



# Briefing Packet

Dr. Tracie Keese: [tracie@trustandjustice.org](mailto:tracie@trustandjustice.org), (212) 393-6004  
Sam Kuhn: [skuhn@jjay.cuny.edu](mailto:skuhn@jjay.cuny.edu), (212) 393-6307

## About the National Initiative

The National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice is designed to improve relationships and increase trust between communities and the criminal justice system. It also aims to advance the public and scholarly understandings of the issues contributing to those relationships. In September 2014, Attorney General Eric Holder announced that the Department of Justice has awarded the National Network for Safe Communities, through John Jay College of Criminal Justice, a three-year, \$4.75 million grant to launch a National Initiative. The National Initiative is led by Professor David Kennedy, with Dr. Tracie Keese as project manager, and John Jay College President Jeremy Travis, Professor Tracey Meares and Dr. Tom Tyler of Yale Law School, Dr. Phillip Atiba Goff of UCLA, and Dr. Nancy La Vigne and Dr. Jocelyn Fontaine of the Urban Institute as principal partners. The project will be carried out in collaboration with the Department of Justice.

The National Initiative will highlight three areas that hold great promise for concrete, rapid progress: **implicit bias**, **procedural justice**, and **reconciliation**. The National Initiative will combine existing and newly developed interventions informed by these ideas in six pilot sites: Birmingham, Alabama; Ft. Worth, Texas; Gary, Indiana; Minneapolis, Minnesota; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and Stockton, California. It will also develop and implement interventions for victims of domestic violence and other crimes, youth, and the LGBTQI community; conduct research and evaluations; and establish a national clearinghouse where information, research, and technical assistance are readily accessible for law enforcement, criminal justice practitioners and community leaders. The pilot sites were chosen for the demonstrated willingness and capacity of their stakeholders to engage in the research, intervention, and evaluation process, as well as for factors such as jurisdictions size, ethnic and religious composition, and population density, and not because they represent particularly problematic communities.

Additional training and technical assistance will be available to police departments and communities that are not pilot sites through the [Office of Justice Program's Diagnostic Center](#). The clearinghouse can be found at [trustandjustice.org](http://trustandjustice.org). The initiative is guided by a board of advisors which will include national leaders from law enforcement, academia and faith-based groups, as well as community stakeholders and civil rights advocates.

## Implicit bias

*Implicit bias* describes the automatic association people make between groups of people and stereotypes about those groups. Under certain conditions, those automatic associations can influence behavior—making people respond in biased ways *even when they are not explicitly prejudiced*. More than thirty years of research in neurology and social and cognitive psychology has shown that people hold implicit biases even in the absence of heartfelt bigotry, simply by paying attention to the social world around them. Implicit racial bias has given rise to a phenomenon known as “racism without

racists,” which can cause institutions or individuals to act on racial prejudices, even in spite of good intentions and nondiscriminatory policies or standards.

In the context of criminal justice and community safety, implicit bias has been shown to have significant influence in the outcomes of interactions between police and citizens. While conscious, “traditional” racism has declined significantly in recent decades, research suggests that “implicit attitudes may be better at predicting and/or influencing behavior than self-reported explicit attitudes.”<sup>1</sup>

Discussions of implicit bias in policing tend to focus on implicit racial biases; however, implicit bias can be expressed in relation to non-racial factors, including gender, age, religion, or sexual orientation. As with all types of bias, implicit bias can distort one’s perception and subsequent treatment either in favor of or against a given person or group. In policing, this has resulted in widespread practices that focus undeserved suspicion on some groups and presume other groups innocent.

Reducing the influence of implicit bias is vitally important to strengthening relationships between police and minority communities. For example, studies suggest that implicit bias contributes to “shooter bias,”—the tendency for police to shoot unarmed black suspects more often than white ones—as well as the frequency of police stops for members of minority groups.<sup>2</sup> Other expressions of implicit bias, such as public defenders’ prioritization of cases involving white defendants,<sup>3</sup> can have major impact on communities. This latter point is particularly significant in light of recent findings about the importance of *procedural justice* in fostering cooperation between citizens and the criminal justice system and cultivating law-abiding communities.

Despite these challenges, the work of Phillip Atiba Goff, President of the Center for Policing Equity, has shown that it is possible to address and reduce implicit bias through training and policy interventions with law enforcement agencies. Research suggests that biased associations can be gradually unlearned and replaced with nonbiased ones.<sup>4</sup>

#### Further reading

Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2000). Reducing contemporary prejudice: Combating explicit and implicit bias at the individual and intergroup level. In Oskamp, Stuart (Ed). *Reducing prejudice and discrimination.* "The Claremont Symposium on Applied Social Psychology", (pp. 137-163). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers

Eberhardt, J. L., Goff, P. A., Purdie, & Davies, P. G. (2004). Seeing Black: Race crime, and visual processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(6), 876-893.

Eberhardt, J. L., Davies, P. G., Purdie-Vaughns, V.J., & Johnson, S. L. (2006). Looking deathworthy: Perceived stereotypicality of black defendants predicts capital-sentencing outcomes. *Psychological Science*, 17(5), 383-386.

Goff, P. A., Eberhardt, J. L., Williams, M., & Jackson, M. C. (2008). Not yet human: Implicit knowledge, historical dehumanization, and contemporary consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 292-306.

Perhaps even more encouragingly, one can reduce the influence of implicit bias simply by changing the context in which an interaction takes place.<sup>5</sup> Consequently, through policy and training, it is possible to mend the harm that racial stereotypes do to our minds and our public safety.

## Procedural justice

*Procedural justice* focuses on the way police and other legal authorities interact with the public, and how the characteristics of those interactions shape the public's views of the police, their willingness to obey the law, and actual crime rates. Mounting evidence shows that community perceptions of procedural justice can have a significant impact on public safety.

Procedural justice is based on four central principles: "treating people with dignity and respect, giving citizens 'voice' during encounters, being neutral in decision making, and conveying trustworthy motives."<sup>6</sup> Research demonstrates that these principles contribute to relationships between authorities and the community in which 1) the community has trust and confidence in the police as honest, unbiased, benevolent, and lawful; 2) the community feels obligated to follow the law and the dictates of legal authorities, and 3) the community feels that it shares a common set of interests and values with the police.<sup>7</sup>

Procedurally just policing is essential to the development of good will between police and communities and is closely linked to improving community perceptions of *police legitimacy*, the belief that authorities have the right to dictate proper behavior. Research shows that when communities view police authority as legitimate, they are more likely to cooperate with police and obey the law.<sup>8</sup> Establishing and maintaining police legitimacy promotes the acceptance of police decisions, correlates with high levels of law abidingness, and makes it more likely that police and communities will collaborate to combat crime.

A key component of the research is that the public is especially concerned that the conduct of authorities be fair, and this factor matters more to them than whether outcomes of particular interactions favor them.<sup>9</sup> This means that procedurally just policing is not consonant with traditional enforcement-focused policing, which typically assumes compliance is a function primarily of emphasizing to the public the consequences—usually formal punishment—of failing to follow the law. Policing based on formal deterrence encourages the public's association of policing primarily with enforcement and punitive outcomes. Procedurally just policing, on the other hand, emphasizes values that police and communities share—shared values based upon a common conception of what social order is and how it should be maintained—and encourages the collaborative, voluntary maintenance of a law-abiding community. Research indicates that this latter approach is far more effective at producing law-abiding citizens than the former. This makes intuitive sense— people welcome being treated as equals with a stake in keeping their communities safe, as opposed to being treated as subjects of a capricious justice system enforced by police who punish them for ambiguous, if not arbitrary, reasons.

### Further reading

Dai, M., Frank, J. & Sun, I. (2011). Procedural justice during police-citizen encounters: The effects of process-based policing on citizen compliance and demeanor. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39, 159-168.

Gau, J. M. & Brunson, R. K. (2010). Procedural justice and order maintenance policing: A study of inner-city young men's perceptions of police legitimacy. *Justice Quarterly*, 27, 255-279.

Mazerolle, L., Bennett, S., Davis, J., Sargeant, E., & Manning, M. (2013). Legitimacy in policing: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 9, 1.

Meares, T. L. (2009). The legitimacy of police among young African-American men. *Marquette Law Review*, 92, 651-666.

Papachristos, A. V., Meares, T. L. & Fagan, J. (2012). Why do criminals obey the law? The influence of legitimacy and social networks on active gun offenders. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 102, 397-440.

Tyler, T. R. & Huo, Y. J. (2002). Trust in the law: encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts. *Russell Sage Foundation*. New York.

Tyler, T. R., Fagan, J. & Geller, A. (2014). Street stops and police legitimacy: Teachable moments in young urban men's legal socialization. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, 11, 751-785.

Taking measures to enhance procedural justice within law enforcement agencies is becoming increasingly possible. Professor Tracey Meares and Professor Tom Tyler of Yale Law School have worked with the Chicago Police Department and others to create a one-day training for line officers and command staff that teaches them how to apply powerful procedural justice principles to their routine contacts with the public. The officers reportedly like it and evaluate it positively, as it improves not only public safety but their own. Indeed, there are many good reasons to cultivate a respectful relationship between police and communities, but the most important is that communities in which police are considered legitimate are safer and more law-abiding.

## Reconciliation

*Reconciliation* is a method of facilitating frank engagements between minority communities, police and other authorities that allow them to address historical tensions, grievances, and misconceptions, and reset relationships. Respect, collaboration, and effective working relationships between police and the communities they serve are central to both community safety and effective policing. However, in many communities where serious crime is concentrated, mutual mistrust and misunderstanding prevent police and communities from working together.

The reconciliation process recognizes the very real American history of abusive law enforcement practices toward minority communities, beginning with slavery. It also respects—without endorsing—the sometimes damaging narratives each side has about the other. Many people in minority communities affected by high levels of violent crime and disorder genuinely believe that police are using drug laws and other law enforcement as a means to oppress them. Their alienation is fueled by the history of slavery, Jim Crow, and other legal oppression of minorities; high levels of intrusive police tactics like arrest and stop-and-frisk; and disrespectful behavior by police. When these communities are furious with the police, they are not inclined to work with the criminal justice system or speak out publicly against violence and crime. Serious offenders may wrongly believe that their own communities tolerate or even support their behavior.

Conversely, some in law enforcement genuinely believe that troubled minority communities are broadly tolerant of—and even complicit in—crime and violence. In fact, both research and national field experience clearly show that high-crime minority communities are the least tolerant of crime and disorder,<sup>10</sup> and that in the most apparently dangerous communities the overwhelming majority of people do not behave violently.<sup>11</sup> However, where police believe otherwise, they are more inclined to treat entire communities as criminal and employ aggressive and intrusive tactics.

The process of reconciliation addresses these deeply troubled relationships through engagement between law enforcement and community members about the long American history of legal abuse of minorities; the fact that traditional law enforcement has sometimes been both ineffective and caused unintentional damage to individuals, families, and communities; how police have often treated minority individuals and communities with disrespect; and the sincere desire of law enforcement to act differently and do better. There is, in turn, an engagement about the central importance, if there is to be community safety, of clear and powerful community norms against violence and other serious crime, and an effective working relationship with law enforcement.

### Further reading

Kennedy, D. M. (2010). Practice Brief: Norms, Narratives, and Community Engagement for Crime Prevention.

Mentel, Z. (2012). *Racial Reconciliation, Truth Telling and Police Legitimacy*. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

The aim of reconciliation is that communities and law enforcement come to see that 1) they misunderstand each other in important ways, 2) both have been contributing to harms neither desires, 3) in crucial areas, both want fundamentally the same things, and 4) there is an immediate opportunity for partnership that can concretely benefit both the community and the authorities that serve it. The process reveals real common ground, shows police that communities reject violence and want to work with them in new ways, and facilitates communities in expressing strong and meaningful norms against violence and for good behavior.

This process has been adopted as part of other effective violence reduction efforts nationwide. Some high-level police executives have been willing to make powerful public statements acknowledging history and seeking to foster reconciliation efforts. Chicago Police Superintendent Garry McCarthy has embraced these ideas and is setting a national standard for speaking about them publicly. Said McCarthy in a 2013 interview with WBEZ Chicago:

I understand the historical divide between police and communities of color – it’s rooted in the history of this country. The most visible arm of government is a police force, and the institutionalized governmental programs that promoted racist policies that were enforced by police departments in this country are part of the African American history in this country. And we have to recognize it because recognition is the first step towards finding a cure towards what is ailing us. Over the years we’ve actually done a lot of things wrong and I’m willing to admit that.<sup>12</sup>

The National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice will seek to build on existing reconciliation practices, employ them on a wider geographic scale in cities, and adapt them to different racial and ethnic communities, youth, victims of crime, and the LGBTQTI community.

## Leadership

**Tracie L. Keesee**, PhD, is the project director of the National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice. The initiative is designed to improve relationships and increase trust between minority communities and the criminal justice system, as well advance the public and scholarly understandings of the issues contributing to those relationships. Dr. Keesee is a 25 year police veteran. She retired as a captain of the Denver Police Department, where her final assignment was as deputy director of Colorado Information Analysis Center (CIAC), the State of Colorado’s fusion center. Dr. Keesee is also the co-founder and director of research partnerships for the Center for Policing Equity, which promotes police transparency and accountability by facilitating innovative research collaborations between law enforcement agencies and empirical social scientists, and seeks to improve issues of equity—particularly racial and gender equity—in policing both within law enforcement agencies and between agencies and the communities

### Contact

Telephone: 212-393-6004

Email: [tracie@trustandjustice.org](mailto:tracie@trustandjustice.org)

Web: [trustandjustice.org](http://trustandjustice.org)

they serve. Dr. Keesee holds a BA in Political Science from Metropolitan State College, academic certifications in Public Policy and Public Administration from the University of Colorado at Denver, an MA in Criminal Justice from the University of Colorado at Denver, and a PhD from the University of Denver in Intercultural Communications. She is a graduate of the 203rd class of the FBI National Academy. Dr. Keesee has published several articles across a variety of collected anthologies and peer-reviewed scientific journals.

The **National Network for Safe Communities**, a project of John Jay College of Criminal Justice, was launched in 2009 under the direction of David M. Kennedy to support jurisdictions implementing strategic interventions to reduce violence, minimize arrests and incarceration, enhance police legitimacy, and strengthen relationships between law enforcement and distressed communities.

The National Network's intervention model identifies a particular serious crime problem; assembles a partnership of law enforcement, community leaders, and social service providers; conducts research to identify the small number of people driving the majority of serious offending; responds to continued offending with a variety of sanctions; focuses services and community resources on offenders; and communicates with offenders directly and repeatedly to give them a moral message from the community against offending, prior notice of the legal consequences for further offending, and an offer of help. This model has a long history of reducing street group-involved violence and eliminating overt drug markets in communities nationwide, and some sites have begun adapting it to problems such as domestic violence, prison violence, robbery, and community supervision.

National Network Director David Kennedy's history in this area includes the Boston Gun Project, which created the now widely-applied Group Violence Intervention, often called "Operation Ceasefire"<sup>13</sup>; the High Point Drug Market Intervention<sup>14</sup>; the Justice Department's Strategic Approaches to Community Safety Initiative, which was applied nationally as Project Safe Neighborhoods<sup>15</sup>; the Treasury Department's Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative<sup>16</sup>; the Bureau of Justice Assistance's Drug Market Intervention<sup>17</sup>; and the theoretical development of focused deterrence, which has informed a range of proved interventions focused on homicide, gun violence, drug markets, and community corrections.<sup>18</sup> "Custom notifications," a method of individualized outreach to those at high risk for violent victimization or offending, which the National Network framed in theory and then developed in partnership with pilot jurisdictions nationally, have received major national press for their successful deployment to stem violence in Chicago.<sup>19</sup> The Group Violence Intervention (GVI) was first developed in Boston, MA, and reduced youth homicide by 63 percent. In subsequent implementations, it was found to reduce gun homicide in Stockton, CA, by 42 percent; reduce gun assaults in Lowell, MA, by 44 percent; reduce homicide in Indianapolis by 34 percent; and reduce gang member-involved homicide in Cincinnati by 41 percent.<sup>20</sup> More recently, it has been successfully implemented in Chicago, IL, New Orleans, LA, Oakland, CA, and Baltimore, MD, and many other cities. The Drug Market Intervention (DMI), first developed in High Point, NC, has eliminated overt drug markets in cities such as Providence, RI, Hempstead, NY, and Nashville, TN.<sup>21</sup>

The National Network initially developed its reconciliation approach as part of DMI. The primary goal of DMI is to eliminate overt drug markets, which it has largely accomplished in the troubled neighborhoods where it has been implemented nationally. It has also been effective in addressing crime and disorder in these areas.<sup>22</sup> The West End of High Point, North Carolina, which was the first neighborhood to test DMI and the reconciliation process in 2004, has seen a sustained reduction in violent crime with results ranging between 12 to 18 percent<sup>23</sup> and 44 to 56 percent<sup>24</sup> in targeted areas relative to nontargeted areas and, centrally, an improved quality of life as the overt drug markets in High Point disappeared. In Hempstead, New York, after DMI implementation and reconciliation processes in 2008, drug arrests fell 87 percent and continued to decline into single digits in 2009.<sup>25</sup> In Rockford, Illinois, after police-community reconciliation and DMI, evaluation found a 22 percent reduction in nonviolent crime in the target area and dramatic improvements reported in quality of life.<sup>26</sup>

**David M. Kennedy** is the Director of the National Network for Safe Communities. For over 20 years, Mr. Kennedy has brought a passion for honesty, reconciliation, and substantive change to America's most distressed communities. He has pioneered strategies for working in real-time partnership with stakeholders at all levels, taking on particular important problems, developing and directing large-scale interventions, and promulgating them nationally. Mr. Kennedy's intervention work in this area has been proven effective in a variety of settings by a Campbell Collaboration evaluation, and is currently being implemented in Chicago, New Orleans, Oakland, Baltimore, and many other cities nationwide. Central to his extensive field work has been a process of reconciliation that Mr. Kennedy designed by engaging communities historically divided from law enforcement, dispelling toxic misunderstandings between them, fostering a process of truth-telling that allows them to find common ground and address serious violence in partnership, and allowing law enforcement to step back and communities to reset their own public safety standards. Mr. Kennedy's work has won two Ford Foundation Innovations in Government awards, among other distinctions. He helped develop the High Point Drug Market Intervention strategy; the Justice Department's Strategic Approaches to Community Safety Initiative; the Treasury Department's Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative; the Bureau of Justice Assistance's Drug Market Intervention Program; and the High Point Domestic Violence Intervention Program.

**Amy Crawford, JD**, is the Deputy Director of the National Network for Safe Communities. Ms. Crawford has extensive experience in developing small teams into sustainable and highly effective organizations through personnel development and cooperative management. In her role as deputy director, she oversees and develops relationships with foundations, governmental agencies, non-profit organizations, and community leaders. She is also responsible for managing and implementing the strategic agenda of the National Network. She is a frequent spokesperson and has presented at numerous conferences and panel discussions on the strategies the National Network advances to reduce violence and community disorder. Prior to joining the National Network, Ms. Crawford served as the deputy director at the Center for an Urban Future, a public policy organization that focuses on economic and workforce development. Before that, she served as the director of development and pro bono at the Bronx Defenders, an innovative legal services organization located in the South Bronx in New York City. During her time at the Bronx Defenders, she represented hundreds of clients and oversaw direct service to underserved, low-income populations, providing legal counsel and advising.

**Jeremy Travis**, JD, brings to this effort his national reputation as a principled leader, as well as extensive leadership experience in government and education. He has forged cooperative problem solving partnerships in a broad range of arenas, serving as both a national executive and as a practitioner on the cutting edge of citizen oversight of the corrections system and community-based reentry initiatives. Travis is the fourth President of John Jay College of Criminal Justice. He has also served as Senior Fellow at Urban Institute's Justice Policy Center, where he launched a national research portfolio on prisoner reentry; Director of the National Institute of Justice, where he promoted research on police-community relations and crime reduction; Deputy Commissioner for Legal Matters for the New York City Police Department, where he was responsible for developing policy recommendations and the research agenda for the NYPD's civilian oversight functions; and Chair of the Committee on Law and Justice of the National Research Council to the U.S. House Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Justice. Travis co-founded the National Network for Safe Communities with David Kennedy to advance proven strategies to combat violent crime, reduce incarceration and rebuild relations between law enforcement and communities.

The **Center for Policing Equity (CPE)** at the University of California, Los Angeles, is a research consortium that promotes police transparency and accountability by facilitating innovative research collaborations between law enforcement agencies and empirical social scientists. Through these facilitated collaborations, the Center seeks to improve issues of equity—particularly racial and gender equity—in policing both within law enforcement agencies and between agencies and the communities they serve. The Center aims to effect cultural transformations within both law enforcement and the academy by creating opportunities that simultaneously preserve the dignity of law enforcement and advance the application of social science to the real world. CPE is designed to further the interests of transparency and accountability in equity matters.

At the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD), CPE was tasked with examining individual officer and aggregate department records with the goal of understanding what (if anything) further could be done to promote racial equity in the treatment of residents, in addition to LVMPD's existing efforts. This project required that CPE researchers examine department data on use of force (including officer involved shootings) and complaints against officers as well as responses by a subset of officers to psychological measurements. The result is an unprecedented investigation into the role that a department's culture and the psychological makeup of its officers play in policing outcomes. CPE found that while LVMPD's overall use of force levels are relatively low for a department and city of its size, there is still evidence that racial and gender biases play a role in the culture of the department and in the department's engagement with the community. CPE then provided LVMPD with a set of recommendations to address these issues that included integrating diversity trainings into operational responsibilities training, monitoring officer discretion where possible, and rewarding excellence in diversity and inclusion.

An example of a policy recommendation aimed at reducing disparate outcomes and work to rebuild community trust is CPE's work with San Jose Police Department (SJPD). CPE recommended SJPD increase

the use of randomized checkpoints for public drunkenness and driving while intoxicated (as San Diego and several other “peer” cities already do). This policy recommendation served as a way to increase enforcement of laws regarding alcohol consumption in locations that are most vulnerable to dangerous alcohol-related accidents. Additionally, it functioned as a check on the effectiveness of police decision-making in non-randomized areas by removing officer-level bias. That is, if the randomized checks for alcohol are more effective (in terms of percent yield from stops) than officers using their judgment on the issue, this suggests the need to increase officer training in identifying public intoxication and/or drunk driving.

**Phillip A. Goff**, PhD, is best known for his work exploring “racism without racists,” the notion that contextual factors—even absent racial hostility—can facilitate racially unjust outcomes. His research is the first to link psychological factors to an officer’s use of force history, creating the first empirical model for predicting police violence and implicit racial bias in police brutality. Dr. Goff is an Assistant Professor at the University of California, Los Angeles. He has worked as an equity researcher and consultant for police departments around the country, and he has recently established the Center for Policing Equity (CPE) at UCLA. This national action research network counts more than 75 researchers and numerous major cities as collaborators, each of which provide unfettered access to data for the purposes of creating new research, sparking policy changes and promoting community accountability.

The **Justice Collaboratory** brings together scholars and researchers of diverse theoretical and methodological orientations at Yale University and elsewhere to work on issues related to institutional reform and policy innovation and advancement. It infuses theory, empirical research, and targeted clinical trials in order to achieve its goal of making the components of criminal justice operation simultaneously more effective, just, and democratic.

Collaboratory scholars seek to develop theory and empirical research relevant to procedural justice, police legitimacy, social network analysis, restorative justice, democratic participation, and the philosophical determinants of punishment. The Collaboratory works to expand the science underlying these strategies so that new and more effective approaches might be developed. Collaboratory members also field test strategies and approaches relevant to the theoretical innovations that it develops.

The leadership of the Collaboratory contributes deep expertise to the areas of procedural justice and police legitimacy. Professors Tyler and Meares have developed a procedural justice training and assisted in its implementation in police departments across the country, including in cities such as Chicago, Oakland, and Salinas. An evaluation of the training authored by criminologists Wesley Skogan, Maarten Van Craen, and Cari Hennessy found that “In the short term, training increased officer support for all of the procedural justice dimensions included in the experiment. . . All of the effects of training were strong. . . . Longer-term, officers who had attended the procedural justice workshop continued to be more supportive of three of the four procedural justice principles introduced in training”.

**Tom R. Tyler**, PhD, brings to the effort his reputation for creating “paradigm shifting scholarship in the study of law and society,” for which he won the Law and Society Association Harry Kalven prize in 2000. He is the Macklin Fleming Professor of Law and Professor of Psychology at Yale Law School. Prior to coming to Yale, he also taught at New York University, the University of California, Berkeley, and Northwestern University. Dr. Tyler has done extensive research and published numerous articles, books, and chapters on how individuals’ judgments about the justice or injustice of certain procedures shape their subsequent legitimacy, compliance, and cooperation, particularly in the field of interactions with law enforcement. Dr. Tyler has worked extensively with Tracey Meares to research and publish findings on police legitimacy and procedural justice and advise agencies on the practical use of these concepts in the field.

**Tracey L. Meares**, JD, is one of the leading national theorists on police legitimacy and, in particular, how racial narratives influence police relationships with minority communities and how deliberate attention to these issues can influence community compliance with the law. She is the Walton Hale Hamilton Professor at Yale Law School, before which she was Max Pam Professor of Law and Director of the Center for Studies in Criminal Justice at the University of Chicago Law School. Her research focuses on communities, police legitimacy, and legal policy.

Founded in 1968 to understand the problems facing America’s cities and assess the programs of the War on Poverty, the **Urban Institute** brings decades of objective analysis and expertise to policy debates—in city halls and state houses, Congress and the White House, and emerging democracies around the world. Today, our research portfolio ranges from the social safety net to health and tax policies; the well-being of families and neighborhoods; and trends in work, earnings, and wealth building. Our scholars have a distinguished track record of turning evidence into solutions. The leadership and staff from the Urban Institute offer extensive evaluation expertise across a wide array of topics germane to the National Initiative.

Urban’s Justice Policy Center (JPC) works to develop knowledge to inform justice practice in the service of creating a safer and more just society. Urban has extensive experience evaluating comprehensive community initiatives and collecting data on community views and perceptions related to justice issues as demonstrated in projects such as the longitudinal Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry study, and the evaluations of the Chicago Violence Reduction Strategy and the Safer Return Demonstration Project.

**Nancy La Vigne**, PhD, has over twenty years of experience as a researcher and evaluator of criminal justice programs, policies, and technologies and brings a wealth of methodological, research, and management expertise to the team. She is the lead author on an upcoming COPS Office report on “stop and frisk,” which explains to a law enforcement audience the potentially negative impact of the practice on police-community relations and describes methods to carry out citizen contacts lawfully, respectfully, and in accordance with the tenets of community policing and procedural justice. Under her leadership, the Justice Policy Center has conducted research projects on justice reinvestment, police accountability, and civilian oversight of the criminal justice system.

**Jocelyn Fontaine**, PhD, leads research projects that evaluate the impact of community-based initiatives at the individual, family, and community level through both qualitative and quantitative data analysis. She has experience developing survey instruments, facilitating focus groups, conducting fieldwork in a variety of settings, facilitating stakeholder interviews, and translating best practices into program implementation.

The **Office of Justice Programs (OJP)** of the U.S. Department of Justice provides innovative leadership to federal, state, local, and tribal justice systems, by disseminating state-of-the art knowledge and practices across America, and providing grants for the implementation of these crime fighting strategies. Because most of the responsibility for crime control and prevention falls to law enforcement officers in states, cities, and neighborhoods, the federal government can be effective in these areas only to the extent that it can enter into partnerships with these officers. Therefore, OJP does not directly carry out law enforcement and justice activities. Instead, OJP works in partnership with the justice community to identify the most pressing crime-related challenges confronting the justice system and to provide information, training, coordination, and innovative strategies and approaches for addressing these challenges.

---

## Sources

- <sup>1</sup> Bargh & Chartrand, 1999; Beattie, Cohen, & McGuire, 2013; Ziegert & Hanges, 2005 in State of the Science 2014.
- <sup>2</sup> Correll, Park, Judd & Wittenbrink, 2002; Correll, et al., 2007; Sadler, Correll, Park & Judd, 2012.
- <sup>3</sup> Richardson, L. S., & Goff, P. A. (2013). Implicit Racial Bias in Public Defender Triage. *Yale Law Journal*, 122.
- <sup>4</sup> Blair, 2002; Blair, Ma, & Lenton, 2001, Dasgupta, 2013.
- <sup>5</sup> Dovidio, J. F. (2001). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: The third wave. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 829-849.
- <sup>6</sup> Mazerolle, et al. (2013). Legitimacy in policing: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 9, 1.
- <sup>7</sup> Tyler, T. R., & Jackson, J. (2014). Psychology of procedural justice and cooperation.
- <sup>8</sup> Tyler, T. R. (2006). Why people obey the law. *Princeton University Press*.
- <sup>9</sup> Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y.J. (2002). Trust in the Law: Encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts. *Russell Sage Foundation*, New York.
- <sup>10</sup> Sampson, R. J., & Bartusch, D. J. (1998). Legal Cynicism and (Subcultural?) Tolerance of Deviance: The Neighborhood Context of Racial Differences. *Law and Society Review*, 32, 777-804.
- <sup>11</sup> Papachristos, A. V. (2009). Murder by Structure: Dominance Relations and the Social Structure of Gang Homicide. *American Journal of Sociology*, 115(1), 74-128; Papachristos, A. V., Meares, T. L., & Fagan, J. (2007). Attention Felons: Evaluation Project Safe Neighborhoods in Chicago. *Journal of Empirical Studies*, 4(2), 223-272.
- <sup>12</sup> Wildeboer, R. (2011, Aug 15). Interview: Garry McCarthy on the future of the Chicago Police Department. *WBEZ Chicago*. <http://www.wbez.org/story/interview-garry-mccarthy-future-chicago-police-department-90445>.
- <sup>13</sup> Braga, A A., Kennedy, D.M., Piehl, A.M., & Waring, E.J. (2001). *Reducing Gun Violence: The Boston Gun Project's Operation Ceasefire*. National Institute of Justice Research Report.

- 
- <sup>14</sup> Corsaro, N., Hunt, E. D., Hipple, N. K., & McGarrell, E. F. (2012). The Impact of Drug Market Pulling Levers Policing on Neighborhood Violence: An Evaluation of the High Point Drug Market Intervention. *Criminology and Public Policy* 11(2): 167–199.
- <sup>15</sup> Roehl, J., Rosenbaum, D. P., Costell, S. K., Coldern, J. R., Schuck, A. M., Kunard, L., & Forde, D. R. (2006). *Strategic approaches to community safety initiative (SACSI) in 10 U.S. cities: The building blocks for Project Safe Neighborhoods*. Web. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/212866.pdf>
- <sup>16</sup> Department of the Treasury & Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. (1999). *ATF: The youth crime gun interdiction initiative*. Collingdale, Pennsylvania: Diane Publishing Co.
- <sup>17</sup> Hipple, N. K., McGarrell, E. F., Bynum, T. S., Perez, H. A., Corsaro, N., & Garmo, M. (2009). *Bureau of Justice Assistance Drug Market Intervention: Implementation Guide and Lessons Learned*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Assistance.
- <sup>18</sup> Braga, A. A., & Weisburd, D. L. (2012). The Effects of ‘Pulling Levers’ Focused Deterrence Strategies on Crime. Oslo: The Campbell Collaboration.
- <sup>19</sup> Main, F. (2014, February 25). Top cop ‘optimistic’ that visiting gang leaders’ homes cuts violence. *Chicago Sun Times*. <http://www.suntimes.com/25722451-761/top-cop-optimistic-that-visiting-gang-leaders-homes-cuts-violence.html>
- <sup>20</sup> Braga & Weisburd, 2012.
- <sup>21</sup> Braga & Weisburd, 2012.
- <sup>22</sup> Kennedy, D. M. (2008). Drugs, Race and Common Ground: Reflections on the High Point Intervention. *National Institute of Justice Journal*, 262; Braga, A. A., & Weisburd, D. L. (2012). The Effects of ‘Pulling Levers’ Focused Deterrence Strategies on Crime. Oslo: The Campbell Collaboration.
- <sup>23</sup> Corsaro, Hunt, Hipple, & McGarrell, 2012.
- <sup>24</sup> Graves, Kelly, Korrine Chiu, Kristen L. Di Luca, Terri L. Shelton, James M. Frabutt, John Weil, et al. 2010. Officially Off the Market: Evaluation of a Pulling Levers Approach to Eliminating Open-Air Drug Markets in High Point, North Carolina. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology (ASC) Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California, November 19, 2010. [http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p\\_mla\\_apa\\_research\\_citation/4/3/1/0/6/p431067\\_index.html](http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/4/3/1/0/6/p431067_index.html)
- <sup>25</sup> Wing, J. Internal police data from Hempstead (New York) Police Department, 2009.
- <sup>26</sup> Corsaro, Nicholas, Rod K. Brunson, & Edmund F. McGarrell. 2009. Problem-Oriented Policing and Open-Air Drug Markets: Examining the Rockford Pulling Levers Deterrence Strategy. *Crime & Delinquency*.