

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

August 13-14, 2014

Introductory Letter from partner organizations (COPS, FLETC, UMD/START)

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: Stevan Weine, M.D., Professor of Psychiatry, Department of Psychiatry, University of Illinois at Chicago, and Bill Braniff, M.A., The START Consortium, University of Maryland.

Contents

Executive Summary	4
Summary of Summit Recommendations	5
Law Enforcement-Focused.....	5
Other Government Agencies-Focused	5
Community-Focused.....	6
Background on Countering Violent Extremism.....	7
Background on the National Summit	8
Goal.....	8
Objectives.....	9
Scope.....	9
Anticipated Outcomes	9
Summit Participants.....	9
Format.....	10
Reporting on the Summit	12
Summit Recommendations	13
Law Enforcement-Focused.....	14
Other Government Agency-Focused.....	18
Community-Focused.....	22
The Summit's Anticipated Outcomes and Next Steps.....	26
Appendix A: Attendees and Support Personnel.....	28
State and Local Participants	28
International Participants	28
Federal Participants	29
Non-Federal Participants.....	30
Appendix B: About the Summit Organizers	31
About the COPS Office.....	31
About the FLETC.....	31
About START.....	32
Appendix C: Glossary	33

Executive Summary

The United States national security policy on countering violent extremism (CVE) recognizes that “our best defenses against this threat are well informed and equipped families, local communities, and institutions.” To further strengthen these defenses the Department of Justice’s (DOJ) Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office) and the Department of Homeland Security’s (DHS) Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers (FLETC) partnered with the University of Maryland’s National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START) to coordinate a 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 Summit participants from multiple disciplines engaged in CVE efforts from federal, non-federal, international, and non-governmental 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 pre-criminal space through engagement, prevention, and intervention programs is a departure 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 a new framework that emphasizes 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 are pragmatic and proactive when 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 recognizing that while the law enforcement community has an important role to play, it should ultimately play a supporting role to communities and other governmental organizations that are more well-suited to operate in the pre-criminal space.

A third paradigm shift is 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, institutions and various government agencies,

communities ultimately become more resilient to all hazards, including but not limited to violent extremism.

Summary of Summit Recommendations

Subsequent to 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.

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

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

Other Government Agencies-Focused

6. Government agencies should aim to increase the civic engagement among marginalized communities and to build the capacity of community-based organizations.
7. Government agencies' approaches to CVE should be based on sustained, collaborative partnerships with communities.

8. Government agencies should better leverage the contributions that other sectors, such as mental health and education, can make to CVE.
9. Government agencies' CVE programs and policies should be based upon both best practices and scientific evidence.

Community-Focused

10. Communities should advocate for a multicultural approach to working with law enforcement and other government agencies which includes not just one ethnic or religious group, and which aims to build capacities and increase civic engagement.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. Community leaders and organizations should work with law enforcement to develop procedures for non-punitive ways of helping people who are in the pre-criminal space of radicalization and recruitment.
14. Community organizations should build community-led CVE efforts either independently or in partnership with law enforcement, government, and/or private institutions.

Background on Countering Violent Extremism

The Summit focused on countering the problem of violent extremism, a concept which has been defined by the White House as “ideologically motivated violence to further political goals.”¹ This definition is centered on the use of violence and not just 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 the goal of CVE programming is to intervene in a preventive manner so as 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 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 to propel 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.”² 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.”³

CVE in the U.S. is rooted in the 2011 White House *Strategic Implementation Plan for Empowering Local Partners to Prevent Violence Extremism in the United States*⁴ (SIP) and its antecedent, the *National Strategy for Empowering Local Partners to Prevent Violent Extremism*.⁵ These policy documents outline a community-based approach and the Federal Government’s role in empowering local stakeholders to

¹ The White House. (2011). Empowering local partners to prevent violent extremism in the U.S, August 2011. Retrieved from: http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/empowering_local_partners.pdf.

² U.S. Government Efforts to Counter Violent Extremism. “Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services United States Senate.” (2010), p. 9.

³ Holmer, Georgia. “Countering Violent Extremism: A Peacebuilding Perspective.” United States Institute of Peace Special Report 336, 2013, p.2.

⁴ The White House, (2011). “Strategic Implementation Plan for Empowering Local Partners to Prevent Violent Extremism in the United States. Retrieved from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/sip-final.pdf>

⁵ The White House. (2011). Empowering local partners to prevent violent extremism in the U.S, August 2011. Retrieved from: http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/empowering_local_partners.pdf.

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.

The U.S. *CVE National Strategy* 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 which attempt to counter extremist ideology through education, dialogue, and counseling).

Given that CVE strategies are still emerging in the U.S. 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, awareness, 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 jumpstarting weak or non-existent 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.⁶ 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.

Background on the National Summit

Goal

⁶ Yoo S, Butler J, Elias TI, Goodman RM. The 6-step model for community empowerment: revisited in public housing communities for low-income senior citizens. *Health Promot Pract.* 2009 Apr; 10(2):262-75.

The goal of the National Summit on Empowering Communities to Prevent Violent Extremism was to advance multidisciplinary efforts to implement effective community-based CVE 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, multi-disciplinary, 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:

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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:

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.
2. 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, non-federal, international, and non-governmental entities engaged in CVE efforts. See Appendix A: Attendees and Support Personnel, 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, faith-based, 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 to 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 to 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 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; Montgomery County, MD) provided overviews of their CVE efforts, describing not only what they were doing, but their thought process for how and why they arrived at those sets of initiatives. Following these, the Summit planners facilitated a discussion on core elements of CVE 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, 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, etc...) 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 pre-criminal 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 a new framework that emphasizes 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 are pragmatic 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 make it problematic for police officers to monitor the pre-criminal space of radicalization. On the other hand, CVE approaches help to 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 rather, intervention on other issues 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

nd paradigm shift is recognizing that while the law enforcement community has an important role to play,

it should ultimately play a supportive role to 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 of CVE-programming occurs in the pre-criminal space and will utilize capabilities 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 recognizing 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.

“For Boston, 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.”

Boston Delegation

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 – law enforcement organizations, other government organizations, and community-based organizations. 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

1. 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.
- 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.

“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

- 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/arrest has occurred.
- Several of the delegations highlighted the importance of hiring police officers who reflect the diversity of the communities that they serve.
- The Australian delegation stated that based on their experience, increased trust leads to greater input from the community regarding prevention, intervention, and disruption efforts.

2. To engage with communities, law enforcement organizations should be engaged with and responsive to community organizations and advocated 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, familiar with, and responsive to their assigned communities on a routine basis. In Minneapolis-St. Paul, Community Engagement Teams play 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 person the 'run-around.'

"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

3. 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.

- 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 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 with police monthly to discuss programming geared specifically for 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.

“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

4. 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 beliefs and behaviors, and not identity itself. 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.”

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, which would be more useful for CVE purposes than merely focusing on suspicious behaviors associated with mobilization – the planning or executing of a terrorist attack.

5. 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 multi-level 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, socio-cultural, 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- 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 then 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 clearing house for this content.

Other Government Agency-Focused⁷

6. 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 adversities. 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, and especially immigrant and refugee communities which frequently face these and other challenges, so as 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 delegation and the Boston delegation stressed the importance of servicing 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 International Cultural Center's Crossroad programs, funded by the Office of the County Executive, provide a model that other counties can adopt. It was 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 over 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 inter-faith non-governmental organization (NGO) based in Berlin that has worked to improve the condition of an underprivileged community.

⁷ "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 Health and Human Services, Departments of Education, and offices of the county executive. 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.

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.

7. 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 co-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 treat 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. Instead, the Office of the County Executive is leading the effort, and does much of its work through its Office of Community Partnerships as well as a network of community-led NGOs.
- 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.

8. 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 a multidimensional problem that requires 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. Additionally, 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 emigration from their country 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 “made CNN last year” by 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 rather than prosecuting violence, 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-related and education-related information with the law enforcement community.¹ 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.

- 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.

"Some may be surprised to see schools here, but 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

9. 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 do so. 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 on 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- 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.
- Montgomery County bases much of its CVE-related training on science-based research, including training on the risk factors of radicalization and "what violent extremism looks like," and other CVE-relevant training on topics like mental illness and mental fitness. 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 vital in revising and validating curriculums used to train law enforcement on their role in CVE.

10. 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 is potentially discriminatory and unconstitutional. Summit participants also stated that a multicultural approach also 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 experience regarding the Somali community.
- Dearborn has an interfaith community that meets regularly and which also engages in an interfaith table-top exercise. These exercises help the community institutions and individual community members build the lines of communication that allows them to “head-off” crises before they occur.
- When the Los Angeles team conducted a news conference, they brought representatives from multiple ethnic and religious groups so the focus wasn’t only on one group and to emphasize 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.

11. Communities should advocate for partnerships with law enforcement that encompass a range of public safety issues that include CVE, but also 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. Additionally, 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. They learned that the communities’ priorities were integration, bullying, bias, and hate crime. This led to the formation of an anti-bullying/bias coalition, which demonstrated the responsiveness of the law enforcement community and helped to engender trust.

⁸For 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, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), interfaith groups, sports clubs, or individual community members active in civil society.

- 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.

12. 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.

13. Community leaders and organizations should work with law enforcement to develop procedures for non-punitive ways of helping people who are in the pre-criminal 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 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 Advisory Center refers those callers to a network of NGOs and state and local resources.
- The Montgomery County delegation communicated that their Faith Community Working Group plays a valuable role contesting militant ideologies when an intervention team determines that ideological factors are playing a significant role in an individual’s radicalization process.
- 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.

14. Community organizations should build community-led CVE initiatives either independently or in partnership with law enforcement, government, and/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. Additionally, 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. Lastly, communities may be

able to help law enforcement to understand how to better connect with difficult to reach sub-groups. 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, it has much more credibility than if it was presented by a government representative.
- The Montgomery County delegation discussed both developing programs internally within a relevant NGO, but also having that NGO work to coordinate and work in partnership with the various governmental organizations that provide CVE-relevant services to communities.
- Several youth organizations from Minneapolis-St. Paul 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 an intervention model created by a Muslim-American NGO involving 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 table-top 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 Department of Homeland Security to train communities on how to respond to other hazards, and provides an opportunity for collaboration in the future.

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 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 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 professionals inside of and outside of government. Additionally, FLETC will post the Summit report on its public website, and will disseminate it to key stakeholders and partners in the law enforcement training community.

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 Countering Violent Extremism (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 and/or take action in support of these groups in order to highlight the various opportunities to identify at risk persons and take the necessary steps to intervene in the radicalization process. The discussions amongst the summit participants confirmed that communities and local law enforcement agencies continue to face the factors and methodologies currently presented by in the FLETC curriculum; however, it also provided numerous examples of intervention methods being employed throughout the nation, and internationally, to provide a counter-narrative to these groups. As a result, the FLETC will incorporate examples of these best-practice models to demonstrate 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. This 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 pre-criminal 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 non-governmental 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 A: Attendees and Support Personnel

State and Local Participants

Boston Representatives

- Deputy Superintendent Kelly Nee (Boston Police Department)
- Brandy Donini-Melanson, Law Enforcement Coordinator (US Attorney's Office - MA)
- Deeqo Ilbril, Founder and Executive Director (Somali Community and Cultural Association)
- Marianna McCormick, Communications and Policy Coordinator (Somali Community and Cultural Association)

Dearborn, Michigan Representatives

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

Los Angeles, California Representatives

- Deputy Chief Michael Downing (Counterterrorism Special Operations Bureau, Los Angeles Police Department)
- Sergeant Michael Abdeen (Homeland Security Division, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department)
- Police Officer II Guy Golan (Liaison Section, Counter Terrorism & 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)
- Tiffany Cohn, Special Agent (North Carolina State Bureau of Investigation)

Minnesota Representatives

- Lt. Dean Christiansen (Minneapolis Police Department)
- Chief Thomas Smith (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

- Assistant Chief Luther Reynolds (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 Inter-religious 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
- Sergeant Derek McDonald (Royal Canadian Mounted Police)
- Hussein Hamdani, Member (Cross-Cultural Roundtable on Security), and Vice-Chair (North American Spiritual Revival)

Australian Representatives

- Inspector Brian Curley (Victoria Police, Australia)
- German Representatives
- Michael Vogel, German Liaison Officer (U.S. Department of Homeland Security)

Federal Participants

- Billie Yrlas Coleman, Policy Analyst, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, US Department of Justice
- Timothy Curry, Deputy Director of Counterterrorism Policy, Office of Policy, US Department of Homeland Security
- Ronald L. Davis, Director, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, US Department of Justice
- Brandi Donini-Melason, Law Enforcement Coordinator, US Attorney's Office (MA)
- Gregory Ehrie, Section Chief - Domestic Terrorism Operations Section, Federal Bureau of Investigations/ US Department of Justice
- Willie Johnson, Program Manager/Training Specialist, National Training and Education Division, Federal Emergency Management Agency
- David Gersten, Countering Violent Extremism Coordinator, US 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, US Department of Homeland Security
- Jennifer Kim, Federal Bureau of Investigations/ US Department of Justice
- John Markovic, Senior Social Science Analyst, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, US Department of Justice
- Carl Milazzo, Deputy Assistant Director, Glymco Training Directorate, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, 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 of the Crime, Violence and Victimization, Research Division, National Institutes of Justice, US Department of Justice
- Jennifer C. Ranger, Branch Chief, Counterterrorism Division, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, Department of Homeland Security
- Martin J. Roddini, Division Chief, Counterterrorism Division, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, Department of Homeland Security
- Mark Royer, Senior Instructor, Counterterrorism Division, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, Department of Homeland Security
- Irfan Saeed, Senior Policy Advisor, Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, US Department of Homeland Security
- Theresa Singleton, Senior Instructor, Counterterrorism Division, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, Department of Homeland Security
- Brette Steele, Senior Advisor on Forensic Science and Senior Counsel, Office of the Deputy Attorney General, US Department of Justice
- Jennifer E. Tocco, Management & Program Analyst, Director's Office, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, Department of Homeland Security

Non-Federal 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,

Appendix B: About the Summit Organizers

About the COPS Office

For 20 years, the COPS Office has strengthened law enforcement agencies' capacity to address public safety through its core principles of community partnerships, problem solving, and organizational transformation. The same community principles that have been used for decades to enhance civic engagement and partnership around traditional crime, disorder, and public service issues are increasingly applicable to homeland security concerns. The COPS Office is committed to advancing public safety and homeland security through the implementation of community policing strategies. To facilitate this, the COPS Office broadly distributes information on addressing CVE through collaborative partnerships and problem solving. COPS strives to develop innovative programs that respond directly to the emerging CVE needs of state, local, and tribal law enforcement, emphasizing preventing, rather than reacting to, violent extremism. COPS-sponsored strategies include developing state-of-the-art training and technical assistance to enhance law enforcement officers' problem-solving capacities, conducting community outreach, and building communication skills. Through this summit, the COPS Office gained a greater understanding of the emerging CVE needs of local law enforcement and the communities they serve. The findings from the summit will inform the development of future CVE-related initiatives funded by the COPS Office.

About the FLETC

The Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers (FLETC) is the Nation's largest provider of law enforcement training. In Fiscal Year 2014, FLETC provided training to 58,666 law enforcement officers and agents. This includes 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 over 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* 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 comprised of an international network of scholars committed to the scientific study of the causes and human consequences of terrorism, and to serve 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 maintain a broad research agenda specific to CVE, START is actively creating educational and training opportunities on the topic. START currently offers one of the only undergraduate course 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.

Appendix C: 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.¹

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.²

Community empowerment - the process of enabling communities to increase control over their lives.³

Community-focused approach – community consent and participation in the governance of various strategies and approaches that are applied.⁴

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.⁵

Community Policing- a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies, which 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.⁶

Community resilience- measure of the sustained ability of a community to utilize available resources to respond to, withstand, and recover from adverse situations.⁷

Counter-narrative- actions to directly deconstruct, discredit and demystify violent extremist messages.⁸

Crime prevention- the anticipation, recognition and appraisal of a crime risk and the initiation of some action to remove or reduce it.⁹

Cultural intelligence – being skilled and flexible in understanding a culture, learning more about it from your ongoing interactions with it, and gradually reshaping your thinking to be more sympathetic.¹⁰

Ejection - removing the individual from the community space, and contacting law enforcement.¹¹

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 identify to address issues affecting their well-being.¹²

Grassroots - people or society at a local level rather than at the center of major political activity.¹³

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.¹⁴

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.¹⁵

Ideological extremism - the result of a process where 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 non-violent and legal activities, but hold extremist beliefs.¹⁶

Intervention – the act or method of interfering with the outcome, especially a condition or process. Here it is dealing with a particular identified individual going down a path of violent radicalization or moving dangerously close to it. Intervention measures are both proactive and reactive.¹⁷

Outreach- an activity of providing services to populations who might not otherwise have access to those services.¹⁸

Partnership- an arrangement in which parties agree to cooperate to advance their mutual interests, involving equality, transparency, and legitimate cooperation.¹⁹

Prevention- the action of stopping something from happening or arising. Here it is dealing with the problem by “nipping it in the bud” through efforts that focus on developing communities or important parts of communities.²⁰

Preventive Interventions - interventions aimed to enhance protective resources at population, community, and family levels so as 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.^{21, 22}

Protective resources –social and psychosocial factors that can stop, delay, or diminish negative outcomes.²³ 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 from events that could endanger the safety of the general public from significant danger, injury/harm, or damage, such as crimes or disasters (natural or man-made).²⁴

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.”²⁵

Resilience - the capacity of a material or system to return to equilibrium after a displacement.²⁶ 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.²⁷

Securitization – reacting to a security threat in such a way as to erode civil liberties, increase executive powers, and decrease due process.²⁸

Stigmatization- to describe and regard (something, such as a characteristic or group of people) in a way that shows strong disapproval.²⁹

Terrorism –politically motivated violence designed to instill fear and anxiety.³⁰

Trust- belief that someone or something is reliable, good, honest, and effective.³¹

Victimization- the process of making someone a victim; unwarranted singly out of one person from a group and subjected to unfair treatment and other wrongs.³²

¹ Spalek, Basia. "Community-Based Approaches to Counter-Terrorism." *Counter-Terrorism: Community-Based Approaches to Preventing Terror Crime* (2012): 60.

² "National Community Based Organization Network." *University of Michigan*. Accessed March 25, 2015. <http://www.sph.umich.edu/ncbon/whatis.html>

³ "Health Promotion, Track 1: Community Empowerment." *World Health Organization*. Accessed March 25, 2015. <http://www.who.int/healthpromotion/conferences/7gchp/track1/en/>

⁴ Spalek, "Community-Based Approaches," 69.

⁵ "Florida's HIV/AIDS Community Prevention: Community Mobilization." *Florida Department of Health*. Accessed March 25, 2015. <https://www.myctb.org/wst/floridacommunityprevention/mobilization/default.aspx>

⁶ "Community Policing Defined." *US Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services* (2014).

⁷ "Community Resilience." *Rand Corporation*. Accessed March 25, 2015. <http://www.rand.org/topics/community-resilience.html>

⁸ Briggs, Rachel, and Sebastien Feve. "Review of programs to counter narratives of violent extremism." *Institute of Strategic Dialogue* (2013).

⁹ National Crime Prevention Institute. *Understanding Crime Prevention* (Boston, MA: Butterworth, 1986).

¹⁰ Thomas, David C., and Kerr C. Inkson. *Cultural intelligence*. (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2009).

¹¹ "Safe Spaces Initiative." *Muslim Public Affairs Council*. Accessed March 25, 2015. <http://www.mpac.org/assets/docs/publications/MPAC-Safe-Spaces-full.pdf>

¹² Queensland Department of Emergency Services. *Charter for community engagement*. Community Engagement Unit, Strategic and Executive Services, Queensland Department of Emergency Services (2001).

¹³ Pilisuk, Marc, JoAnn McAllister, and Jack Rothman. "Coming together for action: The challenge of contemporary grassroots community organizing." *Journal of Social Issues* 52, no. 1 (1996): 15-37.

¹⁴ Bevir, Mark. *A Theory of Governance*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013).

-
- ¹⁵ "What are human rights?" *United Nations Human Rights*. Accessed March 25, 2015.
<http://www.ohchr.org/en/issues/pages/whatarehumanrights.aspx>
- ¹⁶ "Safe Spaces," 31.
- ¹⁷ "Safe Spaces," 64.
- ¹⁸ Jacobs, Bart, Magnus Lindelow, Phoxay Xayyavong, and Philippa Sackett. "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 (2012): 112-121.
- ¹⁹ Israel, Barbara A., Amy J. Schulz, Edith A. Parker, and Adam B. Becker. "Review of community-based research: assessing partnership approaches to improve public health." *Annual review of public health* 19, no. 1 (1998): 173-202.
- ²⁰ "Safe Spaces," 44.
- ²¹ Schensul, Jean J., and Edison Trickett. "Introduction to multi-level community based culturally situated interventions." *American journal of community psychology* 43, no. 3-4 (2009): 232-240.
- ²² O'Connell, Mary Ellen, Thomas Boat, and Kenneth E. Warner, eds. *Preventing Mental, Emotional, and Behavioral Disorders Among Young People:: Progress and Possibilities*. National Academies Press, 2009.
- ²³ Weine, Stevan Merrill. "Developing preventive mental health interventions for refugee families in resettlement." *Family process* 50, no. 3 (2011): 410-430.
- ²⁴ "Public Safety." *City of Chicago, Chicago Recovery and Reinvestment*. Accessed on March 25, 2015,
http://www.cityofchicago.org/city/en/progs/recovery_reinvest/education5.html
- ²⁵ Horgan, John, and Kurt Braddock. "rehabilitating the Terrorists?: Challenges in Assessing the Effectiveness of De-radicalization programs." *Terrorism and Political Violence* 22, no. 2 (2010): 280.
- ²⁶ Bodin, Per, and Bo Wiman. "Resilience and other stability concepts in ecology: Notes on their origin, validity, and usefulness." *ESS bulletin* 2, no. 2 (2004): 33-43.
- ²⁷ Norris, Fran H., Susan P. Stevens, Betty Pfefferbaum, Karen F. Wyche, and Rose L. Pfefferbaum. "Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness." *American journal of community psychology* 41, no. 1-2 (2008): 127-150.
- ²⁸ Lahav, Gallya, and Marie Courtemanche. "The ideological effects of framing threat on immigration and civil liberties." *Political Behavior* 34, no. 3 (2012): 477-505.).
- ²⁹ Kurzban, Robert, and Mark R. Leary. "Evolutionary origins of stigmatization: the functions of social exclusion." *Psychological bulletin* 127, no. 2 (2001): 187.
- ³⁰ Bird, Graham, S. Brock Blomberg, and Gregory D. Hess. "International terrorism: Causes, consequences and cures." *The World Economy* 31, no. 2 (2008): 255-274.
- ³¹ McKnight, D. Harrison, Larry L. Cummings, and Norman L. Chervany. "Initial trust formation in new organizational relationships." *Academy of Management review* 23, no. 3 (1998): 473-490.
- ³² Rader, Nicole E. "The threat of victimization: A theoretical reconceptualization of fear of crime." *Sociological Spectrum* 24, no. 6 (2004): 689-704.