Toward Development of Meaningful and Effective Performance Evaluations

by Robert Trojanowicz
Director National Center for Community Policing
and Bonnie Bucqueroux
Associate Director National Center for Community Policing

National Center for Community Policing
School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University

MSU is an affirmative-action, equal-opportunity institution.

(#'s) correspond with endnotes

Preface

The authors would like to thank the following for their invaluable input and advice:

David Sinclair: Lansing (MI) Police Department
Deputy Chief
Ronald Sloan: Aurora (CO) Police Department

Introduction

When Ed Koch was mayor of New York City, he was famous for asking people on the street, "How'm I doing?" Though a bit gimmicky perhaps, this was a great way for the mayor to receive instant feedback--on how people felt about his performance as mayor, how his administration was perceived, and how people felt about the city in general. A consummate politician, Koch instinctively recognized that everyone in public service must ultimately answer to the "consumer"--the citizens, voters, and taxpayers--and that survival in a political and public job requires knowing how people really feel about your performance. No matter what the polls and surveys say, what really matters is how the person on the street says you're doing.

The police, too, need ways to determine how well they are doing--as a department and also as individuals within the department. No issue is more basic to the functioning of the police in a democratic society, and no issue more clearly underscores the difference between traditional policing and Community Policing than performance evaluation.

This booklet is an initial attempt to stimulate dialogue about how best to assess the performance of Community Policing departments and of individual Community Officers out on the street. The information included in this publication is by no means cast in stone; rather it is an attempt to promote discussion--even argument--about how best to proceed.

Evaluating The Department

The mission of the police

Without belaboring the obvious, the first challenge in creating a yardstick by which we can measure how well any given police department is doing requires defining the job of the police and that is far more controversial and complicated than it might at first seem. Is the primary function of the police to fight crime or to maintain the peace? Which is more basic--catching bad guys or preventing crimes before they occur? Which matters more--how fast the police arrive or what they do when they get there?

Increasingly, the police have come to recognize that defining the function of the police exclusively in terms of crime is problematic, for many reasons:

How much crime is there? Nobody really knows how much crime there is, so this means that even a dramatic rise in the number of crimes reported may not mean there has been any increase in the actual number of crimes committed, but merely that more are coming to the attention of police. The reverse may also account for at least part of any reported decrease in crime. Indeed, in a community where people do not trust their police, crime rates may plunge merely because residents become increasingly reluctant to call the police. **How much can police affect crime rates**? The rise and fall in the rates of various crimes may have less to do with police activity than with other factors beyond police control, ranging from changes in the local unemployment rate to the effectiveness of courts and corrections. **Is crime the measure that average citizens use to assess the police**? There is little doubt that people often enjoy grumbling about how the police should do more to get all the bad guys off the street, but most people understand the limitations under which the police operate. Indeed, most people develop their impressions of police because of contacts that have nothing to do with serious crime-- they are stopped for a traffic violation, or they call the department because of a problem with a barking dog or a loud party next door.

Traditional Versus Community Policing

Traditional police departments have long defined their primary mission and therefore their overall effectiveness in terms of crime-fighting. As this suggests, this all too often leaves police officials no choice but to apologize for increases in the crime rate that are not their fault--and to claim victory for declines that may or may not have much to do with police activity.

The danger is that this will lead to policing by and for the numbers--overvaluing quantitative results and undervaluing qualitative outcomes. It promotes an evaluation system that would, for example, ignore the contribution of an officer who takes the time to convince a youngster suspected of burglarizing dozens of homes to enroll in drug treatment, and who cuts the red tape to get him in. At the same time, the system would record and reward an officer who arrested the youngster as a user, even if that was likely to do little more than engage the rest of the expensive criminal justice system to little effect.

Community Policing, in contrast to the traditional system, focuses on solving the problem rather than on generating arrest statistics--quality not quantity. Community Policing rests on the belief that the police must become partners with the people in the community, so that together they can address local priorities related to crime, fear of crime, social and physical disorder, and neighborhood decay. Instead of making it difficult for an officer to find the time and opportunity to intervene with that youngster who needs drug treatment, Community Policing restructures the department so that Community Officers have the face-to-face contact required to effect such solutions. Community Policing shifts creative problem-solving--which the police have always done--from being an informal part of the job to recognition as the essence of formal police work, while at the same time, the Community Policing approach allows police the continuity they need to make the most of community-based problem solving.

As this suggests, the challenge is to find ways to capture and present Community Policing's successes to others, along with the traditional kinds of data that the police have always kept. How do we record, compile, and codify incidents such as when the officer got that young man into drug treatment? How can the police use such examples to help people understand how Community Policing works?

Persuading public policymakers

This booklet is an attempt to find new ways to gather, analyze, and express qualitative information about police performance in an easy-to-understand format, because the reality in a complex society is that data drives policy. The police must compete for scarce resources in a political environment where other agencies are also building cases to justify receiving more funds.

Particularly in times of recession, dollars grow tighter as social ills multiply--more homeless, more crime, more runaways, more domestic violence, more substance abuse, more unemployment and poverty. All too often, public policymakers do not recognize the role that the police play in dealing with all of these problems because of the perception that the police should focus on crime, as if they were not all part of the same matrix.

Now that Community Policing makes dealing with a broad spectrum of problems an integral part of the police mission, departments must find ways to collect and analyze data that reflect this commitment, as a means of educating public policymakers about the need for strong financial support. The chief should tell that story about how the officer steered the young man to treatment, and how that will cut the number of burglaries in the area overnight. But civic officials and representatives of funders also want cumulative data about how many, how much, how often.

HOW IS YOUR DEPARTMENT DOING?

Basic Ideals

Community Policing appears unstoppable, and estimates suggest that as many as two-thirds of police departments that serve communities of 50,000 population or more have already embraced Community Policing or plan to do so within a year. Yet questions persist concerning the actual depth and breadth of this commitment.

Many departments, especially those in big cities, adopt Community Policing first as a limited experiment, all too often applying sterile and outmoded measures to assess its relative success or failure--primarily before and after analysis of response time, clearance rates, arrests, number of citations issued. Unfortunately as well, because Community Policing is not always fully understood, departments eager to climb on the bandwagon often claim every new initiative is Community Policing, whether or not it accurately reflects the Community Policing philosophy.

So a department that wants to know "How'm I doing?" must first begin by gauging its understanding of Community Policing and how well its activities reflect this approach. Toward that end, it pays to reiterate some of the basic principles of Community Policing, so the following is a checklist of basics for any Community Policing effort:

Community Policing is a philosophy, not an isolated program. Understanding and application of the approach should permeate the entire department, civilian and sworn, and ideally the entire community, including the Big Five (introduced later), and the philosophy is expressed in the organizational philosophy that assigns Community Officers to beats. **Community Policing broadens the mission of the police beyond crime control**. In addition to serious crime, Community Policing targets so-called petty crime (vandalism, low-level drug dealing, juvenile offenses), fear of crime, and social and physical disorder, including neighborhood decay. **Community Policing provides decentralized service**. This often means the officer works directly out of an office in the community, many times as part of a larger team (recognizing that circumstances may dictate other arrangements), with the goal of providing Community Officers a defined beat. Regardless of specifics, the objective is to reduce centralized control of Community Officers by the department, in favor of making them directly accountable to the people in their beat. **Community Policing provides personalized service**. The purpose in decentralizing officers is to allow them the time and opportunity to maintain daily, direct, face-to-face contact with the people in the community, so that they can forge a new partnership, based on mutual trust, to prioritize and address local problems. **Community Policing implies a permanent commitment to the community**. Community Officers are permanently assigned to specific beats, and they must not be routinely rotated or used to fill in for vacancies elsewhere in the system. **Community Policing focuses on problem-solving**. The overarching purpose of assigning Community Officers to permanent beats is to allow the officer the time and opportunity to solve problems regardless of whether the solution includes arrest or some other traditional measure of success. Community Officers are immersed in the life of the community, so that they can fashion creative solutions that address the underlying dynamics of crime, fear of crime, and disorder, with the support and often the direct participation of the community. **Community Policing enhances accountability**, by robbing the predator, the police, and the people in the community of anonymity that can cloak misbehavior. **Community Policing is full-service policing**. Community Policing does not supplant but rather builds upon traditional policing, and Community Officers function as full-fledged law enforcement officers who make arrests, but who do much more. **Community Policing is not a specialty**. Everyone in the department should practice Community Policing, and Community Officers are not removed from--or elevated above--their fellow officers. Instead they are generalists who perform a variety of tasks that enhance the delivery of decentralized and personalized police service. **Community Policing involves average citizens in the police process**. By providing a neighborhood its own officer, Community Policing allows people a voice in how they are policed-- in setting local priorities, in fashioning solutions, in developing new proactive efforts and activities. Average citizens will also be asked to participate directly in a variety of initiative activities. **Community Policing complements reactive policing with proactive policing**. Traditional policing is structured to focus the vast bulk of its resources on responding to calls for service promptly, whereas Community Policing balances those

efforts with activities aimed at short- and long-term prevention of crime, fear of crime, and disorder. **Community Policing must face the test of operating within existing resources**. Community Policing must be affordable and cost-effective; it is not something a department tries for a while or employs as an add-on, but rather it must become the way that the entire police department conducts its business in the community. **Community Policing may serve as the model and as the centerpiece for the decentralization and personalization of other social services**. Experience shows that the next phase of the Community Policing revolution may be the application of the lessons learned from Community Policing to the delivery of other social services. In practical terms, this can mean assigning other social service agents--the social worker, public health nurse, mental health therapist, drug counselor--to a neighborhood storefront called a Neighborhood Network Center, where the Community Officer acts as both protector and catalyst.

Participation Of The Big Five

Important as well is that Community Policing cannot function in a vacuum; it depends on broad-based support inside and outside the department. Success in Community Policing depends on the involvement and interaction of the so-called Big Five--the police, the citizens (individuals and groups), civic officials, the community's public and private agencies, and the media. The following is an initial attempt to outline what police departments can do to educate groups outside the department--those whose support is essential for success:

Citizens (individuals and groups)
Has the department developed and implemented a strategy to educate average citizens about the trade-offs implicit in the shift to Community Policing and the timetable required to see positive change? (Among the most obvious and common trade-offs are that response time for non-emergency calls may be slowed to allow deploying officers in beats, and average citizens are allowed input into setting local priorities in exchange for providing their direct participation and support.)

How will people be made aware of their responsibilities and that the ultimate success of Community Policing depends on them?

Has the department planned (or executed) pre- and post-implementation surveying of the residents of the community? Did the surveys ask residents for input on problems and priorities?

Have Community Officers made contact with both average citizens and community leaders within their beats? Has the department identified the official and unofficial leaders in the community?

Is the department sensitive to the issue of overselling Community Policing to people as a panacea?

Civic officials
Have they been included in the planning process? Do they understand Community Policing, its trade-offs and its timetable?

How will they respond when Community Policing often means that groups which traditionally receive priority service (the business community, the affluent) may perceive that their service has declined in favor of others (typically those who live in poorer neighborhoods)?

Do civic officials understand that Community Policing means giving line officers greater autonomy, including the opportunity to make embarrassing mistakes?

With Community Officers providing what may previously have been the province of constituent service, are elected officials who must run for re-election aware of the potential for jealousy and conflict?

Will elected officials support Community Policing even if a powerful constituent complains?

Community agencies (public and private)
Have they been involved in the planning process?

Are they willing to cooperate? Does this include direct participation and maybe changing their work hours?

Are they willing to consider decentralizing their social service agents, so that they can work directly with Community Officers, part-time or full-time?

The media
Has top command met with editors and reporters in electronic and print media to provide information on Community Policing during the planning process?

Has the department made an effort to explain to the media the importance of educating the public about trade-offs and to encourage them to include this information in their stories?

Has the department provided reporters tips on success stories related to Community Policing?

Do Community Officers speak directly to the press, touting their achievements?

Applying The Community Policing Checklist

For a department to see how well it is doing against the basic ideals proposed above, we offer the Community Policing Checklist. It is a unique instrument because it is as much a stimulus for discussion and debate as a performance assessment tool. The real goal is not to apply this as a traditional test, ticking off yes-or-no answers to see how well the score stacks up to some theoretical ideal. Rather, the checklist is designed to prompt two basic kinds of discussion:

Theoretical
How long must Community Officers spend in the same community?

Would allowing Community Officers occasional use of a patrol car violate the spirit of the approach?

What is the proper relationship between Community Officers and their motor patrol counterparts?

Should average citizens have direct input into setting police priorities--how much influence should they have?

How much participation should we expect from average citizens?

Can Community Officers benefit from advanced technology, such as computer link-ups and cellular phones?

Does Community Policing raise new ethical issues?

Can specialty units really be part of Community Policing?

Does Community Policing make the police more--or less--vulnerable to lawsuits?

Applied
Are our beats too large?

Have civilians, particularly dispatchers, received enough training on how to apply the philosophy of Community Policing?

Do Community Officers have an easier--or tougher--time earning promotions?

Are there safeguards in place to detect burnout in Community Officers?

Are we expecting too much--or too little--from average citizens?
Have Community Officers succeeded in delegating appropriate tasks to other social service providers?

These sample questions are certainly not meant to be exhaustive, only illustrative. Indeed, as noted before, the authors encourage you to provide information about your experience in using these tools, as well as suggestions about how to improve them.

<p style="text-align:center">Community Policing Checklist</p>

The department as a whole

1. Is Community Policing a department-wide commitment, not just a specialty unit?
2. Does the department mission statement reflect the commitment to Community Policing?
3. Has the department implemented a comprehensive strategy to educate the Big Five--police, citizens, civic officials, community agencies, and the media--about the benefits, trade-offs, and risks of Community Policing before, during, and after implementation?
4. Has the department developed a strategy for soliciting and analyzing formal and informal feedback from the community (surveys, a citizen advisory council, etc.)?
5. Is everyone in the department, including civilians, receiving special training in Community Policing?
6. Beyond initial training, is there a follow-up training?
7. Have recruitment and selection guidelines been changed to reflect the new commitment to Community Policing?
8. Have performance evaluations been changed to reflect both a quantitative and qualitative assessment?
9. Have promotional guidelines been changed to reflect the commitment to Community Policing?

Top command

1. Has top command structured and implemented the plan discussed above to educate and involve the Big Five--police, citizens, civic official, community agencies, and the media?
2. Has top command communicated to everyone within the department what is expected of them with a department-wide commitment to Community Policing?
3. Has top command developed and implemented a deployment plan that allows officers, both Community Officers and motor patrol officers, sufficient time and opportunity to express the Community Policing philosophy?
4. Has top command addressed the need to revise hiring and promotional criteria, as well as training, to reflect the department-wide commitment to Community Policing?
5. Does top command clearly communicate the differences between Community Policing and other proactive efforts, such as crime prevention and police-community relations?
6. Has top command developed and implemented a plan to empower front-line employees (civilians such as clerks and dispatchers as well as line officers)?
7. What will top command do to foster creativity and innovation?
8. Is top command implementing Community Policing as a total philosophical and organizational commitment, not as a set of tactics to be applied to specific problems?
9. Does top command communicate that Community Policing focuses on both short- and long-term results?

10. Does top command explain to others inside and outside the department that problem solving requires focusing on arrests as only one tool in achieving results?
11. Has top command structured and implemented a training plan to provide line officers and their supervisors information on how to optimize Community Policing?
12. Has top command structured and implemented a plan to reduce internal friction, particularly between Community Officers and motor patrol officers?
13. Has top command developed and implemented a system so that supervisors and line officers document their efforts?
14. Does top command have a strategy to handle rotation of officers and use of officers as fill-ins that does not unduly rely on interrupting the continuity of Community Officers?
15. Does top command make periodic visits to the field to encourage line officers and to monitor performance?
16. What has top command done to encourage two-way information flow within the department?
17. Has top command developed and implemented a system to measure Community Policing's impact on crime, fear of crime, and disorder?
18. Has top command communicated its willingness to give officers the "freedom to fail" and to tolerate well-intentioned mistakes?
19. Has top command developed and implemented a plan to assist officers in efforts to network with public and private agencies within the community?
20. Has top command developed and implemented a plan to facilitate teamwork and cross-fertilization between Community Officers and sworn and non-sworn personnel in other divisions?
21. Has top command structured a means of promoting and monitoring coordination among Community Policing efforts and the activities of other divisions and units, such as vice, narcotics, motor patrol, etc.?
22. Has top command determined and provided the resources required to implement Community Policing?

First-line supervisors

1. Have first-line supervisors been involved in the planning process and have they been allowed input?
2. Have first-line supervisors received training in Community Policing?
3. Have first-line supervisors been included as part of a Community Policing team effort?
4. Do first-line supervisors make announced and unannounced visits to the beats to provide assistance and monitor performance?
5. Have first-line supervisors taken steps to reduce red tape?
6. Have first-line supervisors communicated encouragement for innovation and a tolerance for well-intentioned mistakes?
7. Have first-line supervisors addressed how to reduce friction between Community Officers and motor patrol officers (and special units)?
8. Have first-line supervisors communicated to motor patrol how they can express the Community Policing philosophy through their job?
9. Have first-line supervisors found ways to express creativity and problem-solving in their job?

Line officers

Beat assignments

- Does the Community Policing plan include clearly defined beat areas?
- Has the community had input in determining boundaries of the beat area?
- Is the size of the beat appropriate, as reflected in analysis of the geographic size of the beat, the number of people in the area, and the number of crimes reported and calls for service?
- Has the officer received a permanent assignment to the beat (at least 18 months)?

Role of line officers

- Are officers freed from the patrol car to allow daily, face-to-face contact with the public?
- Have line officers been delegated sufficient authority to self-initiate innovations with a minimum of red tape?
- Are Community Officers full-service officers who make arrests?
- Are Community Officers provided enough time to do more than answer calls for service?
- Are Community Officers allowed the continuity required to develop rapport and trust?
- Have Community Officers been instructed to make the effort to introduce themselves to everyone within the beat?
- Are Community Officers given the time, opportunity, and instruction to apply problem-solving techniques to address the problem of crime, drugs, fear of crime, and community disorder and decay?
- Are Community Officers selected for superiority in communication skills, as well as for their empathy and sensitivity to ethnic, racial, sexual, religious, and cultural difference?

Line officers' autonomy and attitudes

1. Are Community Officers evaluated on parameters that reflect qualitative as well as quantitative measures appropriate to assessing Community Policing?
2. Do Community Officers have input into their performance evaluations?
3. Do Community Officers have sufficient time to develop rapport and trust with people in the community and to generate proactive efforts?
4. Are Community Officers used unduly to fill in for shortages elsewhere in the department?
5. Do Community Officers complain of being bogged down in red tape?
6. Does departmental policy allow line officers, including Community Officers, to talk with the media about their initiatives and activities?
7. Do officers have backing from their superiors for making well-intentioned mistakes?
8. Is duty as a Community Officer meted out as punishment?
9. Does duty as a Community Officer impair or enhance promotability, or does it have no impact on chances for advancement?
10. Do Community Officers have the autonomy to initiate projects on their own?
11. Do Community Officers have the "freedom to fail"?
12. Do Community Officers have the support of:

    - top command?
    - middle management?
    - motor patrol and other units?
    - sworn and civilian personnel?
    - the police union or association?
    - local politicians?
    - the community?

13. Have Community Officers themselves actively enlisted the support, participation, or cooperation of:

    - the media?
    - average citizens?
    - citizen volunteers?
    - community leaders/groups?
    - other government agencies and officials?
    - public social service providers (code enforcement, social services, mental health, educators, etc.)?
    - non-profit agencies (such as Salvation Army and Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts)?
    - the private sector (ranging from small business to major corporations, including landlords)?
    - private security?

Problem solving and quality of life

1. Do Community Officers initiate proactive short- and longer-term efforts to reduce crime, drugs, fear of crime, and social and physical disorder, including neighborhood decay?
2. Do officers tailor their response to local priorities, needs, and resources in the community?
3. Are average citizens allowed input into the process of setting local priorities?
4. Do Community Officers take into account the capacity of the courts and corrections in the development of strategies to reduce problems such as street-level drug dealing?
5. Do Community Officers balance the efforts of the narcotics unit to target the supply side of drugs with initiatives aimed at drug demand (low-level sales)?
6. Do Community Officers work with landlords on efforts to screen tenants as a means of eliminating dope houses?
7. Do Community Officers work with code enforcement to close dope houses?
8. Do Community Officers work with drug education/treatment specialists?
9. Do Community Officers target at-risk youth for special attention?
10. Do Community Officers help develop positive activities for youth as an alternative to misbehavior?
11. Do Community Officers interact with youngsters in ways designed to promote self-esteem?
12. Do Community Officers support families in efforts to encourage youngsters to live within the law?
13. Do Community Officers take petty crime seriously?
14. Do Community Officers promote informal conflict resolution among residents?
15. Do Community Officers address the needs and problems of special groups:

    - women?
    - the elderly?
    - the disabled?
    - substance abusers?
    - the homeless?
    - runaways?
    - youth gangs?
    - juveniles?
    - members of various racial, ethnic, religious, or cultural groups and those of different sexual orientations?

16. Do Community Officers work with the community on prioritizing and addressing problems with social disorder--panhandling, gambling, prostitution, etc?
17. Do Community Officers work with the community on prioritizing and addressing problems with physical disorder and neighborhood decay--graffiti, abandoned cars and buildings, potholes in the street, trash in yard, uncollected garbage, etc.?
18. Do Community Officers work with code enforcement and landlords to upgrade properties while maintaining affordable rents?
19. Do Community Officers delegate to others as appropriate--fellow officers, other social service providers, citizen volunteers?

Ethical and legal concerns

1. Are Community Officers trained in and evaluated on building rapport with members of the community in ways that promote mutual respect?
2. Has the department taken specific steps to stress respect for individual civil rights?
3. Are there safeguards in place to ensure that sworn personnel do not harass or abuse citizens?
4. Have steps been taken to ensure that civilian personnel express the Community Policing philosophy through courteous interaction with citizens?
5. Do Community Officers take steps to restrain vigilantism within their beat areas?
6. Do Community Officers know and follow the ethical and legal constraints on their behavior?

7. Does training and supervision reinforce the importance of ensuring that Community Officers do not initiate efforts that favor one group over another?
8. Do all officers express respect for racial, ethnic, religious, cultural, and sexual difference?
9. Are measures taken to ensure that Community Officers do not function as the "good cops," while the other sworn and non-sworn personnel conduct "business as usual"?
10. Are Community Officers free of political contamination?

EVALUATING THE COMMUNITY OFFICER

Purposes and functions

Adopting Community Policing as a department-wide approach requires modifying the performance evaluations of virtually everyone in the department to reflect how well they are expressing the Community Policing philosophy in their work. However, it is the Community Officer out on the beat who most completely and directly expresses the Community Policing philosophy, so if we can structure a valid and workable performance evaluation for the Community Officer's job, the changes that should be made in all the other performance evaluations would logically flow from that example.

Yet before we struggle with the question of how best to assess the performance of the Community Officer, we should discuss some of the reasons that performance evaluations are kept. Indeed, many employees resent or ridicule the effort as a waste of time. Others think that management documents performance merely to avoid litigation or defend their decisions in a lawsuit or grievance procedure if someone is fired.

However, as noted earlier, well-crafted performance evaluations provide the department the data that they need to justify budgets to public policymakers. The most basic purpose, however, is to give the employee honest feedback to the question of "How'm I doing?"

Yet the problem is that many employee evaluations fall far short of accomplishing even these basic goals. All too often, formal evaluations over-value those who "play the game" by generating the numbers. Indeed, too many performance evaluations penalize those who innovate. As one former police officer noted, officers who do little more than show up on time, neatly dressed, may well score better than the creative officer willing to take a risk. In professional jargon, the evaluation process in most police departments is risk averse--just don't let us hear any bad or embarrassing news and you will score OK. The winners are those who best play CYA--Cover Your 'Anatomy.'

As this suggests, this kind of performance evaluation process stifles creativity and impairs morale. Admittedly as well, it is far easier to craft a performance evaluation that measures and rewards busyness, efficiency, and speed than effectiveness.

So the attempt to create performance evaluations for Community Officers that accurately reflect the virtues of the approach is indeed a challenge. On the one end of the spectrum is the performance evaluation employed in a small department in Texas where the Community Officers are asked to write one or more sentences every few months about what they are trying to accomplish. While that may be enough to satisfy everyone inside and outside the department in a small town where everyone knows each other, consider the challenge of fashioning fair and effective performance evaluations for Community Officers in a department like New York City, which employs upwards of 27,000 police officers.

The best way to proceed to address the challenge of developing a suitable performance evaluation for the Community Officer requires identifying the many objectives that an ideal evaluation would meet:

To document the individual Community Officer's performance (for purposes of raises/promotions/commendations/censure/dismissal, etc). To provide some basis for comparing one Community Officer's performance to another's. To serve as a foundation for future goals for the individual Community Officer evaluated. To gather and document effective strategies and tactics that can be shared with others. To collect and analyze efforts that failed, to warn others of potential pitfalls. To contribute data to assessments of the impact and effectiveness of all Community Officers within the department. To serve as a foundation for decisions concerning Community Officers, such as those related to training, deployment, etc. To contribute to assessments of the impact and effectiveness of Community Policing as a department-wide commitment. To provide documentation useful to public policymakers/funders.

As this suggests, combining the individual Community Officer's evaluation with others demands finding ways to express quality as quantity, in other words, to make quality a countable commodity. The optimal approach would supplement this information with an essay, to capture anecdotes and to flesh out the data. But the challenge is to identify quantifiable outcomes that truly relate to the job and to ensure that this does not corrupt Community Policing into policing by the numbers.

Opening up the process

Part of the solution in reassuring people inside the department that the performance evaluations are meaningful and fair requires allowing Community Officers input into the process of developing their own performance measurements. Once they understand the range of purposes that a performance evaluation must meet, they will appreciate the difficulties involved, and supervision will have gone a long way toward allaying their anxiety about its uses. There will always be cynics who will carp at the process, but Community Policing recognizes the importance of opening up dialogue as a means of enhancing trust. However, for the opportunity to be meaningful, the department must be willing to allow Community Officers to make substantive contributions to developing the measurements by which they will be judged.

Also vital is ensuring that the evaluations focus on behavior--not character, personality--as a means of enhancing objectivity in the process. Every department wants officers to be hard-working, honest, fair, dedicated, brave, compassionate--but the challenge is to find ways to measure the relevant behavior without resorting to subjective judgments. First-line supervisors can tour the area and ask residents for feedback on how often they see the officer, do they know him or her by name, and has the officer been courteous to them--focus on what the officer does, not on who he is.

Indeed, no doubt many departments have hired individuals who have hidden prejudice toward one group or another--minorities, Jews, Moslems, gays. But the issue is not what the person thinks or feels, but what he or she does on the job. If people allow their personal feelings to influence their behavior on the job, their misbehavior must be uncovered and dealt with. But if they can overcome their biases and behave appropriately on the job, difficult as that may be, then their personal feelings and attitudes are irrelevant in a performance evaluation.

The other consideration in soliciting support for performance evaluations concerns how they are used. It doesn't take long for employees in any organization to figure out when the performance evaluations are used for punitive rather than constructive purposes. One function of performance evaluations is indeed to provide documentation to justify disciplinary action, but this use should apply to only a handful of cases.

Performance evaluations are not a bludgeon to whip people into shape, but rather a tool that can be used to set goals for the future. The challenge is to make the officers a real part of the process, so that they do not feel that they are being coerced by supervisors who have no feel for their problems and potential.

Enhancing quality

We have the example of U.S. automakers to remind us that quality is not something you tack on like chrome,

but it must be everyone's job. When the top brass loses touch with the consumer, when the system pits workers against bosses, quality suffers, and people balk and begin buying from someone else if they can, as happened when American car buyers switched to Japanese and German cars.

The public police have also found that they do not have a lock on the market, but those consumers who can afford to do so are shopping elsewhere for safety. We see the exodus from major cities to the suburbs-- taxpayers voting with their feet, leaving urban police with smaller and smaller budgets. Indeed, the most affluent typically choose gated and walled communities patrolled by private security, where the residents receive decentralized and personalized policing for a fee. Given the choice, people want police officers that they know--officers that they can hold directly accountable.

So police managers should borrow from the experiments and innovations taking place in the private sector, as companies struggle to find new ways to involve workers in the process of producing quality. As Alvin Toffler notes in *Power Shift*, Ford Motor Company discovered that the traditional system of looking for defects and correcting them after the fact just wasn't working. "Only by allowing workers more discretion--no longer programming their every move--could the goal of zero defects be approached...and this...meant 'recognizing the power of the operators right down to shop floor level.'"

In *In Search of Excellence*, Thomas J. Peters and Robert H. Waterman, Jr., insist that the best organizations recognize the importance of treating all employees as adults. They note that one reason that the Roman Empire survived so long, even though managers back in Rome couldn't pick up the phone to issue orders, was that this meant that they had to assign someone to a 'beat' and then trust them to run the show on their own.

Goal-setting and problem-solving

As this suggests, the real function of the performance evaluation for the Community Officer should be that it provides him or her the structured opportunity to talk with management about how to make even more of the job. Indeed, as one management expert said, the biggest mistake that managers make is to use performance evaluations as a way to dwell on weakness rather than to enhance strengths.

As a case in point, the expert noted that Ted Williams was a great batter and a lousy fielder, but Williams didn't waste much time practicing fielding. Williams' coach figured that, no matter how hard he tried, Williams could only make a minimal improvement in his fielding, from poor to fair perhaps, but that focusing on the negative would add to his frustration and self-doubt. So Williams instead spent his time working on batting--his strength--and that allowed him to progress from good to great to fantastic.

All too often, managers use performance evaluations primarily to identify weaknesses. Then the hapless employee spends the next few months struggling to improve--often to the detriment of the person's strengths.

Obviously, if the problem is serious (excessive use of force) or easily rectifiable (chronic tardiness), managers must demand immediate, positive change. But consider the department that urged its Community Officers to write a newsletter for their beats. Now think of gregarious Community Officer Tom, who is a superstar on the beat when dealing with people face-to-face, but who cannot put pen to paper without gritting his teeth in agony. Yet each time there is a performance evaluation, Tom is told that he must concentrate on putting out that newsletter--his boss spends more time talking about that than about all of Tom's wonderful new projects. So instead of concentrating on what he enjoys and does well, Tom spends hours in the office, struggling to put together a newsletter which is likely to be poor at best.

The solution? Encourage Tom to find someone else--a citizen volunteer, the local minister, a teacher--to write the newsletter, freeing Tom to spend more time doing what he does best. In essence, this means applying Community Policing's personalized, problem-solving approach to the problem of producing a good newsletter.

The danger, of course, is that some may perceive "letting Tom off the hook" as a serious fairness issue. A fellow Community Officer who spends the time to produce a newsletter may resent seeing Tom "get away" with "sloughing the job onto someone else." Indeed, because the department will want to document the production of that newsletter, Tom may even be able to claim credit for it, even though it does not take much of his time.

At a certain level, this is reminiscent of squabbling among kids in a family ("Why does Tommy get to stay up later than I do?"), but the issue of fairness must be addressed, to reduce internal friction and maintain morale. And the best explanation is that tailoring the performance evaluation process to the individual, when feasible, will ultimately prove to be the fairest system.

Again, if officers are involved in the process of developing and modifying performance evaluations, they will begin to recognize that they may lose in one instance, but that they can gain in another. Also of importance is the reminder that the goal is to move beyond the family model, where "Daddy" tells "Junior" what to do, to one where adults reason together about how best to proceed, and that requires greater flexibility.

Identifying tasks and activities

As noted in the Preface, the National Center for Community Policing will be working to produce a job description/role definition for the Community Officer. However, the real world cannot wait for research before proceeding, so the following is a tentative list of duties and activities commonly performed by Community Officers, as a starting point for discussion. The more reference points for the job, the more foundation for building a quantitative measurement of quality.

The Community Officer's Duties & Activities

1. **Law enforcement**--The Community Officer performs general duties common to all police patrol assignments.
2. **Directed patrol**--Though increased visibility on the street is an added plus, the main reason for removing the Community Officer from the patrol car is to allow the officer the time and opportunity to work behind the scenes, involving the community in efforts to make the beat a better and safer place in which to live and work.
3. **Community involvement**--The Community Officer attempts to build an atmosphere of mutual respect and trust, so that average citizens and community leaders form a new partnership with the police to address the problems of crime, drugs, fear of crime, and social and physical disorder, including neighborhood decay.
4. **Identifying and prioritizing problems**--The Community Officer works with community residents to identify and prioritize problems.
5. **Reporting**--The Community Officer shares information, including information about problems in the beat, with officers who are part of the team and also with the rest of the department, including special units (such as narcotics).
6. **Problem-solving**--Because of the knowledge that the Community Officer has of the neighborhood and the people who live there, he or she can be the catalyst to develop creative solutions to problems that do not focus exclusively on arrest.
7. **Organizing**--The Community Officer rapidly moves beyond organizing activities such as Neighborhood Watch to organizing a number of community-based initiatives and activities aimed at specific problems and at enhancing the overall quality of life in the community.
8. **Communicating**--The Community Officer gives formal and informal talks to individuals and groups to educate people about crime prevention techniques, to discuss problems in the beat, etc. The Community Officer also employs writing skills to communicate with residents in the beat, and the Community Officer may also be empowered to communicate directly with the media.
9. **Conflict resolution**--The Community Officer mediates, negotiates, and resolves conflicts formally and informally (and challenges people to begin resolving problems on their own).
10. **Referrals**--The Community Officer refers problems to appropriate agencies: code enforcement, social services, drug treatment, animal control, sanitation, etc.

11. **Visiting**--The Community Officer makes home and business visits to acquaint individuals in the beat with Community Policing, to enlist their help, and to educate them about crime prevention.
12. **Recruiting and supervising volunteers**--The Community Officer must solicit, train, and supervise paid and/or unpaid community volunteers, ranging from individuals who assist with clerical duties to people who provide technical assistance, help in coaching youth, etc.
13. **Proactive projects**--In addition to efforts that focus on solving immediate problems, the Community Officer works with the community on short- and long-term efforts to prevent problems and enhance the quality of life.
14. **Targeting special groups**--Part of the Community Officer's mandate is to protect and assist groups with special needs--women, juveniles, the elderly, the disabled, the homeless, etc., as well as to target other groups, such as youth gangs, for special attention.
15. **Targeting disorder**--Unlike traditional police officers, the Community Officer's mandate includes emphasis on developing solutions to problems of social and physical disorder and neighborhood decay.
16. **Networking with the private sector**--The Community Officer contacts and solicits the active participation of business, ranging from donations of goods from small business to broad corporate support for new initiatives.
17. **Networking with non-profit agencies**--The Community Officer acts as both liaison and facilitator with non-profit agencies, ranging from food banks to the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts.
18. **Administrative/professional duties**--The Community Officer participates in:

- **training**
- **roll call**
- **office duties** (answering mail, phone calls, reports)
NOTE: For an example of a job description for Community Officers, please see Appendix A, provided by the Lansing Police Department, which is used when the job is posted.

Building an evaluation

To understand how we can proceed to produce a performance evaluation for Community Officers that includes countable items, it pays to look at the kinds of measures used to assess the performance of the traditional motor patrol officer. While we can debate how well these parameters actually relate to success in the job, the fact remains that most motor patrol officers are evaluated on countable items such as:

Radio calls--Number and types of calls, alarm responses (true and false); disposition; reports written; time spent; follow-up required. **Arrests**--Number and types of felonies and misdemeanors (self-initiated and assigned); warrants; juvenile apprehensions; DUIL's. **Traffic**--Number and types of traffic stops (moving and non-moving), including seatbelt and child-restraint violations (self-initiated and assigned); accidents, injuries; citations issued; action taken; time spent; motorist assists; parking tickets issued. **Suspicious persons/situations checked/investigated**--Number and type (self-initiated and assigned); number of persons contacted; action taken; disposition; time spent. **Property recovered**--Type and value, time spent. **Desk/other assignments**--Number and type, time spent. **Administrative/miscellaneous**--roll call, court appearances, prisoner transport assignments, subpoenas served, patrol car maintenance, reports written/taken, bar checks, etc.

Community Officer Performance Evaluation

In addition to the items listed above, the performance evaluation for the Community Officer must take into account factors directly and indirectly related to the officer's performance. The following is an initial attempt to contribute to a model.

Outcomes INDIRECTLY Related to Officer Performance

Crime rates--Number and types of crimes in beat area; trends up or down from previous month, year; crime analysis. **Agency involvement**--Number and types of other public and private social service agencies operating in the community (including agencies working out of a Neighborhood Network Center).

(Statistics for crimes in the Community Officer's beat area are a valid part of any performance evaluation; however, it is important to recognize that this may be only indirectly related to the specific officer's performance. Also, while the participation of other public and private social service agencies in community-based problem solving is a valid goal, the Community Officer may lack the power to make this happen.)

Outcomes DIRECTLY Related to Officer Performance

Rates of targeted crimes--Number and type; monthly and annual trends.

(With input from the community, the Community Officer may have prioritized specific crimes: drug dealing, burglary, vandalism, etc.)

Neighborhood disorder:

- **Social disorder**--open drug use/sales, panhandlers, runaways, addicts, "winos," truants, curfew violations, prostitution, homeless, mainstreamed mental patients, unlicensed peddlers, gambling, loitering, unsupervised youngsters, youth gangs, etc.

- **Physical disorder**--graffiti, abandoned cars, abandoned buildings, potholes, trash in yards, litter on streets, building code violations (residences and businesses), etc.

[The first-line supervisor and the Community Officer can work together to decide which items apply, then they can develop ways to measure progress. Some items will be countable (see below); the Community Officer can tabulate how many abandoned cars are tagged and towed, but the overall perception of improvement in neighborhood decay will require an on-site assessment from the first-line supervisor. If resources are available, the department could also survey residents periodically to assess their perceptions of progress toward improving the safety and quality of life in the beat.]

Calls for service--Number and type; monthly and annual trends.

(Experience shows that a new Community Policing effort typically results in an increase in the number of calls for service from that area, as people begin to look to the police for solutions to problems more than in the past. However, over time, most effective Community Officers discover that the number of calls for service declines, as people wait to tell the Community Officer about problems in person, or because residents begin handling more conflicts informally. Monitoring calls for service not only helps verify whether the Community Officer is doing a good job in the beat, but public policymakers should also appreciate that the time saved allows the police to do more with the same resources.)

Quantifiable Activities (Community-Based Problem Solving)
(**NOTE:** There is some redundancy and overlap among categories**.)**

- **Communications**

    - **Community meetings**--How many, what kind, number of people in attendance. Did officer attend, organize, or   both?
    - **Newsletter**--Size, frequency, number of readers.

- **Organizing**--Number and type of block/watch groups formed; monthly and annual trends; number of other kinds of   groups and projects formed; number of participants; demographics of participants; time spent.
- **Telephone calls**--Number, type, time spent.
- **Speeches**--Number, kind of group, size of audience, time spent.
- **Home and business visits**--Number, type, time spent.
- **Personal contacts** (on the street, drop-ins at office)--Number, type, time spent.
- **Media contacts**--News releases, interviews, etc.
- **Other outreach**--Surveys, feedback from community leaders, etc.

- **Social disorder**

- Number and types of individual efforts undertaken by the officer aimed at the problems of social disorder listed above.
- Number and type of group projects aimed at the problems of social disorder listed above; number of people involved; demographics of participants (race, income, etc.); participation of youth, area businesses, public agencies (Social Services, etc.), non-profit groups (Salvation Army, etc.)

- **Physical disorder** (beautification)

- Number and type of individual efforts undertaken by the officer aimed at the problems of physical disorder listed above.
- Number and type of group projects aimed at the problems of physical disorder listed above; number of people involved; demographics of participants (race, income, etc.); participation of youth, area businesses, public agencies (code enforcement, etc.) non-profit groups (Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, etc.).

- **Anti-drug initiatives**

- Number and type of individual and group initiatives aimed at drug use (demand); number of people involved; demographics of participants; participation of youth, area businesses, public agencies (drug treatment counselors, etc.), non-profit groups (12-Step Programs, etc.).
- Number and type of individual and group initiatives aimed at low-level drug dealing (supply); number of dope houses closed; number of open drug markets closed; number of arrests; number of people involved; demographics of participants; participation of youth, area businesses, public agencies, non-profit groups.

- **Special groups**--Juveniles, youth gangs, women, the elderly, the disabled, the unemployed, the poor, etc.

- Number and types of individual and group proactive initiatives aimed at the special needs of fragile, troubled, or uniquely vulnerable groups; number of people involved; demographics of participants; participation of youth, area businesses, public agencies, non-profit groups.
- Note in particular those occasions when the Community Officer provided specific support to families, including single-parent families (individual or group initiatives aimed at individual families or groups of families to reduce problems of domestic violence, child abuse and neglect, etc.)

- **Networking**

- Number and types of contacts (in person, telephone, correspondence) with: citizens, community leaders,

business owners/managers, corporate officials, other social service or city service providers, agents of non-profit groups, church officials, teachers/educators, print and electronic media, etc.

- **Referrals**

  - Number and types of referrals; number and types of agencies involved; number of referrals per agency.

- **Intelligence gathering/information sharing**

  - Number of occasions when the officer received useful information that contributed to resolving a crime, drug, or disorder problem; amount and kinds of useful information generated about a crime, drug, or disorder problem (aliases, street names of drugs, availability of different kinds of drugs, etc.); contribution to crime analysis; number of occasions information was shared with others in the department (name of unit, type of information).

- **Innovation**

  - Documentable incidents where the Community Officer has demonstrated an imaginative approach toward problem solving, through new projects, new use of technology, etc.
  - List specific proactive initiatives: educational, athletic, and social activities for youth and families, etc.

- **Teamwork**

  - If Community Officers work as part of a team with other police officers (motor patrol, narcotics, etc.), the performance evaluation should reflect the numbers of contacts/joint activities; outcomes; time spent.
  - If the Community Officer is part of a Neighborhood Network Center, document the interaction with other public social service providers who work from the facility. Note separately those occasions when the Community Officer's role was specifically to protect the other social service agents and when the officer was a participant in group problem-solving.

- **Solicitation of resources**

  - Number and kind of donations from: individuals, foundations, private funders, corporations, small businesses, government agencies, etc. (Options can range from donated paint for a fix-up project to a monetary grant.)

Other Parameters

There are also a number of standard measurements of an officer's performance that should be part of the Community Officer's performance profile:

- **Administrative duties/responsibilities**

  - Attendance (at roll call, on the beat, at meetings, etc.)
  - Promptness (or tardiness)
  - Courtesy to the public and to fellow officers

- Cooperation with others in the department
- Reports (meets deadlines, completeness, etc.)

- **Professional improvement**

  - Participation in in-service training
  - Attendance at other training seminars/workshops
  - College coursework (number of hours, topics, grades)
  - Other efforts toward improvement of knowledge or skills (specify details)

- **Use of technology**

  - Has the officer demonstrated mastery of the appropriate technology (computer, radio, etc.)
  - Has the officer attended workshops/classes on technology when available.

As noted earlier, in addition to the measurements available through this model, the performance evaluation for a Community Officer should also include an opportunity for the officer to write a brief essay concerning any anecdotal evidence of success. It might also be useful to ask the Community Officer to use the essay format to provide anecdotal evidence of success, to document how he or she expresses sensitivity for diversity in the job, how he overcomes vigilantism and apathy on the part of citizens, etc. Quantifiable assessments measure who, what, where, and when, but the essay format allows delving into the how and why.

The officer should also have the opportunity to affix transcripts or tapes of any media coverage of initiatives in the beat. Community Officers can also solicit letters of support from local residents.

As you will see in Appendix B (Management by Objective--MBO), Dr. Bruce Benson, director of Michigan State University's Department of Public Safety, has developed a simple form that asks officers to identify three goals for the upcoming evaluation period, with space at the bottom for follow-up. Benson says that the goals can be as vague as "increased contact with the community," or as specific as "start new basketball league for youth by May 1." The goal is for the officer and supervisor to negotiate items that are appropriate to the challenges in the beat and to determine how progress toward the goals will be monitored.

Appendix C provides a sample log sheet, as used in the Aurora (CO) Police Department. It provides a reference that first-line supervisors can use to document critical incidents related to the Community Officers they supervise.

Opportunities for understanding

An individual Community Officer's performance evaluation should give a useful snapshot in time of that particular officer's activities. Yet performance evaluations must also contribute to a bigger picture, the effectiveness of Community Officers in the field. Toward that end, top command can begin to aggregate information, so that a broader picture emerges.

Obviously, because Community Policing often sparks an explosion in creativity, no one can anticipate all the unique efforts that Community Officers will undertake. However, we find, for example, that Community Officers, many of whom are assigned to low-income areas with a high percentage of renters, spend significant time trying to deal with the disorder problems associated with low-income rentals. The following is the kind of analysis that could be done by combining information from a number of Community Officers' performance evaluations:

Affordable housing--*In the past X months. XX Community Officers have spent more than XX hours dealing with the disorder problems associated with the low-income rental housing in their beats. An immediate sign of success was that such initiatives led directly to the closing of XX dope houses, as well as the arrest of XX suspected dealers.*

XX Community Officers also held a series of XX meetings with landlords, instructing them on how to avoid renting to dealers and other undesirables. One Community Officer is even working on developing a database that they can use to warn each other of problem tenants.

XX Community Officers had XX contacts with code officials, so that they could work together to upgrade housing stocks--without triggering gentrification that can put affordable housing out of the reach of the poor. The officers were able to effect improvements in XX homes, and they were able to assist in resolving XX landlord/tenant disputes. Community Officer X is planning to host a community meeting on the rights and responsibilities of landlords and tenants. The officer has also found a donor who will supply those tenants who need a deadbolt lock.

Community Officers had XX contacts with city officials about improving the street lighting, as an assist in keeping dealers and prostitutes off the street. The officers also made XX contacts with City Sanitation to improve the timeliness of garbage removal.

As this suggests, the individual performance evaluations of Community Officers can provide the raw material for a sophisticated presentation on a variety of topics. Some topics are obvious--efforts aimed at the demand side of drugs, for example--but, since Community Policing tailors its efforts to local needs, the topics targeted for breakout may differ, department to department. For example, some departments may have enough data to justify an entry on public housing, while others may not. In other circumstances, the department may want to keep track of efforts aimed at youth, at the homeless, etc. Departments in states like Florida may need to document efforts to protect tourists. Indeed, the reason for keeping the categories listed above so general is that no one listing could possibly anticipate all the items that might be worth keeping track of.

Blending quantitative and qualitative information in this manner can also go a long way toward making the case for Community Policing within the department and also to public policymakers. Moreover, this kind of report would make an excellent news release to the media on the department's efforts in providing affordable housing. If there is a suitable site, the release of this information might be a good occasion for a news conference. The department must make the case to reporters that footage and photos of officers standing in front of a huge seizure of drugs, guns, and cash tell only part of the story.

A few tips borrowed from the field of journalism: Remember to go from the general to the specific, the specific to the general, as a way of making your point, while maintaining interest. In addition, an opening (or closing) anecdote (culled from the Community Officers' essays) would help humanize the effort and drive home the impact that Community Officers have on the lives of real people.

THE FIRST-LINE SUPERVISOR

A performance evaluation for the sergeant who assists and supervises the Community Officer must obviously build upon the model provided above. To avoid repetition, it goes without saying that the performance of the first-line supervisor can also be measured on the same list of **Quantifiable Activities (Community-Based Problem Solving)** listed above, in terms of the supervisor's activities in the same regard (communication, contacts, etc.) or in terms of actions that the supervisor takes to facilitate the activities of the Community Officer in that regard (such as securing resources that Community Officers can use). The first-line supervisor will also, of course, be evaluated on traditional measures, just as Community Officers are also evaluated on these measures.

In addition, the first-line supervisor can be assessed on:

- **Contacts with Community Officers**

  - Number of face-to-face meetings with Community Officers, time spent.
  - Number of suggestions made for innovation/problem-solving.
  - Number of trips to the beat (announced and unannounced with and without the Community Officer in attendance, time spent.
  - Number of "assists" with other groups; with citizens, community leaders, community groups, civic officials, public agencies, church officials, teachers/educators, non-profit agencies, the media; outcome; time spent.

- **Career development of supervisees**

  - Number of occasions that supervisor facilitates training opportunities and/or secures resources for training Community Officers.
  - Appropriate maintenance and updating of records on supervisees.
  - Development/execution of an appropriate reward/recognition program for supervisees.
  - Efforts to acquire appropriate technology; disposition.
  - Maintenance of technology.

- **Political issues**

  - Efforts to shield Community Officers from political pressure/interference.
  - Activities designed to educate politicians about the benefits and trade-offs implicit in Community Policing.

- **Qualitative issues**

  - Does the supervisor juggle rotation/fill-ins so that Community Officers are interrupted as little as possible?
  - Has the supervisor cut red tape for Community Officers?
  - Has the supervisor run interference for Community Officers with critics inside and outside the department?
  - What has the supervisor done to shield Community Officers from local politics?
  - Has the supervisor found ways to determine how well Community Officers express respect for diversity?
  - Has the supervisor investigated complaints/rumors--about misbehavior, discourtesy, excessive use of force, unethical behavior?
  - Has the supervisor supported the Community Officer when he or she made well-intentioned mistakes?
  - Does the supervisor act as the Community Officer's ombudsman with top command?
  - Does the supervisor "share glory" with the officers?
  - Is the supervisor alert to the danger of burnout among Community Officers?
  - What steps has the supervisor taken to reduce the stress/workload on Community Officers?
  - What has the supervisor done to enhance the autonomy and flexibility of the Community Officer?
  - Does the supervisor ignore petty concerns?
  - Has the supervisor attempted to tailor performance evaluations to the specific problems in different beats?

Conclusion

This booklet should be considered the first word--not the last--in an ongoing attempt to develop performance evaluations that document Community Policing's impact without burying those who must administer them under a blizzard of paperwork and red tape. Again, there is some happy medium between asking Community Officers to write a sentence about their efforts versus an eight-hour marathon session to fill out a 20-page report. But when we consider all of the disparate purposes that -performance evaluations serve, the importance

of the challenge cannot be denied. We look forward to your input, advice, and criticism. How're we doing so far?

Endnotes

1. Toffler, Alvin, *Power Shift* (New York: Bantam Books, 1990), p. 206
2. Peters, Thomas J., and Waterman, Robert, Jr., *In Search of Excellence* (New York: Warner Bookers, 1982), p. 277.

APPENDIX A
SAMPLE JOB DESCRIPTION
(POSTED FOR OPENINGS)

COMMUNITY POLICING OFFICERS--
LANSING POLICE DEPARTMENT

1. The position of Community Policing Officer will be responsible for a variety of duties which will include, but not be limited to, the following:
2. Perform the duties of a police officer assigned to the Uniform Patrol Bureau as necessary.
3. Gather and report intelligence-related information in reference to the officer's assigned neighborhood.
4. Provide a sense of security for businesses and citizens within the assigned neighborhood.
5. Become acquainted with the merchants, businesses, and citizens within the neighborhood and assist them in identifying problem areas or concerns.
6. Enforce local and state laws, particularly those related to, or specifically drafted for, the assigned neighborhood.
7. Respond to all calls for service within the assigned neighborhood when available.
8. Respond to and investigate reports of criminal offenses within the assigned neighborhood when available.
9. Be responsible for building security, where applicable, particularly vacant or temporarily closed businesses and residences.
10. Develop and conduct speaking presentations on topics which have been identified as concerns and/or problems within the neighborhood.
11. Research and develop materials for preparing outlines, newsletters, and citizen training programs, as well as in-service training programs.
12. Conduct interviews with representatives of the media.
13. Serve as a member of various organizations and committees at the direction of the administration.
14. Conduct security surveys, complete business cards and crime risks reports, and provide follow-up contacts on commercial/residential burglaries and robberies which occur within the assigned neighborhood.
15. Prepare and coordinate the tasks to be accomplished within the neighborhood on a weekly basis.
16. Prepare weekly evaluation reports describing task accomplishments related to program goals and objectives.
17. Coordinate the services of various governmental and private agencies in an effort to resolve identified problems within the neighborhood.
18. Due to the nature of the assignment, it is anticipated that the officer selected will have to work a flexible schedule of 40 hours per week with variable leave days. Authorized functions or activities above 40 hours will be compensated as overtime.

Selection Criteria

1. The expression of interest and qualifications for the position.
2. Seniority insofar as possible.

3. Be able/willing to physically withstand the rigors of walking throughout the assigned neighborhood.
4. The willingness to work flexible hours as community needs dictate.
5. The demonstration of an ability to communicate effectively with all levels within the department and with the general public.
6. The demonstration via previous work history of his/her dependability.
7. The demonstration via previous work history of the ability to work independently with a minimum of direct supervision.
8. At the time of selection, all eligible applicants will submit a one-page handwritten document as directed, to demonstrate an ability in the use of written communication skills.
9. Participate in an oral interview board to demonstrate interest in the position and the ability to communicate effectively.

Examples of Problem-Solving Approaches

- Use of community surveys to identify problems and their solutions.
- Citizen surveillance (with or without cameras) at peak times of crime and disorder.
- Drug hotlines for reporting drug-related activity.
- Education and recreational programs for neighborhood children (including such activities as tutoring and playground participation).
- Conflict resolution training for citizen volunteers.
- Self-esteem enhancing classes and activities for neighborhood children.
- Fingerprint identification programs.
- Eliminating abandoned vehicles from the neighborhood that are being used by prostitutes.
- Community Policing Officer involvement in the Special Olympics.
- The CPO being a member of a community problem-solving team.
- Community volunteers escorting the elderly and new neighbors to businesses and resource centers.
- Use of the media to provide safety tips, especially at special times of the year like Halloween.
- Cleaning up vacant lots that attract drug dealers, prostitutes, and other undesirables.
- Tearing down buildings that are havens for problem people.
- Using *No Parking or Standing* signs to reduce congestion and undesirable "vendors."
- Using volunteers to collect clothes for the homeless.
- Enactment of loitering laws to keep streets clear of problem people.
- Encouraging churches, businesses, and volunteers to provide food, clothing, and shelter for street people.
- CPOs using different types of transportation to facilitate movement, including all-terrain vehicles, dirt bikes, ten-speed bikes, horses, and golf carts.
- Enforcing park restrictions and hours to control undesirable persons.
- Development of exchange programs between urban and suburban churches.
- Recreational programs for inner-city youth in rural areas.
- Identification of absentee landlords and holding them responsible for their building code infractions and unkempt property.
- Closing up houses and apartments that have more than one drug violation.
- Removing telephones or limiting them to only out-going calls to eliminate their use for drug dealing.
- Use ID cards for residents of crime-ridden apartments to keep non-residents from misbehaving.
- Establishing Neighborhood Network Centers to decentralize and personalize other service providers.
- Use of volunteers to supervise recreation activities at neighborhood school gymnasiums during non-school times.
- Educating the youth on their legal rights and responsibilities.
- Educating senior citizens on how to avoid and deal with "con" artists.
- Encouraging residents to use their homes as "safe havens" for children going to and from school who may be targets of deviant behavior.
- Supervision of community service/prisoners.

APPENDIX B

MBO (MANAGEMENT BY OBJECTIVE)
WORK PLAN

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Date _____

My main objectives for the period _____
through _____ for my beat are:

1.

2.

3.

<div align="right">

Officer _____
Supervisor_____
Community leader_____

</div>

Date_____

Evaluation of progress toward above objectives:

1.

2.

3.

<div align="right">

Officer _____
Supervisor_____
Community leader_____

</div>

Developed by Dr. Bruce Benson--10/90

APPENDIX C
Community Officer Significant
Incident Log

AURORA (CO) POLICE DEPARTMENT

NOTE: This is kept by supervisors on the employees--this is a copy of actual handwritten entries by supervisors (with names X'ed to maintain confidentiality).

NAME: _____

Evaluation Date From _____ to _____

DATE	EMPL	SUP	INCIDENT
2/14	X	X	Received a good letter from Jackie X regarding assisting them in December on 1989.
	X	X	
3/19	X	X	Corrective action for loss of gas card.
	X	X	
5/8	X	X	Gave me a letter on Community Policing project update.
	X	X	
6/8			Good letter from Adams County DA office.
	X	X	
6/8	X	X	Good letter from Det. Sgt. X on project.
	X	X	
7/16	X	X	Talked to X about unacceptable sick leave. I gave him an order to bring in doctor's slip on future sick days.
7/16			Good letter from Det. X from citizens.
8/6			Gave me a Community Policing memo update for month of July.
8/9			Went over 6 month evaluation.
8/27			Inspection today, all in order--all cards, uniform, etc.

Publications From The National Center for Community Policing

Books

An Evaluation of the Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program in Flint, Michigan
A Manual for the Establishment and Operation of a Foot Patrol Program
Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective, by Robert Trojanowicz and Bonnie Bucqueroux, Anderson Publishing Company, Cincinnati, OH

(Please contact Anderson Publishing directly by calling 1-800/543-0883)

Community Policing Series

Perceptions of Safety: A Comparison of Foot Patrol versus Motor Patrol Officers

Job Satisfaction: A Comparison of Foot Patrol Versus Motor Patrol Officers

The Status of Contemporary Community Policing

The Impact of Foot Patrol on Black and White Perceptions of Policing

Uniform Crime Reporting and Community Policing: A Historical Perspective

Performance Profiles of Foot Versus Motor Patrol Officers

Community Policing: A Taxpayer's Perspective

Implementing a Community Policing Model for Work with Juveniles: An Exploratory Study

Community Policing: Training Issues

Community Policing Programs: A Twenty-Year View

Community Policing: The Line Officer's Perspective

Community Policing: Community Input into Police Policy

The Philosophy and Role of Community Policing

Community Policing: University Input into Community Policing

The Meaning of Community in Community Policing

Community Policing: Would You Know It If You Saw It?

Reinventing the Wheel in Police Work: A Sense of History

Preventing Civil Disturbances: A Community Policing Approach

Turning Concept into Practice: The Aurora (CO) Story

Rapid Response and Community Policing: Are They Really in Conflict?

Community Policing and the Challenge of Diversity

Articles
The Foot Patrol Officer, the Community, and the School: A Coalition Against Crime

Community Policing: Defining the Officer's Role

Foot Patrol: Some Problem Areas

An Evaluation of a Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program

Community Policing is Not Police-Community Relations

The Community Policing Challenge

f you wish to receive a copy of a Center publication, please contact us at the address or telephone numbers given below:

National Center for Community Policing
School of Criminal Justice

Michigan State University
560 Baker Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824-1118
517/355-9648
http://www.ssc.msu.edu/~cj