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Foreword

Over the past two decades, building strong relationships between the police and the community has been widely accepted as a critical component of municipal policing strategies. Under the mantle of community-oriented policing and problem-oriented policing, it has become axiomatic that respect, trust, and communication between police and citizens are vital to effective policing. When pressed on the major elements of effective policing, it would be rare for a police chief to not assert as a top priority the importance of building relationships of trust and respect with the community that will withstand challenges and engender collaborative problem-solving, not confrontation, when tensions arise between the police and citizens.

Several recent events involving violent police and citizen encounters have cast an intense focus on the nature and health of police/community relations and have brought about a national public and political discussion on how best to manage those relationships. For their part, the federal government has responded to community concerns and complaints with pattern and practice investigations of police departments where there is belief and probable cause that the department’s practices raise constitutional concerns. In the most serious cases where a department’s protocols or practices appear to abridge the freedoms of their residents, pattern and practice investigations are both appropriate and necessary.

Pattern and practice investigations can lead to consent decrees and memoranda of understanding and agreements that bring about the assignment of federal monitors and dramatic alteration to a department’s policies and protocols. This process of reform is both costly and lengthy. One approach should not fit all departments, however. Assisting police departments should be a scalable issue; especially for departments whose self-recognized shortcomings do not rise to the level of federal intervention. In the case of the latter, there should be an opportunity for self-improvement and self-correction.

Approximately five years ago, the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice (USDOJ) convened a group of nationally-recognized law enforcement executives, police think tanks and academic scholars to discuss how the federal government could improve the process of identifying and responding to the malpractices of a police department. This dialogue took an unexpected turn when the discussion shifted to the question of how best to assist Chiefs attempting to improve policing practices or support a troubled police department in ways that would self-improve operations and avoid the need for a federal investigation and court-ordered decree.

The good news is that solutions are in place and being used every day in hundreds of state and local police departments across the country. Of particular need was a process through which best practices could be shared; a peer-to-peer counseling process that would link the best practices in American policing with police departments who displayed both a need and a desire to reform.

In the aftermath of the decade-long federal consent decree imposed upon the New Jersey State Police, state police commanders undertook an initiative to explore alternatives to federal intervention. In close partnership with the Rutgers University Police Institute and sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, police leaders from Los Angeles, Cincinnati, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, all of whom had successfully shepherded complex federal consent decrees, met with criminal justice scholars and representatives of the USDOJ, to explore such alternative remedies. The distinguished participants included criminal justice scholars
George Kelling and police executives Commissioner William Bratton, New York City Police Department, Commissioner Charles Ramsey, Philadelphia Police Department and Ron Davis, Executive Director of the COPS office. The outcome was a research project featured in this report, the Excellence in Policing (EIP) project.

The EIP project advances a scalable and affordable approach to assist Chiefs and their police departments in building legitimacy and goodwill within their communities. It seeks to fine tune departmental policies and enforcement routines that often draw the most public criticism: traffic stops, searches, training, use of force and internal affairs investigation. It relies heavily on the collection of data from all these events, while insisting on analysis to disclose individual misconduct, improve performance or perhaps the broader need for re-training a department.

It is the hope of the EIP project that there should be an alternative process for reform where it is needed in the police profession. The agile nature of the EIP permits a timely, self-initiated and pro-active response to address issues related to police conduct and practices. Its aim is to improve community engagement and relationships, and to increase public support for the men and women who are charged with ensuring the safety and security of our communities.

Colonel Rick Fuentes
Superintendent, New Jersey State Police
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The Final Report of
EXCELLENCE IN POLICING:
PREVENTING POLICE MISCONDUCT INITIATIVE

I. Introduction

Trust between law enforcement agencies and the people they protect and serve is essential in a democracy. It is key to the stability of our communities, the integrity of our criminal justice system, and the safe and effective delivery of policing services.

The President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing
Interim Report
March 2015

In a democracy, you need the consent of the citizens to police; the police need the collaboration of citizens to succeed.

George L. Kelling
Professor, Rutgers University School of Criminal Justice
Keynote Address
Excellence in Policing Workshop
March 19, 2013

This is the final report of the Excellence in Policing: Preventing Police Misconduct Initiative (EIP), a joint initiative of the Police Institute (PI) of Rutgers University, the New Jersey State Police (NJSP), and the U. S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs’ Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA). The EIP is a first-of-its-kind demonstration initiative to provide police executives and municipal leaders with the incentive, the opportunity, and the skills to proactively diagnose and address vulnerabilities in their police department operations and practices that could undermine their relationships with the citizens that they serve and subject them to federal civil rights investigations and the threat of litigation.

1 Comments and observations of speakers, presenters, and Subject Matters Experts for the Excellence in Policing Project that appear in text boxes in this report were prepared from Workshop notes and other EIP program materials. These comments and observations capture the sense of the points made by the individuals to whom they are attributed, but are not direct quotes.
Under the tutelage of experienced police professionals, and with on-going mentoring and technical assistance, the EIP guided participating officials through the application of risk management strategies to assessing department performance. Over a six-month period, these officials were provided with the tools for addressing identified problems and vulnerabilities to achieve enhanced performance and professionalism, increased transparency and accountability, improved police-community relations, and reduced exposure to negative scrutiny.

Benchmarks of excellence in policing, as in all fields, evolve over time; today’s best practices may be refined tomorrow by lessons learned or replaced by new strategies and tactics. The uniqueness of the EIP is its focus on educating police leadership in the application of a systemic, internally driven business process for managing risk, change, and new challenges in the pursuit of excellence.

II. Background: The Impetus to Foster Organizational Change

Enactment of the 1994 Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act vested the U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division with the authority to investigate state and local law enforcement agencies that it believes has engaged in a pattern or practice of unconstitutional conduct. Subject to the findings of that investigation, a municipality may be confronted with the possibility of federal intervention to force the adoption of reforms that may take a decade and a significant investment of public resources to resolve. In most cases, the Civil Rights Division and the municipality will negotiate to avoid or settle a suit, and will enter into a consent decree or memorandum of understanding setting out the reforms the department is expected to make. A monitor is appointed by the court to oversee execution of the consent decree and make certain that the terms of the negotiated agreement are carried out.

According to the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF), a Washington, D.C.-based national police think tank, more than 25 police departments were subject to some form of Justice Department scrutiny for civil rights violations in the two decades since that law was enacted, with the resulting investigative and reform processes in some cases taking 10 or more years to resolve. Justice Department intervention with local police departments appears to be trending upward. According to PERF, 15 local law enforcement agencies entered into consent decrees or memoranda of understanding with the Justice Department in the decade following enactment of the 1994 statute, while in the three-year period from 2010 to 2013, the Justice Department had opened 15 more investigations into local police departments. Moreover, PERF reported, the agreements themselves were becoming more extensive and more detailed.

The EIP was the outgrowth of an interdepartmental collaboration that came together following the 9/11 terrorist attack. This informal consortium of East Coast law enforcement officials, the I-
95 Domestic Security Preparedness group, brought state and local police officials from agencies all along the Interstate 95 corridor together to explore ways in which they could improve interagency communication in support of counterterrorism measures. Over time these discussions on information exchange strategies expanded into other domestic challenges facing law enforcement agencies across the nation. In early 2010, attention turned to the impact of consent decrees on local law enforcement agencies, both those agencies that are pursuing reforms ordered under a consent decree and law enforcement leadership across the country that feared that their respective agencies’ practices and procedures could trigger federal scrutiny and potential litigation.

One member of the I-95 Domestic Security Preparedness group, speaking from personal experience in overseeing his agency’s compliance with the conditions of a consent decree, addressed the challenges that agencies face in implementing ordered reforms when they may be ill-prepared to formulate strategies to address the systemic policing issues that triggered federal intervention. Col. Joseph R. Fuentes, NJSP superintendent, postulated that law enforcement agencies would be better served if the federal government could be engaged proactively in a national initiative with state and local police leadership to provide guidance and resources to assist police departments in identifying and remediating conditions that might leave them vulnerable to litigation. With the support of the PI, work began on formulating a proposal for meeting the needs of police departments for assistance in applying best practices to improving their interactions with citizens and addressing deficiencies in practices and procedures that might expose these agencies to federal scrutiny and the threat of litigation.

III. The EIP: Conceptualizing and Implementing the Demonstration Initiative

In June 2010, NJSP and PI officials co-hosted a day-long “Excellence in Policing” planning session. In attendance at that meeting were chiefs from four police agencies -- Los Angeles, Pittsburg, Cincinnati, and the New Jersey State Police -- that had recently completed all required reforms under a consent decree and been released from federal oversight. Also present were four national experts who had worked in some capacity under various consent decree arrangements, and a representative from the BJA.

The proposition at the heart of the EIP concept was that experiences of departments that had successfully dealt with these issues would be extremely useful in helping other departments shape their policy making. Organizations that successfully employ best practices and implement effective systems of accountability have developed a total organization environment that promotes effective relationships with the communities served by the department.

The overall goals of the EIP would be two-fold: To assist participating municipalities in improving their existing police business practices by adopting evidence-based best practices and to capture the experiences of what worked and what did not in this demonstration initiative so that the model could be refined and shared nationally with policing organizations.

During the day-long planning session, the experiences of the four police agencies and the consulting experts formed the backdrop for a candid conversation about the need for this kind of initiative and the form that it would take. Participants agreed that successful prevention of misconduct requires:
• Strong leadership commitment to address issues;
• A recording and accountability system that identified problems and their sources;
• Training throughout the organization;
• A consistent message from top to bottom, but especially from middle managers;
• Policies and procedures;
• Measurements of performance; and
• Accountability for policies and procedures.

The consensus of the group was that the central objective of the initiative should be to foster organizational change within police departments so as to enhance agency excellence and improve accountability to the community. As conceived that day, the initiative would be carried out over a two-year period and would involve some 20 municipalities: 15 New Jersey police departments and five police departments from other parts of the country.

The program would begin with a three-day workshop that would be followed by a six-month implementation period during which participating municipalities would receive on-going mentoring and technical assistance. A five-step protocol for implementing and carrying out the project was envisioned:

• **Solicitation**: Invitations would be sent out to the heads of the police departments selected for participation in the initiative describing the project and explaining that participation would be at no cost to their respective agencies.
• **Curriculum development**: A project advisory group would be formed to develop the curriculum and lesson plans for the three-day workshop.
• **Initial training**: The participants would gather for the three-day workshop.
• **Initial implementation and consultation**: Each department would be paired with a consultant, who would be assisted by a NJSP officer, in mentoring and providing ongoing technical assistance and would begin its implementation of best practices under the guidance of a lead consultant.
• **Follow-up convening**: The agencies would be brought together for a trouble shooting and progress report meeting.

*This is never about getting to a “perfect behavior” police department. It’s about changing the state of mind – putting a system in place that gives the sergeant the ability to step in and correct a problem and a superstructure in place that spots patterns and facilitates the implementation of solutions.*

Col. Joseph R. Fuentes
Superintendent
New Jersey State Police
Excellence in Policing Workshop
March 20, 2013
At the end of the project, each participating agency would be expected to have produced a set of policies and procedures to guide the proactive application of leadership and management strategies to enhance agency performance and improve accountability to the community and strategies in hand to move forward with implementation of those policies and procedures.

Based upon deliberations during that initial project meeting, a proposal was drafted in June 2011 for submission to the BJA, which agreed to entertain a funding request for $300,000 to support that initiative.

The Advisory Group
Over the ensuing year, representatives of the NJSP; the PI, under the leadership of newly appointed Executive Director, Thomas J. O’Reilly; and the BJA continued to refine the EIP concept. In the late summer of 2012, these officials reconvened to continue discussions about which municipalities should be invited to participate in the program and to discuss the selection of the consultants -- the Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) -- from the field.

During that meeting, an EIP Advisory Group was formed, comprised of representatives of the NJSP, the PI, and the BJA (See Appendix A for a list of Advisory Group members). The members of the Advisory Group would carry out executive leadership and administrative responsibilities associated with the EIP program. The PI, under a cooperative agreement with the BJA to support the project, would serve as overall coordinator of the project, as well as the clearinghouse for all questions and communications, and provide the administrative function, handling registration, expenses, and any participant questions. The NJSP Police Academy would assist with the development of curriculum for the workshop, as well as the delivery of technical assistance that would follow the workshop, and would manage some of the program logistics such as providing the workshop space, finalizing PowerPoint presentations when necessary, printing the written materials for the workshop participants, and providing transportation when needed. The BJA would monitor the project to ensure that all Justice Department requirements were met.

Throughout the fall, the Advisory Group convened frequently to continue to deliberate issues relating to project planning, preparation, execution, and follow up, and beginning in February 2013, held weekly conference calls through the end of May 2013.

The Subject Matter Experts and Topics
A key feature of the EIP demonstration initiative was the engagement of knowledgeable police professionals from the field in drawing from their experiences to guide participating municipalities in assessing vulnerabilities in existing policies and practices and developing strategies for remediating the conditions that created those vulnerabilities. Individuals chosen to serve as SMEs were selected by the Advisory Group based upon their recognized leadership in the field of policing, relevant knowledge and experience in the areas targeted for coverage in the three-day workshop, and proven effectiveness as communicators, facilitators, and change agents.

Before moving forward with the selection of SMEs, the Advisory Group identified those topics that would be most relevant for the intended EIP participants. Drawing from available resources and a broad base of experiential knowledge, the Advisory Group identified nine topical “hot button” areas that have triggered scrutiny of law enforcement agencies for civil rights violations.
and that therefore are of paramount importance to those agencies today: Executive risk management, motor vehicle stops, intervention systems, bias-free policing, consequence management, use of force, police field stops, citizen complaints, and internal affairs.\(^4\)

In October 2012, formal invitations were mailed to the individuals who had been selected to serve as EIP SMEs (See Appendix A for a list of SMEs). In November 2012, members of the Advisory Group spoke with each SME about the topic each would be assigned and how he or she would approach teaching that topic to the participating municipalities, with regard to both form and content, and any technical or logistical assistance SMEs might require in conjunction with the preparation and presentation of instructional materials.

From October 2012 through January 2013, the Advisory Group worked with the SMEs on their preparation of lesson plans and other instructional materials. As part of this process, a one-day workshop development meeting was held during which the Advisory Group and the SMEs reviewed the: workshop schedule; supporting logistics; all aspects of the instructional program, including goals and objectives for each topic to be addressed, sequence of topics, and possible presentation omissions and/or overlaps; and the role and responsibilities of the SMEs as mentors and technical assistance team members during the follow-up phase of the EIP program.

**Selecting the Municipalities**

Selecting the municipalities that would be invited to participate in the EIP was a difficult aspect of organizing the project. Identification of the initial pool of possible participants was substantially influenced by two overarching considerations: the vital need to have jurisdictions involved whose leadership would be willing to engage in the open and candid introspection of their police departments; and the desire to have as demographically and geographically representative a group of municipalities involved as available resources would support.

As development of the EIP initiative proceeded, Advisory Group members continued to revisit and refine criteria for selection of municipalities. By early 2013, the Advisory Group had agreed that selection of participating cities would be based upon geographic representation, demographic diversity, and demonstrated progressive leadership in policing. The hope was to engage a constituency of municipalities in the program whose leadership was recognized within the police discipline as forward-thinking, and who could be expected to fully complete the tasks envisioned for the project. The Advisory Group excluded from consideration any jurisdictions under investigation at that time for alleged civil rights violations or that were operating under a consent decree or memorandum of understanding to make court-ordered reforms in their practices and procedures. The BJA was responsible for confirming that the cities being considered for the EIP were not party to an active federal civil rights investigation or operating under any other legal constraints.

By early winter 2013, the Advisory Group was ready to move forward with outreach to a targeted pool of six national cities and six New Jersey municipalities. The head of the police

---

\(^4\) Police Executive Research Forum at 1. PERF observed that the one constant in the Justice Department’s intervention with local police departments for alleged unconstitutional activity is the types of wrong-doing that triggered the federal involvement: improper use of force by police, unlawful stops and searches, and biased policing.
department in each of these jurisdictions was contacted by a member of the Advisory Group who explained that this national-scope demonstration initiative was being undertaken jointly by the NJSP, the PI, and the BJA. The Advisory Group representative described the program scope, focus, and timetable, explained the requirements and expectations for participating municipalities, and advised that involvement in the EIP would be at no cost to participants owing to the availability of federal funding under a cooperative agreement with the BJA. A two-page program description developed by the Advisory Group was forwarded to each invitee for police department administrators’ use in deliberating whether to accept the invitation to participate in the EIP.

Prospective participants were also advised that as condition precedent to their participation in the EIP, they would be expected to designate a team of three individuals to attend the workshop -- the chief of the department, the chief administrative officer for the department, and the city’s chief executive or fiscal change agent. If any one of these individuals would be unavailable to attend the three-day workshop, that city would be disqualified from participation in the EIP. Each municipality was also asked to identify a point of contact who would work with PI and NJSP officials to make travel, hotel and local transportation arrangements for representatives attending the workshops.

Three of the national cities and three New Jersey municipalities elected to opt out of the program. Reasons given for this decision included: conflicts with the scheduled program timetable; lack of time and resources to commit to the three-day workshop and follow up technical assistance process owing to the press of existing demands on the department; inability to secure a commitment from key municipal decision-makers to participate on the cities leadership team and attend all three-days of the workshop; and concern that discussing a participating department’s existing practices and procedures in an open forum might have the unintended consequence of triggering federal scrutiny of that department.

In the end three “national” cities and three New Jersey municipalities accepted the invitation to participate in the EIP initiative: Fresno, CA; Hollywood, FL; Shreveport, LA; and Atlantic City, Orange and Vineland of New Jersey.
The Workshop
The three-day workshop, convened from March 19-21, 2013, was the critical first step for municipalities selected to participate in the EIP initiative. Designed to provide participating municipal executives the opportunity and tools to proactively assess their operations and performance, the workshop did engage participants in intensive instruction from the application of risk management strategies to examining existing practices and procedures (See Appendix B for the Workshop Agenda). The workshop would be led by the SMEs, with ample time budgeted for interaction between participants. The members of this instructional team would continue their engagement with participating municipalities as technical assistance staff who would provide on-going mentoring and support, including one-day site visits to municipalities, throughout the duration of the program. In addition to the substantive presentations on specific topics in the policing field, the workshop program included three keynote speakers on relevant topical issues (See Appendix E for a list of keynote speakers).

The three-day workshop was held in the MetLife Stadium at East Rutherford, NJ. The program was held in one large room with the participants, SMEs, observers, and Advisory Group members seated at a table set up in a U-shaped configuration room. All speakers and SMEs presented from their respective seats around the U. This workshop set-up ensured that all participants and presenters, and any presentations used during the program, could be seen from any seat at that table.

Technical Assistance Process
During the workshop, municipal participants were provided with a handout that explained the follow-up technical assistance process and schedule. As an integral component of that process, each municipality was required to draft and submit to the Advisory Group, by the end of April 2013, a document that identified and described the policing practices and procedures within its agency that it wanted to work on improving. Focus areas selected by municipalities were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIP Timeline for Participating Municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 19-21, 2013:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 22 to May 2013:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2013 to Sept. 2014:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2014 to Oct. 2014:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 2014 to Dec. 2014:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Atlantic City, NJ:
- Ensuring data collected from traffic stops are accurate and integrating that data into the newly acquired AIM software; and
- Developing an early warning system for use of force complaints and all internal affairs complaints.

Fresno, CA:
- Improving the accuracy of data and the data collection process on traffic stops; and
- Reducing officer involved shooting incidents.

Hollywood, FL:
- Improving operation and transparency of the citizen complaints intake process;
- Developing a more comprehensive transparent policy on preventing bias-based policing; and
- Developing a training program for newly promoted sergeants for incorporation in its Field Training Officer (FTO) Program.

Orange, NJ:
- Evaluating the effectiveness of its use of force policies;
- Developing policies on pedestrian and motor vehicle stops; and
- Developing an internal affairs training program for all officer ranks in the police department.

Shreveport, LA:
- Determining the most appropriate course of action to work with those employees who continue to show up on the early intervention system activation list year after year; and
- Extending its recently implemented first-line officer training to its commander ranks.

Vineland, NJ:
- Ensuring that the department is properly analyzing the data it collects through motor vehicle stops;
- Developing an early warning system for use of force and all internal affairs complaints; and
- Engaging the community in its daily operations and continuing to maintain, and even improve, the transparency of its operations.
In May 2013, the Advisory Group convened conference calls with each municipality individually to discuss the write-up it had submitted and the technical assistance that it would require in support of the areas of improvement that it had targeted. The Advisory Group then prepared an executive summary statement for each municipality that was submitted to the head of each police department for review and approval. Five of the participating municipalities explicitly approved their respective executive summary statement that was prepared by the Advisory Group. The sixth municipality wrote its own summary statement.

Following execution and approval of the executive summary statements, each municipality was asked to forward to the Advisory Group all of the policies and procedures that it had in place that related to those areas in which it was seeking technical assistance under the EIP program. Upon receipt of those policies and procedures, the Advisory Group prepared a “materials submitted analysis” in which it organized the materials submitted by area of technical assistance. This analysis helped the Advisory Group to assess the need for, and manage available resources to address, participating municipalities’ technical assistance needs.

The Advisory Group then assigned an SME to each of the six participating municipalities (See Appendix F for a list of SME assignments). Each SME was provided with his or her assigned municipality’s statement, notes from the Advisory Group’s original telephone contact with the municipality, the approved executive summary statement, and analysis of materials submitted by each municipality. In September 2013, the Advisory Group held a conference call with the SMEs to discuss their impressions of the materials they had received and how to follow up with their assigned municipalities.
Excellence in Policing (EIP) Program Technical Assistance
Quick Facts Sheet

Program Objective
To incentivize police executives and city leaders to proactively apply risk management strategies to diagnosing and addressing vulnerabilities in police department operations and practices to achieve enhanced performance and professionalism, increased transparency and accountability, improved police-community relations, and reduced exposure to negative public scrutiny and potential litigation.

The EIP Program Management Team
- The Police Institute of Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey
- New Jersey State Police
- U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs’ Bureau of Justice Assistance

Participating Municipalities
Atlantic City, NJ; Fresno, CA; Hollywood, FL; Orange, NJ; Shreveport, LA; Vineland, NJ

Target Areas
- Executive Risk Management
- Police Field Stops
- Traffic Stops
- Citizen Complaint Process
- Biased-based Policing
- Citizen Internal Complaints
- Use of Force

The Program
- An intensive three-day workshop during which three-member municipal teams engaged with experienced police professionals in identifying their respective city’s vulnerabilities and formulating a strategy to remediate underlying conditions.
- Direct mentoring by leading law enforcement executives serving as subject matter experts (SME), over a period of six months, to include a one-day on-site mentoring visit from the assigned SME and ongoing peer-to-peer interactions.
- Follow-up telephone technical assistance consultations with the EIP Program Team for the duration of the project.

Participating Municipalities’ Priorities
Atlantic City, NJ: Operationalize and integrate automated dispatch, administrative management, and investigative management data collection systems (CAD/RMS and AIM software); develop and implement an early warning system for managing complaints brought against officers.
Fresno, CA: Improve accuracy of data collection on traffic stops, establish a consistent process for receiving, investigating and tracking biased-based policing complaints from traffic stops; reduce officer-involved shootings; review and analyze motor vehicle impound data.
Hollywood, FL: Enhance transparency of citizen complaint intake process; create a more comprehensive policy on preventing biased-based policing; develop a field officer training program for newly promoted sergeants.
Orange, NJ: Review and evaluate use of force policies; develop policies on pedestrian and motor vehicle stops; develop an in-service field training program for officers of all ranks.
Shreveport, LA: Evaluate performance of existing early warning system, specifically to address prevalence of officers with multiple complaints; extend existing first-line officer training to officers of all ranks.
Vineland, NJ: Assess current analysis of data collected from motor vehicle stops; develop an early warning system for use of force complaints and internal affairs complaints; enhance department transparency and community outreach.

Outcomes
New/amended policies, directives, procedures addressing desired changes in targeted conditions and implementation plans for effecting those changes.
IV. The EIP Experience

The EIP evolved from the desire of the sponsors of that initiative to help police executives take steps to reduce their respective departments’ vulnerability to allegations of civil rights violations and an attending loss of public trust and confidence. The strategy was to expose participating jurisdictions to relevant best practices in the field, provide them with the tools to proactively look within their respective agencies to assess existing policies and practices, and support their development of policies in targeted areas with intensive follow-up consultation and mentoring during the EIP’s six-month technical assistance phase.

Following the three-day EIP workshop, in which recognized leaders in the field of policing provided insights on current best practices for diagnosing and remediating vulnerabilities that could open police agencies to public and federal scrutiny and possible litigation, participants returned to their respective jurisdictions to carry out self-assessments of agency policies and practices and identify the areas that they would like to work on under the EIP. Nine topical targeted areas were the focus of presentations during the workshop, and, not surprisingly, targeted areas selected by most municipal team were comprised of one or more of the areas that they were presented in the workshop. This suggests that rather than engaging in a wholesale assessment of agency practices and procedures to identify areas of vulnerability, municipal teams may, at the outset, have centered their assessments on evaluating department performance in the targeted areas that they had been presented during the workshop.

When asked for the reasoning behind their targeted area selections, the majority of municipalities indicated that they had chosen to work on targeted areas in which they concluded they were most vulnerable to public scrutiny. One chief stated that his targeted area selections would support his overarching goal of improving public trust in the police within his jurisdiction, especially within minority communities. One municipality’s selection of civilian complaints as the top priority among targeted areas reflected the concern that poor management of such complaints was the area that was most likely to trigger scrutiny of that jurisdiction’s police department.

According to another municipal official, lack of public support for the police had manifested itself in deep cuts in funding for police salaries and benefits. This official said that improving public perception of the police is vital to garnering community leaders’ support for adequately funding the department.

All of the participating municipalities noted the need for assistance with the implementation of policies in targeted areas. For example, although training and data management-related issues were not stand-alone topics among the nine targeted areas covered during the workshop, some municipalities listed those issues as areas that they would like to target for improvement under the EIP. Other participating municipalities included training and data management as integral elements of the targeted areas that they selected for attention. One municipal official, whose jurisdiction had included civilian complaints in its targeted areas, said that his department needs help on how to manage the processing of these complaints once they have been received.

One police chief expressed confidence in his department’s early warning system policy, but asserted that the effectiveness of the policy in practice has been undermined by difficulties in
communicating that policy to officers and securing their buy-in to that system. Another participating municipal official assigned a high priority to the development of data systems for collecting and analyzing officers’ performance in the field. This official said that he believes that his officers are complying fully with existing policies and procedures, but that he would like to have the data available to support that belief.

Over the course of the EIP’s six-month technical assistance phase, several participating jurisdictions made mid-course modifications to the areas that they had targeted, in some cases to accommodate changes in priorities within their respective agencies or in others, as a result of their interactions with their assigned SMEs. One police chief reported that as a result of an internal audit of three of his department’s divisions, his municipality altered its work under the EIP to focus on developing an internal affairs policy and instituting a training program for department supervisors in support of that policy. Another municipal official said that insights acquired in a site visit to his jurisdiction’s assigned SME prompted the development of new policies on canine and Taser use.

In some of the municipalities, participation in the EIP workshop was a catalyst for, or informed, examination and reform of operations and practices beyond the focus areas selected for attention. For example, in Hollywood, FL, the police department has given over the entire second floor of the police facility to a newly established supervisor management training academy. Although creation of this resource was not included among the areas that the department targeted for attention under the EIP program, the police chief attributes establishment of the academy directly to his municipality’s experience in that program. The academy has reportedly been very well received by the Hollywood Police Department officers and the chief plans to explore expanding the roster of academy training programs currently offered and opening the academy to law enforcement officials outside that department.

Prior to the workshop, Atlantic City had been reviewing information gathered in pedestrian field stops as a potential source of criminal intelligence. However, post-workshop, the police department’s office of professional standards implemented protocols to routinely review that information to track and analyze information on who is being stopped.

In addition, following the workshop, the Atlantic City police chief, city attorneys, and internal affairs personnel reviewed data on excessive force complaints for the previous 10 years and were startled by the number of complaints received that had not been sustained -- a figure well below the national average. Subsequent to this finding, the police chief initiated a review of his department’s internal affairs division’s handling of complaints. As a result of that review, the chief has made leadership changes in the internal affairs division in an effort to improve division efficiency and accountability.

Atlantic City officials also had initiated discussions with the office of professional standards about creating a form to track information about motor vehicle stops, such as race, ethnicity and gender of the subject of these stops. Under consideration as well was movement of the internal affairs function to the office of professional standards. Such a move would integrate the related functions of internal affairs, accreditation, and inspections and compliance under the same operational umbrella and the administrative oversight of the police chief.
One municipal official said that agency accreditation has been a long-time goal of his department. He credited the EIP with providing his agency with the incentive and tools to undertake the comprehensive review and update of agency policies and practices required for accreditation.

Building and Sustaining Momentum
The effectiveness of the EIP initiative in fostering organizational change within police departments to enhance agency excellence and accountability to the community would be dependent upon participating municipalities’ sustained commitment to following through on the work begun in the workshop once they returned to their communities. The Advisory Group therefore sought to structure a program that not only would motivate participants, and provide them with the tools to evaluate and identify deficiencies in existing operations and procedures, but would encourage them to go forward during and beyond the six-month follow up technical assistance phase of that initiative with the development and implementation of policies and practices to reduce identified vulnerabilities. The post-workshop aspects of the EIP initiative would be particularly challenging because municipal officials would need to commit to carving out time from their already demanding schedules to complete their work on the project.

Two features of the EIP played key roles in building and sustaining momentum throughout the program. The first was the on-going follow-up technical assistance and mentoring which involved regular contact between the Advisory Group members and SMEs with the municipalities. That regular contact served the dual purposes of providing municipalities with continued assistance on substantive issues and encouraging them to move forward with policy development in the areas on which they had elected to focus.

The SMEs active involvement with participating municipalities throughout the six-month technical assistance process was instrumental in guiding and assisting these jurisdictions in advancing their work on selected focus areas. The municipalities took advantage of the unique characteristics that their respective SME had to offer. For example, one of Orange, NJ’s targeted focus areas was developing an internal affairs training program for all officer ranks in the police department. The Orange, NJ SME reviewed and provided suggestions on how to improve the existing internal affairs policies, including specific detailed suggestions on how to train to the policy. Orange, NJ officials reported that training administered based upon that revised policy was well received.

Hollywood, FL, received assistance from its assigned SME in re-writing its internal affairs and use of force policies. The Fresno, CA, SME hosted a visit from his assigned municipal team to attend a quarterly meeting of his agency’s risk assessment group and risk assessment team. That visit afforded the visiting officials an opportunity to benefit from lessons learned by their SME’s department in structuring their own risk management program.

The Advisory Group also facilitated outreach for additional expertise when participating municipalities required specialized assistance beyond what their respective assigned SME could provide. When the Vineland, NJ Police Department leadership expressed the need for subject matter expertise with experience specific to New Jersey to assist that department in improving its
internal affairs unit’s early warning system, that assistance was provided by three individuals from the New Jersey Attorney General’s Office of Law Enforcement Professional Standards.

The second of these features that contributed to building and sustaining program momentum was the requirement that municipalities bring a three-member team to the workshop comprised of the police chief, the chief administrative officer for the department, and the city’s chief executive or fiscal change agent. The police chief would serve as the primary EIP program contact for the participating municipality and take the lead on EIP program tasks. However, the latter two officials would play key roles in garnering vital support for implementation of new policies and procedures produced under the EIP within the department and city government, respectively. Including these officials on the municipal team was intended to engage them fully in the EIP program from the outset.

All municipal teams from participating jurisdictions included the police chief. The city official position was filled by the mayor on three municipal teams, and by the vice mayor, the city business director, and the city legal advisor on the remaining three municipalities. The position of police administrative officer was filled by deputy police chiefs on two municipal teams and by command staff of various ranks on the other teams. (See Appendix C for a list of individual municipal teams’ members).

City executives who attended the workshop were fully engaged and active participants in that event. Anecdotal information from participating jurisdictions indicate that these officials’ interest in, and support of, follow-up work on focus areas selected for attention continued throughout the six-month technical assistance process. Time will tell whether these officials’ experience under the EIP program will leverage sustained support over the long term for reform initiatives within their respective police departments.

How are they doing? A Status Report
A status report prepared by the PI in August 2014, indicated that each of the participating municipalities had made substantial progress in their respective focus areas. According to that report, these jurisdictions were on target to accomplish the following:

Atlantic City, NJ:
- Completion of a new canine policy and training of officers on that policy;
- Completion of a new Taser policy and training of officers on that policy;
- Acquisition of on body cameras and training of officers in the use of the cameras;
- An updated internal affairs policy with officers trained, or scheduled to be trained, on that policy; and
- A schedule for the purchase and implementation of the new CAD/RMS system.

Fresno, CA:
- Documentation of a correction in the data collection process;
- Completion of an outline and timeline for implementation of a risk assessment plan; and
- Completion of a strategy for implementing a risk assessment plan.
Hollywood, FL:
  • Completion of an internal affairs policy and a schedule for training officers on that policy; and
  • Completion of a use of force policy and a schedule for training officers on that policy.

Orange, NJ:
  • Completion of a newly drafted internal affairs policy and a schedule for policy implementation and training of officers on that policy; and
  • A newly updated website.

Shreveport, LA:
  • Completion of a revised early intervention policy and the development of a schedule for training officers on that policy;
  • Reissuance of updated S.O.P. manual; and
  • Completion of a training program and the scheduling of training for commander rank officers on the early intervention policy.

Vineland, NJ:
  • Completion of an updated policy on traffic data collection and recording; and
  • Completion of an updated internal affairs policy and the scheduling of officer training on that policy.
V. The EIP in Retrospect: Lessons Learned

As a demonstration initiative, the EIP created the opportunity to test a novel approach to providing specific services to a targeted audience. Accordingly, a secondary object of the Advisory Group was to evaluate that experience in order to determine its efficacy as a platform for delivering program content and its effectiveness in meeting program participants’ needs and expectations. This information then could be used to identify the strengths and weaknesses of that approach and aspects of that initiative that would benefit from retooling for future application. To that end, members of the municipal teams were asked to participate in an evaluation of the three-day workshop. Feedback on the EIP as a whole was solicited from the SMEs.

A workshop evaluation administered by the NJSP elicited high praise for the EIP workshop in all categories queried. Respondents were asked to answer questions using a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being the lowest and 7 the top rating. The workshop received an overall rating of 6.30, and a rating of above 6 in each of the six categories of questions asked: business results, courseware, environment, instructor, job impact, learning effectiveness, and return on investment.

Instructors received high marks for knowledge, preparation, presentation quality, their responsiveness to questions from workshop participants, and their willingness to openly and candidly discuss their own experiences. The diversity of perspectives that emerged during the workshop and the opportunity to network with other law enforcement executives were also noted as important aspects in supplemental comments provided by respondents.

With regard to recommendations for improving future workshops, suggestions offered by survey respondents included:

How do you manage police discretion? Laws, policies, and court orders are merely expressions of the values that we hold to in society. We fail to write policies and guidelines for police that encourage them to think logically and use common sense. When challenged on an action taken, the police oftentimes respond, “you had to be there.” Well, sometimes you really do have to be there to understand the dynamics of the situation that the police found themselves in and to make an informed judgement of the appropriateness of the action taken. Procedures and guidelines should address how police officers should go about evaluating a situation, not attempt to prescribe or proscribe how she or he should act in a given situation. Values should be articulated clearly and lateral decisions should allow the officers some discretion/freedom in applying procedural rules.

George L. Kelling
Emeritus Professor, Rutgers University School of Criminal Justice
Keynote Address
Excellence in Policing Workshop
March 19, 2013
• Offering more time for participants to ask questions of presenters;
• Video-taping sessions;
• Building sessions around case studies to provide participants with the opportunity gain experience in identifying and exploring the parameters of a problem; and
• Adding more instruction on risk management strategies to the curriculum.

During breaks throughout the workshop, attendees from each participating municipality met privately with Advisory Group members to discuss in detail their deliberations regarding selection of focus areas. Many of the participants commented that they felt that these impromptu meetings were highly beneficial and suggested that time be scheduled at any future workshops for these informal consultations.

The SMEs on the EIP Experience
The SMEs were asked to share their thoughts on the EIP initiative in six areas:
• Suggestions to improve the EIP approach;
• Suggestions for keeping the cities motivated to move to excellence throughout the initiative;
• Particular steps that if added would make the initiative more valuable;
• Particular steps that were unnecessary;
• Suggestions with respect to the refinement of the role of the SME; and
• The most valuable “takeaways” from the initiative.

With regard to suggestions for improving the EIP, SMEs offered the following:
• On advanced preparation of participating municipalities:
  ✓ Participants in future projects should undergo some critical self-assessment prior to attending the initial workshop. This information should be an internal document which is designed to open the minds of participants’ commanders to the ideas being presented. A simple Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis could possibly be a valuable exercise.
  ✓ More front-end interaction between SMEs and the participating municipalities to provide greater context for identifying issues that translate into practices that inhibit the police department’s efforts to gain and maintain the community trust and confidence, e.g., SME site visits to the cities to meet with city political leadership, union officials if relevant, and police department leadership.
  ✓ Allowing participating municipalities to be more involved in the selection of their SME rather than being “assigned” someone to fill that role.
• Concerning changes in the workshop format:
  ✓ Incorporation of night sessions involving case studies. The addition of such sessions would produce added value by elevating the EIP to a true executive leadership-style program. The case studies would be based upon the “real” experiences of departments (names redacted) who ignored change, which led to departmental struggles and loss of community support. Case studies also should be included that highlight the experiences of departments that were open to progressive ideas and employed business models that were of proven utility in leveraging change needed to elevate all aspects of policing.
  ✓ Create the opportunity for communities with the same kinds of problems to work together.
✓ Convene communities who are facing the same kinds of issues and carve out time for SMEs to meet with them, broken out from the seminar at large.
✓ Include time on the workshop agenda for the cities to work individually and as a group to flesh out their focus areas and next steps.
✓ Provide participating municipalities more latitude in selecting the operational or policy areas toward which they wish to direct their efforts. The workshop inadvertently may have channeled participating agencies into the pre-determined targeted areas around which the workshop was structured.

• **On the technical assistance process:**
  ✓ Reevaluate the length of the follow-up technical assistance process. Reforms are not made overnight. The process of change requires a tedious cycle of planning, policy development, training, implementation, and evaluation. Technical assistance support of police departments cannot be rushed nor have a time limit attached to it. On-going technical assistance follow-up is needed, but for how long needs to be determined.
  ✓ Technical assistance should be provided in the form of literature as well as making SME’s available after the workshop, if only by telephone, after the workshop to provide continued support to the process of developing and implementing reform strategies.
  ✓ The technical assistance could have been more structured with specific time frames and expectations provided for both the participating municipalities and the SME.

• **Regarding final products/feedback from participants:**
  ✓ Participating municipalities should be required to provide some “proof” of outcomes from their participation in the EIP that may be attributed to that initiative.
  ✓ Participating municipalities should be required to provide a report to the PI on their progress in addressing their stated objectives and with copies of relevant documents included as “proof” of work.

Concerning suggestions for keeping the cities motivated to move to excellence throughout the initiative:
• There must be strong leadership.
• Agencies need to be guided and resources leveraged to identify exactly where their problems lie. Many agencies do not want to admit what their real problems are. The challenge for the cities is not only to change the policing organization; it is to change individuals within that policing organization. Leadership has to embrace and expect certain behaviors, and those behaviors have to be valued and reinforced. There is difficulty on the part of police chiefs to identify major issues while simultaneously having to deal with the ins and outs of daily policing. That is why accountability systems need to be in place to identify, track, and remedy bad police behavior.
• There is a need to create specific benchmarks for participating agency and establish schedules for regular interaction to assess progress. Doing so would “accelerate” the actions of the SME and the participating municipality.
• A schedule and a checklist of minimum activities for the cities and the SME’s should be required and require a quarterly report from both on progress made on checklist benchmarks.

• In each of the participating cities the civilian or government official to whom the police executive is accountable should be more actively involved to help ensure continued motivation. The central project staff, not the SME, should be responsible for this function in order to ensure that it is uniformly provided in each city.

Regarding making the EIP more valuable:
• Outcome measures need to be developed at the workshop, and in 18 months an assessment of progress should be made against those measures. Questions like “what was going on before” and “what is going on after” need to be answered. Does the organization notice any differences? Does the community notice any differences? If outcomes are not measured, how do we know if progress is being made?

• A second meeting of all of the cities and the SMEs would help sustain momentum and allow for the sharing of information on successes and challenges. The focus of the meeting could be on each site presenting what has been accomplished to that point and where help is needed. That meeting also could provide the opportunity for mid-course correction for both the sites and the SMEs.

Concerning unnecessary steps in process:
• The EIP was a first-of-its-kind initiative. Therefore, all steps/phases that were implemented were necessary. This was a learning process for the participating departments and steering committee alike. With more experience, opportunities may emerge to streamline this process.

Regarding the SMEs role:
• The SMEs were chosen for their unique styles of leadership, understanding, policing, and ability to institute progressive change.

• The role of the SME was not defined. Permitting the SMEs to define their specific roles allowed these unique diversities to surface and brought depth to the program as a whole. This proved that there is no “cookie cutter” approach to police reforms.

On most valuable takeaways:
• From the outset, the importance of information exchange was continually prevalent. This was highlighted during the workshop, conference calls, and technical assistance. Individual police departments learn from other agencies/departments and their communities. It is equally important for municipal, state, and federal government officials to be present in an effort to grasp the determination of police agencies to strive for excellence in protecting the citizenry that we are sworn to protect.

• The workshop showed participating chiefs that the leadership team understood the role of chiefs and could help them.

• The collective information and problem solving techniques of this effort will be documented. Although the EIP program may not have been perfect, it was a start to a process that is sorely needed in law enforcement. That program should be presented at IACP and other forums.
Overcoming Obstacles to Implementing Reforms

As conceptualized by the Advisory Group, the EIP would provide participating jurisdictions with the impetus and tools to assess vulnerabilities in the areas on which they elected to focus and a program of on-going technical assistance to guide them through the development, and formulation of strategies to implement, policies and procedures to address those areas. To that end, the program was organized around the sharing of experiences, best practices, and lessons learned in the targeted areas.

In the end, however, it became obvious that participating jurisdictions not only needed assistance in shaping policies and procedures and putting implementation strategies down on paper, but also, critically, in managing the process of change implicit in reform, specifically, overcoming ancillary challenges and impediments, both within and external to a department, to implementing reforms. For example, every participating municipality articulated the need for help in addressing issues related to data collection. However, their needs in this area were not confined to the technical aspects of developing and implementing data systems in support of, for example, early intervention strategies. Equally pressing were participating officials’ need for guidance in securing officers’ buy-in to data collection protocols and requirements. Officials also noted their need for help in interpreting data on police incidents and actions, for example, to distinguish “problem officers” from the officer who uses too much force in a high pressure situation. Police executives not only want to identify “red flags” (actions of some officers who might become targets of scrutiny for possible civil rights violations), but also to learn how to generate and interpret the information that will let them know whether there is a red flag waving on the horizon.

Also cited as impediments to the implementation of reforms embodied in polices were the following:

- Resistance from unions;
- Morale problems stemming from fiscal constraints that have resulted in cutbacks in personnel, salaries, benefits;
- District attorneys’ unwillingness to risk the consequences of potential political fallout from taking action on complaints against police;
- Reluctance of first-line supervisors and line officers to report colleagues who are engaging in potentially problematic behavior; and
- Poor public perception of the police reflected in media coverage of police actions.

How can you manage risk if there isn’t any data?

Col. Joseph R. Fuentes
Superintendent
New Jersey State Police
Excellence in Policing Workshop
March 19, 2013
This finding suggests that future iterations of the EIP program should include increased focus on providing participants with more instruction and tools to help them with the development and implementation of strategies for addressing problem areas that they identify.

When viewed as a collective whole, the comments of representatives of the participating municipalities, feedback from the SMEs, observations of the PI as a partner in this unique demonstration initiative, and the achievements of participating municipalities in addressing areas targeted for improvement suggest that the EIP is a unique and valuable resource. Specifically, that it achieved its goal incentivizing police executives and city leaders to proactively apply risk management strategies to diagnosing and addressing vulnerabilities in police department operations and practices and therefore merits consideration for replication as a national model. “After action” feedback received on the EIP will be invaluable in refining the initiative for future use by law enforcement agencies to achieve enhanced performance and professionalism, increased transparency and accountability, improved police-community relations, and reduced exposure to negative public scrutiny and potential litigation.

| Aggressive policing is not incompatible with protection of civil liberties. |
| Most criticism of use of force is based on ignorance. Departments without transparency compound the problem. I better be able to find your use of force policy in five minutes or you’re not transparent enough. If I have to file a public records request, you’re in trouble. |
| Policies do not equal accountability. Agencies often have beautiful policies, but ignore them. |
| Scott T. Greenwood, Esq. |
| Principal |
| Greenwood & Streicher, LLC |
| Excellence in Policing Workshop |
| March 19-20, 2013 |

VI. Conclusion: Where We Go From Here

National focus on issues of ethics and integrity in policing and building – in many cases, restoring – relationships between the police and the communities that they serve is likely to continue into the foreseeable future. In its Interim Report, the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing made several recommendations for criminal justice reform that are accompanied by action items aimed at building public trust in the legitimacy of the police. Among these are calls upon law enforcement agencies to make available for public review all department policies and to routinely post on agencies’ websites information about stops, summonses, arrests, reported crime, and other law enforcement transactions; to adopt, and provide training in support of, comprehensive policies on use of force and that prohibit profiling based upon “race, ethnicity, national origin, age, gender, gender identity/expression, sexual orientation, immigration status, disability, housing status, occupation, and/or language fluency”;
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and to include in basic recruit training instruction to improve social interaction as well as tactical skills.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American policing will emerge stronger. Why? Because we are reevaluating ourselves.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William J. Bratton, CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bratton Group LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynote Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in Policing Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 21, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mr. Bratton was appointed Commissioner of the New York Police Department in December 2013.

Faced with the demands of day-to-day operations on budgets and personnel, police executives need encouragement to make time to proactively examine their operations and practices to identify vulnerabilities that may expose them to litigation and, over time, to institutionalize systems and protocols for monitoring their performance to maintain the integrity of their operations. And, importantly, they will need assistance to overcome the challenges and risks of change as they pursue reform of policies and procedures.

The Justice Department’s Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Office has been in the forefront of efforts to provide law enforcement agencies with guidance in how to address the issues that are fundamental to effective policing and building public trust and confidence in the police. A number of publications are available through the COPS Office to assist police agencies in addressing ethics and integrity in policing, including guides for police and community leaders on mediating citizen complaints and on the role of the internal affairs function in building public trust in the police.  

In addition, technical assistance guides are available for Boston, Virginia Beach, and San Diego Police Departments programs funded under the COPS Office’s “Creating a Culture of Integrity” grant program. The Boston Police Department guide describes seven strategies employed by that agency in strengthening accountability, both to Department officers and in its interactions within the community. The efforts of the Virginia Beach Police Department to improve its citizen complaint and complaint mediation programs are chronicled in the guide for that Department’s initiative. The San Diego Police Department technical assistance guide includes a step-by-step outline on how that department went about instituting an early identification and warning system.

---


Constitutional policing, in my opinion, is the most critical and important objective that law enforcement faces. It is also my opinion that most agencies truly want to get it right. However, for a plethora of reasons (cultural, financial, managerial, etc.) they struggle. This EIP was designed to assist cities by identifying specific issues and opening honest dialogues between the police agencies and the hosts of the initiative. These agencies have an intellectual grasp of what is at stake, but lack the direction, the tools, and sometimes even the motivation to take corrective and sustaining action.

Charles A. Gruber
Law Enforcement Consultant and Expert Witness
former Chief, South Barrington, IL, Elgin, IL, and Shreveport, LA
Police Departments
Subject Matter Feedback on the Excellence in Policing Program

The EIP is unique among resources that are available today to provide police executives and municipal leaders with guidance in diagnosing and addressing vulnerabilities in their police department operations and practices that could undermine their relationships with the citizens that they serve and subject them to federal civil rights investigations and possible litigation. That uniqueness lies in the EIP’s focus on the process of change and sustaining a commitment and momentum to pursuing excellence over the course of the program and beyond. The EIP offers participants in that initiative a learning experience facilitated by knowledgeable police professionals, informed by their experience, and supported throughout by interactive technical assistance and expert mentorship.

The value and utility of the business transformation process embodied in the EIP initiative is centered in its effectiveness as a strategy for encouraging municipal leaders and police executives to proactively evaluate their respective police departments’ performance and take action to remediate deficiencies and vulnerabilities that emerge from that evaluation. Experience under the EIP demonstration initiative suggests that when municipal leaders and police executives buy into that process, the likeliness that reformative actions will be taken increases exponentially. It takes executive sponsorship, commitment, and hard work to achieve excellence, and the EIP seeks to harness all three of those elements.

Hopefully, the proactive and interactive approach embodied in, and successfully demonstrated by, the EIP will have a place in the future of policing in this country; that it will be adopted as a national model for achieving excellence in policing and included in a continuum of change options that will encourage police chiefs and municipal executives to undertake introspective examinations of their police departments’ operations and practices and provide these officials with the guidance and tools that they need to that end.
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The Workshop Agenda
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March 18, 2013 8:00 p.m. Optional Dinner - Location TBD
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 8:30</td>
<td>Registration/ Check-in  (Staff)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8:30 – 8:45   | Welcome/ Program Overview
|               | Dr. Todd R. Clear Ph.D.  Dean of Criminal of the School of Criminal Justice  Rutgers University |
|               | Shanetta Y. Cutlar  Senior Advisor to the Director  Bureau of Justice Assistance |
| 8:45 – 9:45   | Participant Introduction/Purpose of Session
|               | Mr. Thomas J. O’Reilly  Director  Rutgers Police Institute  
|               | All participants to describe:  
|               | - Who they are  
|               | - Department / Municipality/ City  
|               | - Community  
|               | - Challenge(s) faced |
| 9:45 – 10:00  | Break                                                                |
| 10:15 – 11:15 | Changing Nature of Policing – Emergence of “Hot Buttons”
|               | Dr. George L. Kelling, Ph.D.  Criminologist / Criminal Justice Professor |
| 11:15 – 12:00 | Facilitated Discussion by Dr. Kelling                                    |
| 12:00 – 1:15  | Lunch                                                                 (Each participant will pay for his/ her own lunch) |
| 1:30 – 3:00   | Executive Risk Management
|               | Colonel Rick Fuentes  Superintendent  New Jersey State Police |
| 3:00 – 3:15   | Break                                                                 |
3:15 – 4:45  **Motor Vehicle Stops/ Early Intervention System**  
Chief Robert W. McNeilly  
Chief of Police  
Elizabeth Township Police Department

4:45 – 5:15  **Roundtable Summary of Day’s Discussion**  
*Wrap up/ Questions*  
Dr. Steven Edwards, Ph.D.  
Senior Policy Advisor  
Bureau of Justice Assistance

5:00 – 6:30  **Optional MetLife Stadium Brief**  
*(Technology, Security, Operations)*  
NJSP Commander –TBD

Dinner arrangements made by individual participants
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March 20, 2013

8:15 – 8:45  Set the Day Discussion
Dr. Steven Edwards, Ph.D.
Senior Policy Advisor
Bureau of Justice Assistance

8:45 – 10:30  Bias Free Policing
Chief Ronald L. Davis
Chief of Police
East Palo Alto Police Department

10:30 – 10:45  Break

11:00 – 12:15  Consequence Management
Chief Charles A. Gruber (ret.)
CAG Consulting

12:15 – 1:15  Lunch
(Each participant will pay for his/ her own lunch)

1:15 – 2:45  Use of Force
Commissioner Charles H. Ramsey
Police Commissioner
Philadelphia Police Department

2:45 – 3:00  Break

3:00 – 4:30  Community Perspective/Transparency of Agency
Scott T. Greenwood Esq.
Principal
Greenwood & Streicher, LLC

4:45  Roundtable Discussion/Wrap up/ Questions
Dr. Steven Edwards, Ph.D.
Senior Policy Advisor
Bureau of Justice Assistance

Dinner arrangements made by individual participants
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session Title</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8:00 – 8:30 | Set the Day Discussion              | Dr. Steven Edwards, Ph.D.  
Senior Policy Advisor  
Bureau of Justice Assistance |
| 8:30 – 9:45 | Police Field Stops                 | Chief Charles A. Gruber (ret.)  
CAG Consulting |
| 9:45 – 10:00 | Break                               |                                                                             |
| 10:00 – 11:15 | Citizen Complaints                | Chief Rachel M. Burgess (ret.) |
| 11:15 – 12:30 | Internal Affairs                  | Chief Robert W. McNeilly  
Chief of Police  
Elizabeth Township Police Department |
| 12:30 – 12:45 | Break                               |                                                                             |
| 1:15 – 2:15  | Working Lunch                       | Executive Leadership  
Chief William J. Bratton (ret.) |
|             | (Each participant will pay for his/ her own lunch) |                                                                             |
| 2:15 – 2:30 | Break                               |                                                                             |
| 2:30 – 3:30 | Wrap Up/Questions/Next Steps       | Technical Assistance Delivery Plan  
Linda Tartaglia  
Deputy Director  
Rutgers Police Institute  
Lieutenant Mike Zimmerman  
Executive Officer  
New Jersey State Police Academy |
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hollywood, FL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Fernandez</td>
<td>Assistant City Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Affanato</td>
<td>Interim Chief of Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Blattner</td>
<td>Vice Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Pardon</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norris Redding</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orange, NJ</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwayne D. Warren</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakim Sims</td>
<td>Police Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Warren</td>
<td>Deputy Police Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shreveport, LA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willie L. Shaw, Jr.</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William R. Goodin, Jr.</td>
<td>Chief Administration Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedric B. Glover</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vineland, NJ</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Codispoti</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Ulrich</td>
<td>Captain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben Bermudez</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Subject Matter Experts

In alphabetical order by last name:

**Rachel M. Burgess**, currently federal monitor for the Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, formerly Division Chief of the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Office;

**Ronald A. Davis**, currently Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, formerly Chief of the East Palo Alto Police Department;

**Wayne S. Fisher, Ph.D.**, currently Senior Policy Advisor to the Rutgers Police Institute and adjunct professor to Rutgers Newark School of Criminal Justice, former Deputy Director of the New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice, New Jersey Department of Law and Public Safety;

**Colonel Joseph R. Fuentes**, Superintendent of the New Jersey State Police;

**Charles A. Gruber**, currently federal monitor for the Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, formerly Chief of the Shreveport Police Department and South Barrington, Elgin and Quincy, Illinois Police Departments;

**Robert McNeilly**, currently federal monitor for the Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, formerly Chief of Pittsburgh Police Department and Elizabeth Township, PA Police Department; and

**Charles H. Ramsey**, Commissioner of the Philadelphia Police Department.
Workshop Keynote Speakers

George L. Kelling, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus at Rutgers University and Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute. Topic: *Changing Nature of Policing – Emergence of “Hot Buttons”*

Scott L. Greenwood, J.D., Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Lawyer and Principal Attorney at Greenwood & Streicher, LLC. Topic: *Community Perspective/Transparency of Agency*

William J. Bratton, Commissioner for the City of New York Police Department. Topic: *Executive Leadership*
Mentoring Assignments - SME and the City He/she Mentored with Technical Assistance

Rachel M. Burgess: Shreveport, LA;

Ronald A. Davis: Orange, NJ;

Wayne S. Fisher, Ph.D.: Orange, NJ (after Chief Ron Davis could no longer continue with the Initiative);

Colonel Joseph R. Fuentes: Fresno, CA;

Charles A. Gruber: Hollywood, FL;

Robert McNeilly: Vineland, NJ; and

Charles H. Ramsey: Atlantic City, NJ.
General Information
At the time of the 2010 United States Census, there were 39,558 persons residing in Atlantic City. The racial makeup of the city was 27 percent white, 38 percent black or African American, 30 percent Hispanics or Latinos of any race, and 15.5 percent Asian. Donald A. Guardian, the current mayor of Atlantic City was sworn in on January 1, 2014. Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A: 14-118, the Mayor serves as the “appropriate authority.” Atlantic City Police Department’s Police Chief Henry White was sworn in on December 5, 2013, replacing retired Police Chief Ernest Jubilee. The city is also served by the Director of Public Safety, William Glass. The Atlantic City Policing Department employs 283 sworn officers and 63 civilian staff. The police department is responsible for responding to more than 150,000 calls per year.

On August 21, 2014, Atlantic City officers started wearing on body cameras.

Excellence In Policing Specific Information
Atlantic City brought the following individuals to the Excellence In Policing Workshop from March 19-21, 2013, at the MetLife Stadium in East Rutherford, NJ: William R. Glass, Police Director; Henry White, Deputy Chief; Ron Cash, Business Administrator; and Thomas Gilbert, District Commander.

On April 3, 2013, during the first peer-to-peer exchange conference call following the Workshop itself, Atlantic City preliminarily identified the areas upon which it would like to focus in the technical assistance phase of the project as follows:

1) Internal Affairs (IA), particularly accountability and controls; and

2) Use of force, particularly the “pre-Complaint” phase, especially on demeanor and use of force complaints.

On the April 16, 2013 group conference call, Atlantic City stated that it wanted to add revamping their early warning system as a focus area.

Atlantic City then submitted its statement on areas of focus, which included the following:

1) Atlantic City would like to improve the accuracy and completeness of the data collected on motor vehicle stops;

2) Atlantic City would like ensure that its two recently purchased systems, the CAD/RMS System and the AIM system, interface properly with each other; and

3) Atlantic City would like to develop an early warning system for use of force complaints and all internal affairs complaints.

On September 18, 2013, the Advisory Group assigned Commissioner Charles Ramsey to be Atlantic City’s Subject Matter Expert. The Atlantic City Police Department sent a group of its
staff to spend the day with Commissioner Ramsey and his staff on November 27, 2013. By April 30, 2014, Atlantic City had started providing Tasers to its officers, as well as created new policies for both canine use and use of Tasers. Its officers had been trained on both policies. Atlantic City started using body cameras in August of 2014. It has created its own policy on use of body cameras and does not intend to submit it the Attorney General’s office, as it is not required to by law.

Atlantic City was in the process of procuring a new CAD/RMS system. It had allotted $3.5 million for this new system. Atlantic City maintained its early intervention system manually. When an officer reaches the threshold of three complaints, an IA officer reviews the complaints and sets up an intervention with the subject officer.

On September 4, 2014, Linda Tartaglia and Deb Knapp of the Police Institute, Sgt. Michael Malloy of the New Jersey State Police (NJSP), and Commissioner Ramsey and Deputy Commissioner Joyce of the Philadelphia Police Department all traveled to Atlantic City NJ to meet with Mayor Don Guardian and Atlantic City Police Chief Henry White and members of his command staff. At that meeting, Chief White stated that the Department had completely revamped its Internal Affairs Department with new personnel working it.

The Chief stated that the greatest difference to come from Atlantic City’s EIP involvement was that the Department had formerly been divided into three divisions and that now it was divided into four:

1) Internal Affairs;
2) Inspections and Compliance;
3) Accreditation; and
4) Professional Standards.

Chief White stated that he had gotten the idea for a fourth Division from Philadelphia’s PD. He believed it was important to hold supervisors as well as police officers accountable for their actions.

Additionally, the Atlantic City PD wrote its own on body camera policy because the New Jersey Attorney General has not yet disseminated any guidelines on the topic. Commissioner Ramsey commented that he liked the policy so much that he was going to use it for his own department. Atlantic City mentioned that it had been working closely with the Office of the Attorney General and that the Attorney General was considering using Atlantic City’s on body camera policy as its model policy.

Commissioner Ramsey also made a number of observations on his work with Atlantic City. They included:
1. Police officers in general are not good report writers as they often do not articulate the reasonable suspicion that formed the grounds for a motor vehicle stop on the report itself. Therefore, the Department needs to have a strong auditing component on report write ups to ensure that constitutional requirements are met.

2. The early intervention polices were good, but Atlantic City needed to give supervisors specialized training, including monitoring.

3. The Taser policy was good. The PD needs to treat a Taser shot the same as a gunshot and take the individual hit with the Taser to the hospital every time. There should be a 5 second recycle built into the gun.

4. The canine policy should recommend that a Canine Supervisor be present when the canine unit is called upon, which would result in better quality canine interaction for all. The Chief recommended that Atlantic City look for patterns in its canine cases, in order to identify those areas that need training.

5. Commissioner Ramsey also recommended that Atlantic City have their officers role play how to de-escalate a situation. In general, he felt that police officers do not receive enough training in this area. He mentioned how in Philadelphia his officers were working with social workers who work with the homeless to learn how to de-escalate in those interactions.
Excellence In Policing: Fresno, CA Case Study

General Information
Fresno is the fifth largest city in California. Fresno has a population of 494,665; 49 percent of the population is white, 46 percent are of Hispanic descent, 23 percent are of other races, 12 percent are of Asian descent, and 8 percent are black. In 2008, Ashley Swearengin was elected mayor of Fresno, California. The Fresno Police Department consists of three districts; the police department has 708 sworn officers and 406 non-sworn personnel. Since August 2001, the Chief of Police is Jerry Dyer.

Excellence In Policing Specific Information
Fresno, CA brought the following individuals to the Excellence In Policing Workshop from March 19-21, 2013, at the MetLife Stadium in East Rutherford, NJ: Jerry Dyer, Chief; Keith Foster, Deputy Chief; Lt. Dennis Montejano, Internal Affairs and Larry Donaldson, Legal Advisor.

On April 3, 2013, during the first peer-to-peer exchange conference call following the Workshop itself, Fresno preliminarily identified the areas upon which it would like to focus in the technical assistance phase of the project as follows:

1) Use of force, supervisory review; and
2) Data collection, demographics and technology with regard to use of force.

On the April 16, 2013 group conference call, Fresno, CA, gave the following update: once it started reviewing the data collection more closely, Fresno Command realized there was a technology loop that permitted officers to circumvent the system. That loop has since been eliminated. With regard to motor vehicle stops, Fresno will be employing an “e-Ticket” system. Fresno was also considering using on body cameras, which it felt would be less expensive than motor vehicle recorders for its patrols.

Fresno then submitted its written statement of the areas upon which it wanted to focus, which included:

1) Two concerns arising from motor vehicle or traffic stops:
   a. Fresno would like to improve the accuracy and completeness of the data collected on motor vehicle stops, and
   b. Fresno would like to improve the consistency of the handling of complaints of bias coming out of the motor vehicle stops; and
2) Fresno would like assistance in analyzing both its improvements to its policies and its officer training relating to officer involved shootings.

While not formally identified in its municipality statement, Fresno would like data analysis assistance on its motor vehicle impoundments.
On September 18, 2013, the Advisory Group assigned Colonel Rick Fuentes, Superintendent of the New Jersey State Police to be Fresno’s Subject Matter Expert. On September 30, 2013, the Advisory Group conducted a conference call asking each of the municipalities’ subject matter experts to report on his or her respective municipality’s progress.

Colonel Fuentes said the following about Fresno:

1) Fresno had articulated issues with its early intervention system. They collect data but are not sure of its accuracy and beyond that they are not subjecting the data to any great analysis and so it needs to put it in context;

2) There may be an opportunity for the institution to help out with the system Fresno uses for data collection; and

3) Fresno lacks a risk management team. They do not really analyze for trends – good behavior or misbehavior before it becomes systemic – they should look at the squad level.

The Colonel indicated he has experience with these issues and was looking forward to talking with Fresno. He believed a conversation with Chief Dyer would be helpful to narrow area down to something more able to provide assistance and that MAPPS would be most level of experience and helpful. Anything else may require asking other SMEs for urban based protocols for things they are dealing with.

In December, 2013, the NJSP, led by Colonel Fuentes, had an extended conversation with Chief Dyer and members of his Command Staff, as well as members of the Police Institute. During that conversation, Colonel Fuentes asked Chief Dyer whether he was open to starting a risk management system. The Colonel invited Chief Dyer to come to a quarterly NJSP Risk Assessment Core Group meeting – observe the meeting and how the data is analyzed. The Colonel felt that having the Fresno staff come to New Jersey would make the most efficient use of money and providing technical assistance.

On June 18, 2014, Deputy Chief Keith Foster and Lt. Dennis Montejano (in charge of Fresno’s Internal Affairs Department) travelled to New Jersey to meet with NJSP. Chief Dyer originally intended to come, but had to meet with the City Council and was therefore unable to do so. The first meeting Fresno held was with Lt. Mike Zimmerman. Lt. Zimmerman discussed the NJSP policy on traffic stops pertaining to recording the race, ethnicity and gender of drivers, searching of vehicles and their required documentation for vehicle searches, as well as the parameters for the notification of supervisors and the process for receiving and investigating citizen complaints resulting from traffic stops.

On June 19, 2014, Chief Foster and Lt. Montejano met with Lt. Dave Dragotto, the coordinator of the NJSP Management Awareness and Personnel Performance System (MAPPS). The MAPPS is the NJSP management, accountability and supervision process which insures supervisors and commanders are aware of performance issues pertaining to their employees. The performance information is contained in an encrypted database and reviewed weekly by individual commanders and supervisors and collectively each quarter at a Risk Assessment Core
Group meeting (RACG). Fresno attended the RACG meeting, chaired by Lt. John Villamil, and attended by the executive staff officers and the various bureau commanders. The RACG meeting is also attended by members of the New Jersey State Office of Law Enforcement Professional Standards.

After the RACG meeting, Fresno PD returned to Lt. Dragotto’s office to discuss with him how agencies can utilize and benefit from an early alert system that is accessed by line-level supervisors and middle managers. They also collectively assessed the many strategies that the FPD were already utilizing (i.e., establishing community advisory boards to discuss perceptions, meeting with individuals who have specific complaints and engaging in public service announcements). Finally, Fresno also visited the NJSP training academy, and met with Captain Julian Castellanos and discussed critical training pertaining to traffic stops and strategies to reduce Officer Involved Shooting (OIS) incidents.

Finally, it was collectively determined that this visit to New Jersey would serve as the final site visit and that the New Jersey State Police would not travel to Fresno, CA. The officers who had been working with Fresno will continue to do so when asked by Fresno PD to provide support.
Excellence In Policing: Hollywood, FL Case Study

General Information
Hollywood, Florida, is the 12th largest city in Florida, with a population of 140,768. Approximately 48 percent of Hollywood residents are white (not Hispanic or Latino), 33 percent are Hispanic or Latino, and 17 percent are black. The City Commission is the legislative body that governs Hollywood, FL. As set by the City Charter, the City Commission is comprised of the Mayor and six Commissioners. The Mayor is elected at large, and each of the six Commissioners is elected from a single geographic district. Chief Frank G. Fernandez has served as the head of the HPD since August 13, 2013. Vince Affanato served as interim chief after Chief Wagner retired on January 25, 2013. The department employs 493 individuals, 330 sworn officers and 163 civilian personnel. The police chief is appointed to his or her position.

Excellence In Policing Specific Information
Hollywood, FL brought the following individuals to the Excellence In Policing Workshop from March 19-21, 2013, at the MetLife Stadium in East Rutherford, NJ: Frank Fernandez, then Assistant City Manager; Vincent Affanato, Interim Chief of Police; Richard Blattner, Vice-Mayor; Scott Pardon, Major Hollywood Police Department; and Norris Redding, Major Hollywood Police Department. On April 3, 2013, during the first peer-to-peer exchange conference call following the Workshop itself, Hollywood preliminarily identified the areas upon which it would like to focus in the technical assistance phase of the project as follows:

1) Transparency and accountability with the community;

2) Bias based profiling and the need to look at the data collection issue, how and what to collect and then how to use the date, interpret it, etc., and review the civilian complaint process; and

3) Sergeant and Lieutenant career development to include the topics addressed in the training, and succession planning.

On the April 16, 2013 group conference call, Hollywood, FL stated that in addition to the data collection issue, it would like to continue to ensure bias-free policing.

Hollywood then sent in its statement of areas of focus, which included:

1) Internal affairs – citizen intake process, specifically making that process more transparent;

2) Hollywood would like to develop a training program for newly promoted Sergeants on its Field Training Officer (FTO) Program; and

3) Hollywood would like to develop a more comprehensive policy on preventing bias based policing that is also more transparent to the public.

On September 18, 2013, the Advisory Group assigned Charles Gruber to serve as Hollywood, FL’s Subject Matter Expert. On September 30, 2013, the Advisory Group conducted a
conference call asking each of the municipalities’ subject matter experts to report on his or her respective municipality’s progress. Charles Gruber said the following about Hollywood:

1) Citizen Complaint policies and procedures were an issue within the larger issue of the entire internal affairs process. Does it have a chilling effect on citizenry?

2) Hollywood does not have a bias based policing policy and wants to make it transparent; and

3) Hollywood wanted to develop field training officer program. Charles Gruber said he has everything Hollywood PD needed to put it together. Hollywood needed to write good policy and then get people trained. It would take 1 ½ to 2 years to get it started. Hollywood needed a good set of documents to get them going.

Hollywood uses FL Policeman’s Bill of Rights that Gruber had to familiarize himself with. Finally, Hollywood would soon have a new police chief. (Note: Chief Frank G. Fernandez actually took over as Hollywood Police Chief on August 13, 2013; although Chief Affanato did not officially retire until December 31, 2013.)

On October 7, 2013, Charles Gruber forwarded to Chief Fernandez a number of DOJ publications on EWS systems with emphasis on supervisors’ responsibilities. Gruber felt the Chief would find these publications useful, since this is a piece of the Citizen Complaint Process, Biased Based Policing and Internal Affairs. The documents were:


2. Supervision and Intervention within Early Intervention Systems: A Guide for Law Enforcement Chief Executives


On November 11, 2013, Gruber shared the following article, written by Edmund Brown, M.S., with Hollywood as well: How Police Leaders Can Boost Their Brain Excellence for Leading Innovation.

Since working with Charles Gruber, Hollywood focused almost exclusively on rewriting its Internal Affairs policy the current SOP #104 and rewriting the Department Rules and Regulations, a draft of which, dated April 14, 2014, was forwarded to The Police Institute on May 21, 2014. Additionally, Chief Fernandez moved the IA Unit to a neutral location – it is now at the previous headquarters location with clear signage. Also, the complaint form is readily available on the PD website, as well as hard copies that are readily available at all governmental buildings.

Hollywood PD command staff, in conjunction with its SME, Charles Gruber, and members of the Police Institute, decided it would be more beneficial to have Hollywood come up to New Jersey to have its new Internal Affairs and Use of Force policies reviewed by “a second set of
eyes,” as Charles Gruber put it. Accordingly, on October 2, 2014, Wayne Fisher and Deb Knapp of the Police Institute, conducted a day long discussion centered on the new policies with Hollywood, FL PD Command Staff Chief Frank Fernandez, Majors Thea Basler and Christopher O’Brien, and Commissioner William Blattner.

**Recommendations and Comments from Wayne Fisher**

1) All the Internal Affairs and use of Force policies should be public documents and posted on the PD website

2) The word “totality” needs to be defined and added to the definition section of any policy in which it is used

3) The focus of Internal Affairs should be to keep officers out of trouble, not to get them out of trouble once they are in it

4) Hollywood PD should visualize the discipline on Internal Affairs matters as a “wheel” with selection of discipline based on what the situation dictates rather than an ascending continuum

5) NJDCJ.org – the New Jersey website that has the guidelines and directives for Internal Affairs and Procedures from the New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice.

**October 3, 2014 – New Jersey State Police Visit**

On October 3, 2014, the Hollywood PD Command Staff spent the day with State troopers from the Professional Standards and MAPPS divisions. Among their recommendations:

1) Have a complaint/compliment card available in all police cars and in public buildings readily accessible for citizens; and

2) A periodic comprehensive review of the Internal Affairs Department’s essential functions is necessary to maintain the highest standards of performance.

**New Development: Hollywood Supervisor Academy**

Hollywood PD has created a brand new supervisor management training facility. It took over the entire second floor of the Police Department facility and has training on management, HR, tabletop exercises, and role playing on critical incident training. The Chief has also developed “In Basket” training asking academy participants to fill out certain forms used in policing and those documents are then evaluated. The participant does not “graduate” from the Academy until he or she receives a satisfactory grade on all of those items. The Academy has been very well received by the Hollywood PD officers and Chief Fernandez is looking to expand its use beyond his own department.
Excellence In Policing: Orange, NJ Case Study

General Information
The City of Orange is located in northern New Jersey in Essex County. In 2010, it had a population of 30,134 persons. Orange’s population was 72 percent African American and 22 Hispanic or Latino (of any race), and 13 percent white. An estimated 18 percent of Orange residents live below the poverty line. Dwayne Warren is currently the mayor of Orange, NJ. In 2012, the Orange Police Department employed 109 sworn officers and 18 civilian personnel. It is headed by Police Director Hakim Simms.

Excellence In Policing Specific Information
Orange, NJ, brought the following individuals to the Excellence In Policing Workshop from March 19-21, 2013, at the MetLife Stadium in East Rutherford, NJ: Mayor Dwayne Warren, Police Director Hakim Simms, and Police Deputy Director Todd Warren.

On April 3, 2013, during the first peer-to-peer exchange conference call following the Workshop itself, Orange preliminarily identified the areas upon which it would like to focus in the technical assistance phase of the project as follows:

1) The Orange Police Department has indicated an interest in a new computer-aided dispatch system;
2) A citywide CCTV camera system;
3) A reconfigured personnel structure; and
4) A desire to work with external law enforcement agencies.

Orange then submitted its statement on areas of focus, which included:

1) Reviewing its policies on Use of Force;
2) Reviewing its policies on Internal Affairs; and
3) Reviewing its policies on pedestrian and vehicle stops.

On September 18, 2013, the Advisory Group assigned Ron Davis, Chief of East Palo Alto Police Department, as the Subject Matter Expert for Orange. On September 30, 2013, the Advisory Group conducted a conference call asking each of the municipalities’ subject matter experts to report on his or her respective municipality’s progress. Chief Davis said the following about Orange:

1) Chief Davis stated that Orange identified three areas that they wish to focus on:
   a. Pedestrian stops;
   b. Use of force, (concern on training: how do you get the rank and file to know the policy and not just for promotion exam); and
c. Collection of data.

2) Rutgers would get Chief Davis copies of the New Jersey Attorney General’s guidelines on the relevant subject matter areas.

3) Orange had not developed policies on those areas. Challenge guidelines, protocols, but only time the officers seem to learn it for promotion exams.

4) Implementation of guidelines – policy itself must be consistent with Attorney General’s guidelines, training and then investigation of complaints, trends and patterns, linked to other aspects of organizational behavior – not just an isolated area.

5) Chief Davis felt a phone call with the police director would be very helpful to clarify what he has in mind and to identify a plan and next steps to help and not to undermine him.

In November 2013, Chief Davis was named Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office) of the U.S. Department of Justice and was forced to withdraw from the Excellence In Policing Initiative. After receiving the approval of the Advisory Group, Wayne S. Fisher, Ph.D., was asked to serve in the role of Subject Matter Expert for Orange, NJ. Dr. Fisher reviewed all the policies that Orange had previously provided and met with Orange PD Command Staff on May 14, 2014, where he made the following recommendations:

1. Targeted short message reinforcements of training on both the pedestrian and motor vehicle stop policies are recommended. Focus targeted short messages discreet important point from either a policy or standard operating procedure. Several refresher messages should be built into the department on all topics. Methods could include: roll call, email, two times per year refreshers. This type of targeted message training is not appropriate for every topic. It IS appropriate for those topics where officers have to be aware what the policy is and how important compliance with this policy is to the department. One topic that is not appropriate for targeted messaging training is Use of Force training.

2. The Director should have periodic meetings with ALL Supervisory Staff; even with Orange’s concern about not wanting to pay overtime. The Supervisory staff needs to see it and hear it directly from the Director.

3. The Director should have regularly scheduled meetings with the head of the bargaining units.

4. The Director should have the Internal Affairs department provide him with written monthly summaries on all open cases. In addition, Orange PD should have an Internal Affairs training session.
5. An independent Orange PD website should be built. Orange PD did not have a website; it had a link within the City of Orange website. It consisted of two pages that detail the biography of the Director and Deputy Director. It was indicated that Orange had recently employed a new web master and that he apparently had taken down the Orange PD independent website and folded it into the City’s website. Both the Director and the Deputy Director were unaware of the change.

On July 18, 2014, the Subject Matter Expert Dr. Fisher conducted an Internal Affairs training session for the command staff of the Orange PD. In addition to the training, Dr. Fisher recommended to the officers that anything written by Garrity or Weingarten would provide helpful information for police officer conducted interviews. On September 30, 2014, Dr. Fisher, Deputy Director Todd Warren and Mayor Dwayne Warren, met to discuss Orange’s progress with its Excellence In Policing goals. Dr. Fisher reiterated that he thought the policies were generally well written and emphasized that the Department needs to use multiple messages to reinforce those points that are particularly important for the police officers to remember.
Excellence in Policing: Shreveport, LA Case Study

General Information
Shreveport is a city in Louisiana with a population of approximately 200,300. Its residents are 42.5 percent white, 50 percent black or African American, and 6.5 percent of the population was Hispanic or Latino of any race. Shreveport is governed by a Mayor, and a City Council. The Mayor appoints the Chief of Police and other heads of city departments with the approval of the Council. The current Chief of Police is Willie Shaw, appointed in 2010. The Shreveport Police Department in 2012 employed 661 personnel of which 548 were sworn officers.

Excellence In Policing Specific Information
Shreveport, LA, brought the following individuals to the Excellence in Policing Workshop from March 19-21, 2013, at the MetLife Stadium in East Rutherford. NJ: Mayor Cedric Glover, Chief of Police Willie L. Shaw, Jr., and Chief Executive Assistant William Goodin. (Note: The position of Chief Executive Assistant is filled by a sworn officer and serves as the assistant to the Chief and the Deputy Chief under the Shreveport system.)

On April 3, 2013, during the first peer-to-peer exchange conference call following the Workshop itself, Shreveport preliminarily identified data collection as the primary area upon which it would like to focus in the technical assistance phase of the project. On the April 16, 2013 group conference call, Shreveport, LA, gave the following update: the Chief was greatly concerned about the early intervention process and was particularly interested in creating a way to see that the same individuals do not keep coming before Internal Affairs review, as well as supervisory training for Sergeants, including leadership development.

Shreveport then submitted its statement on areas of focus which included:

1. Its Early Intervention System – specifically, assistance in determining whether the data is being analyzed in an appropriate, helpful manner; and,

2. Extending recently implemented first line officer training.

On September 18, 2013, the Advisory Group assigned Rachel Burgess to serve as the Subject Matter Expert for Shreveport, LA. On September 30, 2013, the Advisory Group conducted a conference call asking each of the municipalities’ subject matter experts to report on his or her respective municipality’s progress.

Rachel Burgess said the following about Shreveport’s two primary issues:

1. Early intervention system: Shreveport had the IA TRAK system with a corresponding comprehensive policy. Shreveport’s issue was that it had officers who do not seem to be concerned about reaching the threshold on a regular basis. Rachel Burgess needed more information from the Chief. She indicated that the department had a good system but asked if the system being followed or does it lack sufficient consequences. She was also concerned with whether supervisors would have sufficient training on follow through; and,
2. Shreveport had developed training for first line officers (which is 8 PowerPoint presentations that are fairly comprehensive) but it wanted to extend training to upper levels of department.

Burgess determined she would submit questions to Shreveport in advance of initial conversation. Burgess submitted the questions on October 22, 2013, which were forwarded to Shreveport on October 23, 2013. On May 1, 2014, Shreveport’s Bill Goodin forwarded Shreveport’s responses to those questions to the Police Institute and Rachel Burgess.

On July 10, 2014, Linda Tartaglia had a telephone conversation with Chief Willie Shaw of the Shreveport PD to ensure that Rachel Burgess had received the above responses to her questions as well as any supporting documentation. On July 25, 2014, Bill Goodin, the Chief Executive Administrative Assistant for the Shreveport Police Department, emailed the Police Institute and Rachel Burgess and forwarded the revised Early Intervention System policy as well as information related to Shreveport’s updated supervisor training. Additionally, Goodwin suggested that Rachel Burgess and Deb Knapp come to Shreveport for the final site visit in early September, 2014.

On September 9, 2014, Deb Knapp of the Police Institute and Rachel Burgess traveled to Shreveport for the final site visit. Shreveport Executive Administrative Assistant Bill Goodin accompanied Burgess and Knapp throughout their visit, which included: an in depth tour of the department, meeting with the heads of Internal Affairs and Training, Lt. Gayle McFarland and Assistant Chief Wayne Smith, respectively; a private meeting with Mayor Cedric Glover; and participating in a City Council meeting. Burgess then prepared her final report with specific recommendations which she then forwarded to both the Advisory Group as well as to Shreveport directly. Her recommendations included the following:

Early Intervention system:

1. The department should provide community outreach and education regarding complaints or commendations about the performance of any employee. There should be no costs to the public, hardships or perceived intimidations associated with filing complaints.

2. There should be a temporary change in the threshold that will capture five to six percent of the population. (Since the threshold level is confidential and determined by the Chief Shaw, this may get the attention of those who don’t seem to be interested in remediation). This may also increase the involvement of the sergeants who have primary responsibility for the coaching and supervision of the officers. It will also give them the opportunity to practice the skills they learned in the Supervisory Training school.

3. The department should consider forming a committee to oversee and review the progress of persons who are in the intervention process, preferably including a person knowledgeable about the resources that are available.
Commander training:

1. Chief Shaw assigned Assistant Chief of Police Wayne E. Smith as the director of the training academy and he has been tasked with developing the new Command Management Academy. He was provided with the Management Training Curriculum from the New Jersey State Police to aid in the development. On the upcoming schedule is a presentation from Jack E. Enter, PhD on Leadership Training for Law Enforcement and a four hour block of the target curriculum plus on-line training from Louisiana State University by October 14, 2014. Burgess found Assistant Chief Smith to be knowledgeable and committed to his task and recommended that he continue with his plan to expand the training to all the ranks.
**Excellence In Policing: Vineland, NJ Case Study**

**General Information**
In 2010 the City of Vineland, NJ, had a population of 60,724 persons. The residents were 67 percent white, 14 percent black or African American, and Hispanics or Latinos of any race were 38 percent of the population. Vineland is run by Mayor Ruben Bermudez, and the City Council. Police Chief Timothy Codispoti was appointed in 2006. In 2011 (the most recent year for which statistics are available) the Vineland Police Department had 142 sworn officers and 26 civilian employees. Vineland’s “appointing authority” is the Director of Public Safety, as confirmed by municipal ordinance approved on August 26, 2014.

**Excellence In Policing Specific Information**
Vineland, NJ, brought the following individuals to the Excellence In Policing Workshop from March 19-21, 2013, at the MetLife Stadium in East Rutherford, NJ: Chief Timothy Codispoti, Captain Thomas Ulrich, and Mayor Ruben Bermudez.

On April 3, 2013, during the first peer-to-peer exchange conference call following the Workshop itself, Vineland preliminarily identified the areas upon which it would like to focus in the technical assistance phase of the project on areas such as data collection and race demographics. Additionally, Vineland was moving to accreditation with assistance from the Rogers group. Vineland looked into training options for distance learning, so as to duplicate in-person in-service for makeup and reinforcement, including topics such as:

1. How to measure output mastery and retention and how to measure understanding of polices in the field by officers post training;
2. Community engagement; and,
3. Analysis of data, including technical assistance from the New Jersey State Police on early warning and data analysis, as well as motor vehicle stop data analysis, specifically learning what is measured and how to use it.

On the April 16, 2013 group conference call, Vineland, NJ, gave the following update: Vineland would need some technical assistance, e.g. what does the data really mean in terms of their geographical area? Vineland captured data it had not previously recorded including data on professional standards and constitutional policing for accreditation. Moving up on equating transparency to protect the officers by showing the public what they are doing. Vineland was also waiting for IA PRO and DMX software to come in. Additionally, it made structure changes to uniform patrol.

Vineland then submitted its statement on areas of focus, which included:

1) Proper analysis of data collected during motor vehicle stops;
2) Developing an early warning system in the framework of Internal Affairs; and
3) Engaging the community and showing transparency.

On September 18, 2013, the Advisory Group assigned Chief Robert McNeilly as Vineland’s Subject Matter Expert. In addition to telling Chief McNeilly of this assignment, the Advisory Group forwarded Vineland’s statement, the Executive Summary Statement, the materials submitted by Vineland and the Summary of Materials Submitted based upon those materials. On a January 2, 2014 conference call with Vineland, Chief McNeilly and the Rutgers Police Institute, when speaking about tracking and analyzing data in connection with an early warning system, Chief McNeilly suggested that Vineland needs to do more than track data. There are other tools that should be used, for example Vineland may have to monitor an individual, that is, have a supervisor appear during a traffic stop. Also, Vineland should make use of counseling and training. Chief McNeilly also recommended one meeting a quarter – “IA CompStat” – comparing numbers to see if there are any explanations for numbers out of the norm, e.g.: high minority population. Vineland then asked Chief McNeilly to forward the categories he recommended Vineland use in connection with its data collection, which Chief McNeilly did on January 4, 2014.

On April 4, 2014, Vineland PD implemented its new Early Warning System. Vineland command staff reported that all supervisors were issued the policy and have signed for it through their Directive Management System. IA PRO is the early warning software that Vineland chose. The Internal Affairs Section has received both onsite and offsite training on the system. Vineland also related its use of social media to keep the community informed of its actions.

Vineland’s PD leadership felt that the department’s efforts to improve its early warning system would be better served by a subject matter expert that had specifically New Jersey experience. Therefore, at Vineland’s request, on July 22, 2014, the Attorney General of New Jersey’s Office of Law Enforcement Professional Standards (OLEPS) sent three individuals to meet with Vineland’s Internal Affairs Unit.

On September 10, 2014, OLEPS provided Vineland with an additional day of training on how to maximize the usefulness and efficiency of IA PRO when used by the Vineland Internal Affairs Department.
Exemplar for Police Departments to Move to Excellence through Self-Assessment

Introduction: This document presents the essential steps a police department should take when seeking to move to excellence through self-assessment.

1. **Literature Scan**: Review resources that articulate the current challenges facing law enforcement today such as: the Interim Report of the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing (http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/taskforce/interim_tf_report.pdf), materials available on the resource center of the Community Oriented Policing Services website (http://www.cops.usdoj.gov), various professional publications available on such websites as the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) (www.policeforum.org), the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) (www.theiacp.org) the National Security Agency (NSA) (www.nsa.gov) and the Police Foundation (www.policefoundation.org) and determine the recommendations and ideas for policing agencies to improve their business practices and achieve excellence status especially in areas involving the interactions between the police and the community.

2. **Academic Partner**: Identify an academic institution that can provide support, technical assistance, mentoring and objective feedback for this process.

3. **Environmental Scan**: Conduct an internal scan of the police department, city government and the community to identify areas where the interaction between the public and the police department might be improved. Use a variety of techniques including interviews with community leaders, reviews of police department performance data, compliments or complaints from the public, interviews or surveys from a cross section of the citizens including youth, minority members, seniors, employers, and students, etc. Review police press coverage, legal actions, Freedom of Information Act requests, discussions at community meetings, City Council meetings etc. to identify areas that additional attention might be warranted.

4. **Test the idea**: After reviewing the information gathered in step three create a sounding board of a few members of the Department and community to focus the specific area/s for attention.

5. **Police Leadership team**: Identify the leadership team that will be committed to the "change process." Have a candid discussion about the problem identification process, the risks and challenges that might be involved; and the potential rewards of improving the relationships with the community in the area selected. The team should include the Executive Sponsor internally, the Police Chief or Director, the PD change agent (whoever that person may be in the particular city), Deputy Chief, the PD Chief of Staff or Chief Executive Assistance and the Officer in charge of training. Start to think who should be external members of the team including the Mayor, Business Administrator, or community leaders.

6. **Problem Analysis**: Conduct further issue analysis with the Police Leadership team identified in step 5 above, to ensure that you have identified the core underlying issues that need to be addressed and not simply the outward manifestations of the issue.

7. **Best Practices**: Conduct a search of best practices that other police departments have used to address the search for excellence in the area selected. Check on state guidelines, CALEA (Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies – www.calea.org) standards, POST (Peace Officer Standards and Training – see, e.g., www.post.ca.gov) requirements and
other reference material to establish the base line. Review websites, University research and other sources for evidence-based examples for change and excellence in this area.

8. **Critical Path:** Agree to the statement of the issue to be address and a methodology to approach the search for excellence, create a critical path that identifies the training, resources, policy, technology and other elements that will be needed to achieve excellence in this area.

9. **Police Leadership Team Recommitment:** Having identified the issue, the methodology, the challenges and potential distractions, reaffirm the commitment of the team to move forward.

10. **Identify and Secure the Commitment of the Executive Branch members of the Team:** Meet with the Mayor and Business Administrator (or whomever serves as the fiscal change agent) to explain the focus area selected, the methodology chosen to address it, and the benefits of following the outlined course of action in order to secure their commitment to the process. In government agencies elections and other turnover can present challenges for continuity of leadership. The Executive Sponsor must be aware of the need to periodically reaffirm the mission and commitment to achieving excellence.

11. **Communications Plan:** Start to communicate with all stakeholders the scope, mission and perceived outcomes. Explain risks and methods to reduce risk.

12. **Technical Assistance:** Seek outside training, mentoring and technical assistance. Attend a course that shares the evidence-based results of other similar implementations or seek a visit out another department who has successfully achieved excellence in this area. Explore University or professional association assistance in this area.

13. **Validation:** Select an outside consultant who is knowledgeable on the self-selected focus area and can bring other viewpoints and suggestions to the table. Review the process to date with the consultant and have him/her validate the outcomes or make suggestions for mid-course corrections. If the consultant suggests changes to the issue or approach share the changes and reasoning with the team.

14. **Implementation:** Implement change by following critical path, ensure the team meets regularly to chart the progress, evaluate policy, and suggest modifications if needed and communicate progress to other stakeholders.

15. **Feedback:** Poll members of the department for feedback and to insure the change is understood and adopted by all members.

16. **Reporting out:** Document outcomes, finalize policy and training for the future and share measures of excellence. Publish results.