The 2016 Public Safety Summit:
Building Capacity and Legitimacy

LEADERSHIP FOR A NETWORKED WORLD
Today’s public safety leaders often feel squeezed in a vise. On one side pressure is ramping up to respond to ever-more-complex crime and public safety threats such as natural disasters, violent extremism, and cybercrime. On the other side are pressing demands for citizen engagement, stakeholder collaboration, and community outreach. Policing leaders can feel torn: Should they focus on fighting crime efficiently? Or should they focus on growing public trust?

Forward-thinking public safety leaders realize that to build legitimacy the answer is “yes” – to improving both crime prevention and public trust. Yet to accomplish both objectives, public safety leaders need to pursue innovations that increase organizational capacity. In a world of limited resources, finding the right mix of innovations will require grappling with tough questions.

To help public safety leaders move forward on this challenge, Leadership for a Networked World and the Technology and Entrepreneurship Center at Harvard, in collaboration with Accenture, convened senior-most leaders for The 2016 Public Safety Summit: Building Capacity and Legitimacy. Held at Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts, from April 29 – May 1, 2016, the Summit provided an unparalleled opportunity to learn from and work with policing and public safety peers, Harvard faculty and researchers, and select industry experts.

Summit attendees dissected case studies and participated in peer-to-peer problem-solving and plenary sessions in an effort to learn and work together on four key leadership strategies:
Innovative approaches and operating models to reduce operational costs and complexity while increasing agility in policing structures, systems, and people.

Digital tools such as social media, data, and analytics to improve crime response and engage the community in the co-creation of public safety solutions.

New training methods to improve current capabilities and develop a pipeline for the leadership and skills needed in the future.

Techniques to build near-term operational capacity while simultaneously facilitating change and adapting organizational culture for the long-term.

This report distills the key findings from the Summit. In particular, it features highlights from a special keynote address by Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe, Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service in London. The report also contains special sections on use-of-force policies and techniques to harness the power of data and analytics, as well as three noteworthy case presentations:

- Kathleen O'Toole, Chief of the Seattle Police Department (SPD), and Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General Vanita Gupta described how SPD, the Department of Justice, and others have partnered to make SPD a model for reform and drive positive, sustainable change.
- Nóirín O'Sullivan, Commissioner of An Garda Síochána, Ireland's national police force, explains how she and her team have transformed the agency and restored the faith of citizens, government agencies, and partners.
- Dermot Shea, New York City Police Department's (NYPD) Deputy Commissioner for Operations, described the evolution of CompStat 2.0 as part of a broader effort to revamp the department and bolster public trust.

We hope this report offers new ideas, strategies, and insights to help public safety leaders lead their organizations to new levels of capacity and legitimacy.
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Noted philosopher John Rawls asserted that the first virtue of public institutions is justice—the measure of how society cooperates to distribute and protect rights, opportunities, and liberties.

Yet we are living in a time when society is reexamining what it means to be just. In today’s world, the concept of justice is by most accounts expanding. In the United States, for example, courts have broadened the scope of the 14th Amendment, which reads: “nor shall any state deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.” Thus, we are in an environment with a larger and more complex set of issues and challenges requiring “equal protection” by public institutions—particularly law enforcement and public safety organizations.

Compounding the challenge of achieving justice is the degree to which changing societal conditions impact what citizens and stakeholders view as “just” and “valuable.” As crime trends shift, as public sentiment changes, and as society expands the scope of equal protection, the nature and definition of “value” shift accordingly. The volume and velocity of this change is staggering. Ninety percent of the attendees at the Public Safety Summit said they are facing significant or extreme change in their operating environment, and 95 percent anticipate significant or extreme change in the next five years.

For public safety leaders, this means that achieving justice—and the institutional value and legitimacy that result from it—is based on three interdependent focuses:

1. Equally protecting citizens from ever-more-complex crime (a particularly important priority in a world with growing cybercrime, mental health problems, and domestic terrorism).

2. Equally protecting access to ever-more-robust rights, freedoms, and liberties.

3. Engaging with communities to define value and co-create solutions that build trust.

The resulting imperative is that public safety leaders and stakeholders must continually adapt their organizations to new value propositions and methods of producing that value. To accomplish this, public safety organizations have to increase organizational capacity—the structures, systems, processes, and people that enable an organization to meet goals effectively and efficiently. What’s more, this capacity needs to be both static (i.e., able to be activated in real-time) and dynamic (i.e., able to grow and adapt over time).
This is not an easy task. Ninety percent of the leaders at the Public Safety Summit said developing capacity in their organizations was “critical,” yet only 10 percent said they are “well prepared” to increase capacity. There is much work to do.

The focus of this year’s Summit was how to grow capacity in policing by working across boundaries—whether those boundaries are internal (i.e., across teams and units) or external (i.e., across agencies and sectors). The right amount of new capacity can often be found internally when an organization reorganizes or recombines best practices and innovations. But sometimes an organization has to reach outside its boundaries to bring in new ideas, technologies, collaborations, and people. These new capabilities—whether they are internal or external—then have to be integrated into the organization, which means leaders have to overcome an array of legal, structural, cultural, and political barriers.

There is much reason for hope. As the cases and insights from this report show, there is enormous creativity and innovation in public safety. Together, we can create new operating models that will help public safety leaders respond to a new environment, adapt their organizations, and build the capacity that leads to better justice, value, trust, and legitimacy. Please join us on this journey.

With hope and resolve,
All the best,

Dr. Antonio M. Oftelie
Executive Director, Leadership for a Networked World
Fellow, Technology and Entrepreneurship Center at Harvard
Harvard John A. Paulson School of Engineering and Applied Sciences
In January 2016, Kathleen O'Toole, Chief of the Seattle Police Department (SPD), received wonderful, if startling news. White House officials wanted to know if she would be interested in sitting in the First Lady's box as an honored guest at President Obama's final State of the Union address.

Nineteen months earlier, when O'Toole had become SPD's chief, it would have been hard to imagine SPD receiving Presidential recognition. In 2012, SPD and the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) had agreed upon a consent decree mandating that SPD engage in significant reform to curb the “unnecessary and excessive use of force” and address concerns about discriminatory policing. Unfortunately, the initial reports from Monitor Merrick Bobb evaluating SPD's progress identified further problems, namely “dug-in” resistance and “foot-dragging” within SPD—in other words, a refusal to work collaboratively with DOJ on reform.

O'Toole, her team, city officials, and their partners at DOJ and the Monitoring Team shifted the tide by fostering a climate that prized teamwork. Within SPD, O'Toole convened an internal leadership team to help foster culture change and focus energy on reform. Externally, she and her staff reached out to the union; community groups; and City Attorney Pete Holmes, whose team helped to negotiate the consent decree and continues to work with SPD on implementation. They also developed a mutually respectful relationship and friendship with Monitor Merrick Bobb.

“I learned very early in my career that the adversarial approach doesn’t work, that we really do need to engage both internally and externally, we do need to listen.”

– Kathleen O'Toole
Chief, Seattle Police Department

Finally, SPD and DOJ have striven to strengthen their partnership. In particular, the chief has worked closely with Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General Vanita Gupta, head of DOJ's Civil Rights Division, and Acting United States Attorney Annette Hayes—both of whom are heavily involved in the enforcement of the consent decree. According to O'Toole, Gupta and Hayes have been “engaging, supportive, and transparent, not just in Seattle, but nationally.”

Nonetheless, that collaborative spirit was not guaranteed to develop, nor will it necessarily endure as O’Toole and her team endeavor to complete the reform required by the consent decree. Rather, they have had to navigate—and will continue to confront—a challenging question: how can they simultaneously build trust, effect change, and ultimately position SPD to achieve positive transformation as a result of DOJ oversight?

Background

Since the mid 1990s, DOJ has played a growing role in local law enforcement reform. In 1994, in the aftermath of the 1991 Rodney King incident in Los Angeles, Congress passed the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act, which gave DOJ the power to investigate local law enforcement agencies that may have “systemic problems – such as use of excessive force, or racial profiling.” In the event that it discovers a department with problematic trends, DOJ can then effect change by pushing for a “consent decree”; this is a legally binding document that outlines a set of reforms, is agreed upon by both parties, and is overseen by a judge.

As of March 2015, DOJ had completed 65 investigations of local law enforcement organizations, leading to 32 reform agreements. Unfortunately, the consent decrees sometimes led to friction between DOJ and local officials. Seattle—where there had been disagreement over (among other things) who should serve as the Monitor overseeing the police—was a case in point.

May 2014 – December 2014: Leadership

In May 2014, amid the acrimony surrounding Seattle's consent decree, Seattle's Mayor Ed Murray nominated O'Toole to become SPD's chief. O'Toole was an attractive candidate in part because she had served as Commissioner of the Boston Police Department; Massachusetts Secretary of Public Safety; and Chief Inspector of the Garda Síochána Inspectorate, Ireland's oversight body to the national police service. In addition, O'Toole had an intimate understanding of DOJ and consent decrees, having most recently served as the Joint Compliance Expert overseeing the consent decree in East Haven, Connecticut. Most observers felt that East Haven and DOJ had established a productive, collaborative relationship.
One of O’Toole’s takeaways from these experiences was the importance of engagement. The chief therefore spent “countless hours” during her first months in Seattle meeting with rank-and-file officers, community groups, union leaders, and a range of city officials. From O’Toole’s perspective, this outreach was crucial to disarm potential critics (outside leaders, she noted, tend to attract skepticism); glean lessons from front-line staff and citizens, who, she observed, are often most in-tune with problems and opportunities; and begin to cultivate an atmosphere of teamwork. “I learned very early in my career,” O’Toole reflected, “that the adversarial approach doesn’t work, that we really do need to engage both internally and externally, we do need to listen.”

Meanwhile, the tenor of SPD’s relationship with DOJ began to change as well. Soon after O’Toole arrived in Seattle, she received a call from Vanita Gupta, a newly appointed Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, who as the head of DOJ’s Civil Rights Division would be heavily involved in the implementation of DOJ’s consent decrees. Gupta wanted to know if O’Toole would be open to “sitting down” to discuss the situation in Seattle. From O’Toole’s perspective, this provided a much-needed “breath of fresh air to the role.” It also served as a jumping off point for a more extensive dialogue in which Gupta and O’Toole discussed the challenges facing SPD and its partnership with DOJ. Equally important, this contributed to the establishment of an outstanding working relationship. O’Toole said, “It’s clear to me that DOJ…and Vanita in particular are there to support us. They’re as interested in our success as we are....” Gupta concurred, lauding Chief O’Toole for “creat[ing] a different tone.”

2015: Reform

O’Toole also understood the importance of marrying this collaborative spirit with action. This was in no small part because, as the chief soon discovered, the recent friction surrounding the consent decree had started to interfere with the day-to-day demands of policing. Not long after beginning her work at SPD, O’Toole was in a meeting with precinct captains when she asked about the effectiveness of SPD’s crime-fighting operations. Her staff responded, “Great, we think.” The chief realized that, amid all of the attention focused on the consent decree, no one had been tracking crime. She therefore launched a new SeaStat process, which is comparable to CompStat and enabled SPD to start tracking crime and crime-fighting efforts more carefully. To the chief, this change was emblematic of the importance of balancing short- and long-term exigencies. “We’ve totally embraced reform and we’ve put lots and lots of effort into that,” O’Toole said, “but we have the day-to-day challenges, we still have to run police agencies and we can’t lose sight of that.”

Meanwhile, O’Toole and her team put in place long-term reform initiatives to ensure that SPD was satisfying the requirements of the consent decree. A case in point was a new community micro-policing plan that SPD has developed in partnership with Seattle University. As part of the program, SPD is surveying residents in the city’s different neighborhoods to understand what their priorities and concerns are and then assigning officers to those neighborhoods to work with them to find solutions. As O’Toole explained, this is an outstanding way to strengthen ties with the community and at the same time shift community sentiment. “Crime is a problem,” O’Toole explained, “but fear of crime and perception of crime are equally problematic, so we need to work with our communities to determine what’s important to them.”

Another critical piece of SPD’s reform initiative is a series of new trainings and partnerships. According to Gupta, SPD has developed a “very successful de-escalation program.” At the same time, SPD has striven to forge partnerships and developed extensive trainings to focus on complex challenges like homelessness, addiction, and people in crisis. This signals that SPD is evaluating its challenges holistically and positioning the city to thrive in the face of uncertainty. As

“Embrace reform. If your community is being scrutinized currently, reform is a good thing. I think it’s created the sense of urgency required to get the job done in Seattle.”

– Kathleen O’Toole
Chief, Seattle Police Department

[10] O’Toole and Gupta presentation. Unless noted, subsequent quotations from and attributions to O’Toole and Gupta come from this presentation.
O'Toole explained, SPD, like departments in any major city, needs to combat the threats of guns and gangs, but it also cannot lose track of the “more complicated challenges” now affecting the city's law enforcement landscape.

SPD is also using data and technology to enable and accelerate organizational change. For example, in October 2015, SPD announced a new partnership with Accenture to create a more advanced data analytics platform; this will allow SPD to bolster efficiency and accountability by helping the agency “to consolidate, manage and analyze data relating to police calls and incidents, interactions with the public, use-of-force incidents, administrative processes, officer training and workforce management.”

Yet the most significant aspect of SPD’s use of data and analytics may very well be the creation of the Real Time Crime Center (RTCC). As department officials explained, this is “the engine of SPD's data-driven policing efforts.” In particular, the facility serves as a convening place where SPD officials can host meetings and come together to analyze data. It also serves as a dissemination tool through which the department can share information with officers so that they can apply information in “real time” in the field. From the perspective of SPD officials, the creation of RTCC is a major reason that the department achieved a 6.6 percent decrease in overall crime from 2014 to 2015.

Finally, SPD, with support and advice from DOJ, has taken a number of steps to institutionalize change. This includes creating a force investigation team and a force review board. Legislation is currently being developed to enhance independent oversight, including through the Office of Professional Accountability and the Community Police Commission. The Commission is important, Gupta explained, because it provides a venue where citizens can provide input; it also serves as another outlet through which O'Toole can leverage and deepen the relationships she has built throughout her time in the city. Reflecting on a community forum she attended, Gupta said, “Kathy knows everyone in the room...and everyone in the community knows her.”

By the end of 2015, many powerful observers were taking note of Seattle’s efforts. In a visit to Seattle that September, U.S. Attorney General Loretta Lynch announced that the city would receive a $1.5 million grant to combat human trafficking and lauded the city’s progress on police reform. (DOJ officials (including Acting U.S. Attorney Hayes), who had also been promoting SPD’s positive work, accompanied the Attorney General on the trip.) Similarly, in a November 2015 report, the Seattle Police Monitor gave SPD “high marks” for being in “initial compliance” with key aspects of the consent decree. The Monitor also praised SPD for “reaching a ‘significant stepping stone along the

“I think there’s no question that Seattle...really demonstrates the power of leadership to create transformation.”

– Vanita Gupta
Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice


[14] Christopher Fisher, Chief Strategic Advisor, Seattle Police Department, personal communication, via e-mail, August 26, 2016.

path toward full and effective compliance and notable improvement from the beginning of the consent decree, when review of force...was superficial at best."\(^{16}\)

As Gupta observed, Seattle had gotten some “quick wins,” so SPD had momentum on its side.

### 2016: A “Sense of Urgency”

Room for improvement remains. From O’Toole’s perspective, the biggest challenge is “consent decree fatigue.” Thus, the City, DOJ, and the Monitoring Team are working together to identify a timeline and deliverables for what SPD needs to accomplish. The chief hopes that this will give her staff a “light at the end of the tunnel,” and Gupta is sympathetic to these concerns. “We don’t want to be in a jurisdiction a day longer than we have to,” she said. Thus, she is working with Seattle to establish barometers for progress while at the same time making sure that SPD is in full compliance.

Navigating questions like how to finalize the consent decree can sometimes lead to differences of opinion, but in O’Toole’s view, this is part of a healthy relationship. “We work collaboratively, but we engage in respectful, spirited discussions,” the chief said. “Spirited discussions and debates have produced many good results.”

O’Toole also sees this dialectic process—in which stakeholders sometimes disagree but take from their conflicting perspectives a new, better result—as emblematic of how consent decrees can benefit an organization. She elaborated, “Reform is a good thing. The consent decree has created the sense of urgency required to get the job done in Seattle...I like to look at the glass as being half full.... Yes, it is hard work, but without a sense of urgency, it’s more difficult to change an organization.”

---

**Leadership Insights**

- **Engage and listen.** During her first months in office, O’Toole reached out to and learned from diverse stakeholders to deepen her understanding of Seattle’s challenges.

- **Collaborate.** Drawing on her experiences in Northern Ireland, Boston, and East Haven, O’Toole decided to work with diverse stakeholders, including DOJ, because she realized they were stronger together.

- **Pair cooperative dialogue with concrete reform.** To ensure that the goodwill she had generated led to progress, O’Toole pursued a number of reform initiatives, such as new trainings and a micro-community policing plan.

- **Embrace reform as an opportunity.** O’Toole treated DOJ’s oversight as an incentive to create a sense of urgency to generate reform.

---

“The rate of change within society is so rapid right now that...if you want to sustain yourself as an organization, you have...to continuously be updating...the things that you do.”

– David Ager

Senior Director, Executive Education, Harvard Business School
Leadership Lessons from Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe

In September 2011, when Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe became the Commissioner of London’s Metropolitan Police Service (MET), he faced significant challenges. The agency had had five commissioners in the previous seven years, a spate of discontinuity that had interfered with the development and pursuit of a coherent vision. More immediately, the MET was dealing with the aftermath of the London Riots, a multi-day event in August 2011 when thousands of people took to the streets following the death of a local resident who had been shot by a police officer. The riots—which involved looting, arson, and violence—resulted in the arrest of more than 1,000 people and damaged the already tenuous relationship between law enforcement and the public. Making matters more difficult, the agency had to recover quickly because in less than one year, London would host the 2012 Olympics—an event that would place the city on the world’s biggest stage and test the MET’s security and event management capabilities.

Hogan-Howe not only helped London to navigate the Olympics without incident; five years into his tenure as commissioner, he has made London significantly safer while pursuing transformation at the MET. Murder is at its lowest level in decades, crime is down by more than 18 percent, and burglaries have fallen to the lowest point since 1973. More broadly, a sense of optimism has begun to permeate the force. As Hogan-Howe recently said, “If you had any doubt, if my officers had any doubt, then let’s be clear – the MET is a ‘can-do’ organization....”

“...It seems to me the task of leaders can be to simplify.”

– Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe
Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service (London)


[18] Keynote Address by Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe, Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service, at the 2016 Public Safety Summit at Harvard University in Cambridge, MA, on May 1, 2016. Unless noted, the data in this special section come from this presentation.

The commissioner has achieved this progress because, as he explained in his keynote address at the 2016 Public Safety Summit, he treated the challenges he faced at the start of his tenure as an opportunity to transform the agency. More specifically, he has employed five leadership techniques—vision, communication, team building, fiscal discipline, and partnerships and engagement—to develop a set of clear priorities for the MET and work with his staff to devise a strategy to achieve those goals and make London safer.

Vision

Hogan-Howe has led in part through establishing a clear vision: “Total Policing.” This is the notion, as the commissioner explained, that the MET “is better as a team than [it is] as 50,000 individuals.” (The MET has approximately 50,000 staff-members.) To concretize this vision, Hogan-Howe further focuses staff on what he sees as three critical priorities: 1) when possible, prevent crimes; 2) care for victims; and 3) be professional. From Hogan-Howe’s perspective, this clear vision and the priorities that reinforce it are vital because they help staff to think strategically in an often-chaotic environment. “It seems to me,” he said, “the task of leaders can be to simplify.”

Communication

The MET Commissioner has reinforced that vision by engaging in substantive, in-person dialogue with his staff. Every four weeks, Hogan-Howe spends half a day with the MET’s chief superintendents; once every 12 weeks, he spends the same amount of time with the agency’s chief inspectors; and he holds an annual meeting with staff sergeants. To supplement these regular sessions, Hogan-Howe has a Commissioner’s Breakfast once every four weeks where staff can ask him questions. Once a month, he also randomly selects a precinct to visit to stay attuned to what is happening in the field. As Hogan-Howe acknowledged, this represents a “huge investment of time.” Nonetheless, he considers it worthwhile because these meetings give him an opportunity to provide progress updates, learn what his team members are seeing, bring in guest speakers, and engage with skeptics. This latter dialogue is important, Hogan-Howe emphasized, because it can often lead to insights about how to improve. More broadly, connecting with people in person is valuable because it provides the agency an opportunity to forge the bonds that can bind a large, diffuse organization together.

Team-Building

Hogan-Howe has also pursued novel recruiting endeavors to create a team that is capable of and committed to transformation. One of these initiatives is “Police Now,” a program that brings college graduates—many of whom were not trained for careers in law enforcement—on staff for an initial two-year contract. The goal is to attract highly educated personnel that can bring valuable skills (e.g., IT expertise) and inject new approaches into the force. The commissioner has also recruited middle managers that have not worked as police officers. As Hogan-Howe pointed out, it takes time to train these non-traditional personnel. Nonetheless, he values these team members because they bring novel perspectives and new leadership styles that help to challenge the status quo.
Fiscal Discipline
Hogan-Howe has imposed fiscal discipline on the MET, which had a 600-million-pound deficit in 2011. One critical change has been eliminating approximately 3,500 of the department’s 14,500 managerial positions. He has also outsourced a number of the MET’s support functions, including human resources, finance, and procurement. Similarly, responding to feedback from a senior advisor, he has reduced the MET’s real estate footprint. This has enabled the agency to reinvest funds in capital projects, including construction of a new Scotland Yard. Finally, Hogan-Howe is embracing technology—including distributing mobile devices to all officers—to decrease paperwork and help the department to function more efficiently. In addition to generating substantial savings (approximately 600 million pounds), these changes demonstrate that Hogan-Howe is not only talking about the need for change, he is actually implementing it.

Partnerships and Engagement
Finally, Hogan-Howe has forged partnerships with a number of key stakeholders. For example, the commissioner has prioritized developing strong, collaborative relationships with government officials regardless of their political persuasion. Hogan-Howe has also built partnerships with academic experts, including faculty at University College London, with whom he is pursuing an initiative to conduct research on best practices in law enforcement. Finally, he regularly speaks with London residents and takes to heart their feedback about how the MET can improve. A case in point came early in his tenure when he was talking to a black family that described how they had been stopped multiple times per week as part of the MET’s “stop-and-search” policy. This helped Hogan-Howe to realize that the department had to reduce the number of searches and combat racial profiling. More broadly, it reflects that Hogan-Howe understands that a law enforcement official must not only be a leader within his/her department; he/she also has to function as an external leader as well.

Conclusion
While Hogan-Howe has made substantial progress in his time leading the London force, he recognizes that the MET needs to continue to evolve. This is in part because London itself will change in the years ahead. The population is expected to expand from 8.6 million to 9 million by 2020 and will experience a major uptick in the number of young men in the city, a trend that Hogan-Howe noted is often associated with an increase in crime. Nonetheless, the Commissioner and his team can take pride in the fact that they have become adept at the process of effecting change. In particular, Hogan-Howe has struck a balance between introducing new approaches, incorporating diverse ideas, and above all ensuring that the organization takes action. This has enabled the agency to make dramatic progress and will propel it forward in the ever-changing environment of 21st-century policing.

“When trying to bridge the gap with the community, communication is the first step.”

- Eric Ward

Chief, Tampa Police Department
A Journey of Transformation in Ireland

On March 24, 2014, Nóirín O'Sullivan got the call: senior Irish officials wanted to know if she would become the Interim Commissioner of An Garda Síochána, Ireland's national police force. Most long-time law enforcement officers spend their entire careers preparing for that kind of opportunity, but O'Sullivan, who had joined An Garda Síochána in 1981 and was then serving as the agency's Deputy Commissioner of Operations, knew that the agency's next leader would face enormous challenges. The organization's previous commissioner had just retired amid a highly publicized whistleblower scandal, damaging already tenuous officer morale and public and state confidence in the organization. More broadly, An Garda Síochána was grappling with a dilemma. On the one hand, because of recent austerity measures, it was operating with a reduced budget and workforce. On the other hand, the organization had to deal with serious and complex security risks, ranging from terrorism to gangland activity to cybercrime. Thus, the next leader of An Garda Síochána would have to do more with less while facing scrutiny from the public and the highest levels of the government. "Those recurring controversies and crises," O'Sullivan explained, "had a very significant impact not just on [the] trust and confidence of the public and our democratic legitimacy, but also the trust and confidence of the institutions of the state in policing and the morale of our own people."

Nonetheless, O'Sullivan felt a compelling call to serve. "I did have a choice," she explained. "I could say, 'No,' but I'd been a career police officer and deeply committed to public service and to the Irish police service, [so] I said, 'No, I really have to do this.'"

Thus, O'Sullivan and her staff set out on what she later characterized as a "journey of transformation and cultural renewal." Along the way, they would have to confront stark tradeoffs as they attempted to answer a core, complex question: facing enormous threats but with limited resources and following years of controversy, how could they simultaneously protect the Irish people, renew their organization's culture, and restore the public's faith?

“We want to renew, we want to modernize, and we want to get to a whole new place.”

– Nóirín O'Sullivan
Commissioner, An Garda Síochána

2014: Beginning Reform

Dating to its inception in 1922, An Garda Síochána has prided itself on its peaceful approach (Garda members are unarmed) and the critical role it plays as a stabilizing force in Irish democracy. But over the past decade, An Garda Síochána had found it increasingly challenging to fulfill that role. This was in part because of a recession beginning in 2007 that prompted the government to introduce severe austerity measures, including a significant pay cut for Garda officers. Meanwhile, the organization was dealing with grave threats, including gang violence, domestic terrorism, and drug trafficking. Finally, the agency had come under fire from whistleblowers alleging that the agency had corruptly handled penalty points on driving violations for “well-connected offenders.”

O’Sullivan had anticipated these challenges when she accepted the post, but upon taking office, she realized that she would have to overcome an additional difficulty: many staff questioned her power. In the past, An Garda Síochána had appointed internal leaders as commissioner; in 2014, however, government officials decided to have an open competition and conduct an international search. Some officers anticipated that the government would hire an external candidate and were unenthusiastic about following O’Sullivan. “It’s very difficult,” she reflected, “to persuade people to come with you on a journey when actually they’re looking at you saying, ‘I only have to put up with you for three or four... months.’”

To steel herself against skeptical staff, O’Sullivan drew on her “personal resilience” and the strength of the community that she had witnessed in decades on the force. At the same time, she prioritized three tasks: bolstering the force’s morale, restoring community trust, and reassuring state institutions.

The commissioner understood that to achieve these goals, she would have to incorporate the insights and assuage the concerns of a wide range of stakeholders while simultaneously effecting broader cultural change. Thus, she and her staff spent much of their first months in office visiting Garda stations where they drank tea with staff and asked about their pain points. O’Sullivan also invited community groups to meet with her and her colleagues and offer feedback. Throughout these interactions, she impressed upon her team the importance of listening. O’Sullivan explained:

For leaders at all levels of the organization, you have to go out there, you have to engage with your people... Does that mean...[you are] going to have an agenda? No, you’re not. The most important thing you’re going to do is listen...and then you’re going to make something happen that lets them know you’ve heard them.

Thus, this dialogue involved an effort to change the organization’s perception in the community. “Every contact leaves a trace,” explained O’Sullivan, whose appointment became permanent in November 2014, “and the culture of An Garda Síochána will be redefined one encounter at a time.”

---

[23] According to O’Sullivan, An Garda Síochána is seen as a “cornerstone of [Ireland’s] democratic society” in part because of its dual role as a policing and security service.
2015: Executing A Strategy

These consultations and analyses, as well as An Garda Síochána’s scan of the international operating environment, led to a new policing plan for 2015. The strategy’s core premise was that the agency had to “renew the present” while “creating the future.” This meant that the organization should not do away with its history but instead find ways to renew it by celebrating its best qualities and improving its weaknesses. At the same time, An Garda Síochána had to start developing a forward-looking approach to learn from recent challenges and effect more permanent reform.26 “We can fix little bits,” O’Sullivan said of the thinking and questions that animated the strategy, “but what’s actually transformational, what’s going to sustain this?”

With these aims in mind, O’Sullivan and her staff began to pursue significant structural change. Some of these reforms were designed to address acute problems. For example, a great deal of crime in Ireland stems from gang-related activity. O’Sullivan therefore combined the agency’s drug and organized crime bureaus to create a single unit that could focus on these dangerous groups.27 Similarly, over the course of her dialogue with community groups and Irish citizens, the commissioner had heard that the agency did not do enough to support victims. O’Sullivan therefore announced the establishment of Victims Services Offices, staffed by trained professionals, in all 28 Garda divisions; she also created a Protective Services Bureau to ensure that the country’s most vulnerable victims (e.g., children and victims of domestic violence) received the support that they needed.28

O’Sullivan introduced a separate set of structural changes to ensure that the agency could manage the overarching reform process. This included creating a Strategic Transformation Office (STO) to manage change at the national level. The STO was initially tasked with helping to create a five-year transformation program, and its staff—which included a mix of Garda personnel and private consultants—reported directly to the Garda Executive, a senior leadership team that included Commissioner O’Sullivan.29 The STO also worked closely with staff at regional Risk Compliance and Continuous Improvement offices, which were responsible for managing the reform process—and ensuring its consistency with national efforts—at the local level. As O’Sullivan explained, this network of reform offices would function as an “organizational spine” that ensured that reform is “cascaded to the frontline,” that feedback could then be transmitted back to officials at the national level, and that innovation would spread across the entire agency.

To ensure that these newly created offices—and other critical Garda posts—were staffed with some of the agency’s most high-performing leaders, O’Sullivan made a series of significant personnel changes. This included promoting 40 officers to newly created superintendent positions; reassigning dozens of other officers; and more sharply defining the roles of “Regional Detective Superintendents,” who would now be explicitly responsible for investigating crimes in their regions. According to one local outlet, this represented a “historic shake-up of the force.”30

[29] The consultants aiding STO possessed expertise in organizational transformation, program and project management, business readiness, and large-scale IT delivery.
Finally, as part of an effort to signal to state institutions that they were taking past feedback and oversight seriously, O’Sullivan and her staff synthesized the extensive feedback it had received from recently established supervisory bodies. Since 2005, when the government had created an ombudsman and inspectorate to oversee it, An Garda Síochána had received hundreds of reform recommendations contained in 43 reports. O’Sullivan understood that it would be impossible to respond to all of these suggestions; but if she and her staff could organize them into broader lessons, it would help the organization improve and reassure the Irish government—which had recently created a new oversight body for An Garda Síochána—that they were committed to incorporating outside guidance. Thus, she and her staff consolidated the insights from these reports into the five pillars of the TRUST program, which stands for “Taking care of our communities, Renewing our culture, Unified governance and leadership, Supporting our people, and Technology-enabled.”

Thanks in part to these plans and reforms, An Garda Síochána began to attract more support for its change efforts. Initially, in November 2015, the agency secured an investment of 5 million Euros from the Irish government to begin an operation to tackle crime in rural communities. Capitalizing on predictive analytics, community text alerts, and a “lock up and light up” campaign, An Garda Síochána decreased rural property crime by 34 percent. More recently, the agency obtained 300 million Euros from the Irish government to back the TRUST program. This has allowed for investments in An Garda Síochána uniforms and fleet that, according to O’Sullivan, have helped to restore the force’s pride. The support has also set the table for more significant technological investments, which will help the agency achieve its vision of not just revitalizing its best traditional qualities but also embracing a more modern approach. As O’Sullivan explained, “We want to renew, we want to modernize, and we want to get to a whole new place.”

2016: The Path Ahead

Two years into O’Sullivan’s tenure as commissioner, the agency still faces obstacles. For example, in June 2016, questions surrounding the agency’s responsiveness to whistleblowers continued to linger.¹³¹

Thus, the agency continues to push ahead with reform. Most notably, in June 2016, An Garda Síochána launched to the public and media a five-year transformation program titled “Modernisation and Renewal Programme 2016-2021.”¹³² The program included over 50 initiatives, subdivided into individual projects. It also included a committed set of initiatives—with concrete timelines and outcomes—under TRUST. The STO—which had been divided into sections focused on program architecture, program management, business readiness, and reporting—was tasked with managing the new program in partnership with Garda’s regional Risk Compliance and Continuous Improvement offices.

In part because of An Garda Síochána’s commitment to sustained improvement, the landscape in Ireland has already dramatically improved. According to surveys commissioned by the department, public trust recently rose to 86 percent, a substantial improvement from the all-time low of 67 percent reported in an Irish Times survey in April


Meanwhile, applications to join the department have skyrocketed, which suggests that An Garda Síochána is reemerging as a point of pride in Irish society. Finally, the structural changes that she and her team introduced in 2015 have led to concrete improvements in public safety. For example, the combined drugs and organized crime bureau has made more than 200 arrests and seized 36 million Euros worth of drugs. For all of this progress, O'Sullivan lauds the extraordinary work and dedication of her staff. “I put that very much down to a testament to the men and women of An Garda Síochána,” she said, “who [went out] every single day, despite everything that was going on out there. They stood up; they stood up and did what was asked of them.”

Leadership Insights:

- Leverage sources of resilience and support. Facing a skeptical staff, O'Sullivan drew on her personal experiences and found inspiration in the community.

- Engage and listen. O'Sullivan reached out to a wide array of stakeholders—including Garda members and community leaders—to demonstrate to people that she cared and to understand more clearly what was bothering them.

- Prioritize. An Garda Síochána received extensive feedback from multiple external oversight groups; but rather than responding to every suggestion, O'Sullivan and her team synthesized the feedback into a manageable set of themes and guidelines.

- Generate momentum. Early in her tenure, O'Sullivan secured quick wins by creating Victims Services Offices as well as the TRUST program.

- Institutionalize reform. O'Sullivan created the Strategic Transformation Office to ensure that reform permeated her diffuse organization.


[34] According to O’Sullivan, public pride in An Garda Síochána typically hovers around 80 to 82 percent, so the 67 percent figure in April 2014, though high by some standards, was a source of concern for agency leaders.
“I firmly believe that the department is only as strong as the belief that the community has in it.”

– Eddie Johnson
Superintendent, Chicago Police Department
Panel Discussion on Use of Force

“I can't breathe.” These three words, uttered in 2014, have stoked discussions on police use of force across America.

More than two years later, the country is still wrestling with many questions and challenges connected to the use of force. One is how to define and track “use of force” incidents; in the absence of a clear metric, even the police rely on the media for their data. Another issue is that law enforcement has not taken enough proactive steps to modify the postures and behaviors that lead to the use of force. Finally, continued confrontations between the public and the police have exacerbated existing tension. This is in part because in some communities, cellphone and camera footage capturing incidents involving the use of force has fueled long-held anger over unjust policing. Meanwhile, the police have often responded to this public outcry by citing the reasons that the use of force was justified—a defensive posture that has caused both sides to become more recalcitrant.

Yet progress is possible. At the 2016 Public Safety Summit, police chiefs, public safety officials, and researchers gathered to share promising ideas and practices around improving use of force policy. The first step is aligning all policies and programs with the principle of protecting the “sanctity of human life.” This grounding can enable the next steps: a deepening of police-community dialogue around use of force, a focused revamping of police training programs, and solutions-oriented oversight that not only promotes justice but also positions law enforcement to become better public guardians.

The time is now, said Camden County (NJ) Police Chief Scott Thomson. “We are doing our officers a disservice if we say that what we have been doing for the last 20 years is right and continue to keep doing it because the courts are changing, the public is changing, and so we are saying ‘Let's hold ourselves to a higher standard.’”

“In the law enforcement field, we’re not much unlike doctors [promising] to do no harm. We need to ensure that it’s not just us going home at the end of the shift, but that everybody goes home at the end of their shift.”

– Scott Thomson
Chief, Camden County Police Department
The Origins and Significance of the Use of Force Debate

Thomson was joined at the Summit by Chris Magnus, Chief of the Tucson Police Department, and Chuck Wexler, Executive Director of the Police Executive Research Forum. They explained that historically, use of force policies too often prioritized maintaining the status quo over the higher principle of “sanctity of human life.” In addition, recent events—such as the shooting of Philando Castile near Minneapolis—have been flash points for public vitriol based on resentment simmering for decades. In particular, deep-set racial inequities in some areas of the country as well as law enforcement’s history of being on the wrong side of civil rights disputes (e.g., police helped to enforce Jim Crow laws) are foundational issues that undergird popular concern.

The Graham v. Connor Supreme Court decision has also sown public discord. In this 1989 decision, the court determined that it was constitutional for a law enforcement officer to use force if it was seen as “reasonable,” considering the facts and circumstances of the case ‘from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene.’ Many refer to troubling use of force cases as “lawful but awful” when an incident stretches the boundaries of “reasonable” as interpreted under Graham v. Connor but still meets the minimum legal threshold. To complicate matters, the public remains largely uninformed around what constitutes legal force, even as it has access to more and more images of police using force.

Today, mobile phones and other technology are giving the public an unprecedented, up-close look at police-citizen encounters and, when those images capture questionable instances of force, are further straining police-community relations. Viral videos of incidents of force are fueling public rage as they whittle away at a base of supporters who previously gave police the benefit of the doubt. This has contributed to citizens taking matters into their own hands (sometimes violently), a refusal to cooperate with law enforcement, and even jury nullification.

Too often, according to Magnus, police exhibit frustration in response to public questions about the use of force. They also attempt to justify force using the strict legal standard of Graham, rather than by engaging the public in a dialogue to help shape policies and oversight. This response raises deeper questions about real integration of the public and police, even in programs praised for doing just that. Magnus explained:

> It ought to make us a little uncomfortable about where we’re at with our community policing efforts because as a field we take a great deal of pride in espousing the degree of participation our communities have and the degree of transparency we have and their level of input into what we are doing. Yet now that there might be an expectation that they not only want to know what’s happening in terms of use of force but worse yet have some actual say in it, is really threatening to a lot of our folks.

From the Ground Up: “Sanctity of Human Life” as a Guiding Principle

In the rapidly changing environment that comprises modern policing, panelists stressed that reforms must be grounded in the guiding principle that values and promotes the “sanctity of human life.” Current conditions exist in large part, Summit panelists maintained, because agencies are losing sight of this guiding principle, and the

— Chuck Wexler
Executive Director, Police Executive Research Forum

protections offered citizens and police are muddled or suffer as a result. For example, we undertrain police in de-escalation techniques and then blame them for using excessive force while publicly claiming justification under Graham.

When policies and procedures flow through the “sanctity of human life” lens, promising possibilities emerge, including three reform practices recommended by the panel: 1) deepening police-community communication, 2) revamping police training programs, and 3) creating oversight commissions that engage in solutions-oriented case reviews. “In the law enforcement field, we’re not much unlike doctors [promising] to do no harm,” Thomson said. “We need to ensure that it’s not just us going home at the end of the shift, but that everybody goes home at the end of their shift.”

Reform One: Deepen Police-Community Dialogue Around Use of Force

One strong recommendation was for police to take proactive steps so that mobile phone footage would not dictate the “use of force” narrative. Step one, Magnus said, is frequent, internal conversations around force to enable police to get comfortable engaging in substantive dialogue on the topic. Clear and consistent conversation around what constitutes appropriate force and when to use it can prevent not only inappropriate force but also a defensive public posture. For example, discussions in Tucson inspired Magnus to release video of a non-lethal shooting. “We ended up sharing that body camera footage with the public and one of the things that was important was that we explained there was no time to de-escalate this guy,” he said.

In that video, officers immediately and humanely treated the man post-shooting, a best practice that also supports the “sanctity of human life” principle. But Magnus added that lethal endings should also be shared and that the public should be educated about the appropriate use of force. “I am entirely willing to defend a shooting that is lawful and appropriate and necessary and to explain what happened and why and to then show the next steps taken to do the right thing under very difficult circumstances,” Magnus said. “The discussion has to be bigger than just the tiny number of officers who are misusing force and how we respond to that.”

Reform Two: Focus Police Training on De-Escalation and Communication Techniques

Perhaps the greatest area a “sanctity of life” lens could have an impact is police training. Every year, approximately 1,000 citizens are killed by police. Approximately one-third or more of citizens killed by police are not carrying guns. Wexler hypothesized that at the very least, the outcomes of approximately 300 of those annual use of force incidents could be different if police received better training in crisis intervention, communications and tactics, and especially in the integration of these de-escalation techniques. At the same time, officer safety could be enhanced.

Unfortunately, in most departments, de-escalation and less-lethal options receive the smallest percentage of time in use of force training, while firearms training comprises the largest share. According to Thomson, this leaves officers primed to use force in situations that could be de-escalated. “There is no effective training for someone who has an edged weapon, short of take out your gun or your Taser,” Wexler said. Thomson added, “When you really drill down into what we’ve been doing and how we’ve been doing it, for many years we’ve been putting officers in harm’s way by not giving them the training and equipment.”

To illuminate the benefits of de-escalation training, the panelists described the approach of European police forces and domestic SWAT teams. Both groups stress de-escalating conflict and slowing down police reactions to allow
clear decision-making. This is especially true for encounters where someone has an edged weapon (i.e., a knife); such incidents are common in places like Scotland, where the vast majority of officers do not carry guns. The Scottish police have therefore implemented a critical decision-making model where, upon encountering a suspect, officers typically take a step back. They then find cover and communicate and, as Wexler explained, figure out how best to leverage the tools at their disposal (e.g., further dialogue, pepper spray, a baton, and a call for additional resources). Clear attempts to prevent shooting deaths and a commitment to slowing situations down and taking as much time as needed to resolve them are also prevalent in training for domestic SWAT teams. For example, in Houston, as Wexler recalled, the SWAT commander routinely says, "We're not going to kill anyone today. Do you understand that everybody—we're not going to kill anyone." They therefore wait as long as it takes to outlast a suspect and are trained negotiators, communicators, and tacticians. What's more, these practices become ingrained when "organizational pride in slowing things down and safe restraint...permeate rank and culture," Magnus said. Wexler added:

Distance and cover equals time. If we can inject that into the American formula of how we respond to incidents...we can have a significant impact on reducing the number of people that are killed by police, reducing the number of injuries that are happening to police officers because they are not putting themselves in that officer-created jeopardy and having to make a split-second decision.

Another key training priority is communicating with persons with mental illness, a demographic that accounts for as many as 25 percent of the people involved in fatal use of force incidents. Magnus highlighted the dissonance around the precision with which departments track technical training on firearms but often fail to provide opportunities for police to practice communicating with this critical population.

This points to a broader takeaway: U.S. police forces need to engage in more frequent and multi-faceted use of force trainings. Magnus summarized:

We talk about perishable skills, but how many of us have use of force training that occurs on a monthly basis even if it's with small groups of officers doing scenarios or talking through situations? [It] only happens through training that people learn about techniques to slow something down, to gain ground, to reposition. This is what our officers are confronting.

Reform Three: Create Solutions-Oriented Oversight

How should a “sanctity of human life” lens affect police oversight in investigating and resolving use of force complaints? According to the panelists, better integration of frontline supervisors and solutions-oriented case reviews can provide an opportunity to heal public trust and prevent future cases of excessive use of force.

Supervisors hold the most sway in influencing frontline officers, and too often, they fall short both on training for and supervising the use of force. Magnus lamented:

We have entire generations of first-line supervisors, of sergeants, who have been able effectively to take a pass when it comes to providing real first-line supervision in use of force situations. In some cases, they don't even show up. In other cases, their job is to check the box. In other cases, it's basically just to reinforce whatever the officer they are supervising has done.... If the supervisor doesn't feel they have a role in critically looking at use of force situations, documenting them, talking to witnesses, making sure that things are appropriately supervised, we are screwed.

No wonder the public questions police commitment to ending excessive force

A solution is to bring the sergeants, the public, and other stakeholders (e.g., legal advisers and other technical experts) together to use of force review meetings. What's more, oversight should focus on conducting case reviews that promote justice, learning what is right, and changing other policies and practices to prevent future harm. Police
officials—from chiefs to sergeants—can then disseminate these lessons and best practices by training their staffs.

Seattle provides an example of how to foster this learning environment. Sergeants are invited to use of force board meetings; they are also given the opportunity to offer their expertise on how to handle use of force incidents. This participation in case reviews in turn provides the sergeants valuable use of force training.

More broadly, Seattle’s work illustrates that having the “right mix” of advisers diagnosing problems and seeking solutions is key. With this aim in mind, it is important to have case meetings that move beyond punitive outcomes and examine what resulted in the use of force (e.g., training, supervision, equipment, or one lone officer). Magnus elaborated:

> We need to have attorneys weigh in on this stuff. We need to have our commanders who are out in the field at those conversations to review. We need to look at that body camera footage if we have it, and compare it against our policy—not with the idea of playing ‘got you,’ but learning what we are doing right and also if we are not doing it right, what are the missing pieces.

The Tucson Chief concluded, “If we don’t do meaningful review, we can’t change it.”

**Next Steps**

Training, a strong frontline presence when excessive force occurs, and solutions-oriented case reviews will not only save lives; they will also begin to heal public trust. Similarly, tough conversations up and down the ranks that include everyone from rank-and-file officers to labor leaders are necessary and critical to rebuilding public trust.

Bolstering this trust is imperative because, as Thomson emphasized, law enforcement’s bonds with the public cut at the core of its efficacy. “We can’t lose sight of the fact that we police in a democratic society, [and] our power comes from the consent of the people. If the people view us as being illegitimate, they are going to reject what we do and how we do it.”

“We can’t lose sight of the fact that we police in a democratic society, [and] our power comes from the consent of the people. If the people view us as being illegitimate, they are going to reject what we do and how we do it.”

— Scott Thomson  
Chief, Camden County Police Department
“Culture is the thing that sits between capacity and legitimacy.”

- Hank Stawinski

Police Chief, Prince George's County (Maryland)
A Time for New Measures: 
Introducing CompStat 2.0 and Broader Reform in New York City

In January 2014, when William Bratton began his second stint as Commissioner of the New York City Police Department (NYPD), he faced a challenge unlike any he had confronted in his 44-year law enforcement career. Although the city’s crime rate was lower than it had been in decades, a survey conducted in spring 2014 revealed that 41 percent of blacks and 31 percent of Hispanics “held a somewhat negative or very negative view of the police.” A separate analysis revealed that 70 percent of NYPD officers doubted that the department would back their decisions. The city and agency were suffering from a crisis of confidence.36

Since then, the department has employed a multi-pronged strategy—highlighted by an increase in community policing, expanded trainings, and a wider embrace of modern technology—to continue keeping New Yorkers safe while restoring trust. These reforms have had a noticeable impact. In 2015, reported crime decreased by approximately two percent. Meanwhile, arrests fell by 13 percent, a reflection of the department’s emphasis on arrest “quality over quantity.” Nonetheless, the killing of four officers on duty and lingering public concerns about safety showed that rifts endured. As Bratton said, 2015 was “a year of great contradictions.”37

“When you know you have to change, what is going to be your posture? Do you dig your heels in or do you accept it and work with others?”

– Dermot Shea
Deputy Commissioner, Operations, New York City Police Department


Thus, NYPD has had to face—and will continue to confront—a difficult question: in one of the most complex operating environments in the world, how can it simultaneously preserve safety, restore public trust, and bolster department morale?

**Background on Crime in New York City and The Emergence and Impact of CompStat**

In 1990, New York City was in trouble: murder was at an all-time high, larceny was rampant, and widespread drug abuse contributed to violence and decay. That September, Time published a cover story lamenting, “the rotting of the Big Apple.” The task of improving safety fell to Bratton, who in 1994 left his post as the Commissioner of the Boston Police Department to lead NYPD. A proponent of the “broken windows” theory of policing, Bratton believed that NYPD needed to do more to prevent crime. He also felt that the agency had to start gathering and analyzing crime data on a real-time basis.

These priorities contributed to the creation in 1994 of CompStat, “a data-driven performance management system” that would help NYPD combat crime. The system revolved around four principles: “timely and accurate information or intelligence”; “rapid deployment of resources”; “effective tactics”; and “relentless follow-up.” More concretely, it involved expanding and computerizing NYPD’s crime data and having multiple meetings per week in which senior department officials analyzed crime trends and asked lower-level officials about their approach. In the year after CompStat’s introduction, crime in New York City fell by 12 percent—a positive trend that has continued for two decades since then.

Yet even as the city became safer, public trust in the police—particularly in minority communities—cratered. A major source of friction was aggressive policing strategies—such as “stop-question-and-frisk”—that, some believe, resulted in racial profiling. Thus, when Bratton—who since leaving NYPD in 1996 had served as Los Angeles's Police Chief—returned to lead NYPD in January 2014, he focused on healing. “We will all work hard,” he said, “to identify why is it that so many in this city do not feel good about this department that has done so much to make them feel safe—what has it been about our activities that have made so many alienated?”

---


[41] Ibid., pp. v and 2; Gilsinan and Stepan, “From Compstat to Gov 2.0….”; and “Compstat: Its Origins….” p. 6.

[42] Presentation by Dermot Shea, Deputy Commissioner of Operations, New York City Police Department, 2016 Public Safety Summit at Harvard University in Cambridge, MA, May 1, 2016. Unless noted, the remainder of this case study draws on Shea’s presentation as well as a personal communication with Shea via e-mail on July 19, 2016.

January 2014 - June 2014: A Frenetic Start

In January 2014, Bratton quickly assembled his command team, marking the beginning of what Dermot Shea, the Deputy Commissioner for Operations, characterized as a “frenetic” period of evaluation and planning. Department officials held strategy meetings on topics ranging from victims’ rights to crime fighting to equipment. They also initiated a bottom-up review of the department. Finally, NYPD commissioned two surveys, one involving rank-and-file officers and another focused on the public, to understand more clearly why NYPD was drawing so much criticism. The data revealed deep mistrust within and outside the department (in some neighborhoods and boroughs) as well as substantial concern over policies like stop-question-and-frisk. NYPD leaders therefore concluded that they needed to pursue three goals: changing elements of their operating model without increasing crime, reengaging the community and building trust, and increasing department morale.

While fully realizing these objectives would take years, NYPD officials felt that they could make immediate progress by developing a less defensive posture toward two recent efforts to increase external oversight. Initially, in June 2013, the New York City Council had passed a law creating an independent inspector general for NYPD. Then, two months later, a federal judge had recommended that the federal government establish a monitor for NYPD.\textsuperscript{44,45} At first, NYPD and city officials bristled at this oversight, most notably by appealing the stop-question-and-frisk case in late 2013. In stark contrast, newly elected Mayor Bill de Blasio decided to drop the appeal. To Shea, this represented a crucial transition. He explained, “If you’re going to change something, if you’re going to dig your heels in and defend your prior actions, what are we really accomplishing? We’re slowing down the pace of change…and in fact it’s going to be an antagonistic situation.”

July 2014 - December 2015: A Crisis of Confidence and A New Perspective

Unfortunately, just as NYPD began to pursue reform, the department and city endured a tragic series of events that caused public ire to rise and the department’s morale to plummet. In July 2014, Eric Garner, a New York City resident, died after an NYPD officer placed him in a chokehold.\textsuperscript{46,47} Combined with several other similar events across the country, including the killing of Michael Brown, a teenager, in Ferguson, Missouri, the incident contributed to an intense national debate surrounding the relationship between law enforcement and the black community.\textsuperscript{48} And in New York City, as Shea said, “the embers were really stoking,” with large protests, rising crime, and an uptick in assaults against and criticism of police officers. Then, in December 2014, a man assassinated two NYPD officers.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{45} and “Overview,” NYPD Monitor, available at http://nypdmonitor.org/overview/ (accessed on June 26, 2016).
\item \textsuperscript{46} Dating to the 1990s, NYPD had also had an Independent Civilian Review Board. Shea presentation.
\end{itemize}
For Bratton, these tragedies presented a delicate balancing act. On the one hand, he had to assuage the concerns of NYPD officers, whose morale had plummeted. On the other hand, he had to demonstrate sensitivity to the public's concerns and accelerate and concretize the reform mentality the department had begun to demonstrate during the first half of 2014. He began to accomplish his first goal—reassuring downtrodden officers—by delivering a powerful eulogy at the funeral for one of the slain NYPD officers in which he lauded NYPD personnel for their bravery and “heroic” work. Meanwhile, the leadership team unveiled a more detailed reform agenda focused on five “T” goals: tackling crime, preventing terrorism, rebuilding trust, improving training, and making better use of technology. These guidelines were helpful in part because they provided a consistent, alliterative message to communicate with the media and community; in addition, as Shea explained, they embodied a new perspective surrounding the priorities that NYPD needed to advance.

The challenge became how to advance these objectives. NYPD had already enjoyed substantial success tackling crime and preventing terrorism, so it needed to sustain its effectiveness in those areas while allocating resources toward the leadership team's other goals. This began with trust, which Bratton and other senior department officials hoped to bolster through an increased emphasis on community policing during officer patrols. In the past, the department had focused patrols on combatting crime and maximizing arrests in high-crime “Impact Zones” scattered throughout the city. NYPD, however, introduced a new model, Neighborhood Coordinator Officers (NCOs). NCOs would be assigned to the same neighborhood every day, and they would be expected to devote approximately a third of their time to community engagement.

To ensure that officers had the skills and tools to interact constructively with the community, Bratton and his leadership team also placed a greater emphasis on training and technology. NYPD introduced trainings focused on non-confrontational communication and a range of alternative physical engagement tactics. At the same time, he modernized the department by distributing smart phones to every officer, equipping squad cars with tablets and automatic vehicle locators, and making more expansive use of social media to communicate with the public and rank-and-file officers. The latter innovation was significant because, as Shea explained, in a heated public discussion, “We will tell our story as opposed to others telling our story [for us].” More broadly, the reforms signaled what Shea characterized as a “complete mind[set] shift” in which NYPD was paying heed to broader goals.

January 2016 - May 2016: CompStat 2.0 and Beyond

While signaling a shift in the organization's mindset was critical, NYPD had to make sure that it institutionalized this change. Thus, in February 2016, NYPD unveiled “CompStat 2.0,” a revamped version of CompStat that placed granular crime data online where it was available to all New Yorkers. CompStat 2.0 also shifted the focus of CompStat meetings from arrests to convictions. This heightened NYPD's focus on arrest quality and shifted the tenor of CompStat meetings and department interactions. CompStat meetings had historically focused on arrest numbers. This contributed to a conflictive climate in which anxious subordinates would respond to concerned superiors with as much data as possible. CompStat 2.0 meetings, by contrast, featured more insightful, nuanced discussions in which NYPD officials—representing an array of departmental bureaus and often working in tandem with other city agencies—gauged whether specific arrests were leading to convictions. “We are no longer satisfied with an arrest,” Shea explained, “because that's not the answer. We're trying to break that cycle of the hamster on the wheel, which will just repeat itself over and over again.”


In August 2016, Commissioner Bratton announced that he would step down in September and transition to the private sector. This meant that it would be up to his successor, then-Chief of Department James O’Neill, to continue the reform process.\textsuperscript{51}

Sustaining this effort was critical because NYPD still saw room for improvement. For example, the department was exploring how to track officers’ time to ensure that a third of patrols focus on community engagement. Nonetheless, NYPD had made substantial progress: index crime was near an all-time low, arrests were down 20 percent, and gun arrests had become more targeted. More broadly, NYPD had embraced the need to collaborate, a realization that, according to Shea, boiled down to a simple question: “When you know you have to change, what is going to be your posture? Do you dig your heels in or do you accept it and work with others?”

\begin{center}
\textbf{Leadership Insights}
\end{center}

\begin{itemize}
\item Expedite change by acknowledging the need to improve and demonstrating a willingness to collaborate, as Bratton and his leadership team did with their stance toward the inspector general and federal monitor.
\item Recognize the gravity of peoples’ work through powerful, public recognition. Bratton reminded the rank-and-file of the importance of their work.
\item Articulate and pursue a multi-faceted reform agenda that balances different priorities. Bratton and other senior NYPD officials identified five organizational objectives and repeated them so that they gained traction.
\item Institutionalize change by refining systems, measures, and approaches. Bratton and his leadership team talked about the need for change; then they introduced CompStat 2.0 and other system changes to realize their goals.
\end{itemize}

“Are we as diverse as we ought to be and should be and need to be so that we don’t miss the boat in being able to provide the type of quality services that communities are asking for, and be reflective of the communities that we serve?”

– Sheree Briscoe

Major, Baltimore Police Department
Public Safety in a Digital World: Harnessing the Power of Data and Analytics

The digital era has not only brought new levels of capacity and efficiency to public safety organizations; it has also created new ways for law enforcement organizations to engage and communicate with communities. The possibilities seem endless—from predictive policing to social media to real-time surveillance—and public safety leaders are on point to prepare their organizations and manage the uptake. Nonetheless, this new age of data and analytics also presents challenging questions: How should we work across policing and partner organizations to respond to community problems? How should we manage, store, and analyze the data we capture? What are best practices to maximize the potential of digital technologies while also protecting civil liberties and privacy?

At the 2016 Public Safety Summit, we addressed these questions via a panel discussion titled “Public Safety in a Digital World: Harnessing the Power of Data and Analytics.” In particular, Nancy Rodriguez of the National Institute of Justice and Denise O’Donnell of the Department of Justice highlighted key insights that have emerged from more than 15 years of research on data and analytics; Accenture’s Kieran Towey relayed cutting-edge innovations from around the globe; and Jorge Villegas of the Los Angeles Police Department reflected on the opportunities and challenges new technologies, data, and analytics present at the department level.
“We are all familiar with the triangle of crime: location-based enforcement and awareness as well as offender-based enforcement and then victim-based education and awareness. We are trying to make sure that we cover all three from a data perspective and/or a technology perspective.”

– Jorge Villegas
Assistant Chief, Office of Operations, Los Angeles Police Department

“Modern life changes expectations to live anonymously. Increased automation is in everything we do.”

– Dr. Nancy Rodriguez
Director, National Institute of Justice
Department of Justice/Office of Justice Programs

“How will we take advantage of both old and new technologies to meet law enforcement needs in the future operational environment?”

– Denise O’Donnell
Director, Bureau of Justice Assistance
Department of Justice/Office of Justice Programs

“We are all familiar with the triangle of crime: location-based enforcement and awareness as well as offender-based enforcement and then victim-based education and awareness. We are trying to make sure that we cover all three from a data perspective and/or a technology perspective.”

– Kieran Towey
Advanced Analytics Lead for Health & Public Safety, Accenture

“Police forces do not exist in a vacuum. You need to work with health and human services and other partner organizations, in particular other law enforcement partner organizations...[because] it’s not only the knowledge that [you] have within [your] four walls...[You] can share and use the information that other agencies have as well.”

– Kieran Towey
Advanced Analytics Lead for Health & Public Safety, Accenture
Summary

As public safety leaders strive to lead their organizations deep into the 21st century, they face the question of how to simultaneously make their communities safer and bolster community ties. Adding to the complexity, they will have to discern how to further both of these goals in an environment marked by growing scrutiny, a wide array of complex threats, and in some departments, a dearth of resources. As a result, law enforcement leaders will feel that they are facing difficult tradeoffs, but those agencies that are able to pursue multiple goals and techniques jointly will be best equipped to succeed in this uncertain future.

The dialogue at the 2016 Public Safety Summit pointed to three critical steps that law enforcement officials can take to navigate this challenging time. First, leaders must leverage modern technology, particularly innovations surrounding data and analytics. From the Seattle Police Department’s Real Time Crime Center to CompStat 2.0 in New York City, law enforcement agencies are discovering that technology can help them to combat crime more efficiently and therefore free valuable resources to bolster community ties. Second, listening, engaging in dialogue, and building partnerships is invaluable. As Nóirín O’Sullivan, An Garda Síochána’s Commissioner, said, “Every contact leaves a trace.” The implication is that law enforcement officials have the opportunity to reinforce a positive image and advance their mission with every move they make. Finally, leaders must be willing to embrace reform as a chance to get better, rather than view it as a punishment. As Dermot Shea, Deputy Commissioner for Operations in New York City’s Police Department said, “When you know you have to change, what is going to be your posture? Do you dig your heels in or do you accept it and work with others?”

Beyond mastering data and analytics and the complex process of community relations, law enforcement officials also need something less tangible but nonetheless significant: a sense of optimism. Given the enormous criticism of law enforcement in America today, it can be easy to become despondent about the state of the field or the difficulty of bolstering community ties. However, this crisis of confidence has also created an opportunity: law enforcement officials can develop a clearer sense of what their communities need and at the same time communities can come to appreciate the critical service that public safety departments provide. If public safety leaders and their communities can foster this understanding, America and the world will become a safer, more peaceful place—and that optimistic spirit will have been both rewarded and realized.

[53] Presentation by Dermot Shea, Deputy Commissioner of Operations, New York City Police Department, 2016 Public Safety Summit at Harvard University in Cambridge, MA, May 1, 2016.
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