

SUBJECT TO DEBATE

A NEWSLETTER OF THE POLICE EXECUTIVE RESEARCH FORUM

HOLD THE DATE

PERF's Town Hall Meeting

(Held in conjunction with
IACP annual conference)

Sunday, October 4, 2009

1:00 to 5:00 p.m., followed by a reception

Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel
Grand Ballroom
Denver, Colorado

VOL. 23, NO. 6 | JUNE 2009

George L. Kelling: Don't Let Budget Cuts Damage Your Commitment to Community Policing

At PERF's Annual Meeting in March, Dr. George L. Kelling made a presentation about a few of the lessons he has learned in more than 40 years of work as a policing researcher and advisor. Dr. Kelling has been at the heart of most of the innovations in modern policing, including his development with James Q. Wilson of the "broken windows" concept. In his speech to PERF members, he focused on the threat to policing posed by the current economic crisis. Following is a summary of Dr. Kelling's remarks.

IF THERE WAS EVER A TIME THAT we needed community policing, it's now. We are in for some hard times. Most of us in this room have already had our lives changed. For most of you who did not live through the Great Depression, the need for a strong sense of community in your life is going to become more important to you than it ever was before in your lifetime.

My fear is that as we enter into this recessionary period, we'll return to what a lot of people are now calling "basic policing." That means returning officers to cars and having them respond quickly to calls for service. That's the trap that I think is facing policing at the present time.

The irony is that tough economic times are exactly when community policing is needed most, because the recession is going to hit poor communities the worst. They're going to be hit very hard. This is when police really need to be on the streets with the citizens, keeping good relations with the communities.



Dr. George L. Kelling

The basic question that we have to ask in good times or bad is, How do you police a democratic society? And if you believe that citizens can govern themselves, then why in the world can't citizens police themselves? The American answer to that has been this radical "non-system" in which every community has its own police department. And as inefficient as that is, it's a strong statement about citizens being able to police themselves. Modern-day "community policing" was the rediscovery of what Sir Robert Peel said in the 19th Century, that "the police are the public and the public are the police"—the only difference being that we pay the police to do what is everyone's social responsibility.

And what is the business of policing? The business of policing is to prevent crime and disorder. How is this done? By conspicuous patrolling in small geographical areas. Notice two things: "conspicuous"—we don't want undercover operators; we want to know we are being policed, and we want to know who's policing us. And "small geographical areas"—we want turf that we can own.

How do you prevent crime? By obtaining public respect, because that is how police obtain public cooperation and public compliance. You get order and control over crime by public compliance, not by forcing people into particular lifestyles. Force is only used when persuasion, advice, and warnings don't suffice. And how do you measure policing? You measure by the absence of crime and disorder, not by the numbers of arrests or

>> continued on page 3

“De-Civilianization” of Policing: A Big Step Backwards

I'D LIKE TO ADD SOMETHING TO THIS MONTH'S *Subject to Debate* cover article, in which George Kelling makes the case that in today's economy, we need community policing more than ever. The people in our most crime-prone communities are being stressed by the tough economic situation, so they need closer relationships with the police and *more* help and cooperation, not less, George notes.

As city and county governments are being forced to cut their budgets, there is a tendency to say, “Let's get back to basics,” and to cut community policing initiatives. This is a bad trend that should be resisted, Dr. Kelling argues.

I think there's another unfortunate development resulting from budget cuts, and that is the tendency to eliminate civilian jobs in policing. I don't know how many newspaper stories I have seen about city councils and mayors saying to their communities, “Unfortunately, the economy is so bad, we even need to cut our police department. But don't worry, we won't lay off any officers—just civilians.”

What a lot of politicians may not realize is that this amounts to reversing one of the long-term trends in the professionalization of policing.

There was a time when police departments had very few civilians. But today, many departments use civilians to help drive some of their most significant initiatives in areas such as administration, research, technologies, human resources, finance, grant-writing, and crime analysis. These civilians have earned the respect of other command staff and are an integral part of a chief's management team.

These civilians have tremendous depths of knowledge about the jobs that they do.

And what will happen when civilian positions are eliminated, as most chiefs will tell you, is that the work that was done by these civilians will not go undone. Chiefs will end up taking officers or command-level personnel off the street and putting them where civilians were. Chief Bill Lansdowne in San Diego is among those who have pointed out that this can be a false economy. It can be terribly inefficient and counterproductive to put police officers in areas that demand skills that are not related to the officers' core competencies.

In one case, a city let go a lower-level civilian clerk who kept crime statistics, and the city wound up being late in turning in its crime figures to the FBI, which cost the city millions of dollars in Byrne grant funding.

We are going back in time and reversing a major professional advance in the field. This issue will not make headlines anywhere, but it is a step backwards in the evolution of policing.

This is a lose-lose proposition. You lose police officers off the street, and you wind up putting them in positions for which they are inexperienced, or overqualified, or both. All of this because of a political dynamic that says you can't cut police officers, but civilians are vulnerable.

This is demoralizing both to civilians and sworn officers. For a long time, civilians were considered second-class citizens in police departments. But today civilians are seen as integral parts of their departments. For civilians to be pushed out of their jobs in a recession, with less consideration than that given to the sworn officers, returns civilians to that second-class status.

And it is equally demoralizing to police officers who are now put in an administrative position which is not what they had in mind when they joined the force, and is not the right “fit” for their training, experience, and interests.

I think this is something that chiefs need to think about, and it is worth fighting for. Chiefs shouldn't simply abdicate their role in assigning priorities for their departments to the politicians, who in most cases have far less knowledge than the chiefs about how the police department really operates.

I hope that in any city or county where a police or sheriff's department faces the necessity of budget cuts, chiefs and sheriffs will make their own best assessments of where the cuts will be least harmful, and then will work to educate the elected officials to make those cuts surgically, rather than using a cleaver to simply lop off civilian jobs.

To paraphrase Jim Collins' book *Good to Great*, we have come too far in “getting the right people in the right seats on the bus” to go back to a time when civilians weren't even allowed on the bus. A budget crisis should not result in a jumbling and mismatching of officers' and civilians' positions.



Chuck Wexler,
PERF Executive Director
E-mail: cwexler@policeforum.org

police actions.

That's the genius of Anglo-Saxon policing, and my argument—and I say this even when I'm in London—is that the Americans really picked up on it and were more true to those ideas than the English have been. The English police have tended to consolidate, and now they have only 43 police departments. In my mind, the American system of having large numbers of local police departments makes more sense for community policing.

In the United States, police have been leading the way back to our neighborhoods. The rest of government is going to be following the police. The police dragged prosecutors into the community, the courts are being dragged into the community, probation and parole are being dragged into the community. Police *had to be* out there, by the very nature of their conspicuous patrolling in small geographic areas.

But right now we are being asked how we will handle these budget cutbacks. I get a lot of calls from the news media, and they say, "We've talked to Department X, we've talked to Department Y, and they're losing a certain percentage of their budgets, so they say they're going to go back to basic policing."

I'm afraid this means that departments think they can eliminate community policing and go back to focusing on rapid response to calls for service. For cops, this means a withdrawal from the streets.

My fear is that there is always the constant search for something sexier than community policing, because community policing sounds kind of soft, a little bit like community relations. But as a matter of fact, people don't realize how intrusive and aggressive community policing is. The model of policing in the 1960s and 1970s was, wait until something happens and then respond. That's what calls for service are about. But when you decide to take the community policing model and *prevent* crime, it means you're intervening *before* things happen. And that's really aggressive. That ought to be the concern of the civil libertarians, not police riding around in cars after the fact.

It is absolutely essential that we maintain community policing values as we face the coming crisis. And within that we include things like problem-solving policing, predictive policing, and "broken windows" policing.

Another thing that I've been thinking about, as I've been working in Boston on the problem of homeless, mentally disturbed people, is that police take ownership of too many problems that they really should not own. The problem of mentally disturbed homeless people should be owned by the psychiatrists—with support from the police. So often, the answer to every problem seems to be, "Let the police handle it." But many of these problems have to be given back to the community. I've never seen a problem that the police can handle on their own.

Part of the job of policing is getting *other* people to do their job. I have a colleague by the name of Marcus Felson who is a wonderful thinker, and one day he knocked on my door and said, "George, I've found a new way to prevent crime." I said, "Quick, tell me before you forget." [laughter] And his response was, "Get people to do their jobs." And it's true. Police need to get probation to do their job. In Newark, New Jersey, probation doesn't go to visit people at night, because they can't be armed so they're afraid to go alone, and the judge won't let them go with the police. What good

is probation then? Probation is a joke to these kids.

If other people were doing their job, we wouldn't have a good share of these problems. So part of the police responsibility is reminding other agencies what their responsibilities are, because we end up in impossible situations when they are not doing their jobs. And sometimes that means saying, "We have enough police, thank you. Let's have some more probation agents."

One final issue I'd like to mention is where I think we should focus the federal stimulus money that is being distributed for research. I think we're well on our way with patrol, we have good ideas of what works. But we haven't had any research in the area of criminal investigation since the 1970s or early 1980s. I think that 9/11 alerted us to the potentials of criminal investigation that are not being exploited anywhere close to their fullest.



Here's what I mean by that. The focus of detectives and prosecutors is on cases. They view their jobs as solving cases. And they're highly individualistic in this; they work by themselves. But as they solve cases, they get information about problems. And there *are* problems out there; in inner cities right now, African-American kids are killing each other at phenomenal rates. So as individual cases are investigated, detectives and prosecutors get information about the problems, but right now there's no means whatsoever, no organizational means, for that information to be used by patrol.

We ought to be thinking, What is the preventive role of criminal investigators? Because the job of criminal investigators and prosecutors ought not to be just solving the case at hand, but also helping to stop the next murder. If that question starts to get asked, you start to redefine the role of criminal investigation.

But the really critical thing now as we face kind of a scary future is how do we maintain the values that we developed in community policing. We had the first generation of community policing in the 1970s. Officers didn't like it; it was "feel good" policing; it was akin to community relations; and it didn't focus on crime. During the 1990s, we said, "Community policing has more potential than this." We began to focus it, we developed Compstat, we got more sophisticated with problem-solving, and we began to find that police really can make a difference. We *can* prevent crime with the tools that we have. And always it has to be done within the context of citizens policing themselves. If we move away from that, we've moving away from democratic values. 

Chief William Bratton Testifies On Need for a New Criminal Justice Commission

On June 11, Los Angeles Police Chief William J. Bratton testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Crime and Drugs in Washington, D.C., in support of legislation introduced by Sen. Jim Webb of Virginia to create a National Criminal Justice Commission.

The commission would be a bipartisan blue-ribbon panel of officials, appointed by the President, House and Senate leaders, and Governors, and charged with recommending reforms to the nation's justice system.

The current justice system is "a national disgrace," Senator Webb said at the hearing on his bill. In Webb's view, the justice system incarcerates too many people, especially minor drug offenders who do not threaten public safety. In addition, Webb said, the system is unfair to minority populations, it fails to provide meaningful reentry programs for offenders, it does not help the mentally ill, it wastes money, and "most importantly—it is not making our country a safer or a fairer place."

Following are excerpts from Chief Bratton's testimony. His complete statement can be found online at http://judiciary.senate.gov/hearings/testimony.cfm?id=3906&wit_id=8060.

SENATOR SPECTER AND DISTINGUISHED MEMBERS of the Subcommittee, I am pleased to be able to contribute to the discussion and debate on what I view as some of the most important issues facing our society today. I agree that we need a contemporary, widespread and far-reaching review of our entire criminal justice system in order to better serve and protect the public. In a free society, it is incumbent upon the government and its agents to safeguard the rights of the victims of violence as well as the rights of the accused and the incarcerated. It is not enough to continue to churn people through a broken and ailing system with no forethought and no long-term solution. Ongoing reform is a necessary component

of democracy that cannot be taken for granted and which requires constant and ongoing attention, focus and prioritization.

It is widely agreed that there has been no truly in-depth study of the entire criminal justice system since the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration and Justice, impaneled in 1965, and that many of today's criminal justice components operate based on its findings and recommendations, as outlined in *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*, published in 1967.

It is my view that while there are many laudable and long-lasting results attributable to the 1965 President's Commission, including the federally funded college education of thousands of young police professionals (myself included), the virtual dismantling of traditional organized crime, and the introduction of automated fingerprint identification systems and other technology, the Commission was not as prescient as it could have been in some areas. I think now is the time to build on what we learned from these past efforts to develop a truly comprehensive and successful criminal justice system for the future.

The most important message that I want to leave with you is that we must focus on preventing crime *before it occurs* rather than respond to it after it does. This has been the focus of my entire career, from a rookie cop in Boston to Chief of the Los Angeles Police Department. One of the great failures of the 1965 President's Commission was the acceptance of the widely held belief that police should focus their professionalization efforts on the response to crime and not the prevention of it. They mistakenly believed that the so-called societal causes of crime (racism, poverty, demographics, and the economy, to name a few) were beyond the control and influence of the police.

They were wrong. Those "causes" of crime are in fact simply influences that can be significantly impacted by enlightened and



Chief Bratton, right, confers with several people after the hearing, including Subcommittee Chairman Arlen Specter, center, with back to camera

progressive policing. The main cause of crime—human behavior—certainly is a principal responsibility and obligation of the police to influence.

My goal today is to briefly offer my perspective on what has transpired over the last 40 years, to voice my support for the formation of a Criminal Justice Commission, and to make recommendations on the composition and the scope of inquiry of such a Commission.

THAT WAS THEN, THIS IS NOW

Thirty-nine years ago, I was entering the police profession as a patrol officer, a profession that in many ways was severely flawed. It has been said that “the price one pays for pursuing any profession or calling is an intimate knowledge of its ugly side.” I believe that is true, and I also believe that there is no greater calling than to protect and to serve the public, even through an imperfect and evolving system of justice.

So, what was happening 40 years ago that prompted our elected officials to act? The main criminal justice concerns in 1965 seemed to revolve around the hostile relationship between police and African-Americans; organized crime; a dearth of research; problems with a growing juvenile justice system; gun control; drugs; the individual rights of the accused; police discretion; civil unrest; and a broken and isolated corrections system struggling to balance rehabilitation and custody issues.

The supervised population at the time [including offenders who were incarcerated or on probation or parole] was quoted as hovering around one million people. That number has now swollen to over seven million. Another finding of the 1965 President’s Commission was that in order to be effective, a parole agent’s caseload should not exceed 35 cases. Now, parole agents in some parts of the country are struggling with caseloads exceeding 80 cases.

That was the scene when I entered the profession. The intervening 20 years of the 1970s and 1980s saw a historic surge in violence, an epidemic of drug abuse and addiction, the deinstitutionalization and abdication of responsibility for the needs of the

mentally ill, an explosion in our prison population, and an ever-increasing commitment of uncoordinated resources to contain the effects of gangs, drugs, and guns on our communities, with diminishing positive impact.

WHAT WE LEARNED OVER THE PAST TWO GENERATIONS

While we failed to effectively address the tremendous increase in crime and violence in the 1970s and the 1980s, we finally started to get it right in the 1990s. Young police leaders were encouraged and financed in their pursuit of education, and that exposure led to a change in the way we were doing business.

We had been focused on a failed reactive philosophy emphasizing random patrol, rapid response, and reactive investigations. In the late 80s we began to move to a community policing model characterized by prevention, problem-solving, and partnership. We turned the system on its head, and we were successful in driving significant crime reduction through accountability, measuring what matters, partnership with the community, and policing strategies that emphasized problem-solving and “broken windows” quality-of-life initiatives. We developed COMPSTAT, with its emphasis on accountability and use of timely, accurate intelligence to police smarter.

The results, as reflected by the dramatic crime declines of that period, continue to this day in New York, Los Angeles, and other cities.

At the same time, the federal government took action to increase the number of law enforcement officers, to strengthen penalties, to control guns, and to support prevention programs, along with widening their efforts to combat organized crime. They became a true partner.

Since the 90s, crime has leveled off in some cities, has increased in others, and is continuing to decline in some others. This has given us the opportunity to pause, to look up from the task at hand, to analyze what we have done, to look at what has worked, and at what we can do better. The partnerships we have formed and the transparency and cooperation we have experienced have allowed us to more critically examine the form, process, and nature of criminal justice in contemporary American society.

SYSTEMIC PROBLEMS PERSIST

The main criminal justice concerns for policy-makers today revolve around the threat posed by gangs (rather than traditional organized crime), continued problems with the corrections system in general and with the seemingly intractable problem of mass incarceration, a fractured and unrealistic national drug policy, and a lack of protection of the individual rights and treatment of the mentally ill.

George Kelling has noted that “The jailing and imprisonment of the mentally ill is a national disgrace that, once again, puts police in the position of having to do something about a problem created by bad 1960s ideology, poor legislation, poor social practice, and the failure of the mental health community to meet their responsibilities. In some places—Boston and Los Angeles are examples—mental health professionals are stepping up to the plate, but it is on a small scale and only affects a small portion of the mentally ill.”

>> continued on page 7



Chief Bratton takes questions from a reporter outside the Senate hearing room

Justice Department Develops Way to Measure A Department's Level of Community Policing

BY BRUCE TAYLOR, PERF
ROB CHAPMAN, COPS OFFICE, AND
REBECCA MULVANEY, ICF INTERNATIONAL

WITH THE RECENT RELEASE OF FEDERAL STIMULUS funding, thousands of additional police officers are being hired across the country, and renewed attention is being placed on the implementation of community policing principles. A new instrument called the Community Policing Self-Assessment Tool (CP-SAT) can help police agencies create a baseline measurement of their current state of community policing, track their progress over time in implementing community policing, and educate residents and others about effective community policing.

FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMUNITY POLICING MAY BE RARE

Measuring community policing implementation has been a thorny issue in the field. Dating back to the early days of community policing, experts have noted how difficult it is to determine the status of community policing implementation (Maguire, 1997; Wycoff and Skogan, 1994). Throughout the 1990s and even today, many agencies have claimed to have adopted community policing, but there is evidence that full implementation is somewhat rare (Fleissner, 1997; Corder, 1997; Trojanowicz, 1994). One reason for this problem may be that many agencies have no way of assessing the extent to which they are successfully practicing community policing. Also, there are many variations in community policing implementation, and an absence of assessment tools designed to capture these various manifestations of community policing.

To help police agencies perform a self-assessment of their implementation of community policing, the Justice Department's COPS Office supported a project by ICF International and PERF to develop the Community Policing Self-Assessment Tool. The original version of CP-SAT was paper-and-pencil-based, but an online version of the CP-SAT has been developed and will be available soon for use by law enforcement agencies.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CP-SAT

To develop the CP-SAT, the project team reviewed a variety of definitions of community policing and numerous practical models for community policing implementation. A consensus emerged regarding a set of commonly accepted elements of community policing, which fall into three categories: community engagement and partnerships; problem-solving; and organizational transformation. Based on this work, the team designed three modules for the CP-SAT:

- **Community Partnerships.** The community partnerships module assesses the extent to which a police agency supports and develops collaborative relationships with individuals and organizations in the community. There are three aspects of partnerships measured here: the extent to which your agency has multidisciplinary partnerships; the resources/commitment of your agency's community partners; and your level of interaction with community partners.

- **Problem-Solving.** The problem-solving module measures the degree to which there is agency-wide commitment to go beyond traditional police responses to crime to proactively address a multitude of problems that adversely affect a community's quality of life. The first section of the module contains general questions about problem-solving. The next section examines problem-solving processes and is framed around the SARA model (Scanning and prioritizing problems; Analyzing problems; Responding to problems; and Assessing problem-solving initiatives). The final section examines problem-solving skill levels.

- **Organizational Transformation.** The organizational transformation module measures the extent to which the police agency environment, personnel, practices and policies are supportive of community policing philosophy and activities. There are four aspects of organizational transformation measured on this assessment: agency management, organizational structure, personnel practices, and technology and information systems.

One of the priorities for this project was to create a tool that not only met requisite scientific standards, but also would receive wide acceptance from practitioners. Accordingly, the team held formal and informal discussions with many practitioners in the field to identify the elements of community policing, understand which are most important, and see what they look like in practice. Our research team conducted focus groups in conjunction with meetings of the National Sheriffs' Association and the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the team convened a discussion with several COPS Regional Community Policing Institute (RCPI) directors and staff. The team hosted a session focusing on usability issues related to the self-assessment tool at a recent PERF annual meeting. The team also secured the support and participation of numerous law enforcement agencies. These departments helped develop the operationalized community policing framework and served as data collection, validation, and usability testing sites.

To ensure a comprehensive assessment, CP-SAT includes surveys tailored for six different agency stakeholder types: Officers; supervisors; command staff; civilian personnel; community partners; and a cross-agency group comprised of sworn and civilian police staff members at various levels and members of the community. Each of these groups completes detailed online surveys which are analyzed by the CP-SAT software and organized into an automated summary report. The inclusion of such a variety of stakeholders also allows the assessment to serve as a communication tool that can inform these groups, especially those that do not receive formal community policing training, about the range of activities that comprise effective community policing.

In addition to the self-assessment tool, an accompanying guidebook is available which includes technical information to assist law enforcement agencies use CP-SAT, as well as references to other resources that agencies can turn to on specific community policing topics covered by the assessment.

The online CP-SAT will enable agencies to reliably measure the extent to which community-policing has been implemented in the agency, as well as serve as a communication tool to provide all stakeholders tangible examples of community-policing activities. The COPS Office is planning to release the CP-SAT in mid-2009.



For questions or additional information, please contact Rob Chapman of the COPS Office (202-514-8278 or Robert.Chapman@usdoj.gov) or Rebecca Mulvaney at ICF International (703-934-3582 or RMulvaney@icfi.com).

My friend and the Obama Administration's new drug czar, Gil Kerlikowske, has said that he wants to banish the idea that the U.S. is fighting "a war on drugs," and shift to a position favoring treatment over incarceration in trying to reduce illicit drug use. I agree with Gil and will go a step further by suggesting that strong enforcement and effective prevention and treatment programs are not mutually exclusive. It is possible to promote a responsible enforcement agenda without driving incarceration rates through the roof.

WE CANNOT ARREST OUR WAY OUT OF THESE PROBLEMS, INCLUDING THE NATIONAL GANG CRIME EXPLOSION

[Senator Webb's] bill recognizes what cops know and what the experience of the past 40 years has shown, that we cannot arrest our way out of our gang crime problem. We recognize that arrest is necessary to put hardened criminals away; however, we will fall far short of our overall goal if this is all that we do. We need to also look for ways of preventing crime before it happens.

Effective and long-term crime reduction can only be achieved through a comprehensive, collaborative approach that includes preventing gang involvement and gang violence, identifying the relatively small number of repeat violent offenders, and restoring public order. Experiences in NYC during the 1990s and LA and other cities now in the first decade of the 21st Century demonstrate that violent crime can be prevented in part by police working in partnership with neighborhoods and communities.

In Los Angeles, we are committed to attacking gang violence through prevention. By flooding our neighborhoods with critical prevention, intervention, and youth development services, and by getting illegal guns off our streets, we are keeping violence down for the long term. Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa and I are determined to continue to crack down on the gang carnage in the city and to provide young people at risk with better alternatives for their future.

We are already seeing some remarkable results. Gang-related homicides are down 26 percent since 2008 and 63 percent from 2002. An even more dramatic example is to compare gang homicides at their height in 1992 to last year's total. In 1992, 430 people lost their lives to gang violence in Los Angeles. Last year, the toll

was 167. Still far too many, but our efforts meant that 263 fewer people were killed by acts of gang violence.

A key part of our strategy to combat the City's gang epidemic is to establish Gang Reduction and Youth Development (GRYD) zones in the communities most affected by gangs. In addition to an increased deployment of police, the GRYD zones receive additional resources focused on prevention, intervention, and reentry programs for those involved or otherwise affected by gangs.

This holistic approach is seen by experts as key to reducing not only the crime rates but also the membership of young people in gangs. In some sense, we are competing with the gangs for our youth, and their lives are at stake.

FINAL THOUGHTS

Our problems are systemic, widespread, and growing. Only a singularly focused blue-ribbon commission comprised of informed practitioners, scholars, policy-makers, and civil rights activists can adequately address the calculated formation of intervention and prevention strategies. Formation of this important commission is a major and essential step in the right direction.

Sustained crime control and improvement of the quality of life of neighborhoods and communities can only be achieved if our focus is on preventing crime. We cannot and should not try to arrest and incarcerate our way out of the crime, gang, and drug problems. There is today in America a better way.

Mr. Chairman, we recommend that any commission impaneled to study criminal justice in the United States examine not just the progress made in traditional crime control, but also evaluate and understand the changes to policing since the attacks of September 11, 2001. The addition of the homeland security mission has forever altered the fundamentals of policing, bringing new challenges to the men and women who wear the uniform of state and local law enforcement.

At the end of the Commission's work, it is my hope that we will have carefully studied the role of policing in the United States from all angles and all perspectives. The Commission's report back to Congress and the American people should anticipate future challenges to policing and issue clear and strong recommendations to enhance the safety and security of the people of the United States.



POLICE EXECUTIVE
RESEARCH FORUM

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

PRESIDENT
John F. Timoney | Chief, Miami Police
Department

VICE PRESIDENT
Charlie T. Deane | Chief, Prince
William County, Va., Police Department

TREASURER
William M. Lansdowne | Chief,
San Diego Police Department

SECRETARY
Rick Myers | Chief, Colorado Springs
Police Department

AT-LARGE MEMBERS
Edward Flynn | Chief, Milwaukee Police
Department

Charles Ramsey | Commissioner,
Philadelphia Police Department
William Blair | Chief, Toronto Police
Service

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR:
Chuck Wexler

The Police Executive Research Forum is a nonprofit association of progressive police professionals dedicated to improving services to all our communities. ■ *Subject to Debate*, published by the Police Executive Research Forum, welcomes input from PERF members and other interested parties. Please submit articles, ideas and suggestions to Craig Fischer, PERF, 1120 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 930, Washington, D.C. 20036. Phone: (202) 454-8332; fax: (202) 466-7826; e-mail: cfischer@policeforum.org. ■ Contributors' opinions and statements do not necessarily reflect the policies or positions of the Police Executive Research Forum. ISSN 1084-7316. ■ Subscription price: \$35/year.



POLICE EXECUTIVE
RESEARCH FORUM

SUBJECT TO DEBATE

1120 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 930
Washington, DC 20036

Pre-Sorted
First Class
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 4889
Suburban, MD

SUBJECT TO DEBATE

George L. Kelling: Don't Let Budget Cuts Damage Your Commitment to Community Policing

PAGE 1

FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR:
"De-Civilianization" of Policing:
A Big Step Backwards **PAGE 2**

Chief William Bratton Testifies
On Need for a New Criminal Justice Commission
PAGE 4

Justice Department Develops Way to
Measure A Department's Level of
Community Policing **PAGE 6**

Subject to Debate
is generously supported
by a grant from:



MOTOROLA

www.Motorola.com