

Southern Illinois University Carbondale

OpenSIUC

---

Research Papers

Graduate School

---

2024

## Cop in New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago: Assessing the Adherence to the President's Task Force On 21st Century Policing

Hayden Allen  
hayden.allen@siu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [https://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/gs\\_rp](https://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/gs_rp)

---

### Recommended Citation

Allen, Hayden. "Cop in New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago: Assessing the Adherence to the President's Task Force On 21st Century Policing." (Jan 2024).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Papers by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact [opensiuc@lib.siu.edu](mailto:opensiuc@lib.siu.edu).

COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING IN NEW YORK CITY, LOS ANGELES, AND  
CHICAGO: ASSESSING THE ADHERENCE TO THE PRESIDENT'S TASK FORCE ON  
21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY POLICING

by

Hayden C. Allen

B.A., Southern Illinois University, 2023

A Research Paper  
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the  
Master of Arts

School of Justice and Public Safety  
in the Graduate School  
Southern Illinois University Carbondale  
August 2024

**RESEARCH PAPER APPROVAL**

COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING IN NEW YORK CITY, LOS ANGELES, AND  
CHICAGO: ASSESSING THE ADHERENCE TO THE PRESIDENT'S TASK FORCE ON 21<sup>ST</sup>  
CENTURY POLICING

by

Hayden C. Allen

A Research Paper Submitted in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in the field of Criminology and Criminal Justice

Approved by:

Julie Hibdon

Graduate School  
Southern Illinois University Carbondale  
July 1, 2024

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
LIST OF TABLES .....	ii
CHAPTERS	
CHAPTER 1 – Introduction .....	1
CHAPTER 2 – Literature Review .....	8
CHAPTER 3 – Strategies .....	17
CHAPTER 4 – Efforts .....	33
CHAPTER 5 – Impact .....	47
CHAPTER 6 – Conclusion .....	54
REFERENCES .....	60
APPENDIX .....	66
VITA .....	68

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Table 3.1 – COP Strategies .....	18
Table 3.2 – Recommendations Reflected in NYPD Strategies.....	21
Table 3.3 – Recommendations Reflected LAPD Strategies .....	26
Table 3.4 – Recommendations Reflected CPD Strategies .....	31
Table 4.1 – COP Efforts.....	34
Table 4.2 – Recommendations Reflected NYPD COP Efforts.....	37
Table 4.3 – Recommendations Reflected LAPD COP Efforts .....	41
Table 4.4 – Recommendations Reflected CPD COP Efforts .....	44
Table 5.1 – COP Impact.....	53
Table 6.1 – Recommendations Reflected .....	57

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

The study of policing has been a constantly evolving field of study, but there are strategies that consistently reappear in the literature and are implemented by law enforcement agencies. Police reform efforts have led to the implementation of community-oriented policing (COP) due to the desire to hold law enforcement more accountable for their actions and to create more effective law enforcement (Green, 2000). For COP programs to be implemented successfully, they must be tailored to the needs of each city, neighborhood, and even block that the police serve. COP is a broad way of thinking about how police should carry out their duties as law enforcement officers actively problem-solving issues that arise in the community and responding to the community's needs. There are a wide variety of different COP models, and many of them vary based on the environment and needs of the community members (Guzman & Kim, 2017).

COP has many different definitions which all include similar basic concepts, with minor discrepancies, because COP is a philosophy. One definition is that COP is a philosophy of policing that focuses on a working partnership between police officers and citizens to find ways to fix community issues that are related to crime, fear of crime, and neighborhood disorder (Cheurprakobkit, 2002). COP is a policing philosophy that places an emphasis on community involvement with crime prevention. This philosophy contains three main parts: community partnerships, organizational transformation, and problem solving (Gill et al. 2014). A good working definition of COP is that there is “an emphasis on improving the number of quality police-citizen contacts, a broader definition of legitimate police work, decentralization of police bureaucracy, and a greater emphasis on proactive problem-solving strategies” (Rosenbaum,

1988, p. 51). That means that COP is not necessarily a program but rather an idea on which police departments should model their programs on. COP programs and policies are designed to encompass and promote organizational strategies that allow for the use and formation of partnerships with the community members. They also encourage problem-solving techniques which are aimed at addressing the current pertinent conditions and needs within neighborhood that cause concern for public safety and address the communities' fear of crime (Dumas et al. 2021). COP is an idea that embraces the use of police and community member relationships to effectively serve neighborhoods and target the specific needs identified by the community. These types of efforts allow residents to share their needs that are specific to their neighborhoods and communities which are then heard and addressed by the police department in hopes of resolution.

The President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing was created in December of 2014 to foster trust between law enforcement and the people that they serve. This report created a list of recommendations that should be taken into consideration by law enforcement agencies. Only a small portion of the recommendations and pillars were specifically about COP. Of the six pillars, Pillar 4, titled Community Policing & Crime Reduction, has seven recommendations specifically regarding what law enforcement agencies should be doing to properly implement COP. There are also several recommendations made in other pillars that are relevant and can be applied to the implementation of COP (Kerns, 2015). It is important for law enforcement agencies and police departments to take note and act upon the recommendations that are made by policymakers according to Resource Dependency Theory (RDT). This is because agencies may lose resources provided by those offering recommendations and making demands if they do not (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978).

This paper will examine three large cities within the United States of America with a population of over 2.5 million people and identify common and unique COP tactics. This will be done by analyzing the strategies, efforts and implementation, and the impact of the COP programs, as well as examine if they align with the recommendations made by the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing. There are three cities that meet the geographic and population cutoffs set for this paper. These three cities are New York City (8.3 million people), Los Angeles (3.8 million people), and Chicago (2.6 million people). With these three cities and their police departments, the implementation of COP programs and policies have the potential to have large scale effects, especially if they adhere to the recommendations made by the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing. The effects of the program are incredibly dependent on the program's complexity as well as how the programs and policies are implemented by departments, along with the scope of the program (Dunham et al., 2015). The spread of innovation such as COP is very valuable for society and leads to a potentially more effective police force.

In order to compare these three cities and their COP efforts, I will analyze them based on three different categories. Those three categories are strategies, efforts and implementation, and the impact of the COP programs. The strategies are what the police departments and cities planned to do for the implementation of the COP programs. The efforts and implementation are what the cities and police departments did, or how the plan that was made is carried out. This will be done by examining the tactics that the officers and officials carried out. The final category is the impact of the COP program, or how well it worked. Each one of these cities has a history of COP programs, and along with that history of COP there is an existing body of literature which can be used to compare the cities. Each city, however, may have had multiple



programs in the past thirty years. To address this issue, I will look at the most recently evaluated programs in New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago. This will help avoid using outdated and irrelevant sources that may have limited relevance and allow for a comparison of more recent efforts made by these cities and their police departments.

The goal of this paper is to identify recently evaluated COP strategies amongst New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago police departments. Doing so allows for the identification of common strategies as well as strategies that are unique to each city. COP programs and policies often have an overlap of programs that are commonly used by departments or cities. These overlaps occur because they are trying to achieve the same goals of crime reduction and the creation of community partnerships. However, despite COP programs having many similarities, there can be drastic differences between them in what is done to implement COP. These differences tailor programs to the specific needs of the area they serve. Identifying the commonalities and differences allows police departments to identify aspects of COP that they wish to implement in their own department. Awareness of program commonalities and differences makes it easier to identify certain aspects of COP that work or fail regularly across these different cities.

New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago have dense and diverse populations, and that leads to complex and unique issues and needs within the community. In these large urban areas where police serve millions of people, police departments hold a great deal of power. Police departments should actively strive to serve their communities as best as they can in a professional manner to form respect with community members and to do their job effectively (Rivera-Cuadrado, 2021). Understanding COP in these areas can create more positive interactions between community members and law enforcement, cut law enforcement cost, and

make the communities safer. COP can help build trust and legitimacy, improve problem solving and problem identification, prevent crime, increase public safety, and reduce fear of crime through the creation of the relationships between police and the community members (Dumas et al. 2021).

Overall, understanding COP and its implementation in large urban cities such as the ones described earlier is an important thing for police departments to do. Identifying the similarities and unique aspects of COP efforts and how well they align with the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century policing, provides an understanding of the common elements in programs that may be responsible for the success or failure of COP efforts. This then can help provide guidance to smaller police departments with less resources to select a few successful components to implement on a smaller level. Adhering to the recommendations made by the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing is important as it can change what police departments do to obtain more resources as RDT suggests. In addition to COP creating better relationships with the community, an improved understanding allows for proper resource allocation and the creation of appropriate policies for law enforcement agencies. This analysis does not intend to find and replicate successes of COP programs; however, this will identify both common and unique COP strategies used within recent years by New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago's police departments and how they fulfill recommendations made by the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing.

The goal of this paper is to examine the similarities and uniqueness of recently implemented COP programs in New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago. Additionally, this paper will assess whether the three largest police departments in the country followed the recommendations of the Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing. When components of COP efforts

across these cities are consistent and effective, they have a wider application than just these cities. Smaller police departments and agencies that do not have as many resources can select components from these cities' COP efforts to implement at a smaller scale and spend less money on these programs. COP efforts conducted by these large cities can be very expensive, which is not possible for many smaller police departments and agencies. Overall, creating a stronger understanding of COP is an important regardless of the size of the city in which the programs and policies are being implemented. Understanding COP programs matters as these programs can affect things such as funding and willingness to adopt additional COP related programs and policies.

## **Methods**

The information included within this paper was gathered through a multitude of avenues. Information on the programs examined and COP was obtained through published books, web searches, and databases of peer reviewed literature. Web searches were conducted through the search engine Google. Peer-reviewed literature was obtained by searching databases, which included EBSCOhost, HeinOnline, and Google Scholar. Some of the common key search terms included: COP, community-oriented policing, New York City, neighborhood policing policy, Los Angeles, Community Safety Partnerships, Chicago, CAPS, Chicago Alternative policing Strategy, etc.

I also reviewed the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing report. This report has many recommendations regarding how law enforcement agencies and police departments should carry out their programs and policies. To identify the recommendations that are relevant to COP, I went through the report and created a list of every recommendation made by the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing. From that list, I identified all recommendations that were

relevant to COP programs and policies. Recommendations were considered relevant if they directly discussed COP, community partnerships, organizational transformation, or problem solving.<sup>1</sup>

In order to compare the elements of COP for New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago with the recommendations made the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing, I first examined the aspects of each city's plan to carry out COP and identified individual aspects of their plan. After that, I identified which of the relevant recommendations were reflected in each city's plan. Next, I examined the aspects of each city's efforts and implementation and identified individual aspects. Lastly, I identified which of the relevant recommendations were reflected in each city's efforts and implementation.

---

<sup>1</sup>To review all recommendations made by the President's Task force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing see Kearns, E. M. (2015). *The President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing*.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### **Introduction**

COP has become popular over the past several decades. In that time COP has been defined in a variety of ways. Many criminologists and researchers have worked on applying theory to justify and explain the logic behind COP. A vast amount of literature explores aspects of the strategy from definitions, theory, and programs. COP has an expansive amount of literature exploring many different components from definitions, theory, and program evaluations.

#### **Defining COP**

COP is difficult to define as it covers a wide variety of topics and is very broad. It is an organizational strategy that changes the goals of policing but allows a great deal of freedom for the people who are working at the street level (Skogan & Hartnett, 2005). The definition given earlier encompasses the idea that COP is “an emphasis on improving the number of quality police-citizen contacts, a broader definition of legitimate police work, decentralization of police bureaucracy, and a greater emphasis on proactive problem-solving strategies” (Rosenbaum, 1988 P. 51). This definition can be broken down into a few key philosophical components. The philosophy behind COP contains three major parts, which are community partnerships, organizational transformation, and problem solving. The idea of this strategy embraces the idea that police should not just carry out traditional law enforcement duties but also embrace COP related tasks. Rather law enforcement should get the residents and community members involved in law enforcement as well, to identify the pertinent issues that the community wants resolved (Gill et al. 2014).

One of the biggest parts of the COP philosophy is community partnership and many programs emphasize these partnerships. These partnerships should span all walks of life within the community from religious groups, business owners, and residents (Maguire et al 1997). Problem solving is also an important part of the COP philosophy, especially the aspect of involving the community in problem solving. Police officers need to rely on the community members and their input on problems to address. Not only should police rely on community partnerships to identify the problems, but the relationships should also be used as a resource for police when determining how to solve the issues (Skogan, 2019).

COP necessitates organizational change, and it often gets forgotten by many. Organizational transformation is the change in how the police department is structured. This can mean several different things such as shifting from a reactive policing model to a community-based model (Gill et al. 2014). Organizational transformation can also mean the decentralization of police departments. One way that this can be done is by shifting the responsibility of identifying and responding to severe crime issues and disorder to the mid-level commanders in charge of districts or precincts. The second option of decentralization and organizational transformation is to place the responsibility of identifying and responding to community problems on the individual patrol officers and the sergeants (Skogan, 2019). Overall, COP programs and policies should incorporate all three of these key philosophical components.

The Peelian principles were the first policing philosophy that embodies community-oriented policing. It is believed that they were written in 1829 (Lentz & Chaires, 2007) and that Sir Robert Peel said, “The police are the public and the public are the police; the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full-time attention to duties which are incumbent every citizen in interests of community welfare existence” (Dempsey & Forst, 2013).

This is similar to the basics of COP which suggest that the police officers should be selected from people from the community, and that they should be paid to serve the community and all of the members. Since officers should be from the community, they will understand the unique needs of the area which they serve. One final aspect of the Peelian principles that connects to COP is that the police should prevent crime by using continuously visible officers throughout the community via assigning patrol officers to beats (Walker, 1998).

### **Logic of COP Adoption**

Law enforcement agencies and departments can be persuaded to adopt programs and policies in a multitude of ways especially with additional funding. One attempt to explain the adoption of these programs is resource dependence theory (RDT), (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). RDT suggests that actions of organizations are done in order to obtain the resources that are necessary for functioning. RDT suggests that organizations will become reliant on other organizations that control critical resources such as funding. This leads to the holder of the resources having a high level of control over the organizations that are dependent on those resources (Johnson, 1995).

RDT can partially explain why COP became popular with police departments throughout the United States. Police departments often seek ways to secure more money to fund their operations. As such, agencies often become reliant on funding organizations for operating costs. Funding is a critical resource that outside sources like the federal government can supply and use to guide and ultimately control programs police departments implement. This places a large amount of power with the organizations that allocate the funding. To obtain funding, the police department must follow any stipulations stated to obtain that money. Those stipulations can be a variety of things like implementing programs and policies such as COP.

## **History of COP**

Funding is a large source of motivation for many agencies. To increase the budget for departments, agencies seek out additional ways to obtain federal funding. Policymakers create laws that influence what law enforcement does. The COPS Office was a prime example of using funds to promote the adoption of COP (Worrall, 2014). The federal government allocated billions of dollars that have been passed out to police departments. One of the biggest programs to pass out federal funding to support COP programs started in 1994. President Bill Clinton signed the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, although it is more commonly known as the 1994 Crime Bill. This led to the creation of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Service, also known as COPS from Title 1 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. The COPS Office was tasked with passing out grant money from the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act (James, 2011). These changes towards COP are not purely for good intentions of improving legitimacy and trust but also to receive funding (Worrall, 2014).

The COPS Office had many different grant programs which promote the adoption of COP through funding. Many of the programs focused on hiring officers while other programs focused on other aspects of police operations. One of the grant programs allowed the Attorney General to authorize the creation of grants for states, local governments, Indian tribal governments, and many other public and private entities to increase the number of police officers and create a focus on COP. Funding from a different program allowed for the hiring of new police officers, the rehiring of laid off police officers, the purchase of equipment, support systems, and to overtime pay connected to an increase in police officers practicing COP tactics. Grant funds that were under the second program were allotted for hiring former members of the armed services to be law enforcement officers if they are to practice COP tactics. A third



program under the COPS Office was the most diverse and flexible with how grant money could be used as it allowed for the money to be used for anything but hiring officers. Most commonly, the funds were used for training law enforcement officers in COP techniques. The grant money could also be used for the development of technology for crime prevention, connecting community organizations, residents, and police together. The COPS Office also focused on making COP an organization-wide philosophy for police departments in the US. Finally, grant awards were used to reduce the time police officers are away from the community and waiting in court (James, 2011). The main objective for these grants was to promote and increase the implementation of COP. This funding allowed for the federal government to what programs police departments implemented and allowed for them to push for COP.

The COPS Office shifted focus away from COP after the 9/11 attacks and focused on information sharing between law enforcement agencies (Dempsey & Forst, 2013). This shift in focus led support for COP to decrease rapidly. The new focus was on sharing information to support homeland security efforts (Lee, 2010). Despite the support of COP being reduced, it has come and gone several times with waves of support, where the key components get recycled (Rosenbaum & Lurigio, 1994). After support was lost following 9/11, the pattern of COP being recycled continued, and once again became popular during times of tension between the community and law enforcement (James, 2011).

In recent years, police brutality cases and wrongful use of force incidents have harmed police legitimacy and relationships with the community, with cases such as Eric Garner from New York City and Laquan McDonald from Chicago. Police brutality cases and wrongful use of force incidents have led to an uphill battle of improving law enforcement and police legitimacy due to the widespread adoption of body worn cameras. When BWC footage is released to the

public, it opens law enforcement to scrutiny and causes people to question the police's legitimacy. The use of body worn cameras make it difficult for law enforcement to hide wrongdoings from the public (Schneider, 2023). After Michael Brown, an 18-year-old who was wrongfully shot and killed by police, President Barack Obama took measures to step in and improve police legitimacy.

On December 18 of 2014, President Barack Obama created the Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century policing through an Executive Order. The task force was composed of 11 members charged with improving legitimacy and trust through the implementation of COP programs which was emphasized through pillar one Building Trust and Legitimacy and pillar four Community Policing and Crime Reduction (President's Task Force 21st Century, 2015). Trust and legitimacy have been questioned by many throughout the years and is not a new issue for law enforcement. In the past decade, there appears to be a heightened level of scrutiny. This is a new modernized resurgence of COP post 9/11.

The six pillars of the Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century policing was building trust and legitimacy, policy and oversight, technology and social media, community policing and crime reductions, training and education, and officer wellness and safety (Kearns, 2015). The first pillar discusses building trust and legitimacy. Fostering trust and legitimacy between law enforcement sets the basis for strong relationships (Kearns, 2015). These relationships are a crucial aspect of COP. The third pillar is technology and social media. Technology and social media can be used to build trust and legitimacy with the community, as well as allow law enforcement to engage with the community which they serve (Kearns, 2015). Pillar four emphasizes the use of COP and crime reduction. The President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century policing discusses how working with the community can help improve public safety through letting community members identify

problems while working together to create solutions (Kearns, 2015). Pillar One (Building Trust and Legitimacy), Pillar Three (Technology and Social Media), and Pillar Four (Community Policing and Crime Reduction) are the most relevant to the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing's support of COP.

The President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing made 61 different recommendations for police departments to improve their trust and legitimacy. Recommendations from all six pillars cover a wide variety of topics, ideas, and levels of law enforcement. The recommendations from Pillar 1, Building Trust and Legitimacy, and Pillar 4, Community Policing and Crime Reduction, pertain to COP the most. (Kearns, 2015). The President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing calls for support of police departments and organizations that are following the recommendations made through funding (Kearns, 2015). RDT explains the adoption of COP programs because the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing supports the adoption of COP and recommends that police departments and agencies who follow these recommendations should be given additional funding. This leads to these police departments and agencies becoming dependent on these outside sources and will then follow the recommendations to continually keep those resources.

### **Evidence of COP**

COP is not a catch-all answer to fixing policing and crime issues. It has limited effects on both crime rates and fear of crime. There is no link between COP and reduction in crime (Gill et al. 2014). Despite no evidence for crime reductions, COP programs and efforts can have effects on the community not directly linked to crime. For instance, there are several positive effects on non-crime control outcomes related to community relations and trust of police. Some of those positive findings include things such as improved citizen satisfaction with police, improved

perceptions of disorder, reduced fear of crime, and an increase in police legitimacy. COP promotes positive relationships and collaboration between officers and citizens (Gill et al. 2014). Additionally, COP has been found to increase social organization and cohesion within neighborhoods (Kerley & Benson, 2000). These are valuable tools for law enforcement agencies in order to carry out their jobs in an efficient manner.

An additional positive outlook regarding COP is that it also improves the officer's satisfaction with their job. Officers will also be seen as legitimate authority figures (Crowl, 2017). The evidence regarding COP conforms to the overall goal and many of the recommendations made by the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing. This is because one of the major goals of the task force was to improve the legitimacy of the police which can be seen through citizen satisfaction, police legitimacy, and promoted through positive non-enforcement interactions. Overall, the findings surrounding COP are positive, however, the one aspect it does not affect is crime reduction. Despite COP not reducing crime, it is still a valuable tool for law enforcement.

## **Conclusion**

There are a wide range of reasons for police departments and law enforcement agencies to implement COP programs. Police have always been under scrutiny by the community, policymakers and others. In recent years, this has become even more true due to the transparency that has been made possible through social media and body worn cameras. COP has a large body of empirically based research which has mixed support regarding the use and implementation of programs, but it is generally positive. Creating relationships with the community has the potential to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of law enforcement. Due to the vast number of different programs that have been implemented, it is important to realize that there is no one

program that works best for all communities. Each program must be tailored to the needs of the community and address the concerns that the community identifies. If properly implemented, COP has the potential to have many positive effects upon the community. In large urban areas with high concentrations of people, it is important to understand what programs have been most effective within these areas.

One of the more recent pushes for COP has come from the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century policing which made many recommendations for law enforcement agencies to improve trust and legitimacy. The President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing recommends supporting police departments and agencies that adopt the recommendations made through federal funding. This means that police departments and agencies will adjust their operations to fit the recommendations made to obtain additional funding. Law enforcement are dependent on those resources and as such continue to follow the recommendations in order to continue getting federal funding.

## CHAPTER 3

### STRATEGIES

#### Introduction

This chapter discusses the COP strategies that the New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago police departments implemented in recent years. Strategies of COP include how police departments are going to achieve their goals and fulfill the recommendations made by the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing. Looking at both strategies and efforts are important because plans do not always result in what is carried out and done. Plans vary city to city, and even within the same city, due to the specific and unique needs of the people, the government officials and leaders in charge, and other factors that can play a hand in policing programs. New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago all have their own COP strategy but there are many overlaps between them. COP strategies for the programs and policies throughout the years have changed to be more successful and adapt to the changing needs but overall have stayed very similar since many are based on the same basic concepts and criminological theories such as social disorganization and broken windows theory (Skogan, 2019). New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago all have crafted their own unique strategies and programs to implement COP programs to target their city's specific needs.

Below is a table that summarizes the COP strategies of New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago. This table breaks down each city's strategy to satisfy the three main categories of COP through their corresponding programs. The table provides an understanding of how three major urban areas have implemented it and shows differences in how facets of COP can be satisfied. Los Angeles has a strong focus on creating relationships with various agencies outside of the police department. New York City and Chicago are more limited in multiagency partnerships.

Each city's plan did decentralize power and create smaller areas in which the police officers are working. To solve the issues that are raised by residents, each city had a very similar approach where they let street level officers address the problems that arise.

Table 3.1 - COP Strategies

	<b>New York City</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>Chicago</b>
	<b>Neighborhood Policing Policy</b>	<b>Community Safety Partnership</b>	<b>CAPS</b>
	<b>2015-current</b>	<b>2011-current</b>	<b>1993-current</b>
Community partnerships	Created new positions for officers dedicated to COP and interacting with community members.	Joint program with the housing authority, community organizations, schools, philanthropy groups, and gang interventionist through the Mayor's Office of Gang Reduction and Youth Development, and host programs to encourage officer interaction with community	Beat meetings to form relationships with community members
Organizational transformation	Divided large city precincts into smaller sector	Form small teams of officers to work within housing developments giving them great deal of discretion and power regarding activities	Shift to a decentralized model placing power into lower ranked officers rather than higher up mid-level managers
Problem solving	Designated time for officers to solve community issues unrelated to calls for service	Very little guidance allowing officers to choose what they find appropriate and align with the program's ideas	Officers learn problems via residents and focus on pertinent issues

## **New York City**

New York City adopted a COP initiative called neighborhood policing policy (Beck et al. 2020). Police Commissioner James O’Neill was one of the primary advocates who helped create the plan for neighborhood policing (NYPD, 2018). The goal of the neighborhood policing policy is to reduce crime and encourage trust and respect of police officers. The neighborhood policing policy was created with the intentions of increasing interactions between police officers and community members. The program’s strategy to increase community interactions is to create neighborhood coordination officers and steady sector officers (Beck et al. 2020).

Neighborhood coordination officers are to be trained and assigned duties related to neighborhood engagement. Two neighborhood coordination officers work as a team in each sector. They will be responsible for monitoring and reporting on crime trends to other officers in the sector (Bratton, 2015). Neighborhood coordination officers are to be trained in community engagement which they are to spend most of their time doing (Beck et al. 2020). The officer training should include the Detectives Bureau course which includes topics such as accident-prone locations, CCTV cameras, crime prevention, domestic violence, policing in public housing developments, nuisance abatement, street narcotic enforcement, subway polkaing, mediation, working with community residents, organizational skills, public speaking, crime analysis, and managing social service resources (Bratton, 2015).

Steady sector officers are assigned beats to walk consistently and have a third of their shift designated to problem-solving matters where they do not respond to emergency calls. This time is to be used to interact with people within the community. The overall goal of this program is to reduce crime and improve the relationship between law enforcement and the community. Along with the new roles of officers, the neighborhood policy also reorganized the New York



Police Department (NYPD) into smaller sectors (Beck et al. 2020). In order to achieve the goals in NYPD's plan regarding neighborhood policing policy, officer positions specifically tasked with increasing community relations have been created.

NYPD's neighborhood policing policy was relatively traditional with a focus on using police officers to create partnerships within the community, create structural change in the organization, and problem-solving within the neighborhoods. In accordance with the neighborhood policing policy, the NYPD created new officer positions to act as liaisons with residents while communicating with the police departments. The NYPD did not want to create division between the officers who responded to calls for service and the community officers who are tasked with solving neighborhood level issues (Beck et al. 2020). This plan creates a sector team that is comprised of steady sector officers, neighborhood coordination officers, and community members instead of having community officers separated (Bratton, 2015). The biggest difference between NYPD's neighborhood policing policy and other COP programs is that it was set to be implemented city wide. This is different since more traditional COP programs tend to only be implemented in crime hotspots, neighborhoods faced with tense relationships between residents and police, or in areas where the officers are willing to participate (Beck et al. 2020). A plan as big as NYPD's neighborhood policing policy is a large undertaking for any organization, department, or agency. Implementing this program across a city with a population of approximately 8.3 million is a lofty goal.

This goal reflects recommendations 1.5 and 4.1 made by the President's Task Force because NYPD's goal is to implement a program that promotes trust through nonenforcement related activities, while placing an emphasis on the importance of communities.

Recommendation 1.5 says that law enforcement agencies should be proactive in promoting trust

through positive nonenforcement related activities, which NYPD's plan incorporates through hiring additional officers to interact with the community. Recommendation 4 says that law enforcement agencies should develop and adopt programs that emphasize the value of community engagement to encourage public safety, which NYPD's plan incorporates through the interactions with community members that are encouraged. Their plan is also containing a wide variety of ways to engage the community, including neighborhood coordination officers and steady sector officers who can interact with the community to promote trusting relationships and solve community problems. This satisfies recommendation 4.3 which says law enforcement agencies should use a multidisciplinary community team approach to plan, implement, and respond to situations that have complicated causal factors. Having officers whose sole job is COP and others who have designated time for COP engrains the philosophies of COP within the organizations culture is how NYPD's neighborhood policing satisfies recommendation 4.2, which says COP should become part of the culture and organizational structure. Finally, one of the largest aspects of COP is using neighborhood members to create public safety. This satisfies recommendation 4.5 which states COP should emphasize working with residents to create public safety through identifying and fixing problems. This recommendation is fulfilled as the partnerships the neighborhood coordination officers and steady sector officers create will allow the residents to take part in improving public safety. Below is a graph that summarizes the recommendations met.

Table 3.2 – Recommendations Reflect in NYPD COP Strategies

Recommendation	Description	How Recommendation is Met
Recommendation 1.5	Promote public trust through nonenforcement activities	Officers are to patrol their beats and interact with residents forming relationships

Recommendation 4.1	Adoption of programs and policies that promote community engagement in managing public safety	Relationships formed with community members are to be used to promote public safety.
Recommendation 4.2	COP should be in the culture and organizational structure	NYPD creates positions for neighborhood coordination officers and steady sector officers who are tasked with COP tasks
Recommendation 4.3	COP efforts should be multidisciplinary in planning, implementing, and responding to situations	Allows officers to interact with residents in a wide variety of manners in order to address problems
Recommendation 4.5	COP efforts should work with residents to create public safety	Officers are to interact with residents and use them as a tool to create public safety

Overall, the NYPD's strategy for neighborhood policing policy is to have officers who are designated to carry out COP duties. The policy dedicates officers' time to go about the community and interact with members and allow a high level of autonomy with this duty (Beck et al. 2020). The neighborhood policing policy has elements that pertain to all three philosophical components of COP. Additionally, it designates officers with tasks to interact with the community and create relationships with the community members. The neighborhood policing policy also designates officers with time in their schedule to focus on problem solving neighborhood issues. Organizational transformation, another key philosophical component of COP, was met as the NYPD planned a reorganization of their precincts into smaller sectors, which carried the idea that it would create more personable relations with residents.

### **Los Angeles**

After New York City, the next largest city in the United States is Los Angeles with its approximate 3.8 million residents. Los Angeles is no stranger to implementing COP programs. Chief Charlie Beck, and city leaders, recognized that traditional policing tactics are not sufficient

at effectively addressing violent crime. This was especially true in certain neighborhoods and communities that had limited access to public services (About Us LAPD, n.d). Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) created the Community Safety Partnership. In 2011, the Los Angeles Police Department implemented the Community Safety Partnership while working closely with the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA), community organizations, schools, philanthropy groups, and gang interventionists through the Mayor's Office of Gang Reduction and Youth Development (About Us LAPD, n.d.). With many partners across Los Angeles working together on the Community Safety Partnership, a wide variety of resources are offered to achieve their goals.

The Community Safety Partnership is built upon four principles which are public safety, community engagement, youth programming, and safe passage (Robin et al. 2020). The first goal of the program is to improve public safety in the city where most crime affects public housing developments. A second goal for the Community Safety Partnership Program is to improve relationships between the LAPD and the communities whose populations are predominantly minority based. These neighborhoods in which the Community Safety Partnership was implemented are more specifically located in neighborhoods that are south of downtown Los Angeles. The development of the Community Safety Partnership is intended to create long-term relationships between law enforcement and community members and community partnerships that lead to a reduction in both crime and improvements in the community's perception of safety. The end goal of the Community Safety Partnership is long term development of a safer and more healthy community (Muchow, 2023). The LAPD and HACLA plans focus on the areas which have the highest need for improvement with crime rates and the relationships between the community and police officers.

One of the strategies to achieve the goals of the Community Safety Partnership is to dedicate designated officers to COP tasks. To form relationships and interact with the community the Community Safety Partnership, officers are tasked with communicating with community members (About Us LAPD, n.d.). The officers engaged with community members in any manner they felt appropriate as they are given a great deal of discretion, this lead to a wide variety of ways in which officers interacted with the community members. Common methods of engagement include foot patrols, providing safe passage for children going to and from school, offering residential programming to the community, and forming partnerships with the local schools and recreational facilities (Muchow, 2023). This program fulfills the main philosophical components of COP. First, the Community Safety Partnership relies on officers to interact with members of the community in a new manner. Second, the Community Safety Partnership incorporates organizational transformation by creating a new group of officers that specifically focus on the niche problems of small geographic areas. Finally, the Community Safety Partnership uses its designated officers to become ingrained in the community to highlight problems and fix them (Muchow, 2023).

The goal of Community Safety Partnership is to have police officers who are solely tasked with COP. These dedicated officers are supposed to be placed in specific housing developments and neighborhoods. While in these housing developments and neighborhoods, the Community Safety Partnership Officers are tasked with interacting with the residents. The interactions should be to create a stronger understanding of the root causes of crime in those specific areas (Muchow, 2023). This ambitious plan of the LAPD falls in line with COP programs and mentalities since it incorporates community partnerships, organizational transformation, and problem solving.

A big part of the Community Safety Partnership is community engagement. One thing that Community Safety Partnership officers are tasked with is to communicate with stakeholders in the community to host meetings where everyone evaluates and creates responses to the crime trends that they are seeing in their neighborhoods as well as quality of life issues. Community engagement would also include Community Safety Partnership officers participating in community events and celebrations that are informal and walking their assigned beats to interact with community members and residents. The events and informal meetings will allow the Community Safety Partnership officers to converse with and build relationships with those who are stakeholders in the communities (About Us LAPD, n.d.). Overall, the goal of the Community Safety Partnership is to create safe neighborhoods and provide services necessary to do so, especially in underprivileged and underserved areas that are lacking in resources. The programs and resources needed by these communities need to be dictated by the community to make sure they are addressing the issues that are most important to the communities.

LAPD's Community Safety Partnership plan fulfilled several of the recommendations made by the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing. The effort aligns with recommendations 1.5 and 2.1 since one of the large goals of this program was to create community partnerships and form relationships in housing developments that needed resources. Recommendation 1.5 discusses the importance of promoting trust via nonenforcement related activities. Recommendation 2.1 discusses how law enforcement should work with residents to create policies and strategies to distribute resources in communities disproportionately affected by crime. This program emphasizes the relationship between law enforcement and community members and the need to engage them which is in line with recommendation 4.1 which says police departments and agencies should adopt programs and policies that promote community

engagement to managing public safety. The Community Safety Partnership took into consideration aspects such as not separating the officers designated with COP and focused on structural change, following recommendation 4.2 which says COP should be engrained into the department culture and organizational structure. The program's plan also met the recommendation of 4.3 which says COP efforts should be multidisciplinary in planning, implementing, and responding to community situations and problems. This is satisfied since it places high levels of discretion with the officers letting them choose what to do. This leads to the creation of an extremely multidisciplinary plan, with a wide variety of agencies. Juveniles are also a key part of this program since one of the common programs was providing students with safe passage to and from school in those areas with high crime rates. This fulfills recommendation 4.6 which says that programs and policies should address the needs of children most at risk of crime and reduce their stigma regarding law enforcement. Overall, the Community Safety Partnership met several of the recommendations from the Task force on 21<sup>st</sup> century policing. Below is a graph that summarizes the recommendations met.

Table 3.3 – Recommendations Reflect in LAPD COP Strategies

Recommendation	Description	How Recommendation is Met
Recommendation 1.5	Promote public trust through nonenforcement activities	Officers have large amounts of discretion to decide what they should do to interact with community members
Recommendation 2.1	Residents and Law enforcement should collaborate on how to deliver resources in areas with high crime rates	Large multi-agency program with lots of resources for residents, and officers can help facilitate the acquisition of resources in the high crime housing developments
Recommendation 4.1	Adoption of programs and policies that promote community engagement in managing public safety	Promote interaction of officers with residents in order to address the issues specific to the housing

		developments and the immediate area
Recommendation 4.2	COP should be in the in the culture and organizational structure	Creation of positions within the department dedicated to COP making COP a part of the organization
Recommendation 4.3	COP efforts should be multidisciplinary in planning, implementing, and responding to situations	Large amount of discretion for officers allowing them to implement a wide variety of tactics to address the needs of the residents
Recommendation 4.6	Take into consideration children most at risk of crime and their stigma regarding police	Program incorporates plans which are targeted at children in these high crime areas such as providing safe routes to and from school

## Chicago

Chicago Police Department (CPD) has a strong history of COP. The most well-known program is the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS). The CAPS Program began in 1993. In 1993 and 1994, CAPS was tested and developed in five of the CPD's districts, but quickly grew to cover all of CPD's twenty-five districts. The goal of CAPS is to create opportunities for residents and police to build positive relationships. These relationships between the police and the community were planned to create trust and confidence in the police (Skogan, 2020). CAPS is designed to create opportunities and venues which make the facilitation of these relationships possible. The model that CAPS had set forth for CPD and their officers was to listen to the residents and take note of the problems that the residents discussed and placed the most emphasis on. This means the officers are to target the problems that the residents deem most important. This plan was designed to allow residents to have an opinion on how the neighborhoods they live in are policed (Skogan, 2016). The CAPS program has been around for a relatively long period of time and through the years it has fluctuated in size.



According to the CAPS office, every community beat meeting should have an agenda that follows a set order. The agenda outline given by CAPS breaks down the meeting into several different sections. The first topic discussed is the feedback from the community regarding progress made and problems that have arisen since the last meeting. Then, meetings address the current crime situations and new problems. Next, the discussion shifts to creating solutions to the issues that had been discussed prior and who are responsible for this plan. The meeting closes with announcements about the next meeting and other programs. See Appendix for full agenda outline (Get The Most From Your Beat Meeting, n.d.).

There are several different groups of people who can run beat meetings. One option is for beat meeting to be held by the resident beat facilitator, also known as the designated community leader, and the beat officer. This is the ideal group to run the meeting according to CAPS. Having the ideal group is not always possible, which CAPS recognizes. The second option is for the beat meeting to be run by one or more beat facilitators. The third option is for the beat meeting to be run by one or more beat officers (Get The Most From Your Beat Meeting, n.d.).

To identify the pressing issues and problems that should be discussed at a beat meeting, there is a set of questions to guide which topics should be discussed. The first question is whether the problem is a concern to several of the residents and the beat team. The answer to this question should be yes. The second question is whether the problem is likely to go away or fix itself on its own. The answer to the second question should be no. The third question is regarding whether the problem continues to return when using traditional law enforcement efforts. The answer to the third question should be yes. The fourth and final question to identify concerns to discuss at beat meetings is the problem that the community, police, or other agencies can impact with the resources that are available. The answer to this question should also be yes (Get The

Most From Your Beat Meeting, n.d.). If the problem fits these filter questions, then it is considered appropriate and severe enough to put on the agenda and discussed at these beat meetings. Using filter questions like these that the CAPS has set forth is an important way to sift through the many needs of the people and the community to identify the most crucial problems that are at hand.

Ideally, these meetings are attended by a diverse group of people that have interest in the neighborhood's success like residents, business owners, representatives from local schools, churches, and local neighborhood organizations. Additionally, beat officers from all three different watches and a sergeant are expected to attend these beat meetings. Other police department members should come to the beat meetings as necessary, such as neighborhood relations personnel, tactical and gang tactical officers, detectives, and others (Get The Most From Your Beat Meeting, n.d.). Participation by both members of the community, people who have stakes in the community, and by people from the police department is an important aspect of CAPS beat meetings.

The final aspect CAPS considers when trying to plan beat meetings is that the space must promote the discussion the issues at hand. CAPS laid out guidelines for creating areas that are conducive to problem solving. The first thing to be considered when picking a location for a beat meeting is that it should have easy parking and be accessible to people with disabilities. Second, the place should be somewhere that the residents are comfortable going to. Third, the room or area should be big enough to hold everyone who wants to participate. The rooms should be set up to encourage discussion like movable chairs that are placed in a horseshoe pattern. Finally, CAPS suggested that the rooms should have chalkboards or other things to record the problems that are brought up during the meetings (Get The Most From Your Beat Meeting, n.d.). CAPS set

forth many plans and guidance on how the beat meetings should be held. Having this guidance and plan can help create a level of equality from beat meeting to beat meeting. This creates a level of quality control to ensure that neighborhoods are all receiving beat meetings in a similar fashion.

CPD's CAPS programs plan took into consideration several of the recommendations made by the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing. The CAPS office plan for beat meetings which allows for transparency and accountability, which aligns with recommendation 1.3 which says law enforcement agencies should create a culture of transparency and accountability to build trust and legitimacy. Additionally, these meetings promote trust through non-law enforcement related interactions aligning with recommendation 1.5 which says law enforcement agencies should promote trust through non-law enforcement related activities. Within the beat meeting, they will satisfy recommendation 2.1 and 4.1 where officers and residents communicate and collaborate to obtain necessary resources and allow for community engagement. Recommendation 2.1 says that both residents and law enforcement should collaborate on how to get resources to areas with high crime rates. Recommendation 4.1 says that law enforcement agencies should create policies that emphasize community engagement to create public safety. The CAPS office has been implemented across the entirety of the city and is engrained into CPD which is in line with recommendation 4.2 which says COP should be part of the culture and organization of the law enforcement agency. The CAPS office's plan is multidisciplinary and incorporates a wide variety of activities and tasks as recommendation 4.3 discusses the importance of a multidisciplinary approach to planning, implementing, and responding to problems within the neighborhoods. Recommendation 4.5 emphasizes the use of community members to create public safety, and the beat meetings take the neighborhood

residents and their concerns and opinions into consideration when figuring out the issues and how to fix them. Table 3.4 below summarizes the recommendations reflected in CPD's COP strategies.

Table 3.4 – Recommendations Reflected in CPD COP Strategies

Recommendation	Description	How Recommendation is Met
Recommendation 1.3	Promote transparency and accountability to build trust and legitimacy	Using beat meetings allows for transparency and build legitimacy through conversations
Recommendation 1.5	Promote public trust through nonenforcement activities	Beat meetings promote trust and are a non-enforcement activity
Recommendation 2.1	Residents and law enforcement should collaborate on how to deliver resources in areas with high crime rates	Beat meeting allow for officers and residents to collaborate on issues and how to address them
Recommendation 4.1	Adoption of programs and policies that promote community engagement in managing public safety	Beat meetings allow for residents to engage with law enforcement to promote public safety.
Recommendation 4.2	COP should be in the culture and organizational structure	CAPS is implemented citywide in all precincts becoming part of CPD and its practices
Recommendation 4.5	COP efforts should work with residents to create public safety	Beat meetings allow for residents to identify and discuss the issues pertinent to the neighborhoods

Overall, CAPS fulfilled the main guiding principles of COP, the first component being the use of community partnerships. CAPS set out to create designated beat meetings where the officers and beat facilitators or community leaders could meet the residents and form partnerships with the members in the community. These beat meetings are important to a second aspect of COP, which is problem solving. During the beat meetings the community members discussed the issues that many of the community members wanted to be addressed by the police

officers. These meetings also are important for organizational transformation since they decentralize much of the power and decision-making process away from higher up police officials and places it in community leaders and the officers who run the beat meetings.

### **Conclusion**

New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago are all large cities that millions of people call home. To properly police these cities and foster healthy relationships between the communities and police officers, each one of the cities has implemented some form of COP in recent years. New York City implemented the neighborhood policing policy, Los Angeles had the Community Safety Partnership, and Chicago had the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy. Each of these departments found a way to have their COP policy or program fit the three key components that any COP program should have which is community partnership, organizational transformation, and problem solving.

## CHAPTER 4

### EFFORTS

#### Introduction

As mentioned previously, what a city or police department plans for a COP effort and what is done often varies. Overall, it is important for police officers to follow through with the programs that are created but that is not always what happens. As police departments grow, it allows for many more people to have specializations (Langworthy & Hindelang, 1982).

Differences between the plan and what is done are common and these discrepancies can occur for a wide variety of reasons. This can be seen throughout the COP plans created by these cities and their police departments. Each city made considerable efforts to fulfill their COP programs and its plans

One reason that there are discrepancies is that the new policy or program is not specific about what needs to be done and is why policies and programs require clear objectives. A second reason for discrepancies between plans and implementation is the willingness of the community members to cooperate. Many community members may not want to form a relationship with police officers as it can place additional strain on the community members to keep a level of social control in their community. A third reason for these discrepancies involves push back from department officers, since many officers still favor more traditional policing styles (Avidija, 2010). Larger police departments employ a diverse group of people who must work in a wide variety of conditions and deal with various crimes. Even within the same police departments there are often discrepancies between plans for a COP program and what the law enforcement officers carry out. These discrepancies between plans and efforts should be targeted and minimized.

Below is a table that summarizes the COP programs of New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago (Table 4.1). This table breaks down each city's efforts to satisfy the three main categories of COP through their corresponding programs. The table provides an understanding of how these three major urban areas have implemented COP and compares their main philosophical components.

Table 4.1 - COP Efforts

	<b>New York City</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>Chicago</b>
	<b>Neighborhood Policing Policy</b>	<b>Community Safety Partnership</b>	<b>CAPS</b>
	<b>2015-current</b>	<b>2011-current</b>	<b>1993-current</b>
Community partnerships	Created new positions including steady sector and neighborhood coordination officers. They were used in all five boroughs and tasked with interacting with the community to form relationships	Joint program with several organizations throughout the community. Also placed officers in housing developments where officers held high levels of discretion on what to do to interact with community. Those actions included things such as foot patrols and residential programs/events	Beat meetings to form relationships with community members, district level advisory meetings, door to door visits by civilian community organizers, increased city services, and involving residents in crime prevention projects
Organizational transformation	Divided large city precincts into smaller sector, and shifted responsibility to lower ranked officers	Form small teams of officers to work within housing developments giving them great deal of discretion and power regarding activities	Shift to a decentralized model placing power into lower ranked officers rather than higher up mid-level managers, and allowed community members power in identifying key issues
Problem solving	Designated time for officers to solve community issues unrelated to calls for	Very little guidance allowing officers to choose what they find appropriate and align	Officers learn important problems via residents and focus on pertinent

	service and resolve local issues to the sector	with the programs ideas and how to solve the problems in the housing developments	issues mentioned by the community members
--	--	---	---

## New York City

New York City was very successful executing their COP strategies and plans. The NYPD has appointed and created hundreds of neighborhood coordination officers and steady sector officers. The neighborhood coordination and the steady sector officers work with officers tasked with traditional patrol. This helps reduce the strain and separation between the officers who have the different tasks (Beck et al. 2020). During the initial neighborhood policing efforts, the NYPD hired an additional one thousand-three hundred officers in hopes to reduce the strain on the officers. Many civilians were also hired to do work that officers were doing while on desk duty. This allowed approximately 400 police officers to conduct patrols (Goldman & Liataud, 2015). By approximately 2018, all of the NYPD had seen a restructuring and reorganization from their large precincts to smaller, more manageable sectors. This allowed for more consistent interactions between officers and community members. These smaller sectors also facilitated interactions with police officers and residents to create better community partnerships.

NYPD's neighborhood policing can be summarized as the creation of dedicated officers who are tasked with building relationships with residents of areas they are assigned. One very impressive part of NYPD's implementation of neighborhood policing is that they were able to implement it across the entire city. Neighborhood policing was present in each of the five boroughs by December 2015. By October 2016, neighborhood policing was running in all patrol boroughs (NYPD, 2018). All neighborhood coordination officers have been given smartphones. These smartphones can be used to access NYPD databases. Smartphones also allow the officers



to easily be contacted since they can give out the phone number and email address to community members (Lamburini, 2018). The NYPD was seemingly successful in carrying out their plans with the neighborhood policing policy due to their ability to hire so many new neighborhood coordination and steady sector. The NYPD's neighborhood policing policy focuses on forming community partnerships via the officers that are designated with the task of interacting with community members. The department also hired officers to free up additional time for officers to focus on solving the issues about which the community expressed concern. Finally, the neighborhood policing policy reorganized the NYPD's precincts into smaller sectors.

NYPD carries out the neighborhood policing policy and their actions align with several of the recommendations that were made by the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing. To create transparency, officers are given cell phones, creating more lines of communication and transparency, an action that follows recommendation 1.3, which says law enforcement agencies should promote transparency and accountability to build trust and legitimacy. This policy promotes creating trust via positive non-enforcement interactions and forming those important partnerships with the community as recommendations 1.5 and 4.1 suggest. Recommendation 1.5 discusses the importance of promoting public trust through non-enforcement activities. Recommendation 4.1 places an emphasis on the adoption of programs and policies that promote community engagement to manage public safety. The efforts of NYPD also reflected recommendation 4.2 which discusses how COP should be in the in the culture and organizational structure as they create the positions for the officers which builds a culture of COP within the police department. Their efforts are multifaceted and include different aspects such as neighborhood coordination officers, steady sector officers, and discretion to fulfill the program goals per recommendation 4.3 which emphasizes how COP efforts should be multidisciplinary in

planning, implementing, and responding to situations. Recommendation 4.5 suggests that COP efforts should work with residents to create public safety. NYPD has an emphasis on using relationships with the community members in order to address specific needs of communities.

Below is a graph that summarizes the recommendations met (see Table 4.2)

Table 4.2 – Recommendations Reflect in NYPD COP Efforts

Recommendation	Description	How Recommendation is Met
Recommendation 1.3	Promote transparency and accountability to build trust and legitimacy	Officers are given cellphones to improve communication and transparency
Recommendation 1.5	Promote public trust through nonenforcement activities	Officers patrol their beats and interact with residents forming relationships
Recommendation 4.1	Adoption of programs and policies that promote community engagement in managing public safety	Relationships formed with community members are to be used to promote public safety.
Recommendation 4.2	COP should be in the culture and organizational structure	NYPD creates positions for neighborhood coordination officers and steady sector officers who are tasked with COP tasks
Recommendation 4.3	COP efforts should be multidisciplinary in planning, implementing, and responding to situations	Allows officers to interact with residents in a wide variety of manners to address problems
Recommendation 4.5	COP efforts should work with residents to create public safety	Officers are to interact with residents and use them as a tool to create public safety

## Los Angeles

The Los Angeles Police Department and the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles have many plans for the Community Safety Partnership. The implementation and efforts of those who are participating in a program is vital. Between the years of 2011 and 2017, the Community Safety Partnership was implemented at eight different housing development sites. The first wave of the Community Safety Partnership was conducted at four different housing

developments in late 2011. Three of the housing developments from the first wave were Jordan Downs, Imperial Courts, and Nickerson Garden. These three housing developments are located less than a mile from Watts Neighborhood (Muchow, 2023). The fourth housing development included during the first wave Ramona Gardens which is in the Boyle Heights. The second wave was implemented in 2015 in two housing developments called Gonzague Village and Avalon Garden. These housing developments are in the neighborhoods of Watts and Green Meadows just over a mile apart from each other. The third wave was implemented in the second quarter of 2016 in a housing development named Pueblo Del Rio. This housing development is located within the Central-Alameda neighborhood. The fourth wave of the Community Safety Partnership was the first implementation that focused on an entire neighborhood, Harvard Park, on the South Side of Los Angeles (Muchow, 2023). These sites for the LAPD's Community Safety Partnership all need extra attention from law enforcement and additional resource groups to achieve the goals made by the police department because of the high crime rates in these areas.

Each one of these housing developments where the Community Safety Partnership is active has a team of LAPD officers dedicated to COP. Officers are given high levels of discretion to pick what activities and duties that they consider to fit the goals of the Community Safety Partnership and COP. These officers are selected from a pool which they voluntarily apply to and are selected based on both their interests and qualifications. Once selected, these officers must complete a total of thirty additional hours of training. That training is broken up into three ten-hour days. The training is conducted by the Urban Peace Institute. The officers who are selected and trained receive a promotion, but they are required to work a minimum of five years at the site they are assigned to. Each housing development team is comprised of ten Community

Safety Program Officers, and they are supervised by one sergeant. These officers are on duty working their assigned housing developments on weekdays between the hours of 7:00 a.m. till 10:00 pm (Muchow, 2023).

Activities vary from site to site due to the officers' discretion. Some of the common activities include foot patrols, helping children get to and from school, creating and fostering residential programs and events, creating partnerships with schools, working with recreational facilities, interacting with residents, proactively problem solving and anything else that embodies the goals of the Community Safety Partnership and COP (Robin et al. 2020). The safe passages are not limited to just schools under this initiative. The goal of safe passages was to place Community Safety Partnership Officers throughout common travel routes and established paths to and from schools, parks, recreational facilities, and centers (About Us LAPD, n.d.). The Neighborhood Safety Partnership gives officers a high level of discretion which lets them decide what to do. The high level of discretion also allows for flexibility in the program but requires the officers to work diligently in order to identify what COP practices are needed. This allows the officers to address the needs of the community and target the causes of crime that are specific to that certain area.

The Community Safety Partnerships offers opportunities for people in the housing developments and neighborhoods where the Community Safety Partnership is being implemented. The programs and opportunities do not have to be directly linked to policing efforts and include various activities. Some of the more notable Community Safety Partnership programs are things such as Zumba, bingo for seniors, rocket building, dinner, and a play (Robin et al. 2020). Through the Mayor's Office of Gang Reduction Development, there are several different programs to help every member in these communities regardless of their age. These

programs are aimed at reducing gang membership and reducing delinquency. The programs also provide employment opportunities for community members. (About Us LAPD, n.d.). These resources are valuable to communities, especially those neighborhoods that need extra help. Overall, the Community Safety Partnership is a collection of many different groups that provide resources and improve policing efforts in order create safer neighborhoods in Los Angeles. They do this by targeting very specific geographic areas incorporating housing developments that needed extra resources and services.

The Community Safety Partnership is an expansive COP effort. The Community Safety Partnership changed the structure of policing for target areas by having a set of dedicated officers deal with the problems present at the housing development. This makes those officers very decentralized from the rest of LAPD. The officers in each of these housing developments are tasked with holding programs and events, along improved resident interactions which ideally helps develop partnerships with community members. Working small geographic areas allows officers to fully understand the specific problems and identify appropriate solutions. That means the way that the LAPD implements Community Safety Partnership fulfills the three main components of COP.

As LAPD has been carrying out their program, they have followed several of the recommendations made by the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing. This program places officers in housing developments where they are encouraged to interact with everyone and form relationships, creating trust per recommendation 1.5 which discusses the importance of law enforcement agencies promoting trust through nonenforcement related interactions. These interactions with the community are an important aspect of the program aligning with recommendation 4.1 which emphasizes how law enforcement agencies should use a

multidisciplinary approach to planning, implementing, and responding to situations.

Recommendation 2.1 discusses how law enforcement agencies should work with residents to create policies and strategies to deliver resources in neighborhoods that are greatly affected by crime and is also met because the officers have large amounts of discretion and can collaborate with the residents of the housing developments to address the needs of the specific housing developments.

This program has many ways in which it interacts and serves the community such as foot patrols, helping children get to and from school, creating residential programs, working with schools, and more. This makes these efforts multidisciplinary per recommendation 4.3 which says law enforcement should use a multidisciplinary approach to address problems. The interactions between the residents and officers creates an emphasis on collaboration to foster a safer environment per recommendation 4.5 which discusses COP and the importance of using residents and law enforcement to work together in order to produce public safety. One final recommendation that this program meets that the other programs do not was recommendation 4.6 since one of the key aspects for this program was to help children get to and from school and monitor the most common routes for the children. Table 4.3 below summarizes the recommendations met by LAPD's COP efforts.

Table 4.3 – Recommendations Reflect in LAPD COP Efforts

Recommendation	Description	How Recommendation is Met
Recommendation 1.5	Promote public trust through nonenforcement activities	Officers have large amounts of discretion to decide what they should do to interact with community members
Recommendation 2.1	Residents and Law enforcement should collaborate on how to deliver resources in areas with high crime rates	Large multi-agency program with lots of resources for residents, and officers can help facilitate the acquisition

		of resources in the high crime housing developments
Recommendation 4.1	Adoption of programs and policies that promote community engagement in managing public safety	Promote interaction of officers with residents to address the issues specific to the housing developments and the immediate area
Recommendation 4.2	COP should be in the culture and organizational structure	Creation of positions within the department dedicated to COP making COP a part of the organization, especially in areas with the housing developments
Recommendation 4.3	COP efforts should be multidisciplinary in planning, implementing, and responding to situations	Large amount of discretion for officers allowing them to implement a wide variety of tactics to address the needs of the residents including foot patrols and residential programs/events
Recommendation 4.6	Take into consideration children most at risk of crime and their stigma regarding police	Programs help children get to and from school in high crime areas

## Chicago

CAPS is a very expansive program and has many different components that encapsulate COP. CAPS implements various measures, such as local community meetings, district level advisory committees, block-by-block door visits by civilian community organizers, increased city services to areas in need, and increased involvement of residents in crime prevention projects (Skogan, 2022). This has led to residents of communities watching over the community and communicating with police officers. This means citizens are reporting crimes and disorder like abandoned cars, overgrown lots, and people loitering (Lombardo & Donner, 2017). CAPS has grown to become a very large program across the entire city. Just like other cities and their COP programs and plans, there is a level of discretion and variance between what the strategy

and plan was and what the officers did. Most notable, CAPS has facilitated local beat meetings (Skogan, 2022). CAPS is comprised of many different parts, that are not consistently applied throughout the city. A reason for the differences in how CAPS is implemented is because needs in neighborhoods are different throughout the city. This can be explained due to the diverse populations. One neighborhood may need more active beat patrols in order to interact with community members while others may benefit more from beat meetings. These different needs cause variations in how programs are applied.

One issue that has hampered the implementation of CAPS budget cuts. These budget cuts have led to approximately 200 CAPS officers being reassigned and as well as the elimination of paid overtime for beat officers to attend meetings. This means officers are not engaging with community members as often and ultimately not hearing concerns communities are facing. Budget cuts also mean that officers who are on duty can only spend one hour at these meetings to save money. As a result, meetings got less frequent and smaller (Skogan, 2022). After budget cuts, CAPS kept on going, but not nearly as strongly as before. Carrying out such large-scale programs can be difficult especially after a series of budget cuts and levels of uncertainty regarding the future, causing a restructuring.

CPD's CAPS key component is the beat meeting. These beat meetings fulfill all three of the key philosophies for COP. During these beat meetings police officers, community leaders, and community members come together where they meet each other and form partnerships. Discussions highlighted resident concerns to police officers in order to be addressed. Finally, these beat meetings place a high level of discretionary power upon the officers working those beats to decide what the issues are that need to focus. This shifts power to the lower ranked officers.



CPD's CAPS program was a widespread COP effort that encompassed many different aspects which satisfies several of the recommendations made by the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing. The beat meetings implemented by the CAPS office support transparency and trust to form between the community and the law enforcement officers per recommendation 1.3 which advocates for transparency and accountability to build trust and legitimacy. These beat meetings, along with other activities, such as block-by-block door visits, increased city services, and involving the residents in crime prevention projects promote non-enforcement related interactions, fulfilling recommendation 1.5, which advocates for the creation public trust through nonenforcement activities. These beat meetings allow for community members and officers to collaborate and create strategies to resolve the issues and place an emphasis on community involvement in creating a safe neighborhood per recommendations 2.1, 4.1, and 4.5. Recommendation 2.1 discusses the importance of involving both residents and law enforcement in the collaboration on how to deliver resources in areas with high crime rates. Recommendation 4.1 emphasizes the need for adopting programs and policies that promote community engagement to manage public safety. Recommendation 4.5 discusses the importance of COP efforts and how law enforcement agencies should work with residents to create public safety. Finally, CAPS is not just some small program implemented by CPD but rather it is city wide and has become part of the police force, creating a culture around COP which is suggested by recommendation 4.2. Below is a graph that summarizes the recommendations met (see Table 4.4).

Table 4.4 – Recommendations Reflect in CPD COP Efforts

Recommendation	Description	How Recommendation is Met
Recommendation 1.3	Promote transparency and accountability to build trust and legitimacy	Using beat meetings allows for transparency and build

		legitimacy through conversations
Recommendation 1.5	Promote public trust through nonenforcement activities	Beat meetings, block-by-block door visits, increased city services and involving the residents in crime prevention projects promote trust and are a non-enforcement activity
Recommendation 2.1	Residents and law enforcement should collaborate on how to deliver resources in areas with high crime rates	Beat meeting allow for officers and residents to collaborate on issues and how to address them
Recommendation 4.1	Adoption of programs and policies that promote community engagement in managing public safety	Beat meetings allow for residents to engage with law enforcement to promote public safety.
Recommendation 4.2	COP should be in the culture and organizational structure	CAPS is implemented citywide in all precincts becoming part of CPD and its practices
Recommendation 4.5	COP efforts should work with residents to create public safety	Beat meetings allow for residents to identify and discuss the issues pertinent to the neighborhoods

## Conclusion

Each one of these cities has implemented some form of COP. Each city has overlap between their efforts to implement COP and how they worked to meet each of the key components of COP. New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago are all very different cities in many different manners, but all used the same basic components of COP in order address the needs of their neighborhoods. Police departments cannot single handedly achieve their goals by themselves and require the formation of partnerships with community members, and organizations. Forming these relationships with the community is essential for police departments to properly carry out all three key components of COP.

The tactics used are similar as they all used designated officers to implement COP rather than having COP duties being added on to an existing list of an officer's duties. One of the key differences is how NYPD and CPD implemented their COP programs across the entirety of the city while LAPD implemented their program on a much smaller scale focusing on specific housing developments. A second difference between these programs is the amount of direction given to the officers. LAPD gives virtually no guidance for the police officers while NYPD and CPD gave their officers more direction in what to do to fulfill the program goals. All of the programs fulfill many of the recommendations made by the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing but LAPD was also the only one to often incorporate juveniles in their actions with helping them get to and from school.

## CHAPTER 5

### IMPACT

#### Introduction

COP programs are an attempt to change neighborhoods and fix crime problems. These programs can be intensive to carry out both financially and in terms of staffing. Community residents, law enforcement, and policymakers expect and hope to see an impact in crime at the community level where these COP programs are being implemented. If there is not a significant impact, then it creates the question of whether all that time and money was wasted or if these COP programs need more time or need to be changed to effectively impact crime rates by reducing crime. It is also important to see if the impact on crime is long lasting, after COP programs are shut down or if they must constantly be done to continue with the lowered crime rates. Since each city is different and the neighborhoods within the cities are different, these programs and their impact will vary. Without measuring the impact of these programs, it is very difficult to assess the effects of them. It is important that the effects are measured to justify the continuation of the program and the resources which are needed to do so.

#### New York City

The NYPD neighborhood policing policy was relatively successful in decreasing crime. Between May 2015 and October 2018, both violent crime and property crime decreased, but still varied based on the seasonal swings throughout the years at the city-wide level. Along with the decline in property and violent crime, there was also a decline in misdemeanor arrests under the neighborhood policing policy in this time period (Beck et al. 2020). The implementation of neighborhood policing in New York City saw a reduction in low-level arrests. This affect was most seen in working-class areas that had a greater percentage of Black and Latino people.

There are discrepancies in the findings between studies regarding the effectiveness of the Neighborhood Policing Policy, creating difficulties identifying effectiveness of programs. Despite the positive findings, a more recent analysis of neighborhood policing found it to have no effect regarding violent crime rates (Antonelli & Beck, 2023). The findings from Beck, Antonelli, and Piñeros study from 2020 and Antonelli and Becks study from 2023 regarding New York City's neighborhood policing and violent crime are contradictory. This is because one source found neighborhood policing to reduce violent crime while another study found the Neighborhood Policing Policy to have no effect on violent crime rates. The discrepancies in findings regarding violent crime could be due several reasons. One explanation for these discrepancies is how, where, what, and when violent crime was measured. Crime rates are not constant, and if a researcher looked at only a small amount of time, they may only examine a down trend or an uptrend in crime rates.

It is difficult to link the implementation of neighborhood coordination officers to reducing crime and improving police-community relations. This can be seen by the two sources having contradictory findings regarding the Neighborhood Policing Policy. NYPD planned to address the success of neighborhood policing anecdotally instead of focusing strictly on numbers and crime rates. There are many examples of positive anecdotes regarding neighborhood policing and its implementation (Lamburini, 2018). These anecdotal accounts regarding the success of the neighborhood policing policy are not as rigorous as other ways to evaluate the COP efforts.

A more unique and interesting aspect of NYPD's neighborhood policing policy is how it is implemented so widely across the entire city. Another success that was also measured from the NYPD neighborhood policing policy is a reduction in racial disparity. The reduction in racial disparity is seen through a decline in the difference between the reduction in the amount of black

people arrested per black residents and the number of white people arrested per white residents. This decline in racial disparity seen may be partially explained due to arrest rates for all groups decreasing. Black people were arrested at a rate of 5.7 times more than white people at the point of January in 2010, however, by 2017 that rate shrunk down to 3.4 times more likely (Beck et al. 2020).

Results changed when looking at the precinct level. At the precinct level with neighborhood policing, there was only a marginal effect. Civilian complaints of police misconduct saw an increase that was statistically significant. This increase was observed during the four to seven months after the neighborhood policing policy was implemented. Officers received 2.3 complaints, but the expected complaint rate is 1.9 complaints. These effects are not long lasting, however. After eight months, the change became no longer statistically significant. The complaints received were predominantly about “discourtesy/abuse of authority” (Beck et al. 2020). Despite the increase in officer complaints, the NYPD issued smartphones that allowed neighborhood coordination officers to communicate with community members in a simpler manner than previously (Lamburini, 2018).

Neighborhood policing did not have an impact on racial disparity during discretionary arrests. Despite less arrests being made, the racial proportions stayed the same with arrests between the years of 2015 and 2018 (Antonelli & Beck, 2023). At the precinct level, neighborhood policing policy has seen a statistically significant reduction in arrest rates. The reduction was seen and continued through the following months after the neighborhood policing policy was implemented. Misdemeanor arrests also saw a significant reduction in the number of arrests. However, after five months, the reduction in misdemeanor arrests continually crept up until they were no longer statistically significant. Despite this, it was still lower than what was

expected. At the neighborhood level, there was not a significant reduction in racial disparity measured through arrest rates. Overall, neighborhood policing policy saw the strongest effects on proactive arrests (Beck et al. 2020).

### **Los Angeles**

The first wave of the Community Safety Partnership saw positive effects on the goals listed. During the first wave in 2011, results showed reductions in crime as well as improved community relations. Two years after the Community Safety Partnership was implemented, the steps from wave one saw 4.21 fewer violent crime incidents every month in comparison to similar housing developments. The effects from the first wave were significant when looking at the reduction of violent crime. The other three waves observed saw little to no impact when looking at the waves. However, looking at the sites of implementation, the effects allowed researchers to understand the potential changes at a smaller level (Muchow, 2023). With little to no impact seen with this program, concern and questions are raised about the lack of success.

A reason that the results varied between waves and cites is the officer's fidelity, loyalty, and integrity. These characteristics in an officer are positive for the implementation of the Community Safety Partnership. The sites participating in the Community Safety Partnership where the highest levels of fidelity were reported by residents had the best outcomes like Ramona Gardens Wave 1. Residents said that they experienced and observed high levels of officer presence, positive police-community relations, and higher levels of increased participation in Community Safety Partnership programming. In comparison, Nickerson Gardens from wave 1, Avalon Gardens from wave 2, and Pueblo Del Rio from wave 3 saw residents reporting low to moderate levels of fidelity which affected many aspects of the Community Safety Partnership. Residents saw little interactions with officers or their presence and did not

receive a notable amount of programming. There was a lack of details from each site, creating difficulty isolating and identifying factors that caused the differences between waves and sites (Muchow, 2023). Fidelity, loyalty, and integrity are things that people should want to see in police officers regardless of what their assigned duties are.

Overall, the Community Safety Partnership created a partnership for collaboration between the HACLA and the LAPD. The Community Safety Partnership also improved engagement between residents, the LAPD, and the HACLA. (Robin et al. 2020). The efforts also lead to more people seeing the LAPD in housing developments. Finally, the Community Safety Partnership increases and improves access to the resources available within the community (Robin et al. 2020).

### **Chicago**

When examining CAPS, there was found to be a significant positive association between CAPS and informal social control. However, CAPS increase on informal social control was related to the satisfaction of the police officers. Police satisfaction was found to have a positive relationship with the increase in resident's informal social control. That means that in areas with higher police satisfaction, residents are more likely to work on local problems. Support for CAPS and COP in Chicago is related to residents' satisfaction with police services (Lombardo & Donner, 2017). Many criminologists and researchers including Skogan, Lombardo, Hartnett, Donner, Olson, Staton, and more have worked and evaluated the effects of CAPS and have observed both positive and negative effects regarding CAPS. One issue that CAPS has faced is sustaining commitment to the program and ensuring longevity of programs (Skogan & Hartnett, 2005). The participation of residents within CAPS has also varied and was an issue during times where involvement declined (Skogan, 2022).



Another study which evaluated CAPS found that people who lived in areas that were CAPS prototype districts had a significantly higher level of satisfaction with the efforts that police made to fight crime, in comparison to the people who lived in areas that were not involved (Lombardo et al. 2010). Residents who are satisfied with police services are more likely to have significantly higher levels of informal social control. That means that CAPS and informal social control are correlated (Lombardo & Donner, 2018). This study is another which provides support for CAPS and other COP programs that focus on building strong community relationships between police officers and the residents. The non-law enforcement duties of police officers are an extremely important part of officer's jobs. These duties include a wide variety of tasks including interacting with the community that are not related to enforcement of laws, like talking to the community members about their concerns. This leads to an increase in satisfaction with police performance as seen with CAPS. Residents' perception of disorganization in the neighborhood is an important factor in changing residents' opinion of the police. That makes CAPS and community policing a strong way of improving citizens interactions with police officers (Lombardo et al. 2010).

## **Conclusion**

New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago all implemented some form of COP in recent years. Each one of these cities intended to improve relations between police and community members. They also aimed to improve the police's effectiveness. Each one of these COP efforts had their differences, despite all trying to achieve the same things. The success of COP is mixed but there is still promise for COP to be successful. COP in these three cities all had great potential to affect many people's lives, and form relationships between police officers and the community members.

Table 5.1 below summarizes the COP programs of New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago. This table breaks down the program impact for each city during the years the programs were active. The table provides an understanding and summary of how these three major urban areas were affected by their recent COP efforts.

Table 5.1 COP Impact

<b>New York City</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>Chicago</b>
<b>Neighborhood Policing Policy</b>	<b>Community Safety Partnership</b>	<b>CAPS</b>
2015-current	2011-current	1993-current
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results varied regarding crime rates</li> <li>• Increased civilian complaints</li> <li>• Decrease in arrest rates</li> <li>• Made communication between neighborhood coordination officers and community easier</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results varied greatly between housing developments implementations</li> <li>• Created large interagency partnership</li> <li>• Improved access to resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased informal social control.</li> <li>• Increased police Satisfaction and satisfaction with police</li> <li>• Issues with long term commitment and longevity to CAPS programs</li> </ul>

## CHAPTER 6

### CONCLUSION

COP is a popular strategy for many. Police departments, politicians, residents, and others like the idea of having police solve the issues that matter to residents instead of the more traditional policing strategies like patrols and responding to calls for service. Many police departments create programs and policies in order to implement COP. This paper examined the most recent COP programs in New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago. These populations of these three cities total approximately 14 million people. Each one of these cities has turned to COP as a tool to help reduce crime, reduce fear of crime, and improve relationships with community members. When looking at these cities and their recent efforts in implementing COP, levels of overlap and common themes were found. According to RDT, governments have control over what policies and programs are implemented by controlling funding. This paper looks at New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago's recent COP efforts and how they incorporate the recommendations made by the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing.

The most common theme of COP between New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago is using dedicated officers to implement COP tasks instead of sharing both traditional policing duties with COP duties. New York City Police Department's neighborhood policing policy had neighborhood coordination officers and steady sector officers who dealt solely with COP. Los Angeles Police Department's Community Safety Partnership had officers who utilized COP efforts like interacting with residents and obtaining a better understanding localized crime and community needs. Finally, CPD and CAPS had their own way of assigning officers with COP. CAPS had many officers that are also dedicated solely to COP tasks. Each city and their COP programs have the same key part. That key part is these dedicated officers who spend their time

focused on COP instead of being burdened and bounced around from COP and responding to calls for service. This tactic is seen throughout the country in more cities other than New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago. This is because of its popularity and general success. Although each one of these COP programs have similarities, each police department has their own unique twist on their implementation.

The most unique aspect of NYPD's neighborhood policing policy is its sheer size. The program covers the entirety of New York City, spanning its 8.3 million people. Most COP programs and tactics are much more confined to smaller areas like neighborhoods, blocks, or even a single housing development. COP programs are often implemented in areas that have high crime levels or crime hotspots, areas where police and residents have strained relationships, or where officers are willing to participate in COP programs. That makes New York City Police Department's neighborhood policing policy unique and impressive since completing a task as large as this is a feat.

Los Angeles has a more traditional approach towards COP and the program that they are implementing. The LAPD and the HACLA focus on small areas that have crime issues, narrowing in on certain housing developments. To do this, they assign teams of officers to increase community interaction and understand the resident concerns.

CPD's CAPS has its similarities but is impressive for a different reason. CAPS is a vast program that covers Chicago, but the number of different aspects of CAPS is what make it unique. The main aspect of many COP efforts, like in Los Angeles and New York City, is the use of officers that are dedicated to creating relationships with the residents, but CAPS took their approach to COP much farther. CAPS activities were diverse and included many local community meetings, district level advisory committees, visits to residents through block-by-

block door visits by civilian community organizers, including residents in crime prevention, increasing city services in areas which are in need of extra support, and the most well-known aspect was local beat meetings. This variety is unique since many programs are much smaller and have fewer moving parts in comparison. Through all these different programs, there are officers dedicated to CAPS. The CAPS office has an impressive number of different parts that worked across the city.

This paper has looked at the three largest cities in the United States, all of which have populations greater than 2.5 million people. While doing this, I have addressed the cities and their police departments recent implementation of COP programs to highlight the most common COP tactics that are being used like dedicated officers tasked with only COP tasks. In doing this, I have also highlighted each one of these cities' more unique aspects of their implementation in COP. Each one of these cities and their programs must be evaluated on several different aspects. The first aspect to be looked at is the strategies of the program, or in other words what the plan was. The second aspect to be evaluated is the implementation of that plan and how it translated into what was done by the people carrying out these programs. Examining the impact of the COP programs and outcomes of them allows police departments to understand how to properly foster relationships with the community and how to properly allocate resources. One final aspect assessed is which of the recommendations from the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing does the COP programs and policies implement reflect.

Below is a table that summarizes the recommendations not incorporated or carried out successfully by New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago's programs. Of the 61 recommendations made by The President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing, only a few are met due to several of the pillars a being irrelevant to COP. Of the 61 recommendations that are

made by the President’s Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing, most of the recommendations are from Pillar 4 Community Policing and Crime Reduction. It was not surprising that the other pillars are not as heavily represented since they are not specifically about COP. NYPD and CPD did not include components that targeted juveniles, but LAPD did by helping children get to and from school safely. Recommendation 4.4 was not taken into consideration in any of the city’s efforts despite its relevance to COP. This recommendation suggests that the communities should support a culture and the practice of policing that promotes the protection of the dignity, especially vulnerable populations. A second recommendation that NYPD and CPD did not implement was recommendation 4.6 which discusses the importance of taking into consideration children that are most at risk of crime and their stigma regarding police. Overall, these three police departments did reflect many of the recommendations relevant to COP in their programs. Table 5.1 below reflects the relevant recommendations that are not reflected by these cities COP programs.

Table 6.1 Recommendations not reflected

Recommendation	Description	NYC	LA	Chicago
1.3	Promote transparency and accountability to build trust and legitimacy		X	
1.5	Promote public trust through nonenforcement activities			
2.1	Residents and law enforcement should collaborate on how to deliver resources in areas with high crime rates	X		
4.1	Adoption of programs and policies that promote community engagement in managing public safety			
4.2	COP should be in the in the culture and organizational structure			
4.3	COP efforts should be multidisciplinary in planning, implementing, and responding to situations			
4.4	Communities should support the culture and practice of COP and reflect the values	X	X	X

	pf protection to promote dignity for everyone			
4.5	COP efforts should work with residents to create public safety			
4.6	Take into consideration children most at risk of crime and their stigma regarding police	X		X

### Future Considerations

Ensuring that current COP efforts align with the recommendations made by the President’s Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing is important due to its support of COP. Policymakers need to carefully decide what programs to support and advocate for implementing in their cities. COP programs and policies should be carefully vetted because through RDT, policymakers can control what is implemented by law enforcement through the distribution of funding. This is due to many police officials electing to follow popular programs and policies to secure additional funding on which they are reliant. Considering how policymakers often support programs and policies, it is important for future efforts to consistently evaluate COP programs and policies to properly understand which aspects are valuable and should continue to be implemented, especially due to the recent support of COP programs via the President’s Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing. It is important to regularly evaluate programs to ensure programs are effective and that the desired goals are being achieved as many departments are implementing COP programs to secure additional funding. COP can be a difficult thing to evaluate because of its flexibility, however, this flexibility allows for it to change to the future needs of a neighborhood and its residents. Overall COP is a valuable tool that should continue to be used by police departments in order to improve community relations. This is because of COP’s generally positive findings regarding community police relations and reduced fear of crime.

## **Limitations**

This paper also contains a very small number of COP programs that New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago have implemented, meaning the scope is rather narrow. These three cities are extremely large and have many different programs that would fall under COP which could provide valuable information. The limited sample used may cause potential bias due to the selection of studies included in this paper. This paper also fails to address COP in rural and suburban areas. Most law enforcement agencies do not have as many resources as New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago. This can affect a wide variety of aspects within COP that are not accounted for in the difference between these cities. One final limitation to this paper is that the findings are not necessarily able to be generalized to other police departments and their COP efforts.



## REFERENCES

- About Us*. LAPD CSPB. (n.d.). <https://www.lapdcsp.org/about-us>
- Akers, R. L., Sellers, C. S., & Jennings, W. G. (2021). *Criminological theories: Introduction, evaluation, and application*. Oxford University Press.
- Antonelli, J., & Beck, B. (2023). Heterogeneous causal effects of neighbourhood policing in New York City with staggered adoption of the policy. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, 186(4), 772-787.
- Avdija, A. S. (2010). Community Policing: Developing an Action Plan. *Critical Issues in Justice and Politics*, 51.
- Beck, B., Antonelli, J., & Piñeros, G. (2022). Effects of New York City's neighborhood policing policy. *Police Quarterly*, 25(4), 470–496.
- Bertelsen, B. E. (2022). Egalitarian lives and violence. *Social Analysis*, 66(3), 104–125.
- Bratton, W. J. (2015). The NYPD plan of action and the neighborhood policing plan: A realistic framework for connecting police and communities. nd, <http://home.nyc.gov>.
- Churprakobkit, S. (2002). Community policing: Training, definitions and policy implications. *Policing: An international journal of police strategies & management*, 25(4), 709-725.
- CPD. (n.d.). <https://home.chicagopolice.org/community-policing-group/how-caps-works/get-the-most-from-your-beat-meeting/>
- Codner, G. (2014). Community Policing. In M. Reisig & R. Kane (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Police and Policing* (pp. 148–171). essay, Oxford University Press.

- Codner, G. W. (2015). Community policing: Elements and effects. In R. Dunham, G. Alpert, & K. McLean (Eds.), *Critical Issues in Policing: Contemporary Readings* (8th ed., pp. 401–418). essay, Waveland press.
- Crowl, J. N. (2017). The effect of community policing on fear and crime reduction, police legitimacy and job satisfaction: an empirical review of the evidence. *Police Practice and Research, 18*(5), 449-462.
- de Guzman, M. C., & Kim, M. (2016). Community hierarchy of needs and policing models: Toward a new theory of police organizational behavior. *Police Practice and Research, 18*(4), 352–365.
- Dempsey, J. S., & Forst, L. S. (2013). *Police*. Delmar Cengage Learning.
- Dumas, P., Gagnon, S., & Micheau, M. (2021). A convention out of the blue: Implementing community policing over the long term. *Public Organization Review, 21*(3), 453–469.
- 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.
- Goldman, H., & Liautaud, A. (2015, June 25). *De Blasio Promises 'True Neighborhood Policing' for New York*. Bloomberg.com.  
<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-06-25/de-blasio-promises-true-neighborhood-policing-for-new-york>
- Greene, J. R. (2000). Community policing in America: Changing the nature, structure, and function of the police. *Criminal justice, 3*(3), 299-370.

- James, N. (2011, June). Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS): Background and Funding. Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service.
- Johnson Jr, B. L. (1995). Resource Dependence Theory: A Political Economy Model of Organizations.
- Kearns, E. (2015). The President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing: Final Report. *Office of Community Oriented Policing Services*.
- Kelling, G. L., & Wilson, J. Q. (1982). Broken windows. *Atlantic Monthly*, 249(3), 29-38.
- Kerley, K. R., & Benson, M. L. (2000). Does Community-Oriented Policing Help Build Stronger Communities? *Police Quarterly*, 3(1), 46-69.
- Lamburini, K. (2018). *Evolution of Community Policing in New York City*.
- Langworthy, R. H., & Hindelang, M. J. (1982). Effects of Police Agency Size on the Use of Police Employees: A Re-examination of Ostrom, Parks, and Whitaker. *ICPSR Data Holdings Police Studies: The International Review of Police Development*.
- Lentz, S. A., & Chaires, R. H. (2007). The invention of Peel's principles: A study of policing 'textbook' history. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35(1), 69-79.
- Lombardo, R. M., & Donner, C. M. (2017). Can community policing increase residents' informal social control? testing the impact of the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy. *Police Practice and Research*, 19(5), 427-442.
- Lombardo, R. M., Olson, D., & Staton, M. (2010). The Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 33(4), 586-
- Maguire, E. R., Kuhns, J. B., Uchida, C. D., & Cox, S. M. (1997). Patterns of community policing in Nonurban America. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 34(3), 368-394.

- Marks, M., Shearing, C., & Wood, J. (2009). Who should the police be? finding a new narrative for community policing in South Africa. *Police Practice and Research, 10*(2), 145–155.
- McNeish, J.-A., Matute, A., Rojas Ospina, E., & Frühling, H. (2022). Comparative reflections on community-oriented policing (COP) in Post-Conflict Central America. *Journal of Human Security, 16*(2).
- Novak, K. J., Alarid, L. F., & Lucas, W. L. (2003). Exploring officers' acceptance of Community Policing: Implications for Policy Implementation. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 31*(1), 57–71.
- NYPD (2018). Shared responsibility viewbook: A new Yorker's guide to neighborhood policing. New York City Police Department. <https://cloud.3dissue.com/167796/168091/212990/Shared-Responsibility-Viewbook/index.html>
- Patterson, T. (2023). Pillars of Truth in Law Enforcement's Past. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*.
- Peyton, K., Sierra-Arévalo, M., & Rand, D. G. (2019). A field experiment on community policing and police legitimacy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 116*(40), 19894–19898.
- Reisig, M. D. (2010). Community and problem-oriented policing. *Crime and Justice*.
- Rivera-Cuadrado, W. (2021). Crafting charismatic cops: Community policing and the faulty reputations paradigm. *Social Problems, 70*(2), 344–360.
- Robin, L., Peterson, B., Doyle, L., Chavez, E., & Bracy, N. (2020a). *The Los Angeles Community Safety Partnership: 2019 Assessment*.
- Robin, L., Peterson, B., Doyle, L., Chavez, E., & Bracy, N. (2020b). *The Los Angeles Community Safety Partnership: 2019 Assessment*.

- Rosenbaum, D. P. (1988). Community crime prevention: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Justice Quarterly*, 5(3), 323-395.
- Rosenbaum, D. P., & Lurigio, A. J. (1994). An inside look at community policing reform: Definitions, organizational changes, and evaluation findings. *Crime & Delinquency*, 40(3), 299–314.
- Roussell, A., & Gascón, L. D. (2014). Defining “Policeability”: Cooperation, Control, and Resistance in South Los Angeles Community-Police Meetings. *Social Problem*.
- Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative science quarterly*, 224-253.
- Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1998). *Neighborhood Collective Efficacy--: Does it Help Reduce Violence?*. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
- Schneider, C. J. (2023). Police Accounts of Body-Worn Camera Footage In News Media. *Symbolic Interaction*, 46(1), 47-71.
- Skogan, W. G. (1995). Community policing in the United States. In *Comparisons in Policing: An International Perspective*. essay, Avebury, Aldershot.
- Skogan, W. G. (2022). Prospects for Reform? The Collapse of Community Policing in Chicago. *University of Chicago Law Review*.
- Skogan, W. G. (2016). Beat meetings, responsiveness to the community, and police effectiveness in Chicago. *Comparing the Democratic Governance of Police Intelligence: New Models of Participation and Expertise in the United States and Europe*, 27-42.
- Skogan, W. G. (Ed.). (2019). Advocate Community Policing. In *Police Innovations Contrasting Perspectives* (pp. 27–44). essay, Cambridge University Press.

- Skogan, W., & Hartnett, S. (2005). Community policing in Chicago. In T. Newburn (Ed.), *Policing Key Readings* (pp. 428–441). essay, Willan Publishing. PO
- Skolnick, J. H., & Bayley, D. H. (1986). *The new blue line: Police innovation in six American cities*. Simon and Schuster.
- Sytsma, V. A., & Piza, E. L. (2017). The influence of job assignment on community engagement: Bicycle patrol and community-oriented policing. *Police Practice and Research, 19*(4), 347–364.
- The President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing Implementation Guide Moving from Recommendations to Action. (2015). *U.S. Department of Justice*.
- Thomas, A. L., Hatten, D. N., & Connealy, N. T. (2022). Does police use of Twitter align with and enhance community policing objectives? an analysis of the New York City Police Department’s Twitter activity. *Police Quarterly, 25*(4), 443–469.
- US Department of Justice. (n.d.). *About the cops office*. ABOUT THE COPS OFFICE | COPS OFFICE. <https://cops.usdoj.gov/aboutcops>
- Walker, S. (1993). Does anyone remember team policing-Lessons of the team policing experience for community policing. *Am. J. Police, 12*, 33.
- Vaughn Lee, J. (2010). Policing after 9/11: Community policing in an age of homeland security. *Police quarterly, 13*(4), 347-366.
- Worrall, J. L. (2014). The politics of policing. *The Oxford handbook of police and policing*, 49-67.
- Yesberg, J. A., & Bradford, B. (2021). Policing and collective efficacy: A rapid evidence assessment. *International Journal of Police Science & Management, 23*(4), 417-430.

## APPENDIX

### Beat Meeting Agenda

“Welcome and introduction of participants.

Feedback on progress made on problems since the last meeting.

- Discuss whether the current problem-solving strategies seem to be working, whether they need to be modified, or whether the problem seems to have been sufficiently reduced or eliminated to justify moving on to new problems.

Discussion of current crime conditions and new problems.

- Beat team officers present information about general crime conditions on the beat.
- New problems (which are chronic in nature) are identified.
- Participants determine whether any newly identified problem is significant enough to be added to the Beat Plan. The Beat Plan is a form used by the beat team to keep track of problem-solving activities on the beat. Generally, the beat team and community will be limited in the number of problems they can work on at any one time. Therefore, the group needs to prioritize which problems will be worked on.

Development of strategies and coordination of responsibilities

- Because there will not be sufficient time at the meeting to analyze each strategy in detail, it is important that a community contact person be identified. This person will take responsibility for working with the beat team and other interested residents to analyze the problem in more detail, develop strategies, and organize and coordinate the community’s involvement.

Next meeting date.

- Announce the date, time and place for the next beat community meeting.
- Schedule working groups for ongoing problem solving. Most of the work on problem-solving strategies will take place outside the beat community meeting. Therefore, residents and police must be prepared to work on these chronic problems in between beat meetings.” (Get The Most From Your Beat Meeting, n.d.)



**VITA**

Graduate School  
Southern Illinois University

Hayden C. Allen

Haydenallen2001@gmail.com

Southern Illinois University Carbondale  
Bachelor of Arts, Criminology and Criminal Justice, August 2024

Research Paper Title:

Community Oriented Policing in New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago: Assessing  
the Adherence to the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing

Major Professor: Julie Hibdon