Appendix: Selected measures and data collection methods

Measure	Object or subject	Methods	Evaluators
1.1.1 Open hearings	Court proceedings	Structured observation	Volunteers
1.1.2 Understanding courtroom calendar	Court calendar and proceedings	Structured observation	Volunteers
1.2.3 Perceptions of courthouse security	Regular users of court	Questionnaire survey	Court staff
1.2.4 Knowledge of emergency procedures	Court employees	Interviews	Court staff; graduate students
1.4.3 Litigant treatment	Court proceedings	Structured observation; questionnaire	Volunteers
1.5.1 Alternatives for the financially disadvantaged	Court services Court resources	Structured observation; document and review; interviews; inventory	Data collection team
3.1.2 Performance in applying the law	Attorneys; court employees	Questionnaire survey	Court staff
3.2.1 Jury source list	Juror source list	Statistical analysis	Court staff
3.2.2 Jury selection procedures	Juror selection	Observation	Court staff
4.5.2 Anticipation of change	Potential issues	Questionnaire survey; Delphi technique; group review	Court staff; consultant
5.(1-3).1 Public perceptions	General public	Telephone survey	Court staff; consultant; graduate student
5.(1-3).2 Community leaders' perceptions	Local bar; law enforcement agencies; local Government; news media	Focus group	Professional group

Measuring Police Performance in the New Paradigm of Policing[1]

by Geoffrey P. Alpert and Mark H. Moore

Introduction

During the 1980's and 1990's there has been a resurgence of interest in community policing. As an outgrowth of police-community relations, the concept of community policing has become the goal, method, and guiding principle for police. Unfortunately, community policing remains a concept and philosophy in search of a process, without proper ways to document or evaluate its efforts. This essay in the BJS-Princeton series focuses on community-oriented policing and takes a new approach to the measurement and evaluation of police performance. Before outlining our paradigm of police performance measures we will review the conventional measures and

---

[1]Portions of this essay have been taken from Alpert and Dunham, *Policing Multi-Ethnic Neighborhoods* (1988) and *Policing Urban America* (1992).

why we believe a new way of thinking must direct our attention to new performance measures.

Citizens and their elected representatives have long sought a bottom line to measure police performance. The goals have been to reassure the public that hard-earned tax dollars were being spent to achieve important results and to hold police managers accountable for improving organizational performance. As police agencies matured, four generally accepted accounting practices became enshrined as the key measures to evaluate police performance. These include —
1) reported crime rates
2) overall arrests
3) clearance rates
4) response times.

As these measures became institutionalized over the years, investments were made in developing information systems to record police performance consistent with these measures. Statistical reports using these measures were routinely issued. Further, the media, overseers in city councils, and auditors in city managers' offices have all been primed to acknowledge and use these measures to compare police performance from year to year and to compare local accomplishments with those of other cities. For most practical purposes, these are the statistics by which police departments throughout the United States are now held accountable.

These measures remain critical as part of an overall system for measuring police performance. As currently used, however, these measures reflect an increasingly outmoded model of police tasks and fail to capture many important contributions that police make to the quality of life. More important, these measures may misguide police managers

and lead them and their organizations towards purposes and activities that are less valuable than others that can be achieved with limited and diminishing resources.

Police performance measures should focus on a new model of policing that emphasizes their charge to do justice, promote secure communities, restore crime victims, and promote noncriminal options — the elements of an emerging paradigm of criminal justice (DiIulio, 1992: 10-12). The purpose of this paper is to describe how policing fits in with this new paradigm, including implications for restructuring the overall objectives and measuring the accomplishments of policing through police agency performance measures (Kelling, 1992).

The evolving strategy of policing

Historically, policing in America has been inspired and guided by a vision of **professional** law enforcement. This vision is a coherent strategy of policing defining the principal ends, means, and legitimating principles of the police enterprise (Wilson and McLaren, 1977).

Professional law enforcement: The dominant strategy of policing

In this vision, the primary, perhaps exclusive goals of the police are to reduce crime and criminal victimization. Police seek to achieve this goal by arresting and threatening to arrest those who violate the criminal law. They organize themselves to produce this result by:
1) patrolling city streets hoping to detect and deter crime
2) responding rapidly to calls for service
3) conducting investigations after crimes have been committed to identify criminal offenders and develop evidence to be used in prosecutions.

In essence, in the vision of professional law enforcement, the police are seen as the all-important entry point to the criminal justice system — the gatekeeper managing the first step in bringing the force of the criminal law to bear on offenders.

To deal effectively with serious crime and dangerous criminal offenders, specialized skills are required. The police have had to learn how to use legitimate force with skill and confidence. They have had to improve their ability to investigate and solve crimes to reduce the chance that serious offenders could escape accountability. Thus, in search of increased effectiveness in dealing with an increasingly challenging and urgent problem, the police consciously narrowed their focus and refined their skills in responding to serious crime and dangerous offenders. By relying on the techniques of patrol, rapid response, and retrospective investigation, the police have been kept at the forefront of community life and have been made available to anyone who needed them when a crime occurred.

Limitations of professional law enforcement

Recently, enthusiasm for this strategy of professional policing has waned. The professional policing model has been ineffective in reducing crime, reducing citizens' fears, and satisfying victims that justice is being done. Indeed, recent research indicates that a majority of the population believes that the crime problem has become progressively worse during the past decade (Gallup, 1992, cited in Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1992: 185). Similarly, citizens have lost confidence in the criminal justice system to protect them (Cole, 1992: 23).

Such charges are, in many respects, unfair to the police. It is unreasonable to expect the police to reduce crime all by themselves. Crime rates are affected by vast social, economic, and political forces. No matter how professional, police cannot solve the "root causes" of crime. They cannot be blamed for increasing unemployment, increasing inequality, or eroding family structures (Bazelon, 1988). In addition, police are dependent on the rest of the criminal justice system to give significance to arrests.

Toward a new paradigm of policing

Many police executives are beginning to think about and experiment with a strategy of policing that differs from the professional model and emphasizes the development of a strong relationship with the community. **The essence of this new paradigm is that police must engage in community-based processes related to the production and maintenance of local human and social capital. The means by which these lofty goals are to be achieved are through the development of strong relationships with institutions and individuals in the community.** While the specific elements of this new strategy of policing have not been agreed upon or clearly delineated, the broad characteristics are reasonably clear.

The major theme of **building a strong relationship with the community** has two justifications. First, it is an important way to make enforcement more effective. Second, it is a way to prevent crime and make the community co-producers of justice (Skogan and Antunes, 1979).

One excellent example comes from the Metro-Dade Police Department (MDPD) in Miami, Fla. In June 1992 the staff of the Northside Station of the MDPD conducted a survey

of local residents (mostly African-American) to determine if any public personalities or activities could serve as common ground between the police and young males (Metro-Dade Police Department, 1992). What emerged was a fascinating finding. The young respondents identified local rap radio disc jockeys and rap music as personalities and activities that interested them.

In March 1993 the police turned these empirical findings into action. They created a series of "Jammin' with the Man" concerts. Local disc jockeys were invited to hold concerts in local parks sponsored by the police. While the youths enjoyed the music and festivities, the police were there, talking with the youths and encouraging them to talk and work with the police to understand each other. Although more than 5,000 people attended the first event, there were no negative incidents. The MDPD report concluded by noting:

> While *Jammin' with the Man* was originally intended to be a single step in a process to improve police-community relations, a step aimed particularly at young men, [it] seems to have become part or all of the answer. It has also become an educational experience for the community as they see police as agents of peace rather than enforcers of law. More importantly, it has demonstrated that the mere act of the police engaged in active listening has the effect of empowering them and perhaps alleviating some of their sense of alienation (Metro-Dade Police Department, 1993: 6).

In other words, this project provided an excellent vehicle for the police to create and maintain positive contacts with members of the community they serve and to be seen in a positive light. Further, by initiating and participating in activities the youths enjoyed, the police had an opportunity to see youth in a positive light.

Dr. Trevor Bennett has classified the various ways to consider community policing and has reduced them to three categories. First, he notes that there are arguments which refer to the intrinsic "goodness" of the general relationship between police and the community. Second, he recognizes relationships in which the police and the public work together to achieve common and specified goals, including the shared responsibility for crime control. Third, he acknowledges the need for police to take into consideration the wishes and concerns of the community. In Bennett's words:

> ... [A] workable definition of a community policing philosophy might include the following basic elements: a belief or intention that the police should work with the public whenever possible in solving local problems and a belief that they should take account of the wishes of the public in defining and evaluating operational police policy (Bennett, 1992: 7).

A second theme emphasizes **attacking the communities' problems on a broader front** — in effect, rejecting the exclusive focus on serious crime. The theme emerging from research is that much fear of crime is independent of victimization and that there are things the police can do to deal with fear (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1988, 1992). Research findings and practice make clear that citizens use the police for many purposes other than crime control and that things other than crime are principal concerns (Alpert and Dunham, 1992: 2-3). Certainly, goals other than the reduction of serious crime should be emphasized when it is realized that crime control is not the principal or only objective of the police. In any case, the police cannot achieve the reduction of fear or crime by themselves. What the police can achieve is the independent goal of public or customer satisfaction.

A third theme emphasizes some important **changes in the way the police visualize their work and their methods.** In the traditional strategy of policing, the key unit of work is the "incident." That is, patrol officers respond to a specific incident, and it is the incident that becomes the focus of a criminal investigation. What we have recently learned, however, is that a large proportion of incidents emerge from a relatively small number of situations and locations. Moreover, analysis of the problems underlying many incidents reported to the police suggests that the police might be able to imagine and mount different kinds of intervention (Goldstein, 1990).

The concept known as problem-oriented policing emphasizes involvement of the police in community life. This strategy has police serve as community agents rather than adversaries with the community. Study group member Professor James F. Short suggests that police should not maintain their gatekeeper function and solve problems **for** the community but should be involved in solving problems **with** community support and assistance. In this way, police can help develop and promote a sense of community (Short, 1990: 225-226). Professor Short makes a critical link from the 1990's problem-oriented policing to the role of police in the Chicago Area Project during the 1940's. As he informs us, there are many similarities in police functioning then and what we are suggesting for the future. The vision was —

> ... [T]he police as a resource for the community, aiding local residents and working with indigenous leaders to solve community problems, with special focus on the problems of young people. The goal in each of these programs is to promote the achievement of "functional communities," that is, communities in which family life, work, religion, education, law enforcement, and other

institutional areas reflect and reinforce common values (Short, 1990: 226).

Although arrests of offenders remains an important tactic, the police repertoire must be widened to include a variety of civil actions, mobilization of citizens and other government agencies to change the conditions that generate crime or that will likely escalate deteriorating conditions. For example, the strategy of "Weed and Seed" is to eliminate drug-related crime and to restore economic vitality to inner cities through multi-agency cooperation and the use of community empowerment and resident involvement (Department of Justice, 1991). An important aspect of this third theme is that the police should become pro-active, interactive, and preventative in their orientation rather than rely solely on reacting and control.

A fourth theme focuses on **changes in internal working relationships.** That is, police agencies need to examine the potential strengths and weaknesses of decentralization of authority by seeking ways to guide discretion and police behavior generally through increasing reliance on values rather than rules and strict methods of accountability (Alpert and Smith, 1993). These ideas are central to the concepts of community policing, problem-solving policing and smarter policing. Incorporating these ideas into strategies of policing, we believe, would truly professionalize police rather than treat them as blue-collar workers. In addition to making police work more effective, these four strategies may increase job satisfaction — and most importantly — community satisfaction (Greene, Alpert and Styles, 1992).

These four themes combine to form the overarching principle of changed police-community relationships. Currently, police work revolves around serious crimes. The commu-

nity participates by becoming the eyes and ears of the police; however, this strategy keeps the police outside and above the community. Police are summoned by the community through individual requests for service, and those requests are evaluated primarily in terms of whether an offense has been committed and a crime has been solved.

Creative, problem-oriented policing strategies place the community in a much different position than they have been in the recent past. Under this new paradigm, police work is oriented toward community satisfaction and the increase in human and social capital in the community. Satisfaction is determined not only by the police response to individual calls, but also by community members banding together to advise and consult with the police. Further, community institutions play the most important roles in changing community conditions that generate crime and in shaping police activities related to crime and other community conditions. Placing police and the citizens in communication with community leaders creates a dialogue and interaction. This removes the police from a hierarchical position and has the effect of increasing the accountability of the police to the community.

One of the crucial issues that must be faced by all concerned with community policing is the assumption that there is a community to organize. Some cities and suburbs have developed rapidly and have not formed what sociologists refer to as communities or neighborhoods. Similarly, some precincts or reporting areas may not be contiguous with natural neighborhoods or communities. Finally, some areas that have deteriorated or are in the process of deteriorating may be difficult to organize. Areas needing organization the least will be the easiest to assist, while less well-organized communities, particularly underclass areas

of the inner city, will be the hardest to organize (Alpert and Dunham, 1988). However, examples of difficult and complicated organization are available.

One example of this community-building comes from Judge Thomas Petersen in Dade County, Fla. Judge Petersen was able to create a sense of community in several areas known for their lack of community spirit or allegiance. Judge Petersen, with assistance from the housing authority, law enforcement officials, and private industry, established three community stores that sold essential items in housing projects. In each, the housing authority found sufficient space and turned the space into grocery stores with supplies donated by private industry. The shelves were stocked with no up-front costs. Further, training for the people necessary to run the business was procured from professionals in the grocery business. Those who were hired to run the store were in need of child care, and the space and training for that service was provided by the housing authority.

After a short period of time, a group of people were working in the store, others were working in the child care center, and all were removed from public assistance. More important, however, was the sense of community created by the stores and child care centers. The stores became a focal point of the projects, and residents, police, and others involved in their establishment gained a mutual respect and trust for each other. Residents who had been scared to talk to other residents began to realize the importance of community spirit and the benefits of mutual assistance. The workers and residents began to identify with the operation of the store, and when anyone began to cause trouble or tried to sell drugs, the police were called immediately, and residents would point out the offender and

work with the police to do justice. After a short period, the stores earned the reputation as establishments that would not only sell goods but also as the heart of the housing projects, serving as a rumor control center, a place to get assistance from others, and a place with respect for the police function.

This new-found respect for police spread very quickly through the projects and neighborhoods. Residents who once despised the police were now working with them to solve crimes and create an atmosphere where street criminals would not be tolerated. In many respects, Judge Petersen had **created** a community spirit that fit neatly into the community-oriented policing strategy (Petersen, 1993).

Implications for police performance measurement

As society and the police approach a new understanding of how each can contribute to the other, it is critical to develop new measures to determine how well the police perform. Measures of performance rely on the definition of what the police are expected to do and how they are expected to do it. The measures must not only reflect but also help to shape community expectations of the police. For example, consider how neatly the current enshrined measures of police performance fit the dominant current strategy of policing.

Current performance measures as a reflection of professional law enforcement

Recall that the current strategy of policing emphasizes crime control through arrests and that arrests are produced by patrol, rapid response to calls for service, and retrospective investigation. Current police performance

measures are linked directly to these tasks. First, the overall objective of police has traditionally been perceived to reduce crime. It follows that the traditional measure of police performance is the level of reported crime measured by the Uniform Crime Reports. Another police task is apprehending offenders. This task is measured by arrests. Other traditional measures related to the crime rate include the ability to solve crimes (clearance rates — a very subjective measure) and the ability to get to crime scenes quickly (response times). These existing measures fit the traditional policing strategy perfectly, and they have become recognized as the important measures.

What is missing from these measures

Limitations of the traditional policing strategy are also represented by the current performance measures. It is important that crime is measured in terms of reported crime, rather than through victimization surveys. Indeed, the police long resisted the development of criminal victimization surveys, concerned that they would reveal differential reporting and would be too subjective. This emphasis on reported crime left invisible many crimes such as domestic assault, child abuse, extortion by armed robbers and drug gangs, and other crimes in communities that did not trust or have confidence in the police (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1992, and Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1992).

It is also important that the measures that could have revealed the fairness and economy within which the authority of the police was deployed got less attention than the question of police effectiveness. There was no routine expectation that the police would publish data on patrol allocations, response times, or crime solution rates across neighborhoods.

Similarly, no serious efforts were made to develop statistical evidence on the incidence of brutality, excessive use of force, discourtesy, or corruption. In principle, one could have collected information about these things by soliciting civilian complaints and taking them as indicators of problems, if not probative of individual officer misconduct (U.S. Civil Rights Commission, 1981). Again, the argument, albeit flawed, was that unlike official crime statistics, such information was suspect and too subjective. Thus, in this area as elsewhere, the commitment to fairness and discipline in the use of authority was less important than the claim of crime control effectiveness.

Further, there was no real way to capture the quality of the response that the police made to citizen calls other than those involving criminal offenses for which an arrest could be made. In fact, most of the operational indicators implicitly viewed responding to non-crime complaints as something to be avoided and resisted rather than taken seriously. Measures included a comparison between time out of service and time in-service. In-service meant being on patrol, while out-of-service included meal breaks but also included meeting citizens and responding to their calls for service. Similarly, time spent on high-priority calls was compared with time spent on "nuisance calls." The purpose was to reduce time on nuisance calls, despite the fact that it was these calls that could be used to build the relationship with the community that was necessary to make their current tactics effective in dealing with crime (Sparrow, Moore, and Kennedy, 1990).

Finally, there was no real way to account for or measure pro-active operations. The only way to do this was through monitoring specialized squads or units. Units were created to deal with particular problems, often on a temporary basis, without the establishment of a method to capture the nature or extent of the units' activities. Similarly, there was no attempt to determine how much of the organization's resources was being committed to such pro-active operations (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1992).

Reforming police performance measures

Orienting the agency to the community

Several options exist to reform police performance measures. First, existing measures could be improved to live up to the challenge of professionalism. This would include audited clearance and arrest rates and the development of statistical evidence on the use of force and the incidence of brutality, discourtesy, and corruption, among others. Second, performance measures could be linked more closely to action in the community, including the level of centralization and community-level programs. Under this structure, programs must be established that encourage calls to the police and evaluate calls to the police for service as well as concerns regarding criminal behavior. Measures should also include —
• police-related and inter-governmental activities that improve the social fabric of the community
• projects with the assistance of private industry that improve informal and formal social control in the community
• fear of crime
• victimization and police service programs that help promote community spirit in those neighborhoods where none existed.

Further, measures of the form and level of self-defense efforts by citizens and measures of trust and confidence in the police should be routinely taken and evaluated. Measures of the quality of service delivery by the police

should be taken to improve departmental functioning and reveal the quality of individual officers as reported by the citizens with whom they come in contact (Furstenberg and Wellford, 1973, and U.S. Civil Rights Commission, 1981).

Encouraging pro-active problem solving

One of the biggest problems in accounting for the performance of police departments is to capture what is accomplished during pro-active and problem-solving activities. One way to measure this concept is to view each problem-solving initiative as a particular program to be evaluated for its immediate impact. A second way to measure the impact is to view each as equivalent to a criminal investigation or special operation. In this way, a file is created, activities are monitored, and results recorded and evaluated.

The problem, of course, is that the problems come in different sizes. Size can be measured in terms of —
1) total resources committed to the problem
2) amount of time taken to solve
3) the number of specialized resources required
4) the extent to which higher-ranking officers must mobilize and coordinate efforts within and outside the department to deal with the problem
5) its importance and scale within the community.

One way to deal with these concerns is to develop a tailored program for individual areas. In other words, do not assume that each community has the same concerns or problems or that each community should respond similarly to certain problems. One product that would result from the effort to create, deliver, and measure these community-oriented programs and surveys is a data base on which a department or a division within a large department could

customize a pro-active or interactive problem-solving approach. Pressure to build a portfolio of problems solved successfully and improved attitudes toward the police could become as intense as current pressures to maintain low crime rates and quick response times.

Managing the transition to the new strategy

One of the most difficult problems faced by police managers in the short run is the awkward period of transition to the new strategy. The new programs will not be up and operating, and the new measurement systems will not be working and widely accepted. Yet the police will still be accountable to the public. Thus, they will have to develop measures that can keep them accountable during the transition.

One method is to identify the particular investments and efforts that are required to implement the new strategy of policing and report progress on these activities. If new training is required, they can report on the development of the new curriculum and the number of participating officers. If the formation of community groups is identified as important, that progress can be monitored and recorded. If the development of a new call management system or a new scheduling system is required, that too, can be monitored. The point is simply to identify and monitor the key organizational investments that are required. Unfortunately, no data sets exist on which to begin an analysis. The Bureau of Justice Statistics has compiled the most comprehensive data set (Law Enforcement Management and Administration Statistics — LEMAS) but its elements do not include many of the critical measures discussed in this paper (Reaves, 1992).

Toward a new strategy

The urgent need today in measuring police performance is to move away from a sterile conversation about performance measurement as an abstract technical problem and to understand it as a device that can be used managerially to shape the future of policing. This is neither a question of the essential unchanging measures that finally capture the value of policing nor a discussion of outcomes versus outputs nor a discussion of single versus multiple measures of performance. Instead, it is a discussion about a strategy of policing that will work in the future and how to measure its effects. Current measures of policing are holding police departments in their current mold and are keeping them mired in the past. These current measures need to be supplemented by innovative policing and new ways to measure their successes.

Our suggestion has several organizational elements that must be added to the traditional components already existing in many police departments. The police initiative must stress the need to learn about the residents and business people in their neighborhoods and to see them in situations that are not always defined as negative or at best neutral. This increased role for the police must include two basic approaches. First, a method must be devised to solicit information from members of the community. This method can incorporate meetings or citizens' advisory and focus groups with the police and can be enhanced by community surveys to determine attitudes and suggestions concerning the police and the police role. Another important dimension of this information gathering is the analysis of what Skogan has found to be measures of neighborhood decline and disorder (Skogan, 1990). Second, the police must use this information to reduce isolation between police and the citizens. The strategy is to assign officers for an extended period, supervised by command staff and advised by community groups. This move toward stability will increase the identification of an officer with the residents, geography, politics, and other issues in a given neighborhood.

These operational elements require proper training, feedback mechanisms, and an institutionalized reward system. Additionally, it is important that these efforts are measured, analyzed, and evaluated by the police officers, command staff, and members of the public.

Neighborhood training

Neighborhood training involves two basic questions the police must answer according to the needs of each community or neighborhood: what to do and how to do it. In other words, the priority of police resources, whether fighting crime or providing social services, changes from neighborhood to neighborhood. Police officers must identify these needs from their own experiences and expectations, from the perspective of the consumers, and from that of the police administration. Neighborhood training can effectively inform the officer as to what he or she can expect from the residents, physical surroundings, or other influences. This in-service training can introduce officers to community characteristics while they are working the streets under a supervisor (in a way similar to a field training officer). What to do can be determined by problem-solving techniques. How to do it is the all-important style of policing that needs to be developed and supervised by command staff.

Distinct differences may exist among officers, administrators, and citizens concerning style. Matching the style of policing to community needs and requirements will im-

prove both the police and the community. This can be achieved through training based upon knowledge of community values and beliefs as well as the attitudes and priorities of police officers. A necessary aspect of this is the continuous dialogue between residents and the police. Research on attitudes, expectations and evaluation of services of both the police and the members of the community is critical.

Monitoring

The final component of this strategy includes institutionalized monitoring and a formal reward system. This requires an ongoing system to monitor both the community and the police. The needs of the community can be determined by periodic social surveys, which, if linked to census data and local planning information, can inform officials of the changing nature of a given neighborhood. While it is relatively easy to identify what constitutes negative behavior, it is difficult to specify exemplary behavior. The proper use of good research, including appropriate sampling and a panel design, could provide a clear snapshot of the needs expressed by a given community. Police officers and administrators can work together to identify critical questions and a research design that can answer them. A Blue-Ribbon Committee studying the Miami Police Department concluded that while crime-fighting activities are important, service activities are equally as important in term of the new paradigm. In the final report, the committee noted:

It is our conclusion that a minor organizational change can have a major impact on community relations and on the interrelationships between citizens and police. We believe that confidence in the police will be enhanced if the police measure and make more visible the activities

they perform. Moreover, police work is usually rewarded by the gratitude an officer receives from those whom he or she helps. Status in the department, promotions, raises, commendations, etc., rest largely on his or her crime-fighting activities, the number of arrests, crimes he or she solves, etc. As a result, the patrol officer may regard service calls as a necessary evil (Overtown Blue Ribbon Committee, 1984: 199).

These creative data, together with traditional law enforcement information, will permit the development and maintenance of neighborhood profiles. Analyzing and monitoring these profiles can assist the police in improving their training, tactical decisions, effectiveness and efficiency.

Rewarding the officers

Most police departments provide incentives for their officers. These include traditional promotions, merit increases, and "officer-of-the-month" recognition. Many departments offer several opportunities for their officers to receive or earn rewards. Traditionally, these rewards have been based upon aggressive actions that led to arrest(s), the capture of a dangerous felon, or some other heroic activity. These criteria for rewarding police officers are important and serve to encourage similar actions from others. Yet other types of police behavior deserve recognition but remain lost and hidden behind the visible, aggressive activities of police officers. Activities that should receive more attention include exemplary service to the community and the reduction or diffusion of violence. Those who provide meritorious service may be recognized but often their actions are lost behind the brave shooting incident or heroic rescue. The local community needs to recognize officers who serve their "beat" or neighborhood

in an exemplary fashion. A "Best Cop on the Block" recognition would be an important reward, if provided by local residents or merchants. When an officer avoids a shooting or talks a suspect into custody, his or her superiors may not find out; if they do, the officer may be labeled as a "chicken" or one who cannot provide needed back-up to his fellow officers. Nonaggressive behavior that reduces violence needs to be reinforced, rewarded, and established as the model for other officers to copy.

An institutional reward system should be established for officers who avoid or reduce violent situations and who avoid the use of force, especially deadly force, when avoidance is justifiable. When command officers, from the chief to the sergeants, support and reward violence reduction, private business and service groups can be enlisted to provide symbolic and monetary rewards for such behavior. The institutional support for the effective policing of a neighborhood can only encourage others to consider a change in priorities and style. While this is only one aspect of a neighborhood intervention and community evaluation model, it could serve as a successful step toward meeting the joint needs of the citizens and the police.

Data on these activities should be collected, assessed and evaluated to help determine police departments' performance to do justice and promote secure communities.

Summary and conclusion

Police departments around the country have instituted one or more of the foregoing organizational components into community policing programs, but we are not aware of any agency that has incorporated them all or that uses many of these nontraditional performance measures. The components of the suggested program need coordination and individual assessment as well as analysis as a total effect.

Effective neighborhood policing requires that police administrators acquire adequate information on the specific neighborhood, including knowledge of the informal control structure of the neighborhood, attitudes about the police, and policing strategies and styles. This information can be obtained from citizen surveys, census data, community advisory groups, and community leaders. After accumulating the information, police administrators can decide how to deal with any incongruence between the neighborhood context and police policies, strategies, and styles. Some of these differences can be reduced by campaigns to educate the citizens and change public opinion and attitudes. In other cases, discrepancies can be reduced by training programs for officers who are assigned to the areas. The training can focus on neighborhood-specific strategies, appropriate styles for the specific neighborhood, and placing priorities on tasks consistent with the neighborhood's expectations. Subsequent to appropriate neighborhood-based training, police administrators need to create and institutionalize a system of monitoring and rewarding police officers' behavior. The police officers assigned to the neighborhood provide the final link integrating the formal control system of the police with the informal system in the neighborhood.

Officers must apply the training principles appropriately through their use of discretion.

From data collected from the neighborhoods, a good plan for neighborhood intervention and community evaluation can bring modern police work in line with our modern world. Moore and Kelling (1983: 65) have previously summarized these ideas quite well:

> Police strategies do not exist in a vacuum. They are shaped by important legal, political, and attitudinal factors, as well as by local resources and capabilities, all factors which now sustain the modern conception of policing. So there may be little leeway for modern police executives. But the modern conception of policing is in serious trouble, and a review of the nature of that trouble against the background of the American history of policing gives a clear direction to police forces that wish to improve their performance as crime fighters and public servants.
>
> The two fundamental features of a new police strategy must be these: that the role of private citizens in the control of crime and maintenance of public order be established and encouraged, not derided and thwarted, and that the police become more active, accessible participants in community affairs. The police will have to do little to encourage citizens to participate in community policing, for Americans are well practiced at undertaking private, voluntary efforts; all they need to know is that the police force welcomes and supports such activity. Being more visible and accessible is slightly more difficult, but hiring more "community relations" specialists is surely not the answer. Instead, the police must get out of their cars, and spend more time in public spaces such as parks and plazas, confronting and assisting citizens with their private troubles. This is mundane, prosaic work but it probably beats driving around in cars waiting for a radio call. Citizens would surely feel safer and, perhaps, might even be safer.

Private citizens working together and through community institutions can have a profound impact on policing. Those community organizations and police agencies that have developed reciprocal relationships will enjoy more success than those attempting to work without the benefit of the others' knowledge and information.

The maintenance and analysis of administrative statistics can provide community members and police supervisors with performance outcomes that promote justice. Patrol officers can be in the best position to understand the varied and changing needs of the community, and with input from research and training, appropriate activities can be devised to do justice and promote safe communities and develop a new meaning for the phrase "professional policing."

Table 1

The mission of the police consists of many diverse activities, not objectives in themselves but which are directed toward the protection of life. Goals include doing justice, promoting secure communities, restoring crime victims, and promoting non-criminal options.

Police: Goals, methods, and performance indicators

Goals

Doing Justice. Treating citizens in an appropriate manner based upon their conduct.

Methods/activities

Balancing formal and informal social controls, responding to calls for service, patrolling tactics, issuing traffic tickets, conducting investigations, writing reports, making arrests, and assisting in criminal prosecutions.

Performance indicators

Nature and type of patrolling strategy, number of traffic tickets issued, known crimes that are cleared by audit or arrest, quality of reports, analysis of who calls the police, evaluation of policies emphasizing values over rules, time invested and quality of investigations, number of known crimes cleared by conviction, arrests and arrests cleared by conviction, cases released because of police misconduct, citizen complaints, lawsuits filed, and results of dispositions and officer-initiated encounters.

Goals

Promoting secure communities, enabling citizens to enjoy a life without fear of crime or victimization.

Methods/activities

Preventing/deterring criminal behavior and victimization, problem-solving initiatives, training for community differences, assisting citizens by reducing fear of crime and victimization.

Performance indicators

Programs and resources allocated to crime prevention programs, inter-governmental programs, resources, both time and dollars dedicated to problem-solving, rewards and monitoring of police, public trust and confidence in police performance, public attitudes toward police actions and public fear of crime, and home and business security checks.

Goals

Restoring crime victims, by restoring victims' lives and welfare as much as possible.

Methods/activities

Assisting crime victims to understand the criminal justice system, assisting crime victims with their difficulties created by the victimization, assisting crime victims to put their lives back together.

Performance indicators

Number of contacts with victims after initial call for assistance, types of assistance provided to victims, including information, comfort, transportation, and referrals to other agencies.

Goals

Promoting noncriminal options, by developing strong relationships with individuals in the community.

Methods/activities

Develop and assist with programs that strengthen relationships between police and members of the community and among community members, increase human and social capital in the community and linkages with private industry.

Performance indicators

Programs and resources allocated to strengthening relationships between police and the community and among community members, including traditional community relations programs, school programs and resources spent to meet with the public in a positive alliance. Innovative programs to develop a sense of community, organizational measures of decentralization, community storefront operations and officer contacts with citizens for positive relations and feedback on performance are aspects of developing strong relationships with members of the community.

References

Alpert, Geoffrey, and Roger Dunham. *Policing Urban America.* Prospect Heights, Ill. Waveland Press. 1992.

Alpert, Geoffrey, and Roger Dunham. *Policing Multi-Ethnic Neighborhoods.* New York: Greenwood Press. 1988.

Alpert, Geoffrey, and William Smith. "Developing Police Policy: Evaluating the Control Principle." *American Journal of Police.* Forthcoming, 1993.

Bazelon, David. *Questioning Authority.* New York: Knopf. 1988.

Bennett, Trevor. *Community Policing in Britain.* Paper presented to the International Conference on Community Policing. Institute of Criminology, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany. September 1992.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. *Crime and the Nation's Households, 1991.* Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics. 1992.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics, 1991.* Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics. 1992.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. *Report to the Nation on Crime and Justice,* 2nd. Ed. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics. 1988.

Cole, George. *The American System of Criminal Justice.* Pacific Grove, Calif.: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co. 1992.

Department of Justice. *Operation Weed and Seed: Reclaiming America's Neighborhoods.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice. 1991.

DiIulio, John. *Rethinking the Criminal Justice System: Toward a New Paradigm.* Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics. December 1992.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. *Crime in the United States 1991.* Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Justice. 1992.

Furstenberg, Frank, and Charles Wellford. "Calling the Police: The Evaluation of Police Service." *Law and Society Review* 7:393-406 (1973).

Gallup, George. *The Gallup Poll Monthly,* Report No. 318. Princeton, N.J.: The Gallup Poll. 1992.

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

Greene, Jack, Geoffrey Alpert, and Paul Styles. "Values and Culture in Two American Police Departments: Lessons from King Arthur." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 8: 183-207 (1992).

Kelling, George. "Measuring What Matters: A New Way of Thinking About Crime and Public Order." *The City Journal* Spring 2:21-34 (1992).

Metro-Dade Police Department. *Survey of African-American Males 15-30 Years of Age.* Metro-Dade Police Department. Miami: 1992.

Metro-Dade Police Department. *"Jammin' with the Man" Project Summary.* Metro-Dade Police Department. Miami: 1993.

Moore, Mark, and George Kelling. "To Serve and to Protect: Learning from Police History," *The Public Interest,* 70: 49-65. 1983.

Overtown Blue Ribbon Committee. *Final Report.* City of Miami, 1984.

Petersen, Thomas. Personal communication. February 1993.

Reaves, Brian. *Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics, 1990: Data for Individual State and Local Agencies with 100 or More Officers.* Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics. 1992.

Short, James F. *Delinquency in Society.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 1990.

Skogan, Wesley. *Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Neighborhoods.* New York: Free Press. 1990.

Skogan, Wesley, and George Antunes. "Information, Apprehension and Deterrence: Exploring the Limits of Police Productivity." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 7 (1979).

Sparrow, M., M. Moore, and D. Kennedy. *Beyond 911: A New Era for Policing.* New York: Basic Books. 1990.

U.S. Civil Rights Commission. *Who's Guarding the Guardians?* Washington, D.C.: USGPO. 1981.

Walker, Samuel. *The Police In America.* New York: McGraw-Hill. 1992.

Whitaker, Catherine. *Crime Prevention Measures.* Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics. 1986.

Wilson, O.W., and Roy McClaren. *Police Administration,* 4th Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill. 1977.

About the authors

Geoffrey P. Alpert is Professor of Criminal Justice at the University of South Carolina and Research Professor, Institute of Public Affairs. He has been a Visiting Fellow at the Bureau of Justice Statistics and has served as the Director of Research in the Georgia Department of Corrections. He has extensive experience in criminal justice agencies and research. For the past 10 years, he has focused his interests on evaluation research. His research efforts include the evaluation of multi-ethnic policing, the police use of deadly force, the impact of indicators of unrest on the prevention of civil disturbances, how police pursuit driving policies affect outcome, the effect of social programs on keeping high-risk students in school, and the effectiveness of tactical narcotics teams. He has published more than a dozen books and monographs and has contributed to legal, sociological, and criminal justice journals.

Mark Moore is the Daniel and Florence Guggenheim Professor of Criminal Justice Policy and Management and Faculty Chairman of the Program in Criminal Justice, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. For a decade he served as the Founding Chairman of the Kennedy School's Committee on Executive Programs. His intellectual interests lie in criminal justice policy, in public management, and in particular, the intersection of the two fields. He has led national "executive sessions" on the future of juvenile justice, policy, and prosecution.