

68-31




REPORT ON A
CONFERENCE ON POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS
HELD JUNE 19 - 21, 1967

PREPARED FOR THE
OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

NCJ501149

University Research Corporation
Washington, D. C.



REPORT ON A
CONFERENCE ON POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS
HELD JUNE 19 - 21, 1967

PREPARED FOR THE
OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

By:

Arnold S. Trebach
and
Richardson White, Jr.
University Research Corporation
1424 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

February, 1968

Preface

This report tells what happened at a conference on police-community relations held in June, 1967. It contains many suggestions on how to deal with police-citizen problems. The report also contains insights on the process of a training conference itself.

We have attempted to provide a portrait of the field of police-community relations within the context of a conference, rather than a black-and-white photograph. This is a report on the subject, not a set of conference proceedings. In the process of writing the report, of drawing the portrait, we have emphasized some points, de-emphasized others, criticized, and approved. Some of the criticism is directed at our own work, for we feel a professional responsibility to report our shortcomings so that we, and others, may do better next time. Criticism was also directed at others. We trust they share our professional approach in this regard.

All opinions expressed here are our own and we bear full responsibility for them. We welcome the comments of all those who read this report. They will be most helpful for the future.

We wish to express our thanks to the many persons who helped us in the conference and in the preparation of this report. Paul Estaver, our principal contact person and the project officer for OLEA, provided valuable guidance and assistance. Daniel Skoler, Associate Director, and Patrick Murphy, Assistant Director, OLEA, made major inputs of their talent and time. Lucia Hatch, of the URC staff, exercised her organizing skills in handling many of the arrangements for setting up the conference facilities and in editing this report.

Our thanks also go to the Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, which prepared a bibliography of police-community relations materials, which was distributed at the conference.

Arnold S. Trebach, LL.B., Ph.D.
President
University Research Corporation
Conference Chairman

Richardson White, Jr., M.S., LL.B
Legal Staff Associate
University Research Corporation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
II. Preparation	
A. Pre-Conference Surveys	5
B. Composition of the Agenda	8
C. Preparation of the Evaluation Design and Instruments	11
D. Physical Accomodations	12
E. Participants	12
III. Conference Proceedings	
A. Morning Session - June 19 th	14
B. Afternoon Session - June 19 th	21
C. Morning Session - June 20 th	28
D. Afternoon Session - June 20 th	35
E. Morning Session - June 21 st	41
F. Afternoon Session - June 21 st	47
IV. Evaluation	
A. Introduction	52
B. Topics Covered During the Conference	53
C. Emphasis Given Conference Topics	59
D. Effectiveness of Training Methods	61
E. Facilities	66
V. Recommendations for Future Conferences	
A. Pre-Selected Topics	67
B. Presentation of Pre-Selected Topics	69
C. Topics Selected by the Conferees	70
D. Organization of the Conference	71
E. Conference Goals	72

VI. Attachments

- A. Agenda Questionnaire
- B. Biographical Questionnaire
- C. Conference Agenda
- D. Police-Community Relations Conference Survey
- E. Evaluation of Conference - Resource Personnel
- F. Participants
- G. Federal Grant and Technical Assistance Programs
Available to Police
- H. Preliminary Evaluation of Questionnaires
Evaluating the Police-Community Relations
Conference

REPORT ON A CONFERENCE ON POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

The National Crime Commission reported that the problem of police relations with the community, particularly the community residing in the inner city slums, is as serious as any which the police face today.¹ Earlier the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice, recognized the imperative need to acquire greater knowledge and understanding of the problems which have alienated law enforcement agencies from the citizens whom they serve and to promote police capacity to deal effectively with them. OLEA therefore has supported research and demonstration projects to develop new methods for improving police and community relations. Many police departments, however, lack even the rudiments of a program for coping with citizen distrust and hostility. These include departments responsible for law enforcement in urban ghettos and slums where antipathy toward the police is greatest. Indicative of the degree to which many of these police forces are out of touch with their communities is their failure to establish community relations units or even to have assigned personnel part-time to develop communication with the community. In order to aid police agencies to lay the ground work for effective community relations programs, the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance established a special police-community relations development program. Under

¹The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office (1967), p. 99 (hereinafter cited as The National Crime Commission Report).

this program grants of up to \$15,000 are awarded to police departments in metropolitan areas with populations of 150,000 or more, to plan police-community relations projects. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, approximately thirty departments had received such planning grants.

Although aware of the need to better their relations with their communities, the recipients of these grants possessed little formal experience in developing or operating police-community relations programs. Nor were most either familiar with, or accustomed to, using sources of technical assistance and consultation outside of their department which could facilitate the planning process. OLEA therefore contracted with University Research Corporation to sponsor a training conference on police-community relations to be attended by representatives of the grantee-agencies and various resource personnel. The conference was scheduled for late spring -- June 19-21, 1967 -- shortly after the last of the grants was expected to have been awarded and before any of the projects had been in operation for a substantial period. Five objectives were sought:

1. To provide the grantees with basic information concerning police-community relations, including major issues, possible goals of community relations programs, various alternative means of attaining such goals, and problems likely to be encountered;
2. To provide a forum in which the police and civilian representatives of the grantees could use one another and outside consultants as resource people;

3. To create an awareness among the conferees of the advantages of working with one another on a common problem such as police-community relations;
4. To offer new insights into relevant aspects of human behavior, including police perceptions of the police role, and into problems associated with social change germane to police work; and
5. To suggest alternative strategies for setting up police-community relations units.

The remainder of this report describes the preparations which were made to achieve the conference's objectives and summarizes the principal topics and issues which were discussed. It concludes with an appraisal of the conference and offers recommendations for future action.

II. PREPARATION

A. Pre-Conference Surveys.

A major element in setting up the conference consisted of an analysis of the relevant needs and characteristics of the grantee departments and of their expectations regarding the context and structure of the conference. It was anticipated that the information thus obtained would make it possible to develop an agenda which emphasized topics known to be of prime interest to most of the conferees. Subjects to which they were indifferent or antagonistic could be omitted or introduced more judiciously than would

otherwise be possible. Similarly, training methods which might be objectionable could be avoided. It also was hoped that by involving the participants in planning the conference, their interest in it, and commitment to making it a success, would be enhanced. Moreover, it was thought that the information would be useful in instructing the resource people not only in the particular issues to be covered but in the level of abstraction to use in their remarks.

The pre-conference information was collected in three ways: questionnaires were sent to all of the OLEA grantee-agencies invited to send representatives to the conference;² URC staff made field visits to five of the grantees; and officials of OLEA and others experienced in police-community relations training were consulted.

Two questionnaires were used. One of these, the Agenda Questionnaire,³ sought the invitees' views with regard to both the subject matter areas to be covered at the conference and the methods to be used in presenting material. In order to encourage responses, only seven questions were asked. The second instrument, identified as the Biographical Questionnaire,⁴ requested such information as age, rank, educational attainments and the like. If the grantee department planned to send two representatives, both were requested to complete the form. Civilian representatives were asked to give comparable information.

²These consisted of twenty-nine police departments and four non-police agencies which had received planning grants, and one department and two non-police agencies which had been awarded police-community relations action-project grants.

³See Attachment A.

⁴See Attachment B.

The Biographical Questionnaire results were limited by the fact that only about one-third of the persons expected to attend returned completed copies. Those which were returned suggested that the participants varied widely in age, rank and education. They confirmed the assumption that none had been assigned officially to community relations work prior to the grant. Several had attended police-community relations seminars, however.

Eighteen, or nearly two-thirds, of the departments which had received planning grants returned completed Agenda Questionnaires. The responses varied greatly in length and detail, and the nature and function of police relations with the community were perceived quite differently in some cases. On the other hand, several patterns emerged. Virtually every respondent, for example, regarded improving communications between police and the community to be an important problem deserving discussion. This concern frequently was expressed as how best to explain the police position, but others saw the problem in terms of facilitating understanding on the part of the police as well as the community. Unorganized, riot-prone youths were seen as being particularly difficult to engage in meaningful communication by several. There tended to be agreement on the relevance of other problems as well. For example, a number suggested that it would be useful to discuss how to cope with the hostility or indifference of command or other personnel toward community relations work. In-service training was the most common solution recommended. Nearly all replied affirmatively to the question whether federal grant programs available to police and the techniques of "grantsmanship" should be reviewed.

Some seemingly significant issues were not mentioned, however. Although all but one of the grants to police departments technically were for planning community relations projects, for example, the process of planning was not proposed as a topic for discussion. Neither were the methods and problems involved in project evaluation. None suggested that police corruption, brutality and other abuses were relevant to the conference. When asked to describe programs which they considered successful, none of the departments indicated that they had modified their recruitment criteria, promotion or assignment policies, field interrogation techniques, or arrest practices as means of increasing public confidence and support.⁵

However, because most of the projects had only recently started, few had either successful experiences or major problems to report. A number did list methods which they were starting or believed would be effective. Lectures to school children, creation of community councils, and lock-your-car and other public safety campaigns were among the techniques considered to be promising.

With respect to recommended training methods to be used at the conference, nearly all of the respondents favored small group discussions and many indicated that lectures and films would be useful. Over-lengthy lectures and role play were disapproved by several.

⁵For an examination of the relationship of such matters to police relations with minority groups and urban slum residents, see The National Crime Commission Report, Chapter 4, and the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force on the Police, Task Force Report: The Police, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office (1967), Chapter 6.

URC staff also visited five departments which had received planning grants.⁶ These departments were identified by the OLEA as being reasonably representative of the spectrum of problems and approaches to their solution exhibited by the grantees. The visits tended to confirm the results of the Agenda Questionnaire survey. The community relations personnel in all five departments, for example, indicated that they spend the bulk of their time contacting various neighborhood councils, civic groups, businessmen's associations, minority group leaders and other influential persons to learn about citizen grievances, explain their department's position and where feasible, to assist in resolving them. Although the departments varied widely in the degree of concern exhibited, all expressed doubts about whether they were reaching the people most angry with the police. They were uncertain whether they were in contact with the real leaders of the ghetto populations, and in two cases acknowledged failure in this regard. Unorganized teenagers and young adults were described as being particularly difficult to deal with. Although the officers in two of the community relations units stated that they had the full support of the chief and the cooperation of the rank and file, the others admitted to some feeling of isolation and impotence within their own departments. The latter were eager to learn what other police-community relations units were doing to educate their departments to the importance of increased support for the police on the part of minority groups.

All the police-community relations personnel interviewed thought that the conference participants should have ample opportunity to discuss their common problems with one another and urged the use of small workshops

⁶ Reports on these visits are submitted to OLEA under separate cover.

for this purpose. Movies, tape recordings and talks by experts were also suggested as useful supplementary techniques.

The results of the site visits and the surveys were discussed with the staff of the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance and consultants to URC skilled in police-community relations work. These discussions were helpful both in evaluating the validity and representativeness of the information which had been collected and in interpreting its application to the goals of the conference. They also led to suggestions for resource people to be used during the conference.

B. Composition of the Agenda.

The topics selected for the agenda⁷ conformed closely to those identified in the Agenda Questionnaire survey and site visits as being of major interest to the grantee departments. Subject matter areas covered in half-day sessions included relations between the police-community relations unit and other elements of the department; the organization and operation of police-community relations training; and the identification of, and effective contact with, key groups and individuals in the community.

The development and evaluation of programs for hard-to-reach troublesome youth also was assigned a half-day on the agenda. Although the grantees had not indicated any special interest in program planning and evaluation, it was felt that this was due more to their lack of familiarity than to indifference or unwillingness to have these topics discussed. Because of their relevance to

⁷See Attachment C.

the objectives of the OLEA planning grant, it was decided to include them on the agenda. Youth programs, a subject of known concern for many of the grantees, was selected as the context for their examination. Other subjects were allocated less than full half-day sessions. These included the OLEA police-community relations program, goals and strategies of police-community relations programs, sources of federal funds available to police, and the art of "grantsmanship."

In addition to determining the agenda topics it was necessary to decide how the topics could be presented. The pre-conference surveys suggested that the grantee representatives favored small group discussions, talks and films.⁸ A combination of two of these techniques, small group meetings and lectures, promised to permit a balance between the competing goals of exposing the conferees to the thinking of knowledgeable and thoughtful resource people on the one hand, and of enabling them to learn from one another while working on common problems and sharing their experiences on the other. It was decided, therefore, that the basic organizational format of the conference would have three components. One would be plenary sessions at which one or two resource persons would each speak for about five to ten minutes to introduce the topic and then lead the ensuing general discussion. Second, following each such plenary session the conferees would divide into workshops. The third element would consist of relatively brief sessions at which the workshops reported their findings and conclusions to the full conference.

Four workshop groups, each consisting of about twelve members, were established. Assigned to each workshop

⁸A suitable film was sought but could not be obtained.

were eight to ten grantee representatives, one or two resource persons, and one URC or OLEA staff member. To encourage familiarity and informality the members were requested to meet as a group throughout the conference. Although it was expected that the workshops would continue to explore the topic opened up during the preceding plenary session, it was left to each group to determine the subject matter to be discussed. As will be reported below, several of the workshops occasionally returned to problems raised in their prior meetings instead of addressing issues developed in the immediately preceding plenary session. In order to encourage the active participation of the most experienced officers present, the chiefs and other high-ranking officials were asked to chair the meetings of the workshops to which they were assigned. They also were responsible for selecting one of their workshop members to report the groups' conclusions to the full conference.

The format of introductory lectures and general discussions at plenary sessions followed by workshops and workshop reports to the conference was followed throughout most of the conference. However, during the first morning of introductory statements, and again during the third afternoon when federal funding programs and techniques for preparing grant applications were described, it was replaced by relatively formal presentations followed by questions and answers. The Attorney General also appeared and spoke briefly to the conference late in the afternoon of the second day. Other minor departures from the agenda occurred as the result of changes requested by the conferees.

A device used to promote informality, flexibility, and participant involvement was the scheduling of an open

forum during one evening. During this session the floor was open to all present to raise whatever subject they felt to be worthy of discussion. Drinks at half price were available. Similarly, in order to enable the grantee representatives, the staff of URC and OLEA, and the resource people to become acquainted under congenial circumstances a reception was held on the evening preceeding the first working session. The reception was given at the home of the Conference Chairman, Dr. Arnold Trebach.

C. Preparation of the Evaluation Design and Instruments.

An elaborate assessment of the results of the conference was not attempted. However, in order to obtain some systematic, if incomplete, understanding of the conference's accomplishments and shortcomings, two types of data were collected. One of these consisted of the responses of the grantee representatives to brief paper-and-pencil questionnaires administered at the beginning of the first working session and again at the close of the final session.⁹ These questionnaires sought to determine the extent and direction of change in the participants' perceptions of the topics covered during the conference, whether and what they had learned during the conference, which sessions they felt were most productive, and what suggestions they had for improving the conference. Lack of time and funds did not permit either pre-testing of the instruments used or extensive analysis of the findings.

The second method used to assess the impact of the conference was to tap the opinions of the resource people. A questionnaire was prepared as a guide to their responses,¹⁰

⁹See Attachment D.

¹⁰See Attachment E.

but they were not required to confine their remarks to the topics listed. While the results of this poll are not susceptible to systematic analysis, they offer insights not available through the objective tests administered to the grantee representatives. They also provide a relatively impartial assessment through which to filter the impressions of URC staff.

D. Physical Accomodations.

The conference was held at a mid-town hotel in Washington, D.C. The police officials and civilian employees representing the grantee departments together with the out-of-town resource people were housed at the same hotel. It was hoped that this arrangement not only would facilitate starting the sessions on time, but also would promote informal contacts among the conference participants.

The plenary sessions were conducted in a large room in which the conferees were seated at tables arranged in the shape of a rectangle. This space was separated by a moveable partition from a second large room which was used as a dining area and as a location for one of the four workshop groups. The other workshops met in smaller rooms nearby.

E. Participants.

Two of the departments which had received planning grants were unable to send representatives because of sudden emergencies. Seven departments sent two delegates, the expenses of the second representative being borne by his department. The Metropolitan Police Department of Washington, D.C., which does not have a police-community relations grant, sent an officer to several sessions of

the confernce. Representation from a police department and from two non-police agencies which had received action-project grants also were present.

Twenty-nine police officials and five civilians representing twenty-eight departments attended. These included two chiefs and one director of public safety, eleven with the rank of deputy chief, inspector, major or captain, eleven lieutenants and four sergeants or corporals. Thus, most of the departments were represented by middle to upper echelon officials. One of the twenty-eight departments sent both a police officer and a civilian, and five other departments were represented by civilian employees only. Five non-police agencies, such as human rights commissions, sent a total of seven representatives. Altogether, therefore, twenty-eight police forces and five non-police agencies were represented by twenty-nine police officers and twelve civilians.¹¹

Conference staff included five full-time and eight part-time resource people. Two of the consultants were police chiefs and a third was a lieutenant and one had retired from his department with the rank of captain. Three officials of the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance attended the conference, one of whom was present at all times. Three URC staff were on hand throughout and two others were present for portions of the conference. Conference staff, therefore, totalled twenty-one as compared with forty-four persons representing grantee departments and agencies.

¹¹See Attachment F for a list of participants.

IV. CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

A. Morning Session - June 19th

Introduction and Welcome

Arnold S. Trebach, President
University Research Corporation

The chairman opened the conference by welcoming the participants. He noted that the conference had been organized with the help and advice of the conferees and explained that the agenda topics had been selected as the result of a pre-conference survey and field visits to five departments. He emphasized that the conference was to be an informal, working meeting, and stated that the program could be modified if the participants so desired. A description of the procedures which would be followed during the plenary sessions, workshops and other portions of the conference concluded his remarks.

Welcome

Daniel Skoler, Associate Director
Office of Law Enforcement Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice

Mr. Skoler asserted that problems of police-citizen relations are among the most critical facing law enforcement during this decade and indicated that they constituted an area of prime concern to the Department of Justice. The Office of Law Enforcement Assistance has awarded a number of grants to facilitate the development of better techniques for dealing with these problems. As the participants here are aware, these grants include those to support the planning of community relations programs in major cities throughout the country.

A responsible federal program, he noted, does not simply give out funds and then absolve itself of responsibility for the effective use of that money. Instead, it attempts to the maximum extent feasible to aid its grantees to achieve their projects' objectives. In keeping with its continuing obligation, OLEA sponsored this conference to give the recipients of police-community relations planning grants an opportunity to become familiar with each others' problems, to exchange ideas and to hear the suggestions of knowledgeable persons in the field.

Police-Community Relations Program of the Office
of Law Enforcement Assistance

Paul E. Estaver, Dissemination Officer
Office of Law Enforcement Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice

Attempting to cope with police-community relations problems is not only challenging but frustrating, Mr. Estaver observed, because they must be dealt with largely on a pragmatic rather than theoretical basis. The field is so new that there are few successful precedents to follow. Another complicating factor is that police-community relations is a game without winners. Unlike baseball, on which most Americans were raised, no one wins and no one loses. Instead, the best one can achieve is greater mutual understanding and cooperation.

Despite obstacles such as these, police must develop the competence needed to deal with the difficult problems of community relations. Moreover, this competence must be generated internally within the department rather than by bringing in people from the outside to do the work. If this is done it will contribute to the professionalization of the police field. For this reason OLEA generally has awarded police-community relations grants to police departments rather than to human rights commissions and other such agencies.

The conference will provide an opportunity to acquire greater understanding of the issues in police-community relations and of various approaches to their resolution. Mr. Estaver closed by urging the conferees to participate actively in all its sessions.

Plenary Session: Goals and Strategies of Police-Community Relations Programs

Patrick V. Murphy, Assistant Director
Office of Law Enforcement Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice

Determining the goals and strategies for a police-community relations program, Mr. Murphy pointed out, requires the same basic approach as is needed to cope with most problems confronting the police. We must find out what we really want to know. Only if we raise the right questions will the answers come.

One publication which raises many of the right questions is the National Crime Commission's Report. It is extremely critical of our law enforcement system. But by identifying and scrutinizing the many basic problems in the police field, it does a great service to the police. It demonstrates that an individual police officer's daily decisions are as demanding in judgment and skill as those made by any professional. It therefore supports the proposition that law enforcement should be a profession. The police officer, for example, should be educated at the college level and provided with proper training. He should be able to move up by transferring to a higher position in another department instead of having to wait for openings in his own department. Also, there should be a constant flow of ideas between police forces in different cities and police should be able to visit other departments throughout the country.

But today these are not happening. The police world is a closed one with little communication within it. We are isolated and defensive. We constantly point out how the community fails to support us, fails to provide sufficient funds, and fails to cooperate in enforcing the law. All this must change. Just as the Crime Commission asked many of the right questions, so must we.

In dealing with the community, we also must learn to look at things differently, to ask the right questions. Although no city has an ideal police-community relations program, many cities are working on the problem. We must look at each one for ideas. In examining these programs, we should recognize that their goals are likely to differ depending on the problems within the particular city. Among the possible goals of a community relations program are: preventing riots; keeping the peace; helping the community police itself; improving communication with the community, particularly those members who are poor, unemployed or delinquent; converting the chief to the need for a strong police-community relations program; converting other officers within the department to this new way of thinking; and converting the mayor, the city council and other sources of power in the community.

In any event, we must learn to look at ourselves and our problems afresh, and to realize that the word today is change, change, change.

General Discussion: Goals and Strategies of Police-Community Relations Programs

Several of the issues which were raised in the ensuing discussion cropped up again during other sessions of the conference.

1. Do we know what the ideal police-community relations

program is? The conferees responded to this question in two different but related ways. One response was that we do not know what an ideal police-community relations operation is any more than we can say what an ideal law enforcement system is. It was suggested that policing a democratic society is too new for an ideal pattern to have emerged. However, in a democracy the police should help the community police itself. Police-community relations, therefore, are the essence of law enforcement in our society and the recent recognition of their significance constitutes an emerging awareness of what law enforcement should be. At present, of course, police are not only ineffective in helping people police themselves, but are frequently influenced by political and corrupt forces within the community.

Other conferees suggested that while we may not know what the ideal police-community relations program is, we do have some ideas of what it is not. The police-community relations unit, for example, should not operate in isolation from the rest of the department, nor should it attempt to build an empire for itself. One participant indicated that his unit attempted to avoid these dangers by functioning as program development staff instead of an operations staff. It finds out what the problems on the street are, devises a program to deal with them and then plugs the new program into the department's operations. Other conferees pointed out, however, that to function in this manner it is necessary to have the full cooperation of the chief and other top officials. For them, the problem of isolation is the absence of support from the command levels in their department. It was asserted that only when they have succeeded in converting the brass to the idea of a police-community relations unit will they be able to influence the rest of the department.

2. What are the goals of police-community relations? Related to the question of whether the ideal police-community relations program is known is the issue of what such a program's goal or goals should be. The representative of one department with relatively extensive experience in police-community relations indicated that his unit's aim was to have people understand the problems of their police. It was objected that selling the police point of view is too limited an objective, and that police-community relations is a two-way street. Not only should the community better understand the difficulties police encounter, but the police should be more aware of citizens' problems and grievances. Another participant re-phrased the goal first asserted: we must get people to give their cooperation. The response again was that before people will give their cooperation, the police must learn what their problems are. If you are willing to sit and listen, you'll learn how to get their support. But if you start with the assumption that everyone must obey the law before being listened to, you'll tend to lecture rather than listen.

Tension reduction was suggested as a possible goal. Some objected that easing tensions is not enough, while another participant asserted that it may well be an essential short range goal of police-community relations efforts. For example, forestalling a possible riot is a legitimate aim of a police-community relations program even though other long range goals also may be appropriate. Police-community relations programs thus have multiple rather than single aims. In addition to variation over time, such program objectives are likely to vary with the needs and problems of the particular community, it also was pointed out.

While acknowledging the need for plural goals, a resource person suggested that an overall goal for law enforcement

should be greater integration into the affairs of the community. The police should be so much a part of their community that they become its weathervane, pointing to solutions to general community concerns. In particular, they should explain to the taxpayers that crime cannot be reduced significantly unless they are willing to reduce poverty, unemployment, bad housing and similar conditions causing crime. He acknowledged that this goal is not currently accepted by police. This qualification was emphasized by a police officer who then stated that the police goal is the reduction of crime.

3. What is "the community" -- how do you "reach" it -- and why do you reach it? While there was general agreement that a police-community relations program should establish contact with the community, there was some disagreement as to which groups and individuals in the community were meant by "the community." One participant, describing his program, stated that members of the clergy, political leaders, shopkeepers and other such persons were the ones sought to be involved in meetings with the police. Finding people sympathetic to the police is not a problem, it was added. Another conferee observed that involving traditional leadership of the type described was not enough, and that his program attempts to enlist the support of beauty culture associations, barbers' unions and similar groups which tend to exercise greater influence over people who are hostile toward the police. It was pointed out that the police often find themselves enforcing middle class mores rather than the law, and tend to be dominated by business interests at the expense of the poor, minority groups and other less influential segments of the community. Thus, although the police may be in contact with the sources of economic and political power in the community, it was suggested that

these contacts may tend to isolate them from the very groups and individuals where cooperation in law enforcement is most needed.

Assuming that contact has been made, however, and that the object is to help them police themselves, what does this mean? One answer given was that if police need witnesses, pressure can be applied through citizens' groups to bring the witnesses to the police. Another participant suggested, however, that attempting to generate pressure to inform is ultimately self-defeating, since it tends to undermine the leadership of those in sympathy with the police over those who are hostile toward the police.

B. Afternoon Session - June 19th

Plenary Session: Relations Between Police-Community Relations Unit and the Police Department

Resource Person: Chief William Smith
Police Department, Syracuse, New York

Resource Person: Professor Raymond T. Galvin
School of Police Administration
Michigan State University

Chief Smith opened the session with a brief statement. He pointed out that to be effective, the philosophy of police-community relations must pervade the entire department from top to bottom. The chief, command officers, detectives, patrolmen, all must be convinced of the importance of police-community relations objectives. Training and planning are two areas where it is crucial for the police-community relations unit to operate. Training may require convincing the chief as well as instructing the men on the street, but there are no easy answers to how this can be done. With

respect to planning, it is essential to discover the community's needs. This will necessitate citizens' coming to you, or if that doesn't work, you must go out to them. In Syracuse, the police department made contact with the people by publicizing a procedure for registering complaints against its officers.

A participant described a program which his city, Chicago, had introduced to receive complaints from persons dissatisfied with police service. Another conferee suggested, however, that a police-community relations unit should be problem-oriented rather than complaint-oriented. That is, it should deal with general issues in police relations with the citizenry rather than the specific grievances concerning individual officers. The representative of another department was of the opinion that it was useful to have the police-community relations unit receive complaints, but not be responsible for investigating them since this would be likely to jeopardize the unit's standing with other members of the department.

Professor Galvin spoke next. He observed that the issue for discussion is not relations between the police-community relations unit and the department. A department may not have a police-community relations unit. It may only assign a man half-time to police-community relations work, for example. Instead, the issue is relations between police-community relations functions and other functions of the department. A police department, of course, has many functions in addition to developing and maintaining citizen support. Crime detection and suppression, for example, are functions which most police regard as their basic responsibilities, even though traffic control, licensing, inspection and other regulatory activities generally consume a far greater proportion of their time. All these other functions, however, are commonly perceived as more central to law enforcement than are community

relations. A major goal of the police-community relations unit, therefore, must be to establish goals, identify problems, and devise procedures and policy to deal with them which will enable the department to foster public cooperation and understanding while at the same time implementing its other functions. In short, as Chief Smith also pointed out, planning must be one technique of the police-community relations unit.

In addition, the police-community relations unit must be involved in training. All department personnel must be trained to handle community relations problems and to recognize their importance. The staff of the police-community relations unit itself must be trained in the application of the science of human relations. Also, of course, the chief has to be sold on the value of police-community relations. Only if this can be accomplished will the unit be able to influence departmental policy and procedure. Field practices and personnel management such as recruitment criteria, promotional standards, and assignments should reflect considerations of police-community relations.

These inter-related functions of planning and training mean that the unit should operate in a staff rather than line capacity. Execution of plans developed by the unit should be the responsibility of the entire department.

In closing, Professor Galvin noted that police-community relations units can expect to experience difficulties in attaining their objectives. One of the most serious will be role conflict. Every unit visited in the course of conducting a study for the National Crime Commission was found to be troubled by the conflicting responsibilities of building trust on the one hand and enforcing the law on the other. In one case, for example, an officer confesses that when he attended meetings in the community he could not avoid looking for needle-scarred arms and dilated pupils. Should he as a police officer close

his eyes to evidence of law violation? This conflict in roles is not confined to police-community relations units but is a problem for all police. They also must develop trust and support within the community. The solution is not to give up the law enforcement role but to temper it with an awareness of the need to take a long-range point of view. Ignoring the needlemarks, for example, may lead to greater community confidence and cooperation and to a greater willingness on the part of people to report crimes, act as witnesses and otherwise aid law enforcement.

General Discussion: Relations Between the Police-Community Relations Unit and the Department

A number of suggestions for strengthening a community relations unit's relationship with its department were made during the general discussion. It was recommended, for example, that the officer in charge of the unit should be of relatively high rank, such as captain. This will enhance the chances of the unit's programs being carried out and increase the respect given the men in the unit by the other officers in the department. Another participant stated that he and the man in his unit spend a lot of time in the squad room in informal contact with the line officers. "In this way they come to know and respect us as individuals and this carries over into their attitudes toward our work," he pointed out. Several departments make a point of inviting patrolmen, sergeants and higher officials to attend meetings with citizens' groups. In one department this is official policy, actively endorsed by the chief.

Recruit and in-service training in police-community relations is practiced by several of the departments represented at the conference. One or two, for example, indicated that all ranks get this kind of training. Other departments implied

that their training program was more limited. One officer, for example, said that he and his men frequently attend roll calls to explain his program and alert the patrolmen to community problems.

The question of how training in community relations should be conducted was raised. One police officer stated that you can't train effectively in the academy but must move the classroom into the ghetto. "You've got to show the men how to talk to the people who are tough to reach -- not the ministers, but the kids with the marcelled hair." A conferee reported that a department, not represented at the conference, had attempted such a program but without success. Another conferee stated that you can't scuttle 100 percent of your training and go into the streets. Others expressed interest in the approach but questioned whether it could be made to work.

A resource person observed that there is little official inducement for police officers to practice good community relations. The failure to recognize such activity combined with the fact that the officer who has a record of good "pinches" or who hands out a lot of traffic citations is rewarded, tends to downgrade the duty to develop good relations with the public. It was urged that departments add community relations to the list of activities which are officially regarded as important, and to discourage the traditional distinction between crime prevention and building good relations with the community. Winston Salem and Chicago police departments are reported to be doing this.

One other technique for increasing support for the police-community relations unit was offered: a conferee stated that his unit plans to publish a newspaper to report on its activities, relevant policy developments in the department, problems in the community, and similar matters. Instead of distributing

it to the men while on the job, it will be mailed to their homes so that their families also will become better informed. The effectiveness of this method was questioned.

The discussion of methods for improving the influence of the police-community relations unit within its department led to a re-examination of how to reach the community. The representative from St. Louis described the assignment of police-community relations staff to multi-service centers located throughout the inner city. Police-community relations officers meet regularly with area residents at these centers. A resource person added that the opportunity to discuss one's problems with a sympathetic listener is helpful and that in his experience police can be effective in this role. Several participants disagreed. They argued that "just going to listen to people tell you their troubles doesn't do any good. You must be able to help them solve their problems. Although they may listen for awhile, if the department doesn't respond they find out and get disgusted." In New Haven the police department is a member of an inter-agency council which coordinates the city's social services. The police refer citizens with problems beyond the capacity of the police to the appropriate agency represented on the council.

A resource person criticized all the methods mentioned. He pointed out that the concern shown by police-community relations officers is seldom representative of the entire department, with the result that their efforts usually are rendered worthless. Only if the chief is committed to the idea of police-community relations and has the full support of his department will a community relations unit be able to operate effectively.

Workshop Reports: Relations Between the Police-
Community Relations Unit and the Department

Workshop No. 1 reported that it had several recommendations to offer. First, police-community relations units should be given full divisional status. The formation of youth or juvenile divisions in many departments is a relevant precedent because the officers assigned to this kind of work experience many of the same problems within their departments as do community relations officers. Second, officers who reduce tension in the community should be rewarded. Possible incentives are policeman-of-the-year awards, salary increases, and promotions. One difficulty, however, is the problem of how to measure tension reduction. One possible device with which Rice University is experimenting is periodic social surveys. The workshop also recommended that in-service and recruit training courses in community relations be given. It also suggested that the training units and the community relations units be combined so as to eliminate competition.

Workshop No. 2 reported that its members presented a wide spectrum of viewpoints and that it had focused more on identifying problems than in working out methods for reducing them. One difficulty police-community relations units have, for example, is demonstrating their effectiveness. "With departments as shorthanded as they are, how can you justify going out and shaking hands? On the other hand, how do you measure the cost of not trying to achieve better relations with the community?" Another problem is how to instruct patrolmen. "They think it's a lot of social work. How do you overcome this attitude?"

The third workshop reported that police departments tend to go through three developmental stages with regard to their dealings with the public. During stage one they tell the citizen to mind his own business and get out; in stage two

they manipulate the truth; and in the third stage they try to do right and tell it openly. To get to stage three, police must bring in better educated people, must recruit minority group members and promote them, must get police-community relations training down to the officer on the beat, and must contact the youth who cause most of the trouble.

Workshop No. 4 had several suggestions for improving the effectiveness of a police-community relations program. It recommended hiring and training teenagers to conduct lock-your-car and similar public safety campaigns. It also reported a successful summer camp program for slum children in which the children were encouraged to make their own rules and run the camp so far as possible. The workshop recommended that police-community relations units accept and refer complaints, but indicated that its members were divided on the issues of whether the unit should process complaints against police officers. It noted, finally, that the wholehearted support of the command is needed before a community relations program can succeed.

C. Morning Session - June 20th

Plenary Session: Organization and Operation of
Police-Community Relations Training

Resource Person: Drexel Sprecher
Leadership Resources, Inc.

Resource Person: Professor Frank Cizon
Director of Research, School of Social Work
Loyola University

Professor Cizon opened by pointing out that training may be directed to three major groups: the police-community relations personnel, the other officers in the department, or the community. What strategies you use in conducting the training, such as how often it is given, the direction of

each session, the length of the training, who the trainers are, and so forth, will vary depending on the group being trained.

Mr. Sprecher suggested another consideration to be kept in mind when conducting a training program. "People do not like being forced into something. They do not like having their noses rubbed in it. When you bring together members of two minority groups like the police and Negroes, for example, they generally feel coerced into the situation and tend to turn off their hearing." "This conference itself has some elements of manipulation despite its official overlay of democratic process," he observed. "People are more likely to listen and learn if they've had a hand in deciding what's to be taught." He illustrated the point by requesting the participants to form into groups of three members each. All of the groups were asked to answer two questions: What is the most difficult problem in police-community relations work; and what is the most successful experience you've had in this connection? The groups were given 5-6 minutes to come up with their answers. Mr. Sprecher then called on every group in turn to tell him its answers. As each group gave its responses he wrote them down on a large sheet of paper, which he then hung on the wall. Both he and Professor Cizon provided brief clarifying commentary on the groups' replies. Most of the groups responded to the second question by suggesting conditions needed to insure success rather than by giving successful experiences.

Group No. 1. Problem: the belief of other officers in the department that police-community relations makes a social worker out of a cop. Success: an incident in which a group of Negroes had willingly and constructively discussed their grievances with the police.

Group No. 2. Problem: the image which police officers have of themselves as being apart from the community. Success: a high-ranking police officer who doesn't just delegate responsibility.

for handling community relations problems but meets with community leaders himself.

Group No. 3. Problem: resistance to police-community relations training by most officers. Success: placing a recruit under the supervision of a good field officer.

Group No. 4. Problem: police-community relations program was forced on the department by outside pressure. Success: when a police-community relations unit takes a realistic view of the department's expectations.

Group No. 5. Problem: veteran officers are particularly resistant to change, and all of the officers are suspicious of non-police trainers. Success: when there is a core of men in the department who vigorously support the police-community relations program.

Other problems mentioned by the groups included the following:

1. Hostility of police academy trainers;
2. Lack of experience and absence of suitable training materials;
3. Negative attitude of the officer toward any kind of training which is required;
4. Difficulty in defining areas of responsibility of police and community representatives in police-community relations training;
5. Tendency of people in general as well as police officers to relate the significance of a problem to the funds budgeted for a program to deal with it.

Among the other suggestions for a successful program were the following:

1. Train recruits in psychology and sociology;
2. Use attitude scales to survey the public's attitudes on various matters;
3. Involve all officers in the department in police-community relations training;
4. Use group sessions to allow police officers to discuss problems within the department;
5. Have the police-community relations unit use good public relations techniques, such as are employed by the F.B.I., to improve the image of the policemen..

After the reports were completed, Professor Cizon led the discussion. He pointed out that a training program must take account of individual differences among the trainees, the particular needs of the department which the training program in intended to meet, and the level and areas of competence of the trainers. Thus, every training program should be unique to at least some degree, because what is effective in one situation may not be in another. "You cannot plug into your department a training program that was used elsewhere, no matter how successful it may have been. Every program must be geared to meet your needs."

With respect to the program's trainees, for example, it is important to determine which of the men have negative attitudes, the content of these attitudes, the reasons for them, how they may be changed, and so forth. In Professor Cizon's experience, the proportion of hostile trainees is usually about 15-25 percent of the group. However, they often seem

to be in greater strength because they tend to make a disproportionate amount of noise. Generally about the same proportion of the group is very interested in community relations, while the remaining 50-60 percent fall somewhere between these extremes. While it sometimes is possible to change the attitudes of the hostile, authoritarian members of the class, Professor Cizon has found that they generally are more authoritarian after the program than before. It may be better strategy, therefore, to concentrate on persuading the large, uncommitted group than struggling with the authoritarian types. Although the latter can be troublesome in the program, their destructive influence tends to dwindle as the group gradually becomes dissatisfied with them.

It is also important to take into account the training capacity of your department. The training unit may just be starting and lack experienced trainers; it may be under-financed or short of staff; it may be allowed too little time to do an effective training job. "In short, don't take a program which someone else has developed and apply it blindly in your department. The chances are that it will need modifying to fit your needs."

Also to be avoided is the "spotty" or "crash" training program developed in response to a crisis. While this type of program may help handle an immediate problem, it is an unsatisfactory approach for the long run. Training, and the development of training programs, should be on a routine, continuous footing. Moreover, it is useful to develop a comprehensive training plan which provides appropriate training for every rank in the department. This is the model developed by industry.

Professor Cizon noted that resistance to training is a common problem. No matter how excellent the training program may be, if the trainees are unwilling to accept it, it will fail. He requested suggestions for overcoming resistance. One conferee

suggested an attitude survey of the department to find out what the men had complaints about. Another recommended that training be entirely voluntary so that only those who requested it would be trained. Such a procedure, it was observed, would result in the training of those men who least need it. Moreover, it would tend to isolate the advocates of police-community relations from their peers and thus diminish support in the rank and file where it is weak to begin with. Payment as an incentive was suggested. One officer stated that his department not only pays its men to train but through an arrangement with a local university enables them to obtain college credit for certain courses.

It was suggested that resistance to police-community relations training would be reduced if the department was totally committed to strengthening its relations with the public. In this case, training merely becomes one expression of a policy which is implemented in various other areas of the department's activities. One would expect minimal resistance under these circumstances.

Another recommendation was to involve the officers who were to be trained in the planning of the training program. The tactic has been found to be effective in the District of Columbia police force where the training department selected two white officers known to be hostile and two officers from the police-community relations unit. The question was raised whether this would undermine the structure of authority.

Also suggested was that an officer with the highest possible rank be assigned to head up the police-community relations training. It was interjected, however, that it might be wiser to find an officer who could do the job most effectively. For example, he might be an officer who is highly respected as an individual apart from his rank, or someone who is not about to retire. (Not clear at this point was whether the head of the

community relations unit or of its training program was in issue.) It was added that his rank should be appropriate to his responsibilities and comparable to the rank of officers in charge of comparable units. Whatever his rank, one participant suggested, he should report directly to the chief.

The discussion returned to the question of how to overcome resistance among the men to police-community relations training. Four possible methods of getting them into such a program were offered. The first is on-the-job training. That is, part of their regular duties the officers are assigned to attend training. They get paid their regular wages and work their usual hours. Because it takes men from their regular assignments, on-the-job training is often avoided by departments which are short of staff. The second is to train the men during overtime and compensate them with additional leave. This method may be unpopular if the officers have second jobs or are unable to use their compensatory leave when they want it. A variant of this is to pay them for the extra hours they are required to put into training. Fourth, ask for volunteers to attend training on their own time. The last is the least realistic. The first is most desirable, particularly if the department uses it as part of a comprehensive revamping of its community relations effort.

Professor Cizon ended the morning's session by briefly describing a number of training techniques.

1. Use visual aides to emphasize points of special importance.
2. Use small discussion groups. However, require the trainees to participate in the same group throughout the training program, because it takes a couple of sessions before they stop feeling one another out and begin to communicate. Moreover, the discussions should be structured and this requires well-trained discussion group leaders and overall coherence.

3. The program's sessions should follow one another in a logical sequence and have a continuity of content. Therefore, don't use eight different speakers at eight different places in the program who talk about eight different and unrelated subjects.

4. Use follow-up sessions to reinforce points made during the training.

5. Evaluate the program. Use this feedback to refine and improve the program and as a basis for developing new programs.

D. Afternoon Session - June 20th

Plenary Session: Reaching the Community

Resource Person: William Downs, President
Associate Services Incorporated

Resource Person: Professor William MacKenzie
School of Urban Studies
Loyola University

Mr. Downs opened the discussion by pointing out that while community relations programs must be concerned with the total community, it may be useful to distinguish subpopulations within the overall group and to develop specialized strategies to deal with them. Business leaders and others in positions of power, for example, may be used to effect changes helpful in coping with the problems of the disadvantaged whose cooperation is likely to be more difficult to obtain. It was suggested that "public relations" may better describe the approach to the white community, and "community relations" the methods for reaching the Negro community.

Professor MacKenzie described his experience in developing police-community workshops in the 18th precinct in Chicago. In this program the police worked with the Conference of Christians and Jews, with Negro groups and with the Puerto Rican community to establish workshops composed of natural community leaders. The Mayor, the Archbishop, heads of city departments and others in positions of power attend the workshops from time to time.

It is important, he pointed out, to give the minority group members the feeling that participation will lead to positive action by those in power and not merely promises. This has occurred in Chicago with the result that the people now help the police by supplying them with information. Such information has led to the recovery of weapons, the identification of a gang of thieves, and the prevention of gang fights.

General Discussion: Reaching the Community

A number of participants indicated that they had had trouble reaching the grass roots community in their cities. In Newark, for example, it was found to be difficult to retain ongoing contact. "Although people will meet with us after a child has been killed by an auto to demand that a stop light be put in, they go away after it has been installed." In Kansas City, Missouri, a conferee claimed that the grass roots leaders use the police as a scapegoat for all the city's social and economic problems and as a target for change around which to mobilize the community. They consistently criticize the police department, and encourage the people to refuse to cooperate with the police. The same problem arose in Rochester, its representative reported. However, in that city the police have managed to incorporate these leaders into the community council. The reasons for the different results in these two cities were not brought out.

A resource person stated that the discussion thus far failed to confront the basic problems which have alienated the police from the community. He argued that the only way to gain people's confidence and support is to eliminate police brutality, police corruption, racial discrimination in hiring, promotion and assignments, and other faults which in varying degrees exist in all police departments. He referred to the results of studies reported by the National Crime Commission to support his contention that these obstacles to public trust are a national problem and not confined to only a few departments. The validity of the Crime Commission's studies was vigorously challenged by another resource person. This participant agreed, however, that too often police departments are not fully committed to achieving sound community relations despite official policy to the contrary. In essence, "it is not what the chief says at the Kiwanis Club, but what the cop does in the alley that counts. The policy must be enforced and if brutality occurs, the offending officer must be fired, not just fined."

Mr. Downs and others suggested that militant grass roots leaders are strong because they build on the unfulfilled promises of the Establishment. Moreover, they benefit from the illusion that those in power are trying to silence them. "Therefore, you must take away their arguments by facing up to community relations problems, and by giving such people every opportunity to be heard. Police departments should open up and demonstrate that they have nothing to hide. Try to make everything you do visible. If someone wants to ride in a patrol car, for example, let him do it. If one of the criticisms of the police is brutality, then it should be dealt with." Departments should make sure that their men are well informed as to what police brutality is, what it means to the community, and how the department will deal with it if it should occur.

Upon resumption of the session, the chairman suggested that police departments employ subprofessionals as one means of strengthening their relations with the community. He noted that other agencies besides the police commonly experience difficulty in communicating with their constituents and that subprofessionals had been used effectively to bridge this gap. He briefly described the New Careers model and the programs which are supported under the Scheuer Amendment to the Equal Opportunity Act.

Several of the departments represented had experimented with subprofessional aides. The Dayton police, for example, are using the "White Hat" program, previously developed by the Tampa police force. Its application in Dayton resulted from the efforts of a state representative who had assembled a group of about fifty teenagers and young adults to discuss their grievances during a period of incipient riot. A disturbance occurred outside the meeting and the youths rushed out into the street. The state representative, however, succeeded in getting eighteen of the boys back into the meeting. Emerging from the ensuing discussion was the decision to permit the youths to assist in trying to cool off the situation in their neighborhoods. As a symbol of their new responsibility, and to enable the community as well as the police to distinguish them from other youth, they were given white helmet liners and cards identifying them as members of the Dayton Police Youth Patrol. The boys patrolled in groups of four, and according to the Dayton representative at the conference, helped stabilize a dangerous situation.

The fact that the Youth Patrol was exposed to considerable danger of physical injury prompted the comment that careful consideration should be given to defining the role of the subprofessional and that he should not be expected to perform tasks beyond his competence. Moreover, several participants questioned whether it was sound to expose untrained youth to physical danger.

If subprofessionals are to be used in a role in which the risk of injury is high, it was urged that they be covered by medical and life insurance.

A Detroit representative reported that his department has used teenagers to find lost children, report damaged stoplights, missing signs, abandoned cars and other traffic hazards, help children register their bicycles, and so forth. At the present they aren't on the Department's payroll, but it is hoped that most will qualify for the Department's cadet program. Another city was reported to use gang leaders to control gangs, and in Chicago subprofessionals are used as housing aides. The St. Louis representative stated that the majority of calls for police assistance from ghetto neighborhoods are for reasons other than enforcement and could be handled by properly trained and supervised subprofessionals.

Despite these encouraging experiences in using subprofessionals, it was noted that police departments traditionally have resisted admitting outsiders. Police-community relations units should anticipate and attempt to neutralize this resistance when planning to use subprofessionals. Resistance from the department probably is more likely than from the community, although there may be problems of acceptability here also. It was reported that the boys at first were accused of being "Toms," but during the next summer there was competition to get into the program. That city's representative felt that if the youngsters feel they are being trusted with real responsibility and are not double crossed, and if they're given a stake in what they're doing, they'll do a good job and enjoy doing it.

The chairman identified the problem of employing persons with criminal records in police departments. This is an important consideration in developing subprofessional jobs in law enforcement, because most of the potential candidates will have been arrested one or more time. It appeared to be the consensus

that persons who have been convicted of a felony could not be hired. There also was considerable doubt concerning the likelihood of employing someone with a felony arrest record. However, the Kansas City, Missouri representative stated that such a person would be hired by his department if an investigation indicated his probable innocence. Misdemeanors and less serious juvenile offenses probably would not present a serious hurdle, at least in some departments.

Before bringing the session on reaching the community to a close, the chairman briefly listed the guidelines for establishing a New Careers program.

1. Develop a detailed job description of the proposed sub-professional role which meets the needs of your department, is within the capability of the persons expected to fill it, and is integrated with the roles of the officers with whom he will be working.
2. If the job description is approved, set up a system for recruiting and selecting the aides.
3. Develop a training program aimed at equipping the sub-professionals with the skills needed to perform the tasks outlined in the job description.
4. Develop a career line so that the subprofessionals will be able to move up to positions of better pay and greater responsibility within the department. This career line may lead into the regular police career structure, or it may require the development of a new, specialized and graduated set of jobs, such as within a community relations unit, which parallels the regular police career system.

Address by the Attorney General

The plenary session then ended and the participants went to their workshops. However, the workshop sessions were cut short in order to meet with Attorney General Ramsay Clark. The Attorney General gave a brief talk in which he described various social, economic and demographic developments in our society which present special problems for law enforcement. He indicated that he regarded the problems of community relations to be among the most serious faced by the police today.

Open Forum

The Open Forum was attended by most of the conference staff and about half the departmental representatives. Some of each group left before the meeting concluded at 10:30 pm. As compared with the plenary sessions in which only a few are able or willing to speak, nearly everyone participated. The comments were outspoken and at times the discussion became heated. In keeping with the forum's spirit of friendly candor, notes were not taken.

E. Morning Session - June 21st

Plenary Session: Development and Evaluation of
Programs for Youth

Resource Persons: Dr. Jacob R. Fishman, Director,
Institute for Youth Studies, Howard University;
Chief Consultant on New Careers, University Research Corp.
Dr. Hyman H. Frankel, Director,
Experiment in Higher Education,
Southern Illinois University;
Consultant, University Research Corporation.

Dr. Frankel opened the discussion by noting that the approach to developing youth programs has changed. Whereas

professionals used to treat problem youngsters as subjects for detached, objective study, they now join with them in establishing a dialogue in which the youth participate in identifying the conditions leading to their getting into trouble and help to devise programs to remedy them. Moreover, getting through to the youth has been found to be less difficult than is generally realized. "If you approach them in good faith, they will work with you and will provide insightful suggestions for coping with their problems." Successful youth programs generally are those which the youngsters have helped to develop and have a major responsibility for running.

Dr. Fishman outlined the principles for establishing youth programs.

1. Try to be as realistic and honest with the youth as possible. If you're mad, tell him.

2. Respect the youth's need for autonomy and independence. You must have the flexibility to deal with him on his own terms when necessary.

3. Understand his need for status within his own group.

Identify the group's natural leader and use him as a vehicle for achieving your objectives.

5. Remember that your role is that of an advisor. The group must be doing the work, not you. One of the biggest problems you'll encounter will be giving the youth enough latitude to reject what you suggest.

6. Put the responsibility for themselves and their community in their hands.

7. Orient the program so that it will prepare the youth to

move into a job leading to an employment career or other responsible community role.

Dr. Fishman indicated that these principles were developed through experimental projects undertaken at the Institute for Youth Studies and elsewhere, and that they are part of the New Careers concept. This concept, which is implemented nationally under the Scheuer Amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act, aims at aiding unemployed, low-income persons to acquire the job skills and other capabilities needed to function effectively as aides to professionals in such fields as health, education, social service, child care, and law enforcement. The program differs from other employment programs for the disadvantaged by providing the training and job development needed to enable the trainee to move up from his entry level job into positions of higher pay and greater responsibility and eventually into a career line.

Although focused on helping the poor to help themselves through opening employment opportunities, the New Careers program also is intended to alleviate manpower shortages and enable the institutions in these fields to provide improved services. One of the major benefits found to date is that agencies using subprofessionals are able to communicate better with, and provide better services to, the people in the neighborhoods from which their subprofessionals are recruited. While experience in the law enforcement field is limited, it is consistent with this finding. Another advantage which agencies have discovered is that New Careerists tend to remain on the job. This contrasts with the costly and inconvenient high turnover rates associated with most dead-end, entry-level jobs.

Dr. Fishman concluded by summarizing the basic requirements of a successful youth program:

1. It must give the youth a meaningful role;

2. It must provide him with status; and
3. It should prepare him for movement into employment, or if that is not possible, into another type of responsible community role.

General Discussion: Development of Youth Programs

It was pointed out that an important problem likely to be met in developing subprofessional roles for delinquent youth is restrictive civil service regulations, such as restrictions on employing persons with delinquency records, or the need to have a high school diploma or meet certain physical and health standards. These should be checked out before starting a youth program. Even if your department is unwilling to employ youth it is advisable to work with any agency which may have, or be developing, youth programs. In the District of Columbia, for example, the Metropolitan Police Department refused to become linked with a group called the Rebels with a Cause. While the Rebels were initially open to developing cooperative relations with the police, they are now actively anti-police.

Evaluation of Youth Programs

Dr. Frankel briefly commented on the techniques of program evaluation. The reason for evaluating our programs, he pointed out, is to find out whether what we are doing works. To be able to do this, however, you have to know exactly what you are trying to accomplish. Sophisticated methodology is useless unless you have thought through and precisely defined the project's intended goals. You don't need an outside expert for this. You should be able to decide what you are trying to accomplish. Deciding the project's goals is the crucial phase of program evaluation. Before you can accurately define the project's objectives, however, you will have to define the problem

which the project is intended to correct. This usually means limiting the problem so that it can be dealt with realistically.

The third step in program evaluation is to develop and implement the means of measuring the project's accomplishments against the goals which it was intended to achieve. An expert should help you with this part of the evaluation process. Finally once your project is running, conditions may arise which cause it to veer from the goals established for it, or the goals themselves may become redefined. These changes may be subtle, occurring gradually and before you are aware of them. Therefore, if you are to keep on top of these changes, to measure them or redirect the project back to its original design, you will need a continual feedback of information on what is happening to the project. Obtaining feedback is called monitoring, and you may need help in setting up and running a monitoring system. In short, by following these four steps, identification of the problem, determination of what you plan to do about the problem, specification of the methods to be used, and monitoring, you will find that evaluation of the project is less formidable than it appears.

Lack of time prevented a general discussion of program evaluation.

Workshop Reports: Development and Evaluation of
Programs for Youth

Workshop No. 1 reported that it discussed projects which its members, police-community relations units, had tried and found to be helpful. One such project was to string a chain across a lovers' lane which had become a nuisance and source

of delinquency in the neighborhood. The unit had acted in response to citizens' complaints and having corrected the problem believed that it had strengthened the community's appreciation of the police. Another police-community relations unit succeeded in having the sanitation department remove trash from a lot with the same satisfactory results.

Workshop No. 2 stated that it had examined the problem of double standards in law enforcement, an issue which had been raised in the Open Forum the preceding evening. While the principle that the law should be enforced impartially and without regard to race, social position or other consideration should be adhered to, there are occasions when exceptions may properly be made. Rather than run the risk of creating an inflammatory incident, for example, police should request a group of youth standing on the corner to move on instead of arresting them for loitering. Only if they appear to be deliberately blocking the sidewalk or annoying pedestrians or shopkeepers should they be arrested. Similarly, an exception should be made to the enforcement of the curfew ordinance in the case of youngsters coming home from a dance or otherwise on the street for good reason.

The Workshop also had discussed riot prevention. In Trenton the police had established contact with community leaders. However, a riot nevertheless occurred, apparently because these leaders had little influence with the young adults and teenagers who caused the trouble. The report concluded by noting that the Workshop Chairman believed that the conference should have provided information on riot prevention.

Workshop No. 3 reported that it had considered the problems inherent in hiring delinquent youth and disadvantaged people by police departments. It pointed out that you cannot recruit many people with criminal records without losing

recruits who have good backgrounds.

Workshop No. 4 also discussed the problem of employing ex-offenders. It is possible, for example, that the testimony of an officer with a criminal record could be impeached if he were to testify. The existence of this danger may mean that if subprofessionals are to be hired they should be used in roles other than law enforcement.

The Flint (Mich.) Police-School Liaison Program also was discussed. Prevention of delinquency and the greater respect for law enforcement are its major objectives. The program consists of assigning detectives to all junior and senior high schools in the city. They became well known to the students, faculty, parents and the people in the school neighborhood. They check out all complaints concerning the children in their school. This may involve conferences with the student or contacts with his parents. The School Liaison Officer also participates on a Regional Counseling Team whose other members are the principal, dean of students, dean of counseling, school community director and principals of the elementary schools that feed the junior high. The program is credited with having stopped vandalism and cut down on other forms of delinquency.

Workshop No. 5 reported that it discussed the problems created for police-community relations by programs aimed at upgrading law enforcement, such as higher educational requirements, replacing the foot patrolman with cruisers, and closing down precinct stations in order to achieve greater administrative efficiency.

F. Afternoon Session - June 21st

Plenary Session: Federal Funds and the
Art of "Grantsmanship"

Resource Person: Mr. Daniel Skoler, Associate Director
Office of Law Enforcement Assistance

Resource Person: Mr. Paul E. Estaver, Dissemination Office
Office of Law Enforcement Assistance

Resource Person: Dr. Arnold S. Trebach, President
University Research Corporation

Resource Person: Mr. Richardson White, Jr.
Legal Staff Associate, University Research Corporation

The Chairman opened by explaining that the final session would consist of statements by several resource people. Although there would be an opportunity after each talk to ask questions, it would be necessary to limit them in order to cover all of the scheduled topics. Before introducing Mr. Estaver the chairman had distributed copies of two bills, the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967 (H.R. 5037) and the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1967 (H.R. 6162), and a pamphlet entitled Federal Grants and Technical Assistance Programs Available to Police.¹²

Mr. Estaver reviewed the role of the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance in the improvement of the administration of criminal justice. He characterized its activities as experimental jointly conducted by the federal government and local governments, in a field which is necessarily local. This relationship means that the grantor and the grantee have a common goal, the success of the project, and must work together to achieve it. OLEA's role is not that of doing favors, but of joining with local police departments and other agencies of the criminal justice system to bring about improvements in law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice.

¹²See Appendix G.

The Office of Law Enforcement Assistance attempts to encourage the development and testing of new ways of coping with crime and criminals. It therefore provides funds for projects which create, experiment with, test and demonstrate new knowledge and techniques. In addition, however, it also takes into consideration the need of a locality for improvements in its system of criminal justice. In the area of police-community relations, the factor of need is regarded as being as important as developing innovations.

Project evaluation is also an objective. Evaluation in this sense means an assessment, not of the problem the project is attempting to deal with, but of the project. The methods you propose to use in evaluating your project should be built into your application. When reporting on the effectiveness of your project, it is important that you be factual and candid. Progress in improving the administration of criminal justice can be achieved only if failures as well as successes are reported.

The next speaker was Dr. Trebach, who outlined the approach to follow in preparing grant applications. "It is most important that you state clearly and succinctly what you propose to do. You should assume that you are communicating with an agency which is unfamiliar with your situation and must have it described before it can understand what you are trying to do. On the other hand, do not try to describe in detail everything that you think that you might do. If approved, your application is a commitment by you to undertake every activity set forth in the proposal, so be sure you indicate only those things that you actually are prepared to undertake."

"The budget is very important. Be sure that it adequately reflects your needs. Ask for as much as you realistically think your costs will be, but be prepared to do some negotiating. You

may find that the grantor is unwilling or unable to allocate as much money as you have requested. In that case, do not try to do too much with too little. Instead, scale down your project so that the money available will cover what you need to do."

Mr. Skoler reported on the status and principal provisions of the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Act. The bill, previously titled the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967, only recently was reported out of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives. The legislation would establish a grant-in-aid program to reduce crime and improve the administration of criminal justice, and is to be administered by the Department of Justice. Title I authorizes grants to States, units of local government, or combinations thereof for the purpose of preparing, developing or revising law enforcement and criminal justice programs. Title II authorizes grants to carry out the programs developed under Title I. Title III authorizes grants to, or contracts with public and private agencies to conduct research, demonstrations or training. It repeals and supercedes the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965. Title IV provides for the administration of the legislation.¹³

Mr. White introduced the topic of federal assistance available to police by pointing out that the pamphlet Federal Grants and Technical Assistance Programs Available to Police had been prepared from material obtained directly from federal agencies and from information given in the Catalogue of Federal Assistance Programs. The Catalogue is recommended as an excellent source of information on federal programs, and
available at no cost from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Although the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Act and

¹³Mr. Skoler's remarks will not be reported in greater detail owing to the substantial modifications made to the bill before being passed by the House. See H.R. 5037.

the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act, when passed, will be most directly relevant to the law enforcement agencies, a number of other sources of federal grants and technical assistance already exist for which police may qualify. These include, for example, the Model Cities program administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, in that the reduction of crime and delinquency through comprehensive programs for rebuilding and restoring slum areas is an explicit objective.

The Community Service Program under the Higher Education Act of 1965 is also available to police. The program supports university-based research and training projects which aid in the solution of community problems. Sixteen institutions have conducted seminars and workshops for police, including conferences on police-community relations.

Other federal programs of particular relevance to police which were briefly outlined were the Crime and Delinquency Program of the National Institute of Mental Health, the Work-Experience Program administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and three programs run by the Department of Labor: New Careers, Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Manpower Development and Training Program.

The conferees agreed to dispense with the workshops, and during the coffee break completed the post-conference evaluation schedule. After concluding remarks by the chairman, the conference ended.

IV. EVALUATION

A. Introduction

The substantive content of the conference has just been summarized. Earlier the preparations leading to the conference were described: recognition of the need to assist urban police in the planning of police-community relations programs; the decision to call a training conference for this purpose; specification of the conferees' objectives; development of the various methods for achieving these aims, including involvement of the grantees in planning the conference, selection of the conference topics and the various methods to be used in their presentation; recruitment and orientation of the resource personnel; and the handling of a variety of essential, if mundane, administrative details. Remaining to be examined is the meaning of the conference, the relevance of its preparation to its outcome and its implications for the future. Were the goals which the conference sought to achieve appropriate when measured against the needs of the grantee-participants? Assuming the validity of the conference's objectives, was the subject matter selected for presentation consistent with them? Were the methods employed to present these topics effective? What did the conferees learn and was it consistent with the conferees' aims? What kind of follow up, if any, should be attempted? Answers to these questions will provide an estimate of the return on the investment of skills, time and money required to put on the conference.

Conclusive answers, of course, cannot be given. Indeed, elaborate and expensive techniques for the collection, tabulation and interpretation of conference data would have been needed if an assessment with even a reasonably high order of probability was to be made. As previously indicated, an evaluation of this nature was not attempted. Instead, some limited information was

collected from the grantee-representatives, the resource people and URC staff. These data permit an instructive, though necessarily preliminary, appraisal of the conference. In this section these data will be reviewed and tentative conclusions regarding various aspects of the conference offered.

B. Topics Covered During the Conference

A basic question is whether the subject matter selected for consideration during the conference contributed to the aims of the conference. Three objectives of the conference are relevant in this regard: to familiarize the participants with the basic information in the field of police-community relations; to provide them with insights into human nature and social change; and to provide suggestions for possible ways of setting up a police-community relations program.

The principal method for selecting the conference topics, it will be recalled, was to poll the departments and agencies prior to the conference regarding the subject matter areas in police-community relations which they deemed important and deserving of consideration. In addition to this method, site visits were made to five police-community relations units, and OLEA staff and other experts were consulted. However, the principal criterion against which conference topics were selected was the express concerns of the invited grantees.

Available evidence indicates that the topics which were covered during the conference were those which the conferees regarded as important. One source of data is the observations of the conference consultants. All but one of the resource people¹⁴ who considered the question believed the conference topics generally covered the basic concerns and interests of

¹⁴Eight resource people, including all those who attended the entire conference, were asked to submit written evaluations of the conference. Seven complied.

the participants. The exception consisted of an individual who attended only one day of the conference and therefore disqualified himself on this point. Second, the conferees themselves provided evidence that they were satisfied with topics selected.

Before the conference began, the police officials and other grantee representatives were asked to indicate how much emphasis they would like to see placed on each of fourteen topics during the conference. The fourteen included all the major agenda items, as well as four which could more accurately be described as basic goals of the conference.¹⁵ All fourteen items were rated by more than half of the representatives (23 of 37) as deserving either "some emphasis" or "much emphasis," and seven of the topics were so scored by 30, or better than three-fourths, of the participants. In contrast to approval of all fourteen topics by more than a majority, only one topic, "to learn how to develop a training program," was rated by as many as 13 participants as requiring "little emphasis" or "no emphasis." The same overall approval of the fourteen topics is indicated by the fact that the average number of participants who believed that some or much emphasis should be given them (29.6) is six times the average number who voted to give them little or no emphasis (5.1).¹⁶

Although these findings suggest that the conferees regarded the fourteen topics as generally deserving emphasis during the conference, they do not indicate that these pre-selected topics included all subject matter areas considered important by the conferees. It is possible, in other words, that the roster of identified topics omitted one or more subjects

¹⁵These included, for example, items such as "to get new ideas for projects," and "to exchange information, solutions, (and) new approaches to problems." See Table I-A, "Preliminary Analysis of Questionnaires," Appendix H.

¹⁶Figures in this paragraph based on "Preliminary Analysis."

which they considered to be important. Because the fourteen included all the major subject areas to which all or parts of sessions were scheduled, an omission from this list in turn would raise serious doubts as to whether the omitted topic or topics actually were covered during the conference.

This danger, however, appears to have been remote. In addition to indicating the relative amount of emphasis or de-emphasis to be given each of fourteen listed subject areas, the participants also were asked to describe a fifteenth topic of their own choosing. The fact that only five¹⁷ of the participants bothered to select additional topics, and that only two of these selected similar subject areas suggests that no matter of general concern was omitted from the list of fourteen. Further confirmation is given by the ratings which the five participants gave to the topics which they themselves chose -- two of the five indicated that their topics should be given little or no emphasis.

Another possible difficulty was that even though the topics identified for specific attention during the conference met the approval of the conferees, they nevertheless constituted the "wrong" topics. In particular, it might be argued that coverage of the basic issues, problems and techniques in police-community relations required the inclusion of matters which the participants regarded as unimportant or antithetical to their concerns. The basic method by which the topics were originally selected -- by polling the grantees -- could be expected to produce a problem of this nature.

One of the resource persons challenged the selection of topics on this score. Although he concurred in the opinion of the other resource people that the agenda items accurately

¹⁷This number might well be reduced to three, since two of the added topics closely resemble those already contained in the list of fourteen.

reflected the interests of the grantee-representatives, he nevertheless regarded it to be an error to equate police perceptions of salient issues in police-community relations with what in fact are the basic problems in this area. Not only are the grantees inexperienced in police-community relations, but more important, their perspective is that of the police, not of the community. What is important to discuss, as well as what is important not to discuss, from the police standpoint is at odds with the judgments which the community would make. He suggested, therefore, that civil rights leaders and human rights officials should have been consulted in selecting the agenda topics. They also should have been invited to the conference.

While this contention has merit, two points should be noted. First, the criticism either misconstrues or rejects the objectives of the conference; and second, although not as well represented as some might prefer, the community perspective on police-community relations issues was included in the preparation and conduct of the conference.

Contrary to the inference drawn by the resource person, the purpose of the conference was not only to provide the participants with an overview of the major elements of police-community relations. Other goals were to provide a forum in which police officials could learn from each other and from resource people, and to create an awareness among the conferees of the advantages of working together on common problems. The technique of involving the grantees in the development of the conference program, including the selection of agenda topics, was employed primarily to achieve these goals, rather than to discover all the major issues in police-community relations.

Had civil rights and human rights officials been given a hand in preparing the conference, a more complete identification of salient issues probably would have been obtained.

But such material would have to have been handled in light of the objectives of the conference, and the objectives encompassed training and did not provide for citizen-police confrontation. This is not to say that such confrontations are useless. It is to say that this technique was not planned for in this conference. It is probable, therefore, that the principal consequence of a confrontation would have been to provoke rather than to instruct most of the conferees. Assuming the resource people, conference staff, and some of the grantees to be sympathetic with the community perspective, it is possible that they would have been drawn into repeated conflict with the police representatives. Had this occurred, it might also have polarized the conferees for the remainder of the conference, and thus increased the belief that little rather than much is to be gained by trying to work with persons with an opposing persuasion.

While there is no way of knowing what the outcome would have been had confrontations been planned, two occurrences during the conference suggest that the risk of jeopardizing its objectives was substantial. One was the heated wrangle over the National Crime Commission's statistics which sidetracked an effort to examine the relationship between police malpractice and police-community relations. The other was the separation into two camps of resource persons and nonpolice agency representatives on one side, and police officials on the other, during the Open Forum when various controversial matters were considered. Although both sides exhibited great candor, the police representatives plainly were uncomfortable and on the defensive. As one resource person later reported:

The low point of the entire conference was the evening open forum . . . Police conferees . . . felt that it was completely dominated by resource people who were not very sympathetic to their problems or at the very least were not willing to accept them as problems. There was considerable hard feeling created and many policemen expressed this feeling the following day.

This finding is consistent with the conferees' rating of the Open Forum as the "least productive" session, in the post-conference survey.

The limited benefits of confining consideration only to those matters which police regard as legitimate and necessary also was recognized. Three steps short of formally scheduling controversial topics were taken. First, the items which were placed on the agenda were defined with sufficient generality to permit a variety of issues and viewpoints to be expressed. Second, resource persons with community-oriented views were recruited. Third, an Open Forum was scheduled at which time the conference chairman and other URC staff planned to raise controversial matters if no one else did. As noted, this proved to be unnecessary. In addition to these preparations, it was considered likely that the representatives of the non-police grantees, two of whom were from human rights commissions, would not permit the police view to go unchallenged.

The appropriateness of the topics selected for coverage is one important measure of the success of the conference. Also significant are the relative amounts of emphasis given to the conference topics. This aspect of the conference is taken up next.

C. Emphasis Given Conference Topics

A greater proportion of the three-day period was formally allocated to some topics than to others. A half-day each was spent in discussing reaching the community, relations between the police-community relations unit and the police department, and on police-community relations training, for example, while a half-hour or so was given to reviewing such subjects as the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967 and sources of federal funds and technical assistance. In addition to formal allocations of time, some subjects cropped up from time to time throughout the conference, while others were mentioned once or twice only. The question arises, then, as to whether these formal and informal allocations of time and attention were consistent with the aims of the conference.

A likely conclusion one can draw from the findings of the pre-and post-conference questionnaires is that the conferees were generally satisfied with the amount of emphasis given to the various conference topics. It will be recalled that before the conference they were asked to indicate how much emphasis they wanted placed on each of fourteen topics. After the conference they were asked how much emphasis they thought had been given to these same topics during the conference. In order to find out if the participants were satisfied with the amount of emphasis given to each topic, their rank orders were compared.¹⁸ Eleven of the fourteen topics ranked in terms of "perceived emphasis" were within three places of the position they occupied in the "desired emphasis" listing. Three others varied five places. Thus, the conferees appeared to feel that most of the topics had been given about the same amount of emphasis during the conference which before the conference they

¹⁸That is, each topic was given a score consisting of the number of participants who voted to give it "much emphasis," and on the basis of that score, was placed in order relative to the other thirteen topics.

thought should have been given them.

One topic, however, they apparently felt had not been given enough emphasis. Before the conference, "learning how to evaluate programs" ranked second in importance among the subjects to be covered. It fell to tenth in terms of emphasis perceived to have been given during the conference. It is conceivable, however, that this shift simply reflected a new perception of the relative unimportance of program evaluation which the representatives developed during the conference. But there is no evidence to support this view, while there are several grounds for believing that the participants were displeased by the treatment of program evaluation. First, in another portion of the pre-conference questionnaire they were asked to rate the difficulty of eleven problems with which they had had to cope in applying for and administering their OLEA grant. By far the most difficult problem was "evaluating effectiveness of your program or projects." Second, in the post-conference questionnaire, they were asked to rate the helpfulness and productivity of the sessions they attended. "Development and evaluation of programs for youth" was among the least productive. Third, Mr. Paul Estaver, the OLEA official responsible for administering the police-community relations planning projects, emphasized the need for candor in reporting on projects. This stress is unlikely to have encouraged the representatives to devalue the importance of program evaluation. Finally, it is plain that program evaluation was not covered thoroughly from the conferee's standpoint. Only about twenty minutes of one session was spent on the topic.

In addition to the suitability of the selection and emphasis given to the conference topics, there is also the complicated problem of how well the various techniques for communicating ideas about these topics worked. Despite the highly impressionistic quality of the information germane to this problem it deserves brief discussion.

D. Effectiveness of Training Methods

Information regarding the effectiveness of the conference, and its component methods, as a training instrument is confined to two types of data. One of these is the results of the pre- and post-conference questionnaire which attempted to discover whether the participants had learned and accepted the approach to various issues endorsed by the resource persons and other authorities at the conference. The other information consists of the opinions of the conferees, resource persons and URC staff regarding the effectiveness of the total conference experience and of various aspects of the conference.

Turning to the latter data first, it will be recalled that one of the objectives of the conference was to create a forum in which the representatives would have the opportunity to exchange experiences and learn from each other. A number of tactics were used which were expected to contribute to this end, such as the holding of a reception, the allotment of nearly two hours out of a tight agenda to lunch periods, and the avoidance of mealtime speakers, housing the conferees together in the same hotel, and by making it financially advantageous to share rooms and eat together. The Open Forum, workshops and general discussions during the plenary sessions also were intended to facilitate interchange among the conferees.

This aspect of the conference appears to have been generally successful. Evidence includes the observations of several of

the resource people, who felt that the conferees benefitted greatly from the chance to make acquaintances and to share experiences with others who were struggling with similar problems of developing and running police-community relations programs. It not only gave them a chance to exchange suggestions and learn from one another, but also to come to realize that they were not alone in trying to do a job which is difficult, unorthodox and generally unappreciated within their departments.

Although it seems likely that this aspect of the conference was successful, evidence suggests that the methods used to attain it were uneven in their effects. The conferees, for example, rated as most productive the "informal, unscheduled meetings," but at the same time scored as least productive the Open Forum and the workshops. Although the information is somewhat conflicting, the workshops appear to have suffered from several defects. First, they were not led by skilled, small group discussion leaders, but by police chiefs. Lacking appropriate training, several of the chiefs tended to dominate the discussion rather than to encourage general participation. Their rank may have deterred full participation by other members. Moreover, the lack of direction from the conference staff as to what should be discussed may have complicated the chiefs' role. Finally, two-thirds of the conferees thought the workshops were too short.

In addition to learning from one another, the conference also sought to enable the conferees to work with, and learn from, selected authorities in various aspects of police-community relations. To achieve this objective, most of the plenary sessions were conducted by two resource people, and generally several others also were present and participated actively in the general discussion; resource persons attended each of the workshops; and all out-of-town resource people

roomed and ate with the grantee-representatives throughout the conference. In addition, the resource persons, particularly those assigned to lead a plenary session, were informed of how the conference had been put together, its aims, and the general subject matter areas they should cover. Beyond this, however, they were largely on their own.

Exposed in a variety of ways to a resource staff of generally excellent quality and pertinent experience in various aspects of police-community relations, it is highly likely that most of the conferees acquired useful information. It is also clear, however, that this experience was not as comfortable as the conferees would have desired, and possibly not as profitable for them as the conference staff had hoped. One difficulty which arose was the tendency of the resource people to talk over the heads of the conferees. This appears to have occurred because the conferees lacked experience in police-community relations, and also because they were less accustomed than the resource persons to formulating and discussing ideas in somewhat abstract terms. The suggestions for improving the conference made by the conferees are illustrative: "More nuts and bolts and less philosophy;" "more input on the part of the conference attendees, more focus on day-to-day problems;" "more definite answers to questions;" and "by staying with one idea or question until fully answered."¹⁹

Although some of the input from resource people was intended to come as a result of brief lectures and talks, much time was given to sessions in which the consultants and police officials were expected to participate jointly in the discussion. This training method suffered not only from the difficulties mentioned above but from several others as well. One was the sheer number of resource persons present. This factor combined with their intense interest in the topic resulted on occasion

¹⁹See Appendix H, "Preliminary Analysis of Questionnaires," Attachment C.

in the conversation's being dominated, if not monopolized, by the resource persons. This difficulty was greatest during the Monday sessions and in the Open Forum, where the ratio of resource people to police officers was nearly one to one.

Another difficulty encountered derives from the selection of consultants with non-police backgrounds to act as trainers of police officers. To an extent which is impossible to ascertain, the resource people never were wholly accepted by the conferees. One resource person, himself a police officer, reported that the participants resented the aloofness of the resource people. The fact that several of the conferees suggested that the conference could have been improved by using more police officials as trainers also indicates some resistance to the resource staff. Similarly, there is the low mark given the Open Forum, in which the conferees were nearly matched in numbers by the resource people, and in which they were over-matched in the discussion of police practices presumed to be deleterious to police-community relations.

What effect the conferees' resentment toward their trainers had on what they learned about police-community relations during the conference is impossible to determine from the data available. Since this antipathy did not appear to be either widespread nor intense, it may not have seriously contaminated the acceptability of the ideas the resource people sought to communicate.

The second source of information regarding the effectiveness of the training methods used at the conference is the results of the pre- and post-conference survey. One section of this survey sought to discover if the conferees learned what was expected to be taught in five areas of police-community relations. On two questions, more of the participants chose the "right" answer after the conference than before the

conference, thus suggesting that some of the group "learned." The other questions either indicated very slight improvement or increased preference for a "wrong" answer. All three of these items, however, assumed that the resource persons would emphasize points which, in fact, they failed to do. For example, the conferees were asked to indicate whether they agreed with the statement "since statisticians do not deal directly with delinquents, their help in evaluating a police youth program is pretty limited." It was expected that the resource person would stress the need to obtain expert assistance in evaluating youth programs, and that the "right" answer would be to "disagree." In fact, however, he emphasized the responsibility of police officials conducting such programs of playing a major part in devising evaluation designs. Possibly as a result, the percentage of those giving the "right" answer declined from 74 percent before the conference to 55 percent after it.

Another section of the survey asked the conferees to indicate the importance or unimportance to police-community relations of 12 factors both before and after the conference. On most items the ratings changed only slightly. The two items to which responses shifted the most, however, changed in a direction consistent with the emphasis given during the conference.²⁰ These results suggest that learning in a least a few areas took place in the desired direction, by some participants.

It would be encouraging to conclude, as one resource person reports, "that after the conference was over, everyone realized that there is a problem of police-community relations, and that there are ways of improving police-community relations, and those with responsibility for developing programs attending

²⁰These were Item 7, "Community relations ability as a factor in police promotions," and Item 12, "Preventing race riots." Eight more persons regarded Item 7 as "very important" after the conference than did before, while ten fewer persons thought that Item 12 was very important after the conference. See Appendix H, "Preliminary Analysis of Questionnaires," Table III-A.

the conference went home with many useful ideas and techniques." The results of the conference questionnaire, of course, are too inconclusive to support any such sweeping affirmation. While one hopes that the resource person's interpretation is correct, the better evidence is that the conference provided a good learning opportunity from which at least some of the participants appear to have profited.

E. Facilities

Before considering the implications of the conference for the future, two remaining aspects of the program -- food and space -- require brief mention. While not ordinarily significant, over a period of three consecutive days both can acquire great importance. This clearly occurred in the case of the meals, which during the first two days of the conference were felt to be inferior by many participants. Judging from the complaints registered at the time, and from the suggestions made for improving the conference, this was a source of real grievance. Meals during the third day were substantially improved. Space was less of a problem. However, the room in which the plenary sessions were held was crowded and required some of the conferees to sit with their backs to one another. A larger room would have been preferable.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE CONFERENCES

The fearful cost in blood and dollars of the summer riots is one index of the price we pay for permitting police-community relations to deteriorate to the flash point of violence. While the causes of these riots run deeper than citizen apathy for the police, this factor is extremely important and must be dealt with together with the other institutional breakdowns in our society.

Events since the conference reported herein have shown that many responsible officials, at all levels of government, are fully aware of this situation and are devoting their best efforts to deal with it. Inevitably, conferences have been called, and more will be, to discuss new strategies for dealing with civil unrest and mass outbreaks. All too often, many officials who style themselves men-of-action view conferences as a simple waste of time, at worst, or the chance to see old friends, at best. Our experience at this conference suggests that this does not always have to be the case. Conferences may be wearing to some, but they can serve vital functions.

In order to provide some guides to those preparing for future police-community relations conferences of this type, we present the following recommendations, which result from our evaluation of this one.

A. Pre-Selected Topics.

Conferences should be sharply focused on a limited number of key topics. One such subject should be the police role in the recent riots. Component areas might include the following: police actions which appear to have been effective

in preventing riots from occurring and the reasons therefore; the kind of incidents either directly or indirectly involving police which seem to have triggered riots and the circumstances surrounding them; the strategies which law enforcement agencies used or attempted to use to control riots during their various stages, and their outcome; the kinds of follow-up actions which police have taken and their effects on relations with the citizenry; and the implications of all of the foregoing for the community relations unit within the department. A second major topic for discussion should be program evaluation and planning. Basic principles and their practical application by laymen should be emphasized. Concrete examples within the experience of the conferees should be used. In addition to these two major topics one or two others selected by the conferees should be given attention in depth.

The conference should not only be more narrowly focused than this conference, but it also should attempt to avoid too much "theorizing." To achieve this objective, discussion of the two pre-selected topics -- police role in riots and program evaluation and planning -- should be centered on the experiences of two or three of the departments present. These departments should be selected because their actions to prevent or control riots, or potential riots during the summer appear to have been both relatively progressive and effective. In addition, so far as possible, departments should be chosen in which the police-community relations unit played an active role in their departments' actions. Dayton's use of the Youth Patrol, for example, might be reason for selecting its department's activities for intensive review. Another city might have avoided a riot altogether. Where this appeared to be attributable, at least in substantial part, to specific policies developed by its police department to head off the danger, that department might be chosen. Another department might have been particularly imaginative in its response to the

community after a riot had occurred.

The principal criteria for selection, progressive and effective action to prevent or control riots relative to that taken by most departments, should be sufficient to permit two or three of the departments to be singled out.

The information needed to make the selection will be obtained from a variety of sources: newspapers and popular magazines; professional journals; technical reports; resource persons; and field visits to several of the more promising departments.

B. Presentation of Pre-Selected Topics.

The relevant activities of the selected departments should constitute the core material for discussion both of police action in preventing and controlling riots and program evaluation and planning. The examination of several departments' actions should serve as concrete illustrations of particular sets of problems and solutions with which the conferees would be encouraged to compare their own experiences. Similarly, the resource people should be urged to present issues and principles in terms of the departments' activities covered at the conference. Later sessions focusing on program evaluation and planning should use the analyses previously used to explain the departments' actions as illustrations of the principles used in evaluating programs. Thus, for example, a previous discussion of why a department undertook a particular action might be used as a concrete example of how one goes about identifying a problem and determining the effectiveness of methods developed to deal with it.

In order to give the conferees a common factual base on which to develop interpretive analysis and in order to sharpen

the focus of the discussion, a substantial portion of the time allocated to each topic in the plenary sessions should be spent in descriptive and analytic input from the resource people. Moreover, the resource people should prepare detailed outlines of what they intend to cover both in their remarks and during the general discussion. The outlines of the issues and facts to be presented during the general discussion, however, should serve merely as guides for the resource people who should be free to pursue other topics if the drift of the discussion indicates such would be profitable.

Great time and effort is required by the resource people in planning for the conference. Each consultant responsible for reporting on the activities of a selected department should spend some time in site visits to that department. He should rely heavily on the staff of the police-community relations unit to aid him in collecting the necessary information. In addition, so far as possible the unit director should participate with the resource person in the preparation and presentation of the materials given at the conference.

The resource persons responsible for the sessions on evaluation and planning should confer with the consultants heading the discussion of police handling of riots. This will insure that the review of the principles of evaluation and planning will be in the context of specific activities with which the conferees already have been acquainted.

C. Topics Selected by the Conferees.

In addition to the pre-selected topics, one or two other subjects may also be given specific attention. Comprehensiveness is not sought. The object instead is to avoid omitting those few subjects which may be of grave concern to most of the conferees.

Those topics should be selected by canvassing the invitees in a manner similar to the methods used to identify the topics for the URC conference. However, in order to increase the specificity of these topics, more than one polling of the grantee representatives might be required. The first questionnaire, for example, might simply request identification of special areas of concern. A follow-up survey should request clarification of the one or two topics which a majority of the grantee representatives had selected as being of great interest.

Each questionnaire should be kept brief, and should be sent out sufficiently in advance of the conference to allow ample time for responses. The respondents should be notified of the importance of their assistance to the success of the conference. The information obtained should be used in several ways. Selection of agenda items, of course, should be based upon it. In addition, it will be employed to orient the resource persons to the kinds of information they should be prepared to present. Conferee interest in the conference also will be encouraged.

D. Organization of the Conference.

The basic organization of the URC conference appears to have been generally sound and may be adopted for future meetings of this type. That is, the conference should be approximately three days long, and the materials should be presented through a combination of opening brief talks and general discussions in plenary sessions, workshops and workshop reports.

As previously indicated, the plenary sessions should be more structured in an effort to avoid problems which developed during the URC conference. In addition, the workshop sessions should be changed in several ways. The chairman should not be