

INTRODUCTION

To The Advancing Community Policing Grant Program

The Advancing Community Policing Grant Program2

Synopsis of Results From Nine Law Enforcement Agencies3

Common Organizational Issues4

Recommendations for Future Policy11

Conclusion11

About This Report13

INTRODUCTION

To The Advancing Community Policing Grant Program

Community policing is based on the premise that partnerships between police and citizens will help increase public safety and reduce crime. A seemingly simple concept, community policing actually requires a complex and challenging mix of changes to a police department's organizational culture and structure. These changes are usually combined with innovative approaches to fighting or preventing crime that may call for extensive community cooperation, planning, and outreach.

Change is complicated, and never more so than in a hierarchical, traditional organization such as a police department or sheriff's office. Aligning a law enforcement agency's resources, processes, and systems with the community policing philosophy can be a taxing undertaking. For a community policing change to last within a law enforcement organization, the nature of the organization itself

must change. Thus, how effectively change is implemented will determine whether that organization sustains community policing as a new policing model or retrenches to a more traditional style of policing.

The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (the COPS Office) was created in 1994 by the U.S. Department of Justice to help local law enforcement agencies develop or improve community policing in their jurisdictions. Since its creation, the COPS Office has awarded more than nine billion dollars in grants across the Nation to hire more officers, purchase new technology, and support local problem-solving approaches to fighting crime and disorder. This report examines the results of the Advancing Community Policing (ACP) Grant Program established by COPS in 1997 to help law enforcement agencies overcome

obstacles and build the necessary infrastructure to strengthen and institutionalize their community policing programs.

The Advancing Community Policing Grant Program

To help agencies garner the necessary resources and the flexibility to use them effectively, the COPS Office organized ACP grants according to Organizational Change and Demonstration Center components. In November 1997, COPS awarded \$18 million under the Organizational Change component of ACP.¹ Ninety-six law enforcement agencies were funded, each agency receiving up to \$250,000 under a one-year grant. The ACP program's main goal was to help law enforcement agencies develop an infrastructure to support the community policing philosophy and corresponding program initiatives. This report collects the lessons learned by many of those 96 agencies and focuses specifically on nine programs that were examined in depth by COPS.

ACP had five funding categories that encompass the wide range of organizational changes COPS believed most needed support: Leadership and Management, Modifying Organizational Structures, Organizational Culture, Re-engineering

Other Components, and Research and Planning. Thus, through the ACP grant process the COPS Office could:

- Foster progressive and creative **leadership and management** approaches
- Help agencies **modify organizational structures** to support decentralized decision-making and responsibility, most often with geographic accountability
- Help change the predominant **organizational culture** from a traditional, response-oriented ethos to one that uses partnerships and an analytical approach to identifying problems in order to develop tailored interventions
- Help police administrators **re-engineer other components** of the organization to support community policing, such as training, crime analysis, 911 call management, department policies, procedures, performance measurement systems, officer evaluation tools, and documents that articulate strategy and vision
- Support the advancement of internal **research and planning**, because public agencies often under-emphasize investments in such efforts
- Improve systems and processes to facilitate **communication and flow of information**

COPS relied on individual police agencies to set their program objectives and strategies. Those agencies were expected to seek out the necessary training, experts, and guidance to meet their goals. COPS attempted to generate ideas during the application process by suggesting allowable project costs that would cover the necessary tools to support the change efforts. Such costs included technology and equipment, hiring new employees, overtime for current employees to devote to the program, travel to other jurisdictions, and external sources of expertise (such as consultants, trainers, and conferences).²

Innovation Through Process Change

What made the ACP program innovative was its focus on the *process* of organizational change. The program's goal was to achieve long-term systemic change that would lead, in turn, to concrete results. Although emphasis on organizational issues might not generate dramatic or immediate program outcomes, changing organizational processes and related activities such as training can result in long-term operational changes that support community policing. Although COPS sought definite long-term outcomes, the ultimate objective was to create the organizational capacity to support, advance, and sustain a philosophy and set of program activities that could run counter to traditional methods.



COPS also encouraged applicants to articulate their organizational change strategy outside the scope of these grant efforts, then link their proposed strategies to further long-term change. The exercise of applying for funding may have allowed many agencies to reflect on both short-term needs and desired long-term changes. The goals were to become better police officers, run more effective organizations, and prevent and solve more crimes. Emphasizing process improvements supported the system changes needed to sustain community policing practices and integrate them into the daily work of the agency.

Synopsis of Results From Nine Law Enforcement Agencies

The ACP grants served as catalysts for a wide range of organizational change initiatives across the Nation. After the program was well under way, the COPS Office sponsored a research study to examine how representative grantees were implementing their ACP-supported initiatives and to cull findings and lessons learned from the grantees' experiences. Nine sites were selected for indepth examination by a visiting fellow and an expert panel.³ After reviewing numerous sites around the country, the expert panel recognized that each agency used its funding differently, customizing its effort to the local community's unique



Exhibit 1. The Nine ACP Programs Evaluated

| AGENCY | PROJECT TYPE | GRANT FOCUS |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| Boston Police Department, MA | Modifying Organizational Structures | Changed organizational processes to support a new patrol strategy and creation of Neighborhood Beat Teams as part of a larger organizational change management process, based on a citywide strategic planning effort |
| Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department, NC | Organizational Culture | Used outside expertise to combine greater use of technology with problem-solving methods to address community problems |
| Longmont Police Department, CO | Re-engineering Other Components | Used a community strategic plan to improve communication with the community; utilized outside expertise to assist in organizational change practices; significantly reorganized the department to support community policing |
| Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office, CA | Organizational Culture | Funded training in community policing leadership for 300 sergeants and 100 lieutenants as part of a plan to develop a community policing bureau |
| Portland Police Bureau, OR | Re-engineering Other Components | Created an emergency information system that integrates with the existing technology infrastructure to address neighborhood communication |
| Rock Hill Police Department, SC | Organizational Culture | Developed a multitiered career ladder program for officers below the rank of sergeant to enhance recruitment and retention; used funds to address an organizational crisis |
| San Jose Police Department, CA | Leadership and Management | Developed strong community policing leadership simulation models for community members and police; involved community members in significant portions of grant activity |
| Savannah Police Department, GA | Leadership and Management | Sent teams of sergeants and lieutenants to community policing agencies around the country to bring ideas back to Savannah and successfully adapted such models as Crime Free Housing for Savannah |
| Windsor Police Department, CT | Organizational Culture | Catalyst for community policing in the department and the community; worked closely with union officials and community members to create an effective foundation for community policing programs |



organizational needs and goals. Exhibit 1 summarizes how the nine sites used their grants, by project type.⁴

Law enforcement executives and their staffs brought energy, passion, creativity, and commitment to the ACP grant program. The participating agencies desired both to learn from their mistakes and to share their successes with others. Although change is inherently difficult, these agencies were happy to be involved in the process and proud to be identified with community policing strategies and activities. Even better, the departments saw tangible results: they became more efficient, solved community crime problems more effectively, and got more involved in their neighborhoods.

The experiences that proved most difficult occurred when leadership was insufficient, e.g., the grant was assigned to just one or two people without support from management. These difficulties demonstrated that widespread support throughout the department or agency is essential.

Misunderstandings during collaboration also detracted from success. In some cases, when multiple agencies worked as partners, issues of power and control arose. The study found that in most cases, agencies need to know more about developing and maintaining collaborative

relationships and how to anticipate problems, especially when sharing money or influence.

The grantees were energetic about their ACP grant efforts and used their grants to explore better methods and processes. They took risks, as their projects often represented changes that ran counter to the prevailing organizational culture. Successful projects incorporated input and activity from many levels of the organization, including line officers, first-line supervisors, and managers.

ACP grantees worked on changes with which law enforcement nationally has little practical experience. Therefore, they had few examples to follow. Nonetheless, the nine agencies featured in this report are excited about their accomplishments and committed to community policing as the next phase of law enforcement in the United States. They are looking for national leadership and ways to build on their successes. As people become more invested in and experienced with the problem-solving process, the desire for continuing progress will grow.

Common Organizational Issues

Although each grantee's experience was different, some shared characteristics of organizational

change emerged during the study. New community policing responsibilities created new expectations from both the agencies and the public. Agencies needed to align their vision and goals for the organization with the day-to-day realities of policing. The following issues were identified by the expert panel study as critical elements of each grantee's ACP project:

- Accountability
- Performance evaluations
- Increased organizational capacity
- Communication
- Community oriented government
- Customized services to fit the location
- Engaging and investing in mid-level management
- Leadership
- Networking, connecting, and learning
- Resources
- Time for change
- Unions
- Vendor selection



The broad range of problems and successes grantees experienced in each of these areas goes to the heart of why the ACP program was so important. Implementing a new community policing initiative is not enough; steps must be taken to institutionalize the initiative within the department. There are many facets, twists, and turns to be managed along the way so that community policing becomes rooted in the department's culture and practices.⁵

Accountability

Accountability was one of the first themes to emerge among the grantees. Changing organizational expectations led to changes in police responsibilities and increased police accountability to the community. At the same time an agency was changing its performance, it also had to change public expectations of that performance. Tensions often developed between traditional public expectations (reactive—police come in and solve the community's crime problems) and emerging community policing strategies (proactive—the community works with police as a partner to enhance public safety as well as to prevent and solve crimes). The newly implemented community policing strategies under ACP sought to share accountability with neighborhoods for increased public safety.

In addition to responding to every community request, law enforcement professionals were expected to be actively involved in the daily life of the community. Officers and deputies could not give up what they had been doing, but they now had much more to do. Teaching members of the community to work with law enforcement as active partners and become accountable for the results was a shift for most officers.

Crossing the barrier between law enforcement and the community often led to reductions in certain crimes. When residents and officers identified a drug trafficking hot spot in a Charlotte, North Carolina neighborhood, police pursued a partnership with the affected community. Although the process was not always easy or smooth, by working together, police and residents moved the drug traffic pattern out of the affected area. After the success of the community collaboration, a paradox emerged that found the police facing enhanced expectations about the level of service in the affected area, and the community's fear about the loss of police presence.

As law enforcement leaders initiated change, the support of mayors, city managers, city councils, and county boards helped legitimize the effort in the public's eyes. Over the course of these changes, the public's involvement and participation

in the law enforcement process increased significantly. Many agencies found that once communities became aware that law enforcement professionals in their areas were beginning to implement community policing, they wanted it implemented in their own neighborhoods, regardless of the local government's ability to fund it. That demand created pressure on law enforcement leaders, who had to remain accountable both to the community and, fiscally, to the city. When asked how he believed the public would react if his agency abandoned its new community policing strategies, the Lowell, Massachusetts' superintendent of police responded by predicting that citizens would bring complaints not only to him as the chief law enforcement executive, but to the city council as well.

The ACP grant program was designed to provide law enforcement agencies a unique opportunity to change in ways that might otherwise have been very difficult. Law enforcement agencies are like any other established organizations: reluctant to abandon traditional methodologies and organizational structures. The support of the COPS Office combined with the support of law enforcement and government executives gave credibility to efforts to change these organizations, which, in turn, increased support for the projects among both line officers and community members. This



widespread support helped participants move more quickly and hold themselves more accountable for meeting their goals. Many agencies were willing to take risks and experiment with ideas for which they might not have been able to raise support without the ACP program.

Performance Evaluations

As law enforcement agencies incorporated community policing ideas into their organizational values, performance evaluations were often revised to reflect the new practices and requirements. This helped institutionalize the change, by literally integrating it into personnel practices.

In Longmont, Colorado police developed Partners in Performance, an evaluation system that reflected such basic tenets of community policing as partnership, ownership, personalization, relationships, permanence, and community oriented activity. New job descriptions were created to reflect these ideals. Administrators also developed action plans that incorporated community policing goals. Monthly performance evaluations were conducted in which supervisors had 51-percent input and the employees being evaluated had 49-percent input. Employees could contest the outcome and request further review if they felt it was necessary. These monthly assessments over the

course of a year meant that annual assessments did not come as a surprise.

In Rock Hill, South Carolina the police department built community policing practices and skills into its career ladder. An evaluation was part of each step up the ladder, and utilization of community policing strategies is now integral to a successful move upward. When active community policing involvement became part of the promotion process, it became more difficult for officers who opposed it to just "grin and bear it." Most began to truly consider community policing as a serious element of their jobs. This helped institutionalize and perpetuate community policing philosophies within the department.

For many officers and deputies, this change was difficult. Some left their agencies rather than change. More frequently, however, law enforcement professionals who might have initially tolerated the change as an unpleasant passing phase changed their attitudes as they began to feel more effective at their jobs and watched support for community policing grow within the neighborhoods they were sworn to protect and serve.

Increased Organizational Capacity

Building an organization's capacity for change means exposing its leaders and personnel to new

methods of training, technical assistance, and investing resources—including time, talent, and money—in the institutionalization of new practices. Achieving this requires a willingness to learn from outside of traditional policing frameworks, to bring in talent and expertise from other fields, and to use existing talent and expertise in the police community.

Law enforcement leaders are not often formally trained in implementing organizational change. Although some agency leaders had both a strong vision for the future and the capability to make it a reality, others did not. Some led agencies with staff members who were willing and able to campaign for change; others looked outside their agencies for expertise in departmental reform. The desire to change sometimes outpaced the ability to do it.

North Carolina's Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department (CMPD) is a good example of successful organizational change. The CMPD brought in outside experts to walk the department through each step of the problem-solving process to implement organizational change. These national experts taught teams of officers how to use the scanning, analysis, response, and assessment (SARA) model and increase the use of technology and data in all phases of the process. Although often tedious, this training built the organization's



capacity to solve community problems by imparting the skills and knowledge to implement organizational change.

In Massachusetts, the Boston Police Department (BPD) has benefited from a long-term working relationship with a change-management consultant who helped create and implement strategies. They have systematically crafted citywide strategic plans and change-management efforts that influence the basic operations of the department.

The New Haven, Connecticut police department has made training in community policing a fundamental part of its academy and promotion system. After sergeants are promoted to lieutenants, they train other sergeants in community policing. New Haven also has developed a close working relationship with nearby universities to create a reservoir of expertise that can be used in academy training programs and community collaborations.

In San Jose, California, the police department employed an active, situational role-playing system that taught officers and community members how to work together to solve mutual problems. Longmont police leaders applied the work of an organizational change professional to flatten the organizational structure and create the Partners in Performance evaluation system.

Some agencies' infrastructures lacked the capacity to handle the proposed grant activity. In Oakland, California, for example, the police department realized it did not have the organizational capacity to handle the accounting for a community-based mini-grant program. Many departments also reported that existing civil service job descriptions and salaries did not meet their needs to hire and pay highly skilled crime analysis or technology personnel.

Communication

To communicate effectively, both externally and internally, the agencies used many channels, from new methods such as websites to old-fashioned practices such as encouraging residents to know their neighbors. In Salinas, California, the police department developed a state-of-the-art intranet to update and share critical day-to-day information so that at the beginning of their shifts, officers could see who had been arrested, when the next community meeting would take place, or where to focus attention because of community concern.

The goal in Portland, Oregon was to integrate all communication and technology systems, building each new phase on the last. The agency also created an emergency response system that not only

alerts citizens to impending situations, but also notifies them of their successful resolution.

Almost every department realized the importance of creating a website to serve as a community resource and a vehicle for interactive communication. California's San Jose Police Department developed an intranet that acts as a repository of information and resources only for members of the department.

Another crucial form of communication is day-to-day contact between law enforcement professionals and the neighborhoods they patrol. Building trust between the department and the community is a core part of community policing; officers and deputies learned that the only way to build and maintain relationships is through regular interaction with residents.

Organizational change can create tension, suspicion, and resistance among the rank and file. It is natural to want to know what is going on, how it will affect one's job, and whether the change is permanent or part of a short-lived trend. Successful change requires patience and communication both inside and outside the agency. That communication can come in many forms. In Windsor, Connecticut, the police department's union



president created the agency's first website, which signaled support for the chief and community policing practices.

Developing and sharing the strategic vision for community policing with key stakeholders, including community groups, elected officials, union officials, and department personnel is critical for success. In Los Angeles, the County Sheriff's Department tracks initiatives that are a source of pride for deputies and that produce concrete results. The department then informs elected officials and the community about those initiatives.

In many cases, police personnel learned how to listen, present their ideas in front of their peers, and participate in community and neighborhood meetings. A lack of communication, however, sometimes led to misunderstandings and resistance. In Sacramento, California, an organizational struggle developed between the officers currently patrolling neighborhoods and the officers the city council wanted to appoint to those neighborhoods. This resulted in confused lines of authority, difficulties with command and supervision, and a communication problem between the city council and the police department. Resolving the problem took time and patience.

Communication through newspapers, websites, email, fliers, focus groups, foot patrols, and direct

engagement with the community helped sell community policing practices. Making the most of these available communication channels strengthened relationships, increased trust between law enforcement and citizens, and pulled together critical information to help agencies and their communities work together to increase public safety.

Community Oriented Government

Community policing must share strategies and the skills, expertise, and resources of other community and government agencies to be effective. Each agency participating in ACP developed working links to other community and city/county agencies. These links often helped resolve mutual problems. For example, officers in Charlotte-Mecklenburg's Police Department worked with the city planning department, local businesses, the city council, and others to solve an auto larceny problem. Police identified solutions, and cooperation with other agencies made those solutions possible (in this case, improving lighting and adding fences).

Fundamental causes and conditions that create community problems are many and complex; often, local problems can only be solved through cooperation among agencies. A problem with domestic violence, for instance, may involve the police department, the health department, mental health services, the faith community, and family services.

The challenge in many agencies is local politics. A sheriff, for example, may need to work closely with a board of supervisors who can access county services on behalf of the department. In other cases, the city's department of parks and recreation or public works may be called on to provide such services as after-school recreation centers for area youths.

Many grantees needed help with the civil service system. In changing an agency, new jobs often must be created and other job descriptions (and salaries) changed to accurately reflect the work needed. Accomplishing this may be cumbersome and require the support of the city council or another such group.⁶ In one case, city accounting system operators lacked the experience or resources to handle the demands of a federal grant. Sometimes departments had a hard time accessing their grant funds.⁷

It was rare to see a community-based law enforcement problem for which the solution did not involve working with many different sectors, including politicians, policy-makers, community service groups, neighborhood associations, local businesses, parks and recreation departments, and transportation, health, and housing organizations. The law enforcement agency may have been the originator, but it was rarely the only organization needed to get things done. When



communication across agency lines was well established, limited resources were more likely to be well applied, with minimum redundancy.

Customized Services to Fit the Location

Each grant had to reflect the community's needs and the agency's priorities for community policing. Because each city and town had its own ethnic population, economy, and political structure, a cookie-cutter approach would not work. Law enforcement agencies developed individual approaches in applying their grants and were free to pursue what worked best. In spite of the differences between agencies, each wanted to gather information and ideas from colleagues across the Nation and use the lessons to do a better job in its own community.

Some departments (including Boston and Longmont) had already made great strides in creating organizational change before the ACP program began. Others, such as Windsor, were just starting the process. Many agencies, including Portland and Charlotte-Mecklenburg, used sophisticated data technology. Others had problems developing multiple collaborations on technology projects. Some agencies, such as the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department, had an entire community policing bureau. In others, such as Albuquerque,

New Mexico, grant activities were the domain of a small research and planning department.

Agencies had to address local conditions in developing ACP projects. Many involved the community throughout the process; others kept the process more internal. Each agency described in this report achieved outcomes that helped its organization advance community policing and work better in its community.

Engaging and Investing in Mid-Level Management

One important theme that emerged from ACP programs was the need for leadership investment up and down the line. Although the chief must be the ultimate champion, a lack of support among mid-level managers almost guarantees that community policing efforts will ultimately break down. Agencies found that investing in people who were in charge of day-to-day activities resulted in more creativity, accountability, and ownership within the organization.

For example, the Savannah Police Department sent mid-level managers to other police departments to gather ideas and build new relationships. This decision was an act of confidence and insight. Not only did it help the department as a

whole, but it validated mid-level managers, gave them exposure outside of Savannah, and created links with other departments. In Boston, mid-level managers were asked to make problem-solving presentations before the command staff. In New Haven, newly promoted lieutenants served as mentors and teachers to sergeants.

The support of sergeants, lieutenants, and captains ensures effective implementation of community policing. These frontline supervisors and mid-level managers are the leaders who must make changes happen and hold others accountable.

Leadership

The leaders in the grantee agencies had to impart their vision of community policing. They needed to lead their organizations through a trial and error transition period to create new cultural norms and behaviors. The change process required their constant attention and persistence. However, when agency executives were passively supportive, ideas often came from the field. It was compelling to find captains, lieutenants, sergeants, deputies, and line officers as agents of change.

Many law enforcement leaders observed that community policing practices built stronger relationships with their diverse communities, building



trust and communication where little had existed before. In Charlotte-Mecklenburg, police wanted to reduce drug trafficking in a neighborhood plagued by the problem. To accomplish this, they had to listen to and engage the community, then apply with confidence new approaches based on community input. This led to great success.

In Longmont, the chief of police has integrated community policing into every facet of the department. He continues to initiate innovative ways to involve the community and work through difficult relationships. He has a clear vision of what community policing means, what it should look like, why it is important, and how it will improve the police department and the communities it serves.

Networking, Connecting, and Learning

ACP grantees noted the need to network, connect, and learn about innovation both within and outside of the law enforcement community. Agencies wanted to hear about successful practices, adapt proven responses to their local problems, and create a vision for successful community policing practices in the future. They requested opportunities to form networks and wanted to know more about outside resources to help with training, technical assistance, and expert consultation regarding methods of organizational change.

Most law enforcement agencies saw their learning processes as cyclical rather than linear, with no beginning, middle, or end. They were invested, not because they had federal grants, but because they knew community policing made them better at fighting and preventing crime and increasing public safety.

Resources

Although the grant money made more of a difference in smaller than in larger agencies, the amount of the grant was not the determining factor in successful change. Almost every agency believed that its grant was a catalyst for internal change.

Grants were more effective when agencies had some experience in implementing community policing, launched strong initial efforts, and maintained a strategic plan. Agencies that were already positioned to be responsive to the community were in a stronger position to further advance community policing.

The ACP program supported a variety of initiatives that otherwise could not have been pursued or could not have been pursued so comprehensively. Agencies that used funds to begin new initiatives found that they could develop more support from

their city by demonstrating the value of the activity, which they might not have been able to do before. Because of the success of the ACP program, many agencies' positions or programs continued after the grant ended.

Even with different organizational structures, community demographics, and community issues, all of the grantee agencies found the process of responding to a grant opportunity—particularly one such as ACP, which demanded creativity—to be a healthy and helpful experience.

Time for Change

Time is always an issue, and change takes time. Institutionalization of organizational change and community policing practices does not happen overnight. Taking and making the time to work on change was a vital ingredient of successful efforts. Many grantees reported that even the simplest things took more time than they expected—sometimes a lot more time. Although the ACP grant program was intended for only one year, most grantees required no-cost extensions.

Unions

Whether a department was unionized (e.g., Boston, Lowell, Windsor, and New Haven),



semi-unionized (San Jose), or non-unionized (Rock Hill) affected the degree of difficulty of the change process. Unions can make organizational change easier (as in Windsor) or more challenging and complex (as in Boston).

Vendor Selection

Selecting a vendor was a challenge for most grantees. Many departments simply did not have the expertise to evaluate or choose the right vendors. Some had difficulty finding qualified vendors, some chose vendors that did not include the agency in the development of their product, and some received inferior or outdated work products.

Portland and Charlotte-Mecklenburg chose vendors well. They knew their own needs, understood the vendor selection process, and had well-defined expectations.

Recommendations for Future Policy

More and more, those involved in public policy and law enforcement are coming to understand the importance of supporting collaborative efforts

among law enforcement, other municipal agencies, and social service providers. Officers and deputies are not the only critical stakeholders in responding to crime and disorder within communities. Community policing relies upon the involvement of citizens, local government, and other outside partners in developing and sustaining innovative problem-solving initiatives to address seemingly intractable local crime or disorder.

Following the short-term successes of ACP grantees, the question remains as to whether the projects will sustain continued transformation to community policing. The challenges are that these changes are time consuming and require a process orientation (as opposed to an action or outcome orientation). Also, no grant exists to encourage the commitment. It will be interesting to see whether the organizations involved in ACP continue incorporating community policing into their traditional culture and practices.

Community policing represents a change from traditional policing that not only affects the relationship of the police to the broader community, but also requires complex internal changes. It requires endurance and a willingness to build bridges. If these changes are integrated into day-to-day practices and sustained, community policing activities

will no longer be viewed as special programs that require special support.


Flexible support must be available to devote to change efforts, because they are typically long-term efforts with outcomes that are unique to federal programs. The lack of structured support for change efforts is precisely why departments need additional support and outside expertise.

Agencies can recognize and promote strategic and systems planning through a special set of skills that can either be fostered and developed internally or supported through external consultants. Departments that have invested in developing skills within a cadre of their own employees have experienced strong results. But, agencies also can recognize the value provided by consultants with expertise in change management. Private sector organizations frequently use consultants with such specialized skills; law enforcement may benefit by experimenting with this same approach.

Conclusion

As the following chapters will show, organizational change in a law enforcement environment can be a





challenging endeavor. Law enforcement agencies are complex organizations with critical missions. Adapting processes, modifying systems, and allocating resources in order to reorient such an organization to community policing takes time, careful attention, commitment, and strong leadership with a clear vision. The lessons derived from ACP-funded agencies' experiences can serve as references for other agencies attempting to implement and advance community policing.

Perhaps the most powerful lesson from the ACP program is that one of the most important elements of successful organizational change is careful attention to the process of change, as opposed to focusing solely on its intended results. Because these agencies embarked on changes that often ran counter to prevailing methods, they often found it necessary to first create the capacity for these changes in order for them to succeed.

Many successful ACP-funded efforts involved personnel from all ranks that brought energy, passion, creativity, and commitment to process. Although very few projects achieved complete success, a desire to learn from the process—especially where that process achieved unexpected goals—resulted in greater benefits over the long term.

These change efforts also frequently changed expectations of what law enforcement is and how it works—in officers and deputies as well as the communities they serve. Tensions often developed between more traditional public expectations and the new expectations produced by the move to community policing. Working with the community, as well as other private and public partners, created a sense of shared ownership of community crime and disorder problems.

Active support from elected officials helped build public support, just as strong leadership and vision from the chief and senior command staff helped build support among the agencies' rank and file. Just the determination to change was not always enough. Some organizations found their desire for change was much stronger than their actual ability to change within what were nearly universally very mature and complex organizations. Agencies that found themselves in this situation often benefited greatly from external consultants. Some of the most successful projects harnessed agents of change across all levels of the organization, each of which made important contributions.

Many ACP grantees found that once communities gained exposure to community policing, they became active stakeholders and supporters,

thus resulting in grassroots support for the philosophy's full implementation within the agency. Day-to-day contact with the community in a community policing context seemed to invariably forge better relationships and stronger trust between law enforcement professionals and the members of their communities.

Some agencies found that embracing community policing required specific changes to policies and procedures, communications vehicles, project tracking systems, and personnel tools. Solutions ranged from developing new tools, such as problem-solving tracking and reporting systems and websites, to modifying performance evaluations and recruitment tools that had been in use for years.

These changes were rarely easy and sometimes created uneasiness and distrust within the agency. There were both creative and traditional approaches for overcoming these understandable reactions to change, but ignoring them in the hope that they would ultimately go away didn't seem to be a viable option for most. Successful change required both patience and communication.

Finally, many agencies recognized the range of expertise that can be brought to bear by involving





other government and social service agencies in the resolution of community problems. Beyond the more traditional community partnerships, some agencies also partnered with such public and private entities as social service providers, planning departments, local businesses, and parks and recreation departments. This recognized that the list of potential interventions to crime and quality of life issues has greatly expanded, resulting in a greater likelihood of success. This is the underlying premise of what many view to be the next logical phase of community policing: community government.

Law enforcement agencies participating in the ACP program addressed organizational change in support of community policing from different perspectives and starting points. Although this impacted their approaches and how far they were able to go, they wanted to gather and share information and ideas from colleagues across the Nation and use these lessons to improve their work. Many see these processes as cyclical rather than linear, crediting innovation not to a grant but to the law enforcement professionals who believe that community policing helps them serve their communities more effectively. The ACP program—and this report—are meant to help these practitioners share their experiences. Hopefully, the lessons they

learned will help other agencies beyond the range of the ACP program.

About This Report

Each of the nine chapters that follow closely examines one of the ACP grantee sites. The chapters are organized alike to help readers compare and revisit areas of interest. The report is intended to serve as a useful, working resource for agencies implementing or considering implementing community policing initiatives.

Chapter 11 briefly sums up the report and provides COPS contact information.

The four appendixes focus on the nitty gritty details of methodology, typology, and identity. Appendix A discusses the fellowship and expert panel that visited sites, interviewed participants, made observations, and derived conclusions and lessons learned. Appendix B gives more details about the five priority areas identified at the beginning of this chapter as encompassing the many projects developed under the ACP grant program. Appendix C is the complete list of ACP projects by state and project focus. Appendix D provides short biographies of the authors.

Notes

1. The ACP grant period was 1998 to 2001.
2. The COPS Office acknowledged that the change process would be challenging and viewed it as a multiyear effort, even though ACP funding was provided for only one year.
3. More information about the ACP Grant Program, the fellowship, and expert panel that evaluated grantee sites appears in Appendix A.
4. Descriptions of the project types appear in Appendix B.
5. Some examples cited in this chapter are taken from grantee sites that are not discussed at length in this report. For a list of all 96 grantees, please see Appendix C.
6. Dealing with outdated civil service codes was a big problem as agencies tried to hire civilians to meet their needs, particularly in technology-related jobs and crime analyst positions.
7. Although the grant money went to local agencies, the agencies did not always have direct access to the money. Sometimes the processing took a long time, or, as in Oakland, California, the agencies were not set up to handle this type of grant.

