

# CONSIDERATIONS IN PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY POLICING

A Policy Paper Revised for the

**REGIONAL COMMUNITY POLICING INSTITUTE**

at

**WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY**



DAVID L. CARTER, PH.D.  
School of Criminal Justice  
560 Baker Hall  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, MI 48824-1118  
Phone: 517.355.2197/FAX 517.432.1787  
E-Mail: [carterd@msu.edu](mailto:carterd@msu.edu)

This paper may be reproduced with appropriate attribution to the author and the Regional Community Policing Institute at Wichita State University. 2000.

## CONSIDERATIONS IN PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY POLICING

Evaluation of community policing policies and practices poses some difficult problems. The concept has been implemented in a wide variety of ways depending on the vision of the police department, demands and characteristics of different communities, resource availability, and an array of other factors which contribute to the uniqueness of any given community-based initiative. Moreover, community policing is not a program or uniform set of tasks. Rather, it is a *philosophy* of management and service delivery which makes the operationalization of an evaluative effort even more difficult. While there are certain practices which may be transferred between departments, even these practices must be amended to meet the characteristics of specific jurisdictions.

A further problem is that community policing requires administrators, managers, supervisors, and officers to think about their responsibilities differently. Reactive and “incident-driven” policies are cleared away for implementation of proactive, innovative, “problem-driven” officer behaviors. As a result, evaluative efforts cannot simply “count beans”—that is, merely tabulating the number of calls answered, response time, tickets written, reports written, and so forth will not give an accurate measure of goal realization under the community policing philosophy.

Finally, there is a problem of unanimity. There are different names for the community policing philosophy around the country as well as different ways the philosophy has been implemented. Beyond the question of the types of activities (or tasks) community police officers perform, there is significant variability in allocation and deployment schemes—some departments utilize community policing department-wide while others are experimenting with the philosophy based upon shift or location.

The reader must keep these issues in mind in developing a model as well as evaluating the community policing model. As a means to manage to these problems, this model begins with the premise of definitions. Critical terms for both the development and implementation of community policing will be presented as well as definitions for different steps in the evaluation process. It is inherent in any research endeavor that *operational definitions* be employed. These are consistent, measurable descriptions of phenomena which enhance the overall quality of program development and evaluation. It is in this spirit that the definitions are presented.

In the authors’ opinions, simply providing a model description of how to evaluate community policing will leave many questions remaining. As a result, this evaluation model addresses peripheral issues related to both the development and evaluation of the community policing philosophy. Beyond descriptions of processes, the authors have appended some sample instruments to serve as models to assist in an assessment.

Before effective evaluation can occur, one must first have a foundation against which measured criteria can be compared. This relates to the conceptual development of a community policing philosophy as well as the specific operational activities which will be employed.

## COMMUNITY POLICING DEFINED

There are a number of definitions available for community policing. For this model, community policing is defined as...

...a philosophy, not a tactic. It is a proactive, decentralized approach to policing, designed to reduce crime, disorder, and fear of crime while also responding to explicit needs and demands of the community. Community policing views police responsibilities in the aggregate, examining consistent problems, determining underlying causes of the problems, and developing solutions to those problems. (Amended from Trojanowicz and Carter, 1988 and Spelman and Eck, 1987).

Among the fundamentally synonymous terms for community policing are: Problem-Oriented Policing (POP), Community Problem-Oriented Policing (CPOP), Neighborhood Oriented Policing (NOP), Community Oriented Policing and Problem Solving (COPPS), Police Area Representatives (PAR), Citizen-Oriented Patrol Experiment (COPE), Experimental Policing (EP), Neighborhood Foot Patrol, and Community Foot Patrol. While there are some variations in the proffered definitions of these concepts, for the purpose of this model all these labels are defined the same as *community policing* is above.

## OPERATIONAL CONTEXT FOR EVALUATION

Of necessity, the evaluation of any policy or activity actually begins with the development of the policy to be assessed. In this regard, it is essential that administrators and managers conceptualize how the community policing philosophy integrates with the police department's organizational existence. That is, the core values and implementation strategies of community policing policies must be clearly linked to the organization's purpose. The purpose can be viewed as having two elements. The first is the department's *mission*, the second is the department's *goals*.

The mission is the *role* which the organization or unit fulfills—it specifies in general language *what* is intended to be accomplished. It establishes the *direction and responsibility* of the organization for which all other administrative actions and activities are designed to fulfill. Thus, the administrative philosophy of policing and all organizational policies and functions should be guided toward fulfilling the mission.

It should be noted, the mission goes beyond a statutory obligation. That is, statutes which empower law enforcement agencies state that the police are responsible for law enforcement and crime repression—they generally do not stipulate any responsibilities about public order. However, city commissions, mayors, or the public in general may require the police to fulfill additional responsibilities of public service, order maintenance, and generally enhancing the quality of life in the community.

The *goal* is the end to which all activity in the organization is directed. A goal is broad based, yet *functionally* oriented. It must be *specific* enough to be clearly understood by all department members, it must be *measurable*, it must be reasonably *attainable* in the time period to which the goal is addressed, and it must be *mission-related*—that is, accomplishment of goals support the mission of the department. Since the mission of an organization will typically be comprehensive and incorporate diverse functions, multiple goals will typically be set. Goals will also likely vary between geographic locations within a jurisdiction and perhaps even between

shifts. In that the environment of the community will change over time as will crime patterns and community problems, goal statements should be reviewed on an annual basis and changed or revised to reflect current issues and trends.

Planning is the anticipation of future situations, estimating organizational demands and resources needed to attend to those situations, and initiating strategies to respond to those situations. Particularly in community policing activities, planning is an ongoing responsibility of *all* organizational members. Middle managers and administrators will primarily be responsible for *strategic* or long-range planning. This includes budget planning, facilities and equipment planning, and staff development. Planning projections should include multiple stages for up to 10 years. In these cases, information learned from program evaluations should be incorporated into the plans so appropriate changes can be made as necessary.

Conversely, community police officers and first line supervisors will generally be responsible for *tactical* planning. This addresses problems, crime, and quality of life issues as immediately affecting the community in specific locations. The time frame for tactical plans is usually one year or less—accomplishment of tactical planning objectives contribute to the overall goals of the department. Once again, program evaluation will assess the efficiency and effectiveness of these activities.

Viewed in different perspective, strategic planning could be viewed as *macro* plans which address the mission and goals of the whole department. Tactical planning is comparable to *micro* plans which are operationalized by units at the line level.

Evaluation and planning are interactive in that new plans (and consequently goals) are dependent on information which is learned from the department's plans. From a substantive perspective, planning issues can be classified based on organization and development issues, administrative issues, and operational issues.

Within this tripartite model, those responsible for planning should use the following questions as a checklist for program development:

1. *Organization and Development Issues*
  - How extensive will resource allocation to various programs be in comparison to the department as a whole?
  - Do the crime patterns and service demands in the jurisdiction warrant specializations? If so, what types?
  - If so, are the specializations anticipated size, structure, goals, and responsibilities consistent with the crime demands and service demands?
  - What is the relationship of community policing activities to other activities in the department?
  - Will there be changes needed in the authority and responsibility for community policing activities?
  - How comprehensive will community policing activities be?
  - What growth patterns, if any, are expected in community policing activities and what expertise will be needed to respond to growth?
  - What are the anticipated equipment needs depending on changes in size, crimes, service demands, and community policing goals?
2. *Administrative Issues*
  - What criteria and procedures will be used to target community policing activities and problems?

- What type of progress reports are expected and on what schedule?
  - What will be the relationship and extent of resource allocation and demonstrable results of community policing efforts?
  - On what criteria are community policing goals changed or revised?
3. *Operational Issues*
- How extensive will community policing activities permeate all departmental activities? Divisional? shift? Selected officers? Department wide?
  - What will the performance measures be and why?
    - + Obviously difficult to assess—performance measures are dependent on goals, needs, and unique characteristics of the department and jurisdiction
    - + Performance measures must be to determine
      - > Are goals being met?
      - > Are tasks and activities officers are performing *functionally* related to goals?
      - > Are tasks cost effective?
    - + Performance measures, to have a true evaluative impact, must *not* be designed to weigh individual accountability, but *should* be designed to see policy activities are responding to goal needs.
  - How can on-going, forward-looking goal preparation be best accomplished?
  - Based on changing police service needs, are any unique staffing patterns emerging?
  - Are new training programs needed or anticipated based upon new and emerging responsibilities of officers associated with community policing?
  - Do changing responsibilities indicate the need for formal links with specialized agencies or groups ?
  - How can community policing activities integrate with non-patrol activities of the department?

### **OPERATIONALIZING PROGRAMS WITHIN THE COMMUNITY POLICING FRAMEWORK**

While community policing is a philosophy of management and operations, there are a number of elements in most community policing initiatives which are fairly consistent. Just as there should be evaluation of the total community policing initiative, there should be “micro-evaluations” for critical elements of the initiative. As a consequence, the following sections provide a summary discussion of those elements which can assist in guiding a community policing evaluation.

*Neighborhood Watch.* The original intent of Neighborhood Watch was not to establish a strong police-community alliance—it was viewed as a means to help prevent burglaries and increase the probability of apprehending criminals. The concept evolved to also include safe havens for children and to address other crime-related problems (such as vandalism) that may be present in the neighborhood.

An obvious inherent element in Neighborhood Watch is to involve the community in crime deterrence and apprehension strategies. The organization of structured groups on a neighborhood basis not only increases the acquaintances among those within the neighborhood but also provides a forum for the police to address the community on crime prevention techniques or other issues which may arise. As such, it increases the quality of the relationship between police and community which ultimately helps address incongruities manifest by the endemic issues. The beneficial consequences of Neighborhood Watch exceed the initial goal of the program by providing an additional avenue to strengthen the police-community alliance.

Thus, any assessment of Neighborhood Watch activities should be certain to include these collateral effects.

*Crime Stoppers.* Like Neighborhood Watch, Crime Stoppers was designed as a crime suppression and apprehension program with no explicit intent to ally the police and community. Crime Stoppers is a joint venture between citizens, the media, and police to locate and identify persons responsible for committing serious crimes (typically when there is a limited amount of evidence for investigators). Selected crimes are a weekly “focus” which are highlighted through descriptions and re-enactments on television (or radio narrations) depicting the crime. Citizens may make anonymous calls to report information they may have on the “focus crime” or any other crime. Selected crimes or information may also have a cash reward.

It is difficult to say whether Crime Stoppers works because it is very probabilistic: A person must have seen (and observed) some information about a crime *and* that crime must be selected to be aired on a Crime Stoppers program *and* that person must also see the program *and* recognize it as the crime he/she observed *and* finally report that crime to the “hotline”. Despite these delimiting probabilities, Crime Stoppers has been surprisingly successful nationwide. This suggests that citizens are aware of criminal occurrences and are sufficiently concerned about crime to both watch the program and make the report to the police.

An inference one may make as an unstated result of Crime Stoppers is that the program has served as an electronic means to develop stronger community relationships. While it lacks the traditional elements of face-to-face contact and individual “bonding” between officers and members of the community, it nonetheless provides an avenue of understanding and involvement which can support other community alliance efforts.

*Volunteers.* For a variety of reasons related to constrained resources, community relations, and community activism, police departments began using volunteers to assist in a wide range of organizational functions. At one end of the spectrum, volunteers were used as “reserve” or “auxiliary” officers to assist in law enforcement activities. Even these programs vary widely—some reserve officers are used simply for traffic control while others, such as Kansas City, Missouri and San Bernardino County, California, provide reserve officers full police powers and responsibilities. At the other end of the continuum of volunteers, departments use citizens who will do odd jobs at the department on an irregular or unscheduled basis.

Volunteers can be a valuable resource for a police department both because of the money saved in salaries and because of the expertise which can be gained from the volunteer. For example, the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) has a structured process for soliciting, screening, and training volunteers to work with a police department. Relying on retired accountants, psychologists, teachers, lawyers, and other skilled persons can provide the department with expertise which may not otherwise be available.

An obvious additional advantage to volunteers is the community alliance role. They can provide a “citizen’s perspective” of issues as well as serve as a sounding board for policies and practices. Hopefully, the volunteers will also serve as a community resource on matters relating to the police department.

The potential outcome of a volunteer program goes beyond any workload reduction by contributing to the favorable profile of the police department. Unfortunately, most organizations do not take complete advantage of the opportunities afforded through volunteers, instead there is a tendency to treat them as interlopers in the sanctum of policing. This attitude, directed toward



those who want help the police through volunteerism, will likely have a negative effect on the police-community relationship. Assessments should focus on how volunteers are used as well as both their direct and indirect impact on the total police function.

*Crime Prevention.* The sociologically based concept of crime prevention was a generally long-termed approach aimed at youthful offenders. The hypothesis was that potential criminal behavior would initially manifest itself in youthful behavior. As such, juvenile delinquency was a precursor—an early warning system perhaps—to adult criminality. Thus, in order to prevent future crime, one needed to identify youthful offenders and change their behavior. There are both theoretical and pragmatic limitations to this hypothesis, however, the basic premise appears to ring true. Unfortunately, because of legal, financial, and practical restrictions, the fruits of this hypothesis cannot be tested. Certainly, however, research in this vein contributed to greater thought about ways to *prevent* crime, not just apprehend perpetrators.

The 1970s saw a tremendous growth in the “physical crime prevention” movement. A very pragmatically oriented approach—sometimes simply known as “locks and bolts”—physical crime prevention initially relied on the premise that is it was more difficult for a burglar or thief to get access to and steal property, the less likelihood the intended crime would be committed. The concept grew to include programs such as Operation Identification wherein the premise was that a thief was less likely to steal property if it was known that the property was clearly marked and recorded, thereby making it more difficult to “fence” the goods. Other variations of this crime prevention theme grew with popularity among police departments. (For a comprehensive discussion of crime prevention see Rosenbaum, 1986).

From a theoretical perspective this movement relied on a probable fallacious assumption: that a crime would be *prevented*. In fact, the likelihood is that a crime would still be committed, just not at the initially intended location: the phenomenon of *displacement*. Despite this theoretical concern police departments embraced the concept because as long as the community had been comprehensively canvassed with crime prevention surveys and “protections,” displacement to another jurisdiction was fine. Indeed, most police administrators accept crime displacement as a legitimate goal.

Just as police departments embraced the concept, so did the public. The program seemed logical and it provided physical evidence of some behavior designed to reduce the probability of crime and, consequently, reduced the fear of crime. As in the case of Neighborhood Watch, these crime prevention programs provided an avenue for the police to open doors to the “law abiding” community and perform a service they wanted. While there are many positive aspects of physical crime prevention, it lacks depth to deal with problems to any substantive degree. Instead, it provides a cushion on which concerns about victimization and fear of crime may rest.

From an evaluation perspective, a department obviously cannot measure crime which was prevented. Other variables can be measured such as reductions in reported crime (which has a number of problems in itself), crime rate changes in contiguous areas or jurisdictions (which may be an indicator of displacement), changes in levels of fear of crime, and changes in 911 calls or calls for service in the targeted crime prevention areas.

*Police Community Relations.* With its roots at the National Center for Police Community Relations at Michigan State University in the 1950s, led by the late Louis Radelet, the police community relations (PCR) movement attempted to resolve the anathema between law enforcement and citizens by opening lines of communications. While the initial ideas of PCR were to develop a means to exchange information, PCR evolved into a programmatic emphasis to

teach officers about communications with the public; teach the public about the challenges and enigmas of police work; and develop reciprocal empathy about the plight of each group in their daily relationship.

The PCR movement was the first initiative which truly attempted to reach the community. The initial focus was to identify community leaders as a focal point for establishing liaison with the citizens. Positive relations between the community leadership and the police, it was theorized, would “trickle down” (to borrow a Reaganomics term) to community members. At the outset, PCR was largely one-sided—its focus was predominantly on changing the community view of the police and to make citizens more supportive and understanding of police actions (President’s Commission, 1967). By the 1970s virtually every police department of any size had a Police-Community Relations unit (or officer) and courses on PCR had become a staple in law enforcement/criminal justice college curricula (Radelet and Carter, 1994).

As the movement matured, the focus on PCR become somewhat more reciprocal. It was felt that police officers needed to learn more about the social-psychological dynamics involved in their relationship with the community. Moreover, PCR needed to be practiced by *all* officers, not just those assigned to a PCR unit. As a result, emphasis was also being placed on police training as a means to get all officers to have a more communicative—sometimes civil—attitude toward the public. Particularly in the late 1970s police departments also regularly incorporated crime prevention programs and Neighborhood Watch with the PCR unit. It was felt that this was an additional step to help the police and community communicate as well as to make an effort to reduce crime (Carter and Radelet, 1999).

PCR was the first comprehensive effort which attempted to resolve the endemic issues inherent in community alliance. The movement recognized that disequilibrium existed between the police and community and it developed programmatic strategies to address this dissonance. The goal of PCR was to establish an effective dialogue between citizens and law enforcement and, consequently, develop better support for the police as well as enhance police accountability to the public as conceptually proffered in the social contract.

Without question, the greatest focus of PCR efforts were minority communities for this is where the greatest disequilibrium existed between the police and the citizens. The need for better relations with minorities became evident in the 1960s. With the force of the Civil Rights Movement punctuated by civil disturbances and protest marches, it became evident changes had to be made in police practices. The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, and the President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice all cited problems in police-community relations—particularly excessive force, deprivation of constitutional rights, rudeness, insensitivity to minorities, and discriminatory practices. As a remedy to these and other strains in the police-community relationship, each of these Commissions recommended that police departments develop aggressive PCR programs.

The PCR concept is by no means dead, but it is being rethought. Concerns emerged from police executives that PCR did not delve deep enough. Despite the intent, PCR appeared to have become a veneer for police inadequacies—a predominantly *reactive* method to deal with problems. The proactive elements of PCR were limited and generally shallow.

Based on the evolving body of research on police practices and the increasingly apparent limitation of PCR programs, practitioners and theoreticians alike felt that the endemic issues of



policing in general—not simply those related to community alliance—were not being effectively addressed. This is the framework from which the embryo of community policing was conceived.

A positive police-community relationship is obviously desired in community policing, although the locus and approach are different than the traditional PCR model. We must re-define that relationship to include many of the issues discussed above as well as such variables as respect and support for the police, numbers of complaints against officers, satisfaction with police service, and other quality indicators. Collectively, an evaluation of these variables can provide important insights to the success of community policing vis-à-vis the police-community relationship.

### THE POLITICAL DIMENSION

Police involvement with the community in a new, proactive relationship is inherently a political dynamic. Moreover, with greater interaction of the police with other government departments and an increased role of officers as community organizers, the more dominant the political role. Considering the political elements of program development and evaluation is a responsibility which should not be neglected.

Crime—and the need to prevent it—has consistently received substantial attention from politicians simply because it is of major concern to citizens. Several explicit reasons come to mind when considering why crime is a political factor.

First, crime is an emotional issue which conjures up feelings of safety and security for oneself and family. The political process feeds on emotion as evidenced by political advertisements both for and against the “Brady Bill” handgun purchase waiting period. A tug on the heartstrings has far more political clout than the weight of empirical evidence. Second, crime will touch most people, either directly or indirectly, at some point in their lifetime. Nearly every American will be a victim or know a victim, consequently crime is something the public can relate to with near unanimity. This comprehensive experience gives the politician a good frame of reference for communicating with his/her constituency.

Third, crime is one issue on which nearly all people can agree to some extent regardless of political position, race, ethnicity, age, gender or lifestyle—people do not want crime. Democrat or Republican, black or white, Hispanic or Anglo, young or old, man or woman, gay or straight; all agree that crime and violence must be controlled. Consequently, it is politically safe to oppose crime and offer *reasonable* initiatives to control it.

Fourth, citizens are willing to make some sacrifices for protection against criminals. Fear of crime is pervasive, fueled by media reports, gossip, and assumptions. To abate this fear many people are willing to make some sacrifices, including taxes. For example, the citizens of Flint, Michigan voted by a two-thirds majority to increase their tax mills to support community policing (Kelling and Moore, 1988). In Texas, citizens voted to spend over \$2 billion to build prisons even though the state’s financial status was lean. The point to note is that increased expenditures for crime control are relatively easier to justify than other government initiatives because crime control efforts are not generally seen as a “pork barrel”. Not to be lost is the fact that spending money on issues of popular concern can be an important way to gain “political chips”, as will be discussed later.

Finally, crime is visible and piques a morbid curiosity among people. News reports about murder and mayhem, television programs depicting “real crime”, and non-fiction books on “true

crime” are all evidence of this. As another illustration, people still go to rural Waco, Texas where the Branch Davidian compound stood, just to see the sight of that calamity (and buy T-shirts). These factors clearly illustrate that incidents of crime draw public fascination, particularly when the crime is senseless or an atrocity. As such, crime makes great fodder for politicians to decry, examine, comment about, and take action upon.

Particularly in recent years as crime has become increasingly violent, invading rural communities, the public schools, and touching white, middle America, the politics of crime have not only become a readily accessible issue for politicians to safely attack, the public is mandating political action. This emotional firestorm is emerging as yet another reason why crime is an important political factor.

While there is a common ground surrounding the concern for crime and the need to control it, there are also notable disagreements on the proper responses to the problems. For example, opinions vary widely on such issues as:

- Should police authority be increased to deal with crime?
- Should some legal rights be temporarily “suspended” in order to deal more effectively with criminals, notably drug dealers?
- What is the best way to prevent crime—educational programs, physical crime security, more police officers, stiffer prison sentences, youth diversion programs, the death penalty? All of the above? Some of the above? None of the above?
- Will crime be more effectively prevented (and will justice be more effectively served) if convicted criminals are punished or rehabilitated?
- Is punishment versus rehabilitation a legal issue, professional issue, or political issue?
- Should drugs be legalized in order to cut down on drug-related crime?
- Is crime a racial problem? A youth problem? An urban problem? A poverty problem? A media problem? A parental problem? A—you fill in the blank—problem?

These questions present a number of issues which stir controversy. Importantly, these questions—and the way they are answered—reflect political perspectives and beliefs far more than substantive knowledge and research. Several examples come to mind. Because violent crime has become a pervasive issue for the public, Congress and state legislatures have attempted to respond with a number of “get tough” measures to deal with the problem.

The label of “get tough” is important from a political perspective. Citizens are both tired and fearful of crime, consequently holding elected officials accountable for doing “something” (particularly as reflected by the November 1993 elections). With political sentiment being this explicit, politicians recognize that some action must be taken; and that action cannot be viewed as being “soft” on crime or criminals. Consequently, youth boot camps, providing federal support for employing up to 100,000 more community police officers, increasing the range of offenses for the death penalty, making mandatory life sentences for career criminals, increasing mandatory penalties for offenses where firearms are used, and building more prisons have been among the common responses. Indeed, creation of the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) agency in the U.S. Office of Justice Programs in 1994 illustrates the political influence of crime in general and community policing in particular. The political dynamic comes into play not because of our actual knowledge about the effectiveness of these measures but because they lessen the political heat from the public.

Just as important as appearing to be “tough on crime” is the prospect that a new crime control strategy has been developed which holds great hope for preventing crime and making the streets safer. This is where community policing comes into play and where jeopardy for the concept lies.

Increasingly, community policing is being embraced by many politicians as the means to more effectively deal with crime while at the same time providing better service to the public, with special concern for increasing the quality of life within a community. In reality, there are probably few politicians which truly understand the philosophy. Despite this, they are providing their heartfelt support (in a political sense) for the concept because it addresses crime, links the police and community together in a stronger bond, and provides a demonstrable initiative which the politician can point to as an effort to show that community concerns are being addressed.

This is not intended to sound cynical or accusatory, rather it is pragmatic. Most politicians realize they have an ethical responsibility to address public concerns. The fact that one’s personal future is tied to this responsiveness is not inconsequential. It is, of course, the nature of the beast. Unfortunately, any new initiative—such as community policing—is also politically fragile because if no “successes” can be demonstrated, then support will dwindle. Defining and measuring “success” is an inherent part of program evaluation, yet the political dynamics cannot be completely ignored.

## PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

While not program evaluation, per se, a common issue which emerges in the assessment of community policing is performance appraisal. Because of the prominence of the issue, the authors felt that some attention should be given to it in this discussion.

Wycoff and Oettmeir (1994), in addressing the need for personnel evaluation, identified six primary reasons...

- *Administration.* To help managers make decisions about promotion, demotion, reward, discipline, training needs, salary, job assignment, retention, and termination.
- *Guidance and Counseling.* To help supervisors give feedback to subordinates and assist them in career planning and preparation, and to improve employee motivation.
- *Research.* To validate selection and screening tests and training evaluations as well as to assess the effectiveness of interventions designed to improve individual performance
- *Socialization.* To convey expectations to personnel about both the content and the style of their performance and to reinforce other means of organizational communication about the mission and the values of the department.
- *Documentation.* To record the types of problems and situations officers are addressing in their neighborhoods and the approaches they take to deal with them. This provides for data-based analysis of the types of resources and other managerial support needed to address problems and allows officers the opportunity to have their efforts recognized.
- *System Improvement.* To identify organizational conditions that may impede improved performance and to solicit ideas for changing the conditions.

In order to fulfill these criteria, a system must be developed which validly and reliably measures individual activities. Unfortunately, this has proven difficult to achieve. Police agencies seek a system which has the ease and objectivity of “bean counting” but the substantive flexibility and ability to be reasonably subjective as is found in qualitative or narrative evaluations.

Any policy which seeks effective performance evaluations must address several points:

- Who is to be evaluated?
  - + Probationary Officers
  - + Patrol Officers
  - + Supervisors
  - + Managers
  - + Administrators
  - + Non-Sworn Personnel
  - + Volunteers
- How frequently will personnel be evaluated?
- Who does the evaluations?
- What kind of training do evaluators need?
- What form will evaluations take? (i.e., qualitative, quantitative narrative, self-evaluation)

Based upon input the authors have received from various police managers seeking to evaluate community police officers, factors which consistently emerged as being important were:

- Does the officer have a clear sense of objectives?
  - + Understand the department’s mission and goals
  - + Understand his/her role in the department’s goals
  - + Have objectives he/she wants to accomplish in their job assignment
  - + Have a sense of direction in work rather than just “occupying space”
- Does the officer understand operational policies and procedures?
- What has the officer done for professional self-improvement? (i.e., taken college courses, taken advantage of training opportunities familiarity with research, current thought, issues and trends in policing or applied diverse knowledge and research to his/her working environment)
- What kind of feedback is received about the officer? (i.e., commendations from the public and department or complaints from the public and department as well as informal feedback from peers)
- How does the officer perform his/her responsibilities? (i.e., competently, understanding the job, confidence, proactively, and professional pride)
- Roles and duties the officer must perform (i.e., report writing, identifying and reporting problems, community involvement, and so forth)

Expanding on the idea of performance assessment, the authors suggest that there be the opportunity for officers to evaluate “up the organization.” That is, officers should be able to provide some input on the effectiveness of supervisors and managers. Inherently qualitative in nature, factors in this upward assessment may address:

- *Leadership*—Does the manager...
  - + Set an example for others to follow?
  - + Motivate using positive reinforcement?

- + Take risks and experiment when appropriate?
- *Communication*—Does the manager...
  - + Provide information critical to successful performance?
  - + Provide constructive criticism?
  - + Choose the right time to deliver messages?
  - + Sense others mood and respond appropriately?
  - + Exhibit compassion and sensitivity?
- *Teamwork*—Does the manager...
  - + Treat employees equally?
  - + Encourage group problem solving?
  - + Share credit with all team members?
  - + Hold effective team meetings?
- *Quality*—Does the manager...
  - + Set a good example by constantly trying to improve?
  - + Provide training opportunities?
  - + Have a good sense of the customers and their needs?
- *Planning*—Does the manager...
  - + Ask for help in planning?
  - + Set realistic, attainable objectives?
  - + Follow through with the plan?
  - + Celebrate accomplishments?

While there will be some resistance by supervisors and managers to this form of evaluation, the organization will benefit from the practice. Specific procedures for the process will need to be refined by each organization to maximize its benefit and to ensure that it is employed equitably.

Police agencies should develop a process wherein a broad range of flexible criteria are articulated which can accurately assess the performance of community police officers. The criteria should be flexible in order to adjust to the various diverse duties of community police officers. The criteria should also be evaluated in a subjective manner. The process of developing a performance evaluation policy should also include a component for personnel to evaluate supervisors and managers (*see* Carter, 1995).

## **THE EVALUATION STRUCTURE**

Evaluation has been defined in many ways—regardless of this multiplicity, it can be classified in two categories, depending on the general purpose of the evaluative effort.

*Outcome Evaluation*—The process of determining the value or amount of success in achieving a predetermined objective through...

- Defining the objective in some qualitative or quantitative measurable terms;
- Identifying the proper criteria (or variables) to be used in measuring the success toward attaining the objective;
- Determination and explanation of the degree of success; and
- Recommendations for further program actions to attain the desired objectives/outcomes

*Process Evaluation*—The assessment of procedures used to attain objectives within the following criteria...

- Do the procedures substantively contribute to the objective?
- Do the procedures effectively utilize resources?

- Are the procedures coordinated with other elements in the intelligence process?
- Are staff members properly trained to execute the procedures?

More simply, each of these types of evaluation are characterized by the following questions:

- *Outcome evaluation*: Are you accomplishing what you want?
- *Process evaluation*: Are the methods for accomplishing outcomes working with maximum utility?

Essentially, evaluation is a scientific process that involves making comparisons between “conditions.” These conditions may range from reported burglary rates to levels of fear of crime to levels of satisfaction with respect to how courteous officers are when speaking to members of the public. Regardless of the nature of the comparison, it must address some activities of the police department which are in support of its goals as related to the mission.

When we say that evaluation is a “scientific” process, that means that it is logical, objective, and has inherent procedures of “quality control” which attempt to ensure the accuracy of the information collected, analyzed, and interpreted in the evaluative process. These procedures are referred to as *research methods* or the *methodology* of the evaluative. The type of methodology used will vary based upon the nature of the program or activities being evaluated. Initially, this largely relates back to the idea of “comparisons”—the factors against which comparisons are made are typically built into the *development* of a program so that an effective *evaluation* can be made. The types of comparisons which are made in law enforcement evaluations include:

- *“Real” versus “Expected” Outcomes*—Serves as a means to assess the accuracy of projections and forecasts. This can be used to assess the accuracy of hypotheses, conclusions, and recommendations. Actual or “real” results of a program or activity as determined by the evaluation are compared to the expected results developed in the planning and development phases of the program/activity.
- *“Before” versus “After” Status*—Examines whether specific activities have had an impact or contributed to a change in the goals or phenomena peripheral to the goals. Measurements are taken before a new program is implemented and once again after a defined period of the program’s operation. Changes in the measured variables are attributed to the effects of the program. (For example, measuring burglary rates and citizens’ perceptions of safety before a Neighborhood Watch is started and then after the program has been in effect for a year. Changes, if any, in the burglary rate and/or the feelings of safety may be attributed to the Neighborhood Watch.)
- *Comparison of Reactions to Operations and Administrative Expectations*—Determines the consistency of perceptions and quality (value) of community policing activities to the expectations of administrative and operational consumers of programs and activities. Simply said, great ideas do not always work as they are planned—this type of evaluative comparison attempts to measure this.
- *Contributory Value*—This attempts to assess the degree to which the program activities contributed to goal attainment. In some cases a program may have some type of effect, but it may not necessarily be goal-related. For example, a community outreach program initiated by the police department may make citizens more aware needs of the public schools or city recreation department.



While this may be viewed as a positive effect, it is not related to the police department goals.

- *Quality Control Assessment*—This is an overall, broad-based assessment of the utility, accuracy, general value, orientation, and need of the community policing philosophy and its related programs. It may be learned that initial philosophical ideas and policies related to the philosophy are unrealistic for the department and/or community. as a result, “fine tuning” may need to be made in order that program and activity quality are reasonably attainable.
- *Processes and Outputs*—As referred to above in the distinction between the types of evaluative efforts, this is an internal assessment of the correlation of expended efforts and procedures in comparison to the type and quality of output produced in the community policing activities.

### THE “CHARACTER” OF EVALUATION METHODS

It was noted above that while sophisticated evaluation techniques should be used, they should be limited to conditions and times that demand the need. Less rigorous methods can be used for effective “evaluative sensing” informally by supervisors or designated evaluators. When problems appear to exist, then formalized evaluation may be warranted. For informal evaluation to work, it must be performed:

- Purposely
- Routinely
- Comprehensively
- Critically

Importantly, evaluation should be viewed as a positive, constructive activity to make the community policing policies more valuable to the organization—evaluation should *not* be viewed as “fault-finding”.

At the heart of any evaluative effort is the identification and assessment (measurement) of relevant *variables*. In a formal evaluation the variables must be critically selected from the particular activity being assessed. Informal evaluation can take a more generalized approach. As a means to maintain an intuitive base of understanding about the philosophy, programs, and activities to be evaluated, there are several types of variables and questions which may be asked during the *informal* evaluations.

1. *Protocols of Officers’ Tasks*
  - Are the proper or best activities being selected for the designated community policing needs?
  - Are personnel properly trained to utilize and interpret the data being collected via the protocol used?
  - Are the protocols fully within the agency’s capability or are resources and expertise being stretched?
2. *Information Processing*
  - Is information being adequately collected and assessed to evaluate the community policing goals?
  - Is the *quality* of information being adequately controlled and assessed?
  - Is too much raw, non-contributory (e.g., high interest but low utility; or simply “bean counting”) information being introduced into the evaluative process?

- Is information being effectively and logically categorized and indexed to evaluate *all* aspects of community policing?
  - Is too much or too little information being introduced into the evaluative process?
3. *Analysis*
    - Are the best and most appropriate analytic techniques being used for evaluative purposes?
    - Are logical conclusions being drawn?
    - How accurate are hypotheses and interpretations of collected data/information?
    - Is the analysis providing useful information for decision making?
  4. *Reporting*
    - Are evaluation reports being produced in an understandable manner?
    - Are the reports comprehensive?
    - Are the reports fulfilling their intended role?
  5. *Dissemination*
    - Are the right people receiving the needed information?
    - Are community police officers and decision makers receiving the information needed to fulfill their responsibilities?
    - Is the evaluative information being disseminated on a timely basis?
    - Are recipients of the information able to use the information they receive?
  6. *Personnel*
    - Are all staff members—e.g., community police officers, supervisors, evaluators—properly trained for their tasks?
    - Is the supervision of community police officers a style which is compatible with the proactive, innovative orientation community police officers must employ?
    - Is the expertise of officers sufficiently diverse to meet the stated goals?
    - Do personnel have effective relations and communications with other organizations which contribute to community policing activities?

As can be seen, the implications from these questions alone poses significant challenges for successful program evaluation. This also reinforces the fact, that the process of evaluation is not simple: It requires, *planning, expertise, and thought*. Of these, perhaps the most difficult is careful, logical, critical thought about transition between community policing philosophy and action—evaluation measures the dynamics of this transition.

#### **COMMON PROBLEMS TO FOCUS EVALUATIONS**

Among the more common problems found in police operations which should be examined as part of the evaluation process are:

*The department becomes too enmeshed in daily activities with difficulty in changing procedures to respond to fast breaking or special needs.*

Most police departments are bureaucratic, paramilitary organizations. As such, they rely heavily on uniform procedures with limited discretion. Moreover, rigid accountability to the *letter* of procedures tends to take precedence over the *spirit* of the procedure (embodied in the policy). Consequently, daily activities become routinized. Community policing requires greater flexibility, use of discretion, and innovation. This *change* is difficult for both the organization and its people to accept. Human behavior is inherently dogmatic, thus change becomes difficult. Yet, it is essential for

community policing to become successful. Ideally planning and leadership will help induce change and evaluation will measure it.

*Little feedback, positive or negative, is given to the department's various units on the quality and value of community policing activities.*

There is a tendency to keep evaluation results—particularly results which are intermediately collected in ongoing programs—among the administrative staff. Sometimes, supervisors in programs being evaluated do not even receive evaluation results. This information *must* be communicated to supervisors and line level employees performing the community policing activities. This not only assists in the process of “fine tuning” activities to make them more workable, it can also help in team building and enhancing the *esprit de corps* of the program participants. Providing feedback is not only good for program development and implementation, it is simply good management.

*Commonly used procedures for responding to calls for service and order maintenance situations become institutionalized with limited creativity.*

More attention should be given to creative problem solving—it must, however, go beyond training and include good *leadership*. There needs to be an ongoing awareness of the need for proactive efforts and innovation in dealing with all responsibilities. In cases where there is disagreement about the best alternative which should be taken to deal with a problem or situation, the disagreements are frequently *compromised* rather than having the various positions and supporting arguments presented for consumption by decisions makers. This process permits *informed leadership* which, in turn, contributes to more robust program development. A well conceived evaluation will aid in this leadership responsibility.

*There must be on-going communications between all units within the department—line and staff—to make community policing work most efficiently and effectively.*

The communications must be two-way—both horizontally and vertically in the organization. Not only must leaders and line level personnel communicate (and *listen*) but there must also be lateral communications between units of the police department. For example, a community police officer may be attempting to deal with a rash destruction of property complaints in his/her assigned area. The officer should be able to ask the department's crime analysts to conduct a special analysis of these complaints and receive a cooperative, rapid response to this inquiry. If there has not been effective communications for the Crime Analysis Unit to understand their role in community policing *and* the need to respond rapidly to such requests, then the potential effect of the officer's activities will be minimized. *All* units must share information, thoughts, and ideas as related to their responsibilities and the department's goals. Evaluation methods should be designed to measure the applicable communications related to the program and activities in question.

*Program evaluators must avoid “circularity” in facts—that is, not loose perspective and believe that earlier made suggestions or assumptions are now fact.*

When there is significant investment in a philosophy and activities in support of that philosophy, there is an obvious desire to see one’s beliefs achieved. Program evaluation is a method to objective measure that success. Because of this desire for success and the reinforcement provided by continued discussion and consideration of the activities inherent in the program activities, it is easy to confuse reinforced belief with scientific fact. Thus, care must be taken to avoid this “circularity”.

In sum, evaluation of community policing activities is to ensure that activities and processes are:

- *Effective*—they accomplish what we want them to do; the activity contributes to attaining goals
- *Efficient*—they are effective without waste or undue expenditures of resources
- *Accurate*—the evaluative processes are valid and reliable
- *Timely*—information is being produced within time frames which make the information useful for decision making
- *Relevant*—community policing policies, programs and activities are all directly related to the department’s mission and goal(s)

Because community policing requires substantially different personnel utilization practices, program evaluation will also be critical to effective personnel allocation and deployment decisions.

*Allocation*—The long-term assignment of personnel by function, geography, and shift/duty tour along with the commitment of required supporting resources to deal with crime and police service demands in the most efficient and effective manner.

*Deployment*—The short-term assignment of personnel to address specific crime problems or police service demands.

Many departments when initially adopting the community policing philosophy will *deploy* officers to perform activities in support of the philosophy. There is greater flexibility in experimental deployment which will lead to further program and policy development. When policies and practices of the philosophy have been tested and “fine tuned” then resources are *allocated* to fully operationalize the philosophy. In many ways, *allocation* can be viewed as a *strategic* activity and *deployment* is a more *tactical* activity. In both cases, evaluation plays an important role for continued policy application.

## METHODOLOGIES USED IN PROGRAM EVALUATION

In all cases, the first methodological issue is to decide is *what information is wanted or needed in the evaluation*. The desired information must be clearly articulated in order that the best method may be used to collect the needed information.

Administrators and policy makers may sometimes simply say “I want to know about...” with no further delineation. In these cases, it is commonly the case that an idea is being explored,

but not enough is known in order to formulate specific questions. In these cases, the evaluators and administrators must work cooperatively to solidify the issues and formulate those issues into “researchable” questions.

Once it is determined *what information is wanted*, then the methodology is selected based on a wide range of factors. In selecting the methodology the evaluator must examine:

- The variables which will yield the information desired, either...
  - + Individually
  - + Collectively (in the aggregate)
  - + Interactively
- The ability to access the variables and measure them
- The reliability of the variables
- The validity of the variable information obtained

Identifying and understanding variables is a critical element in the evaluation process.

*Variable*—Any characteristic on which individuals, groups, items, or incidents differ.

Examples of variables which may be measured in the evaluation of a community policing program include:

- Types of Problems Within the Community
- Alternative Solutions to the Problems
- Solutions Which Have Been Implemented
- Quality of the Relationship Between the Police and Other Departments and Agencies
- Fear of Crime
- “Signs of Crime” Within the Community (the “Broken Windows” Analogy)
- Citizen Satisfaction With Police
- Employee Job Satisfaction
- Degree of Citizen Involvement in Program Implementation and Problem Solving Activities
- Complaints About Police Behavior (Not the Numbers of Complaints, but the Types of Complaints)
- Responsiveness to Citizen Demands
- Effectiveness of the Management System
- Efficiency of the Management System
- Crime Patterns
- Patterns in the Flow and Distribution on Unlawful Commodities
- Changes in Demography

Certainly this list is not exhaustive, rather it is to serve as an illustration. The reader will note that most of these variables are *qualitative*—that is, they are factors which are *described* rather than being *counted*, per se. This is because community policing focuses on prevention, problem solving, and resolution of issues rather than reactive documentation of incidents. Moreover, community policing is concerned about the *quality of life* both in the community and the working environment of the police department. These factors, simply cannot be quantified. The problem with qualitative information is that it is much more difficult to collect, analyze, and base decisions on. Yet, these qualitative dynamics are the heart of community policing initiatives.

This is not to say that quantitative data is never collected in community policing programs. Rather, it is a *caveat* about which one should be aware.

As a related point to variables, the question may be asked, “Why should new data be collected if there is existing data which may answer the questions at issue?” It is true that *new information* does not necessarily have to be collected to evaluate a program. Existing data can be used, but considered in light of the following points:

- How *available* are the existing data, and can they be obtained for research?
- How *valid* are the data? (e.g., Do the data measure what we want it to measure?)
- Do the data *reflect the universe* or a selected, non-representative subset?
- How *reliable* are the available data? (e.g., Is the data dependable? Would the same results be found if measured time after time?)

If these questions can be answered to the satisfaction of the policy makers and research team, then there are distinct advantages of using existing data:

- It is *inexpensive*
- It is more *rapidly available*

In most cases new data will need to be collected. Beyond the methodological issues in involved, policy makers and researchers must also be concerned with...

- Confidentiality of data
- Protection of human subjects
- Maintaining public service/safety obligations
- Getting cooperation of personnel
- Avoiding the collection of too much data (we tend to get obsessive)

With the desired output and the variables identified when collecting new data, a *methodology* must be selected.

*Methodology*—A set of scientifically-based procedures which are used to...

- Collect information from the variables;
- Control the information collection for validity and reliability;
- Analyze the information to describe the subject/target;
- Analyze the information to make inferences about the subject/target;
- Direct the interpretations of the analysis; and
- Report the information

As noted above, there is an inherent difference between quantitative and qualitative variables. The essential difference is that *quantitative* methods collect and analyze information which can be “counted” or placed on a scale of measurement which can be statistically analyzed. *Qualitative* methods collect and analyze information which are described in narrative or rhetorical form and conclusions drawn based on the cumulative interpreted meaning of that information. Thus, the nature of the methodology will be dependent on:

- The *characteristics of the variables*, and/or
- The method which is chosen to collect the information

Methodologies and analytic procedures which can be used include:



- Survey research (both of the community and members of the department)
- Case studies
- Qualitative descriptors based on interviews
- Expert analysis (such as the Delphi Technique)
- Operations research (queuing theory, decision theory, modeling, simulation, gaming theory)
- Experimental and quasi-experimental design
- Descriptive and inferential statistical analysis (including probability-based projections)
- Econometric models
- Actuarial models
- Spatial analysis (location/geography and associated patterns of crimes, persons, commodities)
- Temporal analysis (“time”; e.g., monthly, weekly, daily, hourly, measures of incidents and changes of the targeted entity)

While many research methodologies are available, these are among the most useful for program evaluation. Obviously, many of these methods require specialized training in order to perform them properly. Others require less technical knowledge. In these cases, personnel who have had college courses in research methods may be able to conduct the research. However, it should be cautioned, that most research is far more complex than many intuitively believe. For example, survey research requires important expertise in item construction and analysis; case studies require careful analytic skills; interviewing requires controls in both questioning and inter-rater reliability. As a result, administrators must cognizant of these concerns when decisions are being made based upon research results. No methodology is “pure” or “conclusive”—they all require interpretation by the evaluator. Thus, the best prepared evaluators will produce the best output.

### **REPORTING THE RESULTS OF A PROGRAM EVALUATION**

Once the data has been collected in an evaluation, it must be placed in a consumable form that can be used for both administrative and operational purposes. That is, the results from the evaluation can be used to make *administrative decisions* concerning program financing, personnel allocation and deployment, program continuance, and related issues. The information is also used for *operational decisions* which reflect the specific types of activities, policies, and approaches which will be used in fulfilling the community policing philosophy. There are various evaluation report models which can be used to meet different needs. Generally speaking, any evaluation report should have three component parts:

- *Descriptive*—The report describes the issues and processes which are subject to the analysis; the information and data are presented objectively for the user’s consumption
- *Interpretative*—The evaluator takes the raw data and information and interprets it, based on analysis and experience, with respect to the meaning of the information and its impact on the issues or activities involved
- *Available Alternatives*—In light of the interpretations, the resources available, community policing activities employed, and capabilities/expertise of the agency, the evaluator prescribes alternative actions and strategies for future action

Among the general types of evaluation reports which may be written are:

- *Cost-Effectiveness Reports*—Includes evaluation reports which show ratios of costs to results.
- *Comprehensive Evaluations*—Reports which describe the analysis between program activities (i.e., independent variables) as correlated to outcomes of the activities (i.e., dependent variables).
- *Status and Information Reports for Extra-Departmental Dissemination*—These are reports primarily prepared to inform non-law enforcement government administrators and legislators about community policing activities in general.

## CAVEATS REGARDING PROGRAM EVALUATION

Despite sophisticated methodologies and analytic methods, program evaluations have limitations about which administrators should be aware. The results of evaluative efforts are only as good as...

- The quality raw data/information collected.
- The appropriateness of the methodology(ies) selected.
- Quality control of all portions of the data collection process.
- The quality of the analysis and data interpretation.

Program evaluation is *not conclusive*—it is probabilistic relying on samples of information and data which are generalized. as a result, the probability always exists that the findings of the evaluation are incorrect. while good research methods can significantly reduce this probability, it nonetheless remains. Moreover, evaluations are also subjective based on the experience of the evaluator(s) and decision maker(s), particularly when qualitative variables are measured (as is frequently the case in evaluating community policing). This subjectivity has positive and negative elements. While on the one hand it permits the use of *experience* in the evaluation, it also introduces *emotion* which can cloud objectivity.

Overall, program evaluation is *descriptive*, not *prescriptive*. That is, it can tell “what is” and “what may be”. It can also provide *alternatives* for action, however, it cannot tell *what actions* to take. Decision making remains a human responsibility. Evaluation is *program* oriented, not *individually* oriented. That is, it examines aggregate issues—the cumulate effects of a program, policy, or activity, not individual steps in the process. Finally, program evaluation is a function in support of organizational goals—the output of evaluation is *not a goal in and of itself*.

## A FINAL NOTE

Effective program evaluation is largely dependent on how well an initiative is developed. Thus it is critical at the outset to establish a framework of which will be the basis for operations in order to have clear criteria to assess. The message, of course, is to comprehensively plan an initiative so that a meaningful evaluation can be performed.

There is no recipe for evaluating community policing because the manner in which the philosophy is conceived and implemented varies so widely. However, understanding the critical elements can provide a road map to assist in an assessment.

## PROGRAM EVALUATION STEPS IN A NUTSHELL

### I. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

#### A. **Clearly state**, in a simple and concise manner...

1. *Who* is involved in the program
    - Officers
    - Segments of the Community
    - “Target” Criminal Types
    - Classes/Groups of People in Need of a Defined Service
    - Volunteers
    - Representatives From Other Departments or Agencies
  
  2. *What* the Program is Intended to Accomplish
    - The Goal(s)
    - The Objectives
  
  3. *When* the Program is to Be Implemented
    - Time Frames for Planning and Development
    - Time Line for Employee, Organizational, and Resource Preparation and Allocation
    - Dates for Program Initiation
    - Dates for Initial Program Monitoring Review
    - Dates for Data Gathering
    - Time Line for Analysis and Preparation of Evaluation Reports
  
  4. *Where* Implementation and Evaluation Will be Made
    - Unique Community Characteristics
    - Unique Geographic Boundaries
  
  5. *Why* the Evaluation is Proceeding (Special Evaluation Requirements)
    - Management Decisions on Effectiveness (With Specific Criteria Delineated)
    - Management Decisions on Efficiency
    - Political Issues/Dynamics Which Influence the Program
    - The Need for Evaluation Due to Grants and/or Experimental Program Funding
  
  6. *How* the Evaluation is Proceeding
    - Research Methods Being Used
    - Adherence to Timetable
    - Personnel Responsible for Program Design, Implementation, and Evaluation
- B. Construct all applicable factors in the program into **measurable variables**
- C. Overlapping steps which need to be performed include:

1. Selection of Methods for Data Gathering
2. Finalizing and Gaining Approvals for Evaluation Time Frame
3. Providing Training, as Necessary, for Program Participants
4. Setting Up the *Management Structure* and *Policies* for the Program

## II. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

- A. Program Policies Put Into Effect
- B. Activity Audits Performed by supervisors to Ensure...
  1. Everyone is doing *what* they are supposed to
  2. Activities and duties are being *performed correctly*
- C. Data Gathering Begins (Depending on Research Methods Used)
- D. Program Adjustments are Made as Necessary

## III. EVALUATION

- A. Data Gathering Completed
- B. Data Analyzed
- C. Reports Written
- D. Results Disseminated
- E. Evaluation Results Reviewed by Command Staff in Consultation With the Research Team
  1. Draw Operational Conclusions
  2. Discuss Validity and Reliability of Results
  3. Discuss Possible Program Amendments

## IV. POST EVALUATION DECISIONS

- A. Is further data collection and analysis needed?
- B. What strengths and weaknesses were found in the program?
- C. How can the program be amended?
- D. Should the program be dropped?

## V. EVALUATION STARTS OVER AS APPROPRIATE AND NEEDED

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY AND LIST OF RESOURCES

- Babbie, Earl. (1962). *Survey Research Methods*. 6th Ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Baltimore County Police, Field Operations Bureau. (1988). *Community Foot Patrol Officer Guidelines and Procedures*. Towson, MD: Baltimore County Police Department.
- Bohigian, Haig E. (1971). *The Foundations and Mathematical Models of Operations Research With Extensions to the Criminal Justice System*. Doctoral Dissertation in the School of Education, New York University.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1988). *Report to the Nation on Crime and Justice*. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Cahn, Michael and James M. Tien. (1980). *An Evaluation Report of an Alternative Approach in Police Response: The Wilmington Management of Demand Program*. Cambridge, MA: Public Systems Evaluation, Inc.
- Carter, David L. (1989). *Research in Support of the Community Policing Concept*. Training Document, FBI Academy, Quantico, VA.
- Carter, David L. (1995). *Keystone Human Resource Issues for Community Policing*. An invited paper presented at the NIJ/BJA Annual Conference on Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation, Washington, DC.
- Carter, David L. (1995). "The Politics of Community Policing." *Public Administration Review*. Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 6—26.
- Carter, David L. and Louis Radelet (1999). *The Police and the Community*. 6th ed. New York: Prentice-Hall Publishing Company.
- Carter, David L. And Allen D. Sapp. (1993). "A Comparative Analysis of Clauses in Police Collective Bargaining Agreements as Indicators of Change in Labor Relations." *American Journal of Police*. (12)2:pp. 17—46.
- Carter, David L., Allen D. Sapp, and Darrel W. Stephens. (1991) *Survey of Contemporary Police Issues: Critical Findings*. Washington: Police Executive Research Forum.
- Couper, David C. (1991). *Quality Policing: The Madison Experience*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
- Dolbeare, Kenneth M. (ed.). (1975). *Public Policy Evaluation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Farmer, Michael. (1981). *Differential Police Response Strategies*. Washington: Police Executive Research Forum.
- Franklin, Jack L. and Jean Thrasher. (1976). *An Introduction to Program Evaluation*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Greene, Jack and Ralph Taylor. (1988). "Community Based Policing and Foot Patrol: Issues of Theory and Evaluation." In J. Greene and S. Mastrofski (eds.), *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?* New York: Praeger Press.
- Hartmann, Francis X., Lee P. Brown and Darrel W. Stephens. (1989) *Community Policing: Would You Know It If You Saw It?* East Lansing, MI: National Center for Community Policing.
- Hatry, Harry P., et al. (1976). *Program Analysis for State and Local Governments*. Washington: Urban Institute Press.
- Hatry, Harry P., et al. (1981). *Practical Program Evaluation for State and Local Governments*. Washington: Urban Institute Press.
- Kansas City, Missouri Police Department. (1977). *Response Time Analysis: Executive Summary*. Kansas City, MO: Board of Police Commissioners.
- Katzer, Jeffrey, et al. (1978). *Evaluating Information: A Guide for Users of Social Science Research*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Kelling, George, et al. (1974). *The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment: Technical Report*. Washington: Police Foundation.

- Kelling, George. (1981). *The Newark Foot Patrol Experiment*. Washington: Police Foundation.
- Kerlinger, Fred. (1973). *Foundations of Behavioral Research*. 2d ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Larson, Richard C. and Michael Cahn. (1985). *Synthesizing and Extending the Results of Police Patrol Studies*. Washington: National Institute of Justice.
- Levine, Michael and J. Thomas McEwen. (1985). *Patrol Deployment*. Washington: National Institute of Justice.
- McEwen, J. Thomas, et al. (1969). *Evaluation of the Differential Police Response Field Test*. Washington: National Institute of Justice.
- Morris, Lynn L. and Carol Fitz-Gibbon. (1978). *How To Deal With Goals and Objectives*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Nagel, Stuart S. and Marian Neef. (1975). *Operations Research Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- National Institute of Justice. (1991). *Evaluation Plan: 1991*. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice.
- President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. (1967). *Task Force Report: The Police*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Skolnick, Jerome and David Bailey. (1986). *The New Blue Line*. New York: The Free Press.
- Spelman, William and Dale Brown. (1984). *Calling the Police: Citizen Reporting of Serious Crime*. Washington: National Institute of Justice.
- Spelman, William and John Eck. (1987) *Problem-Oriented Policing: The Newport News Experiment*. Washington: Police Executive Research Forum.
- Thierauf, Robert J. and Robert C. Klekamp. (1975). *Decision Making Through Operations Research*. 2d ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Trojanowicz, Robert and Bonnie Bucqueroux. (1990) *Community Policing*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Trojanowicz, Robert and David L. Carter. (1988). *The Philosophy and Role of Community Policing*. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Community Policing.
- Trojanowicz, Robert C. (1990). "Community Policing is Not Police Community Relations". *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*. (October: pp 6—11).
- Weidman, Donald R. et al. (1975). *Intensive Evaluation for Criminal Justice Planning Agencies*. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice/Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.
- Whitaker, Gerald, et al. (1982). *Basic Issues in Police Performance*. Washington: National Institute of Justice.
- Whitmire, Kathryn and Lee P. Brown. (undated). *City of Houston Command Station/Neighborhood Oriented Policing Overview*. Houston: Houston Police Department.
- Wycoff, Mary Ann and Tim N. Oettmeier, (1994) *Evaluating Police Officer Performance...*, Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.