Community Healing Policy Rubric

The purpose of this form is to evaluate a policy's potential to promote community healing versus its potential to cause community harm.

Must score 80% or higher to receive Community Healing endorsement.

100%- 80% = Promotes healing   79%-60% = Neutral   59% and under = Causes Harm

Instructions:

1. Identify all relevant topics within the Fundamental Sections (left column) that apply to the policy in question and mark with "X" in the next column.
2. Add all the available points for a total available point amount.
3. Rate the policy in question using the identified topics, following the instructions **in red,** then add the total point for that row on the far right column.
4. Divide the total amount of points received by the total amount of points available for a final percentage.

POLICY NAME: **TOTAL POINTS:**

Fundamental Sections						Total Points Received
Justice	**Applies to policy (X)**	Promotes community healing--- Causes community harm				
Accountability Max. 10 points **Circle all that apply**	**X**	Legal Accountability **4 points**	Career Accountability **3 points**	Public Accountability **2 points**	Personal Accountability **1 point**	No Accountability **0 points**	
Restorative practices Max. 10 points **Circle all that apply**		City-wide Engagement **2.5 points**	Neighborhood-wide Engagement **2.5 points**	Organization(s) Engagement **2.5 points**	Household Engagement **2.5 point**	No Restorative justice Engagement **0 Points**	
Restitution Max. 10 Points **Circle One**		Wholly restores financial impact	Supplements financial impact	One time (insufficient) legal payment/	Minimal Financial aid/Resour-	No Restitution	

This rubric was developed by Project VOYCE participants: Caleb Washington, Azariaz Jones, Sikkim Smith-Trent

		10 points	8 points	settlement 6 points	ces Provided 4 points	0 points	
Economic Impact		Promotes community healing-------------------------------------- Causes community harm					
Financial burden onto constituent Max. 10 points Circle One		No negative financial burden	Promotes financial stability	Some financial impact	Debilitating financial hardship	Irreparable financial hardship/poverty	
		4 Points	3 Points	2 Points	1 point	0 Points	
Police Dept. Budget Increases Max. 10 Points Circle all that apply		Provides new resources and programs for community	Provides additional funding for existing community resources and programs	Improvements to administrative functions that positively impact community	Improvements to administrative functions that have no adverse impact	Unnecessary spending that does not extend to community or adversely impacts community	
		4 points	3 Points	2 points	1 points	0 Points	
Police Dept. Budget Decreases Max. 10 Points Circle all that apply		Large Reallocation of funds from internal department use to community resources 3.5 points	Small Reallocation of funds from internal department use to community resources 2.5 points	Large cuts to unnecessary spending that negatively impacts community 2.5 points	Small cuts to unnecessary spending that negatively impacts community 1.5 points	Decreases funding to community resources 0 points	
Resources made accessible (in existing budgets) Max. 10 points Circle One		Easy to access for general populations 4 points	Somewhat easy to access for general population 3 points	Somewhat difficult to access to general population 2 points	Difficult to access for general population 1 points	Not accessible to general population 0 points	

This rubric was developed by Project VOYCE participants: Caleb Washington, Azariaz Jones, Sikkim Smith-Trent

PROJECT VOYCE

Community Engagement		Promotes community healing-- Causes community harm					
Physical (harm) **Max. 10 points** **Circle all that apply**		Prevention of any physical/violent interactions between officers and individuals **3 points**	Promotes alternative solutions to physical protocols for responding to incidents **3 points**	Promotes positive in-person interactions between officers and individuals **3 points**	Promotes neutral interactions between officers and individuals **1 points**	Interactions/protocols that create potential to physically harm individuals or damage private property. **0 points**	
Psychological (harm) **Max. 10 points** **Circle One**		Protection/Prevention of any psychological interactions between officers and individuals **3.5 points**	Promotes alternative solutions to psychological protocols for responding to incidents **3.5 points**	Promotes restorative practices after possible incidents occur. **2 points**	Neutral: No possible risk for harm through interactions between the community and officers. **1 point**	Invites potential interactions that cause psychological harm through intimidation and/or humiliation **0 points**	
Promoting Trust **Max. 10 points** **Circle all that apply**		Requires transparency: shares of information that is accessible and easy for the public to understand and provides metrics for accountability. **2.5 points**	Offers new and innovative opportunities for collaboration between community and police that centers community member's best interest. **2.5 points**	Includes processes for accountability. **2.5 points**	Offers opportunity for police and community to develop relationships that foster mutual respect and reciprocity. **2.5 points**	Does not provide opportunities for trust building or negatively impacts relations between police and community. **0 points**	

This rubric was developed by Project VOYCE participants: Caleb Washington, Azariaz Jones, Sikkim Smith-Trent

Community Education **Max. 10 points** **Circle all that apply**		Extends opportunities for community to attend "Know Your Rights" trainings **2 Points**	Extends opportunities for community education on law enforcement policies and procedures **2 Points**	Extends opportunities for community education on Health and Safety **2 points**	Extends opportunities for community education on law enforcement data and statistics **2 points**	Extends opportunities for trainings on how to access law enforcement information **2 Points**	
Professional Development for Officers		**Promotes community healing--- Causes community harm**					
Officer continued education **Max. 10 points** **Circle all that apply**		Neurodiversity-centered practices and responses **2 Points**	Non-violent conflict resolution alternatives **2 Points**	Restorative Justice practices **2 Points**	De-escalation tactics that prevent demeaning or dehumanizing behaviors **2 Points**	Community conversations: Lived experiences of community members. Talking circles. **2 Points**	

GLOSSARY

Community Healing:
An ongoing and diverse restoration process for individuals, families, and the general population who have been adversely impacted and/or harmed by systems of power by:
- Repairing community relations and restoration of damaged individuals and possessions, through measures of accountability and provisions for resources and relief.
- The promotion of trust and community collaboration in the systems meant to serve community health, safety, and wellness.
- Prevention of emotional, physical, or psychological trauma *before and after* incidents occur that cause community harm.

This rubric was developed by Project VOYCE participants: Caleb Washington, Azariaz Jones, Sikkim Smith-Trent

Community Harm:
   Preventable and adverse effects (ie: violence, trauma, distrust) onto individuals, families, and the general population of people, that reinforce systems of power that impede on a community's ability to thrive, prosper, and succeed. A devaluation of self-determination and mental, physical, and environmental safety that requires accountability from a perpetuation of deliberate or subconscious suffering and distress.

Accountability:
   An obligation or willingness to accept responsibility, repercussions and in some instances consequences for one's actions.

Restorative Practices:
   Processes to build social capital and achieve self-discipline leading to improved social behavior and accountability through collaborative and mutual learning and decision making.

Restitution:

A legal action serving to make amends from injury, harm, and/or loss by imposing a financial or other obligation on the perpetrator.

Economic:
Pertaining to one's personal welfare involving resources of money, material possessions and opportunity for financial stability.

Financial:
Pertaining to monetary matters.

Impact :
   To have a strong effect or influence on someone or something.

Resources:

Supply of money, materials, community support roles, programs for relief (ie. Food, housing, mental health, legal counsel) , and other assets that can be drawn on by a person or community in order to thrive.

Accessibility:

ability to be reached and utilized benefit from some system or entity
- capable of being reached
- being within reach
- easy to speak to or deal with
- capable of being used or seen

Physical (harm):

Bodily injury or neglect; and/or damage to property or material possessions.

Psychological (harm): -

Injury of or affecting, or arising in the mind; related to the mental and emotional state of a person.

Trust

Firm belief in the reliability, truth, ability, or strength of someone or something.

Community

A social unit with commonality such as norms, religion, values, customs, or identity and/or a given geographical area (ie. town or neighborhood).

Community Engagement

(Neutral) Any interactions between police and the community; interactions can be positive or negative.

Education

The ongoing process of receiving or giving systematic instruction, or an enlightening experience.
-solutions

Youth:
A person under the age of 25.

_____