

2005

Performance Management in Local Law Enforcement Agencies

Jason Vibbart

Follow this and additional works at: <http://commons.emich.edu/honors>

Recommended Citation

Vibbart, Jason, "Performance Management in Local Law Enforcement Agencies" (2005). *Senior Honors Theses*. 75.
<http://commons.emich.edu/honors/75>

This Open Access Senior Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors College at DigitalCommons@EMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Senior Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@EMU. For more information, please contact lib-ir@emich.edu.

Performance Management in Local Law Enforcement Agencies

Abstract

Over the past twenty years, nothing has affected the way we structure, operate, and manage organizations more than the performance management movement. Performance management is a form of management in which an organization seeks to maximize its productivity by instituting a system of measures by which to gauge performance levels of each element of the organization. The aim of performance management is to achieve the goals of the organization as effectively and efficiently as possible. In the age of budget cuts that we live in today, performance management is being used more and more to help organizations effectively meet their objectives in an economically responsible manner.

Over the past several years, local governments have increasingly been faced with budget deficits. As it becomes apparent that there is not enough money available to fund necessary programs, and the funding is not forthcoming, local governments have been forced to reexamine themselves to find new ways to provide the essential services that they are obligated to provide. One of the results of this self-examination process has been the growth of performance management programs in many local governments and agencies.

One of the most expensive services that local governments provide is police service. As is the case in many local government agencies today, police departments are being asked to provide more services than ever before with less resources available to fund these new initiatives. Increasingly, local police departments are turning to performance management programs to maximize the effectiveness and the efficiency of the police services they are charged with providing. This paper will examine these performance management programs and look at the role this relatively new management concept is playing in local law enforcement agencies.

Degree Type

Open Access Senior Honors Thesis

Department

Political Science

Keywords

Goal setting in personnel management, Performance standards, Management, Police administration

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IN LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

By

Jason Vibbart
E00123393

A Senior Thesis Submitted to the

Eastern Michigan University

Honors Program

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for Graduation

With Honors in Political Science

Approved at Ypsilanti, Michigan, on this date

4/29/05

Introduction

Over the past twenty years, nothing has affected the way we structure, operate, and manage organizations more than the performance management movement. Performance management is a form of management in which an organization seeks to maximize its productivity by instituting a system of measures by which to gauge performance levels of each element of the organization. The aim of performance management is to achieve the goals of the organization as effectively and efficiently as possible. In the age of budget cuts that we live in today, performance management is being used more and more to help organizations effectively meet their objectives in an economically responsible manner.

Over the past several years, local governments have increasingly been faced with budget deficits. As it becomes apparent that there is not enough money available to fund necessary programs, and the funding is not forthcoming, local governments have been forced to reexamine themselves to find new ways to provide the essential services that they are obligated to provide. One of the results of this self-examination process has been the growth of performance management programs in many local governments and agencies.

One of the most expensive services that local governments provide is police service. As is the case in many local government agencies today, police departments are being asked to provide more services than ever before with less resources available to fund these new initiatives. Increasingly, local police departments are turning to performance management programs to maximize the effectiveness and the efficiency of the police services they are charged with providing. This paper will examine these performance management programs and look at the role this relatively new management concept is playing in local law enforcement agencies.

Definitions of Performance Management and Related Terms

Before one can go about examining and evaluating performance management programs in local law enforcement agencies, he or she must have a solid understanding of what performance management is. The problem is that there are many variations in the definition of performance management from source to source. As a result, it is important to make sure that the source that one chooses to obtain a definition from is a source that is credible and knowledgeable on the subject of performance management.

One of the more respected organizations that has studied performance management is the Urban Institute. The Urban Institute has assisted many local governments around the globe in implementing systems of performance management to help the governments solve community problems. The Urban Institute defines performance management as...

a system of regularly measuring the results (outcomes) of public agency programs, organizations, or individuals, and using this information to improve service delivery and adjust resource allocations. Through performance management the public sector can better understand and respond to the needs of its citizens and can more effectively communicate to them what it is accomplishing. Together with citizens, decision-makers identify outcomes and indicators, set targets, and measure progress towards them.

(Performance Management: Responding to Citizens' Needs 1)

The United States Navy provides a similar definition of performance management. According to the Navy, performance management is "the process of defining a mission and

desired outcomes, setting performance standards, linking budget to performance, reporting results, and holding public officials accountable for results (Strategic Sourcing Terminology 2).”

Regardless of which definition one prefers, a few key concepts of performance management are clear. In a performance management system, there must be some sort of goals or desired outcomes that the agency is expected to achieve. After these goals have been established, a system of measurement must be established to evaluate the agency’s progress towards meeting its goals. This system of measurement should include benchmarks and performance standards so that it can be easily determined if an agency is making progress towards its goals. Under performance management, the funding of the agency should be contingent on its performance (within reason). Public officials and administrators within the agencies should be held accountable for failure to meet expected benchmarks.

Unfortunately, being able to define performance management is only half of the battle. There are many other terms that relate to performance management that people often confuse with performance management itself. People commonly use terms such as performance measurement, performance reporting, and performance budgeting. All of these concepts are related to performance management but do not define performance management. In order to have a good understanding of performance management, you must be able to distinguish between performance management and other related, but different terms.

The term that is probably most often confused with performance management is performance measurement. According to the Interoperability Clearinghouse, an organization that “promotes mechanisms for assuring successful implementation of enterprise technology solutions,” performance measurement is “the process of developing measurable indicators that can be systematically tracked to assess progress in achieving predetermined goals and using such

indicators to assess progress in achieving these goals (ICH Glossary).” The United States Navy’s definition is very similar saying that performance measures are “qualitative measures or indicators of progress toward specified outcomes or benchmarks (Strategic Sourcing Terminology 2).” Both of these definitions make it clear that performance measurement is just that, a measurement. This is one critical aspect of performance management, but it fails to encompass the many other elements that comprise performance management.

Another term that is often confused with performance management is performance reporting. The definitions of performance reporting vary widely, but the essential element in most of the definitions is the same. Performance reporting is the process by which an agency communicates what it does. A lot of organizations have annual performance reports that detail what the organization has accomplished over the previous year. This is an important aspect of performance management, as agencies must be able to communicate the progress they are making towards their goals. However, like performance measurement, it is an element of performance management, not a synonym of performance management.

Performance budgeting is another element that is occasionally confused with performance management. According to the United States Navy, performance based budgeting is “budgeting which ties resources to outcomes. Instead of allocating resources to achieve quantitative output measures, resources are allocated to achieve qualitative outcomes (Strategic Sourcing Terminology 1).” Performance budgeting is the efficiency element of performance management. It requires examining what resources are necessary to achieve a certain objective and then budgeting in such a fashion that the necessary resources are provided. This method of budgeting makes agencies justify their budgetary allotment and show what they are going to

spend the money on. This is a dramatic change from the days when agencies were handed their budgetary allotment and were free to spend it as they pleased in pursuit of their goals.

A final term that is sometimes confused with performance management is performance funding. Performance funding is a part of the accountability system laid out under performance management. Performance funding is when an agency's performance in meeting its objectives is taken into consideration when allocating resources. If the agency has proven itself and is meeting its objectives, it will be more likely to get additional resources. If an agency is mishandling the resources it was provided and is failing to meet its objectives, they are likely to receive less funding with which to operate.

History of Performance Management

The origins of performance management as it pertains to government in the United States began in 1949 when President Herbert Hoover's Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch included a recommendation calling for a system of performance budgeting in the federal government. In 1961, the Defense Department introduced the Planning-Programming-Budgeting-System (PPBS). The goal of PPBS was "to integrate planning and budgeting functions through modern systems analysis, and cost benefit analysis to review alternatives, costs, and consequences (McMurty 2)." When President Johnson saw how well the system was working for the military, he ordered the program to be used government-wide in 1965. (McMurty 1-2)

The next major development in the history of performance management in the United States Government occurred in 1973. In 1973, President Nixon began a program called Management By Objectives. This program was an attempt at managerial reform that sought to

hold government agencies' administrators accountable for meeting stated goals and objectives. The new program also called for linking the achieving of these objectives with the agency's budget request. (McMurty 2)

President Carter also made an attempt at reform. In 1977, President Carter introduced Zero Base Budgeting to the federal government. This program sought to connect a program's expected results with the level of spending. (McMurty 2)

In 1993, Congress passed the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). The purpose of this legislation was to "promote greater efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability in federal spending by establishing a new framework for performance management and budgeting in federal agencies (McMurty 1)." The government is using this program in federal agencies to link the budgets of agencies to the expected results of the agencies, so the "spending decisions can be better aligned with anticipated performance (McMurty 1)."

Under the GPRA, every executive branch agency is expected to have an ongoing system of planning, evaluation, and reporting. The agencies are required to create strategic plans that stretch out six years in advance. Every three years these strategic plans must be updated. The agencies must also create annual performance plans in which the agency presents its what it hopes to accomplish in the current year. Finally, the agency must produce an annual report on program performance. This report is supposed to provide an evaluation of how well the agency achieved its goals.

As is often the case, the GPRA has been slow to take hold in the federal agencies. In large, bureaucratic agencies such as the Department of Homeland Security, it can take many years before a system like this is totally implemented. There has been a noticeable trend towards

performance management in the federal government since 1993. This trend is strengthening with each passing year.

As an outgrowth of the federal government's trend towards performance management, many state and local governments are beginning to use performance management programs as a way of holding agencies accountable for their performance. Since police departments are a governmental agency, it is no surprise that police departments are increasingly turning to performance management programs and concepts to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of their policing efforts.

Performance Management in Law Enforcement

As has been the case in many government agencies, performance management in the police department has been relatively slow to catch on. In my research, I failed to find any local law enforcement agencies in the nation who have completely implemented an all-encompassing system of performance management. However, I did find an increasing amount of law enforcement agencies that are beginning to use performance management based programs to help the agency achieve its mission and to justify the agency's allocation of resources to the governmental body that oversees the agency.

Undoubtedly the highest profile performance management related law enforcement program implemented to date has been the New York City Police Department's CompStat management model. CompStat stands for computer statistics, which are the key component of the CompStat system. According to Paul E. O'Connell, an associate professor in the department of criminal justice at Iona College, CompStat is "a sophisticated performance measurement system that reorders an organization's day-to-day operations, as well as its overall orientation

toward its core mission and goals (O'Connell 6)." The system is based upon the "compilation, distribution, and utilization of "real time" data in order to allow field managers to make better-informed and more effective decisions (O'Connell 6)."

There are four key principles associated with the CompStat model. The first principle is accurate and timely intelligence. Information on crimes is collected, analyzed by computer software and human investigators, and is then communicated to all of the members of the police department. Among the steps involved in this first CompStat step are a daily briefing of offenses for the officers, directed patrols based on the offense information, and assigning cases that need to be followed up to an investigator. These steps ensure that the officers on the street know what types of crimes are occurring, where the crimes are occurring, when the crimes are occurring, and how these crimes are occurring (*modus operandi*). Assigning cases that need to be followed up to investigators ensures that more officers will be available to patrol the streets. (COMSTAT 1).

The second principle of the CompStat system is rapid deployment. This deployment must be coordinated and focused. In their start of shift briefing, police officers are directed to patrol the areas where the problems are occurring. The police officers on patrol are not responsible for investigating the crime. They are simply watching for suspicious activity and/or watching for an individual who meets the description of the perpetrator and taking appropriate action when circumstances arise. Investigators from the police department's criminal investigations division will investigate any crime patterns and trends that the computer statistics are able to discern. (COMSTAT 1).

The third principle that the CompStat system emphasizes is effective police tactics. When a violent crime occurs, detectives are required to respond. Officers are required to canvass

the neighborhood for witnesses. In addition, detectives must interrogate all suspects arrested for index crimes. (Index crimes include murder and non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny and theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson (Uniform Crime Reporting 1). Other serious crimes such as kidnapping would also be investigated by detectives, but are not considered index crimes due to the crime's infrequency.) The interrogation of arrested individuals is important because it may help investigators determine if the individual is responsible for other crimes around the city.

The final principle in the CompStat system is persistent follow-up and assessment. Some of the steps undertaken in this step include debriefing all individuals arrested for felonies and re-interviewing witnesses and victims of crimes. This follow-up process also includes a weekly meeting involving top administrators, supervisors, and investigators in which crime-fighting efforts and strategies are discussed.

The effects of the CompStat program have been remarkable. Since the CompStat program began in 1994, crime has decreased dramatically. From 1993 to 1998, New York City had a 53% decline in burglaries, a 54% decline in robberies, and a 67% decline in murders (O'Connell 8). These declines were much larger than declines in crime reported across the nation during the same period of time. (The declines in crime had continued every year up to the time when this article was published in 2001.)

Due to the success of CompStat in New York City, many other police departments across the nation have begun to utilize the program. The New Orleans Police Department began using a variation of the program in 1996. Referred to as COMSTAT, the program led to "the largest reorganization and philosophy change in the Department's history (COMSTAT 1)." The police department was completely restructured. The department was divided into three bureaus;

operations, technical, and support, with the operations bureau comprising 85% of the department's manpower. The criminal investigations bureau was disbanded and district investigative units were formed in each of the city's eight police districts. The district investigative units were assigned to conduct all follow-up investigations in their districts, with the exception of the rapes and child abuse investigations. Specially trained investigators that serve the entire city, handle investigations of rape and child abuse. (COMSTAT 1).

The results of the COMSTAT program have been very evident in New Orleans as well. In just one year, reported index crimes fell in every district by at least 16%, with some districts lowering index crimes by as much as 34%. There was a decline in every category of index crime citywide. (COMSTAT 2).

One example of the success of the COMSTAT program occurred in the eastern district of the city. In 1997, three neighborhoods within the district were experiencing a rash of burglaries. The data on the burglaries was entered into the COMSTAT computer program and the program quickly identified the clusters of problem areas. Police officials immediately flooded the areas with patrol officers and investigators. Before long the police department had apprehended nine individuals in connection with thirty-five burglaries. Over \$50,000 worth of stolen property was recovered. (ComStat – New Democrats Online 2).

The New Orleans Police Department's website provides a good example of just how COMSTAT is used in performance management. Every week the department has a weekly review session involving the superintendent, the four assistant superintendents, the district commanders, and the district investigative unit commanders. During this meeting, the commander and investigative commander from each district are called upon to explain the crime trends within their district during the past week and the past month. The district commanders

must explain the offenses and provide an outline of how the district is combating any trends or patterns that emerge. The district investigative commanders of each district are “grilled about their knowledge of the crimes in their area (COMSTAT 2).” Each district commander and district investigative commander is expected to know what crimes are occurring, and not only react to the crimes, but take proactive measures to reduce the crimes. The commanders are also held responsible for such things as amount of time handling calls for service and police response time. There is a high level of accountability. The computer software identifies the patterns, and the police are held accountable for responding to the patterns.

Today, the use of CompStat and its derivatives has spread to police departments around the nation. A few of the police departments that use the program are Baltimore, Maryland; Charlotte, North Carolina; Indianapolis, Indiana; Los Angeles, California; Newark, New Jersey; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and Prince George’s County, Maryland (O’Connell 10). Even the agency at which I work, the University of Michigan Department of Public Safety uses a CompStat based program to identify areas to target for different law enforcement activities.

As the CompStat model continues to evolve, one of the interesting things that has begun to happen is that other types of agencies are starting to see how they could benefit from a CompStat based program. In New York City, the Corrections Department and the Department of Parks and Recreation have developed data-gathering programs to help coordinate services within their agencies. In 2000, New York City Mayor Rudolph Giuliani announced the creation of HealthStat, a program that coordinates more than twenty city agencies in working towards identifying and enrolling uninsured citizens in a health insurance program. New York City is not alone in the CompStat movement. After seeing the success of CompStat in its police department, the City of Baltimore, Maryland designed and implemented CitiStat, which

coordinates between all of the city agencies to provide all of the city's major services. (O'Connell 15-24).

Measuring Police Performance

A solid understanding of current performance measures in police departments is necessary before an individual can begin to develop more effective systems to measure the performance of the police. In most police departments, the primary measures of police performance are personnel evaluations.

According to Gary T. Marx in his article "Alternative Methods of Police Performance," "individual performance evaluation is generally not well developed in police departments (Marx 1)." According to Marx, the most common type of performance evaluation "consists of annual or semiannual subjective rating forms filled out by police supervisors, where persons (officers) are rated with respect to global categories such as initiative and appearance (Marx 1)." Many departments have abandoned performance evaluations altogether, as "they have become empty rituals, where almost everyone's performance is rated as satisfactory (Marx 1)."

When police officers are evaluated, they are typically evaluated on a number of different factors. The problem is that most of these factors have very little relevance in regard to their actual duties as a police officer. Typically evaluations of police officers focus in on issues such as conforming to the department's standards, personal appearance, and punctuality. Skills that relate to a police officers duty out on patrol such as using appropriate amounts of force, calming angry individuals, or aiding troubled individuals in seeking help are not taken into consideration. (Marx 1).

Even evaluations that do take into consideration police officers' patrol activities are flawed. Many evaluations tend to focus only on law enforcement activities. The problem with this is that police officers spend a small percentage of each day enforcing the law and dealing with crime. Most of a police officers day is spent responding to emergency service and order maintenance calls. These types of activities, which comprise the majority of the average police officer's time, are ignored in evaluations. Marx sums it up best saying, "We ironically see much attention paid to what police spend little time doing, and may not be able to affect greatly, and we see what police can have the most effect on, and spend most of their time doing, all but ignored (Marx 2)."

Another type of police performance evaluation system arose out of a 1950's movement to make police departments more bureaucratic. This system of evaluation seeks to identify "objective measures of productivity...as keys to performance (Marx 2)." The emphasis of this performance measurement system is to use quantitative indicators to determine a police officer's productivity. Activities such as the number of traffic tickets an officer writes, how many arrests and officer makes, and how many field interrogations an officer performs are taken into consideration. Detectives are evaluated by such things as how many crimes they solve by making arrests, how many of the people they arrest are convicted, and how much stolen property are they able to recover. This emphasis on production and numbers encourages officers to write a lot of tickets and make a lot of arrests. According to Marx, "the question, "How many arrests or tickets?" is asked rather than, "Was it wise to write a ticket, or make an arrest in this case?" (Marx 2)."

Knowing how many tickets police officers in a police department write in a day or how many arrests the department's officers make in a year is not going to help the police department

improve its performance. If a police department truly wants to implement a system of performance management, an entirely new system of measurements needs to be created. Performance evaluations need to be redesigned so as to produce meaningful results that accurately measure what a police officer spends his or her time doing. In addition, performance measures need to be designed and implemented for the police department as a whole. According to an article produced by the Community Policing Consortium entitled "The Police Organization in Transition," "adherence to measurement of the limited dimensions of arrests made, clearance rates, speed of attending calls, and number of accidents reported will not enhance delivery of a new strategic plan for local policing (The Police Organization in Transition 1)."

A good foundation for the implementation of a performance management system in a police department would be to revamp the system of performance evaluation to a system that would provide information on the quality of police work and not just the quantity. Numbers are obviously still important, but the quality behind those numbers is what matters the most. The new system should take into consideration the fact that only a small percentage of police work involves dealing with crime. All of the other aspects of a police officer's job need to be included as well.

According to Gary Marx, three areas that are usually neglected in a prototypical performance evaluation of a police officer are the use of force by the officer, arrests and civil liberties, and the quality of emergency service that the officer provides. These are three areas that would be relatively easy to measure and would be a good foundation for further performance evaluations.

One of the most important powers that a police officer has is the authority to use force, and even take a human life if necessary. Police officers are called upon to use force to make

arrests, to break up domestic disturbances, or to protect citizens and occasionally themselves from harm. Unfortunately, the use of force is also a power that is occasionally abused by the police. It is important that any system of performance evaluation examines a police officer's use of force. A police officer that is eager to use force and is overzealous in his or her use of force should not be allowed on the street. At the same time, a police officer that is too passive and is hesitant to use force when necessary should not be out on the street either.

According to Marx, there are a number of indicators of the use of force that can be measured. Statistics like the percentage of arrests involving force, the number of times the police drew a weapon (baton, pepper spray, firearm, etc.) and used a weapon, the extent of injury and homicide involved in police-citizen encounters, and the percentage of an officer's arrests in which the subject resisted arrest and/or assaulted the police officer. According to Marx, if indicators such as these were collected, after a period of time judgments could be made about how appropriately a police officer is using force. Officers that appear to be using force disproportionately should be reviewed.

The quality of the arrests that a police officer makes is another area that Marx feels needs to be included in performance evaluations. Many times, arresting an individual involves the use of discretion on the part of the police officer. A police officer must follow the standard of probable cause to make an arrest. Occasionally the police make mistakes and arrest the wrong person, or arrest somebody without meeting the standard of probable cause. It is important for a police department to know if officers are making quality arrests. Marx suggests keeping track of the percentage of people an officer arrests that are charged with a crime, the proportion of cases that actually go to trial, and the proportion of cases that are thrown out because of mistakes made

by the police. If this information were collected, the police department would be able to compare police officers to see if particular officers were habitually making bad arrests.

A final area that Marx advocates including in performance evaluations for police officers is the quality of emergency services they provide. Providing emergency services is one of the primary duties of a police officer, and takes up the majority of a police officers time. Unfortunately, the general public often overlooks police efforts in this area and tends to view police officers as crime-fighters rather than emergency service providers like firefighters and paramedics. Marx finds it ironic that “those areas where police spend the most time, are most directly helpful to people, and probably are most effective (compared at least to effectiveness against crime) are those least rewarded and most hidden from public view (Marx 4).”

It would be a bit more difficult to develop a system of measurement to gauge the quality of emergency services that a police officer provides. To begin with, Marx proposes a simple counting of the emergency service incidents that police officers respond to. This statistic could be disseminated to the public and would help to suppress the notion that police officers are only crime fighters. It would also give the department an idea of which officers are providing specific kinds of services and how often they are providing it. Other methods that could be used to measure the quality of police emergency services include having supervisors review an officer's service activity, conducting follow-up surveys of citizens involved in situations at which the police provided emergency services, assessments of a police officer's awareness of agencies that provide services to those who are in need, and possibly even setting up simulated service incidents for police officers to respond to. If such data were collected, supervisors would have a better idea of what areas police officers could use further training in. This would allow the police department to improve the quality of service it provides to the community. (Marx 4)

Undoubtedly, the biggest difficulty in creating an all-encompassing system of performance management for a local police department is trying to develop a system of measurements that accurately reflects the performance of the entire police department. Measuring an individual officer's performance would be simple in comparison to measuring the performance of an entire police department. CompStat is a wonderful system for crunching numbers and identifying trends for police departments to focus on, but crime fighting is only one of the roles of a police department. Things like providing services, crime prevention, and order maintenance also need to be taken into consideration on a department-wide basis.

An important trend that police departments should consider is that what police officers get measured for typically gets done. If the police officers know that they are being measured based on how many tickets they write, or how many arrests they make, the officers will undoubtedly write a lot of tickets and make a lot of arrests. For this reason, police departments should have visions that "aim at effectiveness and not just efficiency; at outcomes and not just outputs; and at quality, not just quantity (The Police Organization in Transition 1)." Changing the current systems of performance evaluations to systems of measurements similar to what Gary Marx proposes would be a positive first step, but additional changes need to be made if a police department truly wants to implement a system of performance management.

Ultimately, the police department is responsible to the community that it serves. A police department can create all the systems of performance measurement that it wants, but they are essentially meaningless unless the police department takes into consideration the desires of the community it serves. Any successful system of performance management in a police department needs to measure "partnership relations" between the department and the community. Things such as a reduced fear of crime in the community, an increased confidence in the police

department by the citizens the department serves, and fewer complaints being made against police officers should be taken into consideration. (The Police Organization in Transition 1)

There are a couple of different ways in which a police department could measure the community's satisfaction with the police department. The easiest and most effective way to gauge the community's satisfaction with the police department is to conduct surveys and send out questionnaires to citizens of the community. The surveys could be designed to solicit citizen feedback on a variety of issues ranging from their views on crime in the community, the quality of service that the department provides, and what things the citizens feel the police department needs to improve on. Having this information would greatly assist police departments in figuring out what things they are doing right, and what things could be done better. If police departments can use this information to improve in areas that the public feels the department is under-performing in, the community will take notice and will have a higher level of satisfaction with the police department.

Community meetings are another medium in which police departments could measure the community's satisfaction with the police department. Some meetings could be specifically between the police and community organizations and neighborhood associations. Other meetings would be open to any citizen who would like to attend. These meetings have the potential to be especially beneficial in measuring police performance. Not only would citizens be able to indicate what areas the police are doing well in and what areas could be improved, but they would also be able to further elaborate on ways to make the improvements that they desire. Meetings would also allow police officers and members of the community to build beneficial relationships that would undoubtedly increase the level of trust that the citizens have for the police. If the citizens feel they can trust the police, they are more likely to confide in the police

about situations that they see occurring. Sometimes, a person sees something that seems out of place, but is not in and of itself enough to call the police about. But if the citizen knows a couple of local police officers from the community meetings that he or she has attended, that individual is much more likely to share his or her concerns with the police officers than he or she would otherwise be. The information may turn out to be nothing, or it may be just the piece of information that the police needed to solve a serious crime. Regardless of what the information turns out to be, it is likely that the police would never have received it if not for the community meetings and the relationships formed as a result. This is a basic component of community policing, but it would benefit performance management programs as well. Anything that will help the police improve their level of service to the community is a step in the right direction.

Police departments in Australia have implemented a new system of performance measures that might be beneficial if introduced in American law enforcement agencies. The system is known simply as activity measurement. According to an article produced by the Australian Institute of Criminology entitled "Police Performance and Activity Measurement," activity measurement "is a method by which the allocation of an input (such as staff time) to a range of activities or outputs is monitored so that the links between them become more apparent (Dadds and Scheide 2)."

There are a couple of different ways in which police departments can implement a system of activity measurement. Some police departments use daily timesheets that break down every single activity that a police officer does. At the University of Michigan Department of Public Safety, every activity that a police officer participates in from morning briefing all the way through the end of his or her shift is documented. When dispatch sends an officer to respond to an incident, dispatch starts a card on that incident. The time the officer is dispatched, the time

the officer arrives, and the time the officer is complete are all documented by dispatch. The individual officer is also responsible for filling out a daily activity sheet that contains much of the same information that the dispatchers records. The daily activity sheet also requires officers at the end of each shift to tabulate how many minutes were spent on different types of activities. Police supervisors use this information to calculate how much time officers are spending on different activities.

Most of the police departments in Australia utilize a different system of activity measurement. In the typical Australian police department where a system of activity measurement has been implemented, activity surveys are conducted once or twice a year. These activity surveys take place over the course of a one or two week period. All of the police department's staff members complete the survey. Once the results are gathered, the time spent on each activity is tabulated and then these statistics are used to project the time police personnel spend on each activity over the course of the year.

Regardless of which method of activity measurement a police department uses, there are a couple of possible benefits that are provided. First and foremost, this system would allow police administrators to measure how much of the department's resources are going towards a specific output. Between eighty and ninety percent of a typical police department's budget is dedicated to personnel costs. Because the cost of personnel makes up such a tremendous percentage of a police department's budgetary allotment, if one can figure out what services the personnel are devoting their time to, one can calculate what services the department is spending the most money on. Once it is determined what police officers are spending their time doing, and calculate the average wage of the police officers, the police administrators will be able to see how the department's money is being spent. With this information in hand, police administrators

can better determine how to allocate department resources to meet expected outcomes. (Dadds and Scheide 2).

Another benefit of implementing a system of activity measurement is that it will provide the police department with useful data to show the community what services the police department is providing. With the data provided by this system of measurement, the police could show the community exactly how their tax dollars are being spent. In an age where more and more citizens are questioning how the government is spending their tax dollars, this system would help in answering these questions. Citizens would be able to see what services the police department is providing to the community, and how much these services are costing. If the citizens can see that their tax dollars are being used effectively and efficiently for the benefit of the community, they are more likely to support giving the police department more money, if and when the department needs it. (Dadds and Scheide 3).

Implementing a System of Performance Management in a Police Department

It has already been established that creating a system of performance management for a police department is very difficult, in large part because it is very difficult to measure what a police officer does. For this reason, no police department in the United States (or at least no police department that I can find any information on) has implemented a comprehensive system of performance management. However, as more and more communities begin to experience budget deficits and start cutting funding to various city agencies, it will be important for police departments to be able to justify their existence.

As an example of what can happen when a police department cannot justify to city administrators that they are getting their money's worth out of the department, look no further

than Mount Clemens, Michigan. Just last week, the City of Mount Clemens decided to disband its 113-year-old police department. The city commission conducted a study and decided that contracting for police services with the Macomb County Sheriff's Department would save the city \$1.5 million. If police departments don't start placing more of a focus on effectiveness and efficiency, there are going to be fewer and fewer police departments as communities begin to move in the direction of contracting out police services.

As the situation in Mount Clemens shows, the time to debate whether or not performance management is necessary in police departments is quickly coming to pass. The answer is obvious. It is crunch time for police departments. The police departments are either going to start proving to the community and the administrators that the department is providing effective police services for a reasonable price, or they are going to shut down in favor of a more efficient alternative. The question police departments should be asking themselves is how to implement a system of performance management.

In my opinion, the best way to begin implementing a system of performance management in a police department is to see which police services are valued most by the community. Police departments, like any other governmental agency exist to serve the community. It is the community that provides the funding for the police department in the form of tax dollars. It is ultimately up to the community to decide if they are getting the services from the police department that they are paying for. For this reason, if I were a police administrator looking to implement a system of performance management, my first move would be to involve the community, and establish relationships with community members.

Cultivating a relationship with the citizens and identifying what police services the residents of a community desire the most can be a difficult task for a police department. Just

because the residents of one community want the police to focus on order maintenance doesn't necessarily mean the residents of another community feel the same way. These variations and differences of opinions undoubtedly vary within the city as well. Residents in a neighborhood that is experiencing a lot of burglaries think that the police should be focused on fighting crime. A few blocks away, in a neighborhood that isn't having any major criminal activity, the residents may think the police should be paying more attention to quality of life issues such as noise ordinances and dog leash laws. Even next-door neighbors will give differing opinions on what the police should be doing. These variations make it very difficult to determine where to start.

The ideal way to figure out what things the community believes the police department should be focusing on is to ask the residents of the community. The most practical way to do this is by conducting a community survey. The objective of the survey should be to get a sense of how the citizens view the police department. The survey should be designed in a way that measures the citizens' knowledge of police services and their attitudes about the police service in the municipality. The survey should also be designed in such a way that the police department is able to find out if the community is satisfied. If the community is happy, that's great. If the community is unhappy, then the police need to find out why and then use this information to try and solve the problem.

The survey could also be used to gather data on crime and disorder problems within the community. A series of questions such as "In your opinion, what is the biggest problem that the police should be concerned about in your neighborhood?" could be asked to get a feel for what people see as being problematic. The survey should be constructed in such a way that the police can identify the neighborhood where the survey respondent lives. If a lot of citizens from one

neighborhood are concerned about the same issue(s), the police can take a closer look at that particular neighborhood to see what can be done about the problem.

Anonymity is an important factor in any public survey, but particularly is important in surveys that involve community opinions on police performance. If people are afraid of the police, they aren't going to respond to the police. If a citizen has a legitimate negative comment on police performance, and he or she thinks the police department might be able to trace the comment back to him or her, they won't write it. It might be better if the survey was conducted by the city council for the police. At the very least, the survey responses should be sent to city council or another governmental agency to avoid the appearance of any improprieties by the police and to encourage people who are not satisfied with the police to send in their surveys without any fear of police retaliation. The data could then be compiled and given to the police department without giving the police any chance to figure out who wrote what.

Even though it may be costly, the ideal way to conduct the survey would be to send every single household and apartment a survey. By sending everybody a survey, everyone in the community will know that the police department cares about what the citizens think and values citizen input. Unfortunately it is often impractical to send everybody a survey, especially in a large city. If sending every household a survey is going to be too time consuming or too costly, another way of selecting the sample population must be determined. The goal should be to have a sample that is as close of a representation of the community's population as possible. A representative sample will help to ensure that the survey results are an accurate reflection of the community's feelings.

Once the survey results are in and analyzed, the police department can determine what the community feels the police department needs to focus on. In an ideal world, the results

would overwhelmingly indicate one problem area that the police need to zero in on. Unfortunately, this is not an ideal world, and the survey is likely to identify several problem areas that the police need to improve on. At least the survey will provide the police with an idea of where to start.

There are a couple of benefits to involving the citizens of the community early on when trying to implement a performance management system. The first benefit of working with the citizens is that the police department will be able to figure out what services the community values the most, and which services they would like to see improved. Knowing what the community expects from its police department will help to establish goals and provide focus for a system of performance management.

Another benefit to getting the community involved is that it would provide a forum through which the police department could build relationships with citizens in the community. By reaching out to the members of the community and asking them what they would like to see to police department doing, the citizens will feel that the police value their ideas. This will establish trust, and hopefully increase community satisfaction. Having the trust and satisfaction of the community will definitely be advantageous to the department in getting additional funding approved in the future.

After determining what services the community wants the police to emphasize, the logical next step in the performance management process would be to implement a system of activity measurement to see how the police department's allocation of resources lines up with the community's desires for particular services. If the community wants the police department to focus on order maintenance activities, the department's allocation of resources should reflect this. If order maintenance is the number one priority of the community, than ideally, the activity

that a police officer devotes most of his or her time to should be order maintenance. If the department's allocation of resources or the officer's average daily activities are not in line with what the community expects, changes need to be made to address the concerns of the community.

A third step in the performance management process would be to reassess the system of performance evaluation used to measure the performance of police personnel. New measures should be developed that focus on quality of police services and not just quantity of police services. Although the measurement of all police services needs to be re-evaluated to reflect the quality of police services, the first areas targeted should be the services that the community most desires. The police personnel need to know what services are desired and what they are going to be measured on. As was mentioned earlier in this paper, what police officers are measured for typically gets done. Knowing that they are specifically being measured on the quality of police service they are providing will hopefully motivate the officers to reassess themselves and their personal style of policing and take steps to improve the quality of the services they render.

Chances are good that major changes aren't necessary. If citizens want to see more of a police presence in their neighborhood, maybe the officer assigned to that neighborhood can make a special effort to park the car and walk that neighborhood once a day and get to know some of the people who live and work there. If citizens are complaining that the department is writing too many traffic tickets, maybe the officers can start issuing more verbal warnings for minor traffic offenses.

Finally, the most important step in the performance management process for a police department is communication. The first type of communication that the department needs to focus on is within the police department. Everybody within the police department needs to be on

the same page in regards to what the community expects from its police department. Police personnel need to be told what is expected of them and what they are going to be measured on. They also need to know that they will be held accountable. Good performance should be rewarded. Bad performance should be punished.

The second type of communication that the department needs to focus on is communication with the community. A police department could have the most effective and efficient system of performance management on the planet, and nobody would really notice unless the police department brought attention to it. The police department needs to show the community what it is doing to address citizen's concerns and expectations. The police department should release statistics that show how the department allocates its resources in a way that reflects the desires of the community. Inviting citizens on ride-alongs with police officers to give citizens a first-hand view of the new police focus on quality would also be beneficial.

Getting citizens involved with the police department provides the police with a valuable opportunity to build relationships with citizens and find out what citizens want from the police. It also provides the police department with an opportunity to really make a good impression on citizens by following up on their concerns. If a citizen complains that cars are constantly disregarding a stop sign in their neighborhood, and the police department promptly begins extra traffic-enforcement patrols in the area, the citizen will likely be left with a good impression of the police department. It is small things like these that will make all of the difference when it comes to getting the next police department bond issue passed.

Conclusion

As we continue moving forward into the 21st century, many local governments are going to be forced to re-examine themselves and find ways to provide more services with fewer resources. Police departments, along with other local government agencies, are going to have to justify their existence. Why should the taxpayers pay the police department this amount when the community can contract with the sheriff's department for a significantly lower amount?

To combat these types of questions, police departments are going to have to make some major philosophical and operational changes. For decades, police departments have viewed themselves as being invincible. Police departments realized that budgets might get cut a bit here and there, and staffing levels may fluctuate, but the thought was that police services were indispensable to the community that the police department would never go away. As the situation in Mount Clemens demonstrates, this is not a safe assumption anymore. Police departments need to start viewing themselves as service-providing businesses with the citizens of the community being their customers. In the business world, businesses must operate effectively and efficiently to provide the customer with top-quality service at a reasonable price. If a business isn't providing top-quality service or if it is charging too high of a price, the customers leave and find other businesses that will give them what they are looking for. This is what happened to the police department in Mount Clemens and in many other localities as well.

Although many police departments are in jeopardy of being dissolved, the situation is not entirely hopeless. Communities still prefer to have their own police department so that they can have some degree of control over the police services in their municipality. If police departments can start operating more effectively and efficiently, communities will be happy to keep the police

departments around. For police departments, and many other local governmental agencies, the answer is performance management.

By implementing an all-encompassing system of performance management, the police can improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the services they provide. If police departments begin to work more closely with the citizens of the community, the police can determine what services the citizens' value the most. Activity measurement can be used to see if the police department is allocating its resources in a manner that reflects the desires of the community. A system of performance measurement can be implemented to gauge the quality of the services the police are providing. Finally, implementing a system performance management would provide police departments with information that could be disseminated to the community to show how the police are managing their resources in a way that effectively and efficiently addresses the desires of the community.

The situation is desperate. The costs associated with operating police departments are spiraling out of control. Many communities are contemplating dissolving their police departments in favor of contracting with other police agencies to provide similar services at a lower cost to the taxpayers. Fortunately, performance management is capable of rescuing police departments from the inefficient ways that have many of them teetering on the brink of being disbanded. The answer is clearly performance management. The time to act is now.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Bjorn, and Tom Fagerhaug. Performance Measurement Explained – Designing and Implementing Your State-of-the-Art System. Milwaukee: ASQ Quality Press, 2002.
- Bennett, Wayne W. and Karen M. Hess. Management and Supervision in Law Enforcement – 3rd Edition. Belmont: Wadsworth, 2001.
- “ComStat.” New Democrats Online. 21 Apr. 2005.
http://www.ndol.org/ndol_ci.cfm?kaid=139&subid=271&contentid=3554
- “COMSTAT.” New Orleans Police Department. 19 Apr. 2005.
<http://www.nopdonline.com/comstat.htm>
- Dadds, Vikki, and Tammy Scheide. “Police Performance and Activity Measurement.” Australian Institute of Criminology. Nov. 2000. 24 Apr. 2005.
<http://www.aic.gov.au/publications/tandi/ti180.pdf>
- Hunter, George. “Police Change Divides Residents.” The Detroit News. 22 Apr. 2005. 23 Apr. 2005. <http://www.detroitnews.com/2005/macomb/0504/22/C05-158361.htm>
- Iannone, Nathan F. and Marvin P. Iannone. Supervision of Police Personnel – 6th Edition. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 2001.
- ICH Glossary – Performance Measurement. Interoperability Clearinghouse. 18 Apr. 2005.
<http://www.ichnet.org/glossary.htm>
- Marx, Gary T. “Alternative Measures of Police Performance.” 19 Apr. 2005.
<http://web.mit.edu/gtmarx/www/alt.html>
- McMurtry, Virginia A. “Performance Management and Budgeting in the Federal Government: Brief History and Recent Developments.” Congressional Research Service – Library of Congress. 16 Mar. 2005. 5 Apr. 2005.
<http://knownet.hhs.gov/performance/performancemanagement.pdf>
- O’Connell, Paul E. “Using Performance Data for Accountability: The New York Police Department’s CompStat Model of Police Management.” The PricewaterhouseCoopers Endowment for the Business of Government. Aug. 2001. 14 Apr. 2005.
http://www.businessofgovernment.org/main/publications/grant_reports/details/index.asp?...
- Performance Management: Responding to Citizens’ Needs. Urban Institute. 17 Mar. 2005
<http://www.urban.org/content/PolicyCenters/International/Focus/Perfo....>
- Strategic Sourcing Terminology. United States Navy. 18 Apr. 2005.
http://strategicsourcing.navy.mil/reference_documents/defs.cfm?ltr=P
- Travis, Jeremy. “Measuring What Matters Part Two: Developing Measures of What Police Do.”

National Institute of Justice. Nov. 1997. 14 Apr. 2005.
<http://www.mrsc.org/subjects/pubsafe/le/le-service.aspx>

“The Police Organization in Transition – Section F. Measuring Performance Management.”
Community Policing Consortium. 19 Apr. 2004.
<http://www.communitypolicing.org/prorgtrans/secf.html>

“Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Summary System Frequently Asked Questions.”
Department of Justice – Federal Bureau of Investigation. 21 Apr. 2005
<http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm>

Weisel, Deborah. “Conducting Community Surveys – A Practical Guide for Law Enforcement Agencies.” Bureau of Justice Statistics – Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
Oct. 1999. 14 Apr. 2005. <http://www.ncic.org/Library/015653>