Report on the National Summit on Empowering Communities to Prevent Violent Extremism

COPS
Community Oriented Policing Services
U.S. Department of Justice

START
NATIONAL CONSORTIUM FOR THE
STUDY OF TERRORISM AND RESPONSES TO TERRORISM

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTERS
FLETC
ARTESIA, NM • CHARLESTON, SC • CHELTENHAM, MD • GLYNCO, GA
GABORONE, BOTSWANA • BANGKOK, THAILAND

Report on the National Summit on Empowering Communities to Prevent Violent Extremism

This project was supported by interagency agreement number HSFLGL-15-P-00053 awarded by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions contained herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice. References to specific agencies, companies, products, or services should not be considered an endorsement by the author(s) or the U.S. Department of Justice. Rather, the references are illustrations to supplement discussion of the issues.

The Internet references cited in this publication were valid as of the date of publication. Given that URLs and websites are in constant flux, neither the author(s) nor the COPS Office can vouch for their current validity.

Recommended citation:
Weine, Stevan, and William Braniff. 2015. *Report on the National Summit on Empowering Communities to Prevent Violent Extremism.* Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Published 2015

Photos, front cover, from Shutterstock: a katz, Dan Holm and mnoa357.

CONTENTS

Letter from the Summit Organizers . . . v
Acknowledgements . . . vi
Executive Summary . . . 1
Summary of summit recommendations . . . 1
Background on Countering Violent Extremism . . . 3
Background on the National Summit . . . 5
Goal . . . 5
Objectives . . . 5
Scope . . . 5
Anticipated outcomes . . . 5
Summit participants . . . 5
Format . . . 6
Reporting on the Summit . . . 7
Summit recommendations . . . 8
The Summit's Anticipated Outcomes and Next Steps . . . 19
Anticipated outcome 1 . . . 19
Anticipated outcome 2 . . . 19
Next steps . . . 19
Appendix. Attendees and Support Personnel . . . 21
State and local participants . . . 21
International participants . . . 22
Federal participants . . . 22
Academic participants . . . 22
Glossary . . . 23
Endnotes . . . 25
About FLETC . . . 27
About START . . . 27
About the COPS Office . . . 28

LETTER FROM THE SUMMIT ORGANIZERS

Dear colleagues,

We are facing a threat that is often undetectable by traditional means—lone wolves and hate groups whose ideologies may lead to violence though they display no signs of criminal behavior. They can be of any religion or political leaning and can be foreign or home-grown. They seldom stand out in a crowd. More often than not, they are the kid or neighbor who kept to himself and flew beneath our radar.

Traditional law enforcement methods often do not work in preventing the violent acts of these individuals, who blend into the local population yet may undergo radicalization at home via their computers. We have to adopt new tactics or adapt old ones. Virtually everyone who has knowledge of or experience with violent extremism agrees that the first step is to embrace community-based strategies.

The National Summit on Empowering Communities to Prevent Violent Extremism was convened in August 2014 to advance interdisciplinary efforts to implement effective community-based intervention strategies. Law enforcement collaboration with the people who are best able to detect violent extremism in its early stages—the families, friends, and neighbors of individuals who might cross the line from extremist beliefs to acts of violence—is critical to prevention efforts. The community will come forward to help if they trust law enforcement. They will also do their best to prevent violence if we educate and empower them to do so through outreach programs and other forms of support.

But law enforcement must also collaborate with other groups—social services and educational, mental health, faith-based, and other federal and local government agencies. As the experiences recounted at the national summit made clear, countering violent extremism isn't "business as usual." It requires creative thinking, new approaches, and collaborative, multilevel, multidisciplinary strategies.

As leaders of the three organizations that sponsored the summit—the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, and the University of Maryland's National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism—we urge you to read this report, consider how your organization can adapt the community-based practices it describes, and discuss the challenges it highlights.

We also encourage you to reach out to community members and other groups to engage them in dialogue about the threats we all face. We hope you will also share your experiences and best practices with other organizations, police departments, and stakeholder groups.

As the summit made clear, we must all work together to counter this insidious threat—with our counterparts in other professions as well as our communities. And we must do it now. The time to prepare isn't after an incident—it's before.

Sincerely,

Connie L. Patrick
Director, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center

Ronald L. Davis
Director, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

William Braniff
Director, University of Maryland's National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks to the following for their dedication and commitment to the project:

The U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, especially Director Ronald L. Davis and Principal Deputy Director Sandra R. Webb.

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, especially Director Connie L. Patrick and Deputy Director D. Kenneth Keene.

The principal authors of this report are Stevan Weine, MD, Professor of Psychiatry, Department of Psychiatry, University of Illinois at Chicago and Bill Braniff, MA, START Consortium, University of Maryland.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The national security policy of the United States on countering violent extremism (CVE) recognizes that "our best defenses against this threat are well informed and equipped families, local communities, and institutions."[1] To further strengthen these defenses, the U.S. Department of Justice's (DOJ) Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office) and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers (FLETC) partnered with the University of Maryland's (UMD) National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Reponses to Terrorism (START) to coordinate the National Summit on Empowering Communities to Prevent Violent Extremism.

The three partners collaborated to plan and coordinate the national summit, which took place at FLETC's headquarters in Glynco, Georgia, August 13–14, 2014. The summit's overall goal was to advance multidisciplinary efforts to implement effective community-based CVE intervention models and to create a community of interest that will continually improve upon those efforts. The summit convened more than 50 participants from multiple disciplines engaged in CVE efforts from federal, state and local, international, and nongovernmental entities. Over the course of the two-day summit, these participants described the CVE work they are conducting in their localities with a focus on lessons learned, best practices, and challenges. Summit participants discussed and debated these matters.

Addressing the problem of violent extremism in the precriminal space through engagement, prevention, and intervention programs is a departure from usual practices for traditional law enforcement and a responsibility that the public has recently articulated for communities and other government organizations. In order for government, law enforcement, and communities to succeed in countering violent extremism, each must undergo paradigm shifts to new frameworks that emphasize using collaborative and multidisciplinary strategies to build community-based multilevel prevention and intervention programs. The delegations that presented at the summit have already begun to experience these paradigm shifts.

The first paradigm shift is the recognition by law enforcement organizations that CVE approaches offer pragmatic and proactive opportunities for dealing with the issue of violent extremism as they build trust and open lines of communication with the communities that police departments protect and serve, enlisting the help of communities to identify and assist at risk individuals and discredit violent ideologies in ways that the law enforcement community is not well-positioned to do on its own.

The second paradigm shift is the recognition that while the law enforcement community has an important role to play, that role should ultimately be in support of communities and other governmental organizations that are better positioned to operate in the precriminal space.

A third paradigm shift is the recognition that CVE requires a broad array of capabilities and participants dedicated to building resilience at many levels of society simultaneously. By building more partnerships involving individuals, families, communities, institutions, and various government agencies, communities ultimately become more resilient to all hazards, including but not limited to violent extremism.

Summary of summit recommendations

After the summit, the COPS Office, FLETC, and START developed a framework to organize the summit participants' recommendations for future actions.

The recommendations included in this report reflect the major themes that emerged, focusing on those that the majority of participants appeared to support. To be clear, these recommendations are not prescriptive; they are experience-based recommendations that the participants felt others should follow if they are seeking to obtain the best CVE-related outcomes.

1. *National Security Strategy: May 2010* (Washington, DC: The White House, 2010), 19, https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/national_security_strategy.pdf.

The summit partners organized recommendations into a framework that addresses what law enforcement, other government agencies, and communities can do to improve community engagement, trust building, prevention, and intervention programming regarding those individuals at risk for engaging in violent extremism. The recommendations ultimately seek to help strengthen family, community, and institutional defenses that will mitigate the risks for violent extremism.

Law enforcement-focused

- Law enforcement organizations should prioritize building and strengthening mutual trust between themselves and the communities they serve.
- To engage with communities, law enforcement organizations should be engaged with and responsive to community organizations and advocates consistently and over time.
- Communication with a wide range of community partners on a broad range of topics should be part of the routine operations of law enforcement.
- Law enforcement organizations should focus prevention and intervention activities on behaviors and not on racial, religious, or ethnic identity.
- Law enforcement organizations should collaboratively develop and evaluate multilevel prevention and intervention programs.

Other government agencies-focused

- Government agencies should aim to increase the civic engagement among marginalized communities and to build the capacity of community-based organizations.
- Government agencies' approaches to CVE should be based on sustained, collaborative partnerships with communities.
- Government agencies should better leverage the contributions that other sectors, such as mental health and education, can make to CVE.
- Government agencies' CVE programs and policies should be based upon both best practices and scientific evidence.

Community-focused

- Communities should advocate for a multicultural approach to working with law enforcement and other government agencies that includes not just one ethnic or religious group and that aims to build capacities and increase civic engagement.
- Community leaders and organizations should advocate for partnerships with law enforcement that address a range of public safety issues including but not limited to CVE, such as domestic violence, child abuse, human trafficking, and gang violence.
- Communities should advocate for the use of community policing approaches for law enforcement to engage with communities on matters of CVE and other pertinent issues.
- Community leaders and organizations should work with law enforcement to develop procedures for nonpunitive ways of helping people who are in the precriminal space of radicalization and recruitment.
- Community organizations should build community-led CVE efforts either independently or in partnership with law enforcement, government, or private institutions.

BACKGROUND ON COUNTERING VIOLENT EXTREMISM

The summit focused on countering the problem of violent extremism, a concept that has been defined by the White House as "ideologically motivated violence to further political goals."[2] This definition is centered on the use of violence—not just on extremist beliefs, which in and of themselves are not criminal in nature. However, extremist beliefs were also of concern to the summit participants because researchers and practitioners widely believe that some forms of extremist beliefs are more likely to lend themselves to violence and also because one goal of CVE programming is to intervene in a preventive manner to stop individuals from ever crossing the line to engage in ideologically motivated criminal behavior.

Yet the ways in which CVE practitioners and community advocates use and understand the term *violent extremism* are often unclear and can be controversial. Practitioners and advocates question why some acts of criminal violence are regarded as violent extremism while others are not. Practitioners and advocates also question why the U.S. media associates violent extremism primarily with Muslims and much less so with far-right or environmental terrorism.

Communities sometimes perceive the public's use of the term *violent extremism* as a derisive label against entire communities. Some community advocates argue that the media is exaggerating the actual risk of violent extremism. For CVE practitioners these concerns have come to mean that in their discourse with community partners they tend to avoid using the terms "violent extremism" and "CVE" so as not to put off community members and potential partners.

The summit convened persons who looked at these issues from different positions and perspectives. Therefore, its aim was less to resolve these issues and more to facilitate a dialogue that could help influence the national discourse to strengthen the family, community, and institutional defenses that will mitigate the risks of violent extremism.

The overall goal of CVE is "to stop those most at risk of radicalization from becoming terrorists."[3] Generally speaking, CVE is "a realm of policy, programs, and interventions designed to prevent individuals from engaging in violence associated with radical political, social, cultural, and religious ideologies and groups."[4]

CVE in the United States is rooted in the 2011 White House *Strategic Implementation Plan for Empowering Local Partners to Prevent Violence Extremism in the United States*[5] (SIP) and its antecedent, the *National Strategy for Empowering Local Partners to Prevent Violent Extremism.*[6] These policy documents outline a community-based approach and the Federal Government's role in empowering local stakeholders to build resilience against violent extremism. They provide law enforcement and government officials with guidance in leveraging existing partnerships with community stakeholders and other activities designed to help prevent violent extremism. The SIP underlined that partnerships with community-based organizations are necessary in order to respond to community concerns and to support community-based solutions.

2. Empowering Local Partners to Prevent Violent Extremism in the United States (Washington, DC: The White House, 2011), 1, http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/empowering_local_partners.pdf.

3. *U.S. Government Efforts to Counter Violent Extremism: Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate,* 111th Congress, 9 (2010) (statement of Ambassador Daniel Benjamin, Coordinator for Counterterrorism, Department of State), http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-111shrg63687/pdf/CHRG-111shrg63687.pdf.

4. Georgia Holmer, *Countering Violent Extremism: A Peacebuilding Perspective,* Special Report (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2013), 2, http://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/SR336-Countering%20Violent%20Extremism-A%20Peacebuilding%20Perspective.pdf.

5. *Strategic Implementation Plan for Empowering Local Partners to Prevent Violent Extremism in the United States* (Washington, DC: The White House, 2011), http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/sip-final.pdf.

6. *Empowering Local Partners* (see note 2).

The U.S. CVE *National Strategy*[7] has the following priorities:

1. Building safe, secure, resilient, crime-resistant communities
2. Training, information sharing, and adopting community-oriented policing approaches
3. Applying community-oriented policing practices that focus on building partnerships between law enforcement and communities
4. Fostering community-led preventative programming to build resilience against violent extremist radicalization (such as those that attempt to counter extremist ideology through education, dialogue, and counseling)

Given that CVE strategies are still emerging in the United States and globally, the summit aimed to explore how key U.S. localities and several other countries are approaching CVE, including lessons learned, best practices, and challenges.

The Federal Government's approach to CVE assumes that communities are a key component to preventing and intervening to stop violent extremism. Within communities reside traditions, relations, values, norms, groups, and institutions that already mitigate violent extremism. Stated in other terms, the community has resilient properties—or protective resources—that help to protect the community and its members against various kinds of adversities and threats. This implies that building resilience for the purpose of CVE is in part about enhancing or strengthening those existing properties and resources and about jump starting weak or nonexistent ones. All of this is part of what scholars mean when they write about empowering communities, and these concepts are critical to successful CVE engagement and partnership activities.

Empowerment refers to the process of increasing the capacities of individuals or groups to make choices and transform those choices into desired actions and outcomes.[8] Empowerment centers on how the community looks at community development and mobilization in terms of its key needs, strengths, and meanings. Empowerment activities may include providing training or aligning resources to increase capacities, especially for community-based organizations that lack them. Empowerment can also include bringing new people to the table where decisions are made. The summit included discussion about how law enforcement, government, and communities are approaching the issue of empowerment with respect to CVE.

7. *National Security Strategy* (see note 1).

8. Seunghyun Yoo et al., "The 6-Step Model for Community Empowerment: Revisited in Public Housing Communities for Low-Income Senior Citizens," *Health Promotion Practice* 10, no. 2 (April 2009), 262–275, http://hpp.sagepub.com/content/10/2/262.full.pdf.

BACKGROUND ON THE NATIONAL SUMMIT

Goal

The goal of the National Summit on Empowering Communities to Prevent Violent Extremism was to advance multidisciplinary efforts to implement effective community-based intervention models and create a community of interest that will continually improve upon those efforts. The summit reflected the Federal Government's role in supporting locally led efforts to create and implement sustainable, multidisciplinary, whole-of-community, and information-driven grassroots efforts to counter violent extremism and prevent violent attacks.

Objectives

The objectives of the National Summit on Empowering Communities to Prevent Violent Extremism were to

- showcase existing law enforcement and local government best practices, specifically demonstrating how authorities are engaging nontraditional disciplines—such as mental health, social work, and clergy—and identifying promising community-led efforts to counter violent extremism;
- identify elements of intervention models that local communities—such as faith-based, school-based, and business communities—can replicate to prevent violence on the part of homegrown, radicalized extremists;
- contribute to FLETC's ongoing review and validation of its CVE training curriculum and identify potential training in need of development.

Scope

To facilitate manageable discussion and clear outcomes, the summit planning team focused the scope of this summit on violent extremism that could occur within the United States. This enabled summit participants to focus on the institutions, roles, and processes in place in the United States that can contribute to prevention. In addition, the summit was not limited to any particular ideological motivations or groups.

Anticipated outcomes

The anticipated outcomes of the summit were as follows:

- Local communities will gain access to best practices for implementing prevention and intervention strategies to prevent violent extremism, which build upon effective community policing practices.
- FLETC's CVE training curriculum will be validated and potentially modified to ensure consistency with national goals and existing best practices in CVE.

Summit participants

Summit participants included federal, state and local, international, and nongovernmental entities engaged in CVE efforts. See appendix A for a comprehensive list of participants.

The Federal Government's approach to CVE focuses on empowering local communities to prevent violent extremism by recognizing warning signs, assessing risk, and using existing tools to mitigate threats. Several communities in the United States are already engaged in extensive CVE efforts. Thus, the summit brought together delegations from five of these communities, including Dearborn, Michigan; Boston, Massachusetts; Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota; Los Angeles, California; and Montgomery County, Maryland. While law enforcement organizations are well positioned to participate in these activities because of their frequent interactions with communities, professionals from other disciplines such as mental health, social work, religion, and education are ideal candidates for participation in CVE efforts. Thus, the delegations comprised not only law enforcement representatives but also community-level stakeholders from a cross-section of sectors and disciplines. In addition, the delegations included proactive community activists and youth leaders who have become role models and ombudsmen for their respective communities and constructive partners for the practitioners engaging in CVE efforts.

In addition, the summit aimed to showcase best practices from several other democratic countries engaged in CVE efforts. Representatives from Australia, Germany, and Canada participated in the summit.

Key stakeholders from DHS and DOJ, including CVE working group members and representatives from public policy offices engaged in CVE efforts also participated in the summit, primarily to listen to the testimonials and concerns voiced by the delegations and also for the purpose of addressing how current efforts throughout the United States align with the national strategy. These stakeholders help establish funding priorities for CVE-related research and grants, disseminate lessons learned to other cities, ensure CVE efforts strengthen civil rights and civil liberties in the United States, and engage in interagency and international dialogue on CVE-related matters. Therefore, their presence at the summit helped ensure that the experiential knowledge of the delegations could inform CVE policy and practice more broadly.

Format

To accomplish its goals, objectives, and anticipated outcomes, the summit included a combination of presentations and plenary sessions during which participants engaged in cross-disciplinary dialogue. The facilitators and attendees sought to focus as much on challenges as on successes.

On day 1, the focus was on CVE in the United States. Representatives from five American jurisdictions (Dearborn, MI; Boston, MA; Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN; Los Angeles, CA; and Montgomery County, MD) provided overviews of their efforts, describing not only what they were doing but also their thought processes for how and why they arrived at those sets of initiatives. Following these presentations, the summit planners facilitated a discussion on core elements of prevention and intervention models.

On day 2, the focus began with CVE in other countries. Representatives from three international sites (Australia, Canada, and Germany) provided overviews of their CVE efforts. Following these presentations, the summit planners facilitated a discussion of key themes, best practices, challenges, and next steps related to CVE. Each location further elaborated on a specific CVE effort (e.g., scenario training, social media) in their jurisdictions.

REPORTING ON THE SUMMIT

The recommendations included in this report reflect the major themes that emerged, focusing on those that the majority of participants appeared to support. The discussion points in this report reflect the participants' debate and dialogue throughout the two-day event.

Addressing the problem of violent extremism in the precriminal space through engagement, prevention, and intervention programs is a departure for traditional law enforcement and a responsibility the public has recently articulated for communities and other government organizations. In order for government, law enforcement, and communities to succeed in countering violent extremism, each must undergo paradigm shifts to new frameworks that emphasize using collaborative and multidisciplinary strategies to build community-based, multilevel prevention and intervention programs. The delegations that presented at the summit have already begun to make these shifts.

The first paradigm shift is the recognition by law enforcement organizations that CVE approaches offer pragmatic and proactive opportunities when dealing with the issue of violent extremism, as law enforcement cannot "arrest their way out of the problem," and both resource constraints and constitutional protections of civil rights can make it problematic for police officers to monitor the precriminal space of radicalization to violence. By comparison, CVE approaches help build trust and open lines of communication with the communities that police departments protect and serve, enlisting their help to identify and assist at-risk individuals. Summit participants observed that law enforcement organizations should not only build relationships with communities specifically related to CVE efforts but should also intervene on other issues, because such intervention may create the kind of trusting relationship necessary for effective police-community relations on CVE efforts.

"If it wasn't for law enforcement, nobody would have reached out to this community. Zero. So we were the ones. . . . At the beginning I thought it was not going to work because I would go into our housing complexes where Somali youth and elders were residing and nobody wanted to talk to us, didn't want to come to our meetings . . . my officers do as much social work today—I never thought when I signed up for this I would be doing social work, intervention and prevention initiatives. I think that's where the dollars should be going, not toward enforcement. That's what we've had to do. We stopped a sexual trafficking case. It was a terrible case. The reason I bring that up is that a woman in a Somali community told us that because of a partnership. We didn't realize this was happening because nobody would come forward because they didn't know if they could trust us. That led to 30 indictments."

–Minneapolis-St. Paul delegation

The second paradigm shift is the recognition that while the law enforcement community has an important role to play, that role should ultimately be in support of communities and other governmental organizations. Summit participants noted that while it may be necessary for law enforcement to initiate CVE efforts, other community entities may be best suited to fully implement cross-disciplinary approaches, as much CVE programming occurs in the precriminal space and will use abilities that are not organic to most law enforcement organizations.

"In the beginning we had to always be out front, as we were the most symbolic form of government—in uniform 24 hours a day. Today it has evolved to where police can still be there in a support role and let these other things take hold."

–Los Angeles delegation

A third paradigm shift is the recognition that countering violent extremism requires a broad array of capabilities and participants dedicated to building resilience at many levels of society simultaneously. By building more partnerships involving individuals, families, communities, and various government agencies, communities ultimately become more resilient to all hazards, including but not limited to violent extremism.

"We want [to build] relationships because they will reduce issues of crime and violence. It has to be about strengthening local communities. I don't think you abandon the CVE title, but put it in context as one of the threats you face."

–Federal participant

Summit recommendations

The summit planners organized the participants' recommendations according to the kinds of organizations responsible for implementing them. To be specific, the summit planners identified three major categories of organizations positioned to implement these recommendations: (1) law enforcement organizations, (2) other government organizations,[9] and (3) community-based organizations.[10] The recommendations center on strengthening family, community, and institutional defenses that will mitigate the risks for violent extremism.

To be clear, these recommendations are not prescriptive; they are experience-based recommendations that the participants felt others should follow if they are seeking to obtain the best CVE-related outcomes.

Law enforcement-focused

Law enforcement organizations should prioritize building and strengthening mutual trust between themselves and the communities they serve.

Summit participants discussed building and strengthening mutual trust between law enforcement and community organizations more than any other single issue. There was consensus that law enforcement and communities should establish a high degree of mutual trust before they can have productive conversations about issues like radicalization and violent extremism. Participants drew from their own experiences to share some helpful strategies. As a member of the Montgomery County delegation stated, "The communities that need us the most often trust us the least."

- The Minneapolis-St. Paul, Boston, and Los Angeles delegations highlighted the importance of communicating success stories from within the community via trainings and in-services to help make law enforcement officers aware of the positive achievements and contributions occurring in the community. As law enforcement officers are regularly exposed to examples of criminality, this helps provide a more balanced view of the communities in which they work, enhancing trust.
- The Los Angeles and Montgomery County delegations highlighted the importance of transparent policies and practices for redress when law enforcement organizations make mistakes.

9. *Other government organization or other government agency* refers to any non-law enforcement agency from Federal, state, local, or Tribal Government participating in a CVE-related activity. Common examples include local departments of health and human services, departments of education, and offices of county executives. While law enforcement organizations have often taken a leading role in CVE efforts, several of the participating delegations stressed the importance of having law enforcement play a supporting to that of other government agencies and communities.

10. For purposes of the summit, the planners used the term *communities* to refer to any individual or group acting outside of formal employment by Federal, state, local, or Tribal Government. For example, it may refer to student groups, NGOs, interfaith groups, sports clubs, or individual community members active in civil society.

"After the bombings we were inundated with support from the communities. That was a testament to our relationship with our community members. To plan the next marathon, we knew it was going to be highly restrictive. Getting information out to everyone affected by the new plan and heightened security, using social media and the traditional media—everyone was incredibly cooperative and understanding."

–Boston delegation

- The Dearborn delegation stressed the importance of ensuring that use of force and surveillance policies are up to date to avoid the potential erosion of trust that can occur between law enforcement and communities due to perceived abuses of power.
- The Montgomery County delegation discussed how their faith communities collaborate to develop law enforcement training regarding CVE. Similarly, the Boston delegation cited how the police department brings community representatives who work with law enforcement on CVE issues into training academies to deliver and receive trainings to increase mutual familiarity and trust.
- The Minneapolis-St. Paul delegation highlighted the use of citizen academies and youth academies focusing on the roles and responsibilities of the police force, as well as youth summits focused on relevant issues, to enhance transparency and dialogue.
- The Los Angeles and Boston delegations stressed the importance of separating their community outreach efforts from their intelligence-gathering efforts entirely, recognizing that using engagement activities to advance specific investigations could erode trust quickly.
- Every delegation discussed the need to build trust prior to an incident occurring, typically through consistent engagement over time, because trust is difficult to establish after a violent extremist incident or arrest has occurred.
- The Australian delegation stated that based on their experience, increased trust leads to greater input from the community regarding prevention, intervention, and disruption efforts.

To engage with communities, law enforcement organizations should be engaged with and responsive to community organizations and advocates consistently and over time.

Summit participants gave many examples that testified to the importance of ongoing commitments to build relationships with community leaders and groups. Engagement is certainly not a one-off event. Summit participants observed that in many cases law enforcement interacted with communities more than any other government agency.

- While each of the delegations stressed that key leaders must be visible participants and champions of community engagement, the Los Angeles, Boston, and Minneapolis-St. Paul delegations also stressed the importance of community policing models in which senior officers are present in, familiar with, and responsive to their assigned communities on a routine basis. In Minneapolis-St. Paul, community engagement teams fulfil this role, while captains lead such efforts in Boston.
- The Montgomery County delegation stressed the importance of following up on routine matters, such as complaints or tips from the community, as a way to build performance legitimacy.
- The Minneapolis-St. Paul and Montgomery County delegations stated that it is important to try to answer questions from the community on the first phone call, without giving the caller the runaround.

Communication with a wide range of community partners on a broad range of topics should be part of the routine operations of law enforcement.

Summit participants emphasized the importance of information sharing and open dialogue for advancing CVE efforts. Through proactive communication practices, law enforcement and other government agencies can enhance their transparency, which would help build trust.

"We take the criticism also. I think it's a good conduit for people to express their opinions on what the police department is doing."

–Minneapolis-St. Paul delegation

- Each of the delegations' law enforcement representatives discussed using social media to increase the reach and frequency of their interactions with communities and to communicate positive messages about their organization and its role in the community. There was also a discussion about how social media platforms can provide a forum for communities to voice their concerns.
  - » The Boston Police Department representative emphasized the pragmatic value of social media platforms, which allowed them to quickly address rumors and incorrect information in the aftermath of the 2013 Boston Marathon bombing.
  - » The Minneapolis Police Department produces a community engagement newsletter, which it sends by email to a large number of recipients.
  - » Several of the delegations' law enforcement representatives stated that they hired individuals with communications or media backgrounds to lead their social media efforts.
- The Los Angeles delegation discussed its Youth Advisory Council, which meets monthly with police to discuss programming geared specifically to 18–30-year-olds.
- The Dearborn delegation discussed various occasions in which the police asked a broad cross-section of the community for help on urgent security issues, and the community responded positively.

Law enforcement organizations should focus prevention and intervention activities on behaviors, not on racial, religious, or ethnic identity.

Summit participants agreed that the focus of CVE activities should be on violent extremist behaviors and not on identity. The participants felt that focusing on one ethnic or religious community can stigmatize that community and generate pushback on CVE efforts.

- The Minneapolis-St. Paul delegation used an Urban Area Security Initiative grant to develop a community awareness program that focuses on recognizing suspicious behavior. They trained approximately 3,000 community volunteers on eight suspicious behaviors associated with terrorist attacks to help secure the Major League Baseball All-Star Game.
- The delegations also emphasized being as inclusive as possible of different communities as another way to avoid stigmatizing any particular community. Dearborn maintains a local CVE working group with members from the law enforcement community, the media, faith-based groups, and schools. "If we have a meeting, we invite everyone. Whatever programming we put on in the east end, we do the same for the rest of the city."

"When we have crime trends, we send out bulletins in two or three languages to homes and schools. We've had great results—whatever crime we have—we inform the community. There was a K2 [bath salts] epidemic in our county a few years ago. Several people died in the county from using it. I called the superintendent; he said, "I support you." We convinced the entire community to take that stuff off the shelves in gas stations and convenience stores—no pushback. I had no expectation of what success would look like. We passed a city ordinance that equally outlawed it and made it a seven-year felony. It worked and became a state law; in 14 days it was on the governor's desk. We got all that stuff off the shelves in Dearborn before the rest of the state. I must have sent out 400 letters—every church, school principal, chamber, etc. You have to keep citizens engaged on every front . . . you can do tremendous things if people are allowed the opportunity."

–Dearborn delegation

Discussion Points

All of the delegations highlighted the importance of objective and credible training on CVE related issues for law enforcement and other government organizations. In contrast, they discussed the "cottage industry" of training providers that offer counterproductive and biased curricula, especially regarding specific religious and ethnic groups.

Several summit participants also voiced the concern that researchers and practitioners have not yet established reliable behavioral indicators of radicalization to violence, which would be more useful for CVE purposes than merely focusing on suspicious behaviors associated with mobilization—planning or executing a terrorist attack.

Law enforcement organizations should collaboratively develop and evaluate multilevel prevention and intervention programs.

Summit participants agreed that engagement and partnership between law enforcement and communities are necessary but not sufficient to build individual, family, community, and institutional defenses that mitigate the multilevel risks for violent extremism. Thus, efforts to mitigate risks must consider multiple levels where risks can exist, including individual, interpersonal, family, community, and organizational levels. Therefore, communities and law enforcement organizations must eventually develop multilevel prevention and intervention programs. Summit participants endorsed program evaluation efforts that are also multilevel (focused on indicators in two or more realms such as community, organizational, sociocultural, family, mental health) and that incorporate both qualitative and quantitative methods. Summit participants discussed several examples of existing evaluation efforts, but emphasized that more resources are needed to support evaluation.

- The Montgomery County program uses pre- and post-intervention measures to assess program impact and is also undergoing a National Institute of Justice-sponsored evaluation of its CVE program.
- The Canadian delegation gives surveys to participants after certain engagement events and uses the results to devise new action plans with the community.
- The Australian government has funded a university-based research panel to host workshops and generate objective research relevant to CVE efforts. This effort has resulted in a website, Resilient Communities (http://www.resilientcommunities.gov.au/pages/home.aspx) which serves as a clearinghouse for this content.

Other government agency-focused

Government agencies' CVE efforts should aim to increase the civic engagement among impacted communities and to build the capacity of community-based organizations.

Summit participants acknowledged that many, though not all, communities where CVE is a focus are communities that face significant social and economic adversity. They did not argue that underlying conditions like poverty or poor governance cause violent extremism, but they did agree that CVE efforts could not be most effective without addressing these needs as well, for two reasons. In addition to the fact that extremist recruiters and ideologues exploit local grievances and conditions, it is difficult for communities to develop capacities when they have limited resources or are focused on more immediate needs. Communities will focus their finite capacity on more pressing issues. While summit participants recognized that ameliorating broader social, economic, and structural problems is beyond the scope of current CVE programs, they did stress the importance of working with underserved communities—especially immigrant and refugee communities, which frequently face these and other challenges—to promote their civic engagement and to build the capacities of their community-based organizations. They offered several compelling examples of this:

- The Montgomery County and Boston delegations stressed the importance of serving newer immigrant communities that may not benefit from existing programming geared towards more established racial and ethnic communities with different needs, such as Hispanic or African-American communities. In Montgomery County, the World Organization for Research, Development, and Education (WORDE)[11]

11. For more information, see www.worde.org.

Crossroads programs, funded by the Office of the County Executive, provide a model that other counties can adopt. They were established in order to provide social services and counseling to populations dramatically underserved by other county programs, primarily because existing service organizations did not have the cultural competencies to serve those communities.

- In Montgomery County, the Department of Health and Human Services maintains a network of more than 500 nonprofit community-led organizations. When a new need is identified, the county executive identifies a community-led organization to take the lead because this is typically less expensive and more responsive to the need than developing the capacity inside the government. The county executive allocates a significant portion of the county's budget for this purpose.
- Germany has embraced the idea of using competitions to highlight local projects that demonstrate potential for success. These contests help spread good ideas, connect local actors, support promising efforts financially, and empower local leaders. The German delegation cited one example of an interfaith nongovernmental organization (NGO) based in Berlin, Kiezbezogener Netzwerkaufbau, which has worked to improve the condition of an underprivileged community.[12]

Discussion Point

While summit participants widely supported making government services available to underserved communities, one delegation stressed that the goal should be to foster empowerment and cautioned that it is important to avoid contributing to a victim-focused identity in communities.

Government agencies' approaches to CVE should be based on sustained, collaborative partnerships with communities.

"The community member will bring the government representative out and have that representative confirm that there's no recording going on, that this is a safe space where people can feel comfortable saying what they're saying. We'll make them say this in front of everyone to give a sense of confidence to attendees that you can be honest here. There are no negative repercussions."

–Canadian delegation

Summit participants agreed that the government approach to CVE should be based on sustained, collaborative partnerships with communities. They expressed the ineffectiveness of developing CVE programs in isolation and then handing them off to communities with no further support or participation. Instead, summit participants believe that when government agencies engage in CVE programming, they should develop programs in partnership with communities or provide support to community organizations developing them on their own. Government should aim to empower communities on a broad front rather than treating communities as merely an audience for their programs—especially narrowly focused national security programs that run the risk of creating a perception that the government is deemphasizing the concerns of the community.

- The Montgomery County model is not law enforcement-centric and is community-led. It was started by WORDE in partnership with the Office of the County Executive and the Montgomery County Police Department. It does much of its work through its Office of Community Partnerships as well as a network of community-led NGOs and the police.

12. For more information, see "Über uns," Berlin vernetzt, accessed August 7, 2015, http://www.kbna-berlin.de/seite/145575/ueber_uns.html.

- The Canadian delegation described an innovative community engagement and awareness program, called Storytelling, which uses first-person radicalization narratives (stories) to highlight moments when friends, family, and community members could have intervened. The community selects which stories will be read from a menu of narratives, selects a location for the event, and invites the attendees. The government representatives and a community member facilitate a conversation focused on how the community members can be empowered to conduct an intervention. Based on this discussion, the government then follows up to help the community develop prevention and intervention tools. The delegation stressed the importance of a strong relationship between the government and community before engaging in a program like Storytelling, as the emotional nature of the narratives can provoke heated discussion.

- Most of the delegations mentioned the value of community advisory boards that convene regularly to engage with local government and stressed how important it is for those boards to include representatives from a cross-section of the community.

Government agencies should better leverage the contributions that other sectors, such as mental health and education, can make to CVE.

Summit participants perceived violent extremism and the efforts to counter it as multidimensional problems that require multidisciplinary solutions. Summit participants noted that government is in a position to bring other individuals and organizations from various disciplines together to identify assets that could contribute to CVE. In addition, they noted that government should be responsive to the needs of its communities and ensure access for persons who require government services, such as health and mental health, even if those services do not appear to be directly related to CVE.

- The Boston delegation described the importance of mental health and educational services for at-risk individuals, such as immigrant youth who experienced trauma prior to or during their departure from their countries of origin.

- The delegations noted that it was important to enable other civilian and government agencies to step forward and take the lead in areas where they have specific capabilities, such as those involving recreation, education, housing, or jobs.
  - » The Minneapolis-St. Paul delegation mentioned that they were featured on CNN a year earlier for working with the local YMCA to provide a culturally specific swimming program accessible to young Somali-American women.
  - » The Boston delegation discussed the need to partner with hospitals and the Boston Public Health Commission to provide families with "wrap-around services" that the police department cannot provide.

- Dearborn is rolling out a Law Enforcement Mental Health Intervention model, which focuses on curbing violence by leveraging mental health professionals within a framework that respects their capabilities and limitations.

Discussion Points

Summit participants discussed the potential or perceived limitations of the mental health and educational communities in sharing health- and education-related information with the law enforcement community. The summit illuminated the need for increased understanding on the part of law enforcement, educational, and other practitioners regarding when it is permissible or mandatory to divulge information. The summit planners support increased training and awareness of these laws, specifically the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

"Some may be surprised to see schools here, but [the] chief and I can tell you incident upon incident we've been able to head off by building trust with our students. Police don't just build trust with adults, but build trust with kids in high schools and elementary schools and have headed off incidents because of those relationships."

–Dearborn delegation

- In Dearborn, the school superintendent is a co-leader of CVE efforts, and schools are a major partner to law enforcement. The school system involves parents, students, and law enforcement in tabletop exercises around school security issues to build trust and familiarity prior to an incident occurring, and to minimize the negative impacts if a crisis does occur.

Government agencies' CVE programs and policies should be based upon both best practices and scientific evidence.

Summit participants' current activities were more focused on program development and implementation than on evaluation or measurement. Summit participants stated that there is little to no formal evaluation of CVE programs in their communities, explaining that they do not have the expertise or resources to conduct such evaluations. Some described limited partnerships with university-based academics around the issues of evaluation and measurement. However, participants described the importance of building not only best practices but also scientific evidence of program impacts. START leadership discussed how having evaluation metrics of CVE programs is important for deriving best practices and for allocating resources within organizations and at the county, state, and federal levels of government. Summit delegates discussed a strategy whereby law enforcement, government, and community CVE programs might partner with university-based academics to collaborate on evaluation projects. Participants observed that demonstrating evidence of the effectiveness of CVE programs is a key to long-term sustainability and should therefore be a priority from the onset. Summit participants discussed how they have begun to do this:

- The Minneapolis-St. Paul delegation is working with the Bureau of Justice Assistance and the Police Executive Research Forum to conduct a study of community perceptions that aims to better understand and increase community trust in law enforcement officers.
- Montgomery County uses a set of pre- and post-intervention quantitative and qualitative evaluative tools to measure the effectiveness of their preventative interventions. Some of the scales are validated from other studies measuring stress or anger management behavior. Others tools are experimental but based on studies conducted in concert with the University of Maryland. Montgomery County is also undergoing an NIJ sponsored evaluation of its CVE program.
- In Montgomery County, WORDE conducts much of its CVE-related training based on the most up-to-date science-based research, including training on its unique risk factors of radicalization cluster model and other CVE-relevant training on topics like acculturation related stress and trauma. The delegation described how they examine prior case studies of radicalization to better understand potential opportunities for intervention.
- FLETC leadership stated that continued research is needed in revising and validating curriculums used to train law enforcement on their role in CVE.

Community-focused

Communities should advocate for a multicultural approach to working with law enforcement and other government agencies that includes not just one ethnic or religious group and that aims to build capacities and increase civic engagement.

Summit participants acknowledged that it was best not to focus CVE efforts on any one ethnic, racial, or religious group. Rather, it was best to be inclusive of multiple such groups in order to avoid the potential for stigmatization. Summit participants also emphasized that adapting a multicultural approach would help to ensure that CVE efforts were focused on individual behaviors rather than group identity, which raises constitutional concerns. Summit participants also stated that a multicultural approach helps to build community capacity and increase integration and civic engagement.

- The delegations noted that multicultural dialogue can facilitate learning, citing how newer immigrant and refugee communities can learn lessons from the experiences of prior immigrant and refugee communities in terms of cooperation with law enforcement and government. The Minneapolis-St. Paul delegation stated that their experience engaging with the Hmong community helped to inform and enrich more recent experiences regarding the Somali community.
- Dearborn has an interfaith community that meets regularly and that also engages in an interfaith tabletop exercise. These exercises help community institutions and individual community members build the lines of communication that allows them to head off crises.
- When the Los Angeles team conducted a news conference, they brought representatives from multiple ethnic and religious groups so the focus was not only on one group and the emphasis was on multi-ethnic and interfaith solidarity.
- The Minneapolis-St. Paul delegation discussed how the Somali community works with other minority communities on issues of mutual concern, such as health care, community service, and immigration.

Communities should advocate for partnerships with law enforcement that encompass a range of public safety issues that include CVE as well as other issues such as domestic violence, child abuse, human trafficking, and gang violence.

Summit participants debated whether or not it was best to focus exclusively on CVE or whether it was better to integrate CVE with addressing other public safety concerns. Summit participants widely agreed that there are advantages to integrating CVE with other public safety concerns. They observed that this type of broader approach is less likely to lead communities to feel targeted in a potentially discriminatory way. In addition, this kind of approach is more likely to engage the interests of a broader range of community partners.

- The Los Angeles delegation stated that engagement should be purposeful and address what the community perceives as its needs in order to be effective. For example, they learned that the communities' priorities were integration, bullying, bias, and hate crime. This led to the formation of an anti-bullying and bias coalition, which demonstrated the responsiveness of the law enforcement community and helped to engender trust.
- The Office of Community Partnerships in Montgomery County maintains three working groups, including the Faith Community Working Group. This interfaith working group does not focus exclusively on violent extremism but instead on working with their broader communities to mitigate all hazards. This approach helps to depoliticize CVE-related issues while increasing the community's capacity to deal with those issues through habitual collaboration and dialogue.

Discussion Points

Communities can perceive the very use of the term violent extremism as a derisive label. Some community advocates argue that the media is exaggerating the actual risk of extremism, and more importantly the movement from extreme beliefs to violent extremist behavior. For CVE practitioners these disagreements about the term violent extremism have come to mean that in their discourse with community partners they tend to avoid using the terms *violent extremism* and *CVE*, so as not to put off community members and potential partners.

Communities should advocate for community policing approaches to engaging with their community on matters of CVE and other pertinent issues.

Summit participants strongly endorsed the significance of community policing approaches to building CVE programs. They observed that communities embrace community policing; however, summit participants perceived a need to clarify and update what exactly community policing means in the context of CVE. Traditionally, community policing combines traditional aspects of law enforcement with prevention, problem solving, community engagement, and partnerships.

Community policing in the context of CVE draws upon that tradition but makes modification and additions that address CVE issues. Modifications may include creating special units with different expertise than typical community liaison units, such as expertise on radicalization and violent extremism, greater or more specific cultural competency, greater familiarity with mental health concerns such as post-traumatic stress disorder, or specific knowledge regarding grants or other government resources available to support community-led intervention or prevention programming. Several delegations emphasized the importance of community policing to their CVE efforts:

- The Los Angeles delegation stated that it was important for CVE never to lose its roots in community policing, suggesting that communities should know that their voices will be heard without having to speak directly to the highest ranking officers in the police department.
- The Boston delegation stated that community policing is "in their DNA" and that it was fundamental to their approach to CVE.

Community leaders and organizations should work with law enforcement to develop procedures for nonpunitive ways of helping people who are in the precriminal space of radicalization and recruitment.

Summit participants shared information on how local, state, and federal law enforcement and communities are finding ways to help steer persons away from violent extremism that do not involve criminal arrest and prosecution. However, they expressed that more work needs to be done in this area.

- The Minneapolis-St. Paul delegation explained that when a law enforcement officer is told, "I'm worried about this person," police officers who are well trusted in the community, such as community liaison officers, will speak with the young person's parents before taking any other action.
- The Los Angeles delegation and the Montgomery County delegation stated that standardized and transparent protocols are important to help establish clear lanes of responsibility between community organizations and law enforcement organizations regarding interventions. However, at present these protocols are often lacking.
- In 2012, the German government established the Radicalization Advisory Center, which provides professional advice free of charge to those who call or email the hotline with concerns that someone they know may be radicalizing. Each case is handled on a case-by-case basis; the goal is to develop strategies with the person seeking help. If there is the need for more extensive counseling, the Radicalization Advisory Center refers those callers to a network of NGOs and state and local resources.
- In Montgomery County, the local government funds WORDE's intervention program, which was set up to provide specialized care to individuals that are vulnerable to recruitment into violent extremism. The Montgomery County delegation communicated that their Faith Community Working Group plays a valuable role in addressing militant ideologies when an intervention team determines that ideological factors are playing a significant role in an individual's radicalization.
- Many delegations discussed the importance of multidisciplinary intervention teams.

Discussion Point

Participants debated whether, or in what circumstances, communities leading these efforts should involve law enforcement. They recognized that there were both advantages and disadvantages of having law enforcement involved. Advantages include protecting the community from legal risks or assuming liability when dealing with an at-risk individual. Disadvantages include creating a chilling effect on communities' willingness to conduct an intervention in the first place, for fear it may result in an unnecessary investigation or arrest.

Community organizations should build community-led CVE initiatives either independently or in partnership with law enforcement, government, or private institutions.

Summit participants shared several community-led CVE activities they are implementing and strongly endorsed developing more of these activities. Summit participants recommended that communities themselves take the lead on multiple elements of CVE. For example, they observed that community-based organizations should take a leading role in counter-narrative campaigns, making more extensive use of social media to communicate with the public. In addition, they noted that community-based organizations should seek partnerships with law enforcement and government organizations that address underserved needs and increase human services, especially regarding youth and families, to help foster trust in government and the resilience of communities. Summit participants also contended that communities are in the best position to build programs and campaigns that give parents better knowledge, skills, and awareness of violent extremism risk and protection. Last, communities may be able to help law enforcement to understand how to better connect with difficult to reach subgroups. Summit participants expressed that communities must have meaningful and ongoing input into CVE programs and policies and that community strengthening should be fundamental to CVE.

- The Los Angeles delegation stated that a division of labor between community and law enforcement was helpful because when community members talk with fellow community members about certain CVE issues, they have much more credibility than a government representative.
- The Montgomery County delegation discussed how an NGO leads their intervention program, but it coordinates and works in partnership with the various governmental organizations that provide CVE-relevant services to communities.
- Several youth organizations from Minneapolis-St. Paul, such as Ka Joog,[13] take a leading role in prevention programming, involving youth in skill-building programming and in using the creative arts to help young people express themselves in positive ways. Some of these groups have then partnered with law enforcement and government organizations to create internship programs.
- Participants from the Los Angeles delegation described the Safe Spaces intervention model, created by the Muslim Public Affairs Council.[14] This model involves crisis intervention teams comprising community members. These community-led intervention teams decide if they are comfortable including a member of the law enforcement community in their team. The program calls for the use of tabletop exercises to prepare the intervention teams to engage with individuals who are engaging with extremist ideas but who have not yet engaged in extremist criminal behavior. This training is similar to training exercises used by offices within the DHS to train communities on how to respond to other hazards and provides an opportunity for collaboration in the future.

13. For more information on Ka Joog, see http://www.kajoog.org/.

14. For more information on MPAC, see http://www.mpac.org. For more information on Safe Spaces, see http://www.mpac.org/safespaces/.

THE SUMMIT'S ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND NEXT STEPS

Anticipated outcome 1.

Local communities will gain access to best practices for implementing prevention and intervention strategies to prevent violent extremism, which build upon effective community policing practices.

To help disseminate the lessons learned during this summit, the COPS Office will publish the summit report and both FLETC and the COPS Office will make the report available on their websites to share with key stakeholders and partners in the law enforcement community. In addition, the COPS Office and FLETC enlisted the help of the START Consortium, a DHS Center of Excellence based at the University of Maryland and comprising a network of scholars and educators from around the world. START engages in research, education, and training pertaining to CVE among other topics related to terrorism, counterterrorism, and resilience. START will post this summit report on its website and will disseminate it in the START newsletter. The content of this report will directly inform START's undergraduate course on innovation and CVE and the coursework in its graduate certificate program. Finally, the summit report will contribute to START's development of a CVE training curriculum, funded by a Federal Emergency Management Agency Continuing Education and Training grant, which will reach a national audience of CVE practitioners inside and outside of government.

Anticipated outcome 2.

FLETC's CVE training curriculum will be validated and potentially modified to ensure consistency with national goals and existing best practices in CVE.

The FLETC curriculum on CVE is designed to provide new federal officers and agents with a basic understanding of the concept of ideological extremism along with an awareness of the various methods employed by foreign and domestic terrorist organizations to recruit potential operatives. The current curriculum focuses heavily on the myriad of factors that lead individuals to radicalize, mobilize, or take action in support of these groups to highlight the various opportunities to identify at-risk persons and take the necessary steps to intervene in the radicalization process. The discussions among the summit participants confirmed that communities and local law enforcement agencies continue to face the factors and methodologies currently presented in the FLETC curriculum; however, they also provided numerous examples of intervention methods being employed throughout the nation and internationally to contest these groups. As a result, FLETC will incorporate examples of these promising practices to further the strategic approach currently underway in support of the CVE mission.

Next steps

The 14 recommendations that emerged during this national summit centered on the need to strengthen family, community, and institutional defenses that mitigate the risks for violent extremism. Risk mitigation occurs when law enforcement organizations, other government agencies, and communities build trust-based, collaborative, and multilevel programs tailored for local communities that address prevention and intervention in the precriminal space. It is the hope of the summit organizers that other communities looking to build resilience to the threat of violent extremism can take the lessons learned and recommendations from this summit to build successful and sustainable initiatives in their locales.

Future areas of emphasis include educating the multiple stakeholders and the broader public about empowerment strategies for countering violent extremism and helping them recognize how they can contribute to those efforts. This should include helping them to make the aforementioned paradigm shifts: recognizing the pragmatic value of CVE programming; leveraging the capabilities of federal, state, and local government and nongovernmental entities in addition to law enforcement capabilities to help enhance community resilience; and adopting an all-hazards approach that strengthens community resilience to violent extremism among many other hazards.

There is also a pressing need to build scientific evidence regarding best practices for prevention and intervention programs that mitigate risks for violent extremism. Finally, while not discussed extensively during the summit, some observers of CVE policy and practice have articulated a need to allocate greater attention to the development and evaluation of rehabilitation and reintegration programming.

APPENDIX. ATTENDEES AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL

State and local participants

Boston, Massachusetts, representatives

- Kelly Nee, Deputy Superintendent Boston Police Department
- Brandy Donini-Melanson, Law Enforcement Coordinator, U.S. Attorney's Office, District of Massachusetts
- Deeqo Jibril, Founder and Executive Director, Somali Community and Cultural Association
- Marianna McCormick, Communications and Policy Coordinator, Somali Community and Cultural Association

Dearborn, Michigan, representatives

- Radwan Mardini, Imam, American Muslim Center
- Brian Whiston, Superintendent, Dearborn Public Schools
- Ronald Haddad, Chief, Dearborn Police Department

Los Angeles, California, representatives

- Michael Downing, Deputy Chief, Counter-Terrorism and Special Operations Bureau, Los Angeles Police Department
- Michael Abdeen, Sergeant, Homeland Security Division, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
- Guy Golan, Police Officer II, Liaison Section, Counter-Terrorism and Special Operations Bureau, Los Angeles Police Department
- Salam Al-Maryati, President, Muslim Public Affairs Council
- Joumana Silya-Saba, Senior Policy Analyst, City of Los Angeles Human Relations Commission

Minnesota representatives

- Dean Christiansen, Lieutenant, Minneapolis Police Department
- Thomas Smith, Chief, Saint Paul Police Department
- Hashi Shafi, Executive Director, Somali Action Alliance
- Kassim Busuri, Education Director, Minnesota Da'wah Institute
- Abdi S. Mohamed, Community Outreach Liaison, Hennepin County Sheriff's Office
- Mohamed Farah, Executive Director, Ka Joog

Montgomery County, Maryland, representatives

- Luther Reynolds, Assistant Chief, Montgomery County Police Department
- Dr. Hedieh Mirahmadi, Founder and President, World Organization for Resource Development and Education
- Rev. Mansfield "Kasey" Kaseman, Interfaith Community Liaison, Montgomery County Executive's Office, Office of Community Partnerships
- Rev. Dr. Carol Flett, Ecumenical and Interreligious Officer, Episcopal Diocese of Washington and Chair of the Board, Interfaith Conference of Metropolitan Washington
- John Kenney, Coordinator, Emergency Preparedness Coalition, Department of Health and Human Services, Montgomery County

International participants

Canadian representatives

- Anna Gray-Henschel, Senior Director of National Security Policy, Public Safety Canada
- Derek McDonald, Sergeant, Royal Canadian Mounted Police
- Hussein Hamdani, Member, Cross-Cultural Roundtable on Security and Vice-Chair, North American Spiritual Revival

Australian representatives

- Brian Curley, Inspector, Victoria Police, Australia

German representative

- Michael Vogel, German Liaison Officer, U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Federal participants

- Billie Yrlas Coleman, Policy Analyst, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice
- Timothy Curry, Deputy Director of Counterterrorism Policy, Office of Policy, U.S. Department of Homeland Security
- Ronald L. Davis, Director, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice
- Gregory Ehrie, Section Chief, Domestic Terrorism Operations Section, Federal Bureau of Investigation/ U.S. Department of Justice
- David Gersten, Countering Violent Extremism Coordinator, U.S. Department of Homeland Security
- Agatha Glowacki, Interagency Coordination Officer, Homeland Group, Countering Violent Extremism Branch, National Counterterrorism Center
- Charles Kels, Attorney Advisor, Office of Chief Counsel, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, U.S. Department of Homeland Security
- Jennifer Kim, Federal Bureau of Investigation/ U.S. Department of Justice
- John Markovic, Senior Social Science Analyst, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice
- Carl Milazzo, Deputy Assistant Director, Glynco Training Directorate, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, U.S. Department of Homeland Security
- Lee Newman, Chief, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (Artesia)
- Connie Patrick, Director, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers
- John Picarelli, PhD, Director, Crime, Violence, and Victimization, Research Division, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice
- Jennifer C. Ranger, Branch Chief, Counterterrorism Division, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, U.S. Department of Homeland Security
- Martin J. Roddini, Division Chief, Counterterrorism Division, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, U.S. Department of Homeland Security
- Mark Royer, Senior Instructor, Counterterrorism Division, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, U.S. Department of Homeland Security
- Irfan Saeed, Senior Policy Advisor, Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, U.S. Department of Homeland Security
- Theresa Singleton, Senior Instructor, Counterterrorism Division, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, U.S. Department of Homeland Security
- Brette Steele, Senior Counsel, Office of the Deputy Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice
- Jennifer E. Tocco, Management and Program Analyst, Director's Office, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Academic participants

- William Braniff, Executive Director, National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism, University of Maryland
- Stevan Weine, Professor of Psychiatry, START Affiliate, Department of Psychiatry, University of Illinois at Chicago

GLOSSARY

community. A space of belonging, consisting of shared meanings, comprised of one or more of a combination of geographical, imaginative, emotional, political, and other ties.[i]

community based organization. An organization driven by community residents in all aspects of its existence, meaning the majority of the governing body and staff consists of local residents; priority issue areas are identified and defined by residents; solutions to address priority issues are developed with residents; and program design, implementation, and evaluation components have residents intimately involved in leadership positions.[ii]

community empowerment. The process of enabling communities to increase control over their lives.[iii]

community-focused approach. Community consent and participation in the governance of various strategies and approaches that are applied.[iv]

community-led. Primarily driven by the agenda, interests, and support of community leaders and their respective congregations or groups.[v]

community mobilization. A capacity-building process through which community individuals, groups, or organizations plan, carry out, and evaluate activities on a participatory and sustained basis to improve health and other needs on their own initiative or stimulated by others.[vi]

community policing. A philosophy that promotes organizational strategies that support the systematic use of partnerships and problem solving techniques to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues, such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime.[vii]

community resilience. Measure of the sustained ability of a community to use available resources to respond to, withstand, and recover from adverse situations.[viii]

counter-narrative. Actions to directly deconstruct, discredit, and demystify violent extremist messages.[ix]

crime prevention. The anticipation, recognition, and appraisal of a crime risk and the initiation of some action to remove or reduce it.[x]

cultural intelligence. Being skilled and flexible in understanding a culture, learning more about it from ongoing interactions with it, and gradually reshaping thinking to be more sympathetic to it.[xi]

ejection. Removing an individual from the community space and contacting law enforcement.[xii]

engagement. A planned process with the specific purpose of working with identified groups of people—whether they are connected by geographic location, special interest, or affiliation or identity—to address issues affecting their well-being.[xiii]

grassroots. People or society at a local level rather than at the center of major political activity.[xiv]

governance. All processes of governing, whether undertaken by a government, market, or network; whether over a family, tribe, formal or informal organization, or territory; and whether through laws, norms, power, or language.[xv]

human rights. Rights inherent to all human beings, whatever our nationality, place of residence, sex, national or ethnic origin, color, religion, language, or any other status. We are all equally entitled to our human rights without discrimination. These rights are all interrelated, interdependent, and indivisible.[xvi]

ideological extremism. The result of a process whereby individuals or groups come to intellectually approve of the illegal use of violence against civilians for political or social aims. Ideological extremists engage in lawful, constitutionally protected free speech and other nonviolent and legal activities but hold extremist beliefs.[xvii]

intervention. The act or method of interfering with a potential outcome, especially of a condition or process. In this context, *intervention* refers to dealing with a particular identified individual going down a path of violent radicalization or moving dangerously close to it. Intervention measures may be either proactive or reactive.[xviii]

outreach. Providing services to populations who might not otherwise have access to those services.[xix]

partnership. An arrangement in which parties agree to cooperate to advance their mutual interests, often by emphasizing qualities such as equality, transparency, and legitimate cooperation.[xx]

prevention. The action of stopping something from happening or arising. In this context, *prevention* refers to dealing with a problem by "nipping it in the bud" through efforts that focus on developing communities or important parts of communities.[xxi]

preventive interventions. Interventions aimed at enhancing protective resources at population, community, and family levels to stop, lessen, or delay possible negative individual mental health and behavioral outcomes. Preventive interventions often use multilevel strategies that simultaneously address family, social, and structural issues.[xxii]

protective resources. Social and psychosocial factors that can stop, delay, or diminish negative outcomes.[xxiii] Protective resources encompass not only resilience (e.g., bouncing back) but also resistance (e.g., preventing). Protective resources can reside in families, communities, and institutions.

public safety. The prevention of and protection of the general public from events that could endanger their safety by presenting a risk of injury, harm, or damage such as crimes or disasters (natural or man-made).[xxiv]

rehabilitation. The social and psychological process whereby an individual's commitment to and involvement in violent radicalization is reduced to the extent that they are no longer at risk of involvement of and engagement in violent activity."[xxv]

resilience. The capacity of a material or system to return to equilibrium after a displacement.[xxvi] Community psychologists use *resilience* to refer to a process shaped by resources—such as economic development, social capital, information and communication, and community competence—that may lead to adaptation after a disturbance or adversity.[xxvii]

securitization. Reacting to a security threat in such a way as to erode civil liberties, increase executive powers, and decrease due process.[xxviii]

stigmatization. To describe and regard something, such as a characteristic or group of people, in a way that shows strong disapproval.[xxix]

terrorism. Politically motivated violence designed to instill fear and anxiety.[xxx]

trust. Belief that someone or something is reliable, good, honest, and effective.[xxxi]

victimization. The process of making someone a victim; unwarranted singling out of one person from a group and subjecting that individual to unfair treatment and other wrongs.[xxxii]

ENDNOTES

i. Basia Spalek, "Policing within Counter-Terrorism," in *Counter-Terrorism: Community-Based Approaches to Preventing Terror Crime*, ed. Basia Spalek (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 60.

ii. National Community-Based Organization Network, "What is a Community-Based Organization (CBO)?" Regents of the University of Michigan, accessed March 25, 2015, http://www.sph.umich.edu/ncbon/whatis.html.

iii. "Health Promotion, Track 1: Community Empowerment," World Health Organization, accessed March 25, 2015, http://www.who.int/healthpromotion/conferences/7gchp/track1/en/.

iv. Spalek, "Policing within Counter-Terrorism," 69 (see note 1).

v. Yugi Nair and Catherine Campbell, "Building Partnerships to Support Community-Led HIV/AIDS Management: A Case Study from Rural South Africa," *African Journal of AIDS Research* 7, no. 1 (2008): 45–53, doi:10.2989/AJAR.2008.7.1.6.434; Derek M. Griffith et al., "Organizational Empowerment in Community Mobilization to Address Youth Violence," American Journal of Preventive Medicine 34, no. 3 (Supplement, March 2008): S89–S99, http://www.ajpmonline.org/article/S0749-3797(07)00757-X/pdf.

vi. "Community Mobilization," Florida Department of Health, accessed March 25, 2015, https://www.myctb.org/wst/floridacommunityprevention/mobilization/default.aspx.

vii. *Community Policing Defined* (Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2014), http://ric-zai-inc.com/Publications/cops-p157-pub.pdf.

viii. "Community Resilience," Rand Corporation, accessed March 25, 2015, http://www.rand.org/topics/community-resilience.html.

ix. Rachel Briggs and Sebastien Feve, *Review of Programs to Counter Narratives of Violent Extremism: What Works and What are the Implications for Government?* (London: Institute of Strategic Dialogue, 2013), http://www.strategicdialogue.org/ISD_Kanishka_Report.pdf.

x. National Crime Prevention Institute, *Understanding Crime Prevention* (Boston: Butterworth, 1986).

xi. David C. Thomas and Kerr Inkson, *Cultural Intelligence: Living and Working Globally* (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2009).

xii. *Safe Spaces Initiative: Tools for Developing Healthy Communities* (Los Angeles: Muslim Public Affairs Council, 2014), http://www.mpac.org/assets/docs/publications/MPAC-Safe-Spaces-full.pdf.

xiii. *Charter for Community Engagement* (Queensland, Australia: Queensland Department of Emergency Services, 2001).

xiv. Marc Pilisuk, JoAnn McAllister, and Jack Rothman, "Coming Together for Action: The Challenge of Contemporary Grassroots Community Organizing," *Journal of Social Issues* 52, no. 1 (spring 1996): 15–37, doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1996.tb01359.x.

xv. Mark Bevir, *A Theory of Governance* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013).

xvi. "What are Human Rights?" United Nations Commission on Human Rights, accessed March 25, 2015, http://www.ohchr.org/en/issues/pages/whatarehumanrights.aspx.

xvii. *Safe Spaces Initiative*, 31 (see note 12).

xviii. Ibid., 64.

xix. Bart Jacobs et al., "Building on Community Outreach for Childhood Vaccination to Deliver Maternal and Child Health Services in Laos: A Feasibility Assessment," *Reproductive Health Matters* 20, no. 40 (December 2012): 112–121, http://www.rhm-elsevier.com/article/S0968-8080(12)40649-8/pdf.

xx. Barbara A. Israel et al., "Review of Community-Based Research: Assessing Partnership Approaches to Improve Public Health," *Annual Review of Public Health* 19, no. 1 (May 1998): 173–202, doi: 10.1146/annurev.publhealth.19.1.173.

xxi. *Safe Spaces Initiative*, 44 (see note 12).

xxii. Jean J. Schensul and Edison Trickett, "Introduction to Multi-Level Community Based Culturally Situated Interventions," *American Journal of Community Psychology* 43, no. 3–4 (June 2009): 232–240, doi: 10.1007/s10464-009-9238-8; Mary Ellen O'Connell, Thomas Boat, and Kenneth E. Warner, eds., *Preventing Mental, Emotional, and Behavioral Disorders Among Young People: Progress and Possibilities* (Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 2009).

xxiii. Stevan Merrill Weine, "Developing Preventive Mental Health Interventions for Refugee Families in Resettlement," *Family Process* 50, no. 3 (September 2011): 410–430, doi: 10.1111/j.1545-5300.2011.01366.x.

xxiv. "Public Safety," City of Chicago, accessed March 25, 2015, http://www.cityofchicago.org/city/en/progs/recovery_reinvest/education5.html.

xxv. John Horgan and Kurt Braddock, "Rehabilitating the Terrorists?: Challenges in Assessing the Effectiveness of De-radicalization Programs," *Terrorism and Political Violence* 22, no. 2 (2010): 280, doi:10.1080/09546551003594748.

xxvi. Per Bodin and Bo L.B. Wiman, "Resilience and Other Stability Concepts in Ecology: Notes on Their Origin, Validity, and Usefulness," *ESS Bulletin* 2, no. 2 (2004): 33–43, http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Per_Bodin/publication/236208772_Resilience_and_other_stability_concepts_in_ecology_Notes_on_their_origin_validity_and_usefulness/links/0c960516faf19c9a03000000.pdf.

xxvii. Fran H. Norris et al., "Community Resilience as a Metaphor, Theory, Set of Capacities, and Strategy for Disaster Readiness," *American Journal of Community Psychology* 41, no. 1–2 (March 2008): 127–150, doi:10.1007/s10464-007-9156-6

xxviii. Gallya Lahav and Marie Courtemanche, "The Ideological Effects of Framing Threat on Immigration and Civil Liberties," *Political Behavior* 34, no. 3 (September 2012): 477–505, doi: 10.1007/s11109-011-9171-z.

xxix. Robert Kurzban and Mark R. Leary, "Evolutionary Origins of Stigmatization: The Functions of Social Exclusion," *Psychological Bulletin* 127, no. 2 (March 2001): 187, http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/bul/127/2/187.pdf&productCode=pa.

xxx. Graham Bird S. Brock Blomberg, and Gregory D. Hess, "International Terrorism: Causes, Consequences, and Cures," *The World Economy* 31, no. 2 (February 2008): 255–274, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9701.2007.01089.x.

xxxi. D. Harrison McKnight, Larry L. Cummings, and Norman L. Chervany, "Initial Trust Formation in New Organizational Relationships," *Academy of Management Review* 23, no. 3 (July 1998): 473–490, doi: 10.5465/AMR.1998.926622.

xxxii. Nicole E. Rader, "The Threat of Victimization: A Theoretical Reconceptualization of Fear of Crime," *Sociological Spectrum* 24, no. 6 (2004): 689–704, doi:10.1080/02732170490467936.

ABOUT FLETC

The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) is the nation's largest provider of law enforcement training. In FY 2014, FLETC provided training to 58,666 law enforcement officers and agents. This included providing basic and advanced training to 96 federal partner agencies and thousands of state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies at FLETC's four domestic training sites and at export locations throughout the United States. In addition, FLETC serves DHS's international mission through participation and leadership at the International Law Enforcement Academies, training and capacity-building activities overseas, hosting international law enforcement personnel at FLETC's domestic training sites, and engaging with international partners in research and the exchange of best practices and subject matter expertise. FLETC pursues ongoing training review, development, and research in coordination with stakeholders at all levels of law enforcement to ensure its training continues to meet its partners' needs. Since 1970, FLETC has trained more than one million students.

For more than 40 years, FLETC has engaged in research to ensure its training remains relevant and meets the needs of the federal, state, local, tribal, and international law enforcement communities. One objective of the Strategic Implementation Plan for Empowering Local Partners to Prevent Violence Extremism in the United States (http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/sip-final.pdf) is "to improve the development and use of standardized training with rigorous curricula based on the latest research which conveys information about violent extremism, improves cultural competency and imparts best practices and lessons learned for effective community engagement and partnerships." To this end, the summit assisted FLETC in ensuring its counterterrorism curriculum meets the nation's CVE objectives as they relate to training.

ABOUT START

The National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism—better known as START—is a university-based research and education center comprising an international network of scholars committed to the scientific study of the causes and human consequences of terrorism and to service as a leading resource for homeland security policymakers and practitioners. Headquartered at the University of Maryland, START is a part of the collection of Centers of Excellence supported by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Science and Technology Directorate and also receives funding and support from a variety of federal agencies, private foundations, and universities.

In addition to maintaining a broad research agenda specific to CVE, START is actively creating educational and training opportunities on the topic. START currently offers one of a small number of undergraduate courses in the country on CVE, an undergraduate fellowship dedicated to the topic, and is currently developing training for CVE practitioners supported by a grant from the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

ABOUT THE COPS OFFICE

The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office) is the component of the U.S. Department of Justice responsible for advancing the practice of community policing by the nation's state, local, territory, and tribal law enforcement agencies through information and grant resources.

Community policing is a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies that support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime.

Rather than simply responding to crimes once they have been committed, community policing concentrates on preventing crime and eliminating the atmosphere of fear it creates. Earning the trust of the community and making those individuals stakeholders in their own safety enables law enforcement to better understand and address both the needs of the community and the factors that contribute to crime.

The COPS Office awards grants to state, local, territory, and tribal law enforcement agencies to hire and train community policing professionals, acquire and deploy cutting-edge crime fighting technologies, and develop and test innovative policing strategies. COPS Office funding also provides training and technical assistance to community members and local government leaders and all levels of law enforcement. The COPS Office has produced and compiled a broad range of information resources that can help law enforcement better address specific crime and operational issues, and help community leaders better understand how to work cooperatively with their law enforcement agency to reduce crime.

- Since 1994, the COPS Office has invested more than $14 billion to add community policing officers to the nation's streets, enhance crime fighting technology, support crime prevention initiatives, and provide training and technical assistance to help advance community policing.
- To date, the COPS Office has funded approximately 125,000 additional officers to more than 13,000 of the nation's 18,000 law enforcement agencies across the country in small and large jurisdictions alike.
- Nearly 700,000 law enforcement personnel, community members, and government leaders have been trained through COPS Office-funded training organizations.
- To date, the COPS Office has distributed more than 8.57 million topic-specific publications, training curricula, white papers, and resource CDs.

COPS Office resources, covering a wide breadth of community policing topics—from school and campus safety to gang violence—are available, at no cost, through its online Resource Center at www.cops.usdoj.gov. This easy-to-navigate website is also the grant application portal, providing access to online application forms.

NOTES

NOTES

The National Summit on Empowering Communities to Prevent Violent Extremism report documents the proceedings of the summit, which was co-hosted by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office), the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) and National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Reponses to Terrorism (START). The summit convened more than 50 participants from multiple disciplines engaged in community engagement efforts from federal, state, local, international, and nongovernmental entities. Over the course of the two-day summit, these participants described their community engagement efforts with a focus on lessons learned, best practices, and challenges. The report provides recommendations for law enforcement, other government agencies, and communities on improving community engagement, trust building, prevention, and intervention programming regarding those individuals at risk for engaging in violent extremism. The recommendations ultimately seek to help strengthen family, community, and institutional defenses that will mitigate the risks for violent extremism.

COPS
Community Oriented Policing Services
U.S. Department of Justice

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
145 N Street NE
Washington, DC 20530

To obtain details about COPS Office programs, call
the COPS Office Response Center at 800-421-6770.

Visit the COPS Office online at **www.cops.usdoj.gov**.

e071522712
Published 2015