

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

---

Williams Honors College, Honors Research  
Projects

The Dr. Gary B. and Pamela S. Williams Honors  
College

---

Spring 2023

## Community Policing: The Challenges of Implementation in The United States

Paris Frank  
paf31@uakron.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/honors\\_research\\_projects](https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/honors_research_projects)



Part of the [Criminology Commons](#)

Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

---

### Recommended Citation

Frank, Paris, "Community Policing: The Challenges of Implementation in The United States" (2023). *Williams Honors College, Honors Research Projects*. 1709.

[https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/honors\\_research\\_projects/1709](https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/honors_research_projects/1709)

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by The Dr. Gary B. and Pamela S. Williams Honors College at IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in Williams Honors College, Honors Research Projects by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact [mjon@uakron.edu](mailto:mjon@uakron.edu), [uapress@uakron.edu](mailto:uapress@uakron.edu).

Community Policing: The Challenges of Implementation in The United States

Paris Frank

The University of Akron

## **Introduction**

Community-Oriented Policing (COP) focuses on the partnership and positive relationship between the police and the community. It encourages the two to work together to address public safety issues and work on problem-solving proactively. Community policing programs feature decentralization and attempt to push authority and responsibility down the hierarchy to encourage rapid decision-making to the changing local conditions (Skogan & Roth, 2004, p. 24). Transitioning the police organization to become more decentralized while having teams that send more officers out into the community increases the chances for community engagement and partnerships. Implementing this method of policing does not come quickly, nor does it come without barriers that prevent it from being fully adopted by a police department. According to The Office of Community Policing Services (COPS), community policing begins with attentiveness to increasing trust and mutual respect between police and communities (COPS OFFICE, n.d.).

Most police departments promote the use of community policing and that they practice these methods within their departments. When asked, they will list a set of activities they engage in that they view as evidence for practicing community policing (Skogan & Roth, 2004, pp. 23-24). The President's Task Force on 21st-Century Policing states that the trust between law enforcement agencies and the public stabilizes all communities (President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing, 2015, p. 5). Major Dan Weis stated in a 2021 Justice Clearinghouse webinar that within every community, community policing looks different (Careless, 2021). Every community, even within one state, is different economically, culturally, socially, and ethnographic composition wise. Each community will require different communication methods and will have different problems. Crime and the fear of crime are one of the most significant

fears in many United States (U.S.) communities. Coming together to build a strong partnership and trusted relationship can help reduce these problems with effort and participation from both sides.

Even though community policing methods are highly regarded and recommended at federal and universal levels, that does not mean all officers and police departments are readily open to the changes that it brings to departments. There are many challenges and barriers that come with implementing these methods in departments. Despite its potential benefits, the implementation of community policing faces significant challenges, including a lack of buy-in from police departments, a lack of knowledge and understanding among both law enforcement and community members, a lack of resources, and a lack of community cooperation. Addressing these challenges will be critical to the success of community policing programs.

The aim of this paper is to contribute to the ongoing conversation centered around community policing and improving the relations between the community and police departments. First, defining community policing and a brief history of the shift towards this style of policing provides the background on the topic. Then by taking note of different departments that have implemented community policing throughout the whole department or have created unique programs to help improve the relationship between police and communities and assess what has been done and how it was done. Finally, using these programs and research on their effectiveness and impact showcases the implementation challenges noticed throughout the rise of community policing.

## **Background**

### ***Brief History of Community Policing***

There have been many eras of police reform and different styles and methods of policing dating back to the early 1700s. Community policing emerged in the U.S. in the 1960s to 1970s (The Origin of The Concept of COP, n.d.). During the Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s, through the political and social turmoil taking place, there were calls for change in how the police treated minorities and overall racial injustices. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice recommended that the police focus more on the community and its needs (Origins and Evolution of Community Policing, n.d.). Traditional policing efforts had limitations that were not working as well as they used to. Police departments realized that they are dependent upon the community for help in solving and reducing crime, and improving public safety (Rosenbaum & Lurigio, 1994, p. 300). In 1967 the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice suggested team policing as a way to reconnect the community and beat officers. This method of policing is one of the earliest efforts to redefine policing in a more community-oriented way (Rosenbaum & Lurigio, 1994, p. 301). By the 1980s, team policing had primarily been forgotten, and the programs and methods we see today for community policing came into implementation.

What started as police reform in just the U.S., has slowly spread all over the world. The United Nations has called community policing "an essential part of peacebuilding" and has adopted community policing instructions into their international peacekeeping missions (Blair et al., 2021). With gun violence rates increasing and public distrust in police at an all-time high, U.S. President Joe Biden focused the center of his domestic policy on community policing by seeking to increase funding for programs (Blair et al., 2021). The popularity of this method is described by Jeremy Weinstein, an intercollegiate researcher, stating that "community policing is perhaps the most celebrated policing reform in decades" (Morgan, 2021). In 2014, former U.S.

President Barack Obama signed an executive order that established the Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing. This task force was created to identify effective and proactive practices while offering recommendations and implementations to help reduce crime (President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing, 2015, p. 1). The task force focuses on and reiterates that the relationship between law enforcement agencies and the people they protect is key in policing.

### **Examples of Implementation**

Research by Susan Sadd and Randolph Grinc that the National Institute of Justice sponsored researched the challenges of implementing community, focusing on the Innovative Neighborhood-Oriented Policing (INOP) programs. The Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) designed this program in 1990 to help focus on community-based approaches to drug demand reduction. The goal was mainly to develop strategies that help reduce demands centered on the community and a relationship between the police and the community (Sadd & Grinc, 1996, p. 2). These were not the only departments introduced to community policing programs during this time. In the 1990s, Chicago, Illinois, was experiencing soaring crime rates. The Chicago Police Department spent a year planning and building the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) before implementing it within 5 of the 25 police districts (Skogan & Harnett, 1999, p. 1). These varying programs and projects intended to bring community policing to communities that needed help. By 2015, most U.S. cities named community policing as one of the core elements of their mission within their police department (Morgan, 2021).

New York City, New York, is another example of a police department that implemented community policing beginning with the Community Patrol Officer Program (CPOP) in June 1984 to help local communities deal with issues that affect their neighborhood experiences (Farrell, 1986, p. 1). The pilot program expanded into other districts following this initial pilot.

A guide on problem-solving for this program by the Police Commissioner, First Deputy Commissioner, Chief of Department, and Chief of Patrol, provided a detailed recommendation with a seven-step process to effectively identify and solve problems in the patrol officers' beats. Realizing that a majority of 911 calls that the department received were regarding situations and issues that did not require a rapid response, they saw more police work involving giving out information and referrals, mediating disputes, and maintaining a sort of order in the streets (Ward et al., 1988, p. 1). Many people living in areas where there were not many resources or ease of access to services that could help improve their quality of life, turned to the police department for help. An evaluation of CPOP by the Vera Institute of Justice in 1986 noted that the initial expansion was successful and that the initial set goals were met (Farrell, 1986, p. 95). Nevertheless, the program also had shortcomings and problems, which led to a new style of policing being introduced in 1994 with a new Police Commissioner (Lamburini, 2018, pp. 9-10).

Some distinct positive outcomes from the implementation of INOP were committees that had both community members and police officers, developing information and referral resource guides, helping strengthen the partnership and trust between community and police, vans that acted as a moveable office of resources and information, and building stronger connections with other agencies and community partners (Sadd & Grinc, 1996). In Chicago, between 1993 and 1995, Wesley G. Skogan and Arthur J. Lurigio collected survey and questionnaire data to evaluate the extent that officers who were being trained through CAPS were coming to accept and support the program (Lurigio & Skogan, 1998, p. 8). The control officers were officers in five similar districts (based on demographics and crime rates) to the original five prototype districts (where the prototype officers came from). They found that the prototype officers felt more qualified and had more favorable opinions toward community policing and the relationship

with the community. In contrast, control officers had the opposite or no change at all (Lurigio & Skogan, 1998, p. 15). This research suggests that officers actively participating in community policing feel more qualified to be engaged with the community and have favorable emotions towards their job.

Chicago is probably the most well-known example of a community policing program that was implemented successfully, but many other departments across the United States also had successful results. LAPD implemented its CSP program in 2011 and has continued to work to improve the program and build better relationships with the community. Chief Charlie Beck worked with local advocates to create the outline for CSP in 2010. They determined that it was essential to create a unit that was small and uniquely picked to be the specialized team for interacting within the housing developments (UCLA, 2020, p. 12). This is interesting compared to the Chicago Police Department's take on community policing and other programs, as it involved the creation of a specialized unit. In other departments, this created feelings of distrust and discomfort within the department. These selected CSP officers underwent training through the Urban Peace Academy, where they learned strategies based on understanding the interrelated cultural, demographic, and economic factors, among others (UCLA, 2020, p. 17). This specialized unit of trained officers assigned to one of the four housing developments allowed them to be actively part of a specific community and build positive, trusting relationships there.

Research on violent crime incidents and violent crime calls for service over a five-year period in two of the four housing developments found that CSP helped prevent violent crimes and suggested that the crime was not displaced to surrounding areas over the eight years of implementation (UCLA, 2020, pp. 27-28). While the effects were not seen immediately following the implementation, after five years, it was found to be helpful in the long term.



Similar research shows that CSP led to an estimated 5.51 reduction in violent crime incidents, and reductions of 21 percent and 3 percent in reported crime incidents and calls for service during a ten-year period (July 2007 – December 2017). The researchers also found that there was an average 21 percent decrease in the Part I crime rate. (Kahmann et al., 2022, p. 1231). Part I crimes are defined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation Uniform Crime Reporting Program (FBI, UCR) as offenses of criminal homicide, forcible rape, aggravated assault, simple assault, robbery, burglary, arson, motor vehicle theft, and human trafficking, among other offenses (FBI, 2012). An evaluation of the program found that respondents living in two of the four housing developments had overall positive experiences and attitudes toward CSP (UCLA, 2020, p. x). Working in those communities directly and creating solutions to those residents' specific problems and needs helped the community feel safer and have more positive attitudes toward the police. These relationships cannot be built up quickly as it takes time to earn trust and collaborate with partners, so in this regard, it would make sense that significant changes took time to be established (UCLA, 2020, p. 40). Many of the CSP officers created and supported programs within the communities. When speaking to the researchers, they spoke about these programs with passion, and the residents responded the same way, with satisfaction and gratitude (UCLA, 2020, pp. 55-56). The evaluations of the CSP program suggest that it effectively reduces crime and builds more positive relationships with those in the housing developments.

The Houston Police Department (HPD) in Texas is another example of a department that is taking steps to implement community policing methods into the department. Starting in the 1970s, the department started a Community Service Division (Houston Police Department, n.d.). This division would help advise community members on how to reduce the risk of being a victim of crime and would help give information on requested crime prevention topics. Through field

experimentations, the Directed Area Responsibility Team (DART) was formed to help provide a policing strategy that would help with reducing fear, improving police services, and helping the department meet future needs (Wycoff & Oettmeir, 1993, p. 2). Through DART and other programs, the department developed Neighborhood Oriented Policing (NOP) as a policing style to help the community and the department. In 1982, the creation of the Positive Interaction Program (PIP) was set into action to help keep citizens informed on the working of the department and the divisions, how they are working to prevent crime, and what to expect if they ever encounter that division (Houston Police Department, n.d.). This program holds monthly meetings inviting citizen members to come to listen and ask questions. Each month one resident is chosen to ride on a tour with a police officer and speak about their experience the next month.

Starting in 1982, the department focused on operating with values emphasizing problem-solving and collaboration with the community and redesigned patrol beats to match neighborhoods better (Brown, 1989, p. 4). This and programs like DART and NOP meant getting the community involved through many outreach methods. Brown noted that there are two phases of implementing community policing. Phase one involves the implementation of individual programs, and phase two is implementing the methods and programs into the department's style (Brown, 1994, p. 4). HPDs' efforts and experiences during the first phase of implementation made the second phase easier, as they had already begun working with the community and slowly introducing them to community policing methods. The style implementation of NOP allowed the department to be responsive to the needs of the community and expand the roles of beat officers to be more engaged and communicative with those in the community of their beat (Brown, 1994, p. 7). An evaluation of foot patrol and other NOP functions found that there was no real change in public opinion. The researchers speculated that this might be because there was

no strong opposition to these methods before they were implemented, as many respondents had neutrality to a slight agreement with these methods (Wycoff & Oettmeir, 1993, p. 55). This could also help explain why the department's transition from phase one to phase two was more manageable. If the public were not against this style of policing and the programs and methods being introduced, then they would be more involved in the implementation, which would help make community policing easier to implement.

## **Challenges to Implementation**

### ***Within the Department***

Sadd and Grinc (1996) found multiple challenges to implementing these community policing methods. Police officers did not fully understand the goals of these methods and did not fully support the changes being made, which caused resistance from patrol officers to the INOP. Sadd and Grinc (1996) note that this may not have been to community policing but rather a lack of credibility in reform from the management or institution. Blair et al. (2021) found a similar barrier to implementation with the lack of prioritization from police leadership. With officers being moved around to different positions and cases, they may not have time to train new people, or they may not have the ability to practice the methods at all. Sadd and Grinc (1996) found that there was also a lack of clear understanding and knowledge. While there may be officers who are committed to using these methods and understand them, often, they may not be able to continue to uphold these practices and help others practice these methods (Blair et al., 2021). This leads to incomers not being trained or not knowing how to use the methods effectively. Throughout the INOP programs, officers involved in the departments involved went through training for community policing, and many of the departments also set goals that aligned with the beliefs of community policing. Despite these efforts to help officers understand community policing, when

researchers asked them what the goals of the project were or what the definition of community policing was, officers noted the community outreach portion and the new relationships between the community and police. However, they barely mentioned problem-solving and interagency cooperation (Sadd & Grinc, 1996). Similarly, in the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) program in Los Angeles, California, researchers found that a critical challenge with the implementation of CSP was that the officers, residents, and stakeholders felt there was an overall lack of knowledge of the CSP model, the components of the program, and the ongoing implementation (UCLA, 2020, p. xiii).

Looking at Oakland Police Department and their community policing program Operation Ceasefire, staffing was challenging. The goal was to have one problem-solving officer (PSOs) per beat within the city. By December 2006, the first year of this program, only 44 percent of beats had their own assigned PSO, which did not meet the initial goal, but by July 2008, 88 percent of beats had a PSO (Wilson & Cox, 2008, p. 5). Wilson & Cox found through interviews with PSO commanders that the PSOs sometimes had to work together on problems due to limited resources (2008). This lack of staffing and availability of resources had many PSOs splitting their time between department work and their beats. This pulled some of them out of their beats, making their job harder, and did not help the community's sense of trust. By PSOs being changed and pulled to other assignments, they could not spend time in their beat talking to community members, learning about the community, and fully understanding the issues the community feels are important. The PSOs also found that the training related to organizing community groups was the least adequate of the subject areas (Wilson & Cox, 2008, p. 19).

The research focused on the New York Police Department CPOP found some negative consequences from the quick expansion of the program into more precincts. Within the New

York City Police Department CPOP, there was insufficient and inadequate training on problem-solving, which was a massive foundation of the program (McElroy et al., 1993, p. 175).

Questions were raised about the development of CPOP and how the personnel issues would be handled. Similar to INOP, many department personnel were not informed fully of the full scope and the complexity of CPOP operations. They found that many precinct supervisors did not understand the responsibilities that officers within this program would be expected to carry out (Ferrell, 1986, p. 97). Part of the problem stemmed from the number of transfers and promotions that were made, which brought in new supervisors who may not have been trained or briefed in detail on the expectations and procedures of CPOP. Not only were those who were in supervisory positions moved and transferred, but also many community patrol officers (CPO) were transferred to other assignments, meaning those with experience and practice were being put elsewhere and replaced with new personnel (Ferrell, 1986, p. 98). This brought in new CPO personnel who now had to receive training, understand the program, and work to gain the same knowledge and practice that old personnel had. The quick turnover rate and the inability to retain qualified CPOs who understood the responsibilities made it hard for the program to develop and improve (Farrell, 1986, p. 98).

The rapid expansion did not allow program developers to monitor the precincts that implemented this program. The program development team (PDT) ensured that each precinct operated within the program design (Farrell, 1986, p. 2). The implementation of the program was considered successful within the precincts that followed the pilot program. It is noted that each precinct would have to adapt to the needs of the surrounding communities and plan CPOP operations accordingly (Farrell, 1986, p. 54). This problem also led to a lack of communication and understanding between CPOs. There was no established system of knowledge and

experiences for all CPOs to draw from for CPOP. They only had personal experiences within their command (Farrell, 1986, p. 102). As mentioned, different precincts used multiple approaches to deal with similar problems. With no unified system of sharing, one precinct could not learn how another was dealing with that same issue. The Vera Institute of Justice suggested that there be methods to help expose CPOs to other precincts and operations in the future. Some of these recommendations were rotational systems with experienced CPOs of the host unit and tours of different established precincts within the initial CPOP training so they can see how CPOs handle issues and the job in established precincts (Farrell, 1986, p. 103).

Changing a system built on control and stability is not easy, especially without the support of the people within the system. There are many disincentives to take risks in law enforcement, such as political fallout, and to be cautious about making such changes and adaptations is appropriate when it affects the lives and rights of the public (Fritzvold, n.d.). When officers were interviewed, they discussed feeling like community policing was “happening to them rather than with them” (Sadd & Grinc, 1996, p. 11). Similarly, in Chicago, CAPS challenges the typical habits and business of the police departments; there were initially pessimist feelings regarding the program and change (Hartnett & Skogan, 1999, p. 9). This call for a new role of patrol officer and for the help and participation of the people also caused issues for the department to implement these methods fully. In Chicago, officers did not enjoy the notion of civilians planning any program for the department or being a part of the discussions where goals and priorities were set. Police officers often believe that civilians cannot possibly understand their job as police officers and do not have a solid knowledge of their actions and the reasoning behind them. This leads to resistance against community policing, as officers view it as political or “social work” that real police officers would not do (Skogan & Hartnett, 1997).

Officers who volunteer for INOP projects noted this challenge and commented that these projects and methods must be “sold” to the officers and not just explained by management (Sadd & Grinc, 1996, p. 8). This, again, can be tied back to the idea that if those in higher positions within a department do not buy in and continuously support these changes, it will be hard to have everyone buy in and uphold these new practices.

Another barrier found from the INOP projects was that many “...officers were concerned their enforcement powers would be limited” (Sadd & Grinc, 1996, p. 11). Implementing these projects was meant to close gaps between patrol officers and special units within a department. In many of the departments involved in these INOP programs, a special unit was formed, and this caused feelings of distrust between the police management and the patrol officers (Sadd & Grinc, 1996, p. 8). With community policing supposed to have the organization decentralized, creating special groups can make officers feel as though they are not on an even playing field within their department, and the special units can become marginalized. Chicago Police Department learned from other cities’ mistakes that it was a high-risk situation to create community policing units within the department (Lurigio & Skogan, 1998, p. 6). This was reiterated by the findings of the INOP programs, as there are recommendations for departments to rethink the special unit status (Sadd & Grinc, 1996, p. 17). These methods used in the INOP projects differed from the traditional law enforcement methods that many officers were used to and had been practicing. Some mentioned that the projects were just “good, old-fashioned policing.” Officers argued that they had been engaged in this type of policing and that they had been practicing it for years when for many of the departments, this project was their first introduction to community policing. They showed a lack of knowledge and understanding about community policing within these arguments (Sadd & Grinc, 1996, p. 11).

### *Within the Community*

Community policing is about building trust and partnership between the police and the community, making the community and the residents a considerable part of the equation. A huge claim that is a main point in any discussion on community policing is that community residents should be heavily involved in efforts to ensure community safety (Skogan & Roth, 2004, p. 27). Despite policing becoming more effective and more organized since the 1990s, polls show the public's confidence in police work is unchanged or decreased (The Presidents Task Force, 2015, p. 23). Communities, where there are more people who are poor or a more significant amount of people of color, may not be willing or ready to work side-by-side with the police to solve community issues. Within policing overall, a huge barrier is the unwillingness of residents to report a crime or participate in criminal investigations (Muchow, 2022). They may have had poor experiences with police in the past and may view the police as a brutal force, especially towards those who are not white. There could also be language, technological, and organizational barriers that could prevent a community from buying into the program (Wilson et al., 2007, p. 35).

The Oakland Police Department (OPD) in California struggled to gain the community's trust and help at the beginning of its community policing program, Operation Ceasefire. The program wanted to reduce violence within the city and improve the troubled relationship between the community and the police (Braga et al., 2019, p. 10). Within police departments that are implementing community policing, there is always a need for community involvement and a continuous effort of involvement. Many factors can play into a community being reluctant to join forces with the police when it comes to community policing, including but not limited to a lack of awareness, language barriers, lack of interest, and a fear of retaliation (Wilson et al., 2007, p. 35). For each beat, there were different reluctances compared to others. Some beats could fear



retaliation, whereas others could experience a lack of interest from the residents. Often it comes down to the specific experiences, knowledge, and level of stress and crime within the beat.

Wilson et al. (2007) found that those who lived or worked in areas with high-stress levels were more fearful of retaliation (p. 35).

In Oakland, the police department had its community policing program funded by the Violence Prevention and Public Safety Act (known as Measure Y), which provides funding for violence-prevention programs (Wilson & Cox, 2008, p.1). Research was done to measure its effectiveness and the challenges faced by Operation Ceasefire. This community partner had 29 other programs for preventing violence outside of working with OPD. When asking problem-solving officers (PSOs) if they had worked with other programs, only one or two (out of 22) reported they regularly worked with another program (Wilson & Cox, 2008, p. 15). Some had never heard of 20 of the other funded programs. When asked why there was so little communication and partnership between PSOs and other community programs, it was reported that some agencies were unreliable or did not have room for referrals from police officers (Wilson & Cox, 2008, p.17). The community members, city partners, and other Measure Y programs (in this case) should all try to be involved and make an effort to help this program be collaborative and effective. It was also noted that for those living or working in high-stress beats, the most active way members participated was by calling the police with issues, but does not involve attending meetings (Wilson et al., 2007, p. 35).

Race and ethnicity also play a part in the communities involved with community policing and their willingness to participate. Looking at Chicago, the research found that Latino communities were often the most troubled groups. Compared to other groups, they had not experienced the same level of progress in neighborhood conditions (Skogan et al., 2002, p. 7). As

mentioned previously, some of this could be because Latinx communities may have had bad experiences with cops previously and did not trust them. Language barriers could also hold them back from fully understanding and buying into a program. Interactions between non-English speakers and police officers who only speak English can be frustrating and difficult, as communication is needed, but it is hard to do so (Culver, 2003, p. 58). Another example of the relationship between police and Latino communities is the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD). In 2011, the department worked with civic partners to establish the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) (LAPD, n.d.). This community policing program set several committed officers who had been trained in community policing in four majority-Latinx housing developments where there were trends of tension between the residents and the police (Muchow, 2022). This program wanted to use community policing methods to help improve the relationship and trust between the Latinx community and the police department, which would also help decrease crime and improve the perception of safety within the community. Research has shown that when Latinx residents have that sense of trust and confidence that police will not use excessive force against them, immigration concerns are less present in their decisions to report a crime (Messing et al., 2015, p. 335).

## **Summary**

Looking at multiple programs and examples of departments implementing community policing, one can see there are many challenges to implementing community policing methods. Within police departments, officers may not fully understand the goals of these methods, which can cause resistance to these changes. There is also a lack of prioritization from police leadership, which is also not helped by understaffing issues and insufficient officers in an area. This can lead to officers not having enough time to train new people and there not being enough

officers to implement the methods into the whole department and community fully. Additionally, there may be a lack of clear understanding and knowledge, which can make it difficult for new officers to learn and use these methods effectively and for the community to feel like the police department is being transparent and honest with them.

Within the community, there are challenges with getting involved in the efforts of community policing. Many barriers like language, technology, or organizational issues can prevent the community from becoming involved. In some communities with more people of color, there could be fears of retaliation or a huge distrust in the police from past experiences. In places like Oakland where many factors made it hard to involve the community in each beat. There could be a lack of awareness, a lack of interest, and the fear of retaliation from gangs or other violent groups. This can differ for each community, just like their needs and what programs and methods may work best may differ.

This paper explored the challenges and benefits of implementing community-oriented policing (COP) programs, which aim to build positive relationships between police departments and the communities they serve. The decentralization of police organizations can encourage community engagement and partnerships but also requires significant changes in departmental culture and decision-making. Building trust and mutual respect between law enforcement and community members is crucial, and successful community policing programs require tailored approaches that address each community's unique needs and concerns. Drawing on a range of sources, including police departments, government reports, and scholarly literature, insights into the potential benefits of COP and the challenges of implementing it effectively are offered. Ultimately, this paper aims to contribute to the ongoing conversation about improving police-community relations and promoting more effective and equitable policing practices.

## Next Steps

Considering the many different approaches and programs that police departments have implemented to try and adopt this community-oriented method of policing, there are many things that other police departments can take away. As a reminder, each department will need to tailor their approach to community policing to match the needs and concerns of the surrounding communities, as no two communities are the same. Making community policing a department-wide effort, with decentralizing the organization, allows every officer from top to bottom to feel involved and essential in the process. Training for every level of the department, from management to beat officers, also helps provide everyone with the proper techniques and understanding to deal with issues that may arise and to problem-solve within the community.

Changing the attitude and culture of the police department is not easy and can prove to be complicated. If those in management or supervisory positions buy-in and promote these methods and practices, those under them are more likely to follow suit. Setting clear, defined goals that involve community policing will also help the department understand the importance of this method of policing and what community policing is. Involving every member of the department and not creating a special unit unique to community policing will help there not be a gap between the officers within the department. This will also require beat officers to be in the same environment for as long as they can, as having them in the same community allows them to build stronger relationships with the residents. This will also help improve community involvement if they feel they know and can rely on the officers assigned to their area.

Like in Chicago, making sure that the communities involved know that they are just as involved in the process as the officers could help them feel more inclined to be involved in addressing issues. Holding monthly meetings with beat officers and their community to address

issues or concerns is a way to promote listening and problem-solving but also to work together to address the topics at hand. Another positive way the department can help increase the positive relationship with the community and build that sense of trust is to try to increase positive interactions with the residents of the community. Noting the factors that may decrease community involvement and trying to overcome them from the start could also be very beneficial. If there are multiple languages spoken in the community, having someone who can speak and understand the languages spoken can help break down language barriers. Promoting meetings or events that bring together the police and the residents of the community can also help raise awareness and increase interest. Looking at programs like the PIP in Houston, inviting different members of the police department to come into meetings and describe their job position, what they do, and how they actively try to promote community policing and solve crime. This can help promote transparency from the department and thus build a sense of trust among the residents towards their department.

The most significant parts of community policing are proactive problem-solving and building trust and partnerships with the community. By focusing on involving the community and identifying the needs and barriers that may hinder the involvement of residents, the police department can fully address those concerns and barriers alongside the community and increase the trust between the two. Making sure that all members of the department are aware of the goals and are involved in the implementation and training of community policing, as well as making sure those in management positions are fully supported and involved in the implementation process, can ensure that they will feel more positive towards these changes and buy-in to the program. Implementing a policing style like community policing is not easy, as shown in this

paper, but with proper communication, involvement, and continuous efforts and support, it can help build strong positive relationships between police departments and their communities.

## References

- About the cops office.* ABOUT THE COPS OFFICE | COPS OFFICE. (n.d.). Retrieved April 20, 2023, from <https://cops.usdoj.gov/aboutcops>
- Blair, G., Weinstein, J. M., & Christia, F. (2021, November 29). *Community policing is not one size fits all.* Foreign Policy. Retrieved April 21, 2023, from <https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/11/29/community-policing-reform-distrust-security-global-south/>
- Bos, H., Cox, A. G., Fain, T., Smith, T. L., & Wilson, J. M. (2007). *Community Policing and Violence Prevention in Oakland.* Rand Corporation. Retrieved from [https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical\\_reports/2007/RAND\\_TR546.pdf](https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical_reports/2007/RAND_TR546.pdf)
- Brown, L. P. (1989). *Community policing: A practical guide for police officials.* Office of Justice Programs. Retrieved April 23, 2023, from <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/118001.pdf>
- Careless, J. (2021, December 1). *Creating a positive impact: Effective community policing strategies.* Police1. Retrieved April 20, 2023, from <https://www.police1.com/community-policing/articles/creating-a-positive-impact-effective-community-policing-strategies-DztozvaIDseOpN44/>
- The Chicago Community Policing Evaluation Consortium. (2004, April). *Community Policing in Chicago, Year Ten.* Skogan.org. Retrieved April 21, 2023, from [https://skogan.org/files/Community\\_Policing\\_in\\_Chicago\\_Year\\_Ten.pdf](https://skogan.org/files/Community_Policing_in_Chicago_Year_Ten.pdf)

- Condon, R. J., Johnson, R. J., Scott, D. W., & Ward, B. (1988, September). *Community Patrol Officer Program Problem-Solving Guide*. Arizona State University Library. Retrieved April 22, 2023, from [https://popcenter.asu.edu/sites/default/files/library/unpublished/ProblemAnalysisTools/175\\_The\\_Community\\_Patrol\\_Officer\\_Program.pdf](https://popcenter.asu.edu/sites/default/files/library/unpublished/ProblemAnalysisTools/175_The_Community_Patrol_Officer_Program.pdf)
- Cox, A. G., & Wilson, J. M. (2008). *Community policing and crime: The process and impact ... - rand corporation*. Rand Corporation. Retrieved April 23, 2023, from [https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical\\_reports/2008/RAND\\_TR635.pdf](https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical_reports/2008/RAND_TR635.pdf)
- Culver, L. (2003, March 14). *Police-Latino Community Relations: Addressing challenges in rural ... Cambio de Colores (Changes of Colors)*. Retrieved April 23, 2023, from <https://mospace.umsystem.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10355/48846/Final2007-Culver.pdf?sequence=1>
- Farrell, M. J. (1986). *The Community Patrol Officer Program - Vera Institute of Justice*. Vera Institute of Justice. Retrieved April 22, 2023, from <https://www.vera.org/downloads/publications/1206.pdf>
- FBI. (2012, June 29). *Offense definitions*. FBI. Retrieved April 23, 2023, from <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2011/crime-in-the-u.s.-2011/offense-definitions>
- Hartnett, S. M., & Skogan, W. G. (1999, April). *Community Policing: Chicago's Experience*. skogan.org. Retrieved April 21, 2023, from [http://www.skogan.org/files/Comm\\_Policing\\_-\\_Chicagos\\_Experience.pdf](http://www.skogan.org/files/Comm_Policing_-_Chicagos_Experience.pdf)



Houston Police Department. (n.d.). *Positive interaction program*. Citizens and Police...

Friendship Through Education. Retrieved April 23, 2023, from

<https://www.houstontx.gov/police/pip/index.htm>

ICT4COP. (n.d.). *The origin of the concept of COP - ICT4COP: Community Oriented Policing*.

ICT4COP | Community oriented policing. Retrieved April 23, 2023, from

<https://www.communitypolicing.eu/the-origin-of-the-concept-of-cop/>

Jrank. (n.d.). *Police: Community policing - origins and evolution of Community Policing*.

Origins And Evolution Of Community Policing - Crime, Patrol, Foot, and Neighborhood -

JRank Articles. Retrieved April 23, 2023, from [https://law.jrank.org/pages/1649/Police-](https://law.jrank.org/pages/1649/Police-Community-Policing-Origins-evolution-community-policing.html)

[Community-Policing-Origins-evolution-community-policing.html](https://law.jrank.org/pages/1649/Police-Community-Policing-Origins-evolution-community-policing.html)

Kahmann, S., Hartman, E., Leap, J., & Brantingham, P. J. (2022, June). *Impact evaluation of the*

*LAPD community safety partnership*. Project Euclid. Retrieved April 23, 2023, from

<http://paleo.sscnet.ucla.edu/KahmannEtAl-2022-AnnalsApplStats.pdf>

Lamburini, K., & Long, D. (2018). *Evolution of community policing in New York City - pace*

*university*. Pace University. Retrieved April 22, 2023, from

[https://digitalcommons.pace.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1207&context=honorscollege\\_theses](https://digitalcommons.pace.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1207&context=honorscollege_theses)

LAPD. (n.d.). *About Us - The CSP Approach*. LAPD CSPB. Retrieved April 23, 2023, from

<https://www.lapdcsp.org/about-us>

Lurigio, A. J., & Skogan, W. G. (1998). *Bringing officers on board - skogan*. Skogan.org.

Retrieved April 21, 2023, from

[http://skogan.org/files/Bringing\\_Officers\\_on\\_Board.Lurigio\\_Skogan.pdf](http://skogan.org/files/Bringing_Officers_on_Board.Lurigio_Skogan.pdf)

McElroy, J. E., Cosgrove, C. A., & Sadd, S. (1993). *Community Policing The CPOP in New*

*York*. The Vera Institute of Justice. Retrieved April 23, 2023, from

<https://www.vera.org/downloads/publications/1266.pdf>

Messing, J. T., Becerra, D., Ward-Lasher, A., & Androff, D. K. (2015). *Latinas' Perceptions of*

*Law Enforcement: Fear of Deportation, Crime Reporting, and Trust in the System*. SAGE

Journals. Retrieved April 23, 2023, from

[https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0886109915576520?casa\\_token=IMPzUdQSGyIAAAAA:klhzufxbkU2b7tRvbkXWWtxu6H1E1sCRIqx42Muyp\\_QWJTquDgSbfsmZbEgtTux5\\_gGxKh0rdYk](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0886109915576520?casa_token=IMPzUdQSGyIAAAAA:klhzufxbkU2b7tRvbkXWWtxu6H1E1sCRIqx42Muyp_QWJTquDgSbfsmZbEgtTux5_gGxKh0rdYk)

NYPD. (n.d.). *Neighborhood policing*. Neighborhood Policing - NYPD. Retrieved April 23,

2023, from [https://www.nyc.gov/site/nypd/bureaus/patrol/neighborhood-coordination-](https://www.nyc.gov/site/nypd/bureaus/patrol/neighborhood-coordination-officers.page)

[officers.page](https://www.nyc.gov/site/nypd/bureaus/patrol/neighborhood-coordination-officers.page)

Oakland City Attorney. (n.d.). *City Council Rules of Procedure - Oaklandcityattorney.org*.

Oakland City Attorney. Retrieved April 23, 2023, from

[https://www.oaklandcityattorney.org/PDFS/Guides%20and%20FAQs/City%20Council%20](https://www.oaklandcityattorney.org/PDFS/Guides%20and%20FAQs/City%20Council%20Rules%20of%20Procedure.pdf)

[Rules%20of%20Procedure.pdf](https://www.oaklandcityattorney.org/PDFS/Guides%20and%20FAQs/City%20Council%20Rules%20of%20Procedure.pdf)

- Rosenbaum, D. P., & Lurigio, A. R. (1994, July). *An inside look at community policing reform: Definitions ...* SAGE Journals. Retrieved April 23, 2023, from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0011128794040003001>
- Sadd, S., & Grinc, R. M. (1996, February). *Implementation Challenges in Community Policing*. U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved April 21, 2023, from <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles/implcp.pdf>
- Skogan, W. G., & Hartnett, S. M. (1999, December 2). *Community Policing, Chicago style*. Google Books. Retrieved April 23, 2023, from [https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=\\_BTrVy\\_OFkMC&oi=fnd&pg=PA3&dq=Community%2Bpolicing%2C%2BChicago&ots=7PX8W2\\_mcS&sig=ZzUfZ8buBMoQX15R6PLiPVDGoBQ#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=_BTrVy_OFkMC&oi=fnd&pg=PA3&dq=Community%2Bpolicing%2C%2BChicago&ots=7PX8W2_mcS&sig=ZzUfZ8buBMoQX15R6PLiPVDGoBQ#v=onepage&q&f=false)
- Skogan, W. G., & Roth, J. A. (2004). *Community Policing Can It Work?* Skogan.org. Retrieved April 21, 2023, from [http://skogan.org/files/Comm\\_Policing-Can\\_it\\_Work\\_Introduction.pdf](http://skogan.org/files/Comm_Policing-Can_it_Work_Introduction.pdf)
- UCLA. (2020). *Evaluation of the community safety partnership*. University of California, Los Angeles. Retrieved April 23, 2023, from [https://lapdonlinestrgeacc.blob.core.usgovcloudapi.net/lapdonlinemedia/2021/11/CSP-Evaluation-Report\\_2020\\_FINAL.pdf](https://lapdonlinestrgeacc.blob.core.usgovcloudapi.net/lapdonlinemedia/2021/11/CSP-Evaluation-Report_2020_FINAL.pdf)
- Wycoff, M. A., & Oettmeier, T. N. (1993). *Evaluating Patrol Officer Performance Under Community Policing: The Houston Experience*. Office of Justice Programs. Retrieved April 23, 2023, from <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/151400.pdf>