Community Policing
and
Countering Violent Extremism

Draft of Curriculum Components

January 2011

DHS CVE Curriculum Working Group

The CVE Curriculum Working Group was assembled after the Homeland Security Advisory Council (HSAC) CVE Working Group's recommendations on ways DHS can better support community-based efforts to combat violent extremism in the United States were released. The CVE Curriculum Working Group was comprised of individual subject matter experts who, while using the HSAC recommendations as a basis, lent their expertise in the creation of this guidance.

Chairman

(b)(6),(b)(7)(C)

Deputy Chief, Counter-Terrorism and Special Operations Bureau,
Los Angeles Police Department, California

Staff

(b)(6) *– National Consortium for Advanced Policing, Los Angeles, California*

Agency Members

(b)(6) *– Office of the Program Manager Information Sharing Environment, Washington, DC*
(b)(6) *Program Specialist for CT Division, FLETC, Georgia*
Rick Dinse *– Assistant Secretary (acting) for State and Local Law Enforcement DHS, Washington, DC*
(b)(6) *– CEO, Freedom and Justice Foundation, Texas*
– Naval Postgraduate School, California
Kevin Livingston *– Deputy Associate Director, FLETC, Washington, DC*
(b)(6) *– FEMA PNP, Washington, DC*
(b)(6) *– Director of Programs and Research, IACP, Virginia*
Tom O'Reilly *– Senior Policy Advisor for the Bureau of Justice Assistance, DOJ, Washington, DC*
(b)(6) *– Law Enforcement Policy Advisor, FLETC, Georgia*
Irfan Saeed *– Senior Policy Advisor, DHS Office of Civil Rights Civil Liberties, Washington, DC*
(b)(6),(b)(7)(C) *– DHS Office of Intelligence & Analysis, Washington, DC*
(b)(6) *– Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, Washington, DC*
(b)(6) *– National Center for Biomedical Research and Training, LSU, Louisiana*
(b)(6) *– Assistant Director (Nat'l Center for Biomedical Research), LSU-NCBRT, Louisiana*

Liaison to Office of the Secretary
U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Nathaniel Snyder *– Liaison for Community Partnership and Strategic Engagement*

1

Participating Federal, State and Local Agencies

3

SUMMARY

This document serves as the outline of a Community Policing curriculum geared toward frontline state and local police officers, key law enforcement outreach personnel and their supervisors. This document also addresses ways to tailor current Community policing curricula to the issue of Countering Violent Extremism (CVE).

Section One: Community Policing - Relevance to CVE

History

A brief overview of the different eras of American policing will set the stage for this class because many aspects of modern-day community policing strategies are grounded in the lessons learned by policing during the decades before – lessons that are instructive in the context of CVE. This historical overview will place special emphasis on how various policing approaches have impacted the police-community relationship and how this relationship has impacted levels of crime and disorder, public perception of police and the level of fear among the citizens. These eras will include:

- **The Political Era,** which emphasized community-police interaction, the provision of social services and a decentralized organizational structure, but was marked by the directing of police resources and activities by ward politicians, inadequate supervision of line-level officers and police corruption;
- **The Reform Era,** which was marked by a centralized organizational model, the deliberate removal of political influences from police business, the professionalization of police and a move away from community-police interaction via foot patrol and toward crime control; and
- **The Community Problem-solving Era,** which is relevant today and emphasizes a decentralized organizational model, problem solving and decision-making at the line-level, the collection of information in crime-fighting and police-community interaction.

During the 19th Century, Sir Robert Peel established the first model for modern policing at Scotland Yard in London. To this date, Peel's Nine Principles continue to serve as a framework for CVE in a blending of the old and the new.

- **Principle 1:** *"The basic mission for which the police exist is to prevent crime and disorder."*
- **Principle 2:** *"The ability of the police to perform their duties is dependent upon public approval of police actions."*
- **Principle 3:** *"Police must secure the **willing co-operation of the public** in voluntary observance of the law to be able to secure and maintain the **respect** of the public."*

4

- **Principle 4:** *"The degree of co-operation of the public that can be secured diminishes proportionately to the necessity of the use of physical force."*
- **Principle 5:** *"Police seek and preserve public favour not by catering to the public opinion but by constantly demonstrating absolute impartial service to the law."*
- **Principle 6:** *"Police use physical force to the extent necessary to secure observance of the law or to restore order only when the exercise of **persuasion**, advice and warning is found to be insufficient."*
- **Principle 7:** *"Police, at all times, should **maintain a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historic tradition that the police are the public and the public are the police**; the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full-time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen in the interests of community welfare and existence."*
- **Principle 8:** *"Police should always direct their action strictly towards their functions and never appear to usurp the powers of the judiciary."*
- **Principle 9:** *"The test of police efficiency is the absence of crime and disorder, not the visible evidence of police action in dealing with it."*

Philosophy

A review of the philosophy, tenets and specific approaches of Community Policing will follow. The goal is to provide the audience with a clear understanding of Community Policing and its operational definitions that they will use as they begin to shape CVE programs in their own organizations.

This section will also include an overview of certain other models of policing and their associated theories that have potential applicability to CVE (e.g., Problem-Oriented Policing, etc.). This approach lends itself to a facilitated class discussion about the relative merits and disadvantages of each. It enables the instructor to emphasize why the Community Policing philosophy is best suited to serve as the foundation for CVE programs. However, Community Policing in the traditional sense will not adequately address the dynamics of Violent Extremism and the associated convergent threats, particularly those that emanate from Diaspora communities. If police intend to practice community policing in an increasingly complex, ambiguous law enforcement environment, they must align community and government resources with the goal of creating environments in which violent extremism is less likely to flourish.

Section Two: Community Policing Models

This section will explore the different models of community engagement that are potentially relevant in the context of CVE. While Section One outlines the underlying philosophical foundation for a CVE program, this section is designed to present the audience with an operational framework based on descriptions of the models themselves, the steps they require and a range of case studies to illustrate how each model has been employed.

Case Study Presentations

Case study presentations will include discussions of topics such as: how police built (or inadvertently undermined) trust, the most central element of community engagement; how police achieved legitimacy in the eyes of the community; the importance of the separation between the outreach and intelligence-gathering functions; how police navigated cultural, religious and linguistic differences; and how police developed measures of accountability and outcomes (in terms of fear reduction, perception of police, lower crime rates, etc.). This section will also include discussion of approaches and lessons learned in other countries with rich histories of community engagement (e.g., the United Kingdom's PREVENT strategy), approaches employed by the U.S. military (the U.S. Army's Human Terrain Project) and novel approaches in the United States (Dr. Gary Slutkin's CeaseFire program in Chicago).

The discussions during case studies will also address topics that will be explored in more detail in Section Three: How are results measured in Community Policing? What metrics can be used to measure success? What analytical methods should be used in the pre-engagement phase of a CVE program to identify problems in the community and/or to determine with whom to engage? What resources will be leveraged in and out of the police department? What problem-solving framework will be employed? How do police mobilize communities that don't have adequate resources, infrastructure or organization to give voice to their issues and engage with police? How do police engage with communities that have a deep-seated distrust in and dislike of police? What sort of internal reporting and decision-making structure is needed to support these approaches (flattened, hierarchical, etc.)? What qualities are needed in the personnel selected for outreach (emotional intelligence, ability to navigate conflict, etc.)? What internal organizational changes need to be made to support CVE work?

The distinction between what police have to do today verses what they did in years past is focused on how they engage with communities that are not actively engaged in civic life in general or with their police departments in particular. In order for policing to evolve in the 21st Century, there must be a deeper understanding of community dynamics, their "local/global" history, narratives and culture.

This involves learning more about:

- Demographics, social structures, and languages;
- Expectations, objectives, desires, and cultural nuance;
- Current and historical relations with other population groups; and
- Common (**shared**) attributes, conditions, and resulting areas of mutual advantage.

Police must seek to create opportunities to harness differences as they build on similarities and create coalitions with shared interests. Beyond merely seeking the "buy-in" of communities, police should seek to promote active enrollment and participation. "Big picture" questions that will be addressed include: How do we inspire civic engagement and participation by our youth in police-sponsored activities?

The models for inclusion in this section include, but are not limited to:

- Value-Based Initiative, to include programs that aim to build trust between police and faith-based communities by partnering with them in a collaborative problem-solving process (e.g., Operation Cease Fire and Operation Homefront in Boston)

- Youth Programs, which often focus on providing children with alternatives to gang and other illegal activity by providing them with life skills, education about law enforcement, sports activities (e.g., cricket matches, Explorer Program, Police Athletic League) and opportunities to talk about their challenges. While there is a range of programs that could be included as case studies in this section, many of them are anti-gang initiatives. This curriculum will focus on developing youth programs that are specifically tailored to CVE efforts.

- Weed and Seed Strategies, which involve two major stages. In the first, violent criminals and drug abusers are "weeded" out of a community through arrest and other measures. In the second stage, community-based organizations and public agencies collaboratively "seed" the area with social services such as neighborhood restoration programs that improve the overall quality of life of residents.

The case studies presented will also address outreach initiatives geared toward specific populations. The topics in this section will largely be determined by the scope of the CVE training as defined by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

Diaspora/Immigrant Communities

Muslim Communities Examples

What are the concerns of the Muslim communities throughout the United States and in the areas in which the trainings are being held? How do these communities differ?

What cultural dynamics should police be aware of when creating programs to engage with Diaspora communities? What roles does fear play in engagement with police, particularly since 9/11? As the most visible representatives of government in civil society, what issues do police need to understand as they engage with these communities? What cultural and linguistic tools should police identify before they engage and where can they find it (e.g.,, personnel who have language skills or cultural knowledge and the personal/attitudinal disposition to conduct outreach)? How can they learn about the needs and issues of importance to the community (niche media, etc.)?

Case Studies: There are excellent examples of how police at both large and small departments have engaged with Muslim populations (Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, New York Police Department, Dearborn Police Department, etc.).

Immigrant Communities Examples

A lack of cultural awareness is often not specific to the police by any means. Many immigrant populations have very little knowledge of U.S. police practices and laws. As police consider this issue in the context of CVE and community policing, what measures can be taken to partner with communities in a way that educates them and lowers the chance that they will encounter police in undesirable ways? Those issues, if left unchecked, can be akin to a powder keg when there is a negative event such as a police shooting that serves as a tipping point for that community. While civil unrest is not necessarily ideologically motivated crime, it could be stated that addressing conditions that could fuel violence and anti-government sentiments are in the best interest of police in the context of CVE.

Case Studies: UNIDOS program developed by the Garland Police Department and the Delray Beach Police Department's programs with the Haitian community.

This section should also include the topic of radicalization in the United States with discussion of the "push" and "pull" factors that can impact individuals and groups perceived to be vulnerable

to radicalization. The "push" factors are those that contribute to feelings of discontent (thought, emotion). Examples of these factors are experiences of racism and discrimination and/or perceived oppression or injustice due to Western policies. The "pull" factors are those that can contribute to the choice of an individual or group to move along the continuum to violent action. Examples of those factors include violent ideology, in many cases espoused or facilitated by charismatic figures, and Internet-based networks of like-minded individuals.

These "push" and "pull" factors are illustrated in three recent cases that: took place in the United States but had transnational components; demonstrated the radicalization process and the traveling of individuals along the continuum to violent action; and demonstrated the failure by law enforcement to find the "tripwires" - the suspicious behaviors and/or criminal acts that, when observed by community members or police, can lead to early detection. These cases are the David Headley case, the Najibullah Zazi case and the Faisal Shahzad case. These were all United States citizens with transnational ties who experienced the "push" factors of discontent and the "pull" factors that led them to choose to mobilize and back their radical thought with violent action. All three could have been discovered earlier if local police and communities had been more sensitized and attuned to the behavioral changes that have a nexus to violent radicalization. These three case studies – and others such as the Fort Hood shooting, which demonstrates that this radicalization process can take place in unlikely settings such as the military – are rich with lessons learned. They also introduce an emerging thought in the counter-terrorism community – that of the eleventh Al-Qaeda affiliate: Al- Qaeda in the United States.[1]

In addition to case studies, facilitated discussions and scenario-driven exercises, this section will also explore real world events and potential crises, which provide both danger and opportunity. These include protests, demonstrations, local reactions to U.S. military actions and public policy, elections, community problems and corruption. Since 9/11, local police officers have learned that what happens overseas has an effect on their own backyards, much the way a pebble causes ripples in a pond. Members of Diaspora communities throughout the United States who maintain strong transnational ties can be heavily impacted or galvanized by events in their native countries. Conversely, police-community interactions that are both positive and negative can be broadcast within hours to the far reaches of the globe. Instead of experiencing anxiety over such events, police should welcome these dynamics as engagement opportunities to build trust, educate the populace, and put credits in the bank. As part of a CVE curriculum, students will build separate event action plans with the required background, purpose, objective, goals and strategies.

---

[1] These examples exemplify the importance of the Nationwide Suspicious Activity Reporting (SAR) Initiative (NSI) and the role that officers play in the identification and reporting of suspicious behaviors.

Section Three: Community Policing and CVE - Creating a Program

Before a Community Policing (CP)-based CVE program can be accepted by communities it must first be accepted by the police executives and line officers who will be designing and implementing it. Section 3 will walk participants through the many organizational considerations involved in creating a CVE program. The discussions will include Community Policing "best practices" that participants can apply to their own programs.

Below is a partial list of the steps involved in developing a CP-based CVE program:

- Identification and analysis of issues/problems relevant to communities in question
    - ✓ Open-source research on topics including, but not limited to, demographics, religious, educational and socio-cultural issues, generational issues and issues of concern to the community
    - ✓ Discussions with people familiar with the communities, both in the department and with community groups/providers of social services
    - ✓ Development of tools to educate the communities about suspicious activities and other behavioral indicators that have traditionally been linked to violent extremism

- Development of strategic plan
    - ✓ Determination of departmental structure and how it will support the initiative
    - ✓ Structure of the program and determination of goals, objectives and measures of success (i.e., metrics) within the department, with the community and at the level of the individual officers doing the outreach
    - ✓ Methods of outreach (e.g., advisory boards, Citizens Police Academy, programs geared to specific populations such as youth or women, etc.)
    - ✓ Outreach to other arms of government, particularly at the local level, so that all government leaders understand the objectives of and need for outreach programs and support them (i.e., whole-of-government approach)
        - ▪ Units within the police department
        - ▪ City/State/Federal offices (e.g., Mayor's Office)
        - ▪ Local, State and Federal law enforcement partners
    - ✓ Decision-making (Line-level officers? Supervisors? Commanding officers?)
    - ✓ Flow of communication/information within the department and with the community
    - ✓ Training
        - ▪ Professional reading lists
        - ▪ Vetted classes and training programs (i.e., proven to be useful)
        - ▪ Helpful Websites, including any that bring police practitioners of this sort together to exchange ideas
        - ▪ Information on conflict resolution strategies

- ✓ Personnel selection, including Officers and Reserves with special skills
- ✓ Resources the police department will offer the communities (e.g., crime prevention seminars, attendance of community events, tailored and timely response to public safety concerns, etc.)
- ✓ Resources the communities will offer the police departments
- ✓ Outreach practices (Issues of trust, accountability, authenticity, conflict resolution, humanization of police and community members, strategic versus tactical, boundaries between outreach and intelligence, etc.)

- Selection of community/communities to engage with
  - ✓ Selection of community leaders
  - ✓ Identification of up-and-coming leaders

- Selection of community-based, academic and government resources and partners

- Messaging/Narrative of the program (internally and externally)
  - ✓ To be developed with community
  - ✓ To be communicated multiple ways ranging from meetings to niche media

- Identification of metrics used to assess outcomes
  - ✓ Within the police department, how outreach personnel will be evaluated (i.e., strength of social relationships, ability to become part of a community network, ability to identify and respond to issues of concern in communities, etc.)
  - ✓ With community, how progress will be measured (i.e., a specific issue is resolved, social services are brought to bear on an issue, etc.)
  - ✓ Incorporation of lessons learned from the Building Communities of Trust Initiative and best practices from DHS HSAC regional meetings with communities and state and local law enforcement

The following is a list of some of the essential law enforcement capabilities and methodologies that departments and officers will need to develop to effectively carry out a CVE program:

- Cultural immersion and knowledge;
- Language capabilities;
- Specialized training for line personnel;
- Open source and neighborhood research;
- Decentralized neighborhood patrols, emphasizing recurrent presence and personal inter-actions;
- Youth activities, community events, and outreach forums; and
- Recruitment and organizational demographics.

Collectively, these lists, once expanded, will serve as a road map for the trainees and provide them with something tangible to bring back to their departments. Again, including executives at this stage will begin to create the buy-in necessary to implement any new initiative.

Finally, instead of dancing around the issue of who and where the adversary is, part of this curriculum should address how to facilitate discussions with community groups relative to isolating violent extremists. Solicit ideas from community groups. This is a good exercise for community engagement, community problem-solving and transferring responsibility to communities. Issues to consider as part of this discussion include: What does this conversation look like? Who participates? Who moderates? Who develops the ideas? How does this speak to trust versus whistle blowing?

While police may be the catalyst and stand on the front line initially, the ultimate goal is for the police to take on a more supportive role while allowing the community to engage the issues directly and in collaboration with police—overall smart and good governance.

Workshop at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC)

On February 8-10, 2011, the following officials traveled to the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) in Glynco, Georgia to attend a "proof-of-concept" session and to discuss CVE best practices. There, these guidelines were reviewed and validated. As a compliment to the curriculum development efforts underway at the local law enforcement level, FLETC is now working to develop a CVE curriculum that will be integrated into Federal law enforcement officer training programs.

FLETC CVE "Proof-of-Concept" Session Participants

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] - Sergeant, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, California

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] - Officer, Los Angeles Police Department, California

[b)(6)] - Nationwide SAR Initiative, BJA, Washington, DC

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] - Officer, Minneapolis Police Department, Minnesota

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] - Deputy Chief, Counterterrorism and Special Operations Bureau, Los Angeles Police Department, California

[b)(6)] - CEO, Freedom and Justice Foundation, Texas

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] Sergeant, Hennepin County Sheriff's Office, Minnesota

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] - Sheriff, Camden County Sheriff's Department, Georgia

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] Lieutenant, Minneapolis Police Department, Minnesota

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] - Detective, Chicago Police Department, Illinois

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] - Inspector, New York Police Department, New York

[b)(6)] Assistant Director (Nat'l Center for Biomedical Research), LSU-NCBRT, Louisiana

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] - Officer NYPD, LSU-NCBRT Subject Matter Expert, Louisiana

Patrick McQuillan - Policy Director, DHS, Washington, DC

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] Deputy Sheriff, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, California

[b)(6)] Director, Nationwide SAR Initiative, BJA, Washington, DC

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] Lieutenant, Brunswick Police Department, Georgia

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] - Lieutenant, Dearborn Police Department, Michigan

Fayrouz Saad – Inter-governmental Affairs, DHS, Washington, DC

Irfan Saeed - Senior Policy Advisor, DHS, Washington, DC

[b)(6)] - COPS, DOJ, Washington, DC

Gary Schenkel – Office of State and Local Law Enforcement , DHS, Washington, DC

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] - Chief, St. Paul Police Department, Minnesota

Nathaniel Snyder – Liaison for Community Partnership and Strategic Engagement, DHS, Washington, DC

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] Commander, Dearborn Police Department, Michigan

[b)(6)] - Program Manager, NCAP, Los Angeles, California

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] Officer, Los Angeles Police Department, California

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] Commander, Dearborn Police Department, Michigan

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] - Assistant Chief, St. Paul Police Department, Minnesota

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] Chief, Oneida Police Department, Wisconsin

[b)(6)] Director, State and Provincial Police Directorate, IACP, Virginia

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] Chicago Police Department, Illinois

[b)(6),(b)(7)(C)] Detective III, Los Angeles Police Department, California

13

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

State and Local Agencies

Brunswick Police Department

Camden County Sheriff's Department

Chicago Police Department

Dearborn Police Department

Freedom and Justice Foundation

Hennepin County Sheriff's Office

International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP)

Los Angeles Police Department

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department

Louisiana State University

Major Cities Chiefs Association

Minneapolis Police Department

National Consortium for Advanced Policing

New York City Police Department

Oneida Police Department, Wisconsin

St. Paul Police Department

Federal Agencies

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Information Sharing Environment

U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS)

U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA)

Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC)

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)

Naval Postgraduate School