Working Group 2

Draft Recommendations re Community Policing

1. Law enforcement agencies should adopt community policing as an agency-wide philosophy. Adopting this philosophy requires agencies to work with neighborhood residents to co-produce public safety, including jointly identifying problems and collaborating on solutions.
	* Staff note: The text of this recommendation was adapted in part from one adopted in St. Paul, Minnesota, and suggested by Mr. Wells: <https://www.stpaul.gov/departments/police/21st-century-policing-report/recommendation/report-recommendation-45>
	* Temperature-taking survey results: Mean response 4.57, comments were few and positive.
2. Agencies should develop community policing plans in collaboration with the communities they serve. This requires identifying and cultivating trusted~~, credible~~ liaisons between the community and law enforcement and meeting regularly with those liaisons and other community members.
	* Temperature-taking survey results: Mean response 4.14. Comments focused on the difficulty of defining “trusted” and “credible.” One comment suggested deleting “credible” and noted that the draft does not specify whether agencies or the community determines credibility.
	* Note re changes: Removed “credible.” “Trusted” seems to capture the meaning adequately with less controversy.
3. The North Carolina Justice Academy should develop training for law enforcement agency heads that focuses on community policing and make that training widely available throughout the state.
	* Staff note: The Justice Academy currently offers a class and a certificate in community policing, and will be offering this fall a new leadership academy that will include several days of content about community policing. Mr. Pettigrew will be one of the instructors for that course, which is for law enforcement leaders including but not limited to agency heads.
	* Temperature-taking survey results: Mean response 4.28. Two comments focused on access – ensuring that the course is offered across the state and that there is an incentive for agency heads to attend. One stated that the training could reinforce current problematic policies.
	* Note re changes: Added access provision in response to comments.
4. Agencies should encourage or require officers to spend non-enforcement time in the neighborhoods they serve. This may include officers coaching sports teams, doing community service projects, or simply engaging in conversation with residents. Proving more non-directed time to officers may require changes to officer scheduling.
	* Temperature-taking survey results: Mean response 4.57, comments were few and positive.
5. Law enforcement agencies should consider providing financial incentives, such as housing subsidies, to encourage officers to live in the communities they serve.
	* Temperature-taking survey results: Mean response 4.14, comments noted that some jurisdictions provide incentives already, and that affordable housing is a larger issue.
6. When law enforcement agencies make mistakes that impact the community, they should publicly acknowledge the mistakes as a way of building trust and transparency.
	* Temperature-taking survey results: Mean response 4.28. One comment suggested acknowledging past mistakes as well. Two comments noted that the timing of any acknowledgement may be difficult when facts are uncertain or investigations are ongoing.
7. Law enforcement agencies should support, financially and otherwise, grassroots organizations that help communities provide public safety for themselves.
	* Temperature-taking survey results: Mean response 3.43. Several comments raised questions about how this would work in practice and what oversight would exist. One comment stated that this is not the role of law enforcement and that entrusting public safety to private organizations reduces accountability. One comment stated that city, county, and state funding should be allocated to community groups as well.