

Table of Contents

Modern Police Administration	ix
Series Editor	xi
Deputy Editors	xiii
About the Author	xv
Preface	xvii
Acknowledgments	xix
Introduction	xxi
1 Choices of Police Leaders in America	1
Policing: An Evolving American Institution	1
Leadership as a Balancing Act: “Walking the Razor’s Edge”	4
Strategies to Reduce Crime While Protecting the Public	4
Community Policing	5
Broken Windows	6
Problem-Solving Policing	6
Measuring Performance and Results Internally	7
Communicating the Vision: Building and Managing a Team	8
Police Leadership Training	8
Internal Police Culture	9
Police Unions	10
Supervision and Internal Accountability	11
External Relations and Political Challenges	11
Community Relationship Building	11
Political Pressures	12
Accountability and Performance Measures	13
Private Security Services	14
Significance of the Role of the Police Leader	14
2 Introducing the Police Chiefs	17
Profiles of the Police Chiefs	17
Significance of Discussion: Why This Group of Police Leaders?	23

3	A Vision for the Department and the Community	25
	Police Leadership in a Democracy: What Does This Mean?	27
	Consistency of the Chief's Message	29
	The Police Chief's Vision Provides the Balance for Success	31
	Challenges to the Leader's Vision: External and Internal Pressures	33
	Significance of the Vision of the Police Leader	36
4	Implementing the Vision: How Chiefs Make It a Reality	39
	Diagnosis of the Problems: A Primary Task of the Chief	41
	Active Persuasion: Gathering Support for the Vision	43
	Police Leadership: It Can Be a Lonely Job	44
	Significance of Implementing the Vision	48
5	Strategies for Enforcement and Working with Communities	51
	Community Policing and Police Accountability	51
	Community Policing or Can You Arrest Your Way Out of Crime?	56
	Bringing the Police and Community Together: How It Can Work	61
	Significance of the Police Department's Relationship with the Community	68
6	Developing a Professional Police Officer: It's a Challenge	71
	Police Training and Its Link to Leadership	73
	A College Degree and Its Value to a Police Officer	74
	Promoting an Officer's Ability to Communicate with People	77
	Sergeants and Their Importance to the Chiefs' Leadership Efforts	79
	Significance of Training and Its Impact on the Department	83
7	Internal Politics, the Police Chief, and Police Officer Empowerment	85
	Chiefs' Experience with Police Unions	86
	Strategies for Working with the Union	89
	Chiefs Confront Officer Empowerment Challenges	92
	Morale, Empowerment, and Officer Performance	96
	Chiefs' Final Thoughts on Police Unions and Officer Empowerment	100

Significance of Internal Politics and Police Leadership	102
8 External Politics and Relationships with Other Partners	103
The Chief's Relationship with the Mayor: Another Challenge of Leadership	103
Lessons Learned about the Relationship with Mayors	106
Watchdog Committees and Departmental Oversight	111
Significance of the Working Relations with the Police Chief's Partners	113
9 The Future of American Policing: Looking Back and Forward	115
Reflections about Leadership and Change	115
Current and Future Challenges	120
What It Takes to Be a Successful Police Leader	125
10 Recommendations for Police Chiefs and All People Interested in Supporting a Democracy	129
Notes	133
Suggested Reading	135
Appendix A: Police Chief Participant List	139
Appendix B: Demographics of Police Chiefs' Cities	141
Appendix C: Methodology of Study	145
Index	153

Modern Police Administration

The books in this series are each focused on a specific police administration topic. The premise of the Modern Police Administration series is simple: Today's police administrators, and those preparing for such responsibilities, although they are currently served by a handful of introductory texts, have access to few books that go into detail on specific topics such as police recruitment, managing training, police media relations, or managing Compstat. There may be a few articles on these topics, a training program or two, and some expert consultants, but little in the way of full-length documentation.

Back in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, much of the early literature on policing was focused on police administration, including textbooks by the legendary O. W. Wilson and articles in such respected periodicals as the *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology & Police Science*, and the *Journal of Police Science and Administration*. Pioneering college programs at Washington State University, Michigan State University, and a few other schools also focused on police science and police administration. During this professional era of police development, much of the emphasis was on figuring out how to run a police agency more efficiently.

But then the field shifted its attention. The focus of reformers turned to such key issues as racial discrimination, community relations, police discretion, and police use of force. Researchers began to study both individual police behavior and police strategies more closely. In higher education, degree programs evolved toward the broader perspectives of criminal justice and criminology, whereas police administration became nothing more than a single course, often an elective. Since the 1990s, the new strategies and paradigms of community policing, problem-oriented policing, and intelligence-led policing have dominated the attention of police executives, educators, and researchers.

These changes have been very good for policing and for communities. Police behavior today is better regulated than in the past, police use of force and pursuit driving are guided by careful policies and procedures, and police strategies are more often based on solid evidence about what works (and what doesn't). Police agencies are more diverse and more representative of their communities than ever before. The police field today is much more scientific, professional, and accountable than most other public services.

However, one other consequence of this policing evolution is that attention has been diverted away from the nuts and bolts of police administration—perhaps not so much in practice, but certainly in the policing literature and in higher education. Since the police field in the United States is such a big enterprise now, with 18,000 separate agencies and over 1 million employees, it would seem deserving of up-to-date books on important topics directly tied to managing police personnel and police organizations. Over the next few years, the Modern Police Administration series hopes to provide a range of such books.

Please encourage your police agency, police academy, police colleagues, university, and library to invest in this series. Our hope is that these books will become indispensable sources of the best thinking and best practices in police administration. Anyone who is serious about police administration should have ready access to this series.

Also, please let us know if you have suggestions for book topics and book authors. We know that there are many expert practitioners and expert trainers in the police administration field, and we hope to provide many of them with the opportunity to distill their knowledge and experience for the benefit of others.

The Modern Police Administration series is overseen by an editorial board representing many years of experience as police executives, professors, trainers, and consultants. Feel free to contact any of us with your ideas and suggestions.

Series Editor

Gary Cordner is professor of Criminal Justice at Kutztown University in Pennsylvania and a commissioner with the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA). Previously, he was police chief in St. Michaels, Maryland and dean of the College of Justice & Safety at Eastern Kentucky University, where he also served on the Kentucky Law Enforcement Council, the Kentucky Criminal Justice Council, and the Lexington/Fayette County Civil Service Commission. He is past president of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences and past-editor of *Police Quarterly* and the *American Journal of Police*. He earned his Ph.D. from Michigan State University.

GARY CORDNER, PhD

Professor, Kutztown University

*Commissioner, Commission on Accreditation for Law
Enforcement Agencies (CALEA)*

Deputy Editors

Theron Bowman, PhD

Chief of Police, Arlington, Texas

Commissioner, Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA)

Ed Connors, JD

President, Institute for Law & Justice

Larry Hoover, PhD

Professor, Sam Houston State University

Past President, Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences

Gary Margolis, EdD

Research Associate Professor, University of Vermont

Commissioner, Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies

Darrel Stephens, MS

Director of State and Local Programs, Johns Hopkins University

Former Chief of Police, Charlotte–Mecklenburg, North Carolina

About the Author

Jim Isenberg is the director of strategic planning for the North American Family Institute. In this capacity, Dr. Isenberg directs the development and implementation of innovative, community-based programs serving adolescents in the juvenile justice, law enforcement and social services settings. He has extensive management, organizational development and program implementation experience in the fields of juvenile justice, youth services, corrections, law enforcement, social services and transportation.

In the criminal justice field, Dr. Isenberg has served as the special assistant for criminal justice to the Massachusetts Secretary of Human Services. He also served as director of planning for the San Francisco Sheriff's Department with a specific emphasis on the development of community corrections programs. Dr. Isenberg also has experience working with three urban school districts' school safety departments. He was project director for the national Police Corps program with specific focus on development of youth training programs, training of police trainers and leadership programs for police officers.

In addition to his criminal justice experience, he served as a senior executive with both the San Francisco and New York transportation systems. In this capacity, he directed the development of a human resources division and a marketing division. Finally, he has an extensive experience in the conflict resolution field in both domestic and international settings. Dr. Isenberg completed his PhD at the University of California in police leadership development.

Preface

This study describes the many leadership challenges confronting America's police chiefs. This book focuses on personal interviews with 26 American police chiefs. The group is composed of a diverse group of police leaders who discuss their leadership challenges in a wide array of cities (and may no longer be in the position they held when interviewed). The chiefs were interviewed about their leadership vision, successes, and challenges. The chiefs discuss their visions for their departments and the many issues they must address on a daily basis to achieve their goals.

In addition to my conversations with the chiefs, they also share their experiences about implementing these visions. The chiefs discuss their strategies for enforcing the law as well as collaborating with the communities in which they serve. The chiefs also discuss their ideas about police officer training, their challenges working with police unions, and their experiences working with mayors and other external political and community organizations. Finally, they examine the present dilemmas of police leadership and provide new insights about the future role of police leaders.

As the chiefs describe their experiences, they offer the reader an opportunity to learn about some of the specific challenges that police leaders in a democracy face. They talk of their efforts to build strong, positive relationships with their local communities while often facing resistance to this idea from within their own department. The chiefs also outline their strategies for enforcing the law and building a strong culture of accountability within their department. They outline their strategies for developing police officers while confronting recruitment issues and, in some cases, negative reactions to their visions from both their officers and the community.

Finally, throughout this study, I assess the chiefs' discussions carefully and offer a set of recommendations for the future of police leadership in a democracy. The recommendations incorporate the chiefs' perspectives and offer the reader an opportunity to implement new ideas for police leadership within the communities of America.

This book offers a unique opportunity to listen to police chiefs explain their problems, successes, and mistakes. The text focuses on key leadership challenges and offers the reader an opportunity to understand police leadership as well as formulate new approaches to developing police officers and police leaders in the future.

Acknowledgments

I appreciate the support of all members of my doctoral committee, with special thanks to William Ker Muir and Donald McQuade. Thanks to all of the police chiefs interviewed. I also thank Dr. Yitzhak Bakal; Dr. Gene Moore; Jay Paris; Jill Dichiara; my wife, Gail; and my brother, Steve.

Introduction

On a daily basis, the American media share their version of the role and behavior of police through news accounts or as part of a never-ending series of popular television dramas. The American public is bombarded with news stories about police officers' excessive use of force or the random violence they must confront on the streets of American cities. The police are presented one day as protectors of America's core values, whereas another day they are attacked for overstepping the bounds of a democratic state. Television leads most of its local evening newscasts with stories of shootings, robberies, and arrests of the "bad guys." After the news, prime-time crime shows highlight the thoughtful nature of police work, which is focused on carefully and persistently uncovering the special clues that lead to the identification and arrest of suspected criminals. Though the American public applauds the many constructive crime-reduction strategies of the police, the public has also witnessed the results of police corruption and failures of police leadership.

The American police saga does not stand alone; stories of police capabilities and inadequacies are omnipresent as headlines and commentators examine the counterterrorism efforts of the British police or the building of a police force in Iraq and other emerging democracies. The dilemmas of policing regularly carried by the news media or television dramas give the public a confusing perception of the role of the police. The stories told by police chiefs themselves in this book provide a realistic window on the day-to-day realities of police leadership in America or any other democracy.

Although there are many celebrated cases of police chiefs leading their departments in solving high-profile murders or dramatically reducing crime in their jurisdictions, the daily reality of their jobs involves constant pressures and challenges. Some chiefs have been confronted with their own deviant officers, who have either deliberately or unconsciously performed their duties in a way that has angered the community. People in communities formally or informally demonstrate their displeasure with overly aggressive arrest policies that target drinking in public, loitering, or dumping trash on the street. In the past decade, police chiefs have encouraged "community partnerships" with the police department, even though many in the community express distrust, if not disdain, for police behavior.

Police leaders and officers wrestle with such issues as judicial and community oversight, inappropriate use of force, the philosophical shifts of

professional policing, and the daily rigors of providing police services in local communities. The rule of law, judicial oversight, and the norms of the community establish a framework for governing the local police institution in a democracy, but it is ultimately the chief who determines how these mandates will be developed and implemented within the police organization and the community.

The field of law enforcement has been evolving from a reactive to a preventive approach to reduce crime and improve community safety. This means continuing to address ongoing issues of crime while mobilizing support from the community for law enforcement and crime-prevention efforts. This is now taking place within the context of a post-9/11 world with the advent of sophisticated, modern technology.

Police leaders must maintain a balance between providing safety and law enforcement, and ensuring the protection of people's civil rights and liberties. This study will explore the specific organizational leadership and community issues that must be addressed by the chief to ensure that the community is safe and that its residents are afforded respect and decent treatment by its police officers. This important balance enables the police chief to maintain a leadership role in a community.

The critical role and behavior of police officers in American society has been thoroughly documented for over 50 years. What is not always well understood is that the person who leads the police department must make constant choices among a number of reasonable alternatives. These choices reflect changes in external contexts and events, evolving social philosophies and policies, and external and internal political pressures. The police chief is responsible for the overall direction of every police department in America.

A police leader is responsible for establishing a vision and mission for the department, creating strategies to implement that vision, building a team that supports the vision, and managing external and internal challenges and accountability for the successful implementation of the vision. He or she must recognize the strong values of the community and the importance of empowering police officers to meet the goals of the vision and mission of the department. The value of the departmental staff and the importance of input from the community must also be acknowledged and incorporated into the chief's vision. Perhaps the most important task of a police chief is to serve as the principal communicator, who must articulate the vision to both the department and the community. He or she must have the ability to not only teach, but also to actively persuade and mobilize support for the vision.

This book tells the stories of 26 American police chiefs, who come from diverse ethnic and racial backgrounds and a variety of departments and communities across the United States. The chiefs were selected to participate in these conversations because of their recognized experience as police leaders. Many of the chiefs have served in more than one city and others

have been acknowledged as leading innovators in the field of policing. They bring their own personal experience and professional leadership style to the position. Many came to policing through their own choice, with no prior family involvement in the profession. Most have a college education and certainly place a very high value on both education and broad experience. Many worked and lived through events of the past 40 years and a few started their police careers following the serious civil disturbances in American cities in the 1960s and 1970s.

These 26 men and women offer insights into their experiences working in a range of communities, from major urban cities to smaller towns across the country. All recognize the serious challenges the United States faces around economic inequality and racial divisiveness, as well as the post-9/11 realities of terrorism and homeland security. Though all the chiefs generously offered an analysis of their departmental challenges, they also displayed gracious acceptance and reflection about the mistakes that had been made during their tenures. In most cases, the mistakes involved hiring the wrong person for the wrong reasons. Some admitted that their inability to build consensus for their vision or address serious challenges in a more thoughtful, timely manner led to their downfall. Whatever the case, all of the chiefs demonstrate an important quality that Martin Linsky and Ron Heifetz so ably underscore in their book *Leadership on the Line* when they trumpet the importance of “leadership adaptability.”¹ The central values that distinguish this group of police leaders include adaptability, tenacity, and willingness to explore new frontiers.

Though their police jurisdictions were different, the chiefs universally agreed that the key elements of successful police leadership included creating a vision of policing in a democracy and developing strategies for implementing that vision. In addition, the chiefs clearly recognized the fundamental need to develop and support their police officers as well as building strong relationships with both the community and the political structure of the city.

Choices of Police Leaders in America

1

Policing: An Evolving American Institution

The vision of what a police department should be has evolved significantly over the past 100 years. In the early 1920s, police chiefs such as August Vollmer of Berkeley, California, were primarily concerned with the structure of their organizations. Vollmer is considered one of America's first professional police leaders. His focus on building a well-constructed, professional organization set the tone for police leadership all over the country. His vision was designed to combat corruption and community disorganization. The increased incidence of crime during what is known as the Progressive Era in the United States created a new mandate to deal with institutional development and serious corruption issues in police organizations. The Progressive Era was a pivotal period in American history during the early 1900s when new American public institutions, such as the police, were in the midst of reform and reorganization.

Vollmer introduced professional standards for recruit selection and officer training, recognizing that these two elements were fundamental to insuring the establishment of a professional police department.¹ He set up a training program that focused on the roles and functions of the officers, and ensured that there were clear policies regarding how the police should interact with the public. Prior to Vollmer's initiatives, most police departments operated within a patronage system and essentially allowed all situations to be handled according to the whims of individual officers on the beat. Though Sir Robert Peel in England had an initial vision of policing as early as the 1830s, it was Vollmer who set the standard for developing the profession in the United States.²

In 1931, President Hoover created the Wickersham Commission to confront an ongoing pattern of corruption and failure of police integrity. The commission was mandated to do a "searching investigation of the whole structure of our federal system of jurisprudence" with particular emphasis on police tactics in a democracy.³ Though Vollmer had outlined some of the key tenets of police professionalism, the corruption and outrageous mismanagement of police departments in the late 1920s necessitated development of a set of professional standards that would guide the world of policing.

In the early 1950s, there was increasing recognition of the need for a strong centralized form of police leadership. Although the Wickersham Commission had made some progress to improve police management, there was still evidence of serious police leadership failures throughout the country. There was also concern that allowing uncontrolled police discretion could undermine the individual rights of citizens. Though the police leaders had tried to address the issues of professionalism and corruption for many years, the institution still lacked a clear professional foundation to manage the essential relationship between officers' discretionary power and the rule of law that was supposed to guide their decision making. Considerable attention was focused on judicial oversight of police officers in order to reduce corruption as well as overzealous behavior, while police chiefs were limited to managerial and technocratic duties. The chiefs' primary mandate was to prevent charges of police misbehavior while instituting policies and controls to prevent the inappropriate use of police discretion in the community. They had little interest in directly involving the community in any form of oversight or collaboration with their departments. The Los Angeles Police Department had set the standard for a legalistic model of policing, which emphasized professionalism and maintained only a minimal technical relationship with members of the community.

In the 1960s and 1970s, while police chiefs continued to focus on the need for improved efficiency and professional managerial excellence, many of the nation's police chiefs began to face direct challenges to their authority. In particular the public was reacting to the police response to civil rights, political, and Vietnam War demonstrations. Cities were erupting in riots that reflected the failure of American leaders to address the legitimate civil rights protections for all citizens. In cities such as Newark, New Jersey, and New York, challenges to police authority not only took place in the halls of the government but in the streets. The bloody confrontations between police officers and citizens underscored the breakdown of law and social order. In 1967, the President's Law Enforcement Commission stated that "the struggle to maintain a proper balance between effective law enforcement and fairness to individuals pervades the entire criminal justice system. It is particularly crucial and apparent in police work because every police action can impinge directly and perhaps hurtfully, on a citizen's freedom of action."⁴

There was considerable external pressure for greater community control of the police departments. Whereas some police departments considered establishing boards of citizens to provide institutional oversight, other departments completely rejected this concept. New internal strategies were initiated, including community relations units, designed to both mollify and engage citizens in a more positive relationship with their local police. Police leaders who had previously made every effort to maintain their distance from any community accountability were now faced with a new reality.

Politicians and community leaders began to demand a direct relationship with their police departments and their police leaders. Police chiefs could no longer maintain a posture of professional distance from the community; instead, they had to explore new policies and structures that would enable their departments to gain both respect and support from their local communities. At the same time, the collective concerns of police officers were being expressed internally with the onset of the police labor union movement.

In the 1980s and 1990s, the evolving police culture expressed formally through the new police unions questioned leadership as well as many of the new strategies for working with the community. Though maintaining professional distance had some value in reducing police corruption, it clearly had alienated many community members. Police officers had to struggle with the accepted internal norms around use of force as well as a profusion of unwritten rules within the policing community. Police leaders in cities across the country began to realize that there was a need for more creative efforts to manage the relationship between police officers and their communities. Program approaches such as community policing and problem-solving policing began to emerge. Research projects such as the Police Foundation's Kansas City Police Study highlighted the need for greater community participation and prevention-oriented efforts to reduce the spread of crime. This study had carefully assessed the Kansas City Police Department's allocation of police resources. The results of the study underscored that there was no clear method or logic for allocation of resources to prevent crime, but found that the police primarily only respond to crime after it had been committed.⁵ However, the internal police culture was not prepared for community-oriented policing approaches, and police leaders found themselves caught in the middle between the community and their own officers. This balancing act requires an understanding of the culture, norms, and practices of the department. Working with the police culture remains a primary concern of police leadership.

The Rodney King incident and ensuing riots in 1992 in Los Angeles sparked a new community dialogue about police leadership. The issue of use of coercive force by police officers was at the top of the agenda, along with the need to improve community relations and protect individual rights. No longer could a police leader focus on managerial priorities alone. In Los Angeles as well as other cities, there had to be a clear organizational vision that included both the department and the community. As the realization of this vision emerged over the past 50 years, it was also clear that the formation of such a partnership was not always achievable. The history of police leadership in America was not a cumulative succession of distinct visions, but a continuing challenge that required police leaders describing a vision continuously during their tenures.

Leadership as a Balancing Act: “Walking the Razor’s Edge”

In the present world of American policing, police chiefs face countless dilemmas as they try to clarify their mission regarding their departments’ direction in the community. One of the biggest challenges is balancing political demands for law enforcement with the need to mobilize community support and maintain trust. In recent years, new challenges, such as terrorism and immigration, are further redefining police departments’ missions. The very tenets of the role of police officers in a democracy have been central to discussing immigration, terrorism prevention, and crime reduction. The need to maintain the safety and security of the public while ensuring a respect for the rights of each individual creates dilemmas for police leaders on a daily basis.

Of course, police chiefs do not make such decisions in isolation and in fact have often had to negotiate with political leaders or superiors, such as the mayor and other constituencies, concerning values, constraints, and ground rules. Chiefs must juggle many external and internal political realities and policies, while maintaining support for their vision and ultimately the successful implementation of policing strategies in a local community. This study enabled police chiefs to tell their stories about the many dramas that unfold in meeting the internal and external challenges to their role and authority.

Central to the success of the police leader is developing a relationship with the community and establishing a vision that creates a clear mission to meet the needs of both the department and the community. Strong leaders are self-directed, but their understanding is formed by learning and their relationships with others. The impact of one’s peers, mentors, and other personal influences ensures development of unique leadership styles. In these conversations with the chiefs, there was an opportunity for them to outline their personal influences and guidance in developing their leadership approaches. They described how they deal with specific crisis situations or built the capacity of their department to address new challenges, such as gang violence or changing community demographics. Chiefs spoke of their own leadership training and how they used the experience and writings of others in developing their style. The role of the police leader is demanding, sometimes frustrating, but at all times central to the life of the community.

Strategies to Reduce Crime While Protecting the Public

Once a police chief has articulated the vision and built consensus for the support of the mission, it is up to him or her to shape and manage strategies for the officers to implement it in the community. Studies, evaluations, and other performance indicators often drive strategies. For example, a fundamental

finding of the Kansas City Police Study by the Police Foundation in the late 1970s was that “random motorized police car patrolling neither reduces crime nor improves the chances of catching suspects.”⁶ In fact, although “it used to be thought that saturating an area with patrol cars would prevent crime, it does seem to, but only temporarily, largely by displacing crime to other areas.” Researchers also found that “police who ride in patrol cars, especially two-person cars, become rather self contained and remote.”⁷ Traditional patrol strategies were neither reducing crime nor reassuring potential crime victims, some of whom feared the police as much as they did the criminals.

Later in the 1990s, police leaders who had placed the majority of their efforts into organizing their departments to respond quickly to 911 calls began to recognize that a response approach was not having much impact on the crime rate. Their police officers were chasing calls and only dealing with issues after the crime had already been committed. Police leaders began to explore the possibility that police could actually prevent crime and ask how they might reorganize their departments to meet this goal. New strategies for crime prevention involved improved relationships with the community.

As a result of the critical feedback received during the 1980s and 1990s, new community-oriented, participatory, and problem-solving policing strategies evolved to manage the relationship between the police and their communities. These approaches emphasized mobilizing police officers to build partnerships with the community and gain support for prevention and problem-solving strategies. Police leaders also began to explore new methods of using data to identify crime patterns and improve accountability for crime reduction from department commanders. Police leaders have introduced the following four strategies across the country in the past 20 years: community policing, broken windows theory, problem-solving policing, and measuring performance and results internally. These strategies have become the core elements of police leaders’ visions for providing safe American communities.

Community Policing

Community policing includes the concepts of police–community reciprocity, decentralization of command, reorientation of patrol, and generalized rather than specialized policing. These managerial approaches are directly linked with the police departments’ overall efforts to communicate with the communities they serve. To facilitate this new level of communication, departments established specific geographic districts for patrol officers, created structures to ensure a regular flow of information between district officers and their communities, and developed an overall mission that underscored the value of positive police and community relations. The results of these efforts have been manifested in many cities by crime reduction, improved community support, and an overall redirection of the norms and values of the policing

institution. Police leaders have embraced their positive relationship with the community because it provides institutional support and offers a clear direction for the allocation of police resources in the local community.

Broken Windows

In 1982 George Kelling and James Q. Wilson outlined their broken windows theory of crime prevention in *Atlantic Monthly* magazine.⁸ This policing strategy sought to reduce crime by addressing the quality-of-life issues that irritate people in the community and indicate a breakdown of order in a neighborhood. It focuses on keeping the physical environment of the community safe and clean, and mobilizes the police force to identify issues such as public drinking in order to establish a strong set of norms that support a law-abiding, safe community. It also provided the framework for police accountability and strategic use of police resources. This approach has become one of the benchmarks for American policing in the new century.

Kelling introduced his theory to the New York City's transit system leadership, and it was applied in an urban environment that was besieged by graffiti, homelessness, and public safety issues. Kelling then joined with Police Chief William Bratton in implementing the broken windows theory in New York City. Their work led to a significant reduction of crime and an overall improvement of the perception of safety on the streets and in the subways of New York City. This theory was linked with zero-tolerance approaches to crime reduction and a new accountability structure that focused on the allocation of police resources to support crime prevention mandates from police leaders.

Problem-Solving Policing

In the late 1990s and into the new century, police leaders explored a problem-solving approach as a key component of the overall community policing strategy. Problem-solving models argue for more police discretion by the person on the beat rather than strictly through the rule of law.⁹ The models highlight the role of the police officer as a participant within the community as well as a source of support even outside of the normal parameters of rule of law. In some locations, officers carefully track burglary patterns and create prevention plans to reduce the incidence of this crime. As one example of problem solving, the Charlotte–Mecklenburg (North Carolina) Police Department implemented a thoughtfully organized marketing campaign to remind people to close their garage doors, and the result of this problem-solving effort was a dramatic reduction of home burglaries. These types of participatory initiatives have become more engaging for police officers in the

past 10 years as police leaders encourage problem-solving and community policing orientations to communities.

Expectations for police participation and, ultimately, resolution of community problems are not always clear or possible. Still, the police leader must be able to find and implement the appropriate approach to settle all matters effectively and respectfully.

Measuring Performance and Results Internally

The debate continues about the efficacy and value of community policing. The debate focuses primarily on the allocation of police resources and how to support both strict law enforcement and a problem-solving approach to crime prevention. The importance of a strong, positive relationship between the police and the community is a constant value. However, the bottom line is always how well the department is able to prevent crime and protect the public's safety.

The Compstat process of internal police accountability was introduced and championed by Chief Bratton in New York City and has become a central accountability tool for police executives.¹⁰ The process brought police commanders together with other top police executives on a regular basis to examine in detail the specific crime patterns, incidents, and suspects that might be involved with criminal activities in police districts. Top police commanders carefully scrutinize strategies and tactics for crime intervention and prevention. In addition at these sessions, the commanders develop specific strategies for enforcement that are formulated at the Compstat sessions. Police leaders have used Compstat to measure their departmental performance as well as demonstrate the value of their prevention and intervention strategies to the entire community. Prior to the introduction of the Compstat model, police leaders monitored their officers' response to 911 calls and attempted to extrapolate information from reviewing the Part One crime data, which essentially tabulates only the more serious crimes that have been committed in a community. The Compstat model gave police leaders a tool that could both monitor local crime and nuisance incidents as well as help them prevent crime, rather than only react to it.

The Compstat approach had a significant impact on allocating resources for community policing. However, chiefs still face numerous external constraints, such as monitoring and oversight, conflicts with the courts and prosecutors, and debates about distribution of resources and application of the law. There have been mixed reactions within departments to the steady, focused review of police officer accountability through the Compstat process. Some chiefs believe the rigorous inquiries and emphasis on data and statistical outcomes can undermine officer morale. However, it remains the chief's responsibility to navigate the department on a steady course among a myriad of bureaucratic, political, and community needs and goals.

Communicating the Vision: Building and Managing a Team

Once a department vision and strategies have been identified, police leaders must be able to organize a team and build its capacity. They must enable the department to understand and value community goals and incorporate them within the department vision. The team also has to recognize the influence of the external political actors. Meeting the needs and expectations of the community in conjunction with the organizational and political goals of the department requires a delicate political and social balancing act. To meet the new challenges of terrorism prevention, emerging new immigration patterns, overall crime reduction, and mobilization of community support has required creating a new organizational capacity and style of police leadership.

Police leaders acknowledge the pivotal role that commanders and first-line supervisors perform in the organization. However, there has been limited success with the formulation of leadership and supervisory training approaches that adequately address the police supervision challenges. According to James Q. Wilson:

Police patrol officers are members of coping organizations: their discretion is not easily limited by imposing rules. An excessive reliance on rules can lead to shirking or to subversion. To solve the problem of arbitrariness one must rely on effective management, especially on the part of first-line supervisors—sergeants and lieutenants.¹¹

Few police leaders have been able to provide adequate leadership development to meet the supervisory challenges that face police officers on a daily basis. The challenge is to understand the variety of situations that police officers encounter and provide the executive leadership to ensure that a take-charge approach on the streets still reflects the vision for policing in a democracy.

Police Leadership Training

Building a team to carry out both democratic goals and crime-reduction objectives requires training. Police training in the past focused on upwardly mobile police officers, who essentially learned on the job from their senior departmental mentors. There was little external leadership training and limited contact by police leaders with members of the political, social, and economic communities. Most officers training focused on the legal requirements of the United States Constitution and its relationship to procedural law, rather than skills to handle the challenging human dilemmas that line officers face daily on the streets. Leadership training focused primarily on managerial skills and did not provide chiefs with the vision, organizational

understanding, or motivational tools to achieve the goals of policing in a democracy.

Even though Vollmer recognized the great value of police training in the early 1920s, it continued to be constrained by time and organizational creativity. With only limited success in subsequent years, in the 1990s the U.S. Congress mandated a new effort at police training with the development of the national Police Corps. This training program highlighted the value of a college education and incorporated much of the discipline and physical rigor of the military. More fundamentally, the Police Corps focused on preparing police officers for actual scenarios they would confront daily on the streets of local communities. They were taught many of the lessons William Ker Muir offered in his book *Police: Streetcorner Politicians*, including the value of knowing how to talk with people in order to prevent issues from escalating into crime or other disorders.¹² Police Corps training was linked directly to developing police officers who could implement a community policing strategy in their assigned communities. It recognized that police officers are community leaders and provided them with the necessary skills to perform these roles. Though it focused primarily on new officer training, it also recognized the value of preparing future police leaders. In addition to Police Corps training, organizations such as the Police Executive Leadership Forum (PERF) initiated training at Harvard University that focused on leadership development. These two programs began to focus police leadership issues on a broader community context rather than a limited tactical leadership training, which had been the primary concern of past police leadership training.

Internal Police Culture

The police culture is a complicated territory. Police officers express a strong allegiance to their country, their community, and their fellow officers. Police officers expound a strong belief in respect for the law and respect for the values of their policing responsibilities. The culture is primarily focused on maintaining the customs and approaches of past policing methods and, in many instances, offers a limited level of support for many new policing initiatives. Long-time police officers are often reluctant to embrace new ways of working. Leaders who attempt to introduce change have to address behavioral norms firmly entrenched in the culture of the organization. Police chiefs who have been involved with community policing bemoan the difficulties of motivating their officers to accept a community-oriented approach. One chief described how his officers normally would retreat to headquarters on New Year's Eve as community members fired off their weapons to celebrate the New Year.

The code of silence is another difficult norm to overcome when attempting to get officers to give one another critical feedback and create more internal discipline. Obviously an internal culture that resists external critique or even internal feedback is not conducive to an honest, open review of organizational operations.

One of the leadership challenges after the Rodney King incident was the ability to manage the use of coercive force by officers. Few departments had ever established a personnel process that identified and corrected officer misbehavior prior to its being reflected by their negative actions in the community. The Ramparts Division scandal, which identified a tight-knit group of officers who engaged in drug theft and assaults on drug dealers in the Los Angeles Police Department, indicated that even positive values could be distorted. In the book *Official Negligence*, which describes the history of the LAPD, the description of the “cohesion” of the Ramparts Division units demonstrates how a valuable norm can become both dysfunctional and dangerous.¹³

In spite of the revelations about the Ramparts Division, Chief Bratton and others continue to address the challenge of reshaping their police cultures. In Los Angeles, Bratton talks about the power of the “warrior culture” in his department. Other chiefs discuss the difficulty of mobilizing the police culture to embrace and incorporate community policing. Police leaders want to empower their officers and the community, but, at the same time, they are responsible for ensuring the rights of people under the rule of law.

Police Unions

Since the 1970s, police unionization has matured into an important political constituency within the department, emphasizing the value and importance of the line officer. Unions have become the key advocates for police officers' benefits, work-related rules, and overall protection within the departmental internal affairs process. This has resulted in efforts to enhance and empower line officers within the department and within the community. In many states, the development of police unions has not occurred because of states' rights issues regarding workers' rights. The issue of officer empowerment continues to be a central theme for police leaders as they attempt to motivate their officers to meet the goals of the vision. There is some evidence of police empowerment in places such as Broken Arrow, Oklahoma, where the chief has been able to engage his line officers in developing new approaches to crime prevention and crime reduction.¹⁴ In the case of Broken Arrow, the chief actively engaged his officers in the internal management of the department as well as the creation of specific new strategies to build a more community-oriented role for police in the local community. Still there are only

limited examples of police leaders being able to muster the support of unions to actively participate in community policing approaches.

There is no doubt that chiefs must establish productive working relationships with unions, and, in most cases, this relationship revolves around wages, benefits, and matters of individual discipline. The broader policies of a police leader, however, are often either not confronted or not very clearly supported by the police union. Many of the chiefs interviewed for this study express their frustration with the continuing challenge to mobilize union support for their vision, especially if it involves a progressive focus on building strong community relationships.

Supervision and Internal Accountability

The manner in which chiefs manage issues of police conduct is critical to their success on the job. In recent years, police chiefs have made the issue of internal affairs and the maintenance of police integrity a primary focus of their administrations. In addition, many have developed new internal accountability structures to manage the daily performance of their officers. At PERF conferences in 2006 and 2007, as well as within informal networks, chiefs are talking about early warning systems, positive discipline–support schemes, improved data collection of officer performance, and new approaches to midlevel supervision and management support of officers. As police chiefs confront the issues of officer accountability and the impact of the police unions on the disciplinary process, they must still generate an active level of officers' participation in determining the allocation of resources.

External Relations and Political Challenges

Community Relationship Building

In the 1950s, the police chief stayed out of any overt involvement in politics and played a more technocratic role. Today's community-oriented policing approaches require an active involvement in the political life of the community. Many chiefs have found themselves carefully commenting on schools, health care systems, and local political issues that impact the police in the community. In Los Angeles, Chief Bratton faced a tenure fight for his position. He had established strong ties with a very diverse set of community leaders. However, during the tenure situation, Bratton also had to confront a serious set of misjudgments by some of his officers who violated a wide range of departmental policies when they mismanaged crowd control at a May 1, 2007, immigration rally in a Los Angeles park. Fortunately, Bratton's strong relationship with the community facilitated his reappointment for

another 5-year term, in spite of renewed concern about the behavior of some of his line officers. Bratton's own reservations about the departmental culture remain quite strong.

Chiefs need to have strong political skills that enable them to integrate their mission with the overall goals of the community. One of the most critical ingredients of the police chief's role as a political manager is the ability to develop and maintain strategic relationships, partnerships, and alliances within the community. Bratton's behavior in Los Angeles demonstrates the necessity of developing these partnerships. Lee Brown, the former police chief of New York City, established some of the earliest community policing approaches in this country. He knew that his relationship with the community was important to his own tenure, but more fundamentally creating a new, productive style of policing in that city was a top priority.

Political Pressures

The impact of the external political world on the work and tenure of a police chief is powerful. The majority of police chiefs remain in their positions for an average of only 3 to 4 years. Those who are successful usually have managed to maintain a fine balance between their vision of policing and the demands of the politicians who put them in their jobs. Chiefs have faced demands by mayors to limit their community relationship-building activities in favor of stricter enforcement policies that have alienated portions of the community. Chiefs have also faced the challenge of their inability to appoint qualified candidates, as mayors have interfered with the chief's staff selection process. The police leader's role includes managing the strategies of law enforcement within the larger context of the politics of law enforcement. Recognizing this fine line seems to be a fundamental act of enlightenment, and how one performs the balancing act is the critical deciding factor in the success or failure of the chief.

Police chiefs struggle to balance their oversight roles within the police organization with monitoring from other political and community actors. James Q. Wilson says that mayors need to define the role of the police chief as "nonpolitical." In this case, the police chief operates as a managerial leader who has received support from the mayor. The chief attempts to operate outside of the political boundaries that might confront the mayor on a daily basis.¹⁵ At the same time, police chiefs must educate their mayors about the past history of anticorruption-oriented policing in America. Chiefs must demonstrate their own clear commitment to law enforcement while mobilizing political support for their management of a first priority city agency. Again, it goes back to the chief's vision, which describes the police services that the police chief has made a commitment to deliver to the people of the community.

Accountability and Performance Measures

As police chiefs have struggled to establish their visions, they have faced numerous internal and external challenges to their management of police officers. Civilian structures for review of police conduct grew out of the need to challenge internal review processes as well as to provide greater police accountability and legitimacy to the community. Though police chiefs have used Compstat measures to monitor the department's efforts to reduce crime, there are limited tools available to measure individual officer street performance. In the absence of these officer measures and internal feedback processes to discuss problematic officer performance, external oversight boards have been established in some American cities. Applying external performance measurements to departmental goals further complicates police leaders' attempts to manage their departments and carry out their vision.

Police leaders have tried to establish indicators of police performance and accountability for over 50 years. In the 1950s, the key indicator of police leadership was the elimination of police corruption and the elimination of political involvement of police in external matters, such as elections or specific illegal business ventures. Managerial efficiency and commitment to technocratic goals were the primary measures of success.

In the 1960s, tense relations between the police and significant segments of the community were exposed and vilified. As the police institution attempted to respond to this negative exposure, police leaders established new accountability standards. For example, the chiefs measured response times to 911 calls and tried to demonstrate that these services had a direct impact on reducing crime. However, these measures raised significant questions about the impact and allocation of police resources, especially when studies such as the Kansas City Police Study found no evidence that the presence of police officers deterred crime in the city as a whole, even if it did in some high-presence neighborhoods.¹⁶

Police chiefs did their best to incorporate these research findings into new accountability criteria, which included both crime reduction and crime prevention. Although police departments had reported on Part One crimes (such as homicide and robbery) annually for years, the community policing approach provided a fundamental link to new strategies for preventing and allocating police resources to serious crimes as well as to lesser crimes in the community.

External oversight mechanisms, such as civilian review boards and other disciplinary processes, have a significant impact on police leadership. Whereas the value of participatory leadership is widely acknowledged, major political forces can and do present challenges, especially when a civilian review board raises questions about a chief's leadership in the department and the community. Questions remain whether a review board, which normally

comprises citizens who monitor discipline or serious community incidents, can ultimately provide legitimacy for policing efforts and protect the rights of people in the community. This external process might be linked with an internal affairs disciplinary process managed through the police chief for the entire department. Oakland, California, and the New Jersey State Police are two police jurisdictions where police officers' accountability issues led to external federal monitoring. The focus in both jurisdictions was on racial profiling, police accountability, and allocation of police resources.

Private Security Services

In the past 20 years, there has been a significant increase in the use of private security services in many communities, which has triggered questions about how to reconcile the boundaries and costs of public and private security resources in a democratic society. The potential effect on public agency budgets is another challenge, as political, business, and community members evaluate police leadership and its effectiveness in providing security services.¹⁷

Significance of the Role of the Police Leader

The police organization operates in a world of great uncertainty, as reflected in the "situational discretion" of the line officer and the methods that police leaders offer to support the positive use of their authority. This underscores the necessity of managing the results of their interactions and providing clear documentation of the outcomes of the police services. Of course this organization of results has been another challenge that police leaders have faced in the last 50 years. Police chiefs have moved from measuring reduction of corruption, to documenting the reduction of serious community and police conflicts, to measuring their response to calls for services, and, finally, to the new challenges of documenting prevention of crime.

These are real challenges that police chiefs confront on a daily basis. Their vision is not a sterile guide to be followed blindly, but a template that reflects the values and the moral compass of both the police and the community. The police chief's vision is the focus of attention for the department, and a representation of the goals and vision of the entire community.

This study is designed to help the public understand how police chiefs operate in a democracy. Though the public expects the police to protect them, little has been written about how police leaders get this job done. With this in mind, 26 police leaders were willing to tell their stories about how they confront the serious challenges that sometimes make our communities unsafe. The police are the ones we call when we are in trouble and we expect them to do something about the problem after that call. The media tell us

about the outcomes of police officers' responses to our calls. Now we will have the opportunity to meet these police leaders. Their stories will show us how police chiefs think, organize, and develop a well-functioning department that it is hoped will keep our communities safe and secure.

In today's post-9/11 society, police chiefs face many challenges, including shifting ethnic demographics, a rise in youth violence, and internal opposition to departmental strategies for law enforcement and community acceptance. Though these challenges are not necessarily new, they are complicated by organizational history and global developments. The police chief of the past, who only had to worry about the daily deployment of officers, is long gone. Today's chief is a community leader who must understand the balance between enforcing the law and ensuring strong community support for the police and their mission. This is the challenge that will be discussed in the following chapters.

Introducing the Police Chiefs

2

Profiles of the Police Chiefs

The 26 police chiefs interviewed for this book have unique stories to tell. They are a special breed because they have committed themselves to ensuring the safety of their communities while supporting the most important values of the United States Constitution. As this study unfolds, you will have the opportunity to meet people who have faced city councils, mayors, and, of course, some of this country's most dangerous criminals. Almost all of the chiefs started their careers as line police officers, but some of the most progressive police leaders bring experiences from other areas of community life. The field of police leadership is not a static, career-ending occupation, but may offer new opportunities for leadership in other community roles. One former chief now serves as a minister in a local community near where he served as a police chief. Others have "crossed the aisle" and have served as mayors or performed in other political leadership roles.

Former Baltimore Police Commissioner Leonard Hamm grew up in Baltimore and enjoyed a distinguished career as a police officer prior to his appointment as commissioner. He was a well-known youth basketball star who enjoyed great respect within the department and throughout the city. When he retired from department the first time, he next served as the director of school safety, first for the Baltimore schools and then at Morgan State University. After the mayor of Baltimore recognized the limitations of importing two New York City police commissioners, he enticed Hamm in the winter of 2004 to accept the position of Baltimore police commissioner.

Commissioner Hamm was a community-oriented, African American police leader who struggled daily with his own intuitive sense of managing the city's difficult social, educational, and economic challenges. He had intimate knowledge of a city school system that was failing and in disarray. He also knew the life of the streets well as a young man who grew up in Baltimore and as a police officer. Hamm had worked closely with two mayors who actively campaigned around issues of youth violence and homicide reduction. He also served as a police commissioner during hotly contested gubernatorial and mayoral elections. He was an optimistic leader who marshaled a committed following of line police officers within the department,

as well as a dedicated team of top police executives who shared his mission for the department.

Hamm's observations about the life of the Baltimore police commissioner underscored the struggle of rebuilding a police department to meet the needs of a rapidly changing community. He epitomized the engaged urban professional with a regular-guy image that resonated well in a neighborhood-oriented city. Hamm also managed a zero-tolerance enforcement strategy while transitioning to a more community policing approach under a new mayor. Though Hamm was successful in many areas, the mayor, in the midst of a tightly contested election race, replaced Hamm. The primary election issue was crime. The homicide rate was rising and the Baltimore media pressured daily for a stronger police response. The mayor chose to bring in new leadership to meet that challenge or at least get the police leadership issue off the front page. Hamm's story is emblematic of the challenges other chiefs will discuss when they reflect on police leadership in a democracy and their communities.

In contrast, Commissioner Frank Straub in White Plains, New York, is an innovative, suburban police chief who has successfully navigated the political waters through two mayoral terms. He is the public safety commissioner, mandated to guide the collaboration of police and fire departments in support of major economic development in one of America's most prosperous cities outside of New York City. Straub's eclectic credentials include experience in the federal government, military, and urban police worlds. He also has a strong academic background, including a doctorate and extensive teaching experience, which enables him to carefully assess problems from an analytical as well as a practical point of view.

In the last 4 years, Straub's leadership has brought about a dramatic reduction of crime in the White Plains community, while supporting new initiatives designed to bolster relationships between police and youth to prevent the advent of gang violence. Straub is part of the new generation of police leaders who resolutely supported the use of Compstat to insure implementing the problem-solving approaches to crime prevention. He has found and applied new ways to develop supervisory personnel and addressed the rapid demographic changes in his community. Specifically, he has introduced a safe-housing plan, a youth violence prevention program, and numerous crime prevention initiatives designed to support a focused economic development program within the city. Although he is a thoughtful, reflective leader, Straub is known for his willingness to join his officers on bike patrol or climb ladders with his firefighters.

Chief Dean Esserman brought his New York City experience to Providence, Rhode Island, another challenging American city. Though he never worked as a line police officer, he had worked closely with some of America's most distinguished police leaders, including Lee Brown, William

Bratton, and George Kelling. Esserman got his start as an attorney with the New York City Transit Police. As general counsel and one of Bratton's key deputies, he provided hands-on leadership that reduced the incidence of quality-of-life violations, such as public intoxication and graffiti, in New York City's subway system. He subsequently became police chief in two Connecticut cities prior to his appointment to the Providence position.

Esserman was brought to Providence to reestablish police credibility in a city that had seen its dynamic mayor sent to prison for a wide range of corruption activities. He came in as a lone ranger forcefully and directly confronting the corruption within the police department. As a result of his efforts, he built a new institution committed to creating a reputation for integrity in policing. He has been described as one of America's preeminent police leaders. He is a strong advocate of community policing and has performed well as a member of the Police Executive Research Forum's inner circle of police reformers. Esserman has tackled some of his city's toughest challenges, including reducing youth violence and addressing serious internal police department corruption. He mobilized support both within the department and from members of the diverse Providence community.

Chief Ron Davis of East Palo Alto, California, is a new chief who worked for more than 20 years in Oakland prior to taking a leadership role in San Mateo County. East Palo Alto, a small ethnically diverse city near Stanford University, has seen its demographics shift dramatically from primarily African American to Latino and Samoan. Davis brings urban policing experience as well as direct involvement with federal consent decrees, where task forces are sent to cities in crisis to make specific changes in the police departments. He has assisted in reengineering departments with serious issues of racial discrimination, poor community relations, and uncontrolled use of force by police officers. Davis was brought to East Palo Alto by the mayor to build a professional department, and engage his officers and the community in building a diverse, economically viable, and safe community. His experience with the Oakland department taught him some positive lessons but also exposed him to methods of doing police business that were completely in conflict with his plans for East Palo Alto.

Other chiefs have had long tenures in a variety of departments. Robert Olson, who now serves as a special adviser to police services in Ireland, served as a chief in Minneapolis, Minnesota; Corpus Christi, Texas; New York City; and Yonkers, New York. While in Yonkers, he faced a serious set of internal challenges to his authority, including a mysterious incident where a bomb was found strapped to the chief's car at a local police station. He has extensive international experience and was the leader of an innovative community policing project in Jamaica that dramatically reduced the incidence of crime in several dangerous neighborhoods.

Olson's long experience is matched by William Lansdowne, the San Diego police chief, as well as Darrel Stephens of Charlotte, North Carolina. Both Lansdowne and Stephens have distinguished themselves as major proponents of problem-solving policing and have offered healthy critiques of the Compstat model of police accountability. Stephens is considered a dean of police leaders, as he provided innovative leadership that spawned the creation of the Police Executive Research Forum, the Washington, D.C., progressive think tank for police reform.

Although there are many distinguished long-time chiefs, Chris Magnus of Richmond, California, and Rick Fuentes of the New Jersey State Police represent a new generation of police leaders and offer important insights about police leadership in challenging policing environments. Magnus, a Caucasian, was brought from Fargo, North Dakota, to a predominantly African American city in California. He has confronted extensive internal challenges from a department that had essentially hunkered down and tried its best to withdraw from the community. Magnus directed that department back into a partnership-building approach with the community to address the high level of violence.

Fuentes was selected as superintendent of the New Jersey State Police soon after the department was slammed with a wide range of negative press accusations and a federal consent decree about their racial profiling policies. Though Fuentes had grown up in the department, he felt a strong commitment to rebuild the department's integrity and unravel its racial profiling practices in favor of a more community and racially sensitive approach to policing.

William Bratton, Lee Brown, George Hart, and Hubert Williams are some of the most engaging and committed police leaders in this country. Bratton has established a lifelong reputation for leadership and policing innovation. His tenure in New York City ensured him a place in the police leadership hall of fame. His creation of the CompStat model and the innovations that he brought to community policing are critical to the overall development of police leadership strategies in the United States and internationally. Bratton's book *Turnaround* documents his experience in Boston and New York City.¹ His interview helps us understand current police leadership challenges as well as new approaches that will guide policing in the future.

Brown has distinguished himself as both a police chief and a political leader. His interview outlines his reservations about the commitment of police leaders to the basic tenets of community policing and a vision that is inclusive of all members of the community. Brown was an early architect of the community policing approach. His skepticism about implementing this model is important to our understanding of police leaders' commitment to working with their local communities.

Hubert Williams—Newark, New Jersey, police chief in the 1960s and 1970s and now the president of the Police Foundation—expressed his

concerns and hopes for the future of policing. Williams is a candid, sober assessor of past police experiences as well as a visionary about how the future of policing may evolve in this country. He was joined in his depiction of the history of policing by David Couper, police chief in Madison, Wisconsin, in the 1970s and 1980s. Couper lived through the student disturbances on college campuses. He tells stories about the tough challenges he faced both from the community and his department. He discusses his decisions managing police use of force and his respect for citizens' rights. Further, Couper collaborated with Herman Goldstein to develop problem-solving approaches to policing in the early 1990s.

Two Oakland, California, police chiefs describe their efforts to professionalize and modernize their departments. Hart, a distinguished police leader from the 1970s and 1980s, discusses his professional approach to policing as well as the challenges his colleague, Wayne Tucker, faced during his tenure in that city. Both Tucker and Hart have extensive professional criminal justice backgrounds and their stories describe many of the internal and external obstacles to community policing.

San Francisco Chief Heather Fong was an administrative executive in her department when the "Fajitagate" fiasco triggered the firing of five of the top commanders, including the chief. The scandal involved serious ethical violations by the senior police commanders and inappropriate use of force by two police officers. Fong was brought in to reestablish the code of ethics and integrity for the entire department. Her story shows the difficulty of implementing a politically mixed department vision, operating in a politically charged external environment, and attempting to build consensus within an unbelievably challenging internal departmental culture. The chief faced serious internal resistance from her officers and the police union.

Her other California colleagues are veterans, including William Kolender, who has served as San Diego County sheriff and the City of San Diego police chief as well as the director of the California Youth Authority. Joe McNamara, now a tenured teaching fellow at Stanford University, served as the San Jose police chief for 15 years and at 38 was the youngest police chief in America when he was appointed chief in Kansas City in 1973. McNamara is well known for his provocative media commentaries about police leadership. His interview was particularly engaging as he discussed the loneliness of the police leader within a changing police culture.

Richard Pennington, the current police chief of Atlanta, talked about his tenure in New Orleans, where he fired more than 350 police officers for corruption. Pennington has also served as an influential leader of the National Organization for Black Law Enforcement Executives. Another Atlanta chief, George Napper, was the only chief interviewed who had never been a law enforcement officer. He was a professor at Morehouse College when he got the

call from Mayor Maynard Jackson entreating him to become Atlanta's police chief. The Atlanta police department was having serious internal and external struggles and needed a new type of leader. Napper had been a colleague of Lee Brown at the University of California's School of Criminology and was able to bring his unique academic perspective to the Atlanta Police Department.

Drew Diamond and Robert Lunney have been chiefs in major cities: Diamond in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and Lunney in Edmonton, Alberta. Both have had extensive experience promoting innovative, problem-solving methods and community policing approaches in the United States and other countries. Diamond is a leading advocate for community policing in the United States and has provided extensive consultation and support to police departments that have made commitments to rebuilding their police cultures and improving their relationships with local communities. Lunney is a well-known adviser to both American and international police chiefs, as he has a distinguished record for building strong, community-oriented police departments.

Another strong proponent of community policing is Gil Kerlikowske. He served as the deputy director of President Clinton's COPS program, which provided America's police departments 100,000 new police officers as well as many new programs and methods to support community policing. Kerlikowske now serves as Seattle's police chief and his tenure has been distinguished by rebuilding the integrity of the department after serious police failures during the World Trade Organization riots in 2000. Kerlikowske's observations about police leadership and the challenges of changing police cultures have been pivotal to the creation of a cadre of future police leaders.

Two police chiefs offer their experience with developing community policing and succession planning for police leaders. Ellen Hanson is a suburban police chief in Lenexa, Kansas. Hanson is a well-respected police leader who has established an excellent reputation for developing succession planning within her department. She has advised numerous chiefs on developing internal police leaders. She joins another fine chief, Jane Perlov, who brought community-oriented policing to Raleigh, North Carolina. Perlov was one of the first female commanders in the New York Police Department (NYPD). She was well respected because she had come up through the ranks. After leaving the NYPD, she served as the secretary of Public Safety in Massachusetts and then was recruited to Raleigh where she has served for more than 6 years. She recently took a position as a security executive for a major corporate banking institution. Another Southerner is the former chief of Hattiesburg, Mississippi, Charlie Sims. Sims served as a leader of the national Police Corps, a program created by Congress to establish new methods for recruit police training and police leadership development in this country. Sims has strong ideas about using training to challenge the status quo of the police culture.

Significance of Discussion: Why This Group of Police Leaders?

Many of the chiefs asked to participate in this study fostered some of the most significant reforms in American policing, including introducing the Compstat process and community policing. Others have successfully provided leadership in some of the most crime-ridden urban cities in the United States. Many have implemented innovative ideas concerning training and management. Still other chiefs have provided the critical leadership that assisted their city leaders in navigating the political and racial turmoil of the past 40 years. Many have a broad perspective from having served in several cities across the country.

Bratton, Brown, McNamara, and Couper will share their insights about the history of police leadership in the past 40 years. Other chiefs will discuss their personal experiences about promoting and leading change in their departments and their cities. All who participated are considered past, present, or future leaders of the policing establishment. They are a diverse group of men and women who have faced social, economic, and political challenges. Though not all started as police officers, they bring years of experience as problem solvers and mentors to other police officers, mayors, and community leaders, and they agreed to share both their positive and negative experiences. They discussed their mistakes, misunderstandings, and misjudgments as well as their successes. Their guidance and observations may assist future police chiefs as well as those who are interested in effective police leadership in their own communities.

A Vision for the Department and the Community

3

On February 10, 2007, a forum on police leadership was held at John Jay College in New York City. It was designed to promote educational opportunities for police leaders in New York State. John Timoney, the Miami police chief, was invited to give the keynote address. He was also joined on the panel by Providence, Rhode Island, Police Chief Dean Esserman; the former police chief of Rochester, New York, Dr. Cedric Alexander; Jeremy Travis, the president of John Jay University in New York City; and Dr. Maki Haberfeld, the director of the John Jay Police Science Program. Timoney was invited to discuss the challenges of police leadership in the United States.

At the outset of his presentation, Chief Timoney described the Knapp Commission era of the 1960s when the New York City Police Department (NYPD) was under intense scrutiny for its corrupt police practices. He had experienced this era of police corruption and the department's shift from an anticorruption emphasis to a focus on crime reduction. He discussed this reorientation of the NYPD's organizational strategy and then outlined some key lessons that he had learned as a police leader in New York City, Philadelphia, and Miami.

Recalling his Philadelphia tenure, Timoney lamented the lack of leadership, accountability, and buy-in from the police officers that underscored his negative experience in that city. There was no clear mission statement and the Philadelphia police culture was resistant to change. The civil service culture did not reward achievement, but quietly supported a negative, change-resistant, organizational culture. He described the police union as "one dimensional," with a system of personnel arbitration that included not only line officers but also his entire command structure. A union attorney at an arbitration hearing told one senior commander that "he should be careful with his statements against police officers as the same attorney may be defending him one day."

In his early Philadelphia days, Timoney had political and media support for introducing changes in the police department. Later, he found himself alone when the real challenges, such as reassigning incompetent staff and developing clear expectations for his line officers, had to be faced by the political leaders. He acknowledged that a major mistake had been his failure to fully appreciate the intransigence of the Philadelphia police culture. He then described the NYPD culture as being more supportive of change, innovation, and police officer education. He explained how the NYPD culture was well known for promoting police officer professional development.

In contrast, the Philadelphia culture was reluctant to encourage professional development and focused most of its attention on its internal civil service promotion structure. In the Philadelphia situation, Timoney lamented that the chief could only appoint one top command person outside of the civil service system. He felt strongly that his inability to appoint commanders for their talents and experience undermined his efforts to implement a progressive policing vision for Philadelphia.

Based on a more positive experience in Miami, Timoney stressed the importance of making changes early in one's tenure, remaining focused on sustaining the organizational changes, and building a culture that supports innovation. When he arrived in Miami, the first issue he faced was the excessive use of force by police officers. The departmental policy clearly prohibited officers from shooting at moving vehicles. Unfortunately, the norms of the department supported this practice in a variety of situations. Timoney enforced the policy of not shooting and clearly mandated that "unless there are tire tracks running over you" officers will not shoot at moving vehicles. He described how he implemented the policy change through active persuasion at all roll calls as officers went on duty. He also instituted significant changes in top management and continuously monitored every situation that involved the use of force. Through good communication and constantly reinforcing the policy, he established buy-in from his officers. This type of shooting is now rare, if nonexistent, in the department in Miami.

Another challenge for Timoney was establishing relationships with African Americans and Cubans after serious conflicts between the department and those communities. His role as a leader was to actively persuade his department and the community of the importance of community policing, problem solving, and respectful working relationships. This has been an ongoing challenge. From his perspective, the key to good leadership was building a team that would support his policing vision. In Philadelphia he had little opportunity for developing this vision or a management team. Fortunately, in Miami he had the latitude to do both as he could appoint a team of talented top commanders who supported his vision and the changes that he promoted for the Miami police department.

After Timoney's presentation, former Rochester, New York, Chief Cedric Alexander reiterated the observation that the consistency of the message from the top was pivotal to the success of a police leader. He also noted the balancing act police leaders face between internal norms regarding obedience to the chain of command and recently instituted norms that support police problem solving and police officer empowerment.

Chief Dean Esserman framed his rather subdued comments around a reference to the Greeks and Romans. He explained that the verb "to lead" in Greek carries the implication that the leader will die in the course of leadership.

He tied this analogy to the police leader's often lonely role and the difficulties of maintaining leadership in a city for an extended period of time.

Dr. Maki Haberfeld noted that concerns about police corruption in United States have been around for more than a century. From her perspective, it was only in the past 40 years, since New York City's Knapp Commission, that real efforts have been made to curtail police corruption. She suggested that training and education, as well as compensation for police officers, have been the pivotal elements of a new vision of police leadership that had helped create a more professional police force.

Timoney and his colleagues spent the evening describing many of the challenges police leaders face on a daily basis. Timoney's failure to understand the Philadelphia police culture prevented him from turning the department into a forward-thinking organization that would embrace his new approaches. Alexander described the difficulty of introducing strategies that require stiff enforcement of the law while insuring the mobilization of community support for police practices. Haberfeld's comments underscored the value of training, but also focused on issues of compensation and respect for the profession, especially when budgets are tight and cities struggle with how to measure the value of their police officers. Finally, Esserman candidly described the lonely role of the police chief who must contend with all of the problems of urban life while maintaining both internal and external support for the police department's vision. The John Jay forum on police leadership provided an exciting opportunity to hear police leaders discuss the challenges of police leadership in America. The stories offered in this study provide further insight into how chiefs manage many of these same struggles successfully and, in some cases, not so successfully.

Police Leadership in a Democracy: What Does This Mean?

The police chief is mandated to protect people's rights in accordance with the United States Constitution and ensure that officers perform their jobs within the requirements of the law. This basic legal framework is constantly drilled into the minds of police officers and its implementation is ultimately a fundamental mandate of police leaders. Ron Davis, the new police chief of East Palo Alto, California, is very cognizant of his role in a democracy.

The role of a chief in a democracy is a simple question with a very complex answer. Historically, police chiefs and departments thought of themselves as enforcers of the law and didn't think they had much of a role in a democracy. Police officers at the lowest level of the organization have enormous power to make arrests, take freedom from individuals, and use coercive force. The police chief has to be able to manage this awesome responsibility so that the

officers are a part of the democracy and not opposing it. At the same time, the chiefs must balance the needs of the community and the political needs along with the issues of civil rights. My sense is that the police chief becomes really a facilitator in a balancing act. You have so many interests to balance, yet you still have to accomplish the basic law enforcement function of the police chief.

For example, you get competing interests in a community. Crime is up and they want you to be aggressive. But if the aggression becomes abuse, which is a likely case, then they worry about too much aggression. You have practical concerns about the officers doing the job out there every day, providing them with the resources and tools to get the job done. Then you have the political concerns, dealing with the city council and elected officials who also have to balance other city services against your needs and have to get reelected.

Even the enforcement of law is political by nature. There are some laws that are considered minor, so people don't want the police to address them. Still laws that are felonies do not allow for any discretion. Robbery is robbery, but enforcement codes and the potential aggressive enforcement of these laws can be problematic. There are other laws that can bite too because it's both a police chief's responsibility and it's also a public values discussion that can involve the community's political leadership. In that sense, the police chief should become the lead adviser, the lead technician, or expert to help guide the city council and elected officials in the right direction.

Chief Davis mentions others in the community that he must take into account when making decisions and choices.

Inside the department you have a balancing act with police officers, unions, and associations. Depending on the size of the organization, this can include rank and file and the police management. So you have to balance management, rank and file officers, political leadership, and the community. We say "community" as if it's one, but it's not. East Palo Alto, for example, has a very large Hispanic population, a large Pacific Islander group, and a large African American community, so this is primarily a community of color. You have to try and balance the needs of all those communities. You want to be consistent in the enforcement of the law, but you also want to tailor your delivery of the law, if that makes sense. If you don't balance that appropriately, it will result in disparate outcomes that could ultimately spell your demise as a police leader!

New Jersey State Police Superintendent Rick Fuentes sees the balancing act as having more of a national security focus.

There are probably two different definitions—before 9/11 and post 9/11. I've been a police chief for this organization in the post-9/11 era and there's now a blurred distinction between homeland and hometown security.

Both Davis and Fuentes clearly see the police chief as the key governmental leader, who must integrate the goals of a democracy through the political, community, and organizational structures in which they work.

Consistency of the Chief's Message

Chiefs who have successfully built strong, committed organizations all seem to be guided by a vision or mission statement. Of course, most books on leadership describe the value of a clear, focused vision for an organization, so it is no surprise that successful police leaders understand the value of their vision statement. The consistency of the message about the value of community partnerships and the importance of not alienating the community through “heavy-handed” police tactics were primary factors in former Commissioner Leonard Hamm’s approach when he returned to the Baltimore Police Department after retirement.

When I first came back what I had was essentially four different police departments with four different missions and four different messages. The reigning thought for officers was to make it through the day to save their asses. If that meant they had to backstab a brother officer, that’s what they would do. I had to get everybody on the same page. I had to create one department again. In order to do that I had to make changes in personnel, changes in people, and those people that didn’t want to abide by the vision had to go. There were some people that wanted to buy in to the new vision, some people that wanted to trust it. I had to create an atmosphere of trust and respect. I had to let these guys and gals who work very hard know that I trusted them. All I asked of them was to be honest with me, don’t lie to me, and give me an honest effort, and we’ll figure out the new direction together.

The organizational challenges Hamm faced after two successive police commissioners had been fired for lack of integrity had to be addressed by developing a new vision for the Baltimore Police Department.

Chief George Napper served as police chief in Atlanta from 1978–1982 and then as the commissioner from 1982–1990. He had never served as a police officer until appointed chief in 1978. His vision of the police chief in a democracy incorporates the concept of human dignity.

The chief has to be very concerned about the human dignity of the people that he serves. I’ve always felt that a democracy had to be not only protected by the police, but also protected from the police in terms of the awesome power and authority they have, and the history of how they oftentimes have used it in a negative way. As a black police chief, I was mindful of that history and wanted to instill in all of our police and the various communities served a very strong

and meaningful understanding of what we would be doing as a police department. I had to ensure that human dignity was respected as a key component of my vision for the department.

Napper was concerned about the response of his personnel when he presented his vision to them.

I was aware that many in the police department were worried about being handcuffed themselves, as it were. I had the impression that they wanted to be able to do whatever they wanted to do any time they wanted to. I was very concerned about this kind of mentality, but there was never any kind of dilemma in my mind about the rights of citizens and the need to make sure these rights were protected!

Napper's close friend and mentor, Lee Brown, had a great influence on Napper's tenure in Atlanta. A former mayor of Houston, Texas, Brown also served as a police commissioner in New York City and police chief in Atlanta and Houston. Brown is very clear about the need for a strong, consistent vision and message for any police department.

First of all, I believe in the concept of community policing. Community policing is value-driven policing. All police agencies in a democracy must have a set of values that they follow and set rules by. Policies, procedures, training—everything a police agency does must be governed by values. One of the values must be that it's the role of the police officer to protect the constitutional rights of the people and that is just as important as enforcing the law. I see the role as probably one of the most important elements of government because their role is to protect the Constitution. If they do that, then in my estimation, they become the most important employees in city government.

As for the “balancing act” between protecting people's rights and enforcing the law, Brown observes:

I don't think it's something that you balance. You are required by the nature of your duty to enforce the law. That's what you're responsible for. But you do so in the context of the Constitution of the United States and all that law results from it. I don't see any conflict. The Constitution is the overarching document that guides how police officers, and certainly the police chief, govern themselves.

Brown then emphasized that the chief's vision sets the direction of the department.

The chief has to have a vision as to where he or she wants the department to go. I'm biased, again, as I believe in community policing. Once that vision is

determined, the chief must have the ability to articulate it so that the police department and the community understand it. Then the third responsibility of the police chief is to mobilize the members of his or her department as well as the community in implementing the vision. I think the important element for a police chief is to have a vision.

The Police Chief's Vision Provides the Balance for Success

Drew Diamond was the former Tulsa, Oklahoma, police chief and is now deputy director of the prestigious Police Executive Research Forum (PERF). He has been a consultant to police chiefs for many years and has developed an impressive record as a national and international police adviser who specializes in the problem-solving approach to policing. One of Diamond's and PERF's most challenging democratic policing successes was in Jamaica. Diamond and his team created a dramatic turnaround in a community that had been very undemocratic and crime ridden.

Unfortunately, I've seen policing in nondemocratic settings, as well as seeing police violate democratic principles in our own country at times. In terms of police leadership, it is the chief's job to ensure that that police services in their communities, in the context of a democracy, are honest, play by the rules, are transparent to the community, and recognize flaws and are constantly trying to fix them. Democratic police forces have to be open and accountable. These are not clichés. This has to be built into the policies and practice. In this country and worldwide, police leadership sometimes thinks that their first priority, in terms of their own survival, is to take care of the needs of the men and women of the police department. That's not correct. The men and women of the department all raised their hands and volunteered. They know the risks. I want police officers to be treated respectfully and I want them to be safe. Still the first priority is the community. This is the balance that at times can be difficult.

Diamond again underscores the difficulty of this balancing act as he describes the variety of needs and interests that must be addressed by the chief. It is this ability to negotiate competing interests that many of the chiefs address, struggle with, and finally, if successful, learn how to manage.

Gil Kerlikowske, the chief of Seattle's police, has extensive police leadership experience as both a chief and as the former deputy director of the Department of Justice's COPS program. He has worked closely with chiefs in departments of all sizes throughout the country and sees a continuum in the way police chiefs visualize their roles.

Chiefs live and work within in a continuum. There are police chiefs who believe that it is solely their responsibility to run an efficient and effective law enforcement agency. Then at the other end of the continuum, there are chiefs who believe that their role is to pontificate on every possible issue from abortion protests to the death penalty. My view is that first and foremost you need to run a good police department. You can't be good on the outside dealing with the community unless you're good on the inside. If you have issues inside—corruption, professionalism, training, etcetera—you've got to take care of those things first. But you also have a secondary responsibility to provide advice and direction, policy, and guidance to the community on legitimate public safety issues that affect the people you're sworn to protect. Policymakers want that advice. You should do it in a reasonable, evidence-based way rather than off the top of your head. Your word in the community carries a great deal of weight.

The chief must have the officers understand that there are limits to their authority. These limits are established to protect people and, in some cases, even people whom the officers arrest. The other fact is that we are a nation and a community of laws. As upset and unhappy as they [the officers] may be at times with a court ruling or a change in the law, it actually strikes a good balance.

Kerlikowske focused on ensuring that the internal culture of the department was clear about its mission and its capacity to deliver police services in accordance with this vision.

Robert Lunney, former police chief of Edmonton and a few other Canadian cities, as well as one of the PERF's most knowledgeable consultants, has done a tremendous amount of work with leadership development. He was a key assessor of the Congressionally funded Police Corps program, which developed training for future police leaders. He was an architect of PERF's successful community policing program in Jamaica and has also worked extensively in Ireland and other British Commonwealth countries. His international work provides another perspective on the balancing act concept.

The role of the police is to support democratic principles and the chief is the one who best embodies them and insures that the force operates on those principles. I see it as a commitment to public service and I see the role of the police as balancing freedom and order. The question is how much freedom and how much order. These are the critical decisions to be made by any chief as he shapes the culture of his organization and the way he presides over its performance. The police are part of the social contract between the government and the people, and the people and each other. The chief's major role is order maintenance and law enforcement, but it's broader than that. At a higher level, I always thought of policing as social engineering. That gets us into areas of prevention and support for those positive forces in the community.

To carry out their roles, good police leaders need to have leadership characteristics. Chief Esserman of Providence, Rhode Island, outlined what he thought those characteristics might be.

One is to provide public safety for the community, which is very different from simply leading the police department. My job is to manage resources of those under my command and those around me to work toward public safety. I look at public safety not only as being about crime but also fear, and I try to address both. I think the second role for me is to develop a Hippocratic oath for those that wear my uniform, which starts with doing no harm. The police have a history of doing a tremendous amount of harm and being apart from the communities. They have enormous power and a tradition of abusing it and they have a hard time reining it in. That has been for the most part the spark for civil unrest in this country—some sort of interaction between a citizen and a police officer. Sometimes one was at fault and sometimes the other. I've always believed that the greatest protector of civil rights could be the police because the police can enforce social justice.

Another reform-minded chief is Chris Magnus of Richmond, California, who served as chief in Fargo, North Dakota, prior to his appointment to Richmond. Although Fargo and Richmond have very different geographies as well as social and ethnic demographics, he focuses on the relationship between the community and the police, and whether the community gets “what it may desire or deserve.”

My vision is to have a department that really helps create a city that you can feel safe in and that you can enjoy living in. When you get people talking and engaged and really thinking about the city's potential, it always comes back to that vision and transforming the community into that kind of place. Departments have mission statements and visions that talk about quality service and professionalism and treating the public with respect and all these kinds of things. Don't get me wrong; I think all of that is extremely important. I look at those as maintenance goals.

Challenges to the Leader's Vision: External and Internal Pressures

When Magnus first came to Richmond, California, his officers were resistant to any organizational changes that required greater contact with the citizens of the community. Many were opposed to the very concept of community policing and engaging the people of the community in crime prevention. In addition, the crime rate was skyrocketing with a significant increase in the number of murders and shootings. The entire community was adamant that

the new chief must bring dramatic changes in policing to the city immediately. He was well aware that his appointment was specifically linked to the community's commitment to change.

In a lot of ways, it comes back to the notion that every community to some extent gets the kind of policing that they ultimately want and that they're asking for, even without necessarily thinking in that particular way. I was going to say what they deserve, but maybe that's a little harsh. Police departments really do reflect what a community wants. Sometimes a community's not sure what it wants and that also comes through very clearly in the type of police department it has. When a police department is under fire or subject to a great deal of public criticism, sometimes it says at least as much if not more about the community itself as it does about the department, in terms of how things have gotten where they are and what the community has gotten from its officers and from its chief. It says a lot about how neighborhoods have evolved in that community and what sort of things have been ignored or tolerated as well as encouraged and even nurtured. Although there certainly are some dysfunctional police departments, the great thing about a democracy is that this is what the community has allowed to develop. When a community's ready for that to change, I think then we will see real change in these departments where there is dysfunction.

Clearly Magnus is focused on safety and actively engaging the community in working with his department to achieve this goal. He knows well that this approach to crime reduction is as risky as it is potentially successful. His vision has been well received in the community, but in some cases challenged in the department. Still he has held firm to its implementation. The vision is an expression of the chief's and the department's values, although there may be conflicts between enforcement of the law and respect for the rights of people in the community.

Baltimore's Commissioner Hamm confronted such a situation, centering on whether the police should be focused on zero-tolerance enforcement for all laws or be more selective in their patterns of enforcement. There was strong resistance from the community to the zero-tolerance approach, especially the enforcement of loitering or drinking a can of beer outside of your home. Accordingly, he tried to balance community interests with the overall interests of law enforcement. Unfortunately, the politics of a mayoral election undermined his efforts and he was replaced by a mayor who was unwilling to confront the political pressures required to meet the challenges of a more community-oriented policing strategy.

Business writers describe the importance of the leader's vision and the failures of companies that lack a clear direction. Police chiefs also have a responsibility to articulate their vision to their officers and the community. Sometimes competing interests within both the department and the community cloud the vision. Many police chiefs have failed, as Timoney did in

Philadelphia when he was unable to provide a vision that resonated with and was inclusive of his police officers. Other chiefs have struggled with determining priorities for their departments and have been criticized by their officers and the people in the community for a lack of clear direction. Offering a dynamic vision is no easy task, but the recognition of this responsibility is fundamental to the role of the police leader.

The late Chief George Hansen of Lincoln, Nebraska, had a reputation for using modern policing approaches in the 1960s–70s when constructive relationships between police departments and their communities were becoming part of the police reform dialogue. Hansen’s “Statement of Mission” shows his clear vision for that relationship.

It is a cardinal principle of democratic societies that ultimate responsibility for peace, good order, and law observance rest with the community of citizens of that society, not with an organized police force.

Although the very complexity of modern societies usually dictates that policing efforts be coordinated and directed by a force of paid professionals, their responsibility is derivative. Their role is to supplement and aid community efforts, not supplant them. And the power permitted to these police must be carefully defined and limited.

A community which abandons its basic duty to police itself, to a professional police service, will soon find that the police can hope to provide no more than a bare modicum of public order and security and this only through such repressive measures that the basic liberties of a free people are eroded, and the very democracy that the police seek to preserve is endangered. Only if the proper balance is maintained between the basic responsibility of the community and the derivative responsibility of the police can a safe and order society be preserved with the least burden on individual rights and freedom.

It is unfortunate, therefore, that the history of urban policing in America in the twentieth century is a consistent record of efforts by the police service to assume a disproportionate share of responsibility for maintaining social control, and the recurrent abandonment by American communities of their portion of the duty. The result has been an increasing lawlessness, which even increasingly repressive measures have been able to curb. The delicate balance between traditional roles of the community and the police needs to be restored. Peacekeeping must again become a joint police–community effort to stand any reasonable chance for lasting success.

Hansen outlined this vision in the early 1950s. He was well aware of the serious dilemma that police leaders would face if they were not able to build a strong, collaborative relationship with their communities. The observations that he outlines in this statement underscore the balance that police leaders have attempted to reconcile between their policing responsibilities and the peacekeeping role in the community.

Significance of the Vision of the Police Leader

The police chiefs discussed their views about the importance of a vision for their departments and their communities. In some cases, they talked about how a total lack of vision caused complicated, internal departmental conflict. The police officers were not clear about their mission and the departments lacked a clear direction. In Philadelphia, Chief Timoney failed to penetrate the police culture and establish an internal vision for the department. However, he came to Miami with a strong, clear vision about reducing gun violence and building support for the police in both the Hispanic and African American communities. Timoney worked energetically to communicate it to his department and the community. Other chiefs describe similar circumstances that highlight the importance of presenting a vision for the department and ensuring that the chief is well aware of the responsibility to constantly sell this vision to officers and the community.

The chief's vision also recognizes departmental and community values. In the case of the police officers, these values are measured carefully in conjunction with the overarching commitment to uphold the United States Constitution. The chiefs discuss this responsibility to these fundamental laws and describe how they try to balance the challenge of their enforcement practices against the framework of the Constitution. This balancing act never ends, but their vision provides the critical lens through which they make judgments about their police officers' actions in the community.

In the interview with Drew Diamond, he was asked about the importance of the chief's vision for the department. He reaffirmed the critical value of the vision and suggested two departments' visions that he had worked with during the past years. He provided the visions for both the Pasadena and San Rafael, California, police departments as clear examples of invaluable statements that provide the overarching guidance for the departments in their work with the community. The visions statements read as follows:

The Pasadena Police Department will be a world class agency based upon a foundation of public trust, and dedicated to keeping the public in public safety.

The department will serve as a beacon of excellence and innovation as we come forward to the 21st century.

By fostering an atmosphere of partnership, we will embody a shared purpose with our community and our employees.

We are committed to excellence developed through pride, setting the standard, and earning a reputation for providing effective, caring, and courteous service.

We will capitalize on our strengths as a diverse community and work force to make this vision a reality.

The San Rafael Police Department will be known for its community service orientation, its effectiveness at preventing crime through community involvement, and for providing a safe living and working environment.

Our enforcement actions will be based on respect for individual rights as well as our commitment to protect the safety of all persons within our community.

We will strive for professionalism and integrity by maintaining high ethical and performance standards. Our policies and procedures will be designed to give simple, clear guidance to all personnel. We will encourage and support technological advances along with training and professional skill development to enhance our effectiveness at fighting crime. The Department will remain committed to a cooperative team effort between all divisions. We will encourage and provide support for employees to be proactive and flexible in identifying problems and solutions within the Department and the community we serve.

Finally, police chiefs need to actively persuade others to dedicate themselves to the vision of the department. They must also give feedback to those officers who are not fulfilling their commitment to the department's vision. However, it is equally important to acknowledge the police officers' contributions and positive behavior in the community, a key component that it is easy to forget. Strategies and efforts to gather support for the vision from the local communities are another major challenge. The chiefs have identified many difficult external political challenges within the local environment. In the following chapters, the chiefs will describe these challenges of implementing the vision with an equal amount of passion and clarity.

Implementing the Vision

How Chiefs Make It a Reality

4

Joe McNamara tells a story about his first days on the job as the youngest police chief in America, replacing a very well-known chief who had been appointed the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation by President Nixon. It was 1973 and the country was still in turmoil about the Vietnam War and civil rights struggles. McNamara was immediately confronted with a police shooting that occurred only 6 days after he arrived in Kansas City. A young African American man was killed by a police officer, and the circumstances were suspiciously unclear. The Kansas City African American community was incensed and demanded that the new chief address the issue of police brutality. McNamara met with his command staff and presented his plan to attend the funeral to show support for the young man. All of the commanders except the one minority member of the command team insisted that he should not go. McNamara listened to their arguments, but he felt strongly that he needed to demonstrate to the community that he understood the situation and supported fair treatment of all citizens. Because he decided to attend the funeral, he faced constant opposition by his commanders and his officers for the remainder of his 3-year tenure in Kansas City.

McNamara spent the next 15 years in San Jose, California, as one of the nation's most innovative and respected police leaders and strongest proponents of community policing. He was on the cutting edge of developing new productive relationships between the police and local communities, based on his experience with the urban riots in the late 1960s. McNamara was also a chief who was committed to building relationships with diverse communities. Though he had this vision in Kansas City, he was never able to implement it because of the strong internal and external resistance to his inclusive approach to policing. When he came to San Jose, he was able to mobilize support for an "inclusive community" vision that resonated in the community and ultimately in the San Jose Police Department.

As chiefs describe their visions, they are also considering the leadership skills required for implementation. Most started with integrity and vision. Others noted the ability to establish good relationships with their own personnel and the community. Still others mentioned understanding the culture of the department and mobilizing support for innovative, community-oriented approaches.

Richard Pennington in Atlanta has a great deal of experience with the issue of police integrity. During his tenure in New Orleans in the 1990s, he was a well-known reformer who addressed some of the most serious internal police corruption practices of the past 50 years. He brought in the FBI to assist him and ultimately fired more than 350 officers. He offers these observations about integrity.

I think integrity is number one. People have to view you as being of the highest integrity and that comes from the community and also from your own police personnel. Both have to trust what you're saying as being truthful and upfront. If they feel as though they cannot trust you by what you say or what you do, you won't be a very effective leader. I think your men and women need to be the same way in how they conduct themselves in the community and in the department.

Pennington's comments emphasized the importance of the leader's ability to walk the walk as well as talk the talk. He understands that the chief must be a role model for both the officers and the community. He believes that integrity and leadership need to start at the top of the organization. Pennington is also familiar with departments where a chief has had difficulty with either the community or line personnel.

I've seen many people become police chiefs that don't make it. I've seen them come and go because the perception of them in the community was that they weren't honest or trustworthy or of the highest integrity.

Pennington addressed the issue of integrity straight on and rebuilt the New Orleans department from the ground up. He brought in the FBI to identify corrupt officers and focused on major changes in the police culture. He specifically outlawed the practice of police officers holding a second job in the local New Orleans clubs and bars, as this was a key ingredient that fed the corrupt practices of police officers. He was not well loved by some of the police officers, but the community welcomed his fresh, honest approach to building a police department that had reestablished the value of police integrity. Unfortunately, the results of his efforts to clean up corruption were marginalized after his departure, particularly during the Hurricane Katrina disaster. The New Orleans police department returned to many of its past practices after Pennington's departure. The leadership of the department basically refused to sustain his vision for the department and its constructive relationship with the community.

William Bratton, now the Los Angeles police chief, is well known for introducing the broken windows theory of policing. His work in the New York Transit Authority coupled with his work as the New York Police Department commissioner highlight his willingness to demand police accountability