

Community Relations and Moving Back to Community Policing

Prepared by Sgt. Wes Honeycutt, N.L.R.P.D.

for

School of Law Enforcement Supervision

U of A Criminal Justice Institute

Spring, 2004

Preface

Community policing has been held up in recent years as the hottest new concept in law enforcement and a panacea for all of the ills of society. In fact, community policing is highly effective when properly introduced and administered but it is no cure-all and it is anything but new.

A Brief History of Policing

In order to have some context for a discussion of modern police, we must first understand something about how we got here. There are several reasons to study policing's past.

- We learn the origins of policing and how it developed over many years.
- We learn of noted political leaders, their contributions, the obstacles they faced and their successes.
- History has a tendency to repeat itself. Perhaps we can learn from past mistakes.
- History shows us that calls for change in the way police operate have occurred often since the beginning of policing.
- New movements in policing are often highly touted, politicized, based on limited, if any, supporting evidence and result in debatable success.
- Policing in the past can be compared to policing in the present to note areas of improvement and areas needing improvement.
- Many new movements and initiatives in policing are modifications of earlier ideas.
- Solutions from the past can possibly be revived and modified as viable solutions for the present.
- We can learn how social, economic, political and technological forces have impacted police agencies, police officers and crime control.
- The past helps us understand the present and anticipate the future. (Purpura, 2001)

During the middle ages, public safety was affected by private citizens. In the feudal system, the land owning nobility provided security for farmers in return for a cut of the farmer's production of crops. This idea of law enforcement being the responsibility of every man is a theme which runs down through the centuries.

Oftentimes, the English are represented as being the only people to have had influence over what has become modern American policing. While they certainly had the greatest influence, the contributions of others should not be overlooked. The Frankpledge system was begun in France and spread from there. In this system, a male over the age of twelve years old was required to be part of a ten member "tithing". A tithing was the smallest unit of private citizens responsible for ensuring public safety. Ten tithings formed a "hundred" which was headed up by an appointed constable. Ten hundreds formed a shire which was commanded by a "reeve" who was responsible for enforcing the king's laws and collecting taxes. The shire reeve is the root of our present day word "sheriff".

These systems of public safety were necessary in those days not only to defend citizens against danger from within their own societies but from outside as well. An example of this was the comitatus, a warlike band of early Germans who, loosely allied, pillaged the countryside of Dark Age Europe. Without some formal means of providing security, peaceful people would have been at the mercy of these barbarians. (Purpura, 2001)

Giving credit to contributors to modern law enforcement other than the English by no means minimizes their tremendous impact. Indeed, modern laws, philosophy, and the structure of present day police organizations can be traced directly back to their British genesis.

England in the 1600's was policed by constables. The constabulary was divided into two watches, day and night. The day watch was staffed by jailers who also had other bureaucratic duties within the government. At night, private citizens carried the ball. They were expected to watch for fires, bad weather and disorderly individuals. Again, this is another example of private, unpaid individuals serving the public good as a matter of civil responsibility.

By the late 1700's, those people who had the means to do so were paying others to stand their watch... the beginnings of a paid police force. (Miller, Hess 2002)

About this time in London, Patrick Colquhoun, a local magistrate, first proposed the formation of a paid metropolitan police force. While this radical new idea received little public support, it did serve to get the idea out there in the mix of public debate.

Colquhoun's idea came about in the midst of the social and demographic upheaval that was the Industrial Revolution. The invention of steam power and mass production techniques changed the world and, firstly, England. As England took the lead in what would become global industrialization, the face of the country was changed forever as it moved from its rural, agrarian past to its urbanized present. With the mass movement of people from the countryside to the cities came changes in the social fabric that were far from desirable. Crime rates soared in urban England.

It was in 1829 that Sir Robert Peel first committed to writing the Metropolitan Police Act and proposed it to Parliament. The idea of a professional police force was far from welcome to the English citizenry. The probability of the new police force turning into another instrument of coercion by the government was real. Real too, however was the worsening state of affairs in

urban London where crime was bad and getting worse.

It was largely due to this grim set of circumstances that Peel was able to succeed where Colquhoun had not.

In 1829, the Act was passed and became law. Parliament chose Peel to lead the fledgling organization and the first official police department existed. (Oliver, 2004)

Sir Robert Peel enumerated twelve principles which are as poignant today as they were in the nineteenth century. Indeed, the basic principles of policing are as enduring as human nature itself because human weaknesses are the sole reason for the existence of our profession.

Peel's principles:

- The police must be stable, proficient and organized along military lines.
- The police must be under government control.
- The absence of crime will prove the efficacy of police.
- The distribution of crime news is essential.
- Proper deployment of police strength, by both time and area, is essential.
- No quality is more indispensable to a policeman than a perfect command of temper. A

quiet, determined manner has more effect than violent action.

- Good appearance commands respect.
- The selection and training of proper persons are at the root of efficient law enforcement.
- Public security demands that every police officer be given an identifying number.
- Police headquarters should be centrally located and easily accessible to people.
- Policemen should be hired on a probationary basis before permanent assignment.
- Police crime records are necessary for the best distribution of police strength.

Sir Robert Peel's men soon came to be known as "Bobbies" after their founder. They were headquartered in an old palace which had previously housed Scottish royalty, hence the name Scotland Yard. They wore blue and white uniforms, carried nightsticks in the event that the afore mentioned quiet, determined manner was occasionally found lacking, and walked beats in their assigned areas. They were not only the first modern policemen, they were in every respect the first community policemen.

In the United States, Philadelphia became the first city to pay both the day and night watches. (Miller, Hess 2002). In 1838, Boston also instituted a police department of six men and in 1844 New York City modeled it's new department after London's and used Sir Robert Peel's Principles to guide it.

Three issues confronted early police in the United States. First was the issue of placing police officers in uniforms. On the pro side, it was believed that criminals would be less inclined to commit criminal acts if police were easily identifiable and visible in the community. Also, victims would be able to locate uniformed policemen more quickly. Further, a uniformed officer would be compelled to act in response to a crime which occurred in his presence as citizens would look to them for assistance whereas an officer out of uniform might be able to escape his duties more easily.

The other side of the issue, advocated by officers of the time, was that uniforms were un-American and they would destroy their sense of democracy and manliness. They also believed that uniforms would hinder police work as criminals would recognize them and escape.

Ultimately, uniforms were adopted in New York City in 1853 and other departments soon followed their lead.

Another contentious issue was that of arming the police. Although London police did not carry firearms, Americans had a history of owning and carrying weapons. Most U.S. citizens recognized that arming police officers was probably unavoidable. In the mid-1800's, newspapers

began printing stories of unarmed policemen being shot while confronting armed criminals.

Soon thereafter, police officers began carrying pistols, often despite their orders and in spite of public opinion.

Finally, use of force issues were hashed out. British police were admired for their restraint in using physical force but early American police were just the opposite. Use of force among was frequent and harsh, largely because of the lack of respect the community afforded them. Force was how they established their authority in this social climate. Compared to law enforcement in other countries, it is a legacy which has endured over time. (Purpura, 2001)



Uniforms ensure that the presence of police officers is obvious to citizen and criminal alike.

**“A good appearance commands respect.”
Sir Robert Peel**



For the protection of the community, police must be armed with weapons superior to those which they may reasonably expect to encounter.

American policing has seen three distinct eras: The Political era, the Reform era and the Community era.

The Political era saw the inception of our first police departments. It was characterized by political control of the police to a degree that was detrimental to the community and led to widespread corruption. Police chiefs and even patrol officers owed their jobs to the whim of local political leaders and were thus controlled by them. Politicians hired and fired police officials based largely on their allegiance to the party in power. Often, illegal businesses (brothels, gambling houses, illegal bars, etc...) which financially supported the campaigns of corrupt politicians could expect little or no attention from that jurisdiction's law enforcement agency.

Further, as a result of this system, a police official's employment was commonly very short lived, providing temptation for the official to avail himself of every opportunity for gain.

Every dark cloud has its silver lining, however, and while such tight political control led to unprecedented abuses of power, it led to one positive effect. Police involvement in the community increased because politicians knew that the more voters they could please the better. They "encouraged" police to assist people in finding jobs, work with health officials to control diseases and help wayward youth. These activities are examples of practices we would expect to find in modern agencies implementing Community Policing programs.

Generally, however, the Political era was a blot on the history of American policing. As one historian wrote, " This was an era of incivility, ignorance, brutality and graft. " (Purpura, 2001) The Political era spanned the period between 1840 and the early 1900's.

The next era was the Reform era (Early 1900's to 1970's). This period saw a movement toward more centralized control of the police and police operations became more standardized. The era was characterized by a movement away from foot patrol in favor of vehicle patrol as well as a more general movement to distance police from the community they served to achieve a more professional detachment and lessen, in the view of the time, the opportunity for police corruption and favoritism.

The Reform era did not result in reduced crime. Indeed, crime soared and correspondingly, citizens fear of crime increased . In distancing themselves from the community, the police succeeded in distancing themselves from street level crime as well as the two are inextricably intermingled.

Beginning in the 1970's and continuing today is the most recent era of policing in the United States, The Community era.

Police agencies in the last quarter of the twentieth century have slowly begun to be more responsive to the needs of the community. The citizens want us to be more proactive in our activities, not to simply respond to crime but to help alter the environment so that crime doesn't have a chance to get out of hand in the first place.

The community era has at it's core a return to the very earliest ideas of *community* responsibility for society's welfare. That the police should be part of the community they serve rather than separate from it.

The current era is referred to by several names, among these are community policing,

community oriented policing, C.O.P., and neighborhood policing. (Miller, Hess 2002) This “new” way of policing involves police and honest citizens working together to accomplish four major goals using techniques limited only by their imaginations.

1.) Arrest offenders.

- This must always be the first priority of the police. Any measures we take in the categories which follow will be far more effective in the absence of the as much of the criminal element as we can arrange.

2.) Prevent crime.

- This can be best accomplished by establishing an intimate knowledge of the area we serve and cultivating relationships within that community.

3.) Solve ongoing problems.

4.) Improve overall quality of life.

COMMUNITY POLICING

Community Policing is a term which defies definition. Since it must, by nature, be geared to a specific set of people and circumstances in order to be successful, North Little Rock, AR Police Department's definition would differ radically from that of Flagstaff, AZ. The cultural, geographic, demographic, social and economic differences between the two jurisdictions would conspire to make one's definition utterly inappropriate to the other's needs.

It is with this in mind that I would suggest that the reader not think of community policing as a program but rather as a philosophy. That philosophy should always have as its goal the betterment of the community and the improvement of the quality of life for those who live there.

Too often in the past, the success or failure of police organizations has been measured by assessing the number of arrests made, the number of citations issued, the volume of recovered property, the rapidity of response to calls for service, etc... Presumably, the reason for this is that these are all values which are easily measured and transformed into statistical data. Winston Churchill divided lies into three categories: lies, damn lies and statistics.

Don't misunderstand, the above activities (arrests, citations etc...) are all absolutely indispensable in law enforcement's goal of making communities better for the residents, but they are not, alone and out of context, meaningful indicators of our success. In the final analysis, it is the residents of the communities we serve, and only they, who can authoritatively say whether we have succeeded or failed them.

When police departments institute community policing programs, one of the first things they do almost universally is create substations. Unfortunately, the effort sometimes grinds to a halt there, as if to say, “ Look! We have substations so we have community policing!” Nothing could be further from the truth. A substation is an office, but in the absence of real philosophical changes in the way we think, operate and interact, it’s just that, nothing more.

Substations are, in my opinion, essential to an effective community policing program because they put police officers in close proximity to the people they serve. An officer assigned to a substation must drive through the community on his way to work, on his way home, and spend his shift immersed in it.

From the community’s point of view, substations allow people to see, on an hourly basis, a police presence in their neighborhoods. They can put names on the faces they see behind the badge every day. They can begin to develop relationships, personal ones, with the officers. They can come to the substation and interact with the police without getting in their cars and driving across town to an inconvenient, impersonal and intimidating police headquarters where they may expect to know no one.

Substation acquisition at the North Little Rock, AR Police Department began in the early 1990's. Like many other departments, we chose to establish substations in the areas of town with the most challenges first.

New construction was, for us, cost prohibitive as it is with many departments and we

chose to renovate existing structures such as vacant office buildings and a disused fire station.

The Department chose sites well within the core of the communities they served so that the substations would be easily accessible to all citizens. They are all on major thoroughfares so that they are easy to find and visible to the community. North Little Rock Police Department's Neighborhood Offices include: Rose City, Downtown, Levy and Lakewood.



The North Little Rock East substation serves the area loosely bounded by Interstate 30 on the west, Interstate 40 on the north and the Arkansas River on the south. Its communities include Washington Street, Glenview, Rose City and the Dixie addition.



The Downtown substation serves most of the historic Argenta community. It is bounded by the Arkansas River on the south, Burns Park on the west, Interstate 40 on the north and, loosely, Interstate 30 on the east.



The author's substation (Levy) provides community policing services to the area west of Ridge Road and north of Interstate 40



The Lakewood Substation serves the community east of Ridge Road and north of Interstate 40

Substations are a necessary tool in the introduction of an effective community policing program. To help the reader understand what successful community policing looks like, we should clear up some common misperceptions, held by citizens *and* officers alike, about C.O.P.

1.) Community Policing is not a technique. It is not taking a specific set of actions in a prescribed order to achieve a desired outcome. As stated earlier, community policing is a *philosophy*. It demands a new way of thinking about law enforcement and its connection to the people.

2.) Community Policing is not the same thing as Public Relations. Public relations has historically been putting the best face on the police department. Educating the public about the department and about the difficulties we face. Community Policing, on the other hand, is actually becoming part of the community on an individual, personal level. Better P.R. may be a beneficial product of C.O.P., but it is not its goal.

3.) Community Policing is not soft on crime. This is a huge misconception among police officers who have never worked a successful C.O.P. program. Indeed, arrest rates may be expected to rise dramatically in the wake of the increased intelligence and community cohesiveness that a good program brings. Simply put, officers know more and, more importantly, they care more.

Community Policing is not paternalistic. Traditionally, agency heads and division leaders have been the agenda-setters. It is often a hard thing for a battle scared veteran cop to turn loose the reins so to speak and empower a rookie officer on the front lines with the authority to make real strategic decisions concerning the community for which

he is responsible. That empowerment, though, is critical and without it, a program will surely fail.

4.) Community Policing is not elitist. Community Policing Officers, by virtue of their close relationships with citizens, often become heroes in the community but at the same time are derided and even shunned by rank and file police officers within the department. A successful program depends not only on selecting the right personnel for the job, but also in educating the entire department about the special mission of the program's officers and how their efforts may be expected to make their jobs easier. Active, department-wide participation in community policing activities may not be possible (it may not even be desirable) but department-wide support of the program is essential.

5.) Community Policing is not "safe". Empowering every officer with a significant degree of decision making authority flies in the face of traditional policing practice. After all, most departments have voluminous sets of general orders or policy directives which spell out exactly what to do in exactly the right order for almost every imaginable circumstance. These enormous documents exist, in large part, exactly because commanders have been unwilling to view officers as professionals capable of making decisions that matter. Is this view justified? Maybe. It depends on the department and the men and women it selects as its officers. Here is a real test for agency heads supervisors. How confident are we in our hiring practices? Our standards? Our training? Can we safely release this power without fear of mistakes that could cause embarrassment or worse? The answer is clearly no, we can't. Mistakes will be made

but the program is hamstrung if line officers are afraid to make decisions and think creatively for fear of being condemned for honest efforts. (Trojanowicz, Kappeler, Gaines 2002)

As we can see, the introduction of a quality community policing program is a complicated process. It depends upon cooperation of the entire department; all divisions and all personnel from the Chief down to the newest rookie officer. If the department can't garner the support of it's own personnel, how can we hope to hope to gain the enthusiasm of a skeptical public?

In the next section, we will examine a case study of one department's move toward community policing.

A case study in C.O.P.

In the early 1990's, the North Little Rock, AR Police Department began fielding it's Community Oriented Policing program. Two major substations were placed in the city's most crime ridden geographical districts, Washington Street / Rose City and the Downtown area.

Application letters were solicited from the 205 sworn officers to staff the substations. From these letters, the administration selected a few officers based on their interest and their ability to work with minimal supervision and maximal result.

By the mid 1990's, the program was expanding and this is where the author had his first exposure to C.O.P. While working as a patrolman on the east end, I was approached by a senior C.O.P. officer and asked if I would like to be part of the cadre of a new substation opening in a severely challenged area west of Pike Avenue called Baring Cross. I eagerly accepted the challenge.

Baring Cross is an area of town bounded by Pike Avenue on the east, I-40 on the north, Burn's Park on the west and on the south by the Arkansas River. It was constructed largely by Union Pacific Railroad for it's workers in the post war years and was for decades a beautiful community filled with working class families.

By the mid-90's, Baring Cross had transformed until it was difficult to find much that was positive about it.

Over the years, most of the railroad families had either died or moved away and much of the real estate had been bought up for use as rental property. As a result, property values for those who remained dropped and many elderly residents who had made their homes in the community were unable to move. Just as many were unwilling to move simply because they had lived there all their lives and would not allow the changing times to force them away.

Rental houses often have high turnover and Baring Cross was no exception. The transient nature of many of the renters led to a diminished investment in the community. Drug houses were in every neighborhood, gunshots were an every night occurrence, violent crime was rampant and property crime was also through the roof.

This was the challenge which lay before me and the two other officers assigned to the brand new substation when I reported to my new assignment on January 1, 1996. I was called into the office of the Lieutenant responsible for Downtown C.O.P. to be briefed on my duties. The briefing was short: “ Go west of Pike, find out what’s wrong and fix it. Dismissed. “ I never even sat down.

North Little Rock P.D. has been recognized as among the most professional and effective law enforcement agencies in the state. That said, it was still policing in the traditional manner of answering calls for service, handling the problem, writing a report if warranted and checking back into service. Not only was this policing method ingrained into our officers, it was what the community had come to expect. How then to proceed? We needed to identify leaders within the community, inform them of our intentions to change the status quo and ask for their help.

Soon after opening our substation, we used various means to begin a crime watch. We placed newspaper ads, passed out flyers and canvassed the streets to get out the word. We enlisted the help of the largest local church and they allowed us to utilize their facility to hold neighborhood meetings, the first of which took place in the early spring of 1996.

Holding true to the principles of C.O.P., we wanted to base our efforts on the principal of solving problems which were important to Baring Cross and thought we were prepared to do it. We were half right. Clearly, the main concern of the residents who attended (around thirty) was the rampant crime and the fear that it instilled. Also, though, the residents voiced concerns about issues we, frankly, had no idea how to fix. Examples included, enormous packs of stray and feral dogs which roamed the neighborhood nightly. Street conditions which had been allowed to deteriorate in the area. Unsightly condition of properties in the neighborhoods (uncut grass, trash in the yards, abandoned automobiles, undocumented neighborhood stores run out of private homes, etc...). It was clear we were going to need some help.

We rolled up our sleeves and got to work.

At the time, C.O.P. was a division unto itself. C.O.P. officers were not subject to calls for service so that they could concentrate their efforts on problem solving. This is not to say that we did not answer calls in our areas, we did. Any call which was of a chronic nature we routinely had special knowledge about and were therefore in a position to handle it with more effect than a patrol officer coming in cold to the situation. Mainly, though, we solved problems and left radio response to patrol. It was a highly effective arrangement.

Our first job was to gain an intimate knowledge of Baring Cross, the geography, the people, the areas that needed the most attention and those that were pretty well self sufficient. We were able to accomplish this through extensive use of foot and bicycle patrol, especially during the spring of the first year. These patrol tactics allowed us more frequent and closer personal contact with the people and the environment, and was beneficial in more ways than one. Not only were we able to meet many new people who were interested in bettering their community, we also met a lot of people who weren't. It came as a huge surprise how effective bicycles and foot patrol were as a *criminal* patrol technique. Almost on a daily basis, we were riding up on drug deals, criminal acts in progress, suspicious persons, disturbances, most of which we would have never even been aware of had we been in our vehicles. In fact, after a while we began leaving one officer in service in a patrol vehicle while the other two engaged in bike patrol. This was a necessary step to avoid friction with Patrol. We were arresting so many people that they were, understandably, chafing at having to transport prisoners for us on an almost hourly basis.

Arrests made from bicycles are highly visible. People are naturally drawn to watching things which are out of the ordinary and seeing two armed thirtyish men riding bicycles in shorts, combat boots and gun belts certainly qualifies as unusual. Add to this the time spent on scene waiting for a transport unit to arrive after the arrest is made and the increasingly frequent bike and foot pursuits involved and you have a recipe for fame on the street. Fame among citizens and among the criminal element as well.

The citizens of Baring Cross had spent years watching as urban blight had slowly

encroached on their community and now they were able to see first hand that the police were not only going to respond to their problems but were going to be aggressive and proactive against them as well. This evidence of a new approach galvanized the community and our neighborhood meetings grew to the point where average attendance exceeded forty people.

In the summer of 1996, we began expanding our efforts into uncharted territory. Earlier I mentioned a problem voiced by residents of stray and feral dogs. We contacted Animal Control, set up a meeting and the cooperation was phenomenal. Animal Control Officer Patti Jones and I set up what we later referred to as “Tranq Night”. One night a month when we were working a 6:00 PM to 2:00 AM shift, we would team up and go hunting. We would use a scoped tranquilizer rifle and shoot the dogs full of drugs to knock them unconscious and transport them to the Animal Shelter at Burns Park. While Tranq Night never completely alleviated the problem, it did improve the situation and, I think more importantly, it showed the community that we were not afraid to use unorthodox and creative means to solve problems not normally associated with police work.

Another agency which we soon developed close ties with was Code Enforcement and over the years they became the outside agency with which we worked most. If we had a residence which was causing an eyesore within a particular neighborhood, we would recruit Code Officers to give it special attention. This occasionally caused some tension and political issues arose when the landlords began being held accountable for the state of their properties but in the long run, the communities gained from the collaborative efforts. Also, tenants who were cooperative gained a

nicer place to live and those who refused to clean up their act gained a new place to live, often beyond the boundaries of Baring Cross. Code Officers were also helpful in dealing with crack houses. Dope dealers, as one might imagine, are not good stewards of the properties they inhabit and this allowed us to utilize Code Enforcement as yet another tool for shutting them down.

Being primarily a residential area, Baring Cross was plagued by daylight burglaries. A person who worked during the day left his home unoccupied for eight hours at his own risk. The burglaries were a real thorn in the side of the community and the police department. When the detectives' office received a burglary report with absolutely nothing to go on, it was typically closed out. After a while, someone decided to begin assigning them to the substations to investigate, the rationale being, who better to look at the case than the people who were responsible for the area? Firstly, we knew everyone and had informants on every block and secondly, we were being held accountable for the burglaries happening in the first place and they were happening to our friends. This made them a personal problem, not just a professional one.

The success we had solving these burglaries was phenomenal. As I recall, residential burglary rates dropped on the order of thirty percent after this program was initiated. I remember one in particular which I still consider one of the best things I did as a policeman. An elderly railroad widow on W. 11th Street was burglarized of several household items including her jewelry box. In it was every piece her husband of fifty years had given her up until his death a couple of years before. The case was passed down to the substation because there was nothing to

go on. Before the day was out, we had found out who had done the burglary and the next morning we did a consent search of the residence (The burglar was a juvenile and the mother gave us consent). I will never forget the tears in that old woman's eyes when I handed her that jewelry box. Mrs. Sutton is dead now, but I am sure her last years were better because she had that box back.

In the ebb and flow of personnel transfers, I left Baring Cross, unwillingly, after about three years. That has been several years ago and I still get calls from the residents regarding goings on in the community and their concerns about them. Even though I am no longer in a position to help them very much, I still care deeply about those people even after all these years.

In conclusion, I would like to relate lessons I learned as a pioneering C.O.P. officer at my department. Earlier we discussed Sir Robert Peel's principles on law enforcement. Think of these as Honeycutt's principles.

- 1.) Select doers, not P.R. men. In bringing Community Policing back to the community, it is only natural that we want to put our best foot forward. Don't make the mistake of choosing your most polished, well spoken poster officers for this job. Choose the smart, aggressive officer instead; the one who never sits still and is always on the radio with self initiated activities. The actions this officer brings to the streets of the community will speak volumes about your commitment to C.O.P.

- 2.) Give C.O.P. officers authority to set priorities and direction. This can't work unless you've chosen the right people for the job. C.O.P. officers must have proven themselves as officers who need little supervision before being assigned to so important a duty.

- 3.) Make officers accountable for the state of their areas. Ask frequent questions of your officers and listen closely to their responses. No one knows their area and it's nuances better than they do.

- 4.) Keep C.O.P. officers attached to but separate from patrol. C.O.P. should be an entity much like the detective's office or the narcotics unit. The officers must know that the department places a high priority on them and their activities and that they are truly a specialized unit. A C.O.P. officer should be a C.O.P. officer every day.

- 5.) Do everything possible to keep C.O.P. officers in place. Continuity is the key to a successful Community Policing program. The citizens cannot be expected to form the close personal bonds required to make the program work on a serial basis. Further, the knowledge gained by the officer after years of experience is at least as important as the special skills of a good investigator.

- 6.) Do everything possible to keep C.O.P. supervisors in place. Again, continuity is the

key. The best C.O.P. program imaginable will be hard pressed to survive the shifts of direction that new supervision brings. Try to keep your supervisors in the program. If promotion or other circumstances dictate reassignment, try to stress to the incoming supervisor the importance of an even keel.

7.) Don't commit to C.O.P. and leave it. You can't go back. If you are fortunate enough and skilled enough to win the trust and cooperation of the citizens, don't let them down by eliminating or downsizing your program. Like anything else, trust lost is not easily regained.

Miller, Linda S. and Hess, Karen M.

Police in the Community. Strategies for the 21st Century

Wadsworth Thompson Learning, 2002

Bennett, Wayne W. and Hess, Karen M.

Management and Supervision in Law Enforcement

Wadsworth Thompson Learning, 2001

Oliver, Willard M.

Community Oriented Policing. A Systemic Approach to Policing.

Pearson Prentice Hall, 2004

Rahtz, Howard

Community Policing. A Handbook for Beat Cops and Supervisors.

Criminal Justice Press, 2001

Stevens, Dennis J.

Case Studies in Applied Community Policing

Pearson Education Inc., 2002

Morash, Merry and Ford, Kevin J.

The Move to Community Policing. Making Change Happen.

Sage Publications, 2002

Trojanowicz, Robert and Kappeler, Victor E. and Gaines, Larry K.

Community Policing. A Contemporary Perspective

Anderson Publishing, 2002

Hunter, Ronald D. and Barker, Thomas and Mayhall, Pamela D.

Police-Community Relations and the Administration of Justice.

Prentice Hall, 2004

Purpura, Phillip P.

Police and Community. Concepts and Cases

Allyn and Bacon, 2001