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FOREWORD

From corporate boardrooms to elementary school classrooms, performance measurement is everywhere. It is at the heart of nearly every contemporary management or organizational development strategy. It is an essential component of zero-based budgeting and management by objectives, reinventing government, reengineering corporations, total quality management, benchmarking, balanced scorecards, and organizational learning.

Law enforcement organizations have been collecting data about their performance since the birth of modern policing in the mid-19th century. The idea of comparative performance measurement began to take root in the early 20th century. The concept has been progressively developed and improved since then with the FBI’s Uniform Crime Reporting system becoming the primary foundation for comparative performance measurement of police agencies in the United States.

Today, performance indicators have taken on a new importance. Police administrators need to measure performance in a variety of areas from use of force to community relations to racial equity in policing that never had been tracked in the past. Having good data on what the police do is important to answering probes from city administrators, civil rights groups, federal prosecutors, and civil lawsuits. Moreover, in this climate of smaller municipal government, police administrators armed with data will be in a better position to resist cuts in their budgets and manpower.

Several years ago, the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc. (CALEA®) instituted an innovative program seeking to develop and implement selected "performance measures" for law enforcement agencies. In 2007 the Rand Corporation approached CALEA to present a proposal that would (1) review the work CALEA had already done on developing measures to compare performance of police agencies, and (2) select specific CALEA agencies to participate in a new project
funded through a grant from the U.S. Department of Justice. The focus of the project was to devise a set of standardized, inexpensive performance measures that can be used by law enforcement agencies to measure effectiveness in mission accomplishment and service delivery.

This guide presents the results of this project and details twenty-eight performance measures that can be used to compare a single organization's performance over time, compare the performance of different patrol divisions within an agency, or compare the performance of two or more organizations. The guide provides a strong course for linking law enforcement, and other public safety agencies, with important and meaningful dimensions for measurement. The guide also has the potential of impacting CALEA's accreditation standards development, focusing public safety agencies on the more significant attributes and providing guidance for successful public safety initiatives.

Sylvester Daughtry Jr.

CALEA – Executive Director
Chapter 1

Introduction
I. INTRODUCTION

Purpose of this book

The functions of modern law enforcement agencies are becoming increasingly diverse. Not too many years ago, under the “professional model” of policing, the primary duty of law enforcement officers was seen as responding to crimes that had occurred. Speed of response, number of arrests, and cases cleared were the primary ways in which effectiveness was judged. The advent of community policing changed the way that we think about the job of the police: Law enforcement agencies today are seen as playing a proactive role in preventing crime; as partnering with community groups to maintain and improve the quality of life in neighborhoods; and as acting as a gateway to services for crime victims. The concerns about homeland security following the attacks of September 11, 2001 have placed additional responsibilities on law enforcement agencies as an essential part of the network of first responders and as eyes and ears on the ground searching out information that might prevent the next terrorist attack. Key court decisions and concerns about civil liability have placed increased scrutiny on how police handle traffic and pedestrian stops, respond to domestic violence incidents, and treat suspects and prisoners.

The traditional measures of police agency performance – number of crime complaints, arrests, response time, and clearance rates – do not begin to capture the range of activities that law enforcement is involved in. Fortunately, law enforcement is undergoing a revolution in information technology. New computer-aided dispatch systems not only capture calls, but also retrieve historical information about locations and persons involved in calls and forward it to patrol officers responding to crime complaints. Fusion centers look for patterns in numerous data streams that may help predict an upcoming terror attack or the trajectory of a series of related crimes. Crime analysts using increasingly sophisticated computers and algorithms predict with increasing accuracy when and where crimes are likely to occur. One of the benefits of these systems is that they create the possibility of developing new ways to measure the complex tasks that modern policing entails.

This guidebook presents a set of standardized performance measures developed by law enforcement professionals affiliated with agencies accredited by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) in cooperation with some of the country’s leading academic policing experts. The set of 28 measures is designed to develop a basic, but comprehensive picture of agency performance in nine domains of police activity. The indicators include both measures that can be produced from agency records and measures derived from surveys of police officers, community members, persons with recent police contacts. Together, they provide a picture of agency culture, activity and productivity, efficient use of resources, and interactions with the community it serves. The measures have gone through two phases of field testing and are designed to be inexpensive to produce. By adopting the use of some or all of this set of standardized measures, agencies will be able to compare performance across patrol areas,
compare performance year over year and compare performance to norms from other similar agencies.

Overview of contents

The next sections of this book provide a short history of the use of performance measures in law enforcement and why performance measures are important to police and municipal administrators. This is followed by a brief description of the genesis of this suite of measures and a discussion of costs and benefits of adopting standardized indicators.

The remainder of the book provides a guide to the use of the suite of measures. First, the guide makes the case for why measuring performance matters to both police leaders and to city administrators. It argues, in particular for the use of a set of standardized performance measures – measures that are scientifically derived and defined and collected in the same way from one agency to the next. The third section presents an overview of the dimensions of performance included in the BJA suite of performance measures, how the set of measures was derived, the rigorous testing process that they were subjected to, and the costs and benefits of implementing them. The measures themselves are presented and defined in section four. The following section describes how the measures are derived from a self-assessment form and survey data collection instruments. It provides a description of the purpose and content of each of the data collection instruments, instructions on how to administer them, how to derive and score the performance measures from them, and how to interpret results. (The instruments themselves are contained in Appendices A through F) The derivation of the measures is followed by a discussion of interpretation and uses of the indicators and finally by some final words on measuring performance and suggests some future benefits that could derive from widespread adoption of a standard suite of measures. The book contains a final appendix that provides the range of scores for each indicator from the agencies involved in the field testing. These norms will enable users of the system to know how their agency performs relative to those involved in the field test.
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II. WHY PERFORMANCE MEASURES MATTER

Performance measurement has become an integral part of the organizational landscape in both private and public sectors. In businesses, interest in outcomes other than bottom line profits is reflected in the use of “balanced scorecards” or total quality management. In government, increasingly complex ways to measure performance are being adopted at federal, state, and local levels. The International City Manager’s Association has been in the forefront of advocating the development of ways to measure the performance of municipal services, including law enforcement agencies. In part, the emphasis on measuring performance comes from technological advances: Once data from a company or a government agency is stored on a computer, new possibilities for assessing performance are opened up that were before at best time-consuming and at worst impossible. The emphasis on measuring performance also stems from a desire to make organizations more accountable to stockholders and the public.

Law enforcement agencies have been involved in the impetus to increase accountability through more comprehensive assessment of performance. In a 1999 symposium sponsored by the Justice Department prominent policing experts presented a series of papers on the theme, “Measuring What Matters”, borrowing from a seminal 1992 paper by George Kelling. In the symposium, discussants echoed the theme of Kelling’s paper – that, with the advent of community policing, the role of the police has broadened considerably and that new ways of measuring performance are needed to reflect the new law enforcement role. Various papers suggested new performance metrics, including fear of crime, indicators of physical and social disorder, community engagement, and community participation in policing.

As the symposium highlighted, traditional measures of police performance including arrests, citations, clearance rates, and response time while important, are no longer sufficient measures for agencies to collect. Modern law enforcement agencies engage in a broad spectrum of work including key functions such as crime prevention; promoting traffic safety and responding to vehicular accidents; controlling drug sales and use and other signs of social disorder; and building strong partnerships with key interest groups in communities. Knowing how agencies are performing in all of these realms is likely to be important to municipal councils, mayors, and other entities to which law enforcement agencies are externally accountable. In a time of tight budgets and deep cuts in municipal services, local officials are likely to demand measurable evidence of quality improvement to justify budget requests.

---

Police executives have a strong stake in using comprehensive performance measurement as a tool to promote internal accountability. By defining what is measured, executives send a signal to their command about what activities are valued and what results are considered important. Performance measures can help administrators track morale within the organization, whether funds are being used efficiently, whether individual officers are headed for trouble, and a host of other barometers that indicate health or dysfunction in an organization. Performance indicators also can aid police executives in assessing and responding to claims of racial bias, patterns of abusive behavior, or failure to protect.

Increasingly, law enforcement agencies are moving toward setting goals and more comprehensive production of performance measures to determine if those goals are being met. For example, the recent U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics’ Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) survey indicate that about a third of law enforcement agencies now attempt to assess community opinion of the police by mail or phone, to determine the level of satisfaction among people who have had contact with the police, or soliciting comments from people who visit agency websites. As city executives and legislators increasingly adopt the concept of outcome based budgeting, police departments are no longer immune from budget cuts. Finding ways to operate efficiently without compromising equity in an era of austerity is a top concern of police administrators.

As law enforcement agencies have moved to develop more sophisticated ways to assess performance, there has been some interest in developing standardized measurement. This is natural since law enforcement managers interested in their agency’s performance need a basis of comparison to tell them if what they are observing in their own agency is good, bad, or indifferent. The International City Management Association has been in the forefront of advocating for the development of ways to measure the quality of municipal services. As part of this effort, the Association collects and publishes on a regular basis limited performance data on participating police agencies including measures of crimes, arrests, and efficient use of resources. The Florida Benchmarking Consortium is a voluntary intra-state collaboration of 20 county and 28 city governments started in 2004 that seeks to improve the delivery of services through the use of performance measurement data and benchmarking tools and techniques. Participating municipalities contribute information for law enforcement, fire and rescue operations, parks, code enforcement, and other agencies. Law enforcement data includes calls for service, clearance rates, officer self-initiated activities, staffing of community policing activities, and workforce demographic composition.

Uniform methods of measuring performance are important for several reasons. As we will discuss below, many new measurement tools consist of surveys – surveys to
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assess satisfaction with law enforcement encounters, surveys to gauge community opinion of the police, and to assess officer morale. Surveys use multiple questions to assess an underlying attribute, for example, satisfaction with how a traffic stop was handled by an officer. A highly desirable attribute of items contained in scales derived from survey data is that they are *internally consistent*, meaning that the items are demonstrated to be highly inter-related and to be measuring a single underlying construct, not multiple constructs. For example, when assessing public opinion of the police, it turns out that it is important to distinguish between opinions of police effectiveness and police professionalism or conduct: These are two distinct dimensions of how people view police performance. Citizens can believe that their local police are both effective in promoting public safety, but also abusive of citizen’s rights. There are scales that have been developed and thoroughly tested that have known statistical properties that do a good job of measuring the distinct dimensions of how people view the police. Surveys that are “homegrown” are unlikely to have the same construct validity and therefore may do a poor job of measuring the phenomenon they seek to assess.

Standardized measurement tools also create the potential for law enforcement administrators to compare their agency’s performance with the performance of other agencies. Of course, agencies differ substantially in mission, size, community composition and many other attributes that make interpretations of performance comparisons across agencies difficult. However, having a benchmark to compare results against is important to understanding whether an agency is doing well or failing badly. For example, an officer survey might indicate low opinions of agency leadership among the rank and file. But the result is less worrisome if the agency head was able to find out that police officers in most agencies complain about agency leadership, based on results from other agencies using the same assessment tool.

**How Performance Measures Can Be Used**

Performance measures can be used in a variety of ways to help law enforcement administrators manage their internal and external environments. Most basically, performance indicators provide a snapshot of existing conditions within agencies and the communities they serve. For example, community surveys take the pulse of the community, letting law enforcement agencies know whether the community is supportive of the work they are doing. Moreover, community surveys can also identify the level of support among subgroups of the population so that agencies can know how they are perceived among different ethnicities, age groups, homeowners, females, and so forth. Officer surveys perform a similar function of gauging the sentiment of the rank and file toward agency leadership.

Performance measures can give administrators information to help make judgments about which patrol areas are performing better and worse. Some indicators can be adjusted for differences among patrol areas. For example, opinions of the police on community surveys can be adjusted for different demographic composition of patrol areas to make comparisons more meaningful. Other measures – for example clearance
rates are more difficult to adjust for local differences. Still, data like these can suggest the need for further investigation to determine the reasons for disparity between patrol areas.

Performance measures provide a way to gauge progress toward goals set in strategic plans. They can also be used to judge the success of innovative programs or policy changes. For example, a chief might want to know the effect of a new high speed pursuit policy on officer morale and perceptions of agency leadership.

Finally, armed with information on how their agency is performing relative to neighboring communities, law enforcement administrators can better defend against criticisms from municipal executives and councils. The financial crisis confronting local governments is changing the budgeting process immensely and austerity is the “new normal” in government. Executives and legislators are increasingly adopting the paradigm of outcome based budgeting. In most municipalities, law enforcement is the largest locally-funded government agency, consuming a plurality of the total general fund tax revenue. Moreover, this percentage is growing in most communities, as economic hardship is driving reductions, and cities prioritize public safety as a higher priority than other governmental functions. Because of this, municipal and county executives and legislators are keenly interested in assuring the efficiency and effectiveness of public safety agencies. In short, law enforcement agencies are no longer immune from the kinds of cuts the Parks Department is quite familiar with. Being able to point out that an agency’s performance in a particular area is well within the norms is a strong defense against attacks and a good tool for justifying budget requests.

**Successful Chiefs Have Endorsed Measurement of Performance**

Forward-thinking police managers have advocated for measurement as key to ensuring accountability in their agencies. The importance of measuring performance is inherent in this 1999 statement from William Bratton:

...like many police managers, I’ve turned to modern business theory and the study of how to make large organizations work more effectively toward their goals. Goals, it turns out, are an extremely important part of lifting a low-performing organization to higher levels of accomplishment and revitalizing an organizational culture.

Bratton has been perhaps the most well-known proponent of measurement through the Compstat process that he created while commissioner of the NYPD. Compstat is driven by nearly real-time crime statistics that are used to encourage
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commanders to watch weekly crime trends with the same attention that private corporations pay to profit and loss. While Compstat initially focused solely on crime trends, other standards, including citizen complaints against the police, have been added over the years. During a pilot project in the early 2000s, the NYPD teamed with the Vera Institute of Justice to produce monthly indices of satisfaction with police encounters in each of the NYPD’s 76 precincts.

Darrell Stephens has been an advocate of measuring non-traditional police outcomes. A strong proponent of neighborhood community policing, Stephens argues that measuring not only crime, but also disorder and fear, are an integral part of promoting neighborhood quality of life:

Measuring crime, disorder, and fear and their effects on the quality of life in the community is important to the police….We should measure crime, disorder, and fear at the neighborhood level and develop tailored responses to deal with these problems. In that way, the police can make a substantial and meaningful contribution to the creation of safe communities.  

It is not surprising that successful chiefs recognize the value of developing sophisticated ways of measuring performance. One of the major lessons learned about policing is that accountability is critical to success, and there is no accountability without accurate measurement.

———

Chapter 3

The BJA Suite of Performance Measures
III. THE BJA SUITE OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Rand and the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) have worked to develop a set of standardized measures with the voluntary participation of law enforcement executives in CALEA’s membership. Several years ago, CALEA assembled a committee on Performance Measurement and enlisted the cooperation of 15 police agencies willing to commit themselves to a pilot project on using standard measures to assess their agencies. They understood that the set of measures that they set out to develop would reflect the diverse range of activities that modern law enforcement agencies are involved in. Drawing heavily on work by Moore and Braga (2003), this group drafted a rudimentary set of performance indicators to assess nine dimensions of policing, including delivering quality service; fear, safety, and order; ethics/values; legitimacy/customer service; organizational competence/commitment to high standards; reducing crime and victimization; resource use; responding to offenders; and use of authority. Each category of performance may contain multiple potential indictors.

The set of indicators attempt to capture the complex public expectations of law enforcement agencies. They apply equally well to large and small agencies, police departments, and sheriff’s offices.

Dimension I: Delivering Quality Services
The police are accountable to the general public and have an obligation to be responsive to the community and especially to emergency requests for service. In the performance of their duties, the police should be observant of individual rights.

Dimension II: Fear, Safety & Order
The police should work to create an environment in which citizens feel safe to go about their business and communities that sustain a decent quality of life.

Dimension III: Ethics & Values
The police should maintain high ethical standards and be respectful in dealing with citizens.

---


Dimension IV: Legitimacy/Customer Satisfaction
The police should interact with persons who request services, persons who are detained, and retail businesses in a way that promotes satisfaction and confidence in the police.

Dimension V: Organizational Environment/Commitment to High Standards
Law enforcement agencies should strive to create a working environment conducive to officer morale. Policies and training should result in officers being prepared to handle routine situations.

Dimension VI: Reducing Crime & Victimization
While it is recognized that the causes of crime are complex, the police should act in ways that promote the reduction of crime and victimization.

Dimension VII: Resource Use
The police should operate in an economical manner, mindful of the public purse. They should strive for efficiency in responding to calls, making arrests and strive to supplement municipal budgets with external grant funds.

Dimension VIII: Responding to Offenders
The police should be effective in their response to crime as evidenced by their ability to solve cases and promote neighborhoods that are free of signs of disorder.

Dimension IX: Use of Authority
The police are entrusted with a unique position of authority. They should use their authority in a fair and impartial manner, using minimum amount of force and treating persons detained respectfully.

RAND and CALEA solicited participation from four CALEA-accredited agencies to develop and test specific measures building on the nine dimensions of performance that CALEA had developed. The four agencies participated in a meeting at RAND offices in Arlington in February, 2008. The agencies were chosen for their diversity, and included Dallas, TX (large metropolitan police department), Knoxville, TN (police department in a medium-size city), Kettering, OH (a suburban police department), and Broward County, FL (an urban sheriff’s office). Senior officials from the four agencies and researchers from RAND and academic institutions defined 28 measures within the nine dimensions. The 28 measures were derived from a set of data collection instruments that included a self-assessment instrument and several types of surveys:

- A self-assessment instrument that asks agencies to supply basic information from records on crime rates, clearance rates, arrests, citizen complaints, and budgetary information. Much of this information is converted to a rate per officer or rate per 10,000 community population to facilitate comparison between sites.
• **Community surveys** in which a random or representative sample of the community is surveyed to gauge people’s opinions of police effectiveness and/or police misconduct.

• **Contact surveys** that assess the quality of interaction between police and citizens who request police assistance or who are stopped by the police. Rather than asking for global opinions of the police as is done on community surveys, contact surveys ask respondents to assess specific behaviors of police officers during a particular encounter (such as whether they were courteous, gave appropriate information, etc.)

• **Officer surveys** (also known as *climate and culture* surveys) that measure officer morale, adherence to principals of integrity, perceptions of agency leadership, and knowledge of policies pertaining to situations commonly encountered by law enforcement. Research has validated the use of climate and culture surveys, with those departments recognized as progressive scoring the highest on the survey measures. Climate and culture surveys have shown substantial disparity among police agencies in terms of the “environment of integrity,” with indications that police managers are largely responsible for setting the tone for the rank and file officers.

• **Business surveys** that assess satisfaction of local retailers with police services, similar to community surveys conducted with residential households.

The measures derived from these sources (presented in the next section) were refined and discussed in site visits to each of the four sites to ensure that definitions of the measures were consistent from one site to the next. An initial field test was designed to determine the feasibility of producing the measures -- how much agency staff time was needed to develop the data that are used to produce the indices, and whether the measures could fairly be compared across agencies. In the case of survey measures (community surveys, surveys of persons who had recent contacts with law enforcement, officer surveys, and retail business surveys) where outside help was needed to collect the data, we wanted to see what the cost would be.

The pilot test demonstrated that the concept of collecting similar measures of performance across law enforcement agencies of varying types and sizes is feasible. While there were a few outliers, on most of the measures the results from each of the four agencies were not radically different. The amount of man-hours needed to compile information from agency records was thought by the agencies to be reasonable and the costs of officer, community, contact, and retail business surveys were surprisingly low.
In a second phase of the field test, this one funded by BJA, we expanded the number of agencies participating in the field test from four to nine. To the original participants, we added the Raleigh, NC, Avon, CT, Boca Raton, FL and Las Vegas, NV Police Departments and the Arapahoe County, CO Sheriff’s Office. We focused on improving the methods of collecting survey data to construct the indicators. We experimented with less expensive ways to conduct various types of surveys, with ways to increase response rates and with ways to improve the extent to which the survey samples are representative of the populations from which they are drawn. The work we did for BJA led to modest revisions to a number of the survey measures that have the effect of making the measures more useful barometers of changes in performance over time resulting from new policies or practices. It also gave us a better understanding of the trade-offs between cost and quality of the surveys include in the set of instruments.\(^8\)

**Costs and Benefits**

The resultant set of standardized performance indicators are broad in scope yet can be implemented at relatively low cost and with a relatively small amount of staff time. The participating agencies have told us that the items contained in the self-evaluation form that are derived from agency records are not difficult to produce: Indeed, the performance measures were designed in large part by law enforcement executives who were very sensitive to the efforts needed to produce the measures. Much of the information contained on the self-evaluation form is information that agencies already are required to produce, whether for internal administrative accountability, reporting to a city or county executive, or reporting to ICMA, CALEA, or another external agency.

Measures derived from surveys that are conducted through the Internet are also very inexpensive. There are a number of user-friendly software packages for designing surveys that are inexpensive to purchase and easy to use, even for novices. The surveys that we use can be programmed within a few hours. The packages will compile basic frequencies and allow simple conversion of the results into Excel and other widely-used formats. A recent study in Chicago that conducted internet-based community surveys to assess community perception of the police and neighborhood conditions found strong support for the validity of data obtained in this manner.\(^9\)

Mail surveys are a bit more costly and phone surveys more costly yet, especially because they should be administered by an outside organization to ensure impartiality in recording answers. Community surveys also need to be concerned about drawing samples that are, in fact, representative of people in the community. The most expensive
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surveys we conducted ran about $24/respondent, or $3,600 for the samples of 150 that we used in the field test. In the sections describing results of the survey field tests, we discuss costs of administration for different modalities of administration.

The set of measures or subsets can be used to compare performance across patrol areas to determine, for example, whether some areas stand apart from the others in how satisfied citizens are with the handling of a crime complain or a traffic stop. They can be used to make year-over-year comparisons of agency of patrol area performance to determine if performance is trending in a positive direction. They can be used to compare performance with other agencies to provide a benchmark against which to assess how an agency is doing in various areas. Of course, the latter comparisons must be used judiciously since policies, data collection systems, and populations served differ from one place to the next. But having benchmarks to use as a guide will give law enforcement executives a point of reference that can serve either to reassure them that their agency’s performance is within industry norms or that there are aspects of performance that need to be further examined.

The measures presented here can be used as a set to perform a comprehensive assessment of how an agency is functioning. But they can also be used individually, as agency requirements dictate. For example, one agency may want to regularly assess officer job satisfaction as part of forming a complete picture of agency performance, while another may be interested only in polling officers at a particular point in time following implementation of a controversial policy.
Chapter 4
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VI. THE MEASURES DEFINED

This section details the 28 measures in the nine domains of performance contained in the BJA scheme. It includes definitions of each measure and indicates the data collection instrument from which each measure is derived (data collection instruments are included in the next section).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension I: Delivering Quality Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1: Response time for priority 1 or emergency calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition:</strong> Priority 1 calls are calls involving immediate threat of harm to people or property (e.g., robbery, burglary in progress, traffic accident with injury) that receive top priority in the 911 system. This measure is defined as the average number of minutes from receipt of call-receiver pick-up to police arrival on scene. On-view or officer-initiated calls (incidents where officer happens on scene) should be excluded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source:</strong> Self-assessment form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Measure 2: Community opinion of the effectiveness of police services |
| **Definition:** Satisfaction with police index contained in surveys conducted on representative sample of community (break down by demographic groups) |
| **Source:** Community survey |

| Measure 3: Officer discourtesy |
| **Definition:** Number of investigations for citizen complaints of discourtesy per sworn officer resulting from incidents investigated by internal affairs, external review board, or supervisors in local commands. |
| **Source:** Self-assessment form |

| Measure 4: Civil suits |
| **Definition:** Number of civil suits filed by citizens against police department per 10,000 population (not to include officer-initiated suits or suits based on jail mistreatment) |
| **Source:** Self-assessment form |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension II: Fear, Safety &amp; Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 5: Community perceptions of disorder and safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**The Measures Defined**

**Measure 1: Index of social disorder contained in community survey**
- **Definition:** Index of social disorder contained in community survey
- **Source:** Community survey

**Dimension III: Ethics & Values**

**Measure 6: Officer ethics & values**
- **Definition:** “Climate and culture” questions contained in survey of sworn officers
- **Source:** Officer survey

**Measure 7: Respectful dealing with citizens**
- **Definition:** Number of sustained citizen complaints per sworn officer resulting from investigations conducted by internal affairs or external review board (not to include minor incidents handled by local district supervisors)
- **Source:** Self-assessment form

**Dimension IV: Legitimacy/Customer Satisfaction**

**Measure 8: Satisfaction of “customers” with police services**
- **Definition:** Satisfaction with police encounters among persons making crime complaints
- **Source:** Voluntary contact survey

**Measure 9: Satisfaction of business community**
- **Definition:** Satisfaction with police services among business owners
- **Source:** Retail business survey

**Dimension V: Organizational environment/commitment to high standards**

**Measure 10: Employee job satisfaction and morale**
- **Definition:** Job satisfaction and morale index on surveys of sworn officers
- **Source:** Officer survey

**Measure 11: Officer perceptions of agency leadership**
**Definition**: Officer opinions of agency leadership contained in surveys of sworn officers  
**Source**: Officer survey

**Measure 12: Absenteeism**

**Definition**: Mean number of days of sick and family leave time taken by sworn staff  
**Source**: Self-assessment form

**Measure 13: Officer knowledge of policies, law relating to job**

**Definition**: Officers’ perceptions of how well-prepared they are by virtue of agency policies and training to handle commonly-encountered situations on the job  
**Source**: Officer survey

**Dimension VI: Reducing Crime & Victimization**

**Measure 14: Violent crime rate**

**Definition**: Number of Part I violent crimes per 10,000 population reported through UCR  
**Source**: Self-assessment form

**Measure 15: Property crime rate**

**Definition**: Number of Part I property crimes per 10,000 population reported through UCR  
**Source**: Self-assessment form

**Dimension VII: Resource Use**

**Measures 16-18: Officer efficiency**

**Definition 1 (Measure 16)**: Number of calls for service per sworn officer  
**Source**: Self-assessment form

**Definition 2 (Measure 17)**: Number of police-initiated actions in the field (include pedestrian and traffic actions) per sworn officer
**The Measures Defined**

### Source: Self-assessment form

**Definition 3 (Measure 18):** Number of custodial felony and misdemeanor arrests (both adults and juveniles) per sworn officer

**Measure 19-21 Cost of police services**

**Definition 1 (Measure 19):** Dollar cost* per custodial arrest

**Definition 2 (Measure 20):** Dollar cost* per call for service answered

**Definition 3 (Measure 21):** Dollar cost* of police department per resident (adjusted for cost of living)

*Note: Costs to include municipal budget line items for law enforcement services only as well as special funds from traffic citations, drug abatement actions, asset forfeiture, or other revenues stemming from police enforcement actions. Excluded are budgets for 911 or 311 call centers, jail operations, and grants.

**Measure 22: Success in obtaining grant funds to supplement annual operating budget**

**Definition:** Dollar value of awarded grants as percent of department budget

**Source:** Self-assessment form

### Dimension VIII: Responding to Offenders

**Measure 23: Clearance rate for violent crimes**

**Definition:** % UCR Part I crimes cleared by arrest and charging of at least one person involved in the commission of an offense (not to include exceptional clearances)

**Source:** Self-assessment form

**Measure 24: Clearance rate for property crimes**

**Definition:** Proportion of UCR Part I property crimes cleared by arrest and charging of at least one person involved in the commission of an offense (not to include
exceptional clearances)

Source: Self-assessment form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension IX: Use of Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure 25: Use of force</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition</strong>: Number of use of force incidents per arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong>: Self-assessment form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure 26: Respectful treatment of persons stopped by police</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition</strong>: Satisfaction with treatment assessed in surveys of persons stopped by police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong>: Involuntary contact survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures 27-28 Officer misconduct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition 1 (Measure 27)</strong>: Number of disciplinary actions (to include oral and written reprimands, suspensions, terminations) per sworn officer, based on violations of code of conduct both on and off the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong>: Self-assessment form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition 2 (Measure 28)</strong>: Index of community perceptions of police abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong>: Community survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Data Collection Instruments
V. THE DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

This section describes the instruments used to collect the data needed to produce the performance measures. Copies of the instruments are contained in the appendices. They include a self-assessment form, designed to be completed by agency staff; a community survey; survey of persons who request assistance from law enforcement; survey of persons stopped by officers; and a survey of retail business owners.

A. Self-Assessment Form

Genesis and content of the form

This form was designed by project staff to capture data from law enforcement agency records. It is intended to be completed from information that is readily available from agencies’ RMS systems and other automated databases. It includes information on staffing and budget and basic statistics on response time, citizen complaints and civil suits against the police, officer absenteeism, reported crimes, arrests, calls for service, officer-initiated actions, clearance rates, use of force, and disciplinary actions. In designing the form, we attempted to include statistics that agencies compile on a regular basis.

Information captured on the form is used in the construction of the following measures:

- Measure 1: Response time for priority calls
- Measure 3: Officer discourtesy
- Measure 4: Civil suits
- Measure 7: Respectful dealing with citizens
- Measure 12: Absenteeism
- Measure 14: Violent crime rate
- Measure 15: Property crime rate
- Measures 16-18: Officer efficiency
- Measures 19-21: Cost of police services
- Measure 22: Success in obtaining grant funds
- Measure 23: Clearance rate for violent crimes
- Measure 24: Clearance rate for property crimes
- Measure 25: Use of force
- Measure 27: Disciplinary actions

A copy of the form is contained in Appendix A.

Administration
It was not our intent to create significant burdens on the agencies participating in the field test, and experience in the field tests suggests that agencies did not find the form onerous. The form was intended to be completed by a departmental research or analysis unit. With information coming from automated information systems, and much of it already reported publically, the field tests suggested that it takes less than two days of effort for an agency researcher or analyst to complete.

**Scoring**

Computation of measures derived from the self-assessment form is straightforward and is contained in the table below. Most of the measures are determined as either rates per officer or rates per 10,000 population.

| Measure 1: Response time for priority calls | Entry in item 5 of self-assessment form |
| Measure 3: Officer discourtesy | Entry in item 6 divided by item 1 |
| Measure 4: Civil suits | Entry in item 7 divided by item 4 |
| Measure 7: Respectful dealing with citizens | Entry in item 8 divided by item 1 |
| Measure 12: Absenteeism | Entry in item 9 divided by sum of items 1 and 2 |
| Measure 14: Violent crime rate | Entry in item 10 divided by item 4 |
| Measure 15: Property crime rate | Entry in item 11 divided by item 4 |
| Measure 16: Calls for service per officer | Entry in item 12 divided by item 1 |
| Measure 17: Police-initiated actions per officer | Entry in item 13 divided by item 1 |
| Measure 18: Arrests per officer | Entry in item 14 divided by item 1 |
| Measure 19: Cost per arrest | Item 3 divided by entry in item 14 |
| Measure 20: Cost per call for service | Item 3 divided by entry in item 12 |
| Measure 21: Policing cost per resident | Item 3 divided by item 4 x 10,000 |
| Measure 22: Success in obtaining grant funds | Entry in item 15 divided by item 3 |
| Measure 23: Clearance rate for violent crimes | Entry in item 16 divided by entry in item 10 |
| Measure 24: Clearance rate for property crimes | Entry in item 17 divided by entry in item 10 |
| Measure 25: Use of force per arrest | Entry in item 18 divided by item 14 |
| Measure 27: Disciplinary actions per officer | Entry in item 19 divided by item 1 |
B. Officer Survey

Genesis and content of the survey

The officer survey contains four separate scales that are used to produce indicators of ethics and values (Measure 6), employee job satisfaction (Measure 10), officer perceptions of quality of agency leadership (Measure 11), and officer knowledge of commonly-encountered situations (Measure 13). A summary of the measures derived from the survey include:

**Job Satisfaction**

The Gallup Q12\(^{10}\) is a survey designed to measure employee engagement. The instrument was the result of hundreds of focus groups and interviews. Researchers found that there were 12 key expectations, that when satisfied, form the foundation of strong feelings of engagement. Tens of thousands of work units and more than one million employees have participated in the Q12 instrument. The instrument contains these 12 items, each rated on a scale of 1 to 5 (strongly disagree to strongly agree). Items tap job expectations, supervision, sense of being challenged and appreciated, and social integration.

**Officers’ Perceptions of Leadership**

The 13-item leadership section of the officer survey is drawn from Police Foundation surveys utilized in operational studies of various police departments including Detroit, Washington, DC, and Phoenix. Each item is rated on a 5-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

The leadership scale contains both items asking for opinions of leadership of immediate supervisors and opinions of senior leadership. Experience from the field test indicates that the two sets of opinions can be quite different.

**Integrity**

The integrity questionnaire developed by Klockars\(^{11}\) was designed to elicit information on the culture of integrity of law enforcement agencies. The version of the questionnaire that we use asks officers to rate different ethical violations (e.g., accepting free meals from retailers, referring owners of damaged vehicles to a particular body shop in return for a kick-back) in terms of how serious most officers in their unit would perceive the scenario. Ratings are done according to a 5-point scale ranging from “Not at all serious” to “Very serious.”

**Job knowledge**

This scale, developed for this project, assesses the degree to which officers feel prepared -- by virtue of their training and agency policies -- to handle situations they are likely to encounter on the job. The matrix consists of six questions each with a five-point Likert response scale. Preceding each answer matrix is a scenario outlining a typical job task of a police officer. Questions range from simple everyday tasks such as medical emergencies and domestic incidents to complex situations that are less frequently encountered such as school shootings.

---


Information captured on the officer survey is used to derive the following measures:

- Measure 6: Officer ethics and values
- Measure 10: Officer job satisfaction and morale
- Measure 11: Officer perceptions of agency leadership
- Measure 13: Officer knowledge of policies and law relating to the job

A copy of the form is contained in Appendix B.

**Administration**

We recommend administering the survey as a web-based instrument in order to minimize the time needed to administer and code the survey and to allow officers anonymity in deciding whether to participate and privacy in completing the survey. The adoption of online surveys has spread rapidly due to the promise of reaching large target populations for minimal cost. Internet surveys can be divided into those that execute on a respondent’s machine (client-side) and those that execute on the survey organization’s web server (server-side). With client-side surveys, the survey instrument is transmitted to target individuals via the internet. Respondents answer the questions on their computer and then the responses are transmitted back to the server belonging to the survey organization. In server-side surveys, on the other hand, data are transmitted from the respondent to the survey organization’s server in real-time. Each time a respondent answers a question, the answer is immediately transmitted to the server.  

We have worked with server-side surveys in the field tests. These surveys can easily be programmed using Zoomerang, Survey Monkey, or other products commercially available for under $200 per year. These organizations have good protections for safeguarding data. In conducting a web-based survey, it is important to guarantee the confidentiality and safety of data posted by respondents. Here are some considerations in selecting a software vendor and designing a survey:

- Survey data should be stored at a secure hosting facility with both physical and software-based security systems. Staff of the vendor should perform regular security audits on its servers.

- Information from respondents should be stored in secure databases protected by passwords as well as database and network firewalls to prevent the loss, misuse or alteration of personal or survey information.

- In order to assure anonymity to survey respondents, the vendor should not keep track of respondents’ IP addresses

---

Programming the survey should take only a few hours even for someone without prior knowledge of the programming product. Our experience indicates that nearly all officers are able to complete the survey in less than 20 minutes. Survey results can be output in Excel files for basic analysis and can also be readily converted to SPSS or SAS packages for statistical analysis.

**Scoring**

For each of the four scales, scoring is simply calculating the mean of the non-missing items, as indicated in the table below: Scores on each of the scales range from 1-5, with higher scores indicating superior performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 6: Officer ethics and values</th>
<th>Mean of items 26-31*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 10: Officer job satisfaction and morale</td>
<td>Mean of items 1-13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 11: Officer perceptions of agency leadership</td>
<td>Mean of items 13-25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 13: Officer knowledge of policies/law relating to job</td>
<td>Mean of items 32-42*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means of non-missing items
C. Community Survey

**Genesis and content of the survey**

Community surveys are the most complicated and expensive data collection method in this set that we developed. Still, the cost is still relatively low, and many agencies conduct some form of community survey on a regular or semi-regular basis. What we are proposing is that survey content and method of administration be standardized and scientifically sound. Using the question set that we have developed does not preclude the inclusion of other items: The 23-item community survey can be administered in about 10 minutes, leaving time for additional questions of local interest.

The community survey incorporates scales used to develop indices of community satisfaction with police services, community perceptions of disorder and safety, and victimization rates. The public opinion section included questions pertaining to *police effectiveness* using five questions (e.g., the police are doing a good job of fighting crime, the police are good at working with local residents to solve neighborhood problems) derived from the work of Wes Skogan in his evaluation of the Chicago community policing program.\(^{13}\) It also included four questions on police professionalism, also derived from Skogan’s work (e.g., how common is it for police to stop people in your neighborhood without a good reason, how common is it for police in your neighborhood to use offensive language when dealing with suspects or other members of the public). Research findings have suggested that opinions of police professionalism are only somewhat correlated with opinions about police effectiveness. That is, people can think that their local police are effective, but at the same time, believe that they engage in unprofessional behavior.

A second set of survey questions queries respondents about perceptions of disorder and safety, including car break-ins, home break-ins, violent street crime, people selling or using drugs, fear of going out at night, and youths loitering or committing vandalism. Response options ranged from “very worried” to “somewhat worried” to “not at all worried.”

We had originally included (and intend to include in future versions of the measures) a set of questions about victimization during the past year. However, the preliminary scale that we developed proved to be an unreliable measure, so we have not included it here.

Data captured in the community survey is used to produce three indicators:

- Measure 2: Community opinion of the effectiveness of police services
- Measure 5: Community perceptions of disorder and safety
- Measure 28: Community perceptions of police professionalism

---

A copy of the survey is contained in Appendix C.

**Administration**

In conducting a community survey, it is important that the sample of people surveyed be representative of the community at large. This is usually achieved through random sampling – a selection process in which each person in the community has an equal chance to be selected for participation. In our field testing, we experimented with different ways to administer the survey – including phone surveys, mail surveys, and surveys of agency website users. While there are advantages of the latter two survey modalities in terms of cost, phone surveys are the most likely to be representative of the larger community. Surprisingly, however, we did not find major differences in the demographic characteristics of phone survey respondents and mail survey respondents or visitors of agency websites. For agencies whose budgets are very limited, the latter two survey modalities provide a less expensive way to conduct a community survey.

While we recommend telephone surveys as the best alternative, they are by no means perfect. Some households do not have phones, and an increasing number have cell phones only. (For this reason, we recommend that the sampling frame, or listing of eligible households, include cell phone listings as well as land line listings.) Completion rates for phone surveys have also gone down over the years, as people have become overwhelmed by the number of intrusions of their privacy. Caller ID has made it possible for people to be selective about which calls they answer.

There are basically two ways to define a sampling frame that will generate a sample that is representative of the population. Random digit dialing (RDD) is a method that generates phone numbers at random using pre-defined area code and local exchanges. It has the advantage that it includes unlisted numbers that would be otherwise missed. However, the increasing number of households that have cell phones only are missed using this technique. If those households without land lines are demographically different from the rest of the population (which is likely), then the representativeness of the sample is compromised. Moreover, if the desired coverage area does not match up closely with exchanges, then survey administrators have to rely on self reports of persons called to verify that they reside within the target area. The alternative to RDD is to purchase lists of phone numbers of households within the target area. These lists are readily available from commercial survey companies, are reasonably priced, and can include cell phones as well as land lines.

The other big decision to be made is how many people to include in the survey. There are two approaches to determining sample size. One is to base sample size on how accurately you want to estimate the population parameters you are trying to measure, for example community opinion of police effectiveness. Generally, the larger the sample size, the greater confidence that estimates obtained from the sample will be close to the true value for that parameter in the entire community. In general, samples can be smaller if the population is relatively homogeneous and/or if only rough estimates of what the
community thinks or feels are needed. If differences between subgroups in the community are important (e.g., assessing opinions of effectiveness among different racial groups), sample sizes must be larger. In that case, it is common procedure to stratify samples so that targets are set for each group or strata and then random selection proceeds within each of the strata defined. There are a number of websites that will enable calculation of sample sizes based on population size and other parameters. A good one can be found at http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html.

Sample size is determined differently if the intent is to compare survey results between different commands or to compare results from one time period to another. In that case, sample size is determined by the size of the expected difference in mean scores between the two comparison groups, the amount of variability in the data, and the level of statistical significance determined to be acceptable. Based on scale properties known from the demonstration project results, sample sizes of 150 per comparison group would permit a high probability (statistical power equal to 0.84) of detecting as small as a 10% difference between groups.

Decisions about sampling and sample size determinations can be complicated. Fortunately, there are many good commercial survey services available, often through local universities. Statisticians in survey firms can help work through the sampling method and sample size issues, and using professionally trained interviewers helps to ensure objectivity in asking survey questions and recording responses.

**Scoring**

Survey companies should be able to supply results in Excel, SPSS or SAS format for statistical analysis. Scores for each of the three scales are the mean of the non-missing items, as indicated in the table below: Scores on police effectiveness and police professionalism scales range from 1-4, and scores on the perceptions of safety and disorder scale range from 1-3. In each case, higher scores indicating superior performance.

| Measure 2: Community opinion of the effectiveness of police services | Mean of items 1-6* |
| Measure 28: Community perceptions of police professionalism | Mean of items 7-12* |
| Measure 5: Community perceptions of disorder and safety | Mean of items 13-18* |

* Means of non-missing items
D. Voluntary and Involuntary Contact Surveys

Genesis and content of the surveys

These two surveys together are used to derive indicators of “customer satisfaction with police services (Measure 8) and respectful treatment of persons stopped by the police (Measure 25). The brief surveys drew their content from surveys developed and tested at the Vera Institute of Justice in cooperation with the New York Police Department in 2001-2002. The Vera surveys were administered monthly to 5,000 people who had recent contact with the police because they reported a crime or had been issued a summons. Unlike community opinion surveys, the Vera work indicated that responses to the questions were not greatly influenced by age, race, or gender. This suggests that people were able to isolate their perception of how the specific incident was handled from pre-existing attitudes toward the police.

Both the voluntary contact and involuntary contact surveys include seven questions on satisfaction with the way the police officer or officers handled the encounter. Samples of items on the voluntary contact survey include promptness of response, professionalism of responding officer(s), and respectful treatment by officers. Examples of questions on the involuntary contact survey included professionalism, respectful treatment, and reasonableness of time detained. Each question included response options on a four-point Likert scale (e.g., the officer treated me very professionally, somewhat professionally, somewhat unprofessionally, very unprofessionally).

The two surveys are used to produce the following indicators:

- Measure 8: Satisfaction of citizens who receive assistance from the police
- Measure 26: Respectful treatment of persons stopped by the police

Copies of the surveys are contained in Appendices D and E.

Administration

In the field tests, we experimented with administering the survey by phone, by mail, and by soliciting participation in a web-based survey on agency websites. We concluded that telephone was the desired mode of administration, although results from the three modalities were surprisingly similar in terms of satisfaction ratings and demographics of survey completers. Phone surveys had completion rates twice as high as

---

15 While other work tends to support the idea that demographics play a minimal role in determining satisfaction with police encounters, some differences have been found between blacks and other ethnic groups in satisfaction with involuntary encounters; see Skogan, W.G., (2005), Citizen satisfaction with police encounters, Police Quarterly, 8, 298-321 and Bureau of Justice Statistics (2002), Contacts between police and the public: Findings from the 2002 national survey. Washington, D.C.: Author.
mail surveys and – using graduate student interviewers under faculty supervision – cost just $8 per completed survey.

If funds are available, we recommend that the contact surveys be conducted by a professional survey company that will have well-defined procedures for dividing attempts at contact evenly between days, evenings, and weekends and for converting respondents who initially refuse to be interviewed. Using a professional survey firm also ensures that interviewers are not biased in recording responses. It should be possible to find a firm to conduct these brief, five minute surveys for under $20 each. However, if funds are limited, we believe that competent results can be obtained even more cheaply by teaming with a local university faculty member who recruits student interviewers.

Call lists should be compiled from the most recent crime reports and summonses (and/or pedestrian or vehicle stop reports). Our experience has shown that the success rate is much higher with recent contacts than with contacts even just a few months old. Statistics from the Vera Institute work suggest that samples as small as 75 completes per patrol area can detect moderate effect sizes between divisions with a high level of statistical power.

**Scoring**

Once data have been collected, a single satisfaction score is calculated by taking the mean of each non-missing item from the five-item scales. Each scale has a range of 1-4, with higher scores indicating more positive perceptions of treatment by the police.

| Measure 8: Satisfaction of citizens who receive assistance from the police | Mean of items 1-5* |
| Measure 26: Respectful treatment of persons stopped by the police | Mean of items 1-5* |

* Means of non-missing items

**E. Retail Business Owner Survey**

**Genesis of form**

This survey assesses satisfaction of retail business owners with law enforcement services, and is used to derive an indicator of satisfaction of the business community. The brief form contains seven items modeled after the community survey administered to private citizens. Sample items include how well the agency is doing fighting crime, whether it promptly responds to calls from business owners, and whether the police maintain a sufficient presence in the neighborhood. Each item contains four response options ranging from very positive to somewhat positive to somewhat negative to very negative.
The survey is used to produce the following indicator:

- **Measure 9: Satisfaction of business community with police services**

A copy of the survey is contained in Appendix F.

**Administration**

In the field test, we experimented with both mail and web-based methods of survey administration. Although response rates were somewhat better with mail surveys, we recommend programming this as a web-based survey (see detail on web surveys in officer survey section above). Local chambers of commerce have listings of area retailers, often including e-mail addresses. We suggest sending an initial invitation via e-mail containing a link to access the survey and then following up with a reminder two weeks later.

**Scoring**

A single index of retail business owner satisfaction (Measure 9) is obtained by calculating for each respondent the mean score of all non-missing responses for each of the seven items, and then averaging over the entire sample.
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VI. HOW TO USE THE DATA ONCE COLLECTED

The set of measures that we have presented have been tested and shown to be feasible and meaningful for both large and small agencies and for sheriff agencies as well as police departments. The cost is quite reasonable, given the new web-based survey technologies available. But what is the payoff for law enforcement administrators who make the investment in time and funds to produce the suite of performance measures?

Taken together, the measures present a broad overview of agency performance – both effectiveness and efficiency. Since the measures are designed to be inexpensive and easy to implement, they are not intended to provide a detailed assessment of performance in specific areas. Rather, they can alert administrators and city managers of areas where possible problems exist so that they may investigate that area more closely.

We present below four ways in which the standardized set of performance measures can be used. The most controversial will be in making comparisons across agencies. There are many reasons why performance of one agency may differ from norms. First, the phenomenon being measured may differ from one place to the next. For example, the time required to make an arrest may vary substantially from one agency to the next. In one agency, the arresting officer may simply turn a prisoner over to another authority for processing, while an officer in another agency may be required to fingerprint, photograph and transport the prisoner to a detention center. Second, definitions may vary from one place to the next for something even as basic as what constitutes a call for service. Third, the process of capturing, classifying, and reporting data may be different in one agency than in another. For example, in one jurisdiction, citizen complaints for officer discourtesy may be investigated and reported by an internal affairs department or citizen complaint agency while in another some or all such complaints may be handled informally by district commands and not reported as reliably. The value of the performance measures, then is to alert agency administrators to a potential problem, much as an early warning system may indicate a problem with a particular officer. More detailed investigation is then needed to determine whether there is, in fact, a problem.

Besides providing an overview of agency performance, there are four specific ways in which the suite of measures can help administrators to better manage their agencies.

(1) Assess achievement of goals in strategic plans

The most important goals in strategic plans of law enforcement agencies typically are reducing crime and gaining confidence of the community. The suite of indicators presented here includes both measures of crime and disorder (measures 5, 14, and 15) and community opinion of the police (measures 2 and 28).

It is important to gauge not only overall community opinion of the police, but also opinions among segments of the population. Research has consistently shown striking
differences in confidence in the police among ethnic groups, among men and women, and among people of different ages. The community survey captures respondent age, gender, ethnicity, education, and home ownership so that confidence in the police can be compared within different population segments. If substantial differences are found, law enforcement administrators may want to delve deeper into the causes of the differences and/or devise programs or policies to enhance confidence among targeted groups.

For example, using similar questions in a survey of 1607 Seattle residents in 2004, we found similar perceptions of police professional conduct among whites, Hispanics, and Asians. But, as the table below shows, on most of the items, blacks were 50% more likely to perceive problems with police conduct than respondents from other ethnic groups. These statistics prompted an effort by the city to engage the African-American community in focus groups to better understand the reasons for the serious lack of confidence in the police.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stopping people without good reason</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in racial profiling</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using offensive language</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being verbally or physically abusive</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Conduct year-over-year comparisons

We recommend that the suite of measures be produced at least once a year. There may be value in collecting some measures more frequently if they indicate problems in particular areas. Research has shown that community opinion of the police can change dramatically as a result of incidents involving allegations of serious police abuse or media stories that consistently berate on the police. On the other hand, our experience with contact surveys suggests that scores do not change quickly, at least in the absence of major policy shifts in how officers deal with the public.

Once the set of measures have been collected for two consecutive years, comparisons can be made to determine if performance is moving in a positive direction. The example below shows two-year trends in the number of discourtesy complaints per officer in two of the agencies that participated in the field test. It is obvious that, while there was little change in these complaints for Agency 3, the rate nearly doubled in Agency 2. The results alerted administrators in Agency 2 of the need to further investigate the causes of the increase.
(3) Compare performance among patrol areas

Many of the measures can also be used to compare performance among patrol areas. Community opinion of the police, citizen complaints, and absenteeism, to name just a few, can be strongly influenced by the quality of leadership at the division level. Of course, population demographics will differ substantially so, when making comparisons between divisions, it is important to adjust for the fact that the nature of the public served may be very different. That means, when making comparisons between divisions in crime rates, numbers should be adjusted for community demographics. Community opinion of the police, scores should be adjusted for ethnicity, education, home ownership, and other demographic variables.

In Dallas, we collected a sufficient number of community surveys to make comparisons between the city’s seven police divisions. The figure below presents the results for community opinions of police effectiveness, controlling for demographic differences between the divisions. Divisions with scores significantly more positive than the citywide average are shown in green; those no different statistically from the city average in black, and those significantly lower than the city average in red.

---

16 In the multivariate analyses, means for the divisions were adjusted statistically to take into account the fact that divisions may have very different civilian population demographics that are biased toward more or less favorable opinions of the police.
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Community Opinion in Seven Patrol Divisions In Dallas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg.</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code: Black = no different from city average/Green = significantly above average/Red = below average

Of course, there can be many reasons why a division may be more or less positively perceived than neighboring divisions. The survey results alert administrators that there are differences in how the police are perceived in the community and that additional investigation may be warranted. In some countries where performance measures are an integral part of the police culture, rewards or prizes may be given to patrol units that show above average performance or that show improvement year over year.

(4) Compare performance with similar agencies

As we argued earlier, one of the major advantages of using a standardized set of performance measures is that it allows law enforcement administrators to compare their own agency’s performance to the performance of other agencies using the same measures. Clearly, there will be differences in how the instruments are administered from place to place that will introduce error into any comparisons between agencies. Moreover, as we have discussed, differences in agency operations and data collection systems also introduces challenge to the validity of inter-agency comparisons. Nonetheless, comparing results from one agency to others using measures derived from the same instruments will alert law enforcement administrators to potential performance problems in their agency that may not be detected in year-over-year comparisons.

The figure below compares the property crime rate for seven of the agencies that participated in our field test. It is immediately obvious that one of the municipalities is an outlier. We checked and verified the data, and found that the data are accurate. This is one of the most pronounced differences that we observed, and a good argument for why it is useful to examine agency statistics in the context of statistics from other municipalities.
Another example in the figure below shows the overall cost of law enforcement for the seven agencies. It is apparent that there are substantial differences between the seven agencies on this important measure, with a range of $129 to $567. Of course, there are many possible explanations for the difference in cost. But the comparison is good ammunition for the chief of Agency 5 to argue against budget cuts and good reason for city council members to further investigate the reasons for the substantially higher costs in Agencies 6 and 7.

We have included in Appendix A, a table of norms for the agencies that participated in the field testing of the performance measures. The table provides both the range of scores and the mean for the participating agencies.
In closing, we want to reiterate that, if an agency sees its numbers on any measure to be substantially different from the norm, it should serve as an alert, not a final conclusion. The alert should trigger a deeper investigation starting with a careful examination of how the measure is defined and how data is collected for that indicator. If differences in definitions or data collection systems do not seem to account for the difference, then a more detailed investigation is warranted.
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VII. FINAL WORDS

During the upcoming year, we hope to include an expanded number of agencies in the project so that we can have several groupings of agencies that are similar in terms of size and types of operations. For the first time, agencies would be responsible for implementing the surveys as well as the self-assessment form, with technical assistance in locating competent survey companies, defining samples, and the like from members of the BJA project.

We hope that, ultimately, the project will lead to creation of a national database containing the annual performance results from many law enforcement agencies. A website would allow law enforcement administrators to examine their performance against other similarly-situated agencies in the database. (If agencies choose, the data in the database could be maintained without publically revealing agency identities.)

The database would also have significant national research applications. As data are added over a number of years, it would provide a window to examine trends in law enforcement performance beyond the very basic measures now reported through the UCR system. National policy-makers would be able to track changes in use of force incidents, citizen complaints, satisfaction with the police in the community and among persons with recent police encounters, as well as the numerous other indicators in the suite of performance measures. Finally, as the database grows larger, researchers would be able to examine relationships between agency characteristics, policies, and operations on one hand and performance on the other. For example, researchers could ask whether agencies that have a strong community policing orientation tend to have a greater number of officer-initiated activities or greater public support. Or, researchers could examine the relationship between agency size and the several measures of efficiency included in the BJA suite to help inform the potential effect of small agency mergers.

For more information contact: Rob Davis at the RAND Corporation (robertd@rand.org) or Craig Hartley at CALEA (chartley@calea.org).
APPENDIX A:

SELF-ASSESSMENT FORM
Appendix A

BJA PERFORMANCE SELF-ASSESSMENT DATA FORM

January 10, 2011

Fill in the tables below using information for the most recent year available, or the most recent 12-month period that you have available. All data should be readily derivable from agency records.

1) Number of sworn FTEs (exclude jail and 911 staff, if applicable): _____________

2) Number of civilian FTEs (exclude jail and 911 staff, if applicable): ____________

3) Agency annual operating budget (include grants or revenue from sale of assets, penalties levied on convicted offenders, state aid, etc): ____________ For which 12-month period is this budget? ________

4) Residential population of area served divided by 10,000: ______________ (For example, for a city with population 103,000, this would be 10.3)

5) Mean response time for priority 1 calls from agency records: ________

  **Definition**: Priority 1 calls are defined as calls involving immediate threat of harm to people or property (e.g., robbery, burglary in progress, traffic accident with injury) that receive top priority in the 911 system. This measure is defined as the average number of minutes from receipt of call-receiver pick-up to police arrival on scene. On-view or officer-initiated calls (incidents where officer happens on scene) should be excluded.

6) Annual number of citizen complaints for discourtesy: __________

  **Definition**: Annual number of citizen complaints filed with IAD and/or civilian complaint agency for discourteous language or disrespectful behavior by officers.

7) Annual number of civil suits: ____________

  **Definition**: Number of civil suits filed by citizens against police department. Not to include officer-initiated suits or suits based on mistreatment of prisoners jailed for pretrial detention or serving time for misdemeanor convictions).

8) Annual number of sustained citizen complaints: ____________

  **Definition**: Annual number of all types of citizen complaints filed with IAD and/or civilian complaint agency that are sustained after investigation.
9) Days absent from job: _________________
   \textbf{Definition:} Total annual number of sick and family leave time taken by sworn employees and by civilian staff

10) Annual number of violent crimes: ____________
   \textbf{Definition:} Annual UCR Part I violent crimes.

11) Annual number of property crimes: ____________
   \textbf{Definition:} Annual UCR Part I property crimes

12) Annual number of reported crimes: ____________
   \textbf{Definition:} Annual crime reports resulting in a police unit being dispatched

13) Annual number of police-initiated actions in the field: ________________
   \textbf{Definition:} Sum of traffic and pedestrian stops

14) Annual number of arrests: ________________
   \textbf{Definition:} Sum of adult and juvenile custodial arrests

15) Annual revenue from grants: ________________
   \textbf{Definition:} Total revenues generated from grants from state or federal government or private sources.

16) Annual number of violent crimes cleared: ________________
   \textbf{Definition:} Number of UCR Part I violent crimes cleared by arrest (not to include exceptional clearances)

17) Annual number of property crimes cleared: ________________
   \textbf{Definition:} Number of UCR Part I property crimes cleared by arrest (not to include exceptional clearances)

18) Annual number of use of force incidents: ________________
   \textbf{Definition:} Number of incidents in which a use of force form was filled out.

19) Annual number of disciplinary actions: ________________
Definition: Number of times in which formal discipline was issued. Includes any suspensions and forced terminations.
APPENDIX B:

OFFICER SURVEY
SURVEY FOR PATROL OFFICERS

Your leadership is interested in better understanding the work environment and how it affects your job satisfaction and perceptions of the agency. The following brief survey asks some questions about your work environment and knowledge of how to handle common situations that you may come across in your job. The survey will take less than 20 minutes to complete, and your answers will help us to develop better ways to assess the performance of law enforcement agencies. Your participation in the survey is completely voluntary and will not affect your standing with the department. Responses will be confidential: Your name is not included on the survey form and the information you provide will be used only for statistical purposes.

Instructions: Please read all statements completely and circle the answer choice that best sums up your opinion. Your participation in this survey is voluntary. You may skip any questions that you find inappropriate and you may discontinue the survey at any time.

Organizational Strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Scale</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I know what is expected of me at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have the materials and equipment I need to do my work right.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. At work, I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In the last seven days, I have received recognition or praise for doing good work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My supervisor, or someone at work, seems to care about me as a person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. There is someone at work who encourages my development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. At work, my opinions seem to count.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The mission/purpose of my company makes me feel my job is important.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My associates (fellow employees) are committed to doing quality work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have a best friend at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. In the last six months, someone at work has talked to me about my progress. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
---|---|---|---|---|---
12. This last year, I have had opportunities at work to learn and grow. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

**Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Departmental leaders articulate a compelling vision of the work of the agency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Departmental leaders communicate what is expected of police officers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Departmental leaders are consistent in their expectations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Departmental leaders motivate officers in this department to perform exceptionally.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Departmental leaders hold themselves to high standards.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My direct supervisor is available when I need him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My direct supervisor recognizes my exceptional work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My direct supervisor attempts to inspire me to perform my duties to the best of my ability.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My direct supervisor provides useful information and guidance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My direct supervisor seeks differing perspectives when solving problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My direct supervisor motivates the officers under his/her supervision.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My direct supervisor spends time teaching and coaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My direct supervisor helps me to develop my strengths</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Organizational Knowledge

Please indicate the extent to which you feel departmental training and policies have prepared you to handle the following situations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26) You are dispatched to respond to a restaurant where a 54-year old man is experiencing severe chest pains. As you enter, the manager approaches you and says the man has just lost consciousness and shows you where he is. Dispatch informs you that an ambulance is on the way to the scene with a five-minute ETA.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) You are dispatched to respond to a loud argument occurring in a home. As you pull up you can hear yelling and crying. You approach the front door and are met by the homeowner. He states that he and his wife are having an argument. As you enter the home, you see a table knocked over and a women crying.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) You are dispatched to respond to a suspicious situation at a local home. Neighbors report that they have not seen the homeowner in a few days and the mail is piling up. When you arrive, you check the house and find a broken window in the back of the home and an open back door. As you enter, you see a male fitting the homeowner’s description on the kitchen floor with a gunshot wound to the head. He has been dead for a few days. As you look around, you notice that the home has been ransacked.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) You are driving while on routine patrol and observe a car driving erratically. You follow the car and observe that the vehicle is</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
not staying within the marked lane and that the driver is exceeding the posted speed limit. You initiate a traffic stop and as you approach the driver, you see that the driver has an open bottle of vodka on the passenger seat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30) You are dispatched to respond to a local school for the report of shots fired. As you pull up, you can hear the sound of loud automatic gunfire and kids are running from the school. Several run up to you and tell you that a man is in the school with a machine gun and that he is shooting people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31) You are dispatched to respond to a dispute at a local store. As you enter, you are approached by a customer and a manager. The customer explains that he purchased a television from the store and that it stopped working after two days. The manager tells you that he has already told the customer that he must contact the television manufacturer to resolve the problem.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational Integrity

32. A police officer runs his own private business in which he sells and installs security devices, such as alarms, special locks, etc. He does this work during his off-duty hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all Serious</th>
<th>Less Serious</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Very serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How serious do MOST POLICE OFFICERS IN YOUR AGENCY consider this behavior to be?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. A police officer routinely accepts free meals, cigarettes, and other items of small value from merchants on his beat. He does not solicit these gifts and is careful not to abuse the generosity of those who give gifts to him.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all Serious</th>
<th>Less Serious</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Very serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How serious do MOST POLICE OFFICERS IN YOUR AGENCY consider this behavior to be?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. A police officer stops a motorist for speeding. The officer agrees to accept a personal gift of half of the amount of the fine in exchange for not issuing a citation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all Serious</th>
<th>Less Serious</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Very serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How serious do MOST POLICE OFFICERS IN YOUR AGENCY consider this behavior to be?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. A police officer is widely liked in the community, and on holidays local merchants and restaurant and bar owners show their appreciation for his attention by giving him gifts of food and liquor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all Serious</th>
<th>Less Serious</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Very serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How serious do MOST POLICE OFFICERS IN YOUR AGENCY consider this behavior to be?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. A police officer discovers a burglary of a jewelry shop. The display cases are smashed, and it is obvious that many items have been taken. While searching the shop, he
takes a watch, worth about 2 days' pay for that officer. He reports that the watch had been stolen during the burglary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How serious do MOST POLICE OFFICERS IN YOUR AGENCY consider this behavior to be?</th>
<th>Not at all Serious</th>
<th>Less Serious</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Very serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. A police officer has a private arrangement with a local auto body shop to refer the owners of cars damaged in accidents to the shop. In exchange for each referral, he receives payment of 5 percent of the repair bill from the shop owner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How serious do MOST POLICE OFFICERS IN YOUR AGENCY consider this behavior to be?</th>
<th>Not at all Serious</th>
<th>Less Serious</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Very serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. A police officer, who happens to be a very good auto mechanic, is scheduled to work during coming holidays. A supervisor offers to give him these days off, if he agrees to tune up his supervisor's personal car. Evaluate the supervisor's behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How serious do MOST POLICE OFFICERS IN YOUR AGENCY consider this behavior to be?</th>
<th>Not at all Serious</th>
<th>Less Serious</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Very serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. At 2:00 a.m., a police officer, who is on duty, is driving his patrol car on a deserted road. He sees a vehicle that has been driven off the road and is stuck in a ditch. He approaches the vehicle and observes that the driver is not hurt but is obviously intoxicated. He also finds that the driver is a police officer. Instead of reporting this accident and offense, he transports the driver to his home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How serious do MOST POLICE OFFICERS IN YOUR AGENCY consider this behavior to be?</th>
<th>Not at all Serious</th>
<th>Less Serious</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Very serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
40. A police officer finds a bar on his beat that is still serving drinks a half-hour past its legal closing time. Instead of reporting this violation, the police officer agrees to accept a couple of free drinks from the owner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Serious</th>
<th>Less Serious</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Very serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How serious do MOST POLICE OFFICERS IN YOUR AGENCY consider this behavior to be?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. Two police officers on foot patrol surprise a man who is attempting to break into an automobile. The man flees. They chase him for about two blocks before apprehending him by tackling him and wrestling him to the ground. After he is under control, both officers punch him a couple of times in the stomach as punishment for fleeing and resisting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Serious</th>
<th>Less Serious</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Very serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How serious do MOST POLICE OFFICERS IN YOUR AGENCY consider this behavior to be?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. A police officer finds a wallet in a parking lot. It contains an amount of money equivalent to a full day's pay for that officer. He reports the wallet as lost property but keeps the money for himself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Serious</th>
<th>Less Serious</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Very serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How serious do MOST POLICE OFFICERS IN YOUR AGENCY consider this behavior to be?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. How many years have you been a police officer? _________

44. Which best describes your current assignment?

1. Patrol
2. Investigations
3. Specialized Unit
4. Administration
5. Communications
APPENDIX C:

COMMUNITY SURVEY
SURVEY OF COMMUNITY OPINIONS OF THE POLICE

We are conducting a survey for your local law enforcement agency to find out how people feel about policing services. You are one of ___ residents who were randomly selected to take part in the survey. I want to ask you some questions about what you think about the effectiveness and the professionalism. It will take about 15 minutes, and your answers will help your local agency to do a better job of serving the community. Your participation in these interviews is completely voluntary: If you participate, the information you provide will be used only for statistical purposes: Your name will not included on the survey form and will never be used in any report. If you have any questions about the project, you can call (FILL IN NAME AND NUMBER OF CONTACT PERSON). Do you have a few minutes to talk now?

**Police Effectiveness**

1) **In terms of fighting crime, would you say the police in your neighborhood are doing**

1 A very bad job  
2 A somewhat bad job  
3 A somewhat good job  
4 A very good job  
5 Don’t know  
6. Refused

2) **In terms of responding promptly to calls for assistance from residents, would you say the police in your neighborhood are**

1 Not at all prompt  
2 Somewhat less than prompt  
3 Somewhat prompt  
4 Very prompt  
5 Don’t know  
6. Refused

3) **In terms of working together with residents in your neighborhood to solve local problems, would you say the police in your neighborhood are doing**

1 A very bad job  
2 A somewhat bad job  
3 A somewhat good job  
4 A very good job  
5 Don’t know
6. Refused

4) **Overall, how effective are the police in dealing with the problems that concern people in your neighborhood?**

1 Not at all effective
2 Somewhat less than effective
3 Somewhat effective
4 Very effective
5 Don’t know
6. Refused

5) **From your experience, do you think that the police treat people fairly, regardless of who they are?**

1 Not at all fairly
2 Somewhat less than fairly
3 Somewhat fairly
4 Very fairly
5 Don’t know
6. Refused

6) **How satisfied are you with police presence (the number of uniformed officers that you see in patrol cars, on foot, or on bikes) in your neighborhood?**

1. Very dissatisfied
2. Somewhat dissatisfied
3. Somewhat satisfied
4. Very satisfied
5. Don’t know
6. Refused

**Police Professionalism**

7) **In your opinion, how common is it for the police in your neighborhood to stop people on the street or driving in their cars without a good reason?**

1 Is very common
2 Is somewhat common
3 Is somewhat uncommon
4 Is very uncommon
5 Don’t know
6 Refused
8) In your opinion how common is it for the police in your neighborhood to use excessive force? For example, by using guns unnecessarily, or using more physical force than required?

   1 Is very common  
   2 Is somewhat common  
   3 Is somewhat uncommon  
   4 Is very uncommon  
   5 Don’t know  
   6 Refused

9) In your opinion, how common is it for the police in your neighborhood to use offensive language when dealing with criminal suspects or other members of the public?

   1 Is very common  
   2 Is somewhat common  
   3 Is somewhat uncommon  
   4 Is very uncommon  
   5 Don’t know  
   6 Refused

10) In your opinion, how common is it for the police officers in your neighborhood to break the law or break police rules when carrying out their work?

    1 Is very common  
    2 Is somewhat common  
    3 Is somewhat uncommon  
    4 Is very uncommon  
    5 Don’t know  
    6 Refused

11) In your opinion, how common is it for the police to target citizens based on their gender, ethnic background, religion, or sexual orientation?

    1 Is very common  
    2 Is somewhat common  
    3 Is somewhat uncommon  
    4 Is very uncommon  
    5 Don’t know  
    6 Refused
12) In your opinion, how common is it for the police in your neighborhood to use their powers in ways that are unfair or inappropriate?

1. Very common
2. Somewhat common
3. Somewhat uncommon
4. Very uncommon
5. Don’t know
6. Refused

Neighborhood Perceptions

13) In your neighborhood, how much do you worry about having your car broken into or stolen: Would you say you are....[READ LIST]

1. Very worried
2. Somewhat worried
3. Not at all worried
4. Refused

14) Having your home broken into: Would you say you are....[READ LIST]

1. Very worried
2. Somewhat worried
3. Not at all worried
4. Refused

15) Being assaulted or robbed: Would you say you are....[READ LIST]

1. Very worried
2. Somewhat worried
3. Not at all worried
4. Refused

16) Being out in your neighborhood at night: Would you say you are....[READ LIST]

1. Very worried
2. Somewhat worried
3. Not at all worried
4. Refused

17) People selling and using drugs: Would you say you are....[READ LIST]

1. Very worried
2. Somewhat worried
3. Not at all worried
4. Refused

18) Being hassled by youths or others drinking, loitering, or panhandling: Would you say you are.....[READ LIST]

1. Very worried
2. Somewhat worried
3. Not at all worried
4. Refused

**Demographic Information**

19) How old were you on your last birthday? _____________

20) Which of the following categories best describes your racial or ethnic heritage?

1. White
2. Black
3. White Hispanic
4. Black Hispanic
5. Asian or Pacific Islander
6. American Indian or Alaskan Native
7. Other [SELECT AND RECORD]
8. D/K
9. Refused

21) What is the highest grade or year of school you have completed?

1. Elementary school
2. High school or GED
3. Some college
4. College degree
5. Some post-graduate school
6. Master's degree
7. Any doctorate, professional, or medical degree
8. Vocational or technical degree beyond high school
9. Other [SELECT AND RECORD]
88. D/K
99. Refused
22) Do you own the home you currently reside in?

1. Yes
2. No
8. D/K
9. Refused

23) Gender

1. Male
2. Female
3. Uncertain
APPENDIX D:

VOLUNTARY CONTACT SURVEY
VOLUNTARY CONTACT QUESTIONNAIRE

Our records indicate that you recently called upon this agency for help with a problem. We are conducting a survey of people who have had a recent encounter with our officers to find out if they are satisfied with the way that the encounter was handled. I want to ask you some questions about your experience recently when you called them for help on (FILL IN DATE). It will take under five minutes, and your answers will help us to do a better job of serving the community. Your participation is completely voluntary and will not affect any services you get from this agency or any ongoing court case you may have. If you participate, the information you provide will be used only for statistical purposes: Your name will not included on the survey form and will never be used in any report. If you have any questions about the project, you can call (FILL IN NAME AND NUMBER OF CONTACT PERSON). Do you have a few minutes to talk now?

☐ CHECK HERE IF RESPONDENT DENIES HAVING HAD CONTACT WITH POLICE

Before we get started, could you please tell me whether you are at least 18-years-old?

☐ Yes, at least 18 years old
☐ No, I am under 18 (TERMINATE INTERVIEW)

1. How respectfully would you say that you were treated by the officer(s)...  

(Interviewer: Read list.)

1 Very disrespectfully
2 Somewhat disrespectfully
3 Somewhat respectfully, or
4 Very respectfully
5 (Do NOT Read) Not applicable
6 (Do NOT Read) Refused

2. How promptly did the police respond to your situation? Would you say they responded...

(Interviewer: Read list.)

1 Not at all promptly
2 Somewhat less than promptly
3 Somewhat promptly, or
4 Very promptly
3. How well did the officer(s) explain where you could get help for any problems you might have had as a result of the incident? Would you say the officer(s) explained this.....

*(Interviewer: Read list.)*

1. Very unclearly
2. Somewhat unclearly
3. Somewhat clearly, or
4. Very clearly
5. (Do NOT Read) Not applicable
6. (Do NOT Read) Refused

4. Are you satisfied that the officer(s) did everything they could do to help you resolve any problems you were having?

*(Interviewer: Read list.)*

1. Very dissatisfied
2. Somewhat dissatisfied
3. Somewhat satisfied, or
4. Very satisfied
5. (Do NOT Read) Not applicable
6. (Do NOT Read) Refused

5. Overall, how satisfied are you with how the officer(s) handled your situation...

*(Interviewer: Read list.)*

1. Very dissatisfied
2. Somewhat dissatisfied
3. Somewhat satisfied, or
4. Very satisfied
5. (Do NOT Read) Not applicable
6. (Do NOT Read) Refused

6. What is your age? _______ □ Refused to Give Age
7. Which of these categories best describes your racial/ethnic heritage? (CHECK ONLY ONE)
   a. White ..................................................
   b. Black ..................................................
   c. White Hispanic .................................
   d. Black Hispanic .................................
   e. Asian or Pacific Islander ...............
   f. American Indian or Alaskan Native ☐
   g. Other [as volunteered by respondent] ☐
   specify:____________________________
   h. Refused .............................................

8. INTEVIEWER RECORD CIVILIAN’S GENDER
   a. Male ..................................................
   a. Female ..................................................
   b. Uncertain .............................................

VI. CLOSING MESSAGE

Thank you for your time. Your responses will be combined with the responses of many others to develop a measure of how this agency is doing in dealing with citizens. The information will be used to help improve the way the agency interacts with the public.
APPENDIX E:

INVOLUNTARY CONTACT SURVEY
IN VOLUNTARY CONTACT QUESTIONNAIRE

Our records indicate that you recently were stopped by one of our officers. We are conducting a survey of people who have had a recent encounter with our officers to find out if they are satisfied with the way that the encounter was handled. I want to ask you some questions about your experience recently when you called them for help on (FILL IN DATE). It will take under five minutes, and your answers will help us to do a better job of serving the community. Your participation is completely voluntary and will not affect your relationship with this agency or any ongoing court case you may have. If you participate, the information you provide will be used only for statistical purposes: Your name will not included on the survey form and will never be used in any report. If you have any questions about the project, you can call (FILL IN NAME AND NUMBER OF CONTACT PERSON). Do you have a few minutes to talk now?

☐ CHECK HERE IF RESPONDENT DENIES HAVING HAD CONTACT WITH POLICE

Before we get started, could you please tell me whether you are at least 18-years-old?

☐ Yes, at least 18 years old
☐ No, I am under 18 (TERMINATE INTERVIEW)

1. How respectfully would you say that you were treated by the officer(s)…
   ☐ Very disrespectfully
   ☐ Somewhat disrespectfully
   ☐ Somewhat respectfully, or
   ☐ Very respectfully
   ☐ Not applicable
   ☐ Refused

2. Would you say that the time you were detained during this encounter was…
   ☐ Very unreasonable
   ☐ Somewhat unreasonable, or
   ☐ Very reasonable
   ☐ Not applicable
   ☐ Refused

3. Do you believe that the officer was justified in stopping you? Would you say….
   ☐ The decision to stop you was very inappropriate
   ☐ The decision to stop you was somewhat inappropriate, or
   ☐ The decision to stop you was somewhat appropriate, or
   ☐ The decision to stop you was very appropriate
4. I want to ask you about how clear the officer(s) was in explaining the reason you were stopped. Would you say he or she explained the reason……
   □ Very unclearly
   □ Somewhat unclearly
   □ Somewhat clearly, or
   □ Very clearly
   □ Not applicable
   □ Refused

5. Overall, how satisfied are you with how the officer(s) handled your situation……
   □ Very dissatisfied
   □ Somewhat dissatisfied
   □ Somewhat satisfied
   □ Very satisfied, or
   □ Not applicable
   □ Refused

6. What is your age? _______ □ Refused to Give Age

7. Which of these categories best describes your racial/ethnic heritage? (CHECK ONLY ONE)
   a. White .........................
   b. Black..........................
   c. White Hispanic............... 
   d. Black Hispanic............... 
   e. Asian or Pacific Islander.....
   f. American Indian or Alaskan Native  
   g. Other [as volunteered by respondent] 
   specify:______________________
   i. Refused ........................

8. INTEVIEWER RECORD CIVILIAN'S GENDER
   a. Male..........................
   a. Female........................
   b. Uncertain ....................

VII. CLOSING MESSAGE
Thank you for your time. Your responses will be combined with the responses of many others to develop a measure of how this agency is doing in dealing with citizens. The information will be used to help improve the way the agency interacts with the public.
APPENDIX F:

RETAIL BUSINESS OWNER SURVEY
SURVEY FOR RETAIL BUSINESS OWNERS

Your local law enforcement agency is working with the Chamber of Commerce to find out if business owners are satisfied with police services. The following brief survey asks some questions about your opinions of local law enforcement. The survey will take just five minutes to complete, and your answers will help the agency to do a better job of serving the community. Your participation in the survey is completely voluntary. If you participate, the information you provide will be used only for statistical purposes: Your name is not included on the survey form and will never be used in any report.

(1) In terms of fighting crime, would you say the police in your neighborhood are doing

1 A very poor job
2 A somewhat poor job
3 A somewhat good job
4 A very good job
5 Don’t know
7 Refused

(2) In terms of responding promptly to calls for assistance from business owners, would you say the police in your neighborhood are

1 Not at all prompt
2 Somewhat less than prompt
3 Somewhat prompt
4 Very prompt
5 Don’t know
7 Refused

(3) In terms of helping business owners who have been victims of crime, would you say the police in your neighborhood are

1 Not at all helpful
2 Somewhat less than helpful
3 Somewhat helpful
4 Very helpful
5 Don’t know
7 Refused
(4) In terms of working together with business owners in your neighborhood to solve local problems, would you say the police in your neighborhood are doing

1 A very poor job  
2 A somewhat poor job  
3 A somewhat good job  
4 A very good job  
5 Don’t know  
7 Refused

(5) How satisfied are you with police presence (the number of uniformed police officers that you see in patrol cars, on foot, on bicycles, etc) in your neighborhood?

1 Very dissatisfied  
2 Somewhat dissatisfied  
3 Somewhat satisfied  
4 Very satisfied  
5 Don’t know  
7 Refused

(6) Overall, how effective are the police in dealing with the problems that concern business owners in your neighborhood?

1 Not at all effective  
2 Somewhat less than effective  
3 Somewhat effective  
4 Very effective  
5 Don’t know  
7 Refused

(7) How good a job are the police doing in creating a safe environment for retail customers? Would you say the police in your neighborhood are doing

1 A very poor job  
2 A somewhat poor job  
3 A somewhat good job  
4 A very good job  
5 Don’t know  
7 Refused

Thank you for your participation. Please check the department website for results.
APPENDIX G:

NORMS FOR PERFORMANCE MEASURES
The table below presents norms for the agencies that participated in the field testing of the performance measures. (Depending on the measure, the statistics are based on data from 3-8 agencies.) The table provides both the range of scores and the mean for the participating agencies. These tables will provide a rough guide as to whether an agency’s performance on each dimension is within the bounds established by agencies involved in the field test. Scores outside of the bounds may suggest that either the measure of performance is being defined somewhat differently than it was among the agencies in the field test or that an agency’s performance actually is exceptional in that particular area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Response time for priority 1 or emergency calls</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Community opinion of policing effectiveness</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Officer discourtesy</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Civil suits</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Community perceptions of disorder and safety</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Officer ethics &amp; values</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Respectful dealing with citizens (sustained complaints per officer)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Satisfaction of “customers” with police services</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Satisfaction of business community</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Employee job satisfaction and morale</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Officer perceptions of agency leadership</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Absenteeism (sick days per officer)</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Officer knowledge of policies pertaining to job</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Rate of reported crimes per 1,000 population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Part I violent crimes</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Part I property crimes</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Rate of victimization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) # Calls for service per officer</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) # Police-initiated actions in the field per officer</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) Number of arrests per officer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) Dollar cost per Part I crime arrest</td>
<td>$2563</td>
<td>$11,740</td>
<td>$6945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) Dollar cost per call for service answered</td>
<td>$194</td>
<td>$705</td>
<td>$517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) Dollar cost of agency services per resident</td>
<td>$129</td>
<td>$567</td>
<td>$308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) Success in obtaining grant funds</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) Clearance rate for violent crimes</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24) Clearance rate for property crimes</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25) Use of force (% arrests involving use of force)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26) Respectful treatment of persons stopped by police</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27) # disciplinary actions per officer</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28) Community perceptions of police abuse</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>