The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

A "Partnership" Report
Ada County Sheriffs Office
BSU Department of Criminal Justice

Performance Criteria under a Problem Oriented Policing Model: A Report Prepared for the Ada County Sheriffs Office.

Prepared by

John P. Crank
Department of Criminal Justice
Boise State University

FINAL REPORT

Approved By: _Louise Lofte_

Date: _4-22-00_

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Performance Criteria under a Problem Oriented Policing Model:
A Report Prepared for the Ada County Sheriffs Office.

OVERVIEW

In the Winter of 1987, the Ada County Sheriff's Office (ACSO) initiated a review of then current patrol procedures. In late spring of 1988, the department began to consider transformation of patrol service delivery to a "beat integrity" model organized to facilitate problem oriented policing (POP). The ACSO selected a generalist rather than a specialist model of organizational transformation, adapting the work of all patrol officers to a POP service model.

In the spring of 1988, the Sheriffs Office was collaborating with the Department of Criminal Justice at Boise State University on a partnership grant (grant # 96-IJ-CX-0085). The principal tasks of the project had been completed. The project manager, Dr. John Crank, was invited by Commander Bill Chalk, personnel director of the ACSO, to assist in the development of performance evaluation criteria for deputies working under a POP model. The ACSO Personnel Director asked Dr. Crank to provide a review and recommendations for performance evaluations in a POP environment with the following considerations in mind:

1. Provide recommendations on a personal development assessment program that also will have credibility with the rank-and-file.

2. Suggest a process that employees can use to improve areas of weakness.

3. Expand the skillset assessed by peer evaluation to include problem oriented policing.

1

Dr. Crank contacted Dr.Jeffries at the National Institute of Justice, and approval was provided to conduct this task and produce a product for the ACSO as part of the partnership grant. The enclosed document is that product. The National Institute of Justice approved an extension of the partnership grant so that Dr. Crank could assist in the development of evaluation protocols for the ACSO.

This document represents the findings and recommendations produced by Dr. Crank. It is organized into 4 sections. Section I is a brief statement of the purposes of the document. Section II describes current efforts of the ACSO to change to a problem oriented policing service delivery style. Section III discusses the role of performance evaluation in a problem oriented policing context. Particular issues pertinent to the evaluation of problem oriented policing are discussed. The contributions of each rank to problem oriented policing are developed, with consideration given to how that rank can also contribute to performance evaluation. Section IV examines performance evaluation measurement processes and products. Three different processes and two products are presented for deputies. Team and sergeant performance evaluation are also considered. Recommendations are presented throughout the text of the document.

SECTION I: PURPOSES

Three general considerations guide this product.

1. The development of performance criteria under a problem oriented policing model is not clearly distinguishable from the development of a task structure needed to implement problem oriented policing. This report takes a broad view of the development of performance criteria as a corollary outcome of problem oriented policing. Simply put, officers should be measured by what they do.

2. Performance evaluation under a POP model is more than a

2

reconsideration of measurement criteria -- it also reflects a different way to think about police work and accountability for the work product. Consequently, this document also considers fundamental philosophical issues and problems associated with POP implementation. Developing criteria for assessment necessitates that I also consider the POP task structure implemented by the ACSO.

3. A comprehensive implementation of POP affects all positions and ranks in an agency. Consequently, to develop performance criteria it becomes necessary to think about and assess the contributions of all ranks, including the Sheriff and commanders, to POP. A need exists to consider performance criteria for all agency ranks, a task included in the report.

This paper provides a review of literature on performance evaluation and provides recommendations for the development of performance criteria for the evaluation of problem oriented policing in the ACSO. This task must of necessity deal with the reward/discipline infrastructure as it affects deputies and the implementation of community problem-solving. This document consequently addresses issues of problem oriented policing implementation as well as broad accountability processes.

This document contains discussions of many elements pertinent to the implementation of POP, as well as of infrastructural career development, of which performance is a part. While this document is discursive at times, I believe that it can be constructive in the development and presentation of recommendations.

> **Performance evaluation criteria, to be relevant, must be designed in the spirit of both the process and the philosophy of Problem Oriented Policing under a SARA model.**

3

Many researchers describe performance appraisal in terms of the agency itself. According to this idea of performance evaluation, public surveys are used to asses the extent to which the department is successful in improving quality of life or in reducing fear of crime. Citizens are also frequently asked about the quality of their relationships with deputies. A consideration of this dimension of performance evaluation is beyond our purposes, though I will briefly discuss public surveys in the section on middle manager accountability. The task assigned herein is to provide a means to asses the performance of individual officers. For that reason, broader considerations of organizational outputs and how they're received by citizens will generally not be considered.

SECTION II: THE ADA COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE AND POP: THE TRANSITION

Overview: Problem oriented policing. In the first part of this document I will review the current efforts of the ACSO to shift its service delivery style to a POP model based on the concept of "beat integrity." The ACSO has initiated substantive changes toward the adoption of a community policing model. This section will document the history and nature of the changes the Sheriffs Office has undertaken in its efforts to shift the delivery of patrol services to Problem Oriented Policing.

The Ada County Sheriff's Office (ACSO) is in the process of dramatic change in its patrol services division. Traditionally, the ACSO has provided patrol services consistent with a traditional model of reactive policing. However, the Sheriff has recently initiated steps toward the provision of community policing and problem-oriented policing strategies to complement traditional patrol. In the small communities of Eagle and Kuna the ACSO is establishing a police sub-station and assigned personnel to the station. The ACSO is also implementing problem-oriented policing among its patrol officers.

Traditional delivery. The ACSO has provided patrol services using a traditional, time-honored delivery system. The traditional delivery of patrol services is as follows. Ada

4

County was divided into 5 areas of responsibility, along with two small contract cities, Eagle and Kuna. A "North Area" car was responsible for the North side of Ada County,. and a "South Area" car was responsible for the South side. The remainder of cars on patrol were designated "rove," and could go wherever they wanted to in the county. They were not specifically assigned responsibility for any of the designated county areas. The rovers did random preventive patrol and provided assist when needed. Nor were the North and South cars restricted to those areas: They could go where they wanted to if needed. On any particular shift, there would be a total of 3 to 6 cars on patrol across the county.

Beats were assigned primarily on the basis of seniority. The Sergeants could select whom they wanted to serve on patrol across the beats. There was, as I was told, no "beat integrity," a sense of personal responsibility for particular beats. Officers were rotated across locations and allowed to rove where they wanted. There was no sense of accountability linked to particular geographic locations, including the five areas. Moreover, if an officers was needed to backup another officer, the closest officer would provide backup. This could result in a circumstance in which large sections of the county were effectively unpoliced for short periods of time.

The transition. The following is a brief history of the transition to a "beat integrity" model of service delivery. In December, 1997, the ACSO was informed that the city of Eagle was looking for other contract services. The ACSO entered into negotiations to redesign their services there in order to retain the contract. At the time, two deputies were assigned to Eagle.

The Sergeant currently in charge of the transition to POP, Sergeant Freeman, had recently moved from the jail supervisory responsibility to patrol supervision. He was asked to assess the Eagle contract and provide recommendations. He met with the mayor and city council and discussed the possibility of moving to a service delivery model tied to principles of community policing. A third deputy was also assigned to Eagle.

5

A small group of officers began to reconsider the traditional delivery of services. Sgt. Freeman met with Lieutenant Bowers and a School Resource Officer in Kuna, who was beginning to implement innovating programs consistent with community policing. The Sheriff and Capt. Douthit also became involved, and the Sheriff indicated a strong interest in the shift in patrol services. Following these deliberations, in mid January, 1998, the Sheriff decided to initiate a county-side change in patrol services. In May, the Sheriff made Sgt. Freeman the patrol Commander, who at that point expanded training and review in preparation for the county-wide change in patrol services.

The WRICOPS report. In March, 1998, the Western Regional Institute for Community Oriented Public Safety (WRICOPS) was invited to conduct an assessment of the preparedness of the ACSO for community policing. WRICOPS produced a "Community Policing Assessment Report" whose purpose was to "build a comprehensive picture of the community policing efforts" of the ACSO (WRICOPS, 1998: 4). A full review of that report is beyond the purposes of this document. However, it called for general organizational changes consistent with contemporary conceptions of community policing, including the decentralization of command authority to the line level, the training focused on community policing, clarification of the roles of deputies under a community policing philosophy, and development of performance guidelines.

The latter WRICOPS recommendation, the development of performance guidelines, identifies the following "strategic recommendations:" It is reprinted here because it reflects the current spirit and purpose of the document I am preparing here, and locates this document in the historical context of Sheriff's efforts to convert to a community policing model. The ACSO is currently addressing these recommendations in the recommended spirit.

> 1. Both the process and criteria for evaluation of Deputies should reflect the vision, mission, and value statement, and should measure employee actions that further the community policing mission (See section 4 of this document).

6

2. The department should evaluate the potential effectiveness and negative impact of the new evaluation system being considered. Particular concerns were raised about the perception that the new system was negative, "only focusing on ...negatives of the individual." (WRICOPS, 1998: 24). (This concern is common to POP implementation and evaluation, and is discussed throughout this document).

3. Community policing principles should be integrated into the evaluation instrument and process. "Focus on results in addition to, or in lieu of, counting statistics such as the number of arrests, citations, traffic stops, etc." (WRICOPS, 1998: 24).

The ACSO has undertaken a redesign of the delivery of patrol services. Teams will be responsible for the delivery of patrol services. An officer on each team is assigned to each area, with only a few officers assigned to STEP (selected traffic enforcement patrol). This redesign is intended to provide deputies on patrol with "beat integrity." By beat integrity is meant that officers will be responsible for their particular areas. This is intended to reinforce deputies' commitments to and concerns with the problems, people, and issues that occur in the various areas of the county.

The new design coincides with the shift to a problem oriented policing (POP) model of policing. Officers are currently undergoing monthly block training for the SARA model of problem identification and resolution. The beat integrity model of patrol, providing officers with locatable responsibilities within the county, will dovetail with an expanded mission aimed at increasing their skills in problem solution. The model contains both expanded responsibilities and greater empowerment of deputies. It is a true community policing model, thoughtfully applied to a predominantly rural environment by committed leadership.

The new team structure facilitates cost-efficient training. The ACSO provides a training intensive environment, requiring in-service block training monthly. This has been

7

expensive, because work schedules did not permit for patrol coverage and training. Training had to be conducted on overtime hours, in order to preserve county wide patrol coverage. Under the new model, two teams are responsible for services on each shift. The teams overlap schedules one day each week. This design facilitates training by permitting officers to break away during overlapping shifts to take training without losing patrol coverage. In this way, the new model of service delivery is cost-efficient.

The press conference. On Wednesday, August 19, Sheriff Vaughn Killeen held a press conference announcing the restructuring of patrol and the transition to a POP model of service delivery. The press conference was held on the small town of Eagle, one of the communities that had contracted with the ACSO for services and was to be a primary beneficiary of the expanded services.

Sheriff Killeen noted that the patrol style currently in place, a team style of county-wide patrol, did not provide the level of community responsiveness currently needed in Ada county.

Figure 1

The Transition To Community Oriented Policing

We want to take the department as a whole and immerse it in community policing so that the direction isn't coming from me anymore, but from members of the communities we're servicing.

Sheriff Vaughn Killeen, Idaho Statesman, August 20, 1998.

The Sheriff announced that the entire departments was decentralizing the decision-making process to provide deputies wider discretion in problem identification and solution. The two contract cities, Kuna and Eagle, would receive expanded, 24 hour coverage by the ACSO. Funded by a $450,000 grant from the National Institute of Justice, the ACSO was assigning 3 new officers to Kuna and three to Eagle.

Also present at the press conference were Bob Wright from WRICOPS, the mayor and city council president of Eagle, and the mayor of Kuna. Both Kuna and Eagle representatives mentioned the positive aspects that they anticipated from the expanded coverage. Of particular interest was the establishment of permanent sub-stations. Bicycle patrols were in place in Eagle, and substations were being established in both communities.

9

Figure 2

The transition from reactive patrol to problem oriented policing

Problem oriented policing is a fundamentally different kind of police service delivery. Arrests cease to be a criteria of good policing. Solving problems is a sign of good policing. Indeed, over the long term, increases in arrests are a sign of *bad* policing - problems are not being solved. Arrests, stops, and the like are a measure of police processes. Outcomes, on the other hand, are measures of policing's impact on its most important constituency - the citizens it polices. Departments that continue to believe that making arrests is the primary measure of police activity are, by these standards, not doing good policing. This has several implications.

1.   The hearts and minds of patrol officers has to be sold on the change. They have to understand and believe in it.

2.   Traditional performance measures -- the accumulation of statistics concerning stops, arrests, and the like -- should be de-emphasized in favor of measures of the outcomes of police behavior on citizens.

3.   The most important police service is improved quality of life through lowered fear of crime for citizens.

The SARA model

The ACSO is adopting what is widely called the SARA model of problem-solving (Goldstein, 1990). This model is frequently described in the following way (Stephens, 1996; from Eck and Spelman, 1987).

Scanning represents the part of the process where problems are identified.
         Rather than focusing exclusively on a specific call or crime, officers are

10

expected to group these incidents together and attempt to define the problem in a more precise manner.

Analysis is the stage of the process where (information is gathered) on the problem in order to gain a much better understanding of the underlying conditions. The analysis includes searching for information from a variety of sources, including the community.

Response is the part of the process where solutions are developed and implements. The solutions are tailored to the specific problem, based on knowledge gained from the analysis stage.

Assessment is the stage where officers are expected to determine if the solution that was implemented had any impact on the problem.

Accompanying the implementation of SARA is a genuine effort to decentralize decision-making in the department. Managers provide deputies with a limited authority to make decisions about strategy and resources traditionally reserved for the middle-ranks. Decentralization is still in the incipient stages and the form it will mature into remains to be seen. Deputies are also reallocating their activity, expanding problem-identification activities and seeking ways to de-emphasize enforcement activities. This also is in its incipient form and the department continues to sell the viability of alternative activity structure to the rank-and-file.

Problem Oriented Policing affects more than changing the quantity of time officers spend on different activities. Under a POP model, traditional activities are recast so that new kinds of information can be required. Different questions must be asked on calls and follow-up investigations. Stephens (1996: 126) identifies these as follows:

1. Have we been here before? -
2. What is causing this situation to occur or reoccur?

11

3. How can it be prevented?

4. What should the police do?

5. What should the caller do?

6. What should the community do?

7. What should the victims do?

SECTION III: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IN A PROBLEM ORIENTED POLICING CONTEXT

Section III contains two parts. Part 1 deals with issues in the development of performance evaluation criteria. Part 2 considers performance evaluation by rank, and provides an overview of appropriate criteria for each organizational level.

Part 1: Issues in the Development of Evaluation Criteria.

POP as accountability. The activity of problem-solving and the development of performance evaluation measures are highly interrelated tasks. In figure 3, Sparrow, Moore, and Kennedy (1990) capture the task similarity in their efforts to identify criteria to evaluate the performance of officers doing problem oriented policing:

We can see in figure 3 that the tasks associated with the SARA model of POP and measures of performance evaluation are similar. In this similarity, we also see the overlap of problems faced by management and line-officers. The task of "What do I do?" is equivalent to "What am I being held accountable for?" Answer one, and the other is also answered. But if the department hasn't sold the troops on problem oriented policing, it will alienate them in any evaluation efforts.

Recommendation: Before instituting evaluational programs, make sure that the rank-and-file are behind the POP transition.

12

Figure 3

Developing Performance Measures

A meaningful monitoring and appraisal system for beat officers should exhibit features such as the following:

1. Measure their knowledge about their area, its residents and their problems, and its community institutions.
2. Log problems, not just incidents.
3. Record the process of problem-solving through steps like:
   a. Problem identification
   b. Analysis of causes.
   c. Design and implementation of action.
   d. Monitoring of the action's effectiveness and subsequent reassessment.
4. It could emphasize initiative and avoid penalizing officers for trying solutions that fail.
5. It could formally measure community satisfaction with the officer's work. This assessment inevitably involves some kind of public canvassing - either random or representative.
6. It could provide a regular opportunity for the community to highlight any problems that, in its view, are receiving inadequate or unsuitable police attention.

Beyond 911: A New Era for Policing. Sparrow, Moore, and Kennedy. 1990: 227

We also see in figure 3 an example of the problem of concretely identifying tasks suitable for doing POP and for measuring it for evaluational purposes. The advice provided above by Sparrow and his colleagues is more of a general statement of POP evaluation measurement rather than a practical set of constructive guidelines. Officers reading this are going to wonder *What do I do*, and *How is it going to be measured.* Translated into the language of street police culture, the latter question becomes *How is it going to be used against me*? In Section IV of this document, we will suggest some

13

evaluation criteria.

Wycoff and Oettmeier (1995: 136) add that the adoption of innovative police procedures and tactics, to be successful, requires changes throughout the organization's infrastructure. A performance evaluation process was viewed as a critical element of the adoptive process:

> ... a personnel performance measurement process designed to reflect and reinforce the functions that officers are expected to perform can provide structural support for a philosophy of policing and can be a valuable aid in the implementation of organizational change.

The most compelling problem confronting Sheriff's Deputies is in convincing them that the model is relevant to their work. Clearly, part of the answer to this problem is in convincing them about the viability of the SARA model as a problem solving protocol. Another part of the answer is in integrating community policing and problem-solving into their traditional work-related evaluation. criteria. In other words, they are more likely to commit themselves to POP if they believe that (1) it is important, and (2) it is tied to raises and promotions.

What can be accomplished by evaluation? Wycoff and Oettmeier (1997: 12) observe that performance measures should be tied to the reasons for collecting the data. For agencies moving to a community policing model of service delivery, they identify three important reasons:

1. *Socialization*: the evaluation should "convey expectations content and style of (an officer's) performance" and reinforce the mission and values of the department.

2. *Documentation*. Evaluations should record the types of problems and situations officers encounter in their neighborhoods and their approaches

14

to them. This also allows for officers to have their efforts recognized.

3.   *System improvement.* What organizational conditions impede improved line-officer performance?

In this context, evaluation is not simply a basis for discipline and reward, but serves other important organizational objectives. Deputies should recognize that evaluation can make positive contributions to both organizational goals and to anti-crime activity and not necessarily be a basis for personal discipline.

What criteria should evaluational instruments meet? Mastrofski and Wadman, (1991) identify the following problems for the development of POP performance evaluations.

1.   *Validity.* the evaluation accurately reflects the content of the work the employee is expected to do.
   a.   Task analysis: what work is an employee expected to do?
   b.   feedback from employees describing frequency and criticality of assigned tasks.
   c.   Tasks are prioritized, and KSA's (knowledge, skills, and attitudes) are identified for evaluation. Note: the performance evaluation should not be fixed, but should be flexible to adapt to changing job considerations. However, in a POP context, the work product is variable. Officers may work together. Evaluations consequently must be flexible, not of fixed content.

2.   *Equity.*
   1.   Evaluators need to provide the same performances the same way. This is particularly difficult in a community policing context where officers deal with their assignments in different, often creative ways.

15

2. Individual considerations should be considered in work assignments. "The underlying theory here is that certain types of people are more likely to perform in desirable or undesirable ways depending on the kinds of work environments and specific people and problems they encounter." Geller and Swangler, 1995: 153.

3. *Reliability.* Raters need to evaluate outcomes in the same way. The problem with reliability is that it biases raters toward measurable phenomena like arrests, stops and the like. These are enforcement criteria and will not assist in the evaluation of community policing or POP objectives. Indeed, one of the key problems or in the establishment of a new system is breaking away from traditional, law-enforcement criteria whose measurement is straightforward.

As Wycoff (1982) noted, when important behaviors cannot be counted, those that are countable tend to become the important ones. She notes that quantifiable criteria tend to fall into two groups:

Crime-fighting: rapid response, numbers of arrests, numbers of stops.
Administrative regulations: sick time, accidents, tardiness.

Neither of these provide insight into the degree to which officers are effectively or creatively performing community policing or POP activities. Agencies wedded to these criteria may inhibit the willingness of their officers to adopt new strategies and tactics not so readily measurable. If deputies are permitted to develop their own evaluational means and criteria, commanders should review it closely for compliance with relevant policy and law.

4. *Legality.* Some requirements of the evaluation system may be established

16

by law.

5. *Utility*. What is the purpose of the evaluation? If it is not used for some identifiable goal, it lead to hostile feelings about employers by line personnel.

Community policing: Specialists or generalists?   Departments deciding to implement community policing and problem-oriented policing (POP) protocols confront an immediate decision. Should specialists in POP or community policing be hired, trained, and assigned to specific assignments? Or should POP and community policing be introduced across the organization, so that all personnel are responsible for implementation. The latter route -- agency-wide implementation -- is more difficult in the short term. Managers and commanders can't pick and choose among potential line-level candidates for community policing and POP assignments, but must convince the rank-and-file of the value of innovation in their traditional patrol techniques. Yet implementation across-the-board is widely viewed as a preferable route. As Oettmeier and Wycoff observe, when officers are selected for specialized positions,

> Confusion, frustration, and animosity among personnel are common results of this specialization, and frequently there is a lack of service delivery at the local level. Oettmeier and Wycoff, 1997: 2.

The transition to community policing and problem solving is a fundamental change in philosophy, organizational design, and activity. Agencies that haphazardly clabbord community policing onto traditional reactive policing patrol can create many long term problems vis-a-vis mismatched and inconsistent organizational functions and stigmata assigned to specialized community policing officers by the traditional rank-and-file. This is not to say that agencies cannot benefit through a specialist approach. However, it is recommended that departments that so start should develop plans to extend it to the rest of the department.   Departments adopting POP and community policing reform need to anticipate and make allowances for the breadth of organizational change

17

involved in the transition.

The ACSO elected to integrate POP standards into the daily routines of all patrol officers. The implementation process is current, and at the present time POP protocols are in the immediate pre-implementation stage. Goldstein's model of POP is being used by the ACSO. Officers are learning about the SARA model, and they are developing strategies for the codification of problems in Ada County.

For those agencies implementing a generalist approach, McGarrell and his colleagues recommend that

> management must ensure that these generalists have adequate training
> and the time to actually engage in community policing activities. Finding
> champions of community policing within the ranks who can model the new
> role will be important. McGarrell, Langston, and Richardson, 1997: 64.

Recommendation: The current transition to a generalist mode of POP implementation
is the recommended program implementation procedure. The
development of performance evaluation criteria should follow the
same generalist strategy. All line officers and sergeants should be
involved in a practical capacity in the selection of evaluation
criteria.

The effectiveness/relevance dilemma. The development of any performance evaluation confronts a widely recognized problem. Although performance criteria may be well designed, the extent to which they distinguish between individuals depends on the personnel conducting the performance evaluations. Many observers of performance evaluations have lamented that it is nearly impossible to actually acquire outcomes that are simultaneously effective and relevant. If evaluations for POP are to be effective, evaluators should be willing to distinguish between the people who they are evaluating, and have to be willing to provide information that may not be well

18

received. Evaluators have to be willing to be critical of those they evaluate. Yet evaluators are often unwilling to write critical evaluations if they will affect the ratees chances for promotion or for raises, and especially if the evaluation might be used in a way to discipline the ratee. Lawler (1971) describes this as a conflict between objectivity and trust: the greater the subjectivity, the greater the trust; the greater the objectivity, the less the trust. The dilemma is this: How can an evaluation be conducted so that it will be objectively conducted by raters, and at the same time be recognized as a document that will be used to discipline or reward officers?

Marx identifies some of the problems of rater subjectivity in performance evaluations:

> When one consider's only a supervisor's rating, other problems come to mind. For instance, each supervisor has different standards and frames of reference. These subjective opinions are prone to an individual's possible bias, indifference, or lack of knowledge regarding an officer's actual performance. Also, a supervisor might hesitate to criticize his officers either because he fears it would alienate them or because he think it would reflect negatively on his ability to supervise. These difficulties are enhanced by the fact that few, if any, police departments provide a means of assessing the reliability or validity of these evaluations. Marx, 1986: 161.

Recommendation: Deputies should be involved in the development of evaluation criteria and in the decision about who will conduct evaluations and how they are conducted. This will commit deputies to the process and, I think, is most likely to balance trust and objectivity.

Individual versus team evaluations. Evaluations used to "grade" employees may be problematic in organizations that place premiums on team-work. This may be the case with community policing initiatives, where police must work closely with each other and with the community to achieve important objectives. Scholtes (1987) has cautioned us

19

about the dangers of performance evaluations. They can be a divisive influence, inhibiting the ability of individuals to work together.

Recommendation: Use team performance as an evaluative outcome in addition to individual evaluations.

Oettmeier and Wycoff (1997: 11) also identify purposes that evaluations can serve that are different from traditional, "individual" criteria of discipline and reward.

1. Inform governing bodies about the work of the organization.

2. determine nature of problems in neighborhoods and the strategies that offer promise in addressing them.

3. Permit officers to "exhibit' the work they are doing.

4. Determine career objectives and progress of individual employees.

Recommendation: Identify specific uses of evaluation that will not be used to discipline and/or reward.

The cultural limitations of performance appraisal. Many commanders have lamented the way in which police culture protects line officers from managerial directives. This is particularly the case when directives expand internal accountability procedures.   Consider the following words:

The self-protectiveness of the police subculture and the fact that little concrete depends on the evaluations means that many departments have abandoned these ratings; or, at best, they have become empty rituals where almost everyone's performance is rated as satisfactory. Marx, 1986: 160.

The willingness of line officers to be sold on POP, and to be evaluated for their performance for POP activities, depends a great deal on the extent to which managers,

20

especially the chief, actively seek their advice in implementation procedures. The most effective strategies for avoiding resistance are co-optive. By bringing line officers into the implementation process, and by letting them make important decisions about evaluation, a great deal of line resistance can be overcome.

Recommendation.   Inevitably, some commanders are going to resist some of the recommendations put forth by a task force of deputies. My recommendation is that, on significant differences of opinion, ask the Sheriff to himself act as arbiter. This will convey to both the line and management personnel that the Sheriff cares about the POP venture and how officers are being evaluated for it.

21

Figure 4

Rewarding What Matters

Another way to put the challenge of reinventing performance appraisal standards and systems is that police departments need to reward the things that matter. In community problem-solving systems, what matters includes contributing manifestly to community safety and fear reduction through criminal justice and noncriminal justice tactics; providing other emergency services; officers' knowledge of and involvement in the community in various appropriate ways; the adequacy of problem-solving efforts from the point of view of those who live and work in the affected neighborhoods; officers' behavior towards the public; officers' initiative in tackling problems...By contrast, things that don't matter - or are downright harmful - to a community policing implementation effort include precipitous and glutinous use of arrest and other criminal justice system resources, meaningless paperwork and other "CYA" activities; running breathlessly and unthinkingly to every call for service without regard to its nature; and excessive emphasis on officers' attitudes rather than behaviors - since attitudes are likely to change *after* behaviors do.

W.A. Geller and G. Swanger.1996: 151. Innovation in Policing: The Untapped Potential of the Middle Manager. Washington, D.C.: PERF.

PART 2: Tailoring evaluation to rank

The roles and associated accountability standards of line officers change under a POP style of service delivery. Traditional law enforcement criteria are de-emphasized in order to provide opportunity for crime prevention and order-maintenance activities as well. Under a proactive POP model, line personnel need expanded time in order to talk to residents, to keep logs of problem activity, to meet with community figures, and carry out a large number of associated responsibilities. Accountability has to refocus on these items, so that reward structures and advancement within the organization is associated in some meaningful way with the work officers do.

Changes in role and accountability among other department personnel are less well

22

understood. This is unfortunate. When comprehensively implemented, problem oriented policing realigns the responsibilities at all rank levels in a police organization. The organization is at once more fluid and relaxed in internal command structures and more penetrated by community influences. It is important that administrators don't view the expansion of line activity under a POP model as an opportunity to hold officers more accountable for a wider variety of criteria than in the past.

Given the tendency of police organizations to use bureaucratic accountability policy as a base for punishment, expanded accountability protocols can undermine any program during its implementation phase. One of the lessons of successful programs has been the ability of managers to relax, to permit mistakes to happen, and to create a positive working environment that encourages good outcomes. In the following section, I will present a discussion of the responsibilities associated with all ranks in a department, with a focus on performance evaluation of the work appropriate to that level.

The Role of the Sheriff

The contribution of the chief executive is of inestimable importance. The Sheriff establishes the commitment the organization makes to any innovations occurring in the department. If the Sheriff wavers in his commitment to POP, innovations will fail however great their promise. With thoughtful, patient, and energetic leadership, the chief executive can accomplish a great deal. Even in the current age of program decentralization, the chief executive plays a pivotal role in the moral and spiritual well-being of the agency.

In a previous article, I described the important contribution that agency executives can make. I include it here, presented in the spirit of decentralized decision-making. The expansion of innovation at the line ranks will be futile if officers aren't also provided the opportunity to err. Evaluation should not be used to stifle creativity and innovation among officers.

23

Chief John Turner of Mountlake Terrace, Washington, is an eloquent advocate of administrative innovation for community policing. He exhorts administrators to learn how to relax their group on line behavior, to cease trying to control everything that line officers do. His is a forceful view, and it is a vision central to the theme of this paper. If street cops are to be advocated o change, they have to be trusted. It is not enough to speak in lofty platitudes about their contribution to local communities. Management has to learn to trust their rank and file. They have to accept and live with mistakes, knowing that mistakes go with the territory.

Administrators face a dilemma - on the one hand, they want to employ community policing strategies and reap the positive press that tends to accompany such ventures. On the other, they want to hold police officers accountable to be sure that they are doing community policing and that they do not "screw up" in the process. This latter goal, accountability, can stifle innovation. Rather than facilitating community policing, it can encourage the most hostile aspects of the police culture and close the door on all efforts to create a viable community policing program Crank, 1997: 56.

The agency executive is more than a spiritual leader. Sheriffs and Chiefs are at the top of the organization, and power enamates from the top. The executive is capable of, and should engage in substantive action aimed at assessing program innovation success. This extends to performance evaluation as well. In the following figure, program planning guide published by the Bureau of Justice Assistance suggests the practical role that an executive of a small department can play in the implementation of community policing.

Chief Executives and Evaluation in Small Departments

Astute police leaders recognize that large gaps can exist between what policy dictates and what personnel do. Management must take nothing for granted in the implementation of Neighborhood Oriented Policing (NOP) policies and procedures. In one form or another, the chief must constantly ask "How are we doing? Are we on track? What problems are occurring? What help is necessary?"

In smaller and moderate-sized departments, this critical assessment can be accomplished through the chief's "management by walking around," stopping by at offices of key managers and groups to get on-the-spot reports on implementation efforts. The chief can also talk with patrol officers to get their views of how implementation is proceeding. In any size organization, the chief executive can hold useful regular meetings with those responsible for overseeing implementation of NOP and ask for their reports in a setting that reinforces accountability and allows for immediate discussion of ways to deal with problems.

Bureau of Justice Assistance (1994), Neighborhood Oriented Policing in Rural Communities: A Program Planning Guide. p. 64.

It is clear in the early stages of POP innovation that Sheriff Killeen has taken an active leadership role. He has also demonstrated the capacity to permit decentralized decision-making. This is an important threshold requirement for PO, and encourages optimism that the dramatic changes being undertaken by the Sheriffs Office will succeed.

The Role of middle managers.

The role of middle managers in police innovation is understudied and poorly understood. The traditional tendency is to view middle managers, like police culture, as

25

a powerful source of resistance to change (see Kelling and Bratton, 1993). Other observers have a different view. As Geller and Swangler (1995: 102) observe, *don't accept "middle manager's" resistance to change as the definition of the problem.* Managers can be resources for the adoption of meaningful POP performance evaluation just as they can assist in the implementation of POP itself: *Middle managers,* Geller and Swanger (1995: 149-150) note, *can foster first-line supervision that, in turn, fosters quality problem solving by helping sergeants enhance their credibility with officers concerning community problem solving.*

> In most agencies and for most sergeants, the reality will be that these first-line supervisors are being asked to coach a type of work they have never done themselves. That, of course, can produce significant credibility problems among the rank-and-file officers. Geller and Swanger, 1995: 150.

Figure 6

What can be accomplished by performance evaluation

Administrators are often so constrained by personnel rules, labor contracts, and other restrictions on their opportunities to offer rewards and impose penalties that they may wish to refocus the department's performance appraisal system on helping employees improve. Mastrofski and Wadman, 1991: 365.

In the ACSO, Captains and to a lesser degree Lieutenants are responsible for developing strategy and forecasting strategy to fit the budget. The change over to POP

26

will affect them as well. Deputies will be promoted from a POP working environment. And managers will have to provide command authority over officers working in a POP environment. What can they contribute? consider the following items, many mentioned by Geller and Swanger (195).

1. Help sergeants enhance their credibility with deputies. Become familiar with POP and display clear support for the organizational changes that Sergeants have to implement.

2. Assist in the development of comprehensive performance evaluation packages for first-line employees and their supervisors. We argue elsewhere in this document that deputies must themselves take the lead in this task. Performance evaluation, however, must be consistent throughout the organization. Managers working with the personnel director can insure that the recommendations of deputies are systematized into department policy, and can provide important feedback on the legality and practicality of proposed evaluation criteria.

3. Develop criteria to appraise overall organizational performance for community feedback. The organization itself should be responsive to the community. While deputies must take the lead on developing records of their work, managers can provide access to critically needed resources to convey departmental activities to the public. The following figure suggests a relatively inexpensive means to develop community feedback through questionnaire surveys.

Figure 7

Using citizen surveys to measure feedback.

Central to POP is the role of citizen input into police activity. It is becoming increasingly commonplace to tap citizen satisfaction with police services and in order to find out how well the police are doing. Mastrofski (1989) discusses the use of scientific polls to measure citizen satisfaction. Chief Couper provided an alternative way to measure citizen satisfaction that might be more useful for many departments. The survey used by Chief Couper in Madison is reprinted in the appendix.

> Madison, Wisconsin Chief David Couper began mailing questionnaires to every 50th person who filed a report with the department in early 1987. This amounted to about 160 surveys mailed each month. They received a return of 35 to 40 percent. The survey asked citizens to rate the police response on a scale of one (poor) to five (excellent) on seven areas, including concern, knowledge, quality of service, solving the problem, putting citizens at ease, and professional conduct. An open-ended question, How can the police improve?. was also included in the survey. The responses were routed back to the chief, who read them all. Couper and Lobitz, 1991; in Stephens, 1996: 113.

The Sheriff's Office has already begun the work of collecting and analyzing data suitable for assessment of citizen attitudes. In July, 1998, under a National Institution of Justice Grant, a community survey was conducted. In the spirit of the partnership grant - long-term collaboration between the ACSO and BSU - the Sheriffs Office might consider asking BSU to (1) revise the survey so that officers could themselves distribute it and (2) provide data resources for the collation of findings.

4.   Be publicly visible. Make yourself physically present to deputies and to the public they serve. If deputies are attending and/or developing community meetings, show up on occasion. This will convey that command is in the spirit of the program. Close the gap between the ACSO

28

and its customers.

5.   Some problems encountered by deputies will require contacts or
      resources from different functional units of the ACSO. Managers can
      assist in the coordination of these resources. Deputies in the
      implementation phase of POP often lack access to critically needed
      resources to deal with problems. Middle managers are the knowledge
      brokers in an agency, and can assist in these kinds of problems.

6.   Assist in the development of educational seminars or classes for deputies.
      This is already carried out to a large extent by monthly block training
      provided for deputies by the ACSO.

7.   B a "buffer." Protect deputies from pressures that subvert efforts to
      implement and carry out problem oriented policing. The following box
      discusses this important responsibility:

Figure 8

On Being a Buffer: Commanders as Protectors.

One of the more difficult, risky tasks that middle managers may need to
perform to assist the implementation of community problem solving is
protecting (and seeking help from senior managers in protecting) problem -
solving officers from pressures to revert to traditional methods. Those
pressures may be imposed by the officers' peers, other managers, sister city
agencies, politicians, the media, and others with power. Mastrofski (191)
suggests that the challenge "is in buffering [community policing] experiments
from the demands of organizational routine and a public that is not so tolerant
of trial and error.

Geller and Swanger, Managing Innovation in Policing, 1995: 167.

29

The contributions listed above are general, and are included to spark discussion on performance criteria appropriate for measurement. As with deputies, we recommend that the actual performance criteria are selected by the commanders themselves, as well as the means for assessing the performance.

The role of the Sergeant. POP innovation has a large impact on the responsibilities of the Sergeant. It requires a reformulation and broadening of the Sergeant's role. Wycoff and Oettmeier (1997) identify several dimensions of change involving the role and responsibilities of the sergeant.

1. Sergeants have to support the greater discretion associated with community policing. .

2. Accountability of individual officers has to occur in a broader sense of officers discretion.

3. Be more efficient managers and group facilitators.

4. Active participants in the development of POP solutions.

5. Sergeants need more effective means of getting information about community means. Three recommendations:

   1. Community meetings.

   2. Door-to-door surveys conducted by officers.

   3. Scientific surveys. We have conducted such a survey here. The sergeant in charge, Sgt. Ron Freeman, might review the survey in order to assess the county's (1) perceptions of

30

problems, (2) relations with deputies (3) satisfaction, (4) improvements in service. (Note that I earlier recommended that surveys be a responsibility of mid-level managers, who are the only group that can allocate scant resources for their collection.)

These changes require that sergeants have wider access to pertinent information than in the past. In ways central to the success of POP, line-officers have to be able to approach their Sergeant as a broker of knowledge and information about the community. Indeed, in important ways the role of the sergeant is empowered to a greater degree than are line-officers under a POP organizational philosophy. Oettmeier and Wycoff (1995: 141-142) describe the way in which the role of the sergeant is broadened.

The community policing sergeant would need to be familiar with the area the officers works, the problems and concerns within that area, and the efforts made by the officers to address those issues. Considerable knowledge would most effectively be derived from frequent conversations between the sergeant and the officer. <u>These discussions could be guided by using weekly or monthly assessment forms that target specific problems, activities, and expected results</u>.

Sergeants are the first "clearinghouse" resource for officers who think they have identified a problem. They consequently need wide access to information about what is going on in the community as well as what their officers are doing. The (following recommendations) describe several means to acquire) information about officers performance:

1.   Direct entry of information by other sergeants into a computer using a predefined software format.

31

2.   maintaining a "log" of observations about officers recommendations, accomplishments, and failures ascertained from frequent coaching sessions between the officers and sergeant.

3.   Input from the "community" that could be obtained through

   a.   direct communication between the sergeant and community representatives.

   b.   Citizen letters directed to the officer, sergeant, division commander, or chief of police.

   c.   Survey responses from service recipients; comments from citizens attending community meetings

   d.   News stories.

4.   Verbal or written communication with other agencies, inclusive of other city departments and private sector organizations

5.   An officer "resume" in which the officer periodically would report career progress and significant events or activities of which the officer would want the sergeant and organization to be aware.

The Role of Deputies.

Mastrofski and Wadman (1991) observe that peer assessment -- in the ACSO, by other deputies -- is increasingly a routine, informal feature of police life. Consequently, if peers are included in the department's formal performance appraisal, routine, informal practices are simply formalized. Further, peer appraisals are as reliable as supervisors ratings (Farr and Landy, 1979). Peer reviews are also empowering for line officers.

Mastrofski and Wadman (1991: 373) note that "If peer appraisals are used to supplement supervisory appraisals, supervisors could be required to take peer appraisals into account and justify significant differences between their own and the per ratings."

Recommendation: Incorporate peer appraisals into evaluation procedures. The Personnel Director has suggested that 360 evaluations can provide a means for peer appraisal. This is a sound idea that can be reasonably be put into practice. After review by deputies, this or a similar peer review system should be implemented.

Line resistance to performance criteria. Line officers resist performance evaluation for a variety of reasons. Mastrofski (1996: 222-223) identifies 2:

> ...street officers resent and invalidate any attempt to assess their performance, unless the evaluator is a skilled police officer also present. But that is probably not their strongest objection. It is, rather that authorities (both inside and outside the department) are unable to provide workable performance priorities a priori (Brown, 1981). Instead, managers review police performance only when things go awry and establish priorities ex post facto. Mastrofski, 1996: 222-3.

This has implications for the likely success of efforts to introduce policing innovation:

> Developing systematic performance measures at the encounter level without strong leadership that establishes priorities through policy mandates, guidelines, and training will doom the endeavor to tremendous rank-and-file resistance . Without such leadership, performance measurement will be viewed as another way to increase officer vulnerability without any appreciable benefit to those whose work is being assessed.

33

Recommendation: Organizational leadership should take a strong, proactive stance in supporting the development of peer evaluation systems. Deputies will have many ideas that they do not know how to implement or lack to resources to do so. Managers should make resources -- particularly their time -- available to officers.

PART IV: MEASUREMENT PROCESS AND PRODUCT

The development of measurement criteria is a 2-step process. The first step is the process used to select criteria. The second step involves the identification of relevant measurement criteria.

In the following sections, I will review various alternatives for both the process and the product. It is my opinion that the selection of both the process and the product should be determined by the officers who will be evaluated in collaboration with organizational managers, so I will not recommend either a specific process or product. By presenting alternatives for both process and product tat I believe are viable and that have worked in other organizations, I hope to provide ACSO officers with "stepping stones," ways of thinking about how other organizations or individuals have solved these problems. In the spirit of problem oriented policing, the final selection of product and process is up to the officers involved in the implementation of POP.

Part 1. Measurement Process

In this part I discuss three processes for the development of performance evaluation. The first recommends a task force, the second is an expert system, and the third is a blend of expert-personnel director involvement.

Model 1: Oettmeier and Wycoff. These authors describe a task force approach to the development of performance criteria. The task force is made up of both line level and management personnel.

34

Purposes of task force.

1. What is the nature of activities being conducted by officers trying to implement the POP philosophy?

2. What are the challenges to measuring these activities?

3. A list of tasks, roles, and skills essential for officers implementing the POP component of patrol need to be developed.

How to carry out the activities.

Develop a task force of personnel involved: sergeant and line officers. The role of the project director is critical.

Project manager develops a data collection instrument to capture detailed information about the behavior of officers, including supervisors, involved in POP.

Caution: It should not be expected that this process can be carried out quickly.

Model 2: Mastrofski. Sometimes, "experts," -- highly regarded line personnel in the department -- can make a significant contribution to the development of performance evaluation criteria. Mastrofski (1996) identifies the following contributions that "expert" officers can make toward developing their own criteria. He describes a seminar type laboratory setting in which highly regarded officers systematically develop performance criteria.

1. Identify who the highly skilled officers are - the craftsmen. There tends to be a high consensus about who they are in the

35

department (Bayley and Garofalo, 1989). These leaders may disagree on what constitutes good performance. This provides an opportunity to develop diversity in considering what constitutes good problem-solving.

The temptation to develop all-purpose performance criteria should be avoided at all cost.

2. The police "experts" should openly discuss their views, and clarify differences. Mastrofski recommends a "seminar" kind of circumstance where individual officers are encouraged to spell out their ideas and differences.

3. The deliberations should be structured in a way as to develop performance criteria. This can be done in two ways.

    a. Identify general traits that are considered good or bad performance.

    b. Discuss specific incident types and develop what would be considered good and bad responses. I recommend the latter; it is more consistent with the way in which knowledge develops from beat encounters with the service population (Crank, 1998).

4. Seminar participants develop the set of performance criteria.

5. Social scientists develop data collection instrument from performance criteria. This is where the department needs to lean of the local university resources.

36

6. The instrument is pilot tested among selected police officers. Review reactions of officers to the instrument.

7. Review by departmental management, then field test agency wide.

Figure 9

Management-Line Disagreement Over Evaluational Criteria

...master craftsmen may generate performance criteria and measures distasteful to the top leadership or important department constituents. Although management may reject such measures or demand alterations, it can hardly be regarded as a major advance in employee-manager relations to engage in this endeavor only to stoke controversy and combativeness. Mastrofski, 1996: 233.

Model 3: Fine. The following model was discussed in a police context by Mastrofski and Wadman (1991: 367). The strength of this system is that it includes an analysis of performance for POP in the broader context of the development of performance criteria for all patrol activities.

Sidney Fine, a proponent of functional job analysis, suggests a multi-step process that makes use of extensive in-house expertise and does not require sophisticated statistics.

1. Preliminary orientation of the job analyst himself or herself and invitation of subject-matter experts to participate.

2. Group interviews in which experts are asked to list job outputs, knowledge, skills, and abilities required.

37

3.   Creation of an inventory of tasks based on the previously generated list, continuing until the group is satisfied that 95% of the job is covered.

4.   Grouping and rank ordering (or weighing) of tasks.

5.   Identification of performance criteria by asking experts to indicate how they would distinguish levels of work quality for each group of tasks.

6.   Reliability check, in which the analyst sends the subject-matter experts an edited task inventory for each part of the job, with performance standards for each category, for final review, revision, and approval.

7.   Validity check, in which the revised inventories are sent to a separate sample of employees who are subject-matter experts for verification.

Part 2: Performance measures

Measuring deputy performance. Below are two models for measuring deputy performance. The models are similar in goal, differing primarily in simplicity and detail. The first model is more elaborate but somewhat complicated. The second does not provide the depth of objective criteria but is simpler to employ.

Model 1. Performance evaluation task-activity measurement model. The measurement of performance of police under a POP model ties them directly to the communities they serve. Police are traditionally evaluated for "process" variables, such as the number of arrests, traffic stops, and the like. Police agencies have confronted the anomalous circumstance that measures of "process" improve but neighborhood quality of life declines (Stephens, 1996). What is needed is a measure of "effects, outcomes, and impacts of officers' efforts" (Oettmeier and Wycoff, 1995: 143). Put

39

differently, police typically deal with the observable outcomes of problems, and their work is to respond to those outcomes. But the underlying problems go unaddressed.

The measurement process it to evaluate officers for the consequences of their behavior for the public they serve. Performance evaluation, like POP, must tap outcomes. However, some processes have to be in place to achieve outcomes. Officer's can't be "turned loose" to learn on their own how to do POP. Structures exist for carrying out POP, the most well known of which is Herman Goldstein's (1990) SARA model. Line officer performance criteria, developed from that model, consequently represent both outcomes and processes measures.

The chart below, copied from Oettmeier and Wycoff (1996) describes a task structure under a SARA model. This is the model that the ACSO is implementing. It might be possible for the ACSO to leap-frog through some of the implementation problems in order to develop performance criteria. This chart embodies the operative principle under which this paper is written: Performance evaluation criteria, to be effective, must be directly tied to the goals and objectives of patrol work. The evaluational criteria below link patrol evaluation to a POP - SARA environment.

Tasks-Activities.

Activities are listed beneath the tasks they are intended to accomplish. Several activities could be used to accomplish a number of different tasks.

1. Learn characteristics of area, residents, businesses.
    a. Study beat books.
    b. Analyze crime and calls-for-service data.
    c. Drive, walk area, and make notes.
    d. Talk with community representatives.
    e. Maintain area/suspect logs.
    f. Conduct area surveys.

40

g. Read area papers.

h. Discuss area with citizens hen answering calls.

i. Talk with private security personnel in area.

j. Talk with area business owners/managers.

2. Become acquainted with leaders in area.

a. Attend community meetings, including service club meetings.

b. Ask questions in survey about who formal and informal area leaders are.

c. Ask area leaders for names of other leaders.

3. Make residents aware of who officer is and what s/he is trying to accomplish in area.

a. Initiate citizen contacts.

b. Distribute business cards.

c. Discuss purpose at community meeting.

d. Discuss purpose when answering calls.

e. Write article for local paper.

f. Contact home-bound elderly.

g. Encourage officers to contact citizens directly.

4. Identify area problems.

a. Attend community meetings.

b. Analyze crime and calls-for-service data.

c. Contact citizens and businesses.

d. Conduct business and residential surveys.

e. Ask about other problems when answering calls.

5. Communicate with supervisors, other officers and citizens about the nature of the area and its problems.

a. Maintain beat bulletin board in station.

b. Leave notes in boxes of other officers.

c. Discuss area with supervisor.

41

6. Investigate/do research to determine sources of problems.

    a. Talk to people involved.

    b. Analyze crime data.

    c. Observe situation if possible (shakeout).

7. Plan ways of dealing with problem.

    a. Analyze resources.

    b. Discuss with supervisor, other officers.

    c. Write Patrol Management Plan, review with supervisor.

8. Provide citizens information about was they can handle problems (educate/empower)

    a. Distribute crime prevention information.

    b. Provide names and number of other responsible agencies: tell citizens how to approach these agencies.

9. Help citizens develop appropriate expectations about what police can do and teach them how to interact effectively with police.

    a. Attend community meetings/make presentations.

    b. Present school programs.

    c. Write article for area paper.

    d. Hold discussions with community leaders.

10. Develop resources for responding to problem.

    a. Talk to other officers, detectives, supervisors.

    b. Talk with other individuals or agencies who could help.

11. Implement problem solution.

    a. Take whatever actions are called for.

12. Assess effectiveness of solution.

42

a. Use data, feedback from persons who experienced the problem, and/or personal observation to determine whether problem has been solved.

13. Keep citizens informed.

    a. Officers tell citizens what steps have been taken to address a problem and with what results.

    b. Detectives tell citizens what is happening with their cases.

Model 2: A qualitative assessment, adapted from Portland Police Department.

Portland's police department uses a reporting and tracking form to assess progress on problems identified by police officers. It contains the following components:

Problem Solving: Portland, Oregon
Reporting and Tracking Form

I. Problem as agreed on by Involved Parties

    A. Short Description.

    B. Long Description.

II. Major goal(s)

III. Actions Taken (Strategies)

    A. Starting Date

    B. Completion Date

List in chronological order the strategies taken to address the problem and meet the goal(s).

    Date: Activity:

43

IV: Resources for Strategies.

    A. Law Enforcement Agencies: Role in Activities:

    B. Other Government Agencies: Role in Activities:

    C. Other Organizations: Role in Activities:

Use additional sheets for Resources for Strategies as needed.

V. Individuals Involved in Partnership.

    Name: Organization: Phone:

_____

Portland's problem solving form is intended to track progress of officers in their work on particular problems. It is clearly not designed to assess non-POP activities, and is inadequate as a "stand-alone" document to evaluate overall police performance. However, it has three strengths particularly useful for evaluators.

1.   It provides a Sergeant with a written document assessing when a deputy is actually doing with regard to problems. With this sort of document, the implementation of POP and its evaluation become virtually equivalent.

2.   It is designed to be descriptive, with both short descriptions and long descriptions. This is particularly suitable for the evaluation of POP. A frequent complaint about evaluation is that it "shoehorns" police activities into narrow and inappropriate categories that don't capture the variety of police work. A descriptive document such as this one does.

3.   It is a relatively brief document. It doesn't require a lot of time to write, an important feature for Deputies who must add POP paperwork to the docket of existing paperwork.

Recommendation: The performance criteria above are intended to be suggestive. Though well-designed, these criteria were developed for a

municipal agency in a city environment and may not adapt well in a more rural setting with a Sheriff's Office. Performance criteria should not be accepted until after a task force comprised of deputies has had the opportunity to carefully weigh them. The list above. it is hoped, will provide a "head-start" in the rough process developing criteria relevant to deputies' tasks in a POP agency environment.

Measuring team performance. It is recognized that team efforts may occasionally be involved in dealing with problems. It should not be surprising if officers working the same areas across shifts encounter the same problem, or if some problems involve deputies across different areas. The Sheriffs Office should encourage the development of team as well as individual effort, and provide them with recognition through performance measurement. The following criteria are adapted from recommendations by Oettmeier and Wycoff (1995) for measuring the performance of teams.

1. Ability of the group to work together

2. Effective use of individual skills

3. Competence in addressing community issues, ranging from the performance of daily tasks to complex projects.

4. Ability to engage neighborhood and small town groups, to coordinate activity in rural and neighborhood communities.

5. Ability of the team to function as a part of the organization.

6. Ability to identify problems

7. Ability to reach agreement on possible methods for problem

45

identification and response

8.   Outcomes produced by the team.

Recommendation.   Since individuals make varying degrees of contributions to teams, it
is recommended that records be kept of individual as well as team
efforts in the evaluational process.

Measuring Sergeant performance. The sergeant's role is critical and central in the
success of COP endeavors. His or her performance should also reflect POP activity.
The following criteria are recommended by Oettmeier and Wycoff (1995) for assessing
Sergeants.

1.   Communication with deputies about strategic and tactical
responses to neighborhood crime and disorder problems.

2.   Interaction with community leaders to develop a global perspective
of needs and demands.

3.   Leadership qualities appropriate to the assigned area.

4.   Knowledge of what deputies need (including system changes) in
order to accomplish jobs.

5.   Coordination of deputies' efforts across multiple assignments.

6.   Monitoring the "appropriateness" of deputies' relationships with
community representatives.

7.   Familiarity with what deputies have done, are doing, and would like
to do.

46

8. Ability to encourage the development of new skills within their officers.

Recommendation: Review with Sergeant and his commandeers the appropriateness of performance criteria. Provide deputies the opportunity to review the performance criteria for the Sergeant. Deputies may feel more comfortable with these criteria knowing that their evaluator will himself or herself also be evaluated. What's good for the goose...

47

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bayley, D. and J. Garofalo (1989) "The Management of Violence by Police Patrol
Officers." Criminology 27: 1-26.

Brown, M. K. (1981) Working the Street: Police Discretion and the Limits of Reform.
New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bureau of Justice Assistance (1994) Neighborhood Oriented Policing in Rural
Communities: A Program Planning Guide. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive
Research Forum.

Couper, D. and S. Lobitz (1993) "Leadership for Change: A National Agenda." The
Police Chief (December) 15-19.

Couper, D. and S. Lobitz (1991) Quality Policing: The Madison Experience.
Washington, D.C. Police Executive Research Forum.

Crank, John (1998) Understanding Police Culture. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co.

Crank, John (1997) Celebrating Agency Culture: Engaging a Traditional Cop's Heart in
Organizational Change. PP. 49-57 in Q, Thurman and E. McGarrell (eds.),
Community Policing in a Rural Setting. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co.

Crank, John and Michael Caldero (1999) The Corruption of Noble Cause: Police and
the Ethics of Power. Forthcoming.

Eck, J. and W. Spelman (1987) Problem-Solving: Problem Oriented Policing in Newport
News. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.

Farr, James L. and Frank J. Landy (1979) ""The Development and Use of Supervisor and Peer Scales." Pp. 73 in C. D. Spielberger (ed.), Police Selection and Evaluation: Issues and Techniques. New York: Praeger.

Fine, Sidney (1986) "Job Analysis." Pp. 54-60 in R. A. Berk (ed.), Performance Assessment: Methods and Applications. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Geller, W.A. and G. Swanger (1996) Innovation in Policing: The Untapped Potential of the Middle Manager. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.

Goldstein, Herman (1990) Problem Oriented Policing. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kelling, George and William Bratton (1993) "Implementing Community Policing: The Administrative Problem." Perspectives on Policing # 17. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Lawler, E, III (1971) Pay and Organizational Effectiveness: A Psychological View. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Marx, Gary (1986) "Alternative Measures of Police Performance." pp.159-169 in M. Pogrebin and R. Regoli (eds.), Police Administrative Issues: Techniques and Functions. Millwood, NY: Associated Faculty Press.

Mastrofski, Stephen D. (1996) "Measuring Police Performance in Public Encounters." Pp. 207-241 in L. T. Hoover (ed.), Quantifying Quality in Policing. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.

Mastrofski, Stephen D. and Robert C. Wadman (1991). "Personnel and Agency Performance Measurement." Pp. 363-397 in W. Geller (ed.), Local Governmental Police Management. Washington, D.C.: International City Management

49

Association.

McGarrell, Edmund, Elizabeth Langston, and Deborah Richardson (1997)
"Implementation Issues: The Specialized Unit or Department-Wide Community
Policing?" Pp. 59-64 in Q. Thurman and E. McGarrell (eds.), Community Policing
in a Rural Setting. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co.

Oettmeier, Tim and Mary Ann Wycoff (1997) Personnel Performance Evaluations in the
Community Policing Era. Washington, D.C.: Community Policing Consortium.

Oettmeier, Timothy and Mary Ann Wycoff (1995). "Police Performance in the Nineties:
Practitioner Perspectives." Pp. 131-156 in G. W. Cordner and D. J. Kennedy
(eds.), Managing Police Organizations. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.

Scholtes, Peter (1987) A New View of Performance Evaluation. Paper presented to
William G. Hunter Conference on Equality. Available from Joiner and
Associates, Inc., Madison, Wisconsin.

Sparrow, Malcolm, Mark Moore, and David Kennedy (1990) Beyond 911: A New Era for
Policing. United States: Harper Collins/Basic Books.

Stephens, Darrell (1996) "Community Problem-Oriented Policing: Measuring Impacts."
Pp. 95-130 in L. Hoover (ed.), Quantifying Quality in Policing. Washington, D.C.:
Police Executive Research Forum.

Western Regional Institute for Community Oriented Public Safety (1998) "Community
Policing Assessment Report." Spokane, WA: WRICOPS.

Wycoff, Mary Ann (1982) "Improving Police Performance Measurement: One More
Voice." The Urban Interest. Spring.

Wycoff, Mary Ann and Timothy N. Oettmeier (1993) <u>Evaluating Patrol Officer Performance under Community Policing: The Houston Experience</u>. Research in Brief. Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.

51

APPENDIX

PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION DOCUMENTS

1. Performance Appraisal (2 pages).

2. Performance Evaluation (6 pages).

3. POP Task Structure (1 page).   It is included because its content might be useful for the developoment of performance appraisal criteria.

LUMBERTON POLICE DEPARTMENT

Community Police Officer

Performance Evaluation

_____   From_____ To_____
Officer's Name   Evaluation Period

_____
Date Completed

I.   Communications

   A.   Community Meetings.   (How many, what kind, number of
        people in attendance. Did officer attend, organize, or
        both?)

        _____
        _____
        _____
        _____
        _____
        _____
        _____
        _____
        _____

   B.   Newsletters (Size, Frequency, Number of Readers)

        _____
        _____
        _____
        _____
        _____
        _____
        _____
        _____
        _____

   C.   Presentations.   (Number of group, size of audience,
        subject, time spent)

        _____
        _____
        _____
        _____
        _____
        _____
        _____

D. Security surveys. (Number of security surveys conducted
    to enhance crime prevention activities)

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

E. Media contacts. (News releases, interviews, etc.)

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

F. Neighborhood   surveys   (Location   and   results   of
    neighborhood surveys)

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

II. Social Disorder

A. Types of group projects aimed at the problem of social
    disorder.

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

61

III. Physical Disorder

    A.   Types of group activities aimed at the problems of physical disorder.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

IV. Anti-Drug Initiatives

    A.   Types of individual and group initiatives aimed at drug use (demand).

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

    B.   Types of individual and group initiatives aimed at low-level drug dealing (supply). Number of drug houses closed, number of arrests, number of open drug markets closed.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

62

V. Special Groups (Juveniles, youth gangs, women, the elderly, the disabled, the unemployed, the poor, etc.)

A. Individual and group proactive initiatives aimed at the special needs of the fragile, troubled or uniquely vulnerable groups.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

B. Note in particular those occasions when the community police officer provided specific support to families.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

VI. Networking

A. Types of contacts (in person, telephone, correspondence) with: citizens, community leaders, business owners/managers, corporate officials, and other social service or city service providers.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

63

VII. Referrals

    A.   Type of referrals to other agencies (private and public).

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

VIII. Intelligence Gathering/Information Sharing

    A.   Occasions when the officer received useful information that contributed to resolving a crime, disorder or drug problem. Number of occasions information was shared with others in the department.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

IX. Innovation

    A.   Documentable incidents where the community policing officer has demonstrated an imaginative approach toward problem solving.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

64

X.   Overall Performance Ratings

   A.   Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory (Explain)

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

_____   _____
Supervisor   Community Officer

_____   _____
Division Commander   Chief of Police

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Name _____   Assignment _____

Rank _____   Supervisor _____

Appraisal Date _____   Prior Supervisor _____

Date last Appraisal _____   Overall Performance Rating _____

Overall Rating:

| Below Standard | Standard | Above Standard | N/A |

[   ] General Field Operations

[   ] Problem Solving

[   ] Develops Beat Profile

66

[   ] Develops Relationship with Community

[   ] Youth Initiatives

[   ] Crime Prevention

[   ] Information Handling

[   ] Coordination of Activities