Thesis: Increasing public safety in Baltimore through building transformative community and
police relationships

by

Linda Keely

June 2021

Presented to the

School of Criminal Justice

University of Baltimore

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Science, Criminal Justice

Approved by: _____*Elias Nader*_____

Dr. Elias Nader, Thesis Advisor

_____*Prof. H*_____

Dr. Patrick Hughes, Committee Member

Completed by Elias Nader on 7/13/21 per verbal request

_____

Dr. Benjamin Wright, Committee Member

Abstract

The Baltimore Police Department (BPD) is required under a federal consent decree to commit to community policing principles and establish a partnership with the community. This paper addresses three research questions related to the required change: Are the community and BPD ready for transformative relationships, what matters to the Baltimore community in informal and formal engagement, and what is necessary for BPD to collaboratively produce public safety solutions with the community. A qualitative analysis and triangulation were performed on three data sources: BPD staff focus groups on community policing; focus groups, interviews, and public forums on community policing with community members; and observations of BPD-community monthly district meetings. The data contained almost 2,000 references which were coded into 84 categories that addressed the research questions. The findings are mixed. BPD is not ready for change; what matters to the community, and BPD staff, is simply positive interactions with each other; and to collaborate on public safety, BPD must view residents as subject matter experts and embrace them as part of entire decision-making process.

Acknowledgements

Thank you, Dr. Nader, for your tireless explanations of the process, thought partnership, and enduring encouragement.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

In 2017, the United States, the Baltimore City Mayor and City Council, and the Baltimore Police Department (BPD) signed a consent decree to ensure constitutional policing and increase public safety in Baltimore. In the third sentence of the 227-page document, the Consent Decree states, "The parties recognize that these outcomes require partnership between BPD and the communities it serves" (United States of America v. Police Department of Baltimore City, et. al., 2017, p.6). To support these outcomes, the Consent Decree requires BPD to commit to community policing principles throughout its entire organization and infrastructure. In April 2020, in support of the Consent Decree requirements, the Baltimore Police Department (BPD) Community Policing Plan (CPP) was published. The mission of the plan is two-fold: (1) Improve police-community relations, and (2) Reduce crime and disorder through collaborative problem-solving partnerships with the community (BPD, 2020, p.6).

The plan encompasses a community policing strategy that should enable residents and patrol officers to collaboratively produce public safety solutions and supports three key components necessary for success (Santos, 2019):

1. Partnerships with the community that enable joint problem solving;

2. Organizational transformation that allows for decentralized decision making and ownership of community policing on the front lines (i.e., resident-facing positions); and

3. Problem solving that proactively addresses challenges and systematically

identifies and deploys solutions.

The CPP acknowledges, "Community Engagement is key to the implementation of Community Policing" (BPD, 2020, p.7), yet the implementation details are limited. The plan notes officers will participate in informal and formal engagement and partner with residents to solve problems. However, other than an eight-hour community policing training, the CPP does not address how BPD will transform officers' personal and institutionally endorsed mindsets from warriors (i.e., those who fight crime) to guardians, (i.e., those who protect and serve; Owens, Weisburd, Amendola, & Alpert, 2018). The plan also acknowledges that building partnerships with the community is vital. Although, it does not address how to establish trust or legitimacy in a city or within a department that has both a police commissioner and an entire unit of officers in prison for breaking the law that they swore to uphold. As noted by Doane & Cumberland (2018), though the concepts of community policing are comprehensive and well researched, the application of those concepts and steps required for implementation is very challenging.

Therefore, this thesis will explore: How can BPD develop transformative relationships with the community that increase public safety? More specifically,

1. Are the community and BPD ready for transformative relationships?

2. What matters to the Baltimore community in informal and formal

engagement?

3. What is necessary for BPD to collaboratively produce public safety solutions

    with the community?

The discussion section of this thesis will also include specific application

recommendations based on the literature review and the results of the research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Given only 30% of organizational change implementation projects are likely to succeed, the feasibility of implementing community policing is understandably questionable (Arnéguy, Ohana, & Stinglhamber, 2018). Research indicated the primary reasons for failure are employee resistance due to lack of input into the change process and lack of consideration of employees' attitudes towards change, employees losing the trust and security of the known status quo, the impact of change on work practices, and a dispute with the ethical and strategic value and benefits of the proposed change (McKay, Kuntz, & Näswall, 2013; Arnéguy, Ohana, & Stinglhamber, 2018). Additionally, when residents are promoted as co-producers of public safety and not just consumers, a successful shift to community policing must consider and mitigate the community's resistance. To mitigate both the resistance of the community and the resistance of BPD staff, as well as develop transformative relationships between the two entities, it is critical to assess four areas: the definition of "community", how to prepare the community and BPD staff for change; what transformative relationships look like, and how to collaboratively increase public safety. The remaining sections of this Chapter review the research available to perform that assessment and develop specific strategies to avoid failure.

Definitions of Community

When change involves the community, the first question to ask is, who is the community? The CPP defines community as:

[P]eople living and/or working in a particular area, as well as people who share

formal or informal interests and characteristics that bring them together. This

includes but is not limited to people's shared geographies, activities, ideals,

languages, and norms (BPD, 2020, p.7).

However, community is not just residents and neighborhood associations; it can

also encompass community-based organizations; anchor institutions; city, state, and

federal government agencies, and even the media (Bond-Fortier, 2020). Community is

also defined as a neighborhood, shared culture (e.g., immigrants born in a particular

country, practicing a particular religion), or a shared experience (e.g., homeless, formerly

incarcerated, youth) (Gill, Weisburd, Telep, Vitter, & Bennett, 2014).

Using a community governance framework expands the definition of community

to include community-based organizations, local businesses, and other city agencies

(Diamond & Weiss, 2009). Community governance is the extension of community

policing to encompass other municipal and community services. This takes a more

holistic view that each of these entities is required for co-production of public safety

solutions and acknowledges those who live and work in the city may serve in multiple

capacities. After defining community, the next step is to determine what is necessary to

prepare the community and BPD for change.

Readiness for Change

A change-management framework or model can provide a roadmap and the

structure to guide a transformational change process. Change-management frameworks,

such as McKinsey's 7-S Framework, provide the elements for a leader to consider when

implementing change (Anderson & Ackerman Anderson, 2001). These may include

people, expertise, and systems (Anderson & Ackerman Anderson, 2001). Alternatively,

change-management models, such as Kotter's Eight State Process of Creating Major

Change, provide the sequence in which the elements are considered and the actions to

accomplish the change (Anderson & Ackerman Anderson, 2001). The Baltimore CPP

includes categories of change (i.e., a framework) though neither the sequence nor the

actions.

To ensure the community and BPD staff are ready for change, those involved and

impacted must agree with the value of the change and have "affective commitment", i.e.,

a personal attachment to the organization's values (McKay, Kuntz, & Näswall, 2013).

Though there is no gold standard for organizational readiness assessments (Miake-Lye,

Delevan, Ganz, Mittman & Finley, 2020), there are multiple criteria that can be

considered. To start, Holt, Armenakis, Feild, & Harris (2007) identified four key

components to determine readiness:

1. Appropriateness – do employees believe this is the right strategy to resolve the
   organizational issues,

2. Management support perception – are organizational leaders committed to the
   change,

3. Change self-efficacy – do employees believe they have the personal capacity
   to make the change, and

4. Personal valence perception – does the change personally benefit the

employee.

Culture Change

Though addressing these components may be a precursor of success (Arnéguy,

Ohana, & Stinglhamber, 2018), as noted by Peter Drucker and taught in BPD's

administrator training, "Culture eats strategy for breakfast". Culture change is the

theoretical framework for the transition to community policing; if the culture can be

shifted, change comes more easily and is more sustainable. The *BPD Crime Reduction &*

Transformational Plan (BPD, 2019) emphasizes creating a culture of service within the

community, yet neither this plan nor the BPD CPP mentions the steps required.

In a case study of a new police chief attempting to shift a department "from the

dark ages to the twenty-first century" (Thomas, 2010, p.255), multiple lessons were

learned as to what is necessary for change to occur (Thomas, 2010). These included

assessing readiness for change, understanding the history of the agency and its successes

and failures with previous change, and recruiting change agents throughout the

department who are ready to carry out the change. When cultural change involves

reconciling a history of harm, initiating a reconciliation process can repair the damage

between the police and the community as well as between the department and its officers

(Kuhn & Lurie, 2018).

Community Reconciliation – Accountability & Trust

Acknowledging harm begins with recognizing the generational harm done, particularly to marginalized communities (Kuhn & Lurie, 2018). There is a long history of harms committed by the police including defending those colonizing the land of Native Americans, serving the personal agendas of politicians through corruption and brutality, and enabling White citizens to lynch Black people (Potter, 2013). As noted by the president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), Terrence Cunningham, law enforcement must be accountable for the damage it has done through oppression and violence to communities of color for healing to begin (Kuhn & Lurie, 2018). Though officers may not understand why history does not stay in the past, minority communities have generational distrust as the harms committed to their families and communities have not been acknowledged or repaired (Kuhn & Lurie, 2018).

Officer Morale & Organizational Justice

Similar to reconciling with community, resolving harm done to officers may include enabling officers to share their narratives and acknowledging failed leadership policies and practices (Kuhn & Lurie, 2018). Though some believe that national incidents and more specifically, media's portrayal of the events, damage officers' willingness to do their jobs and engage with the community (known as the *Ferguson Effect*), research has demonstrated that it is the relationship between the officer and the department that has the most impact on an officer's motivation to work with the community (Wolfe & Nix, 2016).

This relationship framework (i.e., organizational justice) is comprised of three

components (Wolfe & Nix, 2016): Distributive Justice – is the system for who gets

promoted and raises fair? Procedural Justice – do I have a voice within the organization?

and, Interactional Justice – am I treated respectfully? Some researchers add a fourth

dimension, Informational Justice – am I provided information about organizational

decisions (Arnéguy, Ohana, & Stinglhamber, 2018). The perception of organizational

justice is also correlated with readiness for change (Arnéguy, Ohana, & Stinglhamber,

2018).

Institutionalizing Change

Despite the low probability of success, the Lowell Police Department in

Massachusetts, whose city has a very slight White majority, a struggling economy, crime,

corruption, and police legitimacy issues, successfully transformed its identity and

relationship with the community over a ten-year period. Those changes were sustained

for ten more years even with significant financial and organizational challenges (Bond-

Fortier, 2020). Lowell demonstrated that like a doctor prescribing medicine, if the

dosage, timing, and duration of medicine needed to achieve community policing is

adhered to, the patient can thrive versus decline (Roman, 2020).

Some may question whether deploying community policing officers in

Baltimore's most violent neighborhoods is effective. However, community policing is

also recommended in the countering violent extremism. Traditional policing methods

(e.g., surveillance, use of force) degrade the trust and public confidence necessary to both

gain the cooperation of the community in fighting terrorism and deter individuals from viewing terrorist organizations as more legitimate than police (Gerspacher, Wilson, Al-Rababah, & Walker, 2020). Similarly, traditional policing methods have degraded trust and legitimacy in Baltimore.

However, if agencies view community policing as solely a responsibility of neighborhood liaison officers, it is likely to fail (Bond-Fortier, 2020). Community policing requires de-siloing structures (Bond-Fortier, 2020) and rooting out cultural barricades through the organization (Skogan, 2006). Institutionalizing change is dependent on what is expected, trained, and measured.

Roles & Responsibilities

For a transformative implementation of community policing, everyone has a new role and responsibility, including residents, other city agencies, and community organizers (Skogan, 2006). Though decentralizing responsibility is a cornerstone of community policing, to ensure community engagement it is critical that ownership of community policing occurs within the unit most responsible for carrying out the work (i.e., Patrol). For example, though responsibility for Chicago's initial implementation of community policing lay in a position four levels down in the chain of command, in support of decentralization, the position did not have authority over patrol services (Skogan, 2006). Therefore, those that were responsible for carrying out community policing had no philosophical or tactical buy-in of the plan (Skogan, 2006).

After the Chicago Police Department completed a successful pilot implementation, civilians were hired to operate a new centralized unit responsible for recruiting residents, coordinating problem-solving initiatives, and marketing/outreach (Skogan, 2006). Each district had a community organizer, who often worked for a community nonprofit organization and was subcontracted to the CPD, to create block collaboratives, engage existing organizations, teach residents how to organize and problem solve, and identify resources (Skogan, 2006).

The Madison Police Department has a three-prong approach to community policing deployment, which is funded by local foundations (Police Executive Research Forum [PERF], 2019): (1) Community Policing Teams consist of a sergeant and five officers who focus on specific crime patterns; (2) Neighborhood officers, in lieu of responding to calls for service, focus on problem solving in particularly high crime neighborhoods. Neighborhood officers serve four-year terms and may run youth outreach and other programs; and (3) Patrol officer liaisons are assigned to a specific beat and act as a designated liaison for neighborhood associations, businesses, and residents.

Some departments (e.g., Fort Worth) put the responsibility for community policing on "community service officers", while other cities have specialized problem solvers that move from problem area to problem area (Skogan, 2006). If community policing is a philosophy, not a tactic, this leaves those most likely to interact with residents and carry out problem-solving tactics not indoctrinated in the philosophy, which is likely to degrade legitimacy. Ultimate responsibility must rest with those that have the

most direct relationships with residents and "translate principles into practice", i.e., patrol officers and their direct supervisors (Santos, 2019). BPD staff recommended eliminating Neighborhood Coordination Officers (NCOs) so that all officers are focused on community policing (National Police Foundation, 2019).

Though patrol officers are the vanguard of community policing (Diaz, 2019), leadership is one of the most critical elements in a successful implementation (Lum, Koper, Gill, Hibdon, Telep, & Robinson, 2016). Therefore, sergeants could be a single point of failure. Though the BPD CPP highlights the supporting role of sergeants, it does not place any formal ownership of community policing on sergeants (BPD, 2020). Patrol officer supervisors, as recommended by police practitioners, must model community policing by developing and nurturing formal partnerships within the community (Santos, 2019). Where officers focus on building and maintaining relationships with individual residents and informal partnerships with businesses, sergeants can focus on developing relationships with a goal towards identifying key stakeholders and establishing formal partnerships with community-based organizations (Santos, 2019). Sergeants should consistently attend neighborhood association meetings in their sectors to determine which community leaders are most influential in building trust within the community and establishing a partnership to address crime and disorder (Santos, 2019). In addition to neighborhood association meetings, sergeants should also seek other venues for regular information exchange such as business councils or development associations, community centers, or multipurpose community organizations (Santos, 2019).

Training

BPD intends to deliver an eight-hour training on its community policing plan as well as infuse the concepts of community policing throughout its curriculum (BPD, 2020). However, changing individual mindsets and in turn, changing organizational culture requires more. When officers believe they have some self-determination in changing behavior and the capacity to learn the new training techniques, they are more likely to be receptive to change (Wolfe et al., 2019). Transformational training enables learners to question the efficacy of what's being taught with facilitators prepared to accept and address challenges to the curriculum. Though officer's attitudes may not always change, their skills may still improve (Wolfe et al., 2019; Krameddine et al., 2013).

To determine if community policing training is effective, evaluation could extend beyond "did an officer learn anything from the training" to "did an officer's behavior change because of the training" (Bradley & Connors, 2007). Assessing whether training is transformative requires learning new knowledge, having the desire to apply the new knowledge, applying the new knowledge to the job, and then attributing the application to the training (Bradley & Connors, 2007; Kirkpatrick, 1998). This requires more intensive measurement efforts such as evaluating pre- vs post- training data, focus groups, and control groups to determine if transformative learning occurred. (Bradley & Connors, 2007).

Evaluating Officer's Performance

To track community policing field operation activities, the BPD CPP notes four computer-aided dispatch (CAD) signals: business check, community meeting, directed patrol, and foot patrol (BPD, 2020). However, based on an analysis of 2 million CAD records from four police departments, three of which had from 500 to 2,000 sworn officers, and 180 hours of officer observation, proactive policing was primarily limited to traffic stops and location checks (Lum, Koper, Wu, Johnson, & Stoltz, 2020). Unless more specific proactive activities are recorded and tracked, officers are likely to fall back on more traditional policing tactics (Lum et al., 2020).

Cost of Change

Lastly, another important consideration in assessing readiness to change is the cost of the change. The Chicago Police Department (CPD) community policing implementation office had a budget of approximately $9 million, which covered community outreach, community organizers, and service coordinators within each of the districts; coordination of problem-solving initiatives; and youth service coordinators (Skogan, 2006). Contrarily, the Lowell Police Department went through years of budget deficits where its only choice was to determine what staff could do differently without additional resources (Bond-Fortier, 2020). However, ~~Lowell~~ also applied for and won $13 million in state and federal grants over a ten-year period and leveraged partnerships, including using graduate students to staff initiatives (Bond-Fortier, 2020).

There is also evidence that investing in police-community collaboratives can both reduce crime and have a positive return on investment. For example, the violence reduction initiative in Boston and Springfield, Massachusetts cost $2M and saved $15M and significantly reduced violent crimes (Giffords Law Center, 2017). However, as the Tulalip Office of Neighborhoods (n.d.) noted in partnership with the Tulalip Police Department and Housing Authority:

> The bottom line is that there is not enough money in the world to pay for Community Policing. Community Policing is a value driven philosophy and - - like human affection or friendship - - it cannot be bought. (p.2)

Community Engagement

Intentionally and continually involving the community in addressing public safety enables government institutions to build authentic relationships within the community. Developing these relationships is like opening a legitimacy bank accountant (Skogan, 2019). When traumatic events occur, there is a balance in the account that may help government institutions through the bad times (Skogan, 2019). Though the CPP notes that partnerships are critical to the goals of the plan, it does not define who or what is a partner (BPD, 2020). However, rather than labeling the types of relationships a government institution has with its community, the literature focuses on the types of involvement.

Definitions of Involvement

The city of Longmont, California defined four levels of involvement with city

agencies to help clarify the relationships of different boards and commissions (Diamond

& Weiss, 2009): (1) *Inform* – provide information; (2) *Consult* – receive feedback on

options or decisions; (3) *Involve* – direct collaboration to ensure the communities'

concerns are considered and addressed; and (4) *Partner* – collaborate throughout the

entire process of decision making on the identification of issues, development of possible

solutions, and selection of the solution.

However, partnering is not necessarily ensuring every decision is made jointly. In

a transparent partnership, the spectrum of issues that the community is experiencing is

defined (Harkin, 2018). Then the partners determine for each set of issues whether the

community will participate in the "steering" of the resolution (i.e., analyze the needs) to

set the priorities and determine and provide oversight of the solutions or the "rowing"

(i.e., participate in the deployment the selected solution; Harkin, 2018). The spectrum

ranges from solely a policing issue to a collaborative policing and community issue

(Harkin, 2018).

Informally Engaging Residents

The BPD defines informal engagement as the interaction that occurs between

police and the community in the daily course of police activities such as responding to

calls, patrolling neighborhoods, or investigating crimes (BPD, 2020). In these daily

interactions, residents are likely to respond to police in accordance with the tone and

attitudes used by the police (Gau & Brunson, 2009). If a harsh or demeaning approach is used by police, police may expect residents to respond in kind.

Positive Interactions

The New Haven Police Department in Connecticut found that one positive, brief interaction from police going door-to-door to informally engage residents resulted in increased legitimacy, satisfaction, and cooperation (Peyton, Sierra-Arévalo, & Rand, 2019). This informal engagement had the most positive impact on Black residents and those that had the most negative views of police (Peyton et al., 2019). Officers introduced the engagement as "community policing visits", encouraged a dialogue about policing and challenges with the neighborhood, and provided residents with a business card that included their cell phone (Peyton et al., 2019).

Beat Integrity

In Baltimore, both officers (National Police Foundation [NPF], 2019) and residents (NPF, 2020) acknowledged that police appear to be avoiding any interaction with community (e.g., pulling back from enforcement and not taking initiative to prevent or confront crime). Beat integrity patrols (i.e., having the same officers in the same sector on the same shift) could change that and build trust (Ratcliffe & Sorg, 2017). Just as appearance and body language of an officer can discourage residents from approaching officers, not having the same officers on the same beats can also deter approachability (Ratcliffe & Sorg, 2017). Many Baltimore residents want patrol officers assigned to the same beat so they may build relationships, for more consistent visibility of police in their

neighborhoods, and for officers to engage as if they were part of the community (NPF, 2020).

The Chicago Police Department implemented beat integrity by permanently assigning patrol officers to smaller, geographic areas so they could build relationships with residents and build a knowledge base of problems in particular areas and how to solve them (Skogan, 2006). Beat teams consisted of officers that covered a specific geographic area for all shifts and a sergeant to ensure continuity and sharing of information across shifts (Skogan, 2006). Beat team assignments were for a minimum of a year and shifts did not rotate (e.g., day and evening shifts did not switch monthly) as this practice was problematic to building relationships in other cities (Skogan, 2006).

Calls for service within beats went to beat officers first (i.e., post integrity), particularly when local knowledge and relationships may aid calls (Skogan, 2006). "Cold" calls such as insurance reports were given to "district rapid response teams", rather than assigned to beats, to prevent beat officers from having to leave their post (Skogan, 2006, p.60). Sergeants also monitored calls for service to ensure community calls were dispatched to beat officers and non-community calls were dispatched to non-beat officers (Skogan, 2006).

Foot Patrols

In the Philadelphia Police Department (PPD) foot patrol experiment, all officers graduating from the academy were deployed in pairs on foot patrol after spending time with field training officers (Ratcliffe & Sorg, 2017). Each pair of officers covered about

15 street intersections (1.3 miles) and performed three times the number of pedestrian stops (compared to vehicle patrol officers) and over 1,500 vehicle stops (Ratcliffe & Sorg, 2017). Though the experiment showed evidence that officers increased social order within their beats and reduced crime in areas that had high crime levels, the effectiveness of foot patrols decreased over time (Ratcliffe & Sorg, 2017). The Kansas City Police Department also found that foot patrols were less effective with crime (aggravated assaults and robberies) after initial deployment and rotated foot patrols every 90 days (Novak, Fox, Carr, & Spade, 2016).

Foot patrols are effective at both reducing crime and increasing legitimacy if agencies adhere to some general principles (Ratcliffe & Sorg, 2017). First, officers should consistently cover the same, manageably sized beats (Ratcliffe & Sorg, 2017). Officers also need an understanding of the history and marginalization of the community and enthusiasm about building relationships with the residents (Ratcliffe & Sorg, 2017). Those performing foot patrols should have high social-emotional intelligence, using humor, eye contact, and reflective listening to engage residents (Ratcliffe & Sorg, 2017). Foot patrols should consist of both new and veteran officers as newer officers may be more motivated to engage in problem-solving policing while veteran officers may be more comfortable and interested in relationship building and more experienced in de-escalation of calls (Ratcliffe & Sorg, 2017). Lastly, it is important that these officers believe the work is valued by their supervisors and a departmental priority (Ratcliffe & Sorg, 2017).

In 2015, Baltimore County, with the support of the Fraternal Order of Police, required officers to do at least 30 minutes of foot patrol per 10-hour shift (Ratcliffe & Sorg, 2017). However, if officers only have a small amount of time allocated for community policing or do not have regular beats, this practice is unlikely to build relationships, provide a community with a sense of safety, or solicit officer investment in the new strategy (Ratcliffe & Sorg, 2017). It is critical that foot patrol officers are not isolated from other patrol officers and are viewed as an integral part of sector teams (Ratcliffe & Sorg, 2017).

Referrals for Service

When interacting with residents, officers must understand how to respond to needs for services outside their purview with compassion, guidance, and referrals (Skogan, 2019). Not doing so perpetuates the belief that police do not offer value to marginalized communities and deters residents from cooperating with police (Skogan, 2019). Patrol officers need an efficient method for identifying points of contact in city agencies, social services, and community-based organizations that they can provide residents. The CPD developed "special service request forms" that enabled patrol officers or anyone else in the department to initiate a prioritized response from public works, transportation or other city agencies and was tracked through completion (Skogan, Hartnett, DuBois, Comey, Kaiser, & Lovig,1999). The service requests were generated during shifts and at beat meetings, as well as when residents walked into the police station and requested assistance (Skogan et al., 1999). The Chicago Mayor's Office of

Inquiry and Information would receive the forms and distribute them to the appropriate

agency (Skogan et al., 1999). If an issue needed an immediate response, a district

community officer would contact the mayor's office directly (Skogan et al., 1999).

Formally Engaging Partners

Formal engagement is defined as pre-planned interactions such as establishing

public safety commissions or attending neighborhood association meetings (BPD, 2020).

In the development of formal relationships with a community, three levels are

considered: commissions, affinity groups, and beat partners. However, regardless of the

level, the police first must develop the skills to listen to overcome barriers in forming

these relationships (IACP, 2019). As the subject matter experts and authorities on crime,

the police find it difficult to invite others to speak first. However, expertise may erode

efficacy if residents are consistently relying upon police to solve its problems (IACP,

2018). Additionally, police must demonstrate they can move from "power over" to

"power to" or "power with" (McKee & Lewis, 2016).

Commissions

A commission may be considered an "involve" relationship. For example, the

Albany Community Police Advisory Committee (ACPAC) has 25 members, including

representatives from each district, the Chief of Police, selected senior staff, and the Union

presidents (IACP, 2018). The committee both represents and is representative of the

community. To determine if there are gaps in representation, the first question a

commission should tackle is, "Who is missing from this table?" (IACP, 2018).

ACPAC conducts public meetings 10 times annually and has representation at all

police-community events (IACP, 2018). The functions of ACPAC, as well as similar

boards/commissions in Camden County, New Jersey, Columbia, South Carolina, and

Hennepin County, Minnesota include mediating between public concerns and policing

policies and practices and reviewing community feedback to develop legislative and

policy recommendations for improving public safety (IACP, 2018). Commissions may

also develop bottom-up approaches to reducing violence and increasing police-resident

cooperation, secure funding for new initiatives, receive briefings on major incidents, and

develop public messaging approaches (IACP, 2018). In Doral, Florida, citizen advisory

members were so impressed with the effectiveness of mobile license plate readers, they

worked with the City Council to allocate funding for purchasing more (IACP, 2018).

Affinity Groups

Affinity is defined as having a relationship based on similar characteristics

(McKean, 2005). These groups may have a "consult" or "involve" relationship. Arlington

Police Department in Virginia has a clergy affinity group, Arlington Clergy and Police

Partnership (ACPP), which is responsible for messages to the community (IACP, 2018)

and ultimately building trust and legitimacy between the community and the police.

ACPP has over 30 members and is an independent 501(c)(3) organization (IACP, 2018).

ACPP activities include a prison ministry, supporting police-initiated community events

such as clothing drives, and inviting officers to educate youth on their legal rights and

safe ways to engage with the police (IACP, 2018).

To relay messaging about the police and immigration policies, Dane County, Wisconsin created an Immigration and Refugee Task Force consisting of law enforcement, immigration leaders, and residents (Police Executive Research Forum [PERF], 2019). Dane County, with a population similar to Baltimore's, also partnered with leaders of color such as the local NAACP branch and created the Law Enforcement and Leaders of Color Collaboration (PERF, 2019).

Beat Partners

The term partner is reserved for a co-development relationship, one of the three tenets of community policing. CPD established monthly meetings with beat partners, which were facilitated by residents (Skogan, 2006). In addition to residents, other city agencies, school principals, and business owners attended meetings to collaborate on problem solving (Skogan, 2006). Beat police would follow up and report on actions taken (Skogan, 2006). If attendance was consistently low in one neighborhood, they would combine it with another beat (Skogan, 2006). When sworn officers were surveyed about beat meetings, over 90% reported positive relationships between the community and officers; over 80% reported informal engagement with beat residents when not doing calls for service; 80% stated problem solving involved neighborhood versus individual issues; and 70% were satisfied with beat meeting attendance (Skogan, 2006).

Collaboration

Collaboration is involvement at the most intense level, i.e., a partnership throughout the entire process of decision making from identification of issues to selection

of solutions (Diamond & Weiss, 2009; McCampbell, 2011). McCampbell (2011) outlines

nine critical elements of an effective partnership:

> (1) stakeholders with a vested interested in the issue, (2) trust among and between
>
> the partners, (3) a shared vision and common goals, (4) expertise among partners
>
> to solve community problems, (5) teamwork strategies, (6) open communication,
>
> (7) motivated partners, (8) sufficient means to implement and sustain the
>
> collaborative effort, and (9) an action plan.

In law enforcement, collaboration involves both formal and informal engagement

generally at the neighborhood level. Unfortunately, there is little research on the

implementation of collaborative problem solving at the neighborhood or district level.

The Watts neighborhood in Los Angeles is an example of a community with a history of

oppression, uprisings, and drug epidemics that has significantly reduced crime, including

homicides, based on building trust and partnerships with the community (Kuhn & Lurie,

2018). The LAPD in Watts focused on building trust as a core foundation versus building

trust solely to reduce violence (Kuhn & Lurie, 2018). Collaboration began with the

LAPD, the City Controller, and a civil rights activist and included weekly problem-

solving meetings with the community and resources for residents in the meeting room so

individuals could immediately access support such as employment, immunizations, and

grief counseling (Kuhn & Lurie, 2018).

Neighborhood Policing Plans

Parallel to Baltimore, Seattle is viewed as a "city of neighborhoods" and had experienced almost a 30% increase in violent crime rates from 2010 to 2013 in some precincts (Helfgott & Parkin, 2017). In 2015, Seattle implemented micro-community policing plans for over 50 neighborhoods through a collaboration of precinct captains and community-based groups and residents (Helfgott & Parkin, 2017). Each precinct employed a research analyst/assistant position to support the analysis of problems and development of problem-solving strategies and collect data for evaluating the plans (Helfgott & Parkin, 2017). Seattle also developed a system for collecting quantitative and qualitative data throughout the two-year implementation, including stakeholder (police, residents, community organizations) observations, annual resident surveys, resident focus groups, community priority and strategy logs, Nextdoor activity, and crime data (Helfgott & Parkin, 2017).

The Seattle Police Department partnered with Seattle University to measure the results of their two-year implementation (Helfgott & Parkin, 2017). Two of the concerns that were identified as part of the evaluation are officers who did not consider residents' perceptions of crime as important and officers who did not perceive the plans as anything they had not been doing for years (Helfgott & Parkin, 2017).

The New York Police Department (NYPD) neighborhood policing plans did not result in a reduction in crime based on a research model comparing what did happen with what could have happened if there were no NPPs (Beck, Antonelli, & Piñeros, 2020).

This was despite hiring hundreds of Neighborhood Coordination Officers (NCOs),

allocating a third of each patrol officer's shift to community engagement and problem

solving, increasing community meetings and resident surveys, and deploying new

officers to specific beats to build sustainable relationships (Beck, Antonelli, & Piñeros,

2020). However, NYPD was also simultaneously continuing their policies of broken-

windows policing and there was no evidence that the community policing rhetoric of

command staff was trickling down to the streets (Beck, Antonelli, & Piñeros, 2020).

There was a decrease in arrests though this may be attributable to a lack of officer support

for the new community policing approach (Beck, Antonelli, & Piñeros, 2020).

In working with neighborhoods, it is also important to consider the capacity of the

residents to effectively co-produce, implement, and evaluate an NPP. The Irving Police

Department in California provided a train-the-trainer class in community engagement and

problem solving using SARA (scanning, analysis, response, and assessment) to a select

group of officers (Diamond & Weiss, 2009). These officers, in turn, were able to

facilitate problem-solving meetings with the community and provide guidance to other

officers to do so (Diamond & Weiss, 2009). Eventually other city agencies were also

trained by on the community policing model through participation in a one-day

workshop. Longmont, Colorado provided leadership training to residents, which included

an understanding of the city's history and governance as well as meeting facilitation,

effective communication, diversity, and other community policing skills (Diamond &

Weiss, 2009).

District Policing Plans

District advisory committees were not successful in Chicago (Skogan, 2006). The committees included community, school, church, and business leaders though not necessarily those on the ground directly facing problems (Skogan, 2006). Therefore, there was little follow through on action plans and a lack of engagement in problem solving and priority setting (Skogan, 2006). In Anaheim, California, district teams were led by lieutenants and assigned a sergeant and four community policing officers (Diamond & Weiss, 2009). Neighborhood councils were established and supported by the district teams and other city agencies and developed long term-action plans to address neighborhood challenges (Diamond & Weiss, 2009).

Chapter 3: Methods

This study explored how BPD can develop transformative relationships with the

community that increase public safety. More specifically, the analysis addressed three

research questions:

1. Are the community and BPD ready for transformative relationships?

2. What matters to the Baltimore community in informally and formally

    engaging with BPD?

3. What is necessary for BPD to collaboratively produce public safety solutions

    with the community?

Though the literature may address some of these questions for other jurisdictions, the

specific cultural and historical context of Baltimore requires an implementation plan

customized to meet the needs of the community and BPD while adhering to the

requirements of the Consent Decree (United States of America v. Police Department of

Baltimore City, et. al., 2017; BPD, 2020). Therefore, the focus of the study was on

operational strategies and tactics BPD can consider for incorporation into existing and

new implementation plans. To address the research questions, the study used the

qualitative analytic methods of thematic content analysis, thematic observations, and data

triangulation and a qualitative data analysis software to record results.

Data Collection

The study relied on data from three populations: BPD staff who participated in

focus groups on community policing and participated in community meetings;

community members who participated in focus groups, interviews, and public forums on community policing; and community members who were engaged with BPD to address crime in their neighborhoods. The first data source was the *Community Policing in Baltimore: Perspectives from Baltimore Police Department Personnel* [*BPD Staff Perspectives*] (NPF, 2019). This data was collected through a randomized sample of 129 BPD sworn officers and non-sworn employees who were invited to 11 focus groups (NPF, 2019). The focus groups explored two questions:

1. What challenges prevent BPD from engaging in community policing today?

2. What should the BPD community policing strategies include (activities, philosophies, etc.)?

    (NPF, 2019, p. 4-6)

The data for this study was based on a complete list of responses to both questions and a comment box.

The second source was the *Baltimore Community Input to the Baltimore Police Department Community Policing Plan [Baltimore Community Input]* (NPF, 2020). The data for this study was collected from 618 community members, with particular focus on marginalized residents, through 12 focus groups, 28 interviews, and public forums (NPF, 2020). These four questions were asked of the 618 participating individuals:

1. In your experience, do the police in your community treat you and others fairly?

2. What steps could the BPD do to better engage with you/your family in your neighborhood/community to develop trust?

3. What are the three things that BPD can do to enhance safety and be responsive to you and those in your neighborhood/community?

4. What should the BPD do to strengthen its relationships with you/your neighborhood/community?

(NPF, 2020. p.9)

The data for this study was based on selected responses from question #1 and a consolidated list of selected responses from questions #2 through #4 as published by the NPF (2020, p.62-91).

The third data source was collected from observations of 13 BPD-community monthly meetings [BPD-community meetings] with over 339 participants, which included nine Commander's Crime and Community (CCC) meetings, one Community Relations Council (CRC) meeting, and three joint CCC-CRC meetings. The CRC meetings are facilitated by community liaisons who represent each BPD district and the CCC meetings are facilitated by district commanders. The number of participants for the CRC meeting was unavailable. These meetings are held in each district. However, only eight out of nine districts were observed as one district moved its meeting from the regularly scheduled night to the previous night without notification. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, all meetings were held virtually. As the function of the research team is to

purely observe these meetings, no interjections were made in the meetings (e.g., asking questions or asking for clarification).

The University of Baltimore Institutional Review Board approved the protocol for collecting the data as exempt. In accordance with the IRB protocol, the research team virtually observed the public meetings and took observational notes for the purposes of supporting the evaluation of the project and BPD's efforts in implementing community feedback into their work. No identifiable or demographic information on community members was collected or recorded.

Though the community participants at these meetings were self-selected, their presence at the meetings demonstrated they were willing to engage with the police and have interests in public safety. Therefore, despite the participants not being representative of all Baltimore community members, their experience was relevant to the research questions. The observations of community meetings followed a saturation principle (Saunders et al., 2018) such that the observation of community meetings was discontinued when data collection becomes redundant in relationship to identifying and creating themes and answering research questions.

Analysis

A thematic content analysis of the *BPD Staff Perspectives* and *Baltimore Community Input* and a thematic observation of BPD-community meetings was conducted along with a triangulation of the three datasets. All qualitative data was analyzed for themes and patterns and categorized in relationship to the research questions

using the steps outlined by Braun & Clarke (2006) and Nowell, Norris, White, & Moules (2017) as follows.

Transcription & familiarization – A review of the *BPD Staff Perspectives* and the *Baltimore Community Input* and the concepts and coding schemes used in the analysis conducted by the authors of these reports was performed in preparation for the content analysis. For the BPD-community meetings, observational notes were taken during each public meeting. In accordance with the Institutional Review Board submission for this project, no audio recordings were used. To support the validity and reliability of note taking, both members of the research team attended the same meeting and took independent notes. Then, they met and discussed the note-taking process to standardize what content was included in the observational notes and the format of note taking to facilitate the coding process.

Coding – Though the two published reports were already coded in their respective studies, a new latent and semantic coding scheme was developed based on the research questions defined for this study. This coding scheme allowed for thematic coding of the three data sources into references, i.e., statements or discussions on particular topics, and nodes, representing the categorization of topics, such as informal engagement or accountability. While the structure of the coding scheme was informed by the literature review, it also allowed for the coding of new, emergent themes in the data. The coding was captured in NVivo and revised throughout the process as new themes emerged.

Additionally, all data was coded into cases representing 10 individual types that

made a statement such as BPD District Commander, BPD District Staff, or resident. A

final review of nodes and cases resulted in additional merging of and deletion of

duplicate or inefficacious nodes or cases. In addition, a text search was conducted to

identify missing references. For expediency, some of the responses on the same topic,

such as youth engagement, from the *Baltimore Community Input* report were coded as

one reference.

For the first research question, is the community and BPD ready for

transformative relationships, data from the thematic content and observation analysis was

assessed and themes were recorded based on the contributing factors in the literature such

as organizational justice and the four key components of readiness identified by Holt,

Armenakis, Feild, & Harris (2007):

1. Appropriateness – Do BPD staff and the community believe this is the right

   strategy to resolve the organizational issues?

2. Management support perception – Are organizational leaders committed to

   the change?

3. Change self-efficacy – Do BPD staff and the community believe they have the

   personal capacity to make the change?

4. Personal valence perception – Does the change personally benefit BPD staff

   and the community?

For the next two research questions: *What matters to the Baltimore community in informal and formal engagement?* and *What is necessary for BPD to collaboratively produce public safety solutions with the community*?, the coding scheme was categorized based on logical nodes such as informal engagement and formal engagement as well as nodes that may contribute to implementation strategies such as agency-to-agency and BPD-to-resident collaboration.

Search, review, and define themes – In phase one, themes were identified through a review of all relevant nodes and recorded based on relevance to the research questions. For example, related to research question #1, *Are the community and BPD ready for transformative relationships*, a theme that was supported by data from both the *BPD Staff Perspectives* and the *Baltimore Community Input* was: Allowing misconduct to occur without consequences creates a lack of trust and accountability internally and a stigma that erodes trust within the community.

Finalizing the analysis – The final analysis was conducted with an intended outcome of developing additional implementation strategies based on the data and informed by the literature. Additionally, quantitative data was compiled based on the meetings observed such as number of participants and lengths of the meetings. The analysis included the triangulation of data from the three data sources and across multiple themes. In this process, themes identified by other research teams for the two previously mentioned reports were cross-examined with themes coded for this research project. By examining the qualitative data collected in these studies of different populations and

comparing it with the new qualitative data collected for this study, "the scope, depth, and

consistency" of the research was improved (Flick, 2002, p. 227) in the coding and

analysis of the data.

Chapter 4: Results of Analysis

In total across the 15 data files, 82 nodes and 12 cases were created, and approximately 2,000 references were assigned to applicable nodes and cases. Figure 1 displays the categories and subcategories of nodes.

Figure 1: Node Categorization

Collaboration	Leader commitment	Prosecution
Agency-to-Agency	Personal-organizational benefit	Recruitment-retention
BPD-to-Community-based Organization	Right strategy	Reentry-diversion-at risk programs
BPD-to-Elected Official	Personal-organizational capacity	Reporting
BPD-to-Residents	BPD capacity	Crimes
	Community capacity	Abandoned vehicles
Engagement	Officer capacity	Burglary-larceny
Additional patrols		Dirt bikes
BPD challenges	**What matters**	Domestic violence
BPD strategies	911-311	Drag racing
Community suggestions	Behavioral health	Drug activity
Community treatment	Body worn camera	Fireworks
Enforcement	Consent decree	Gambling
Formal engagement	Crime statistics	Gangs
Informal engagement	Disorder	Guns
Media-outreach	Dispatch	Homicide
Victims-witnesses	Equipment-technology	Illegal dumping
Youth engagement	Non-Policing	Loitering – cars
	Businesses	Loitering – people
Readiness	City event	Low-level offenses
Culture change-reconciliation	Clean up	Nuisance
Accountability	Community event	Parking-traffic issues
Equity-bias	Housing	Robberies
Historical-cultural context	Introductions-closing	Sex workers
Leadership support-organizational justice	Public health	Specific crime
Misconduct-corruption	School system	Stealing packages
Transparency	Policy-legislation	Trespassing
Trust	Problem-solving policing	Vandalism
		Violent crime

Note. Within the category *Engagement*, the nodes: BPD challenges, BPD strategies, Community treatment, and Community suggestions reference the questions in the published reports.

Cases were coded to eight individual types: BPD staff (i.e., central headquarters staff), district commander, district staff, general staff (which includes sworn and non-sworn personnel), community-based organizations, CRC liaison, elected officials or their representatives, local business owners-managers, Mayor's office or city agency, resident, and State's or U.S. Attorney Office. Table 1 displays the number of references coded for the 13 CRC-CCC meetings. BPD staff made almost twice the statements than residents in the monthly meetings that were observed, and elected officials had the next highest number of statements after BPD and residents.

The top nodes for *BPD Staff Perspectives* were: Informal engagement, Leadership support, and Right strategy. For *Baltimore Community* Input, the top three nodes were: Officer capacity, Informal engagement, and Enforcement. The top three nodes for the CCC-CRC meetings were: leadership commitment, agency-to-agency collaboration, and problem-solving policing. The following three sections discuss the themes identified for each of the research questions.

Table 1

References by Individual Types in CRC-CCC Meetings

Individual Type	References
BPD Total	214
Central Staff	41
BPD District Commander	109
BPD District Staff	64
Community-Based Organization	6
CRC Liaison	44
Elected Official-Representative	54
Local Business Owner-Manager	2
Mayor's Office or City Agency	33
Resident	116
State or U.S. Attorney	17

Readiness for Change

The literature review identified a model with four components to answer the

research question: are the community and BPD ready for transformative relationships,

while other research associated the need to evaluate the culture, both internal and external

to an organization, with assessing readiness in policing. Therefore, four primary nodes

were coded based on the model: leaders' commitment to change, recognition of the

benefits of change, capacity for change, and staff and resident support that the change is

the right strategy. An additional seven nodes were coded as indicative of internal and

external culture change: accountability, trust, transparency, equity-bias, understanding of

historical-cultural context, leadership support of staff (i.e., organizational justice), and

misconduct-corruption. Table 2 shows the number of references coded to each of these nodes by data source.

To further examine the themes of capacity for change, it was broken down into three sub-areas: organizational, officer, and community. References may denote challenges to readiness, e.g., "allowing bad apples not to be accountable creates lack of trust" (NPF, 2019) or signs of readiness, e.g., "This is awesome collaboration though so many of us don't know each other. This is an opportunity to get to know each other because we are a team". The following subsections highlight the themes supporting or challenging to readiness to change.

Accountability, Trust, & Transparency

The *BPD Staff Perspectives* and the *Baltimore Community Input* reports concurred that allowing misconduct to occur without consequences creates a lack of trust and accountability internally as well as stigma within the community. *BPD Staff Perspectives* also noted two other contributing factors that negatively impact accountability: lack of beat integrity (also known as post officers or section teams) and not being held responsible for developing the relationships needed in the community to increase public safety. One respondent in *BPD Staff Perspectives* went as far as stating, "the community should hold the rank and file accountable not the head of the district that is normally locked in an administrative function and does not understand the limitations and lack of resources that patrol has." One district commander in a CCC-CRC meeting also noted being held accountable by residents.

Table 2

Readiness References by Data Source

	BPD Staff Perspectives	Baltimore Community Input	CCC-CRC Meetings
Accountability	14	14	13
Trust	22	16	1
Transparency	1	11	3
Equity-Bias	1	39	5
Historical-Cultural context	19	22	2
Leadership staff support	75	1	2
Misconduct-Corruption	13	22	3
Leadership commitment	18	2	31
Personal-Organization benefit	0	0	4
Capacity			
BPD capacity	35	12	1
Officer capacity	37	61	1
Community capacity	19	3	3
Right strategy	61	7	6

However, BPD staff also expressed concerns with accountability for community members and for political representatives in the city. Examples of community accountability were parents are not accountable for their children and residents are not accountable for the community. BPD staff noted that officers should not be responsible for cleaning up the community as other city agencies are responsible for this activity. Residents at the CCC-CRC meetings also wanted to know how other city agencies are held accountable for quality-of-life issues and crimes, like holding BPD accountable

through the consent decree. They expressed concerns that other city agencies do not have

representatives at the CCC-CRC meetings.

BPD staff also acknowledged that the community does not trust police and

reconciliation is needed both internally at BPD and within the community. Some BPD

staff viewed BPD's trust-building message as mere rhetoric. They are concerned that the

"community judges most officers on the actions of a few when most BPD are great police

and people" (NPF, 2019, p.59). The community does not trust BPD at the micro or macro

level. They do not trust that crimes are investigated or follow through occurs. They are

also concerned that the "blue wall" prevents transparency and enables BPD to hide

investigations, suppress body worn camera video, and implement gag orders.

Leadership Support-Organizational Justice

In the *BPD Staff Perspectives,* there were 72 references related to organizational

justice, i.e., is BPD fair and do they respect, listen, and inform staff of organizational and

system changes. Almost 50% of the responses came under the first question related to

community policing challenges and 50% of responses came under the second question

related to strategies. BPD staff responded that there is "No upward mobility unless

connected" (NPF, 2019, p.37) and no matching of skills to positions. There were

numerous comments related to a lack of support and respect for patrol officers by

supervisors, command, and city leaders. Given this is a BPD internal issue, organizational

justice was not raised in the *Baltimore Community Input* or the CCC-CRC meetings.

Leadership Commitment

Another indicator of readiness is whether BPD staff believe their leadership is committed to change. Responses in the *BPD Staff Perspectives* expressed concerns that commanders do not support community engagement and that support for community policing is purely rhetoric. They also believe there is no unity of command, no incentive for leadership or elected officials to improve public safety, and BPD's centralization, deployment, and role assignments as designed by leadership do not support community policing.

At the CCC-CRC meetings, six of the district commanders articulated commitment to community policing as a whole or a particular aspect of community policing. They referenced support for diversion programs, appreciation for residents bringing unknown problems to their attention, the benefits and need for community engagement and collaboration, it "takes a village", and optimism that residents will build support for the police. However, in the other two districts there was either no indication of commitment or the commander alluded to doubt that BPD is moving in the right direction.

Personal-Organizational Benefit

The benefits of community policing were not referenced in either the *BPD Staff Perspectives* or the *Baltimore Community Input*. However, district commanders and a district staff person did mention the benefits at CCC-CRC meetings in four of the districts. More specifically, it was noted that the current reduction in crime in one district

was attributable to the community calling 911 and engaging in BPD-community

meetings. In the other meetings, commanders noted, that "new policies will give us

greater reach due to collaborations", the consent decree is "helping us to get back on

track and get the training we've needed for a long time", and shootings are likely to

decrease in broad daylight if the community does prayer walks.

Personal-Organizational Capacity

Belief in the capacity for change was analyzed at the organizational, officer, and

community levels. As an organization, BPD staff noted the need for internal healing,

establishing trust, and building morale in the organization. A concern was also raised that

BPD is not using in-house expertise. As stated by one respondent, "[I]nternally we are

not utilizing those who have proven to be most knowledgeable, effective, and trusted by

the communities to lead the charge, instead bring in outside experts – strategy has failed

repeatedly" (NPF, 2019, p.54). In addition, BPD staff indicated that a lack of stability and

consistency in leadership threatens capacity, given the high turnover of district

commanders. Another issue negatively impacting capacity is the lack of prioritization of

patrol. As asserted by one respondent, "In order to engage in community policing, the

BPD has to abandon its long-standing practice of over specializing." (NPF, 2019, p.37).

The community, BPD staff, and an elected official in a CCC-CRC meeting all expressed

that more staff and resources are needed for reform.

There were significant concerns voiced about officers' capacity for building

community relationships in the *BPD Staff Perspectives*. For example, BPD staff

perceived officers as self-focused and in need of better mental health services to handle stress and trauma. Officers were too tired to the point of exhaustion because of too much overtime and need more time to engage. Additionally, officers need training with the community, qualified trainers with street experience and qualified field training officers, and training on new policies and methods. Notably, officers also expressed the need for performance measurements for community engagement.

Both officers and the community were concerned that command is not matching skills with positions, i.e., "[S]ome people are better in community engagement, some are better responding to calls" (NPF, 2019, p.51). In the *Baltimore Community Input*, respondents specifically noted that some officers were not interested in engaging and some were; some were responsive and some were not; some officers have good communication skills and some were rude; and some officers dehumanize the community, viewed the community as the enemy, and were brutal.

BPD Staff also indicated that the community does not have the capacity for change, which was emphasized by one respondent as, "There is a double standard and without the communities having personal accountability there will NEVER be a change" (NPF, 2019, p). BPD staff declared there is a need for public education on policing, the law, and other available community resources to address public safety. They also believe that the community has lost connection with each other, parents have lost connection with and are not accountable for their children, and a snitch culture produces fear of and prevents collaboration. Neither respondents in the *Baltimore Community Input* nor

residents at the CCC-CRC meetings expressed the same concerns. However, it was noted that the community models the attitudes and actions of officers, and officers must see positivity in the community before they will engage.

Right Strategy

Right strategy determines whether those *not* in a position of leadership support community policing and engagement. The need for a new strategy in developing transformative relationships between BPD and the community was clearly articulated in the *BPD Staff Perspectives.* BPD staff noted the need to heal and clean house first and change mindsets from zero tolerance to community policing. They also affirmed the need for more action and less talk with tangible results and communication on the progress of the consent decree. A few respondents mentioned past efforts to build community that were effective. One respondent stated,

> "The philosophy of 'An Engaged Presence brings Reduction' proved 100% correct. What was interesting was that presence did not have to be a police officer but rather it could be a community presence and proven to be just as if not more successful. Th[is] was having the right trusted police leader by the community to train the community and officers on how to collaboratively and singularly implement those strategies" (NPF, 2019, p. 54).

Another respondent indicated support for community policing as the right strategy by stating that Officer Friendly should be a mindset, not a program (NPF, 2019).

However, BPD Staff also voiced concerns that there is too much city involvement in policing. Multiple staff noted that in deploying the new strategy, it is difficult to find balance between community policing and enforcement as well as policing to improve statistics versus engagement. They felt like they were in a lose-lose situation: If officers focus on engagement, then that will result in more violence. If they focus on the violence, officers are deemed too aggressive. As noted by one respondent, "If you break the law there is a consequence. It should be up to the officer to gauge the severity of the breach with the intended consequence. The police are not intended to be your friend, they are there to protect the innocent from the small portion of individuals who prey on the community" (NPF, 2019, p.57).

In the *Baltimore Community Input* there were only three comments in opposition to the current strategy. These entailed recommendations to disband police or start over with a new force that is committed to equity, engagement, and de-escalation. However, the community indicated that addressing public safety goes beyond BPD. The problems are societal and deeply entrenched. At CCC-CRC meetings, there were four references, only one of which was from BPD staff, that community policing is the right strategy. Three additional themes were identified that are also deeply entrenched in society and Baltimore policing: equity-bias, historical & cultural context, and misconduct-corruption.

Equity-Bias

Neither equity, race, bias, nor diversity is mentioned as a challenge in the *BPD Staff Perspectives* other than noting that the well-off neighborhoods were not concerned

about the homicide rate until a "white guy got killed in a nice neighborhood" (NPF, 2019, p.57). However, the community clearly views race and bias as a barrier to culture change as it was referenced in the *Baltimore Community Input* almost 40 times and mentioned in three districts at CCC-CRC meetings. More specifically, residents, even those with no personal experiences or challenges with BPD, stated that white people get quicker police response; black people are targeted, even when victims; poor residents are treated differently than rich residents; and more tolerance is needed of Hispanic and immigrant residents.

Historical & Cultural Context

Numerous BPD staff and community members noted that officers do not understand Baltimore, and do not comprehend its urban environment, melting pot of diversity, culture, policing history, community history, neighborhoods, the struggles of poverty, and causes of crime. This was mention in 19 *BPD Staff Perspectives* responses and 22 *Baltimore Community Input* responses. One district commander also mentioned pushing for diversity training given Baltimore's melting pot and the need to understand each other's culture.

Misconduct-Corruption

Both the *BPD Staff Perspectives* and the *Baltimore Community Input* concurred that BPD does not hold its officers accountable for misconduct and BPD needs to "clean house". However, it was also noted in both reports that BPD and city leadership are modeling the corruption. There were a few responses by BPD Staff that correction

actions have gone overboard. Misconduct and corruption were only discussed at CCC-CRC meetings during a BPD consent decree presentation. A CRC liaison expressed concerns about the lack of progress.

Community Engagement

If the end goal is to develop a collaborative relationship between BPD and the community, then answering the research question, what matters to the Baltimore community, is critical to consider. Not surprisingly, there are some distinct differences in viewpoints. For example, Table 3 shows there were nine times as many mentions of additional patrols in the *BPD Staff Perspectives* than the *Baltimore Community Input*. BPD Staff also provided many more responses about what works and does not work in informal and formal engagement. The CRC-CCC meetings have significantly less responses than both reports for all nodes except for formal engagement, victims-witnesses, and youth engagement. Two common themes were mentioned multiple times in the *BPD Staff Perspectives*: Patrol is not prioritized, and BPD has too many specialized units. Though 21 responses (44%) clearly affirmed BPD is understaffed, some BPD staff also noted there is no need for additional patrols; what is needed is to remove patrols from administrative leave and use civilians wherever possible. In comparison, only five respondents from the *Baltimore Community Input* noted BPD as being understaffed.

Table 3

Engagement References by Data Source

	BPD Staff Perspectives	Baltimore Community Input	CCC-CRC Meetings
Additional patrols	48	5	6
Enforcement	32	56	8
Formal engagement	60	29	27
Informal engagement	89	56	2
Media-Outreach	37	7	8
Victims-Witnesses	2	5	11
Youth Engagement	40	5	22

Additional Patrols

A high call volume was mentioned by multiple BPD staff, which they stated

leaves no time to engage with the community or address lower-level calls. In three of the

district meetings, residents requested additional patrols in a specific location to deal with

specific issues. Two district commanders committed to deploy additional patrols as

requested by the residents and the other commander instructed residents to call 911 if the

issue reoccurs. One resident was also interested in how they could help officers and

inquired if there are trainings available for civilians. The district commander affirmed the

availability of trainings though did not provide any specifics.

Enforcement

In *BPD Staff Perspectives* multiple respondents were fearful of engaging in enforcement. Respondents also view the discontinuation of some programs (e.g., the Police Athletic League [PAL]) and initiatives (e.g., foot patrol) and the focus on statistics as indication that BPD expects zero tolerance policing. Others understand that the BPD "can't arrest our way out of problems – Does not work and builds resentment" (NPF, 2019. p.50).

As seen in Table 3, the *Baltimore Community Input* references on enforcement were almost double that of *BPD Staff Perspectives*. Respondents in the *Baltimore Community Input* do not feel safe and feel officers are de-sensitized to residents' humanity. Affirming what BPD staff stated, they see that there is little response and engagement from officers when there are issues and no engagement or follow through in problem solving. Others still experience officers as militarized who violate their civil rights through unconstitutional stops and seizures and using excessive force. Some are frustrated that those clearly committing crimes are not arrested or arrested and let back out on the streets. Respondents in the *Baltimore Community Input* are also frustrated by the lack of response to quality-of-life issues. Enforcement was also raised in four district meetings by elected officials related to addressing lower-level offenses and confusion about when to call 311 versus 911. In summary, one respondent noted officers need to "abide by their oath to protect and serve" (NPF, 2020, p.83).

Formal Engagement

Formal engagement was the second most-mentioned node in *BPD Staff Perspectives* with informal engagement in the top spot. Numerous officers identified the need for more formal opportunities (e.g., community meetings, events) to engage residents. The value of formal programs that occur away from the community, such as Outward Bound, were questioned by two respondents.

The *Baltimore Community Input* highlighted the need for officers to specifically get to know and engage elderly residents. There were numerous respondents that encouraged officers to attend community meetings and highlighted the need for a regular forum (e.g., "Pizza with the Police" [NPF, 2020, p.75]) for officers and the community to share their experiences and build trust. Multiple respondents also mentioned ways for the community to help police through watch groups and civilian volunteers. Only one respondent criticized the presence of officers at community meetings.

The benefits of community walks were discussed at four district meetings. Additionally, the chaplain program came up at four district meetings. In these four districts, both BPD district staff and residents mentioned need for and efforts to conduct neighborhood clean ups.

Informal Engagement

Informal engagement was mentioned more than any other individual node in the *BPD Staff Perspectives*. BPD staff acknowledge that officers are not engaged verbally or nonverbally with residents. They attribute this to lack of skills, lack of interest or

disrespect by the community, community's fear of repercussions, lack of foot and bike

patrols, getting rid of beat patrol officers (i.e., post integrity), no knowledge about the

neighborhoods, lack of time, rotating shifts, lack of call management skills, officers

staying in cars, and understaffing.

 Baltimore Community Input concurred with BPD staff that lack of foot patrols and

beat integrity negatively impacts officer engagement. They also mentioned slow or no

response times, and how officers are always around or never around, do not get out of

their cars, and do not smile, wave, or make eye contact. An overwhelming number of

respondents expressed that officers need to "know who you are supposed to protect and

serve" (NPF, 2020, p.71). How to do that was summed up by two respondents:

"Communicate and build rapport with community. Interact with the people. Start

conversations with people, come off friendly and ask questions" (NPF, 2020, p.71) and

"Talk to us, walk with us, break bread with us" (NPF, 2020, p.74). Respondents want

officers to interact with residents, local businesses, and community-based organizations

as if they are part of the community, because they are. Though informal engagement was

not discussed for the most part at CCC-CRC meetings, one district commander

emphasized this idea, i.e., "I patrol like my parents live here".

Media & Outreach

 Two major themes arose in the *BPD Staff Perspectives* related to media and

outreach: Negative media coverage is a serious challenge to community policing, and as

shared by fewer respondents, the public needs to be educated about policing and policing

perspectives. BPD Staff are asking for the department to counter the media narrative with positive stories. The handful of responses from the *Baltimore Community Input* and CCC-CRC meetings affirm those themes and add one more, i.e., develop new mechanisms to communicate to the community about public safety incidents and updates.

Victims & Witnesses

BPD staff mentioned the snitch culture as a challenge to community policing. However, the *Baltimore Community Input* respondents also had concerns about how victims are treated and protecting witness anonymity. More specifically, one respondent mentioned, "[O]fficers treat the criminals better than the victims" (NPF, 2020, p.66). During CCC-CRC meetings it was shared that the CRC liaison, the mayor's office, or 311 were other mechanisms for reporting crime without directly interfacing with BPD. The utility of victim and community impact statements was also discussed and encouraged in three districts.

Youth Engagement

The loss of the Police Athletic League (PAL) was mentioned over 30 times in *BPD Staff Perspectives* and *Baltimore Community Input* as a challenge to community policing. According to BPD Staff, outreach programs are needed in schools and youth need to be engaged in recreation centers and mentored. Officers consistently engaging youth at schools was mentioned by BPD staff 25 times, and the respondents in the *Baltimore Community Input* concurred with 17 references. Over 10 BPD staff also mentioned bringing back Officer Friendly and a few mentioned DARE as a strategy to

support community policing. Youth programming was also discussed at CCC-CRC

meetings in seven districts.

Collaboration

To assess the research question, what is necessary for BPD to collaboratively

produce public safety solutions with the community, references from all three data

sources were coding into three sub-nodes:

- Agency-to-Agency - BPD collaboration with other federal, state, and city

  agencies to improve public safety,

- BPD-CBO: BPD collaboration with community-based organizations to

  improve public safety,

- BPD-Elected Official: BPD collaboration with elected officials to improve

  public safety, and

- BPD-Residents: BPD collaboration with residents to improve public safety.

These sub-nodes were used in support of the community governance model, i.e.,

community is more than just residents (cite). References were either evidence of

challenges to or success in collaboration. Table 4 displays how many references for each

type of collaboration by data source.

The CCC-CRC meetings were clearly opportunities for all entities to collaborate.

On average, 28 individuals participated in the meetings of which 19 were residents.

Additionally, an average of six residents raised issues, contributed ideas, or asked

questions at the meetings. However, one district meeting had only one resident speak while two district meetings had 13 residents engage.

The efforts to advertise CCC-CRC meetings were problematic for many districts. For example, only one of the districts posted the correct day and time for monthly meetings on the BPD Districts webpage. In addition, only one of the districts consistently posted notifications of upcoming meetings on social media. Another district posted the May and June meetings, however the remaining districts had sporadic or no notifications at all. When calling the districts to confirm meeting times and Zoom information, using the phone numbers posted on the BPD District webpage, some districts did not answer the phones and others were unaware that monthly meetings were held. The remainder of this Chapter reviews the results for each type of collaboration.

Table 4

Collaboration References by Data Source

	BPD Staff Survey	Community Survey	CCC-CRC Meetings
Agency-to-Agency	18	1	28
BPD-to-Community-based Organizations (CBO)	3	5	19
BPD-to-Elected Official	0	0	11
BPD-to-Residents	19	3	25

Agency-to-Agency

Notably, of the 18 Agency-to-Agency references in the BPD Staff Survey, about half of the references described challenges to collaboration between agencies and the other half described strategies to improve collaboration between agencies. One of the primary challenges identified in the *BPD Staff Perspectives* is the relationship between the State's Attorney Office (SAO) and BPD. BPD staff specifically noted there is either no relationship or a broken relationship with SAO, which results in cases not being prosecuted and those committing crimes ending back out on the streets to commit more crimes. As noted by one respondent, "The unwillingness to prosecute cases and inability to obtain convictions hurts more than just the morale of BPD it puts citizens who've helped with cases in the direct line of fire for retaliation from those arrested."

Multiple BPD staff and residents at the CCC-CRC meetings also mentioned the need for other city agencies to step up and direct resources towards high crime areas. However, though there was a Mayor's Office neighborhood liaison at 4 of the 13 CCC-CRC meetings observed, only two of the meetings had a representative from a city agency and two of the meetings had a representative from the Liquor Board (which was noted by a district commander as a great partner with BPD). The same commander and respondents in the *Baltimore Community Input* also expressed that other city agencies need to work with BPD to address problems.

It was also noted by both BPD staff and residents at CCC-CRC meetings that the relationship between BPD and SAO needs to be fixed. Though SAO representatives

attended multiple meetings, only one district commander acknowledged that the Mayor, BPD Commissioner, and SAO are working together. Another district commander and an elected official both questioned SAO's ability to prosecute when necessary and a resident inquired why crimes statistics for the same crime and time period and presented at the same meeting differed. During one CCC-CRC meeting, when statistics that showed crime was going down was shared by a district commander, a resident questioned whether crime is actually going down or is there less reporting since BPD, SAO, and residents are not working together.

BPD-to-Community-based Organizations

For collaboration with community-based organizations, respondents in the *BPD Staff Perspectives* and *Baltimore Community Input* emphasized the need to work with and educate local businesses about local laws, enforce laws and policies that businesses ignore, and encourage businesses that are supporting the community. All three data sources highlighted the need for clinicians to respond to people in crisis, however there was clearly confusion at multiple CCC-CRC meetings on the new process. There was also a concern that a new referral system cannot handle the capacity of calls received by BPD.

Specific examples of collaboration with CBOs were demonstrated in three of the districts. Two of the districts had the CBO present at their meetings, one CBO presented on the availability of services for children and youth, and another district had a CBO present on the provision of conflict mediation services. Another district discussed their

outreach efforts to residents involved in domestic violence and a city-wide partnership to provide preventative services to victims.

BPD-to-Elected Officials

Collaboration with elected officials did not come up in the *BPD Staff Perspectives* or the *Baltimore Community Input* except to note that BPD staff did not feel supported by elected officials. Elected officials participated in all district CCC-CRC meetings except for one and actively collaborated with BPD and residents on public safety meetings in three districts. These same elected officials demonstrated appreciation for BPD's accessibility to address social disorder issues such as illegal dumping and abandoned vehicles, while also noting specific neighborhood locations that need more police presence and encouraging residents to be part of Citiwatch. In contrast, in one district an elected official vented about BPD, SAO, and elected officials not being on the same page and went so far as to emphasize that community leaders were getting a "B.S. runaround at BPD and SAO" when reaching out to address publicly documented issues.

BPD-to-Residents

Support for collaborating with residents was very apparent in the *BPD Staff Perspectives*. As noted by one respondent and supported in other feedback, "Community policing is the implementation of crime fighting tactics that seek to use the resources embedded in the community which is being policed" (NPF, 2019, p.61). More specifically, BPD staff noted the importance of listening to the community, helping to build efficacy within the community, and the need to change the culture of misconduct.

Respondents in the *Baltimore Community Input* noted that officers need to get out into the community and "learn the people and businesses" (NPF, 2020, p.63). Respondents also stated that BPD should seek input on what the community needs to feel safe. One respondent acknowledged that the exchange of ideas to solve community problems must flow in both directions., i.e., "Bring ideas to solve community problems to the community. Just like the community bring problem-solving ideas to the police. You can't be a cop and not know what's going on in the community" (NPF, 2020, p.74).

Collaboratively addressing specific public safety issues with resident in CCC-CRC meetings occurred in four of the eight districts. Generally, district commanders either invited questions during the topics presented or conducted a question-and-answer session at the end of the agenda. Residents made suggestions to BPD staff on how to improve outreach of safety tips, where more patrol presence was needed, and where cameras should be located. Residents also acknowledged that BPD has more knowledge about the community than other agencies and inquired if there are ways to better support districts, given officer shortages, through education and training or providing video footage. However, there were no instances of BPD collaborating through an entire process of decision making with residents or CBOs, which would include soliciting ideas, development of possible solutions, and selection of the solution.

Residents also voiced many micro- and macro- issue concerns at CCC-CRC meetings. They identified specific issues (e.g., loitering, shootings, trespassing/drug dealing, drag racing) and even specific individuals committing crimes. They also shared

concerns that crime statistics did not match their reality as victims are afraid to report and

patrol officers are showing up at problem locations though not getting out of their cars.

The collaboration in four of the districts also included resident-to-resident

problem solving and building efficacy. Residents collaborated on how to address drug

dealers on the corner or in front of a community-based organization, addressed concerns

of CBOs new the neighborhood, and gambling; They gave each other concrete advice on

how residents can improve safety of the neighborhood or get services for those in need.

Residents and an elected official also discussed how to write victim or community

statements and share information safely with BPD.

District staff were responsive to resident concerns in the CCC-CRC meetings and

either very familiar with the issues raised or let the resident know they would record the

location of the issue and follow up. The BPD district staff also proposed solutions at

times such as deploying bicycle units, encouraging residents to call 911 and ask for a

supervisor if the service does not meet their expectations, getting new programs in their

district such as shots-fired, and community walks.

In summary, the triangulation of the data and thematic analysis uncovered three

major themes related to the research questions. First, though BPD staff and the

community believe developing relationships to improve public safety is the right strategy,

the necessary accountability and transparency practices are not in place and BPD staff do

not believe that leadership is committed to the change. Second, what matters most to

BPD staff and the community is deploying beat officers that understand the community,

respect the community, and are part of the community. Lastly, there are significantly

more opportunities for BPD to collaborate with other agencies, elected officials, and most

importantly residents that do not require a lot of overhead.

Chapter 5: Discussion

As noted in the title of the BPD's *Crime Reduction & Departmental Transformational Plan* (BPD, 2019), to become "the greatest comeback story in America" transformation is required. While "reform" efforts make changes to an institution or practice to improve it, transformation involves dramatically altering its form or character (McKean, 2005). Therefore, in addressing the question that underlies this research of *how can BPD develop transformative relationships with the community that increase public safety*, a critical question to consider is can BPD dramatically alter its form or character: Is transformation even possible?

To begin to answer the question, it is important to consider that the probability of change projects being successful is significantly low (Arnéguy, Ohana, & Stinglhamber, 2018). The reasons for failure are well defined: Employees do not have input into the change process, do not understand the benefits of or support the change, and do not trust the change (McKay, Kuntz, & Näswall, 2013; Arnéguy, Ohana, & Stinglhamber, 2018). When the change involves a relationship between BPD and the community, BPD must also ensure that the community has input into, sees the benefit of, and trusts the change. Yet, who is the community? The CPP's definition of community limits it to residents and those who work in the city. Yet to transform public safety, the city needs *all* "hands on deck". Therefore, BPD should consider expanding the definition of community to include community-based organizations; anchor institutions; city, state, and federal government

agencies, and even the media (Bond-Fortier, 2020) as these entities can either block or pave the way to progress.

Next, BPD must consider if it has done the work required to prepare for transformation, what a transformative partnership would look like, and the steps necessary to make this vision a reality. These considerations require an understanding of the current mindsets of officers and the community. Yet BPD staff talked approximately twice as much as residents in monthly community meetings, and other opportunities for developing partners in the community, who collaborate throughout the entire process of decision making, are scarce. BPD should consider adopting the definitions of involvement (Diamond & Weiss, 2009) in Chapter 2, to acknowledge where partnerships exist today and manage community expectations of involvement. Each of the sections below further explore these considerations and include a table with implementation recommendations for BPD to consider starting with Table 5.

Table 5

Definition of Community

Recommendation
1. Expand the definition of community to include community-based organizations; anchor institutions; city, state, and federal government agencies; and even the media
2. Adopt the Longmont, California model of four levels of involvement and classify current relationships based on that model
3. Change the format of monthly community meetings to listen to the community as much as talk to the community

Getting Ready for Change

The first research question asked was *are the community and BPD ready for transformative relationships*. To address this question, the literature noted that preparing for change in policing requires assessing readiness, acknowledging history and current harms through a departmental and community reconciliation process, and recruiting proponents of change (Holt, Armenakis, Feild, & Harris, 2007; Thomas, 2010). The major gaps in these areas identified through the thematic analysis were increasing leadership commitment, providing training unique to Baltimore's history and current environment, educating BPD staff and the community's understanding of the benefits of community policing, instituting a reconciliation process, and building trust within the department and the community. This section provides recommendations in these areas based on the literature review and the thematic analysis.

Improve Leadership Commitment

Though District leadership, for the most part, voiced their commitment to building relationships with the community in CCC-CRC meetings, in the *BPD Staff Perspectives,* BPD staff viewed this as mere rhetoric. To explore the validity of BPD staff opinions, it is critical that BPD leadership (e.g., district commanders, captains, lieutenants) is provided a forum to voice their concerns and doubts with the current strategy and learn why reconciliation is essential. Otherwise, leadership may share its apprehensions during community policing training or interactions with staff at the district level. In both instances this could further enable patrol officers to continue to question

leadership commitment and degrade progress in building relationships with the community. As noted by Lum et al. (2016), leadership commitment is a cornerstone to successful implementation.

Expand Training & Outreach

Based on the research, the biggest gap in training and outreach appeared to be a lack of understanding of how the change personally benefits BPD staff and the community. Though district commanders voiced some benefits and many supported community policing as the right strategy, BPD staff and the community did not articulate the benefits of community policing, and particularly, building transformative relationships. BPD should identify and use every opportunity to emphasize how relationships with the community can improve public safety and the health and welfare of both staff and residents.

To improve readiness of the community to build relationships, BPD needs to ensure that BPD staff, and in particular, supervisors and patrol officers in the districts, understand and acknowledge bias in policing and Baltimore's history, diversity, history of policing, impact of poverty, and causes of crime. BPD should consider developing a training solely focused on learning about the Baltimore community. District commanders can extend this training to educating patrol officers about the neighborhoods within the district. This training could address who are the key neighborhood leaders, what major policing incidents occurred in the neighborhood, which businesses support versus discourage the prevention of crime, and what community-based services are provided in

the neighborhood. In lieu of developing formal trainings about neighborhoods, district supervisors can encourage the expertise of officers by asking them to share this information as five-minute overviews during roll calls, and then the information can be compiled and archived. Training on the historical context and current conditions may help mitigate the self-focus of officers and deter unethical behavior (Blumberg, Papazoglou, & Creighton, 2018).

Another key finding was officers cannot find the balance between community policing and enforcement. Again, this could be presented through informal discussions at roll calls. Officers who demonstrate this balance could share specific scenarios where this has occurred and invite discussions on how to replicate it in other situations. Lastly, in addition to internal training, the BPD staff requested that the community should be better informed about policing law and policies, and as demonstrated in the CCC-CRC meetings, particularly on the new lesser offenses policies and use of 911 versus 311. This could occur through a "know your rights" campaign, training on lesser offenses at CCC-CRC and other public meetings, and the marketing of the civilian training schedules.

Reconcile with the Community & BPD Staff

Clearly there were concerns in the community about BPD accountability and within BPD about organizational justice. Therefore, it is recommended that BPD undertake a formal reconciliation process with both staff and the community. In High Point, North Carolina, the police commissioner would start community meetings with "I'm sorry" and then proceed to acknowledge the mistakes made and failures in stopping

drug trafficking and violence (Kuhn & Lurie, 2018). Similar apologizes have been

offered by police chiefs in Rockford, Illinois, Las Vegas and Los Angeles (Kuhn &

Lurie, 2018). Police can view these apologizes as a sign of courage and a recognition that

truth telling starts the road to repair, framing the apologies as "I am responsible for the

house I did not build, but in which I now live" ~ Unknown (Kuhn & Lurie, 2018).

Though each police chief must identify their own words of acknowledgement and

apology (Kuhn & Lurie, 2018), command staff need to own the acknowledgement as well

(Gerspacher, Wilson, Al-Rababah, & Walker, 2020). Those speaking on behalf of BPD

should affirm that misconduct and bias is still occurring today and explain what BPD is

doing about it because one dissenting voice can de-legitimize all voices. As part of the

reconciliation process, BPD can identify change agents within command staff, patrol

officers, supervisors, residents, and other city agencies to continue the messaging.

Build Trust

Given it is the relationship between the officer and the department that has the

most impact on an officer's motivation to work with the community (Wolfe & Nix,

2016), building trust should begin with addressing organizational justice issues internally.

A formal reconciliation process should include a regular forum for patrol officers to

speak directly to command staff about the dysfunction at BPD. District leadership must

also demonstrate a commitment to directly hearing the concerns of patrol officers, not

just through supervisors and impersonal surveys. This may begin to mitigate officers'

concerns that patrol is a punishment, not a priority. Leadership should also develop

mechanisms to transparently acknowledge the concerns expressed to date by BPD staff as reported in *BPD Staff Perspectives* and other recent surveys, provide leadership's viewpoints on these concerns, and explain any progress made to address the concerns. This is critical as BPD officers must set the standard for community members in treating each other with dignity and respect. Officers are unlikely to do so if leadership is not treating officers with the same dignity and respect.

In addition, BPD should consider the positive capital associated with previously successful policing programs, such as Officer Friendly, and consider building upon the branding of these programs. Rather than solely relying on formal evaluation methods to determine the community's perception of progress, BPD leadership could actively solicit stories of progress and or barriers in community and BPD staff forums. Table 6 summarizes the recommendations in this section.

Table 6

Getting Ready for Change

Recommendation
1. Create a forum for BPD central and district leadership to voice and process doubts and concerns about community policing and relationship building
2. Train command staff on the value of and process to reconcile with BPD staff and the community
3. Incorporate a discussion about the specific benefits of building transformative relationships in every training, meeting, and forum
4. Implement evaluation of pre- and post-bias training to ensure learning is transferred to the field

5. Develop stand-alone training about Baltimore and institute district sharing sessions about neighborhoods

6. Incorporate discussions on finding the balance between community policing and enforcement during roll calls

7. Develop community training and outreach on policing laws and policies starting with lesser offenses and use of 911 versus 311

8. Initiate a reconciliation process both within the department and within the community that acknowledges the history of harm

9. Identify change agents within command staff, patrol officers, supervisors, residents, and other city agencies

10. Implement regular forums for patrol officers to speak directly to central and district command staff about their concerns as patrol officers

11. Develop a mechanism to acknowledge, express viewpoints, and share progress on patrol officers' concerns.

12. Resurrect or build on previous programs that were viewed positively by BPD staff and the community

13. Solicit the opinions of BPD staff and the community as to whether the progress noted in formal evaluations is perceived as progress by these entities

Engaging with the Community

While the research question in this section was *what matters to the community in informal and formal engagement*, what matters to BPD staff is also a consideration given that they are half of the relationship needed to increase public safety. This was emphasized by the thematic analysis as formal and informal engagement had the most responses from BPD staff. However, from the community's perspective engaging with

BPD staff includes more than just informal and formal activities, as defined by the CPP

(BPD, 2020). It starts with deployment.

Reimagine Deployment

Although reconciliation is a top-down approach to building trust, to build trust

bottom up it is critical that the neighborhoods most adverse to policing are served by the

officers who have the most knowledge and understanding about the neighborhood as well

as the skills to positively engage residents and CBOs. Though some may question using

community policing officers in the city's most violent neighborhoods, community

policing is also recommended in countering violent extremism as traditional policing

methods (e.g., surveillance, use of force) degrade the trust and public confidence

necessary to both gain the cooperation of the community in fighting terrorism and deter

individuals from viewing terrorist organizations as more legitimate than police

(Gerspacher, Wilson, Al-Rababah, & Walker, 2020).

The CPP states that "every officer is a community policing officer" (BPD, 2020,

p. 11). However, that does not acknowledge that some officers have the skills for

community engagement and some officers are better at responding to calls. As stated in

the *Baltimore Community Input*, some officers are not interested in engaging, some are;

some officers are not responsive, some are; some officers are rude, some have good

communication skills, and some officers are brutal, dehumanize people, and treat the

community as the enemy and some do not. Therefore, BPD may want to consider a

variation of the Madison Police Department's three-prong community policing approach

in the most violent neighborhoods. This could include dedicating some officers to responding to calls of a serious nature, dedicating others to respond to lesser offenses and engaging the neighborhood, and dedicating an NCO to act as a designated liaison between the neighborhood associations, businesses, and residents and BPD. This can help build trust within the community because serious crimes are enforced, while the community is engaged, respected, and not over-policed.

The literature review, community, and BPD staff are in alignment on re-establishing beat integrity. When residents see the same patrol officers on the same shift, this encourages approachability, builds trust, (Ratcliffe & Sorg, 2017) and enables officers to better understand the neighborhood and its residents. Like the Chicago Police Department, BPD should consider a minimum of a year assignment to a beat patrol, eliminating rotating shifts, and assigning calls for service to beat officers when local knowledge and relationships may help de-escalate situations. Other calls such as alarm checks or those possibly requiring stronger enforcement tactics could go to a team of officers who are less suitable for community engagement. Beat integrity assignments could start with those neighborhoods experiencing the most violence. Furthermore, beat integrity enables patrol officers to take ownership for building a sustainable relationship with the community, which can be measured by increased cooperation in investigations, attendance at BPD-community meetings, and collaborative resolutions.

Foot patrol, like beat integrity, can increase police legitimacy and improve public safety (Ratcliffe & Sorg, 2017). However, the effectiveness is directly related to the

deployment strategy. Within each beat, the districts could designate a manageably sized area that would benefit from foot patrol. The beat officers who are permanently assigned to the area should be those that view the assignments as beneficial to the community and have the social-emotional intelligence to engage residents and CBOs. If these beat officers are motivated to do foot patrol, it is unnecessary to put time requirements on the assignments. Beat officers can determine the most effective times during the shift to do foot patrol and how to balance the assignment with calls for service.

Build Rapport

Despite officers' perceptions that a high call volume leaves no time to engage, officers have the opportunity to engage before, during, and after every call, regardless of whether they are assigned to beat or enforcement teams. These are critical opportunities to build trust and mutual respect with the community. BPD should emphasize that engaging with residents does not take more time; it is just using time differently. As supported by the literature review, one positive, even brief interaction with a police officer can increase legitimacy and cooperation (Peyton, Sierra-Arévalo, & Rand, 2019). Respondents in the *Baltimore Community Input* would like to see officers getting out of the car or at least rolling down their windows and engaging with the elderly.

Establish Partnerships

Both BPD Staff and residents stated the need for more forums for BPD and the community to interact (NPF, 2019). However, these forums should take place in the community and include both opportunities to collaborate on public safety and

opportunities for officers to engage in neighborhood functions to build rapport. Except for long-standing BPD community events that residents have come to depend on, districts do not need to host new social events. Instead, beat officers could attend neighborhood-sponsored events and use these events to build trust, particularly with the elderly and youth. BPD should continue affinity groups to work with marginalized populations such as immigrants, meeting these residents where they feel most comfortable and deploying an *Involve* relationship type, i.e., collaborating to ensure their concerns are heard and addressed (Diamond & Weiss, 2009).

To engage youth, BPD should collaborate with the Baltimore City School Police force to identify ways to extend the positive relationship school officers have developed with youth to BPD. Additionally, PAL was identified as a successful activity to build relationships between youth and officers by BPD staff and the community (BPD, 2020; BPD, 2019). Given the expected influx of federal and state funding for youth programs over the next few years, BPD should consider collaborating with the Baltimore City Public Schools to resurrect this program. Table 7 summarizes the recommendations in this section.

Table 7

Engaging With the Community

Recommendations
1. Assign officers with expertise in community engagement to the most violent neighborhoods
2. Deploy a three-prong community policing team approach in sectors with the most violence: Beat officers handle calls where knowledge/relationships can help de-escalate and attend community meetings; Calls for service officers handle the remaining calls, and NCOs act as liaisons between community associations, CBOs, and local businesses
3. Establish beat integrity in sectors with most violence with minimum one-year assignment and no rotating shifts
4. Evaluate beat officers based on knowledge of neighborhood and relationships with community leaders, increased cooperation in investigations, and collaborative problem solving
5. Identify areas for foot patrol by permanently assigned beat officers in every district
6. Train and encourage officers to view non-violent calls for service as opportunities to engage residents and CBOs
7. Set expectations that officers get out of their cars between calls
8. Encourage officers to reach out to the elderly and youth
9. Research and develop a new mechanism for residents to report crimes anonymously

Collaborating on Public Safety

What is necessary for BPD to collaboratively produce public-safety solutions with the community? As part of the CPP, BPD intends to collaboratively develop Neighborhood Policing Plans in areas in which there is high crime (BPD, 2020). However, the monthly CCC-CRC meetings provide an opportunity to start that collaboration now across all districts. What is necessary for collaboration is for BPD to develop the skills to listen first (IACP, 2018), actively solicit ideas, and transparently develop and select solutions. These skills were not deployed at CCC-CRC meetings that were observed. There were no instances of BPD partnering, i.e., collaborating with residents or CBOs throughout the entire process of decision making on the identification of issues, development of possible solutions, and selection of the solution as defined by the level of involvements (Diamond & Weiss, 2009). However, the first step to collaboration is expanding participation at these meetings.

Advertise CCC-CRC Meetings

The primary mechanism for BPD to collaborate with the community to increase public safety is the monthly CCC-CRC Meetings. With an average of 28 participants and 67% being residents, participation may be perceived as high. However, the potential for greater participating seems feasible by improving outreach efforts. To start, ensure that the information on the district websites matches reality. Additionally, advertise the meetings on the districts' Facebook and Twitter feeds at least twice prior to meetings and ensure city agencies that can improve public safety are represented. The front desks for

each district should also have the information readily available. Lastly, publish the

monthly meeting schedule and location information across all districts as a mayor's news

release and in elected officials' newsletters.

Solicit Input in CCC-CRC Meetings

　　　　Setting aside time for a question-and-answer period during the monthly CCC-

CRC meetings was a start to identifying residents' issues though that only led to selection

of solutions in 50% of the districts. To encourage residents, CBOs, and city agencies to

be part of the entire decision-making process, district commanders should allow

questions and comments throughout the presentations and actively solicit ideas from

participants. To mitigate residents constantly relying on BPD as the subject matter expert

to solve all the problems (IACP, 2018) and criticism that BPD is not doing its job, district

commanders could state their intended plans and then ask for feedback, i.e., "Our plan is

to deploy a bicycle patrol in [this area] to address [this issue]. Do you think this will

resolve the issue or are there other places where we could be more effective with these

limited resources?" This affirms that the residents are also subject matter experts whose

voices need to be part of the decision-making process and builds efficacy within the

community. District commanders can also actively ask questions where clearly the

community is the expert, i.e., "How do we get the word out to residents that they can

protect their window AC units with cages". District commanders can also use CCC-CRC

meetings to evaluate whether residents feel the strategies and tactics deployed are

working. Moving to more collaborative meetings may entail allowing meetings to go over 60 minutes versus cutting off conversation because of a pre-selected ending time.

Deploy New Mechanisms for Resident Input

BPD should also consider new mechanisms for residents to report issues and crimes anonymously. As suggested in the *BPD Staff Perspectives,* "Baltimore Police Department should have either physical or electronic suggestion/comment boxes for each post in the city. The patrol officers should then be able to see and respond to these questions and concerns as to better understand and engage with the community" (BPD, 2019, p.54).

Repair and Build Interagency Relationships

In the *BPD Staff Perspectives,* the relationship most concerning to BPD staff was between BPD and the SAO. The disconnect between BPD and SAO was also noted in multiple CCC-CRC meetings by residents, elected officials, and a couple of district commanders. Assuming that there is an MOU with the SAO documenting the working relationship and expectations of the interface between BPD officers and SAO on cases, the MOU should also consider public-facing responsibilities to present a united front to residents and CBOs (e.g., which organization will present crime statistics). In addition to having an SAO representative at every CCC-CRC meeting, BPD and SAO should develop a consistent mechanism to solicit feedback from officers and investigators on what is working and what is not working. For example, SAO staff could attend roll calls quarterly to receive feedback directly from officers.

To build trust in the community that crimes are actually investigated and follow through occurs, BPD should conduct meetings at least quarterly meetings at the district level with SAO and elected officials to make sure they are all on same page. For example, develop speaking points to support the new policy with EO, SAO, and BPD on when residents should contact 311 versus 911 and a plan to publish the guidelines on district-level social media, through officers handing out flyers, and in the elected officials' newsletters. SAO staff and district commanders could also coordinate the use of CCC-CRC meetings to solicit community or victim impact statements to strengthen prosecutions. Additionally, to increase officers feeling supported by politicians, BPD should consider requesting that elected officials do ride-alongs quarterly in their districts.

Community walks are another opportunity to collaborate across all entities, i.e., city agencies, community-based organizations, elected officials, and residents. Rather than schedule these ad hoc, BPD should consider setting up a quarterly schedule that rotates through the neighborhoods that have the most concerns. Additionally, NCOs could arrange quarterly meetings with small groups of patrol officers and CBOs that serve local needs to familiarize officers with their services and leadership. Table 8 summarizes the recommendations in this section.

Table 8

Collaborating on Public Safety

Recommendation
1. Provide a forum for district commanders to discuss transitioning to collaboratively problem solving with residents
2. Transition CCC-CRC meetings such that district commanders actively solicit ideas and identify solutions to solve public safety issues
3. Update district webpages with current meeting schedule
4. Advertise meetings at least twice prior to each meeting on district Facebook and Twitter feeds
5. Ensure district front desk staff are aware of meeting dates and locations
6. Publish monthly meeting schedule for all districts as a mayor's news release and in City Council newsletters
7. Develop mechanisms to hold other city agencies accountable for helping to mitigate quality-of-life crimes/issues.
8. Expand the MOU with the SAO to address public-facing responsibilities to present a united front to residents and CBOs
9. Set up a regular mechanism for SAO to receive feedback directly from patrol officers
10. Conduct quarterly meetings in each district with SAO and elected officials to make sure all are on same page
11. Use CCC-CRC meetings to solicit community or victim impact statements to strengthen prosecutions
12. Request that elected officials do quarterly ride-alongs in their districts
13. Develop a quarterly schedule for community walks in every district, which include city agencies, community-based organizations, elected officials, and residents

14. Arrange quarterly meetings between small groups of patrol officers and CBOs
that serve local needs

Limitations

Though there are biases in all research, consider the recommendations in this

research with caution because they are based on past studies and the experience of the

author, not on the will and experience of the Baltimore community. Only the community

can affirm the validity of the recommendations in supporting the development of a

transformative relationship. In addition, the CCC-CRC meeting observational data is

based on those that self-selected to be in relationship. Although, triangulation of the

Baltimore Community Input data may have mitigated some of that bias.

Future Research

Future research may include evaluation of whether trainings focused on building

relationships with the community transfer to actions on the street; further analyzing the

BPD-community meetings to determine what facilitates collaborative problem solving

and what breaks it down; which public performance-evaluation mechanisms increase

community trust; how improving BPD staff morale impacts community engagement, and

whether transformative relationships with BPD and the community increase efficacy

within the community.

Conclusion

What if instead of 2,000 officers working on preventing crime in Baltimore, we had 600,000 people working on preventing crime? [Adapted from the Chief of Police, Rockford Illinois. (Austen, 2018)]

This nirvana of community policing is understandably questionable given that over 70% of organizational change implementation projects are likely to fail (Arnéguy, Ohana, & Stinglhamber, 2018). To answer the question are transformative relationships between BPD and the community even possible and if so, how can they be developed, this research analyzed three areas: Is BPD and the community ready for change, what matters in engaging the community, and what is needed to collaborate on public safety solutions. The findings are mixed. BPD is not ready for change. There are some important components of readiness such as leadership commitment, reconciling with the community and improving organizational justice, that need to be addressed first. What matters to the community and BPD staff is simply positive interactions with each other. Moreover, how BPD staff and the community engage appears more important than any specific strategy or tactic (Gau & Brunson, 2009). Lastly, to collaborate on public safety, BPD must view residents as subject-matter experts and embrace them as part of entire decision-making process.

However, this study addressed only one component of transformation within the sphere of public safety, a component that may not have the impact that BPD and the community seek. As affirmed by Potter (2013, p.14),

"Community policing is the latest iteration in efforts to (1) improve relations

between the police and the community; (2) decentralize the police; and, (3) in

response to the overwhelming body of scholarly literature which indicates that the

police have virtually no impact on crime, no matter their emphasis or role,

provide a means to make citizens feel more comfortable about what has been a

seemingly insoluble American dilemma".

Others have argued that true transformation cannot occur without dismantling

policing as it is structured today and reinvesting the police budgets directly into the

community (Vitale, 2020).

References

Anderson, D. & Ackerman Anderson, L. (2001). *Beyond Change Management :*

   Advanced Strategies for Today's Transformational Leaders. Pfeiffer.

Arnéguy, E., Ohana, M., & Stinglhamber, F. (2018). Organizational justice and readiness

   for change: a concomitant examination of the mediating role of perceived

   organizational support and identification. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*, 1172.

Austen, B. 2018. *Peace officers*. Retrieved from

   https://newrepublic.com/article/148854/peace-officers.

Baltimore Police Department [BPD]. (2019). *Crime reduction & departmental*

   transformation plan. Retrieved from

   https://www.baltimorepolice.org/sites/default/files/General%20Website%20PDFs

   /BPD_Crime_Reduction_and_Departmental_Transformation_Plan.pdf

Baltimore Police Department [BPD]. (2020). *Community policing plan*. Retrieved from

   https://www.powerdms.com/public/BALTIMOREMD/documents/435325

Beck, B., Antonelli, J., & Piñeros, G. (2020). *The effects of New York City's*

   neighborhood policing program on crime, misdemeanor arrests, and racial

   disparities. Retrieved from https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/xyz4w/

Blumberg, D.M., Papazoglou, K., & Creighton, S. (2018). Bruised badges: The moral

   risks of police work and a call for officer wellness. *International Journal of*

   Emergency Mental Health and Human Resilience, *20*(2). 1—14.

Bond-Fortier, B. J. (2020). *Organizational change in an urban police department:*

innovating to reform. Routledge.

Bradley, K., & Connors, E. (2007). *Training evaluation model: Evaluating and improving criminal justice training*. Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/244478.pdf

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Diamond, D., & Weiss, D. M. (2009). *Advancing community policing through community governance: A framework document.* Retrieved from https://cops.usdoj.gov/RIC/Publications/cops-p161-pub.pdf

Diaz, A. 2019. *Community Policing: A patrol officer's perspective*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Doane, E., & Cumberland, D. M. (2018). Community policing: Using needs assessment to gain understanding before implementing. Performance Improvement Quarterly, 31(2), 165-187.

Flick, U. (2002) An Introduction to Qualitative Research, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gau, J. M. & Brunson, R. K. (2009). Procedural justice and order maintenance policing: A study of inner-city young men's perceptions of police legitimacy. Justice Quarterly, 27(2), 255- 279.

Gerspacher, N., Wilson, N. L., Al-Rababah, M., & Walker, J. B. (2020). *Community-oriented policing for CVE capacity: Adopting the ethos through enhanced*

training. Lulu Press, Inc.

Giffords Law Center. (2017). *Investing in intervention: The critical role of state-level support in breaking the cycle of urban gun violence*. Retrieved from https://giffords.org/lawcenter/report/investing-intervention-critical-role-state-level-support-breaking-cycle-urban-gun-violence/

Gill, C., Weisburd, D., Telep, C. W., Vitter, Z., & Bennett, T. (2014). Community-oriented policing to reduce crime, disorder and fear and increase satisfaction and legitimacy among citizens: A systematic review. *Journal of experimental criminology*, *10*(4), 399-428.

Harkin, D. (2018). Community safety partnerships: the limits and possibilities of 'policing with the community'. *Crime prevention and community safety*, *20*(2), 125-136.

Helfgott, J. B., & Parkin, W. (2017). *Seattle Police Department's micro-community policing plan implementation evaluation: Final report* [PDF document]. Retrieved from https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/Police/Reports/SPD-MCPP-Implementation-Evauation-Final-Report.pdf

Holt, D. T., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Harris, S. G. (2007). Readiness for organizational change: The systematic development of a scale. *The Journal of applied behavioral science*, *43*(2), 232-255.

International Association of Chiefs of Police [IACP]. (2018). *Practices in modern*

policing: Community participation and leadership. Alexandria, VA: International

Association of Chiefs of Police.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1998). The four levels of evaluation. In Evaluating corporate training:

Models and issues (pp. 95-112). Springer, Dordrecht. Klein, G. (2008).

Naturalistic decision making. *Human Factors*, *50*(3), 456–460. https://doi-

org.proxy-ub.researchport.umd.edu/10.1518/001872008X288385

Krameddine, Y., DeMarco, D., Hassel, R., & Silverstone, P. H. (2013). A novel training

program for police officers that improves interactions with mentally ill individuals

and is cost-effective. Frontiers in psychiatry, 4, 9.

Kuhn, S., & Lurie, S. (2018). *Reconciliation between police and communities: Case

studies and lessons learned*. New York: John Jay College, 130.

Lum, C., Koper, C. S., Wu, X., Johnson, W., & Stoltz, M. (2020). Examining the

empirical realities of proactive policing through systematic observations and

computer-aided dispatch data. *Police Quarterly*, 1098611119896081.

Lum, C., Koper, C.S., Gill, C., Hibdon, J., Telep, C. & Robinson, L. (2016). *An evidence-

assessment of the recommendations of the president's task force on 21st century

policing — implementation and research priorities*. Fairfax, VA: Center for

Evidence-Based Crime Policy, George Mason University. Alexandria, VA:

International Association of Chiefs of Police.

McCampbell, M., (2011). *The collaboration toolkit for law enforcement: Effective

Strategies to Partner with the Community*. The U.S. Department of Justice Office

of Community Oriented Policing Services. Retrieved from

https://rems.ed.gov/docs/COPS_CollaborationToolkit_CommunityOrgs.pdf

McKay, K., Kuntz, J. R. C., & Näswall, K. (2013). The effect of affective commitment,

communication and participation on resistance to change: The role of change

readiness. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, *42*(2), 29–40.

McKean, E. (2005). *The new Oxford American dictionary*. New York, N.Y: Oxford

University Press.

McKee, A. J., & Lewis, A. L. (2016). The new community policing: Developing a

partnership-based theoretical foundation. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Partnership

Studies*, *3*(3).

Miake-Lye, I. M., Delevan, D. M., Ganz, D. A., Mittman, B. S., & Finley, E. P. (2020).

Unpacking organizational readiness for change: An updated systematic review

and content analysis of assessments. *BMC health services research*, *20*(1), 106.

National Police Foundation [NPF]. (2019). *Community policing in Baltimore:

Perspectives from Baltimore Police Department personnel*. Arlington, VA:

National Police Foundation.

National Police Foundation [NPF]. (2020). *Baltimore community input to the Baltimore

Police Department Community Policing Plan*. Arlington, VA: National Police

Foundation.

Novak, K. J., Fox, A. M., Carr, C. M., & Spade, D. A. (2016). The efficacy of foot patrol

in violent places. Journal of Experimental Criminology, 12(3), 465–475.

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis:

Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International journal of qualitative methods*, *16*(1), 1609406917733847.

Owens, E., Weisburd, D., Amendola, K. L., & Alpert, G. P. (2018). Can you build a

better cop? Experimental evidence on supervision, training, and policing in the

community. *Criminology & Public Policy, 17*(1), 41-87.

Peyton, K., Sierra-Arévalo, M., & Rand, D. G. (2019). A field experiment on community

policing and police legitimacy. *PNAS Proceedings of the National Academy of

Sciences of the United States of America*, *116*(40), 19894–19898. https://doi-org.proxy-ub.researchport.umd.edu/10.1073/pnas.1910157116

Police Executive Research Forum [PERF]. (2019). *Community policing in immigrant

neighborhoods*. Retrieved from

https://www.policeforum.org/assets/CommunityPolicingImmigrantNeighborhoods.pdf

Potter, G. (2013). The history of policing in the United States. Retrieved from

http://www.plsonline.eku.edu/sites/plsonline.eku.edu/files/the-history-of-policing-in-us.pdf Pratt-Harris, N.C., & Winbush, R.A. (2020). *The community's

experiences and perceptions of the Baltimore City Police Department survey

report*. Morgan State University. Retrieved from

https://issuu.com/morganstateu/docs/dojpolicereport?fr=sYzIxMzEyNTEzNzg

Ratcliffe, J. H., & Sorg, E. T. (2017). *Foot patrol: Rethinking the cornerstone of policing*.

Springer.

Roman, I. (2020). *When strategies cause unintended harms*. National Police Foundation. Retrieved from https://www.policefoundation.org/when-strategies-cause-unintende…tes&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_cc7e50d847-fd3b467d05-109385353

Santos, R. (2019). *Community policing: a first-line supervisor's perspective.* Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Saunders, B., Sim, J., Kingstone, T., Baker, S., Waterfield, J., Bartlam, B., ... & Jinks, C. (2018). Saturation in qualitative research: exploring its conceptualization and operationalization. *Quality & quantity*, *52*(4), 1893-1907.

Skogan, W. (2019). Community policing. In Weisburd, D., & Braga, A. A. (Eds.). Police innovation: Contrasting perspectives. Cambridge University Press.

Skogan, W. (2019). Community policing. In Weisburd, D., & Braga, A. A. (Eds.). *Police innovation: Contrasting perspectives*. Cambridge University Press.

Skogan, W. G. (2006). *Police and community in Chicago: A tale of three cities*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Skogan, W.G., Hartnett, S.M., DuBois, J., Comey, J.T., Kaiser, M.,& Lovig, J.H. (1999). *On the beat: Police and community problem solving.* Boulder, CO: Westview Publishing Co.

Thomas, D. J. (2010). Facilitating organizational culture: New chief old value systems. *Southwest Journal of Criminal Justice*, *6*(3).

Tulalip Office of Neighborhoods. (n.d.). *How much does community policing cost?*

    Retrieved from

    https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja

    &uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwjfrpzGvMTtAhWMs54KHYbHDewQFjAAegQIAhAC

    &url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.nwtemc.org%2Fblockwatch%2FHowMuchDoesCo

    mmunityPolicingCost.doc&usg=AOvVaw2dHafudpqYMqgxuaw2bp8T

United States of America v. Police Department of Baltimore City, et. al. (2017). Case

    1:17-cv-00099-JKB. Retrieved from

    https://www.justice.gov/opa/file/925056/download

Vitale, A. S. (2020). The answer to police violence is not 'reform.'it's defunding. Here's

    why. *The Guardian*.

Wolfe, S. E., & Nix, J. (2016). The alleged "Ferguson Effect" and police willingness to

    engage in community partnership. *Law and human behavior*, *40*(1), 1.

Wolfe, S. E., McLean, K., Rojek, J., Alpert, G. P., & Smith, M. R. (2019). Advancing a

    theory of police officer training motivation and receptivity. *Justice Quarterly,* 1-

    23.