulletins boards, and FAX machines to improve communication between districts and other offsite police locations.
- Adoption of Standards of Performance and Strategic Plans to improve vertical teambuilding in all areas of the department.

Patrol Officer Availability for Community Interaction

The Aurora Police Department faced a challenge in developing ideas to encourage motor patrol officers to get out of their cars and interact with the community. If officers are to exercise this new freedom, it means that they will no longer be as close to their Mobile Digital Terminals (incar computers), and that requires changes in procedures and operations for nonsworn Dispatch personnel.

Patrol officers continually tell the Core Team that whenever they leave their cars to talk to people in the community, they face problems. Sometimes it's because dispatchers chastise them for being away from their computers, or dispatchers urge them to handle nonemergency calls instead. Other times, a dispatcher may send an officer from an adjacent district in to handle a nonemergency call, creating friction among patrol officer. And patrol officers also worry about being out of their cars when an emergency call comes in.

On the other hand, Communications personnel also have complaints. They note that procedure requires them to dispatch nonemergency calls within a certain period time, so they do not have the flexibility to wait. They have also had problems with officers who do not let them know when they were out of their cars talking to people, which causes concern for their safety and which makes supervisors wonder whether they are actually doing the job. Other concerns include problems with holding calls and the potential for huge backlogs.

Although these issues have not been completely resolved, supervisors and managers from both Patrol and Communications are working on answers. We hope that this collaborative effort will balance availability and accountability with the need to put officers in closer touch with the community.

Police MiniStations

Decentralizing police service so that it is readily accessible to the community is an important goal, but one that quickly runs afoul of budget constraints and NIMBY Not In My Backyard. We plan to open two offices in the community during 1990, but we must move slowly.

To cut costs and foster a commitment from the community, the space and most of the furnishings for the new offices will be donated. Some of the staffing of these ministations will be handled by volunteers, but in no case will we pay for additional personnel. We will limit the hours for public "walkin" traffic, and these ministations will not be used for primary deployment of department resources.

We hope that by implementing the MiniStation experiment we can dispel concerns about coping with rising budgets in future lean times. We feel that is essential to provide a way for the department to work with people other than at headquarters and in our substations.

Special Programs

Although our basic thrust is to instill Community Policing in our everyday functions, we do see the need for special programs and strategies. One special program that involves the police department, the community, and the city government is called the Macon Moline Project, where we use various strategies to reduce drug and gang problems in an area dominated by crack cocaine and dilapidated apartments. Patrol officers and retail merchants in the Colfax Corridor, which has substantial problems with transients and related petty crime, have now initiated an effort called the "COP CARE" program. These efforts illustrate what a Community Policing approach can achieve, and we hope that they serve as the groundwork to spark other creative efforts.

8. The Challenges Ahead

As with any major undertaking that involves so much change, we face problems and challenges beyond those that the public police are forced to contend with. But as a conclusion to this report, we would like to identify and discuss the issues particular to the Community Policing approach that all departments making the shift must contend with.

Community Involvement

It's far easier to talk about improving the department's interaction with the community than to achieve that goal. We have been struck by the apathy that we must contend with. We know that we must maintain formal groups and organizations so that people and their police can work together, but we have already seen participation in our Neighborhood Watch programs decline, and we have seen the Community Police Partnership forum in Aurora and Denver literally die.

Yet we are encouraged by the renewed interest in efforts to combat neighborhood decay exhibited by homeowners' associations and the growing concern in the business community about their relationship to the police. Becoming an integral part of such groups will remain top priority as we move into the future.

The ideal is to create an environment that allows members of the community from all walks of life to have input into police priority setting and police development. The now defunct Police Community Partnership was the perfect forum, but lack of community involvement dramatically reduced its effectiveness. We will continue to make efforts to find a similar vehicle in the future.

Political Influence and Corruption

It would be extremely naive to presume that a police department that encourages its employees to become more interactive with the community does not risk having those officers become a target of political influence. The image of the old-fashioned beat cop as the tool of local politicians still lingers today. Through training as well as communication about our organizational ethics, we remain vigilant in warning our employees of the danger, and we closely monitor the effort for signs of problems.

Police leadership has the ultimate responsibility for instilling ethics in the department. In an article in the 1988 issue of *Perspectives in Policing* by Mark H. Moore and Robert Trojanowicz, "Corporate Strategies for Policing," the authors wrote:

> ...what the police must take from their legal foundation is the obligation to say no to the community when the community asks them to do something that is unfair, discriminatory, or illegal. In the end, although it is valuable for the police to seek a close working relationship with the community by being responsive to community concerns, the police must also stand for the values of fairness, lawfulness, and protection of constitutional rights. Indeed, they must defend those interests from the interests of the politically powerful.

This issue may be the biggest obstacle that Community Policing faces. Because of the importance of maintaining the gains in public confidence that we have made in the past 50 years concerning our ability to provide fair and unbiased delivery of public safety, we must keep constant vigil over our actions as public police.

Fiscal and Budgetary Constraints

It has often been argued that investing in Community Policing requires more funding. To ask officers to spend more time with citizens and business people, to ask them to pay more attention to disorder, and to ask them to develop and implement more problem solving efforts would seem to demand more people, more equipment, and more time.

It's true that Community Policing puts a demand on police resources, but the same could be said of traditional efforts. The fact is, if you give the police more resources, they can be more effective. What we are trying to do in Aurora is demonstrate that Community Policing can be achieved with existing resources that a change of heart and mind matters as much as the total dollars spent.

Part of the challenge requires educating the public that there is no free lunch. We cannot arrive immediately to commiserate about the theft of a bicycle that is long gone, if that means pulling an officer from a program aimed at juveniles that holds the promise of preventing more bicycle thefts overall in the future.

People must recognize that each time an officer comes to help them when they have locked their keys in the car, they are expecting a highly trained professional, paid at a relatively high rate, to provide service for "free" that actually costs them more in taxes than if someone else in the private sector did the job. We also hope that as our officers educate people about problem solving, they will settle more of their differences informally, without involving as much police time.

This paper has provided an overview of the major issues that will influence the future of Community Policing in the Aurora Police Department resistance to change, the conceptual challenge, understanding the philosophy and practice, performance assessments and rewards, department wide institutionalization, physical deployment, community apathy, the potential for corruption, response time, and reduction of services. We will meet these issues head on as we make the transition from the traditional policing of the past to the Community Policing of the future. Wherever our journey leads us, we are confident that the coming generation of police employees at the City of Aurora (Colorado) Police Department will embody our new slogan Community Commitment.

Works Cited

Braiden, Chris. "Community Policing: Nothing New Under the Sun." Edmonton (Ontario, Canada) Police Force, December 1987.

Broskowski, Anthony, William L. Mermis, Jr., and Farrokh Khajavi. "Managing the Dynamics of Change and Stability." *The 1975 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators,* 173-177.

Brown, Lee P. "Community Policing: A Practical Guide for Police Officers." *The Police Chief*, August 1989.

Lawrence, Paul R. "How to Deal with Resistance to Change." *Harvard Business Review*, January-February 1969.

Moore, Mark H., and Robert C. Trojanowicz. "Corporate Strategies for Policing," *Perspectives on Policing No. 6.* Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice and Harvard University, November 1988.

Sparrow, Malcolm K. "Implementing Community Policing." *Perspectives on Policing No. 9.* Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice and Harvard University, November 1988.

Trojanowicz, Robert C., and David Carter. *The Philosophy and Role of Community Policing.* East Lansing, Michigan: National Center for Community Policing. 1988.

Trojanowicz, Robert C., and Bonnie Bucqueroux. *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective.* Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing, 1990.

National Center for Community Policing Publications

Books

An Evaluation of the Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program in Flint, Michigan

A Manual for the Establishment and Operation of a Foot Patrol Program

Articles

Perceptions of Safety: A Comparison of Foot Patrol Versus Motor Patrol Officers

Job Satisfaction: A Comparison of Foot Patrol Versus Motor Patrol Officers

The Status of Contemporary Community Policing Programs

The Impact of Foot Patrol on Black and White Perceptions of Policing

Uniform Crime Reporting and Community Policing: A Historical Perspective

Community Policing: A Taxpayer's Perspective

Implementing a Community Policing Model for Work with Juveniles: An Exploratory Study

Community Policing: Training Issues

Community Policing Programs: A Twenty-Year View

The Foot Patrol Officer, the Community, and the School: A Coalition Against Crime

Community Policing: Defining the Officer's Role

Foot Patrol: Some Problem Areas

An Evaluation of a Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program

Community Policing: The Line Officer's Perspective

Community Policing: Community Input into Police Making

The Philosophy and Role of Community Policing

Community Policing: University Input into Campus Police Policy-Making

The Meaning of Community in Community Policing

Community Policing: Would You Know It If You Saw It?

Reinventing the Wheel in Police Work: A Sense of History

Preventing Civil Disturbances: A Community Policing Approach

If you wish to receive a copy of a National Center publication please contact us at the address or telephone numbers given below:

National Center for Community Policing
School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University
560 Baker Hall
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1118
800-892-9051 or (517) 355-9648