A STUDY OF

STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE

MEASUREMENT

IN CANADIAN POLICE ORGANISATIONS

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in Police Studies

University of Regina

by

Terence G. Coleman

Regina, Saskatchewan

July, 2006

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-20201-2
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-20201-2

UNIVERSITY OF REGINA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

SUPERVISORY AND EXAMINING COMMITTEE

Terence G. Coleman, candidate for the degree of Master of Arts, has presented a thesis titled, ***A Study of Strategic Management and Performance Measurement in Canadian Police Organisations,*** in an oral examination held on July 11, 2006. The following committee members have found the thesis acceptable in form and content, and that the candidate demonstrated satisfactory knowledge of the subject material.

External Examiner:	Dr. Murray Knuttila, Department of Sociology and Social Studies
Supervisor:	Dr. Ken Leyton-Brown, Department of History
Committee Member:	Dr. Jeffrey Pfeifer, Department of Psychology
Committee Member:	Professor Margot Hurlbert, Department of Justice Studies
Chair of Defense:	Dr. Chris Oriet, Department of Psychology

ABSTRACT

While community-policing has been touted as the operating philosophy of Canadian police organisations since the mid-1970s, evidence indicates that the culture change to community-policing is generally incomplete in Canada. Moreover, a review of the literature suggests that police organisations have often continued with practices, such as the measurement and management of performance, that are arguably inconsistent with community-policing despite their claims to have changed to the contemporary strategy of community-policing. Consequently, this study explored the extent to which police organisations in Canada have incorporated business practices, in particular those of strategic management and performance measurement, which are congruent with the contemporary public and private sectors and have thus moved from the traditional model of policing to that of the contemporary model – community-policing.

To answer this, seventy-five Canadian police leaders were surveyed to provide insight into the extent that police organisations in Canada have actually implemented strategic management and performance measurement so that they operate as strategic and outcome-focused organisations. While most of the Canadian police leaders who responded to the survey described their organisations as community-policing organisations, which suggests they have rejected the business practices of traditional policing and have embraced those of contemporary policing, the situation is not so straightforward. The findings of the survey show that some police services were clearly more progressive than others were by being strategic and outcome-focused to at least some degree. What is of interest, however, is that despite community-policing having been present in Canada for 30 years and that each respondent organisation considered

itself to be a community-policing organisation, many do not appear to have fully embraced strategic management and might still be primarily output, instead of outcome, focused. That is, the findings suggest that many of the surveyed police organisations have yet to make the culture shift to contemporary policing. For instance, while most respondents (74%) seem to understand the concept of the bottom-line of policing, there are indications from the study that some police leaders, instead of using a strategic approach to leading and managing their organisations, have not sufficiently – and in some cases possibly not at all – implemented contemporary policing as an organisational strategy.

Without an organisational strategy with which to guide the organisation, it is unlikely that the organisation has a strategic performance management system that is focused on the bottom-line. Even if they do have a performance measurement system, without taking a strategic approach that system will exist in an organisational vacuum and thus will probably not have a true outcome focus. This apparent absence of a strategic approach to policing in many of the organisations surveyed and an apparent failure to implement performance accountability mechanisms such as are found in successful public and private sector organisations suggests these police organisations have yet to fully move into the era of community-policing – contemporary policing – despite their claims to the contrary.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgement must first go to Dr. Ken Leyton-Brown, Faculty of Arts, University of Regina, for providing me with support, advice and assistance and in particular for championing the establishment of a program for a Master of Arts in Police Studies at the University of Regina. I am truly grateful for the opportunity this program has provided for me.

My appreciation also to all who made this study possible including those who took the time to respond to the survey, fellow students who assisted with previous class projects that have culminated in this study, and the many friends and colleagues, inside and outside of policing, who have provided valuable support, encouragement, time, and feedback. Thank you.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Appendices

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Since the mid-1970s, community-policing has been touted by most police leaders in Canada as being the operating philosophy of their police organisations.[1] Nonetheless, evidence indicates that the culture change in Canada from traditional policing[2] to community-policing[3] is generally incomplete. The literature suggests that this might be because police organisations have often failed to make the shift to organisational structures and practices consistent with community-policing. Two of the structures necessary for contemporary policing to succeed are those of strategic management and results-based performance measurement.

This raises the question: to what extent have police organisations in Canada actually implemented strategic management and performance measurement, so that they are outcome-focused organisations and, thus, operate congruent with the successful contemporary public and private sectors? To answer this question, Chapter 1 first compares traditional policing with contemporary policing and considers the environmental influences, in particular the public sector reform movement, which affect the need for change. Chapter 2 then reviews the literature to determine which of the elements of performance management found in the contemporary private and public

---

1 The Calgary Police Department became the Calgary Police Service in 1973 when it was the first Canadian police organization to embark upon community-policing.

2 This study will use the term "traditional policing" to collectively describe the "professional," the "reform" and the "bureaucratic" eras of policing which preceded "community-policing."

3 Since the introduction of community-policing in Canada, most, if not all, of Canadian police organisations use this term to describe the style of policing they are delivering even when investigation suggests that might not be the case. This appears to be because different interpretations and levels of understanding about what is, or is not, community-policing often prevail. Therefore, in an attempt to remove possible misunderstandings, this study will use the term contemporary policing, as well as community-policing, when it is necessary to clearly identify the difference to traditional policing.

sectors are applicable to contemporary policing. From that framework, contemporary indicators of outcome performance are identified and commonly used traditional indicators of performance are reviewed to determine whether they are still appropriate to the contemporary strategic model of performance management. Chapter 3 then discusses the subsequent design and content of a survey, which was constructed based on what was learned in Chapter 1 and Chapter 2, to determine whether Canadian police organisations are managed strategically and whether they have moved to outcome-focused performance measurements, as opposed to continuing to use traditional measures of performance. The intent of the survey was that the findings would be indicative of the extent to which the respondent organisations have truly moved to the contemporary model of policing.

The survey was distributed by mail to leaders of seventy-five Canadian police organisations that were selected from the Police Resources in Canada, 2004 report, published by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS),[4] based on the criteria that they were staffed with 50 or more police officers.[5] This criteria, although it might appear to be arbitrary, was established because, based on observations of the author,[6] smaller police organisations, such as those with less than 50 police officers, usually have insufficient capacity, even if they have the desire, to measure and analyze performance outside of measuring and reporting the traditional outputs necessary to comply with the mandated Uniform Crime Report (UCR) data collection.[7] Chapter 4 discusses the

4 *Police Resources in Canada, 2004* (Ottawa: Statistics Canada – Canadian Centre for Statistics, 2004).

5 The RCMP and the provincial police organisations of Ontario and Quebec were each considered as one police agency. That is, individual detachments of these organisations were not classified as separate police agencies for the purpose of this study.

6 The author of this study has been a police officer since 1969 and a chief of police since 1997.

7 Required by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.

findings from the survey and what they mean in the context of where the respective organisations are located on the continuum of traditional policing – contemporary policing. Of note, is that not all data from the survey are used in this study. However, the remaining data will be used in future studies.

Extensive literature and the results of substantial research exist with respect to the evolution of policing, in particular the concept of community-policing and the challenges and solutions often encountered in the implementation and management of community-policing. However, most of the literature and research is U.S. based because of considerable funding having provided by the U.S. government for this over time. A second major source of literature is found in Britain where similar funding for research has been provided by the central government. While there is an increasing base of Canadian literature and research with respect to policing, it is small in total when compared to Britain and the U.S. However, the paucity of Canadian literature, although perhaps regrettable from a Canadian perspective, does not present a problem when reviewing police practices because, even though there are some differences, policing in the U.S., Britain and Canada is generally similar.

In the context of strategic management and performance measurement in the public sector in general and specifically as applied in the police environment, several authors and researchers are pre-eminent. They include David Ammons, David Bayley, Mark Moore, Harry Hatry, George Kelling, David Kennedy, Herman Goldstein, Robert Trojanowicz, Bonnie Bucqueroux, Michael Porter and Larry Hoover in the U.S. as well as Neil Carter, Rudolf Klein, Patricia Day and Tony Butler in the U.K. In 1999, the U.S. Department of Justice – National Institute of Justice initiated a process in the U.S. that

brought numerous public sector performance management experts together with experts on policing to discuss the measurement and management of police performance. The resulting substantial compendium of literature – *Measuring What Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Institute Meetings* – is considered influential work in this area.

Since the establishment of modern policing in the mid-19th century, police organisations have been paramilitary, bureaucratic structures where police officers have been socially isolated from the community. As pointed out by such leading authorities on the evolution of policing as Robert Trojanowicz and Bonnie Bucqueroux and also George Kelling and Mark Moore, the traditional models of policing have been problematic.[8] They argued that this was because these models were bureaucratic responses characterized by rigid and centralized organisational controls; a tendency toward a functional structure with high degrees of specialization, isolationism and conservatism; a failure to be innovative; limited discretion afforded to employees; organisational inflexibility; and clearly defined lines of authority, responsibility, and communication. The police departments[9] were closed systems, described by Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux as "paternalistic hierarchies,"[10] which used defensive strategies that ignored developments outside of the police domain and were thus unresponsive to the external environment.

---

8 Trojanowicz, R. and B. Bucqueroux, *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective* (Cincinnati: Anderson, 1990); Kelling, G. L. and M. H. Moore, *The Evolving Strategy of Policing. Perspectives on Policing. No. 4* (Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice & Harvard University, Vol. 1. No. 16, 1997).

9 While some police organisations are still called police departments or police forces, since the advent of community-policing Canadian and British police organisations have increasingly called themselves police services to reflect the emphasis on service rather than identifying themselves as a bureaucratic department of government.

10 Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective*, 24.

According to David Kennedy and Mark Moore in *Underwriting the Risky Investment in Community Policing: What Social Science Should be doing to Evaluate Community Policing,* traditional police culture, as it affects strategic management and organisational change, manifests itself as inertial pressures that make it difficult for organisations to adapt their strategies and structures in response to environmental changes and, thus, be able to affect organisational change.[11] In addition, they posit, a rational framework, such as the framework inherent in traditional policing, i.e. quasi-military, bureaucratic, and hierarchical, inhibits as well as discourages participation and the creative potential of employees. Viewed another way, police organisations operating traditionally tend towards McGregor's Theory X organisations that perpetuate a hierarchical, inflexible organisational culture through a leadership and management style that is predominantly non-participative and where the contribution of employees is not valued.

Criminologist George Kelling, a pioneer in recognising the difficulties of traditional policing, found that because the culture of traditional policing was rooted in scientific management and a military command structure, which valued and emphasized efficiency over effectiveness and stressed quantity rather than quality, the outcome of policing was not addressed and, thus, was essentially out of the public view.[12] Neil Carter, Rudolph Klein and Patricia Day in their work *How Organisations Measure Success: The Use of Performance Indicators in Government* were concerned that

---

11 Kennedy, D. M. and M. H. Moore, "Underwriting the Risky Investment in Community Policing: What Social Science Should be doing to Evaluate Community Policing," in *Critical Issues in Policing: Contemporary Readings. Third Edition*, eds. R. G. Dunham and G. P. Alpert (Prospect Heights: Waveland, 1997), 469 – 488.

12 Kelling, G. L, *"Broken Windows" and Police Discretion* (Washington: U.S. Department of Justice – National Institute of Justice, October 1999).

traditional indicators of performance had not helped to understand the impact of policing because policing had been "steeped in the tradition that good performance depends primarily on inputs and processes."[13] For example, they explained, police budgets were often justified based on the notion that there was a direct relationship between the numbers of police officers and the crime rate, and, therefore, police managers usually responded to crime and disorder by adding resources such as personnel and various technologies. However, as numerous researchers and contemporary observers of the public sector and policing, including George Kelling, David Kennedy, Mark Corriera, Jihong Zhao, Neil Carter, Rudolph Klein and Patricia Day, as well as David Osborne, Ted Gaebler, Larry Hoover and David Bayley, have pointed out, although this traditional, and still prevalent, model of policing casts the community as passive participants and the police as the active participant, the real success of policing relies on mutually beneficial relationships and shared values. This is developed through internal and external consultation, accountability, decentralization of authority, the sharing of power both internally and externally and a primary focus on results as opposed to attention only to processes and outputs. Because of the realisation by progressive police leaders that there must be a better way to reduce crime and disorder, starting in the 1960s the more open system of community-policing began to evolve. This transition received added impetus in the 1980s with the advent of substantial reforms across the public sector. The key characteristics of traditional policing and contemporary policing are outlined in **Table 1.**

13 Carter, N., R. Klein and P. Day, *How Organisations Measure Success: The Use of Performance Indicators in Government* (London: Routledge, 1992), 54.

Table 1 Characteristics of traditional policing and contemporary policing

Traditional policing	Contemporary policing
Bureaucratic: rigid, formalized, paper based, rule oriented, "by the book policing," standardized	**Non-bureaucratic:** corporate flexible, rules to fit situation, paper where necessary, collegial atmosphere
Centralized: centralization of all management, support, operational, and authority functions	**Decentralized:** decentralization of authority and management function to optimize customer and client interaction and fulfillment of community needs
Hierarchical management: pyramid with multiple rank levels	**Flatter management (rank) structure:** additional responsibility and accountability at the operational level
Specialization: various police functions are specialized to increase efficiency (criminal investigation functions, crime prevention, etc.)	**Generalization:** specialization is limited, support for generalist officer, patrol based
Closed organisation: distinct from the environment, resistant to environmental influence, internally defined agenda, means over ends	**Open organisation:** interacts with the environment, open to change, sensitive to the environment, results oriented
Adapted from Murphy, 1991	

According to David Osborne and Ted Gaebler in their seminal work *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector,* public sector reform[14] emerged when the concerns of taxpayers about what is achieved with public funds not only increased demand for public services, but also significantly increased expectations of equity; fairness; responsiveness; accountability; and value-for-money[15] with respect to public services.[16] Consequently, to satisfy customers and clients[17] and their expectations of quality service, the public sector began to implement private sector performance-based management practices, such as value added management, corporate re-engineering, Total Quality (TQ) and strategic management. These approaches focused attention on measurement[18] to improve the performance of government, to increase accountability and to reduce the cost of public sector services.

Traditionally, as noted in the *Report of the Auditor General: Moving toward Managing for Results* from the Canadian Auditor General, public sector managers were "held accountable for the prudent use of the resources they were given, the authorities they used and the activities they carried out."[19] This led to a narrow cost-centred focus of staying within budget and strictly following policies and procedures. Christopher Lovelock et al. identified this as a problem with respect to organisational performance in

---

14 "Public sector reform" is also known as NPM [New Public Management]; "the reinvention of government" and "managerialism."

15 Since the 1980s, the thrust of the value-for-money movement in British policing has been to "energize the principles of NPM and institutionalize the performance culture [of police services]" (Leishman, Loveday & Savage, 2000: 1).

16 Osborne, D. and T. Gaebler, *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector* (Don Mills, ON: Addison-Wesley, 1992).

17 The terms "customer" and "client" will be used interchangeably in this paper.

18 Measurement is about quantifying, counting and assigning meaningful scores to variations in some phenomenon using valid and reliable methods (Maguire & Uchida, 2000: 497).

19 Auditor General of Canada, (1997), *Report of the Auditor General of Canada. Moving Toward Managing for Results,* October. Chapter. 11. para. 11.9 [online]. Available: www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/domino/reports.nsf/html/ch9711e.html [2005, August].

that, although public sector services must satisfy the needs of the public at an acceptable cost, "[w]hen operations are in a cost-centred environment, managers and staff are likely driven inward to focus on their operation rather than outward to reach toward their customers."[20] The consequence, they concluded, is a compliance culture instead of a culture focused on results. Harry Hatry, a highly respected specialist in the measurement of public sector performance, shared this perspective and recommended in *Performance Management: Getting Results* that to meet the demand for cost effective and valued public services, public organisations instead of focusing just on inputs, processes and outputs must think and act strategically by focusing on the "measurement on a regular basis of the results (outcomes) and efficiency of services or programs."[21] It is the consensus amongst experts in the field of contemporary business management, including the contemporary public sector, that the achievement of agreed upon outcomes should be the overall goal of management. Therefore, because outcomes are derived from inputs through the application of processes and the generation of outputs, it is necessary to establish what each of these terms mean.

In the context of policing, organisational inputs are two fold. Firstly, inputs are the funds received from taxpayers to resource policing activities. These are quickly converted by managers into human resources and various technologies. Secondly, and arguably more importantly, inputs include the authorities of the state, which are used, as necessary, by police to create safe communities and, thus, address the quality of life in communities. Processes are the means by which inputs are converted to services, and

---

20 Lovelock, C. H., G. Lewin, G. S. Day and J. E. G. Bateson, *Marketing Public Transit* (New York: Praeger, 1987).

21 Hatry, H. P, *Performance Measurement: Getting Results* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press, 1999), 3.

thus outputs, delivered to the clients. Outputs, in turn, are the means to the end – the outcome. They are generated through the processes and are usually the immediately visible and tangible results of police activities such as arrests made or charges laid. Outcomes are the aggregate of the outputs and are the results experienced by a member of a community or by the community as a whole. In the case of policing, this is usually the achievement of safe streets and safe communities free from a fear of crime. However, because it is apparent from the literature that the interpretation of the meaning of outputs, outcomes and objectives might vary slightly depending on the source, **Table 2** provides a consolidation of these terms as they are applied to this study.

Table 2 Performance measurement - inputs, processes, outputs and outcomes

Category	Descriptor(s)
Inputs:	are the resources required to operate the organisation. In police organisations, these are the funding raised through taxes and the authorities of the state. The latter includes society's ultimate sanctions: the use of force and the authority to restrict a person's freedom
Processes:	are the ways in which outputs are generated and service is delivered
Outputs:	are produced through the processes and activities of the organisation (e.g., in a police organisation, they include the number of arrests/charges and the number of calls-for-service answered)
Outcome(s):	is an event, occurrence or condition that is of direct importance to the clients/customers - the community. It is the net sum of the outputs generated by programs/tactics to achieve the end-result for the consumer - a safe community(s) without a fear of crime and disorder. Service quality, such as the timeliness with which the service was provided, is often an important aspect of outcome measurement
Intermediate Outcome:	is an outcome that is expected to lead to a desired end, but is not an "end" in itself. Examples include service response time, which is of concern to a member of the community requesting service but does not inform directly about the "success" of the service. An intermediate outcome could be a reduction in crime and/or a reduction in social disorder
Morley, Bryant & Hatry, 2001; Carter, Klein & Day, 1992; Harris, 1999; What Works, 2001; Osborne & Gaebler, 1992; Moore & Poethig, 1999	

Although the appropriate measurement of police performance has perplexed police practitioners for many years, increasingly, there is agreement that the measurement of outputs alone is not sufficient. Many authorities on policing in Britain, the U.S. and Canada, including Larry Hoover and David Bayley in the U.S., have concluded that traditional police organisations have focused almost entirely on the *processes* and *outputs* achieved through rigid adherence to bureaucratic processes and the finite measurement of easily determined performance indicators.[22] These include the reported crime rate; the number of arrests made; crimes solved/cleared; the clearance rate per police officer; response times; workloads of police officers traffic enforcement, and charges laid.[23] However, they argued, because police officers apply discretion to many of these activities, measurement is necessary beyond recording and relying on this type of data. Further, they observed, activity measures have traditionally been popular because they are usually easily tabulated and collected. The situation in policing might be similar to what Will Kaydos encountered in the private sector when he conducted surveys of private sector Total Quality (TQ)[24] organisations and found that while there was agreement by middle managers and executives of the necessity for performance measures, very few of their businesses had contemporary performance measures in

---

22 A performance indicator, also known as a performance metric, is "a specific numerical measurement for each aspect of performance (i.e., an output or outcome) that is under consideration" (Morley, Bryant & Hatry, 2001: 35).

23 Hoover, L. T, "Translating Total Quality Management from the Private Sector to Policing," in *Quantifying Quality in Policing*, ed. L. T. Hoover (Washington: PERF, 1996), 1-22; Bayley, D. H, "Measuring Overall Effectiveness: or Police Force Show & Tell," in *Quantifying Quality in Policing*, ed. L. T. Hoover (Washington: PERF, 1996), 37-54.

24 This paper will use "TQ" for all strategic initiatives focused on quality and valued service delivery, such as, but not limited to, Total Quality Management, Total Quality Leadership, Total Quality, Total Quality Service, Total and Continuous Improvement (MacDonald, 1994), and the initiatives found in "high involvement" organisations (Lawler, 1992).

place.[25] If this is so in Canadian policing, then notwithstanding other variables affecting the successful implementation and management of community-policing, policing will continue to operate partly in the traditional model and partly in the community-policing model. However, as Larry Hoover pointed out in *Translating Total Quality Management from the Private Sector to Policing*, despite widespread media coverage and public interest in activity measures, enlightened police practitioners and academics have criticized these traditional simplistic tallies as being inadequate indicators of police effectiveness because they do not relate to impact – the outcome – of police activities.[26]

The relevance and importance of an outcome focus was reinforced by Carter, Klein and Day in *How Organisations Measure Success: The Use of Performance Indicators in Government* when they characterised successful reform in the public sector as being evidenced by the presence of three critical and mutually dependant components:

- the specification of objectives;
- the allocation of costs to activities/programs; and
- the development of performance indicators and output measures sufficient to assess the degree of success in achieving agreed upon outcomes.[27]

Further support for the use of outcome-based measurement can be found in the public sectors of several countries. For example, in Australia, New Zealand, Britain, the United States, and Canada, reforms of the public sector have been characterized by a desire for outcome performance measurement, in particular, with respect to the delivery of quality service and determining value-for-money. In 1995, the Canadian federal government recognized the public's demand for quality of service with a "Declaration of

---

25 Kaydos, W, *Operational Performance Measurement: Increasing Total Productivity* (Washington, DC: St. Lucie Press, 1999).

26 Hoover, "Translating Total Quality Management from the Private Sector to Policing," 1-22.

27 Carter, Klein and Day, *How Organisations Measure Success: The Use of Performance Indicators in Government,* 5.

Quality Service Principles."[28] As the President of the Urban Institute in the U.S. stated, "[r]egularly measuring the outcomes of services provided by government to its citizens, and using those measures to improve outcomes, is as worthy a goal for the next millennium as it has been for this one."[29] As cited by Nyhan and Marlowe, the American Society of Public Administration (ASPA) expressed similar support in 1992 when they endorsed the development and adoption of performance measures by governments at all levels.[30]

William Bratton, Chief of Police in Los Angeles, and former Commissioner of the New York Police Department, and William Andrews pointed out in *Leading for Innovation & Results in Police Departments* that an outcome focus facilitates accountability. They maintained that this is important for policing because, historically, a lack of accountability has been viewed as "a hallmark of police [organisations]."[31] Richard Common, Norman Flynn and Elizabeth Mellon in *Managing Public Services: Competition and Decentralization* observed that when an organisation manages for results, then the process of agreeing on the desired results, the measurement of the results to improve performance and effectively reporting on overall performance fosters the necessary organisational culture of accountability.[32] They argued that such accountability is further achieved by an important characteristic of public sector reform –

---

28 Auditor General of Canada, (1997), *Report of the Auditor General of Canada. Moving Toward Managing for Results.* October. Chapter. 11. [online] www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/domino/reports.nsf/html/ch9711e.html [2005, August].

29 Hatry, *Performance Measurement: Getting Results*, xx.

30 Nyhan, R. C. and H. A. Marlowe, Jr., "Performance Measurement in the Public Sector: Challenges & Opportunities," *Public Productivity and Management Review*, Vol. 18, No. 4 (1995), 333 – 348.

31 Bratton, W. J. and W. Andrews, "Leading for Innovation & Results in Police Departments," in *Leading for Innovation and Organizing for Results,* eds. F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith and I. Somerville (New York: Jossey Bass, 2002), 260.

32 Common, R., N. Flynn and E. Mellon, *Managing Public Services: Competition and Decentralization* (Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1992).

the decentralization of decision-making. This revitalizes managerial motivation and improves service to clients by being responsive to local needs. Those to whom authority has been delegated are, therefore, held accountable to follow the strategy of the organisation and achieve organisational goals through the effective measurement of the various activities, programs and work units. They can then assess and report their contribution to the goals of the organisation such as the satisfaction of clients and consumers of services.

Even though most organisations, including those in the public sector, have traditionally focused on inputs, processes and outputs rather than on the outcomes achieved, the reinvention of government and its focus on the end results of organisational activities has created, according to Howard Rohm in *Public Sector Performance Management in the USA. The Foundation for Performance Measurement,* "a new way of doing business."[33] It requires the public sector to get "closer to the customer" and to put the "customer in the driver's seat."[34] Despite the necessity for probity and prudence, this encourages and facilitates the introduction of systems so that desired results can be better identified and achieved. However, as Norman Flynn observed in *Public Sector Management*, even though focusing on results leads to better results and enhances the external credibility of the organisation, staying within budget has still often been considered as the most important element of public sector success.[35]

---

33 Rohm, H, (December, 1996), "Public Sector Performance Management in the USA. The Foundation for Performance Measurement," 6 [online]. Available: http://www.fpm.com/script/UK/Dec96/961206.htm [2005, October].

34 Osborne and Gaebler, *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector,* 167.

35 Flynn, N, *Public Sector Management: Third Edition* (Toronto, ON: Prentice Hall/Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1997).

The continuing use of performance indicators based on inputs, rather than on outcomes, is problematic in that this not only ignores the quality of the output(s) and, thus, the outcome(s), but it is also a problem because there is little incentive to strive for improved performance when organisations are funded based on inputs. On the other hand, as Osborne and Gaebler stated in *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector,* when performance is funded based on outcomes, organisations quickly focus on results.[36] Nonetheless, this can be complicated because even though outcomes are the true measure of performance, outputs are sometimes easier to identify and measure. Moreover, because the identification and measurement of results in government is not as straightforward as in the private sector, it is sometimes necessary to use measurements of processes and outputs as proxy measures of the ultimate outcome.

Regardless, it is still a problem when organisations measure only processes and outputs without an ultimate focus on the outcomes. This is particularly true in policing, which has had difficulty in understanding and establishing relationships between inputs, processes and outcomes. As Flynn observed, although it is "difficult to quantify quality"[37] with respect to the public sector, this can change when public administrators, partners, elected officials and the public think in terms of outcomes rather than inputs. It was Osborne and Gaebler who said that when outcome-focused performance measures are used in the public sector, the right questions are asked to redefine the problem such

---

36 Osborne and Gaebler, *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector, 139.*

37 Flynn, *Public Sector Management: Third Edition,* 43.

that it can be diagnosed from a different perspective to generate suitable solutions for the benefit of the respective community.[38]

While the public sector has different customer expectations, leadership, performance management strategies, and organisational cultures than the private sector, the primary concern of the public is that they receive good quality service regardless of the provider. They do not generally make a distinction between public sector services and the services they receive from the private sector but, because of an increased focus in the overall economy on quality, they do expect that the public sector will deliver quality service. Warren Friedman and Michael Clark, in their contribution to *Measuring What Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Meetings*, maintained this is also true in policing due to the often-enthusiastic marketing of community-policing by police governance authorities and police leaders.[39] As a result, they argued, the transition to community-policing has not only changed public attitudes about policing but has increased the expectations of police performance. The public now expects and demands quality and value through client-focused services instead of the previous rigid bureaucratic-based systems and services. Consequently, performance measurement in the environment of contemporary policing must include measurement of quality and value.

---

38 Osborne, and Gaebler, *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector, 147.*

39 Friedman, W. and M. Clark, "Community Policing: What is the Community and What Can it Do?" in *Measuring What Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Meetings,* ed. R. H. Langworthy (Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice - National Institute of Justice, 1999), 121 – 131.

It was Peter Drucker, in his work *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities and Practices,* who identified the characteristics of quality in contemporary service-sector organisations, such as policing, as being:

- a clearly defined nature and scope of function, mission and activities;
- clearly established objectives and priorities;
- a concentration on established standards of performance derived from the most important objectives;
- audits of performance conducted regularly to ensure the management system is functioning properly; and
- the measurement of performance, analysis of results and subsequent work to correct deviations from established performance standards.[40]

Consequently, Total Quality (TQ), which has been widely applied in the private sector and is considered by Common, Flynn and Mellon as an "acronym for good management,"[41] is now used in the public sector as a means of addressing the demand for quality public services. TQ, which derives its success primarily from a strategic approach, and continuous improvement based on performance monitoring and data analysis, emphasizes quality and valued service **(Table 3).**

40 Drucker, P. F, *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities and Practices* (New York: Harper & Row, 1975), 158-159.

41 Common, Flynn and Mellon, *Managing Public Services: Competition and Decentralization,* 112.

Table 3 Fundamentals of Total Quality (TQ)

Fundamentals of Total Quality (TQ)
➢ a customer focus through consultation and collaboration ➢ a culture of quality product/service ➢ continuous improvement ➢ teams and teamwork and cooperation ➢ training ➢ organisational alignment ➢ total involvement/ownership ➢ leadership commitment ➢ employee empowerment/delegation of decision authority to lowest possible organisational level ➢ a long-term perspective ➢ assessment and measurement for improvement ➢ fact-based decisions to achieve customer or client satisfaction ➢ internal and external alignment ➢ rewards for results/equitable rewards ➢ job security ➢ perceived fairness is reality
Adebanjo & Kehoe, 1998; Daley, 1992; Gunther & Hawkins, 1996; Kinlaw, 1992; Martin, 1993; Peak & Glensor, 1999; Hoover, 1996

In *Re-inventing the Business of Government: An Interview with Change Catalyst David Osborne,* Barry Posner and Lawrence Rothstein concluded that TQ is "appropriate in the public sector to help it decentralize control and identify with its customers ... [by getting] people from different areas of expertise working on the same problem."[42] While the business practices and contemporary management philosophies of the private sector have had a significant affect on the evolution of policing, the impact of TQ has been such that community-policing can be considered, according to David Carter, to be the "application of quality management to police organisations"[43] to maximize service and to achieve value-for-money. Similarly, Kenneth Peak and Ronald Glensor viewed TQ as a means for police organisations to meet the expectations of effectiveness, efficiency and accountability that although they originated in the private sector are now expected of public sector agencies including police services.[44] Herman Goldstein, who has been credited as being the architect of problem-oriented policing, determined that the use of "total quality management (TQM) in policing has demonstrated very positive results, holds much promise [and can teach us important lessons]."[45] However, the literature is clear that shifting a police organisation to a culture of contemporary policing and thus to a TQ culture, requires the integration of the fundamentals of contemporary policing **(Table 4)** into all aspects of a police organisation, including the evaluation of organisational performance.

---

42 Posner, B. G. and L. R. Rothstein, "Re-inventing the Business of Government: An interview with Change Catalyst David Osborne," *Harvard Business Review* (May-June 1994).

43 Carter, D. L, "Measuring Quality: The Scope of Community Policing," in *Quantifying Quality in Policing,* ed. L. T. Hoover (Washington, DC: PERF, 1996), 79.

44 Peak, K. J. and R. W. Glensor, *Community Policing & Problem Solving: Strategies & Practices* (Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1999).

45 Goldstein, H, *"The New Policing: Confronting Complexity,"* Presented at Conference on Community Policing. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice - National Institute of Justice (24 August 1993), 12.

Table 4 Fundamentals of contemporary policing

Fundamentals of contemporary policing
➢ due process, equity and fairness ➢ a customer and client focus ➢ consultation and collaboration with the community ➢ quality and valued customer service ➢ continuous evaluation, continuous improvement and change ➢ teamwork ➢ decentralisation of authority and decision making ➢ total involvement ➢ participative leadership ➢ increased communication ➢ internal and external alignment ➢ outcome focused
Dantzker, 1999; Hoover, 1996; Swanson, Territo &Taylor, 1998; Carter, Klein & Day, 1992

Police organisations, as Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux observed, "must [therefore] not only change the way they think, but the way they act"[46] if they are truly committed to a culture change. For instance, if police organisations are to move to the contemporary model, they must change not just human resource management practices, work structures, reward systems, information systems, and decision-making processes, but they must also have the ability to successfully apply problem-solving skills and be able to continuously learn by collecting, as well as interpreting, relevant data.

Community-policing is driven by demands of the customer[47] and, as with TQ, is concerned about providing valued and quality service. Furthermore, community-policing focuses organisational attention on the measurement of performance and the implementation of performance management systems to produce actionable data that are easily accessible to those who make decisions. The desired outputs and outcomes are clearly identified and developed, and their relative importance is established so that the quality of the outputs and outcomes is monitored and measured for the purpose of continuous improvement. Of importance is that in a TQ-based organisation, such as community policing, continuous improvement of service delivery and performance measurement are unified concepts.

Because, in a TQ organisation, the customer is of primary concern, organisational success from their perspective can be determined through surveys similar to the market research conducted in the private sector. This direct communication with the customer and the consequent feedback enables organisations to recognize opportunities and reduce

---

46 Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective,* 7.

47 In a TQ environment, a customer or client is anyone, internally or externally, who receives or uses a service or product (Keehley, 1993).

their vulnerability to trends that are otherwise unforeseen. Theodore Poister and Gary Henry in *Citizen ratings of public and private service quality: a comparative perspective,* considered customer surveys to be useful tools in the public sector because surveys view the public as consumers whose attitudes about service delivery in the absence of market competition can be considered as an expression of the bottom-line of government.[48] David Kennedy and Mark Moore agree and consider a practical way to obtain the necessary feedback in policing to be through a survey of communities,[49] even though tools such as focus groups of police and the public, after-action audits of problem-solving initiatives, and systems to measure corruption and abuse of authority are usually also necessary.[50] However, caution is required when interpreting responses to surveys because customer assessments of service quality are not only subjective, but assessments also tend to change in proportion to the number of employees that customers encounter during the receipt of services. As a result, close one-on-one relationships between customers and employees are desirable for maximising customer satisfaction.

Nonetheless, although surveys are not a measurement panacea, Darrell Stephens in his paper *Community Problem – Oriented Policing: Measuring Impacts*, observes that when appropriately designed and interpreted, they are a useful gauge of the extent to which customers are satisfied with the quality and value of the service they are receiving.[51] In a policing context, they can also identify the extent to which the

---

48 Poister, T. H. and G. T. Henry, "Citizen Ratings of public and private service quality: a comparative perspective," *Public Administration Review,* Vol. 54, No. 2 (March-April 1994), 155-160.

49 Sometimes called Quality of Service (QS) surveys.

50 Kennedy and Moore, "Underwriting the Risky Investment in Community Policing: What Social Science Should be doing to Evaluate Community Policing," 469 – 488.

51 Stephens, D. W, "Community Problem – Oriented Policing: Measuring Impacts," in *Quantifying Quality in Policing*, ed. L. T. Hoover (Washington, DC: PERF, 1996), 95-129.

community has a fear of crime, the number of repeat calls-for-service and the degree of social disorder in public spaces,[52] all of which can potentially affect the outcome of policing. Additionally, rather than relying on just the crime and disorder that is reported to police, community surveys can provide superior information such as the extent of the non-reporting of crime, which is not easily available from an analysis of traditional police data. The degree to which crime and disorder is not reported is, of course, very important when assessing the performance of police.

Joseph Wholey and Harry Hatry stated in *The Case for Performance Monitoring*, that although "[r]egular monitoring of service quality and program results is a key component of informed public management"[53] it is not necessary to be a TQ organisation to realize substantial benefit from implementing and using performance measures. However, if leaders of the organisation have not embraced the concept of TQ, then strategic performance management will have difficulty flourishing. Leaders of outcome-focused organisations must, therefore:

- ensure the organisation's mission, or the strategic objectives of the program, is focused on results and is accepted and communicated broadly;
- ensure that performance appraisals of employees, in particular managers, include the assessment of progress in managing for results;
- support experimentation and innovation;
- lead by example;
- visibly and regularly assess the progress of managing for results;
- demonstrate sustained interest and personal involvement in results management;
- communicate performance expectations of employees and managers and then include these expectations in employee accountability documentation; and

52 Some aspects of social disorder may be difficult to categorize and thus measure, because, for example, what is an annoyance to some may be music to others.

53 Wholey, J. S. and H. P. Hatry, "The Case for Performance Monitoring." *Public Administration Review,* Vol. 52, No. 6 (1992), 604.

- engage in partnerships with other departments and agencies in the pursuit of management for results.[54]

In general, quality and value in the public sector is about providing service to a defined standard, on time and in a manner that satisfies the public. When a leader uses a combination of Total Quality (TQ) and strategic performance management, Kaydos maintains that the organisation will move toward the delivery of the necessary quality and value by:

- focusing management's attention on satisfying external and internal customers;
- raising questions about strategy;
- identifying previously unrecognized quality and waste problems;
- providing objective information to establish priorities;
- providing feedback about the success of performance initiatives;
- getting support from managers and employees for further change when they see tangible improvements in performance; and
- increasing employee involvement by enabling managers to delegate responsibility.[55]

Nevertheless, there are some unique but surmountable challenges when applying TQ to public sector agencies such as policing. For example, as Rudolph Garrity in *Total Quality Management: An opportunity for high performance in federal organisations* pointed out, one challenge is the difficulty in articulating the bottom-line of public sector agencies.[56] This gives rise to challenges in identifying, and then collecting, the necessary performance data. Another challenge is that there is often a failure to understand that when TQ is implemented it must be implemented strategically as a total organisational

---

54 Auditor General of Canada, (1997), *Report of the Auditor General of Canada. Moving Toward Managing for Results.* October. Chapter. 11. para. 11.45 [online] www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/domino/reports.nsf/html/ch9711e.html [2005, August].

55 Kaydos, W, *Operational Performance Measurement: Increasing Total Productivity,* 150.

56 Garrity, R. B, "Total Quality Management: An opportunity for high performance in federal organisations," *Public Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 16, No. 4 (1993), 430.

culture, as opposed to being implemented as just a program added to the existing organisational structure.

This is relevant to this study because, as Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux stressed, it is important that community-policing is understood as being the dominant philosophy of a police service operationalized through an organisational strategy rather than as a specific program, tactic, technique or "an add-on, deploying a handful of [community policing officers]."[57] Unfortunately, in police organisations this has often not been the case. This is supported, at least in part, by the results of a study by Coleman in 2001, which indicated that the failure to manage human resources strategically was likely a factor in the incomplete evolution of community-policing in Canada.[58]

Despite challenges to the implementation of TQ in the public sector, the 1993 Gore Report, with respect to public sector reform in the United States, recommended that public sector organisations could improve performance through the implementation of TQ and by taking a strategic approach to management.[59] Michael Porter, the Bishop William Lawrence University Professor at Harvard Business School and an authority on strategic planning and strategic management, emphasised in his work *What is Strategy?* that even though the development of a clear organisational strategy is often not straightforward and requires strong leadership, a strategic approach is critical if an organisation is to achieve superior performance.[60] In *Corporate Strategies for Policing:*

---

57 Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective,* 6.

58 Coleman, T, *A Study of the Relationship Between Strategic Human Resource Management in Canadian Police Services and the Evolution of Contemporary Policing* (Unpublished Paper, Regina, SK: University of Regina, 2002).

59 Gore, A, *Creating a government that works better and Costs Less: A Report of the National Performance Review* (New York: London House, 1993).

60 Porter, M. E, "What is Strategy?" *Harvard Business Review,* HBR ON – Point No 4134 (November-December, 1996).

Perspectives on Policing, No. 6, Moore and Trojanowicz explained that the necessary strategic approach is achieved when "the executive [of the police service] discovers the best way to use [the] organisation to meet the challenges or exploit the opportunities of the environment."[61] Strategic management, according to Janet Vinzant and Douglas Vinzant in *Strategic Management Spin-offs of the Deming Approach,* is a "comprehensive management approach that helps organisations align organisational direction with organisational goals to accomplish strategic change"[62] through the establishment and implementation of a corporate strategy.

A corporate strategy is important to a police organisation because it not only enables internal understanding of the mission and organisational objectives, but also communicates to those outside the organisation what the organisation proposes to do, and how it will be achieved. Consequently, as Osborne and Gaebler identified, police leaders in collaboration with the community and employees, must establish a clear strategic direction through a decentralized and results-oriented organisational mission to be used to develop budgets that fund outcomes rather than outputs.[63] The content of the mission statement is thus significant because, as Moore et al. pointed out, when constructed appropriately, it "embodies a shared, collective conception of what police [services] should try to achieve, and how they ought to behave in trying to achieve their goals."[64] This is important because if the management control system is incompatible with the

---

61 Moore, M. H. and R. C. Trojanowicz, *Corporate Strategies for Policing. Perspectives on Policing, No. 6* (Washington: Harvard University & National Institute of Justice, 1988), 2.

62 Vinzant, J.C. and D. H. Vinzant, "Strategic Management Spin-offs of the Deming Approach," *Journal of Management History,* Vol. 5, No. 8 (1999), 516.

63 Osborne and Gaebler, *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector.*

64 Moore, M., D. Thacher, A. Dodge and T. Moore, *Recognizing Value in Policing: The Challenge of Measuring Police Performance* (Washington: PERF, 2002), 31.

corporate strategy, and thus the appropriate information is not available to decision-makers, the strategy is likely to fail.

Strategic performance management, in contrast to traditional performance management that was output focused, is outcome-focused with a future perspective that is customer driven and is concerned about the achievement of strategic goals. This difference is important to police leaders because, as Bayley pointed out, they are frequently pushed internally and externally to demonstrate that their organisations are led and managed effectively and are thus delivering value-for-money.[65] Strategic performance management enables them to embrace political accountability for achieving goals and objectives, through the development of measurable goals based on their mission, as well as establishing internal measurement systems to ensure all employees are accountable and working towards the achievement of organisational goals. When widely and clearly communicated so that employees are motivated as well as able to understand organisational expectations and how well they and the organisation are performing, strategic performance management is an effective means of achieving and demonstrating the necessary accountability. Such accountability is dependant on measurement systems that not only record the activities and outcomes of the organisation but also enable analyses and decision-making.

However, a performance management system is of little value unless it is also reliable, valid and credible. It must indicate not only what is observed and experienced but must also be able to adjust to the internal and external environments by accommodating changes such as those affecting policies, priorities, resource availability,

---

65 Bayley, "Measuring Overall Effectiveness: or Police Force Show & Tell," 39.

program delivery mechanisms and restructuring of the organisation. Furthermore, the design of a measurement system should change as the vision of the organisation changes and must therefore be tied to the organisation's strategic vision in what Carolyn Brancato described, in her work *New Corporate Performance Measures,* as "an iterative loop."[66] Because organisations are complex systems, caution is necessary, however, when designing measurement systems so that measuring performance in one part of the organisation does not create a problem in another part.

Although public sector organisations have usually only had a *cost-line*, which made it difficult to assess compromises between service improvement and cost reduction, according to Carter, Klein and Day in *How Organisations Measure Success: The Use of Performance Indicators in Government*, the evolution of strategic performance measurement in the public sector has been driven by the desire of the public to not only control public expenditure, but also to ensure managerial competence and increased accountability.[67] Strategic performance management facilitates this by maintaining meaningful links between the organisation's vision, mission and strategic goals. Furthermore, while it enables the necessary accountability and facilitates decision making, overall it provides for effective planning, budgeting; program evaluation; the appropriate allocation of resources; the direction of operations; internal and external communication about the effort expended by the agency for the financial investment and the provision of information to the public about what is achieved with their taxes. Taken as a whole, it improves the service delivery of the organisation.

---

66 Brancato, C. K, *New Corporate Performance Measures* (New York: The Conference Board, 1995), 10.

67 Carter, Klein and Day, *How Organisations Measure Success: The Use of Performance Indicators in Government.*

Strategic performance measurement is also necessary for organisational learning as well as for building consensus for change. Organisations that attend to the required skills and expertise of employees, and embrace organisational learning as part of a strategic approach, will be able to "stay relevant and responsive to the changing needs of clients."[68] Organisational innovation, for example, is "stillborn"[69] unless the organisation is outcome focused and has feedback on results. Consequently, because organisational learning is imperative to quality and valued customer focused service, it is important to assess the ability of the organisation "to learn to cope with change and to improve through its people, its systems, and its infrastructure."[70] In addition, to maximise the benefit of results-oriented management, employees require expertise in strategic planning, the concepts and practices of performance measurement, and the use of performance information in decision-making. Organisations that attend to the required skills and expertise of employees, and embrace organisational learning as part of a strategic approach, will be able to "stay relevant and responsive to the changing needs of clients."[71] As pointed out by Stephen Gates in his work *Aligning Strategic Performance Measures & Results*, this is demonstrated in the private sector[72] when the stock prices of

---

68 Auditor General of Canada, (1997), *Report of the Auditor General of Canada. Moving Toward Managing for Results,* October. Chapter. 11. para. 11.55 [online] Available: www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/domino/reports.nsf/html/ch9711e.html [2005, August].

69 Osborne and Gaebler, *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector,* 151.

70 Wisniewski, M. and A. Dickson, *Hello, hello, hello! What's going on here then? Measuring Performance in Dumfries & Galloway Constabulary. Research Paper No. 2001/5* (Management Science: Theory, Method and Practice. Glasgow, Scotland: Strathclyde Business School, 2001), 6.

71 Auditor General of Canada, (1997), *Report of the Auditor General of Canada. Moving Toward Managing for Results,* October. Chapter. 11. para. 11.55 [online] Available: www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/domino/reports.nsf/html/ch9711e.html [2005, August].

72 Seventy-seven per cent of private sector companies considered strategic performance measurement to be very important (Gates, 1999: 5).

companies with a formal strategic performance measurement system have demonstrated their success by outperforming their competitors.[73]

Kaydos maintained that not only is strategic performance management an integral part of delegated management, but it is also "a catalyst for creating a culture of excellence, teamwork and continuous improvement."[74] Moreover, a Conference Board study, cited by Gates, found teamwork and risk taking by employees with respect to creativity and innovation was greater in "measurement-managed companies."[75] While some of those organisations used performance measurement as a management and accountability tool and for continuous improvement, and some linked it to incentive compensation, progressive organisations, as Osborne and Gaebler pointed out in *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector,* use performance measurement for all three purposes.[76]

---

73 Gates, S, *Aligning Strategic Performance Measures & Results: Report R-1261-99-RR* (Conference Board, October 1999).

74 Kaydos, *Operational Performance Measurement: Increasing Total Productivity,* xv

75 Gates, S, *Aligning Strategic Performance Measures & Results: Report R-1261-99-RR,* 11.

76 Osborne and Gaebler, *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector.*

CHAPTER TWO: STRATEGIC PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

The overall affect of introducing reforms from the private sector, such as TQ and strategic management, has been that the principles of contemporary policing **(Table 4)** are not only substantially similar to those of Total Quality **(Table 3)**, but are also comparable to the characteristics of post-bureaucratic organisations as articulated by Kenneth Kernaghan, Brian Marson and Sandford Borins in their work *The New Public Organisation.*[77] The consequence is that, whereas traditional policing was a "closed" model concerned about "means over ends," "community-policing" is an "open" results-oriented system **(Table 1)**.

Consequently, community-policing, by virtue of being open and participatory, breaks down the isolation and alienation inherent with traditional policing. For instance, as already noted, contemporary policing is dependant for success on a strong relationship with the community to prevent crime and to enlist the community as co-producers of justice. Moore, Thacher, Dodge and Moore stated in *Recognizing Value in Policing: The Challenge of Measuring Police Performance,* that unlike in the private sector, the delivery of quality and valued service is only strategically important to a police service as a stand-alone measure if the collective - the community – agree it is important. Community consultation and cooperation are, therefore, essential because the mission, and thus the strategic direction, must be the expression of "a collectively defined aggregate purpose, not an individually valued transaction."[78]

---

77 Kernaghan, K., B. Marson and S. Borins, *The New Public Organisation* (Toronto: IPAC, 2000).

78 Moore, Thacher, Dodge and Moore, *Recognizing Value in Policing: The Challenge of Measuring Police Performance*, 31-32.

This relationship with the community is based on normative sponsorship theory[79] and critical social theory,[80] founded on not only mutual respect and trust but an acknowledgement that the community is a stakeholder in community safety. It is the enhancement of community safety, and thus the quality of life in communities, that is the important goal of contemporary policing. This is accomplished by placing an emphasis on the identification and the solving of problems rather than repeatedly attending to symptoms of problems. The assessment of contemporary policing must, therefore, focus on the contribution that police organisations make to justice and the quality of life as well as the extent to which police promote non-criminal options. This is contrary to traditional policing, which placed a higher priority on responding to crime than on order maintenance and non-emergency services and was, as Stuart Sheingold explained in *Constituent Expectations of the Police & Police Expectations of the Constituents,* "biased toward symptomatic reactions to what might well be underlying structural problems."[81]

It is a basic of community-policing that crime can be "prevented if the conditions leading to [crime] can be identified and the potential offenders dissuaded from pursuing the crime."[82] This is achieved by balancing "traditional foci with those activities that

---

79 Normative sponsorship theory assumes most people are of good will and that they will cooperate with others to facilitate the building of consensus to satisfy their needs. The more the groups have in common with respect to values, norms and beliefs the more they will be supportive of activities to improve their communities (Sower, 1957).

80 Critical social theory is defined as practical social science that inspires people to become socially active to correct their socio-economic and political circumstances to satisfy their unmet needs (Fay, 1987; Fay, 1984).

81 Sheingold, S. A, "Constituent Expectations of the Police & Police Expectations of the Constituents," in *Measuring What Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Institute Meetings,* ed. R. H. Langworthy (Washington: U.S. Department of Justice - National Institute of Justice, 1999), 190.

82 Blumstein, A, "Measuring what matters in Policing: The police and measurement of their impact," in *Measuring What Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Meetings,* ed. R. H. Langworthy (US Department of Justice - National Institute of Justice, 1999), 5.

have not traditionally been seen as police responsibilities."[83] However, the acceptance of numerous non-traditional activities within the scope of community-policing, such as the reduction of victimization; the resolution of conflicts; traffic flow in neighbourhoods; the removal of abandoned cars; the enforcement of alcohol, health and safety regulations; dealing with neighbourhood decay and unsightliness; street maintenance; disorder in public parks and the reduction of the fear of crime and disorder, has raised the expectations of communities. This has ramifications for the management and performance measurement of police organisations. For instance, in the contemporary environment, although arrests of criminals are still an important tactic to achieve crime reduction and possibly crime prevention, police, as Geoffrey Alpert and Mark Moore stated, are also expected to include "a variety of civil actions"[84] as well as mobilizing the community and other public sector agencies to change criminogenic conditions. Police, therefore, must be co-active, proactive, interactive and preventative rather than being only reactive and relying on crime control. In *Managing Innovation in Policing: The Untapped Potential of the Middle Manager,* William Geller and Guy Swanger explained this means that what is important in the context of community-policing, and thus what should be measured by police, includes the contribution police make to "community safety and fear reduction through both criminal justice and non-criminal justice tactics."[85]

In general, the success of contemporary policing will depend on whether conditions such as crime and disorder, as well as the perception of the presence of crime

---

83 Carter, "Measuring Quality: The Scope of Community Policing," 81.

84 Alpert, G. P. and M. H. Moore, "Measuring Police Performance in the New Paradigm of Policing, in *Critical Issues in Policing: Contemporary Readings. 3rd Edition,* eds. R. G. Dunham and G. P. Alpert (Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1997), 269 – 270.

85 Geller, W. A. and G. Swanger, *Managing Innovation in Policing: The Untapped Potential of the Middle Manager* (Washington: PERF, 1995), 151.

and disorder, improve in neighbourhoods subsequent to police intervention. Because contemporary policing is less about doing for the community and more about building and improving community capacity by working with the community, police officers must have the ability to be community catalysts in order to resolve community(s) problems through the establishment of the necessary mutually beneficial relationships. Moreover, by accommodating the "cultural and environmental uniqueness"[86] of a community, police officers can then establish a shared identity that will "facilitate the development of shared goals and objectives."[87] This will not occur, however, unless the communities have trust and confidence in their police.

To build the necessary relationships, based on trust and confidence, to facilitate productive participation in decision-making, police officers must have superior interpersonal skills and be effective team members skilled at problem-solving, seeking feedback, planning and organizing as well as quantitative measurement and analysis. The public's trust and confidence with respect to their police organisation is also affected by their perception of crime and disorder, which, in turn, affects the quality of community life. Therefore, starting in the 1980s, a new measurement of police performance emerged – the extent of a community's *fear-of-crime*.[88] Although this fear might be due to ready access to media reports unrelated to the local environment and thus not linked to what local police are doing, it is relevant to goal achievement, and thus goal

---

86 Duffee, D. E., R. Fluellen and T. Roscoe, "Constituency Building and Urban Community Policing," in *Measuring What Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Meetings*, ed. R. H. Langworthy (Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice - National Institute of Justice, 1999), 111.

87 Duffee, Fluellen and Roscoe, "Constituency Building and Urban Community Policing," 111.

88 "Fear of crime" can be categorized as the concern about the level of crime, the perception of a personal risk of victimization, and the perceived threat of crime in their environment (Skogan, 1999: 47).

measurement, because it might be a local criminogenic factor. Furthermore, knowing the extent of the fear of crime is important because the deployment of police resources based on just the community's perception of crime could result in an inappropriate distribution of those resources to deal with the actual local crime and disorder. Because of the importance of mutual trust, communication and collaboration with the community, performance measurement should also include indicators such as the frequency of complaints about police conduct and the extent of problem-solving interaction between police and the community. This is accomplished, for example, by assessing the frequency of police contacts with the community.

In the contemporary environment, regardless of the focus on the local community, a performance management system must also be designed to enable cross-jurisdictional comparison – benchmarking[89] and be multi-dimensional rather than using just a few measures chosen because of their financial impact. Morley, Bryant and Hatry in their work *Comparative Performance Measurement,* took the view that in the absence of the dynamics of the private sector market place, benchmarking can create a competitive environment in the public sector, and thus stimulate innovation and continuous improvement, by comparing the performance of similar agencies or organisations.[90] Ammons described benchmarking, in the context of the public sector, as the making of comparisons based on "anticipated or desired performance results anchored either in professional standards or in the experience of respected [public sector organisations]."[91] This requires the measurement of internal performance, the comparison of performance

89 Also known as Comparative Performance Measurement (CPM).

90 Morley, E., S. P. Bryant and H. P. Hatry, *Comparative Performance Measurement* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press), 2001.

91 Ammons, D. N, *Municipal Benchmarks: Assessing Local Performance & Establishing Community Standards, 2nd Edition* (London: Sage Publications, 2001), 24.

data from similar organisations, the identification of the reasons for any differences in performance, and then a determination of how performance can be improved by internalizing and applying lessons learned. Furthermore, by providing information that can be used to make decisions, benchmarking data not only enables improvement of the management and operation of an organisation but it also provides a means of communicating to politicians, consumers of the services and taxpayers about what is being achieved, what needs to be achieved, or needs to be achieved better. It is an effective means of assessing value-for-money and determining the degree of organisational success.

Although strategic performance management is essential in the contemporary business environment, it is only achieved in the public sector when performance data are integrated into the organisational decision-making processes to achieve continuous organisational improvement and to enable rational decisions to be made about where to spend public money. Hatry, in *Performance Measurement: Getting Results,* maintained performance indicators should be selected to extract and analyze performance to allow causal analysis and interpretation, as opposed to being stand-alone data, so that decision-makers are better informed to manage and assign resources to achieve organisational goals, and thus satisfy clients.[92] Larry Hoover cautioned that performance measurement must also be constant and routine, and used to improve processes rather than to judge people. He further noted that when performance measurement that is intended to

92 Hatry, *Performance Measurement: Getting Results.*

improve processes is mixed with measurements designed to judge employees then both purposes are compromised.[93]

The selection of appropriate indicators of outcome performance is critical because even though there are numerous benefits of strategic performance measurement, such as improved internal and external communication about the strategic direction, the results achieved and the progress in achieving organisational goals, when an organisation uses too many indicators of performance these advantages can be reduced. Nyhan and Marlowe in *Performance Measurement in the Public Sector: Challenges & Opportunities* cautioned that only the minimum number necessary should be used so that they are not only understandable but also, and more importantly, useable.[94] For instance, according to Robert Knowling in *Leading with Vision, Strategy & Values*, a strategically managed organisation should be aligned around three to five key metrics which, when aggregated, define the degree of success of the organisation from both the customers' and the organisation's perspective. These metrics must be selected and designed such that they can be disaggregated in order to be meaningful to employees and supervisors who can then relate what they do on a daily basis to the "high corporate metric."[95] Consultation and agreement between management and employees is, therefore, necessary to establish a balanced set of appropriate key performance indicators that focus on the quality of services and organisational outcomes as opposed to just reporting the inputs used or the outputs generated. Ammons recommended not only that these indicators should be

---

93 Hoover, "Translating Total Quality Management from the Private Sector to Policing," 6.

94 Nyhan and Marlowe, Jr, "Performance Measurement in the Public Sector: Challenges & Opportunities," 333 – 348.

95 Knowling, Jr., R. E, "Leading with Vision, Strategy & Values," in *Leading for Innovation and Organizing for Results*, eds. F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, and I. Somerville (New York: Jossey Bass, 2002), 182-183.

"customer sensitive, emphasizing effectiveness in meeting customer expectations as well as efficiency in service delivery,"[96] but also that they should measure a specific aspect of outcome performance which can then be used with other relevant performance indicators to assess the status of the outcome. It is the measurement and subsequent analyses of these indicators that drives the organisation's strategy and decision-making. Overall, according to Brancato, the performance indicators applicable to the public sector can be categorized as both workload and productivity measures;[97] efficiency measures; or effectiveness – outcome - measures,[98] which should be designed to address:

- the quality of the output(s);[99]
- customer satisfaction and retention;[100]
- the turn-over of employees;
- the training and learning of employees.[101]

Performance indicators should be such that the data collected are relevant, actionable and within control of the organisation as well as accepted throughout the organisation. Moreover, the collection of data must focus on that which will lead to enhanced performance in achieving the mission and goals of the organisation. It must also be kept simple, even though performance measurement must often be customised to meet multiple needs of many interested parties. For example, the authorizing

---

96 Ammons, *Municipal Benchmarks: Assessing Local Performance & Establishing Community Standards, 2nd Edition*, 22-23.

97 Also called output measures. Although workload information indicates the amount of work performed or the amount of services received and can be of some value, it only reveals how much work was done. It does not indicate how well or how efficiently the work was done.

98 Ammons, *Municipal Benchmarks: Assessing Local Performance & Establishing Community Standards, 2nd Edition.*

99 The quality of the respective output will affect the quality and value of the outcome.

100 "Customer retention" in the context of the services delivered by a police organisation could be considered as continued support of the police organisation.

101 Brancato, *New Corporate Performance Measures,* 9-10.

environment of police organisations is comprised of numerous players[102] that often view police performance from different perspectives and dimensions of value. Furthermore, although performance indicators are essential to the establishment of accountability mechanisms, Carter, Klein and Day cautioned that performance indicators should be selected as means of improving organisational performance rather than to enhance the organisation's image.[103] Care is also necessary to avoid information being mistaken for data and to realize that what gets measured is managed. That is, it is important to collect the right data or else it may be that the wrong activities are being managed. Because this might have unintended organisational consequences, measurement systems must, therefore, be well balanced and weighted based on employee input and feedback, and have a multi-dimensional focus so that they do not encourage and support undesired results. In addition, even though there must be consistency in measurement and reporting so that a "change in a performance measurement is a reliable indicator of a change in performance,"[104] performance indicators must be refined or replaced as necessary to ensure the collected data remains useful and relevant.

Although the quantitative measurement of outputs was the primary type of measurement for traditional policing, community-policing within a strategic management framework requires a selection of performance indicators that provide a blend of qualitative as well as quantitative measurement to determine success with respect to

---

102 Including police boards; city councils; mayors; city managers; communities of place; communities of concern; police unions/associations; media (as a conduit to other players); complaint commissions; comptrollers; good government groups; special interest groups; courts (Moore, Thacher, Dodge & Moore, 2002: 84-85).

103 Carter, Klein and Day. *How Organisations Measure Success: The Use of Performance Indicators in Government,* 30-31.

104 Kaydos, *Operational Performance Measurement: Increasing Total Productivity,* 51.

outcomes. As Hoover pointed out, this is necessary even though not all qualitative elements of police work can be quantified because there are many exigencies, contingencies and intangibles with respect to policing.[105] However, police organisations that do not include qualitative as well as quantitative performance measurement are not only missing an opportunity to increase the effectiveness of service delivery but when performance measurement only relies on numbers, employees learn how to manipulate their activities and, thus, influence the data generated. Qualitative measurement can include an assessment of the establishment of corporate value statements, functional policies and procedures in general, and procedures for handling complaints about police conduct.

Notwithstanding the benefits, the implementation of performance management in the public sector has not been straightforward. For instance, a Conference Board study, cited by Gates, found "cultural and political resistance [to strategic performance measurement was] more problematic than expected."[106] Other studies have also shown that while managers and leaders often agree performance measures are necessary; very few of their organisations had the necessary performance measurement systems in place. For instance, David Ammons noted in *Overcoming the inadequacies of performance measurement in local government: the case of libraries and leisure services*, that although some municipalities had performance measurement systems, many of these had systems that only answered the question of "how much" – workload and outputs. They

---

105 Hoover, "Translating Total Quality Management from the Private Sector to Policing," 1-22.

106 Gates, *Aligning Strategic Performance Measures & Results: Report R-1261-99-RR.* 6.

did not address the "how well" – the effectiveness – or, the "how" – the efficiency.[107] This deficiency was compounded when organisations attached labels of efficiency or effectiveness to low-level performance indicators. This, he concluded, was probably because while some managers understand the need for measures of effectiveness and efficiency, they avoid the complexity and costs of collecting and analyzing the appropriate measures. Notwithstanding an apparent reluctance to embrace performance management, and even though the public sector has not traditionally used data for the purpose of decision-making and for looking forward, a comprehensive and strategic measurement system that integrates the collection, analysis, and application of data into all aspects of the organisation is necessary to provide an indication of when changes are necessary. As Hatry explained in *The status of productivity measurement in the public sector,* this will then enable the alignment and incorporation of quality systems to "permit governments to identify problem areas and, as corrective actions are taken, to detect the extent to which improvements have occurred."[108]

While defects are relatively simple to identify and rectify in the manufacturing sector, and quality is defined essentially to be a lack of defects, the determination of quality and valued service in policing is situational and, thus, can present challenges to a strategic approach to performance management. Overall, because the external environment has considerable influence over what police are required to do and how well they can do it, the ownership of performance, in particular the measurements of effectiveness and the achievement of outcomes, has been difficult to attribute as many

---

107 Ammons, D. N, "Overcoming the inadequacies of performance measurement in local government: the case of libraries and leisure services," *Public Administration Review,* Vol. 55, No. 1 (January-February 1995), 37-47.

108 Hatry, H. P, "The status of productivity measurement in the public sector," *Public Administration Review,* Vol. 38 (January – February 1978), 28.

conditions that lead to crime and social disorder are beyond the control and capacity of police. For example, many factors affecting a variance in the crime rate are structural, economic and social factors of a community. Stephen Mastrofski, in *Measuring Police Performance in Public Encounters,* concluded that these factors, such as demography, economy, social inequality, unemployment, education, the prevalence of minorities, family and child rearing styles, households headed by single women, household size, home ownership, and a "variety of social and political forces"[109] encountered in a community, can predict crime rates in large cities 80%-90% of the time. Mastrofski suggested that in the contemporary police environment, this should be reflected in the design of performance measurement systems.

Because of the difficulty in determining the contribution police make to safe communities and thus to the quality of community life, the selection of appropriate indicators in the contemporary police environment requires close attention. In the past, when the reported crime rate decreased, or the time to respond to calls-for-service was reduced or the number of use of force incidents declined, the reaction by police leaders as well as the public was to conclude that a police organisation was performing well. However, such traditional indicators of performance do not take into consideration the complexity of evaluating a contemporary police organisation. For example, as Tony Butler pointed out in *Managing the Future: A Chief Constable's View*, the of many police managers that the main job of police is to catch criminals shows "a substantial lack

109 Mastrofski, S.D, "Measuring Police Performance in Public Encounters," in *Quantifying Quality in Policing*, ed. L. T. Hoover (Washington: PERF, 1996), 209.

of understanding of the social dimensions of the role of police"[110] and, therefore, by continuing to use traditional measures they might work towards the wrong goals. As a result, indicators of policing outcomes are not only difficult to design, but some outcomes of policing often cannot be measured directly. This can be overcome in part, however, by using carefully selected indicators of output performance to assist collectively in the measurement of outcome performance.

To better identify the appropriate performance indicators for contemporary policing, and thus be able to determine whether police organisations have moved from the traditional model to the contemporary model, it is useful to review traditional performance indicators and consider their limitations in the contemporary environment.[111] For example, as Carter, Klein and Day pointed out, *"the cost per incident response"* for "patrol" is problematic in that responding to incidents is not the only function of "patrol" and thus does not take into consideration the proactive aspects of "patrol."[112] By just decreasing the number of police officers on "patrol", the economy and efficiency can be increased but it might do nothing to maintain or increase effectiveness. They also pointed that an efficiency indicator of *"cost per complaint received"* is also flawed as it does not consider how and if complaints are resolved. That is, how effective was the response?

Because, as Bayley explained, personnel account for 85% to 90% of the operating budgets of police organisations and because politicians, police associations, and even the

---

110 Butler, T, "Managing the Future: A Chief Constable's View," In *Core Issues in Policing: 2nd Edition.* eds. F. Leishman, B. Loveday and S. Savage (Harlow, England: Pearson Education, 2000), 313.

111 The data collected by Canadian police organisations and published by the Canadian Center for Justice Statistics is almost exclusively data derived from traditional output indicators.

112 Carter, Klein and Day, *How Organisations Measure Success: The Use of Performance Indicators in Government.*

media and public often use the number of police officers as a reference point, in the contemporary environment some human resource data have relevance to the analysis of performance and when determining performance differentials.[113] For example, Carter, Klein and Day considered staff absenteeism and turnover to be useful performance indicators of low morale and possibly poor performance.[114] However, even though the number of police officers in a police organisation has often been used as an indicator of the respective government's commitment to public safety, measures that use the number of police officers or employees are not good measures of organisational performance.[115] For example, notwithstanding the ratio of the number of police officers to the size of the population[116] has frequently been used as a performance metric for comparisons between police organisations, it is flawed as an outcome indicator. One reason is that the ratio of the number of police officers to the population fails to consider how many police officers are operational and how many are administrative. Another reason is that various research conducted in the 1970s and cited by Bayley in *Police for the Future* failed to demonstrate that the number of police officers, the amount of money spent on policing, or the methods used by police have an effect on crime rates.[117]

---

113 Bayley, D. H, *Police for the Future* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 6.

114 Carter, Klein and Day, *How Organisations Measure Success: The Use of Performance Indicators in Government.*

115 For many years in Canada, there has been a concerted move to replace police officers in numerous functions with non-police officers. For example, but by no means limited to, as communications officers and as tactical/strategic analysts. However, because different police organisations have made these changes to different extents and at different rates, the ratio between police and non-police personnel can differ between police organizations (Police Resources in Canada, 2004). Therefore, this makes accurate and meaningful comparisons between police organisations difficult when based on a ratio that includes the number of police officers.

116 Used in Canada by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (Police Resources in Canada, 2005).

117 Bayley, *Police for the Future*, 9.

Overall, traditional measures of police performance that are based on the population of a community are not ideal. This is because, even though population size can provide a general indicator of demand for police services, it is of questionable value in that it suggests it is the size of the population that determines service demand rather than taking into account the nature of the population. For example, as Ammons explained, the demand for service will vary between urban and rural areas and is dependant on the efforts of police, the economic factors of the community, and the demographics as well as the geographics of the community and adjacent areas, the density of population and the nature of the people being policed.[118] These are far more relevant, when measuring police performance and determining the necessary police resources for a community.

While the ratios of "*calls-for-service per officer*" and the "*arrests made per officer*"[119] might be some improvement over the "*police per population ratio*" in that they provide service demand and workload information, they are also not good measures of police performance. For example, as Blumstein explained, the arrest rate can be influenced by the amount of attention and effort police put into the investigation of offences but it tells nothing about whether the community is any safer as result.[120] Similarly, measures based on calls-for-service, such as "*calls-for-service per officer*," are also problematic because not all calls-for-service or incidents reported require a police

---

118 Ammons, *Municipal Benchmarks: Assessing Local Performance & Establishing Community Standards, 2nd Edition,* 303.

119 The Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics calculates and distributes the ratio of the total criminal code offences (excluding traffic) reported in a jurisdiction to the number of police officers in that jurisdiction. It can be argued that this is not a useful benchmark. Arrests per police officer and calls per police officer are not collected by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics and thus are not easily shared between police services for the purpose of benchmarking. This data, however, is collected internally by most police organisations.

120 Blumstein, "Measuring what matters in Policing: The police and measurement of their impact," 5.

officer to attend. A communications officer or a report taker can handle some situations on the telephone and, as Bayley pointed out, in some police jurisdictions not all calls-for-service are processed by a central dispatch.[121] This can affect the recorded number of dispatched calls. In addition, police officers variously respond alone or with one or more other officers. Overall, a determination of the number of incidents handled by first responders and thus a determination of their workload is not useful from an outcome perspective because the number of calls-for-service recorded by a communications and dispatch centre often does not take into account the "on view" and self generated proactive policing activities.

As Bayley pointed out in *Measuring Overall Effectiveness: or Police Force Show & Tell,* one of the most common, popular, and visible performance indicators of policing has been the *crime rate.*[122] This is notwithstanding that continued reliance on performance indicators that include the *crime rate* is risky when considering that police, and even the respective level of government, have little control or influence over many of the factors contributing to crime as well as over the numerous variables that affect the successful implementation and management of crime reduction strategies and tactics.[123] Furthermore, the *crime rate* and derivatives of it, when considered in isolation, is essentially a measure of outputs rather than of outcomes. A further problem with focusing on the *crime rate* is that some crime, for various reasons, is not reported to police. That is, the widely cited *crime rate* is dependent on what the community reports to police and, as Bayley described, the "assiduousness of police in recording what is

---

121 Bayley, *Police for the Future,* 6.

122 Bayley, "Measuring Overall Effectiveness: or Police Force Show & Tell," 39.

123 Measurement of crime prevention and crime reduction is relevant because they are the basic functions of policing by which police organisations can make a difference when they are held accountable for suppressible crimes (Kelling, 1996: 31).

reported."[124] This can be overcome, to some degree, by including a victimization survey as part of the performance measurement system.

David Bayley cautioned that the utility of the *crime rate* as a meaningful measure is further compounded when considering that studies in the U.S. and Britain have found that, depending on the jurisdiction, only 15%-25% of a police officer's work was crime related and might be closer to 7%-10% when calls-for-service are more closely analyzed. He pointed out that a larger part of police work is that of traffic safety. Whether this is by enforcement of traffic laws, by responding to vehicle accidents or by more pro-active means such as community education, the regulation of road user behaviour is important because the number of people killed and injured and the costs of damage due to accidents are usually substantially greater than the result of criminal activity. Moreover, because more members of the community encounter police because of traffic-related incidents than they do because of criminal situations, their assessments of police organisations are more likely to be shaped in the context of traffic safety related contacts.

Nevertheless, despite the substantial limitations with respect to relying on the *crime rate* as a meaningful measure, common Canadian benchmarks of policing have historically included the *"crime rate per 100,000 of population;"* the *"percentage change in the crime rate;"* and the *"clearance rate of criminal offences"* reported to police.[125] The latter is particularly problematic because research cited by Bayley indicated that the crime rate, overall, is not affected by the success rate of solving and clearing criminal offences. Rather, the critical factor in solving a criminal offence is

---

124 Bayley, "Measuring Overall Effectiveness: or Police Force Show & Tell," 40.
125 *Police Resources In Canada*, 2004.

whether the community, victims and witnesses have sufficient trust and confidence in the police to provide information to identify suspects.[126]

In the manufacturing and service sectors, a reduction of cycle times is regarded as an important indicator of improved quality. Similarly, in policing it is *response times*, such as how quickly the telephone is answered, the time taken to respond to a call-for-service or even the time it takes for a member of the public to receive a copy of a police report, that have traditionally been used as measures of police performance. However, these are measures of outputs. Not only do such measures fail to address the quality of a police response but also, as Bayley pointed out, research has indicated that "contrary to what most police officers think, rapid response is not even a key element in satisfying the public."[127] Notwithstanding it has a poor correlation to successfully solving crime or addressing problems and although research conducted by Albert Reiss Jr. and cited by Bayley suggested only 5%-7% of calls to police on the emergency telephone number require an emergency response; the quick response to a call-for-service remains a commonly used output metric of police organisations. Alternatively, Bayley suggested, because research indicates that it is the predictability of response that is important to a caller, it would be better "for the police to make reasonable promises they can keep rather than to reduce average response times by [a few] minutes."[128]

Even though, historically, the determination of police performance has relied primarily on output data such as the time taken to respond to a call-for-service or the number of arrests made, police are expected to perform numerous additional functions.

---

126 Bayley, "Measuring Overall Effectiveness: or Police Force Show & Tell," 37-54.
127 Bayley, *Police for the Future,* 6
128 Ibid, 7

This traditional assessment of performance fails to appreciate that it is the aggregate of multiple activities that shapes the outcome of contemporary policing. These activities range from ensuring safe streets, safe communities, crime prevention and crime control reduction, locating missing persons, quelling disturbances, responding to emergencies, solving problems to improve the quality of life and establishing relationships with the community as well as numerous other activities that constitute the expected performance of a police organisation. Consequently, rather than continue with traditional activities and measurements, Moore and his colleagues at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government suggested that police should include initiatives, and thus the appropriate performance indicators, to:

- reduce victimization;
- make offenders accountable;
- reduce fear and enhance personal security;
- promote secure communities and make public places safe;
- satisfy customer demands;
- achieve legitimacy with those policed;
- ensure the effective, efficient and fair use of financial resources; and
- ensure the effective, efficient and fair use of force and authority.[129]

While all of these are important, it is the last two items – the raw resources entrusted to police – that make the other initiatives possible. However, while how police organisations use their financial resources has historically been of concern, the authorities granted to police by the public through various levels of government have not traditionally been measured and reported. This has changed in the contemporary environment, because, as described by Carter, Klein and Day, the defining characteristics of good and democratic government are due process, equity, fairness, accountability and

129 Moore, M., D. Thacher, A. Dodge and T. Moore, *Recognizing Value in Policing: The Challenge of Measuring Police Performance* (Washington: PERF, 2002).

quality with respect to the delivery of public services.[130] It is the use of the authority of the state, which includes society's ultimate sanctions: the use of force, including lethal force when appropriate, and the authority to restrict a person's freedoms, which in particular, are important because they must be used sparingly, effectively, efficiently and with justice and fairness. That is, although it is important to account for how financial resources are used, the measurement of contemporary police performance also requires an assessment of a police organisation's capacity to produce justice and fairness in their quest for safe communities. For instance, as Moore and his colleagues pointed out, if crime and disorder is reduced at the cost of personal freedoms and liberties because of intrusive or repressive activities, then the assessment might be that the cost is too high.[131] This is a critical facet of the accountability required in a contemporary police organisation.

Consequently, the use of authority is an important aspect of determining police performance and, as Moore et al. explained in *Recognizing Value in Policing: The Challenge of Measuring Police Performance,* by including it as a measurable "changes the substantial criteria [used] to evaluate police performance."[132] Moore et al. also suggested that the measurement of how a police organisation uses its authority "has a profound effect on [the] understanding of who [are] the important customers."[133] However, notwithstanding police organisations must be accountable for how they use the authority of the state, traditional measures of performance have relied on reported crime

---

130 Carter, Klein and Day, *How Organisations Measure Success: The Use of Performance Indicators in Government.*

131 Moore, Thacher, Dodge and Moore, *Recognizing Value in Policing: The Challenge of Measuring Police Performance.*

132 Ibid. 27.

133 Moore, Thacher, Dodge and Moore, *Recognizing Value in Policing: The Challenge of Measuring Police Performance.*

and have paid little attention to the "fairness and economy within which the authority of police was deployed."[134] As a result, the effectiveness of crime control was interpreted as being more important than a commitment to "fairness and discipline in the use of authority."[135] In the contemporary police environment, this must change.

As already noted, the demonstration of due process, equity and fairness is essential to the establishment of the necessary public trust of the public sector and is fundamental to a democratic system of government. The design of a strategic performance measurement system should, therefore, be such that the organisation can demonstrate resources and services are fairly allocated based on need rather than allocated based on political influence or the ability to pay. Accordingly, as Kennedy and Moore observed, because "the values of accountability, responsiveness, economy in the use of force and authenticity, freedom from corruption and abuse, adaptability and the acceptability of police behaviour"[136] are dependant variables when assessing community-policing, measures of police accountability must also reflect the values of policing. Consequently, police leaders and managers, in what is essentially a monopoly, must ensure they are sensitive and accountable to customers by including indicators of justice, integrity, the wise use of force, community satisfaction, and efficiency when measuring their performance.

Notwithstanding the criticality of due process, fairness and equity, the second resource of police organisations – the funding received from taxpayers – is also important. As Ammons observed in *Municipal Benchmarks: Assessing Local*

134 Alpert, and Moore, "Measuring Police Performance in the New Paradigm of Policing, 272.

135 Ibid.

136 Kennedy and Moore, "Underwriting the Risky Investment in Community Policing: What Social Science Should be doing to Evaluate Community Policing," 480.

Performance and Establishing Community Standards, because much of the funding received by a police organisation is expended on human resources, how police officers spend their time is a significant concern from an outcome perspective and when considering value-for-money. In general, a police officer's time is divided between operational time – responding to calls; following up investigations; administrative work – completing necessary reports; attending to court; and maintaining a public profile to provide reassurance to community.[137] However, it is uncommitted time[138] that is also important in the contemporary policing environment. This time is considered as an indicator of the organisation's capacity to build necessary relationships with the community and then work directly with community members to solve and identify neighbourhood crime problems and thus provide quality and valued service to the customer. While the appropriate ratio of time spent on the various police activities is, to a large degree, dependant on the specifics of the community, the League of California Cities[139] determined that in a police organisation which delivers a high level of service 45% of a police officer's time is uncommitted; that in a police organisation which delivers a medium level of service officers have 30%-45% of uncommitted time; and that officers in a low-service level police organisation usually have less than 30% of

---

137 Ammons, *Municipal Benchmarks: Assessing Local Performance & Establishing Community Standards, 2nd Edition.*

138 "Uncommitted time," which is sometimes called the "proactive time rate," is the total time of a police officers shift less the time responding to calls-for-service, conducting follow-up investigations, dealing with "on view complaints," completing administrative activities and taking breaks such as lunch. Theoretically, at least, it is the time available for officer-initiated activities with the community (Ammons, 2001).

139 The League of California Cities conducted focus groups and consulted with police organisations to establish these benchmarks (Ammons 2001: 301). This appears to be the only published assessment/estimate of the relationship between uncommitted time and the level of service delivered. In the absence of further research, these have become the accepted parameters.

uncommitted time.[140] The amount of uncommitted time is of direct relevance to the achievement of outcomes and can be used as one indicator of outcome performance.

In *Overcoming the inadequacies of performance measurement in local government: the case of libraries and leisure services,* Ammons concluded that in general, the successful introduction of strategic performance measurement in the contemporary public sector has been complicated because implementation requires the identification and establishment of suitable "yardsticks" for functions of government that substitute for the private sector *bottom-line* measure of profit or loss.[141] In *Managing Public Services: Competition and Decentralization,* Common, Flynn and Mellon agreed that although it will be different for each public sector organisation, it is necessary to find "a measure of reconciliation equivalent to that of profit in the private sector."[142] However, whereas financial profit is used as a measure of organisational success in the private sector, the determination and measurement of organisational success – the outcome – in the public sector and thus the necessary measurements is not that straightforward. That is, even though the public and politicians have long tried to identify a *bottom-line* of police organisations for the purpose of accountability as well as to determine value-for-money, police officers, including police leaders, as well as police governance authorities and the public overall, have struggled with this concept. However as George Kelling has maintained, "measuring police performance solely by crime statistics simply ignores consequential values ... [such as] justice, integrity, fear

---

140 Ammons, *Municipal Benchmarks: Assessing Local Performance & Establishing Community Standards, 2nd Edition,* 301.

141 Ammons, "Overcoming the inadequacies of performance measurement in local government: the case of libraries and leisure services," 37-47.

142 Common, Flynn and Mellon, *Managing Public Services: Competition and Decentralization,* viii.

reduction, citizen satisfaction and help for those who cannot protect or help themselves."[143]

Despite the difficulty, the media, politicians and the public, have often considered the widely distributed crime data reports from the central government[144] to be, in the words of George Kelling, the "ultimate bottom line" of policing.[145] Kelling conceded that, although not perfect, because they are essentially reports of outputs, the data collected through the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) survey can be considered as documenting to some extent the performance of police in achieving organisational goals with respect to dealing with crime.[146] However, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (F.B.I) in the U.S. warns that because the UCR only records reported crime, the simplistic and incomplete analyses of UCR data is misleading when used to make comparisons with other police organisations, or with the national average.[147] Regardless, Ammons argued that the UCR data could be used as benchmark indicators provided the user is informed and understands the substantial limitations of the data.[148]

The *bottom-line* of policing can also be considered as the extent to which crime has been reduced. In their work, Recognizing *Value in Policing: The Challenge of Measuring Police Performance,* Moore et al. pointed out if that is so then crime reduction must be part of the organisation's mission and police organisations must then measure

---

143 Kelling, G. L, "Defining the Bottom Line in Policing: Organizational Philosophy and Accountability," in *Quantifying Quality in Policing,* ed. L.T. Hoover (Washington: PERF, 1996), 32.

144 In Canada, this is data from the Uniform Crime Reporting Survey (UCR) survey collected and published by Statistics Canada - Canadian Center of Justice Statistics.

145 Kelling, "Defining the Bottom Line in Policing: Organizational Philosophy and Accountability," 5.

146 Ibid, 32.

147 *Crime in the United States 1998: Uniform Crime Reports* (Washington: Federal Bureau of Investigation U.S. Department of Justice - Government Printing Office, 1999), iv

148 Ammons, *Municipal Benchmarks: Assessing Local Performance & Establishing Community Standards, 2nd Edition.*

and be accountable for whether crime is, or is not, reduced.[149] However, because contemporary organisations are customer driven as opposed to traditional private sector organisations which followed "a business theory built on capital, driven by profits and organized as a hierarchy,"[150] Moore et al. suggested an alternative interpretation of the *bottom-line* in a contemporary human service environment is the feedback from the consumers of public service about the value and quality, and thus the satisfaction, they place on the product or service they receive.[151] A study of U.S. Fortune 500 and Canadian Post 300 private sector businesses found 93% of respondents rated customer service as the most important deliverable. According to Stivers, and his colleagues in *How Non-Financial Performance Measures are used,* it is reasonable to conclude that similar results would be obtained in a public sector human service organisation.[152]

However, as Hoover stated, although the calibration of quality and value, and thus customer satisfaction, is reasonably straightforward in most interactions between the police and the community (e.g. if the police handle an incident well the victim is likely to be satisfied) there are many interactions for which the measurement of quality and value is not so clear.[153] Albeit that an assessment by the community of police performance might be influenced by their expectations and preconceptions of police rather than by the experience itself, when assessing the quality of service it is the recipients of the services

---

149 Moore, Thacher, Dodge and Moore, *Recognizing Value in Policing: The Challenge of Measuring Police Performance.*

150 George, S. and A. Weimerskirch, *Total Quality Management: Strategies & techniques proven at today's most successful companies: 2nd Edition* (Toronto: John Wiley & Sons, 1998), 2.

151 Moore, Thacher, Dodge and Moore, *Recognizing Value in Policing: The Challenge of Measuring Police Performance.*

152 Stivers, B., T. Covin, W. Hall and S. Smalt, "How Non-Financial Performance Measures are used," *Management Accounting* (February 1998), 45-49.

153 Hoover, "Translating Total Quality Management from the Private Sector to Policing," 1-22.

and products; the key deliverables supplied to the customers; the customer's expectations of level of quality and value and the various process(s) and sub-process(es) for each product and service that should be taken into account. However, George Kelling cautioned that just as UCR data are preoccupied with crime as an indicator of performance, a preoccupation with client or customer satisfaction to the exclusion of other measures could have the "same corrupting and distorting potential."[154]

Although, traditionally, police have used measures of outputs and efficiency rather than measures of effectiveness to indicate outcome performance, successful private-sector organisations have used performance measures that incorporate non-financial measures as well as traditional financial measures for many years. The literature is clear, however, that most evaluations of police organisations continue, at best, to focus on individual programs rather than assessing the overall effectiveness of police activities even though George Kelling, in 1992, was one of the first to conclude traditional measurements were no longer relevant to contemporary policing. Furthermore, despite discussion starting in the 1970s about the inclusion of new measures such as criminal victimization and the fear of crime as well as assessments of community confidence and satisfaction with police, it is apparent from the literature that many police organisations still do not routinely collect data that enables an assessment of the quality and value of policing. Although police interest has increased with respect to the identification and gathering of neighbourhood indicators and non-arrest data, the literature suggests police persist in paying more attention to traditional measurements

154 Kelling, "Defining the Bottom Line in Policing: Organizational Philosophy and Accountability," 33.

rather than how the police and the community can achieve positive changes with respect to the fear of crime and disorder or the prevalence of crime and disorder.

Overall, even though the evolution of policing has not been in isolation from the public sector in general, and even though in the 1990s the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) began to examine how to measure "the amount of crime, disorder, and fear and their affects on community life,"[155] the performance measurement of policing has remained rooted in the traditional model. Larry Hoover concluded in *Translating Total Quality Management from the Private Sector to Policing* that the continuing use of traditional and simplistic measurements is prima facie evidence of a failure to understand the complexity of policing.[156] Albeit traditional measures, when viewed in isolation and not in the context of an outcome focus, do not represent how well a police organisation responds to the community, Hoover pointed out that some police organisations which abandoned traditional measures of outputs found that the number of arrests made, the amount of traffic enforcement and the clearance rates of reported offences often dropped substantially. Therefore, even though traditional output-based measures are inadequate and more sophisticated outcome-focused measures are required; some might argue that traditional indicators of performance are still necessary. However, as Hoover succinctly stated, the retention of such traditional measures of performance requires careful consideration so that the organisational focus remains on the outcomes of organisational strategies, programs and tactics.[157]

---

155 Langworthy, R. H, "What Matters Routinely?" in *Measuring What Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Institute Meetings,* ed. R. H. Langworthy (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice - National Institute of Justice, 1999), 1.

156 Hoover, "Translating Total Quality Management from the Private Sector to Policing," 1-22.

157 Ibid.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS

The literature on contemporary policing makes it abundantly clear that for policing to be relevant and to meet the expectations of the community, it must be managed strategically and have an outcome focus rather than a continuing reliance on the output measures of performance. The goal of this study was to determine the extent to which Canadian police organisations have done this – that is, whether they have moved to the contemporary model of policing not only by operating strategically but also by changing their traditional narrow focus on outputs to a focus on outcomes. In order to determine what shift, if any, has occurred, a self-report survey of police leaders was constructed **(Appendix A).** More specifically, this two-part survey was designed to obtain information from police leaders about strategic management and the performance measurement systems of their organisations. It is important to note that care was taken when constructing the survey to use language that is common in the police management universe and when there could have been a possibility that terminology might be misinterpreted, an explanation or definition was provided in the survey instrument. The information obtained in the responses was used to determine where the respective organisations are located on the continuum from traditional policing to fully-evolved strategic community-policing – contemporary policing.

Part I of the survey asked the respondent to describe their understanding of community-policing **(Question 1)** and the bottom-line of policing **(Question 3)** as well as to identify whether they considered community-policing to be a proactive policing program, a policing program, a reactive policing program, an organisational strategy, a vision, or a philosophy **(Question 2).** The responses to these questions, along with

responses to Question 43 in Part II, which asked the respondent to describe their organisation's mission and then identify the organisational strategy of their police service, were intended to provide information that would enable the researcher to determine the level of understanding and appreciation of strategic management, and, in particular, whether or not the respondent understood that community-policing must be the organisational strategy if it is implemented and managed properly.

Questions 4 to 39 of Part I asked respondents to identify, from a list comprised of both traditional indicators as well as outcome indicators, which indicators of performance they considered important when assessing how well their organisation was performing. For example, the survey asked questions such as:

> *From your perspective as a police executive, which of the following indicators of performance (performance indicators) should a police organisation measure as a means of determining how well the police organisation is serving the community"* **(Question 4, Part I).**

The purpose of these questions was to obtain information about whether respondents had a predominantly output focus or an outcome focus. This, in turn, would provide an indication of whether the respective organization tended to traditional policing or toward the contemporary policing model.

The second part of the survey **(Questions 40-123)** addressed essentially the same topics as Part I, but, rather than trying to learn the professional opinions of the respondents, it was designed to determine whether the respective police organisations were actually managed strategically, and whether specific traditional performance indicators and outcome-focused indicators of performance were being used. For example, the question corresponding to Question 4 in Part I was:

Which of the following indicators of performance (performance indicators) does your police organisation use to measure how well your organisation is performing overall?" **(Question 73, Part II).**

Overall, the responses to Questions 40 to 123 in Part II were intended to provide information about the prevalence of strategic management and a results-based focus in the organisations that were surveyed. In order to identify whether there was a difference in practices, and thus possibly differences in the implementation of community-policing, based on the size of a police organization or the province in which it was located, respondents were asked to identify their province and the size of their police service **(Questions 124-128).** Given the small size of the target group, and the desire to protect the anonymity of the respondents and their organizations, the surveys were mailed to the target group of seventy-five Canadian police leaders together with a blank envelope. The respondent was asked to first place the completed survey in the blank envelope before placing it in the mailing envelope. This was done to remove the risk of the respondent being identified from the postmark on the exterior envelope.[158]

Because the intent of the survey was to obtain and analyse a sample that was representative of Canadian police organisations, the survey sought information about the size of the respondent police organisation and the province in which they were located **(Questions 124-128).** Of the 75 surveys mailed to Canadian police leaders, 39 responses were received from all provinces. This is a return rate of 52% and represents approximately 56% (33,500) of the 59,906 federal, provincial and municipal police

158 In conformity with a requirement of the University of Regina Research Ethics Board see Appendix B.

officers across Canada.[159] Because there are more police organisations in Ontario than in any other single province, 32 of the 75 surveys (42.7%) were distributed to police leaders in that province. The 16 responses received (n=39) from Ontario represent 41% of all those returned. The province with the second largest number of police services is Quebec. Surveys were mailed to 19 chiefs of police in Quebec, which represented 25% of the total distribution across Canada. Although the survey was not translated into French, five of the 19 surveys were completed and returned which represents 6% of those originally distributed nationwide. Of the 75 police organisations initially surveyed, 65.3% were staffed with between 51 and 300 police officers; 59% of the returned surveys were from this group. Police organisations with more than 300 police officers represented 34.6% of the surveys distributed and account for 41% of those returned **(Data Table 1).** As a result, the returned surveys can be considered as a reasonably representative cross-section of Canadian police organisations based on province and size of the organisation.

Data Table 1: Surveys distributed and responses received based on the size of police organisation measured by the number of police officers

distribution and responses based on size of police organisation		
# of police officers	**distributed (%age)[160]**	**received (%age)**
51-100	25 (33.3)	11 (28.2)
101-300	24 (32.0)	12 (30.8)
301-500	7 (9.3)	5 (12.8)
501-1000	7 (9.3)	5 (12.8)
1001-3000	7 (9.3)	4 (10.3)
3000 plus	5 (6.7)	2 (5.1)
total	**75 (100.0)**	**39 (100.0)**

159 *Police Resources in Canada*, 2004.
160 Total percentage has been rounded to 100%.

In order to understand the extent of the implementation of strategic community-policing in Canada and, thus, the shift, if any, from traditional policing, the response to the surveys were separated into eight groups of findings for the purpose of analysis and discussion. These groups were identified because they can be considered individually, as well as in aggregate, to be indicators of a police organisation's commitment to strategic management and a results-based organisational focus.

Because community-policing must be implemented and managed strategically, the first of the groups to be considered was whether the respondents understood what was meant by "community-policing must be an organisational strategy." Participants were, therefore, asked whether their police organisation was a "community-policing" organisation **(Question 47)** and to briefly state the "organisational strategy" of their police organisation **(Question 43)**. This question required a short narrative response, which was then evaluated to determine whether, or not, the respondent understood what "organisational strategy" means. To better interpret the responses to Question 43 it was also necessary to ask police leaders whether they understood "community-policing" to be a proactive policing program; a policing program; a reactive policing program; an organisational strategy; a vision; a philosophy; or none of these **(Question 2).** The responses to Question 47 were cross tabulated with those from Question 43 **(Data Table 2)** to learn whether those who reported their organisation to be a "community-policing" organisation also understood the concept of an "organisational strategy" in the context of contemporary policing. The responses to Question 43 were also cross tabulated with the responses to Question 2 **(Data Table 3)**. This was to identify whether those who

indicated that they understood "community-policing" to be an "organisational strategy" also understood what is meant by an "organisational strategy."

Data Table 2: **Crosstabulation: respondent's organisation is a community-policing organisation * does respondent understand "organisational strategy"? (n=39)**

Q.47-organisation is a community-policing organisation?		Q.43-does respondent understand "organisational strategy"?				total
		no	yes	partially	n/r	
no	count (% age)	1 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (100)
yes	count (% age)	17 (45.9)	6 (16.2)	8 (21.6)	6 (16.2)	37 (100)
n/r	count (% age)	1 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (100)
total	**count(% age)**	**19 (48.7)**	**6 (15.4)**	**8 (20.5)**	**6 (15.4)**	**39 (100)**

Data Table 3: **Crosstabulation: does respondent understand "organisational strategy"? * community-policing is (n=39)**

Q.43-does respondent understand "organisational strategy"?	Q.2-community-policing is:							total
	a proactive police pgm	a policing pgm	organisational strategy	a vision	a philosophy	don't know	n/r	
no	2	1	4	0	7	4	1	19
yes	1	0	**3**	0	2	0	0	6
partially	0	1	**4**	0	3	0	0	8
n/r	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	6
total	**4**	**2**	**13**	**1**	**13**	**4**	**2**	**39**

Of the 37 (n=39) respondents who considered their organisation to be a community-policing organisation, 17 of them did not appear to understand the concept of an "organisational strategy." An additional eight appear to have only a partial understanding **(Data Table 2)**. While 13 respondents (n=39) identified "community-policing" to be an "organisational strategy," only seven of these seem to understand either fully or partially what is meant by an "organisational strategy" **(Data Table 3).**

Even though the literature tells us community-policing should be implemented as the organisational strategy of a police organisation, these findings suggest that some Canadian police leaders might not understand this. It is particularly interesting, given that "community-policing" has been present in Canada in various forms for more than thirty years, that even though 37 respondents (n=39) considered their respective organisations to be community-policing organisations **(Data Table 2),** only 13 of the respondents (n=39) considered community-policing to be an organisational strategy **(Data Table 3).** While a further 13 respondents (n=39) considered "community-policing" to be a philosophy **(Data Table 3),** a philosophy must be operationalized as the organisational strategy if it is to be successfully implemented and integrated into the organisation. Thus, the respondents who considered "community-policing" to be a philosophy, while correct to some extent, did not appear to understand the concept of strategic management. However, of perhaps greater interest, despite the relatively few responses, is that six respondents (n=39) considered community-policing to be a program **(Data Table 3).** These respondents clearly did not understand that if the organisation is a community-policing organisation then "community-policing must be the organisational strategy." Overall, of the 37 respondents (n=39) who considered their organisation to be a "community-policing" organisation, only 14 seemed to understand at least partially what is meant by an "organisational strategy" and only seven of the 14 considered community-policing to be an organisational strategy. This suggests that the majority of the respondents did not understand that "community-policing must be an organisational strategy" and thus their respective organisations might not be led and managed strategically.

The second group of findings to be considered was whether the police organisation has a corporate plan or business plan. According to the literature, organisations that are led and managed strategically have a corporate plan or a business plan with which to communicate their strategy and to guide their achievement of organisational goals. Therefore, Question 44 asked respondents if their *"police organisation has a formal corporate plan/business plan."* The responses to this question were then cross-tabulated with the responses to Question 43 **(Data Table 4)** that sought information about the respondents' level of understanding of what is meant by an "organisational strategy." The reason for this was that while some organisations might have a corporate plan or a business plan, it might be because they are directed to have such a plan by either legislation or by their governing body. That is, having a corporate plan or a business plan does not necessarily mean the respective organisation is managed strategically. Therefore, by cross tabulating the responses to Question 44 with the responses to Question 43, it was intended that a more accurate evaluation could be made of the extent to which the organisation had a strategic focus.

Data Table 4: **Crosstabulation: does the organization have a corporate plan or a business plan? * does the respondent understand "organisational strategy"? (n=39)**

Q.44-does the organisation have a corporate plan or a business plan?		**Q.43-does the respondent understand "organisational strategy"?**				**total**
		no	**yes**	**partially**	**n/r**	
don't know	count (% age)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (100)	1 (100)
no	count (% age)	2 (66.7)	0 (0)	1 (33.3)	0 (0)	3 (100)
yes	**count (% age)**	**17 (50)**	**6 (17.6)**	**7 (20.6)**	**4 (11.8)**	**34 (100)**
n/r	count (% age)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (100)	1 (100)
total	**count (% age)**	**19 (48.7)**	**6 (15.4)**	**8 (20.5)**	**6 (15.4)**	**39 (100)**

Seventeen of the 34 police leaders (50%) whose organisations reportedly had a corporate plan or a business plan, when asked to articulate the "organisational strategy" of their organisation, did not seem to understand the concept of an "organisational strategy" **(Data Table 4)**. Only six of them seemed to understand what is meant by an "organisational strategy" and a further seven demonstrated only a partial understanding. Four of the 34 leaders did not respond at all when asked to describe the organisational strategy of their organisation. This suggests that, while 34 of the organisations represented in the study reported that they had a business plan or corporate plan, not all of these might be led and managed strategically.

Because community-policing is results-focused, it is important to determine what police leaders understand as being the outcome of policing.[161] Therefore, the third group of findings to be considered was whether police leaders understood the bottom-line – the outcome – of policing. Even though the identification of the bottom-line is challenging and the literature offers more than one perspective, the extent to which a police leader understands what constitutes the outcome of policing can provide insight into whether they are strategic and outcome focused. In turn, this can provide assistance in determining whether their organisation is strategic and results-based. Because two of the outcomes suggested in the literature are a "safe community" and "community trust and satisfaction," the following question, which required a brief descriptive response, was posed:

161 Some authorities on policing have considered the outcome of policing to be the equivalent of the bottom-line found in the private sector.

> *The "bottom line" in private business can be considered as the profit/loss of the business or the return on a shareholder's investment. From your perspective as a police executive, what is the "bottom line" of policing?* **(Question 3)**.

The responses to Question 3 were then cross-tabulated **(Data Table 5)** with those of Question 72, which asked participants to identify the primary use of performance data in their organisations from the following list:

- *learning information such as the number of arrests made, the number of cases cleared and the amount of traffic enforcement;*
- *determining the degree of success of a police program(s);*
- *assisting in determining which new program(s)/service(s) to deliver ;*
- *assisting in determining which program(s)/service(s) to discontinue;*
- *determining how safe the community is;*
- *providing information to the public;*
- *providing information to the governance authority of my police organization;*
- *determining the degree of community satisfaction with my police service;*
- *none of the above;*
- *don't know;*
- *other.*

The rationale for Question 72 was that if respondents identified the bottom-line as being a "safe community" or "community trust and satisfaction," then arguably that would be their primary use of performance data if they were actually outcome focused. It is important to note that while all of the alternatives provided in Question 72 could be considered as a reason to measure and use performance data, only one response was required of the respondent – that being the primary reason for collecting performance data. Because "community trust and satisfaction" is one of the suggested outcomes of policing and because this can be learned by directly asking the community, respondents were also asked whether their organisation:

uses a periodic customer/client (community) satisfaction survey(s) to assist with measurement of organisational performance **(Question 69).**

The reason for this was that if a response to Question 3 indicated that "community trust and satisfaction" was an element of the bottom-line but the organisation did not conduct community surveys to determine "community satisfaction," then the organisation might not be truly committed to an outcome focus. The responses to Question 3 were, therefore, cross-tabulated with the responses to Question 69 **(Data Table 6)**. To clarify the situation with respect to the primary use of performance data in an organisation that conducted community surveys, Question 69 was also cross-tabulated with Question 72 **(Data Table 7)**.

Data Table 5: **Crosstabulation: the outcome (bottom-line) of policing is: * primary use of performance data (n=39)**

Q.3-the bottom-line of policing is:		Q.72-primary use of performance data:									
		learning info on outputs	degree of success	which new programs to deliver	how safe the community is	info to public	info to governance	community satisfaction	don't know	n/r	total
safe community	count	4	4	0	1	0	5	2	10	1	***27***
	% age	14.8	14.8	0	3.7	0	18.5	7.4	37	3.7	100
did not understand the bottom-line	count	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	4
	% age	0	0	0	0	0	50	25	25	0	100
community trust and satisfaction	count	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	***2***
	% age	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	50	0	100
other	count	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	4
	% age	0	25	25	0	25	0	0	25	0	100
no response	count	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
	% age	50	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	100
total	**count**	**5**	**5**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**7**	**3**	**13**	**1**	**39**
	% age	**12.8**	**12.8**	**5.1**	**5.1**	**2.6**	**17.9**	**7.7**	**33.3**	**2.6**	**100**

Data Table 6: **Crosstabulation: the outcome (bottom-line) of policing is: * organisation conducts community surveys to assess organisational performance (n=39)**

Q.3-the bottom-line of policing is:		Q.69-conducts community surveys?		total
		no	yes	
safe community	count (% age)	4 (14.8)	23 (85.2)	27 (100)
did not understand the question	count (% age)	0 (0)	4 (100)	4 (100)
community trust and satisfaction	count (% age)	0 (9)	2 (100)	2 (100)
other	count (% age)	1 (25)	3 (75)	4 (100)
no response	count (% age)	1 (50)	1 (50)	2 (100)
total	**count (% age)**	**6 (15.4)**	**33 (84.6)**	**39 (100)**

Data Table 7: **Crosstabulation: organisation conducts community surveys to assess organisational performance performance * primary use of performance data (n=39)**

Q.69-conducts community surveys?		Q.72-primary use of performance data:									total
		learning info on outputs	degree of success	which new programs to deliver	how safe the community is	info to public	info to governance	community satisfaction	don't know	n/r	
no	count	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	6
	% age	16.7	0	0	16.7	0	0	0	66.7	0	100
yes	count	4	5	2	1	1	7	3	9	1	*33*
	% age	12.1	15.2	6.1	3.0	3.0	21.2	9.1	27.3	3.0	100
total	**count**	**5**	**5**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**7**	**3**	**13**	**1**	**39**
	% age	**12.8**	**12.8**	**5.1**	**5.1**	**2.6**	**17.9**	**7.7**	**33.3**	**2.6**	**100**

Although there were some differences in how respondents articulated their understanding of the bottom-line, overall 29 (n=39) identified the bottom-line – the outcome as being "a safe community" or as being "community trust and satisfaction" **(Data Table 5)**. It is of interest that, while 25 of the 29 respondents who seemed to understand the bottom-line of policing directly surveyed their communities **(Data Table 6)**, only five of the 33 who reported they use community surveys also use performance data for the primary purpose of determining "how safe the community is" or to gauge the "degree of community satisfaction" **(Data Table 7)**. This raises the question: if most of the participant organisations survey the community directly, but do not use the resulting data for the primary purpose of identifying the outcomes of "community safety" or "community trust and satisfaction" **(Data Table 7)** what data are they seeking through the survey and to what use are they putting that data? While there might be reasons for

this which are outside of the control of the police organisation, one inference that could be made is that notwithstanding 29 leaders (n=39) indicated they understood what is meant by the bottom-line of policing; only five of the participant organisations might actually be results-based. That is, while not conclusive and more research is necessary, this might indicate that most of the organisations represented in these findings are not actually outcome focused.

Of further interest is that five respondents (n=39) advised that their primary use of performance data was to learn "information such as the number of arrests made, the number of cases cleared and the amount of traffic enforcement" **(Data Table 5)**. This is output data which suggests these organisations might still be predominantly output focused. A further seven respondents (n=39) advised that their primary use of data was for "providing information to the governance authority of my police organisation" **(Data Table 5).** While to some degree this might satisfy the need to be accountable, if the information communicated to the governance body is not outcome-focused then that body might be getting incomplete and misleading information.

When trying to identify whether a police organisation operates strategically, the literature is clear that a mission statement in a strategically managed organisation should be measurable. Consequently, the fourth group of findings to be considered when trying to identify whether a police organisation operates strategically was an assessment of the measurability of the mission statements of the participant organisations. To achieve this, respondents were first asked if their organisation had a mission statement **(Question 40)** and if so to include the wording of their mission statement in response to Question 41.

This narrative response was then assessed to determine if the mission statement was measurable. Respondents were also asked:

> *when considering all factors and the public's expectations of your police organisation, how important...when assessing how well you are policing the community is the measurement of the goals of your organisation as articulated in your mission statement* **(Question 24).**

The responses from all three questions were then cross-tabulated **(Data Table 8)** to determine not only if participants understood the value of a measurable mission statement but also whether their mission statement was measurable.

Data Table 8: Crosstabulation: how important in assessing police performance is the measurement of goals in mission statement * is language of mission statement measurable? * does the organisation have a mission statement?

Q40-does the organisation have a mission statement?				Q41-is language of mission statement measurable?			total
				no	yes	n/r	
yes	Q24-how important in assessing police performance is measurement of goals in mission statement?	slightly important	count	0	4	0	4
			% age	0	100	0	100
		important	count	13	11	1	25
			% age	52	44	4	100
		very important	count	2	7	1	10
			% age	20	70	10	100
	total		**count**	**15**	**22**	**2**	**39**
			% age	**38.5**	**56.4**	**5.1**	**100**

While all respondents (n=39) advised that their organisations had a mission statement **(Data Table 8)**, and even though all respondents (n=39) considered the measurement of the goals in their mission statement to be important (4/39 slightly important, 25/39 important, and 10/39 very important) when assessing the performance

of their organisation, a qualitative review of the submitted mission statements indicated that at least 15 (n=39) were not written in language that could clearly enable performance measurement **(Data Table 8).** Although a further 22 mission statements (n=39) have been classified by the author as measurable **(Data Table 8)**, and thus potentially able to form a base for strategic performance measurement, the categorisation erred on being generous. Overall, the mission statements of the respondent organisations tended to be a blend of a vision statement and vague objectives. In general, they failed to provide a clear picture of the purpose of their organisation such that an assessment could be made about whether the mission was being achieved. While the findings from this analysis might not be conclusive when considered alone, it does provide an indication that the respective organisations might not be managed strategically.

In a strategic environment, performance data should be used to make decisions. Conversely, unless performance data is routinely used to aid decision-making, the organisation might not be led and managed strategically. Therefore, the fifth group of findings to be considered when determining whether the organisation is operating strategically is how the organisation uses performance data. The survey sought this information, in part, by asking for a "yes", a "no", or a "don't know" response to the following:

> *My police organisation routinely uses the performance data we collect to make strategic management decisions* **(Question 77).**

To further explore whether an organisation has a strategic focus, the survey also sought information about whether the organisation employed a strategic analyst **(Question 63)** and whether they trained their leaders and managers in strategic planning

and strategic management **(Question 101),** as well as how to use performance data to make decisions **(Question 100).** The purpose of these questions was to clarify the responses to Question 77 **(Data Tables 9, 10, 11).** For example, if an organisation reports that it uses performance data to make decisions but the leaders and managers have not been trained how to do this, it is possible that the data is either not actually used to make decisions, or that the data is not used as effectively as it could be. Similarly, data that has been processed by a strategic analyst is likely to be of more value to decision makers than if it has not been expertly analysed. It could also be argued that the presence of strategic management is evidenced by the employment of a strategic analyst, and by the training of leaders and managers in strategic management. Consequently, the intention was that the responses to Questions 63, 77, 100 and 101 would provide an indication of actual commitment to strategic performance management.

Data Table 9: **Crosstabulation: routinely uses performance data to make strategic management decisions * organisation employs a strategic analyst? (n=39)**

Q.77-uses performance data to make strategic management decisions		**Q.63-employs a strategic analyst**			**total**
		No	**yes**	**n/r**	
no	count (% age)	6 (75)	2 (25)	0 (0)	8 (100)
yes	count (% age)	11 (36.7)	17 (56.7)	2 (6.7)	30 (100)
n/r	count (% age)	0 (0)	1 (100)	0 (0)	1 (100)
total	**count (% age)**	**17 (43.6)**	**20 (51.3)**	**2 (5.1)**	**39 (100)**

Data Table 10: **Crosstabulation: routinely uses performance data to make strategic management decisions * does the organisation train leaders and managers how to use performance data to make decisions? (n=39)**

Q.77-uses performance data to make strategic management decisions		Q.100-trains for decision-making				total
		don't know	no	yes	n/r	
no	count (% age)	0 (0)	4 (50)	4(50)	0 (0)	8 (100)
yes	count (% age)	2(6.7)	19 (63.3)	8 (26.7)	1 (3.3)	30 (100)
n/r	count (% age)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (100)	1 (100)
total	**count (% age)**	**2 (5.1)**	**23 (59)**	**12 (30.8)**	**2 (5.1)**	**39 (100)**

Data Table 11: **Crosstabulation: routinely uses performance data to make strategic management decisions * trains for strategic planning and management**

Q.77-uses performance data to make strategic management decisions		Q.101-trains for strategic planning and management				total
		don't know	no	yes	n/r	
no	count (% age)	0 (0)	4 (50)	4 (50)	0 (0)	8 (100)
yes	count (% age)	1 (3.3)	11 (36.7)	17 (56.7)	1 (3.3)	30 (100)
n/r	count (% age)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (100)	0 (0)	1 (100)
total	**count (% age)**	**1 (2.6)**	**15 (38.5)**	**22 (56.4)**	**1 (2.6)**	**39 (100)**

Of the 30 organisations (n=39) that reportedly use performance data to make strategic decisions, only 17 (57%) of these organisations employ a strategic analyst **(Data Table 9).** Furthermore, 19 (59%) of these 30 organisations reportedly do not train their leaders and managers in how to use performance data to make decisions **(Data Table 10)** and eleven do not train their leaders and managers in strategic planning and strategic management **(Data Table 11).** Although most of the participant organisations reported that they use performance data to make strategic decisions, the absence of a strategic analyst and relevant training for managers and leaders in many of the organisations questions the extent to which these organisations are operating strategically. As with the

findings of the other groups, while not conclusive when taken alone, these findings are an indication that many of the organisations that participated in the study might not be totally strategic.

An indicator of a commitment to a strategic approach and an outcome focus is whether the organisation has a system and personnel to determine how well it is performing and meeting the needs of the customer – the community. Therefore, the sixth group of findings used to cast light on where the respondent organisations were situated on the community-policing continuum is a consideration of the type of performance systems and the performance measurement expertise that they have in place. To achieve this, participants were asked three questions. Firstly:

> *Do you have a performance measurement system to determine how well you are meeting the needs of your community* **(Question 112)**.

Secondly, because, in the contemporary environment, surveys of the community are a valuable tool, they were also asked whether their police organisation:

> *uses a periodic customer/client (community) satisfaction survey to assist with measurement of organisational performance* **(Question 69)**.

Achieving the outcome of a safe community, and maintaining community trust and satisfaction also includes dealing with the perception of crime and disorder in the community. Because the perception of the prevalence of crime and disorder – and thus the extent of the fear of crime and disorder, in a community is a potential criminogenic factor and therefore affects the outcome of policing – whether a police organisation tries to determine the extent of the fear of crime in the community is one indication of an outcome focus. Therefore, thirdly, respondents were asked if their police organisation:

> *Formally measures/assesses the "fear of crime" in [their] community* **(Question 115).**

The responses to these three questions were cross-tabulated **(Data Table 12)** to help identify whether the police organisation is externally focused with respect to performance management or still has a traditional output focus.

Another indication of an outcome-focused police organisation is whether it employs personnel to evaluate services and programs and to measure the performance of the organisation. Therefore, participants were also asked whether their police organisation:

> *employs an evaluation specialist(s) who conducts evaluations of the services/programs we deliver* **(Question 59)** and
>
> *employs a person(s) whose primary job is to measure and assess the performance of our police organisation* **(Question 65).**

The responses to Questions 65 and 59 were then cross-tabulated with the responses from Question 112 **(Data Tables 13 and 14)**. The reason for this was that even though an organisation might report that they have a performance measurement system in place, unless expertise is applied to the management of the system and to the interpretation of results it is likely to focus on easily measured outputs rather than on outcome measurement required of contemporary organisations.

Data Table 12: **Crosstabulation: has a performance measurement system? * conducts community surveys? * measures the fear of crime (n=39)**

Q.112-has a performance measurement system?				Q.115-measures the fear of crime		total
				no	yes	
no	Q.69-conducts community surveys	no	count	2	2	4
			% age	50	50	100
		yes	count	6	6	12
			% age	50	50	100
total			count	8	8	**16**
			% age	50	50	100
yes	Q.69-conducts community surveys	no	count	1	1	2
			% age	50	50	100
		yes	count	4	17	21
			% age	19	81	100
total			**count**	**5**	**18**	**23**
			% age	**21.7**	**78.3**	**100**

Data Table 13: **Crosstabulation: has a performance measurement system? * has a performance measurement specialist? (n=39)**

Q.112-has a performance measurement system?		Q.65-has a performance measurement specialist?			total
		no	yes	n/r	
no	count	12	4	0	16
	% age	75	25	0	100
yes	count	11	9	3	23
	% age	47.8	39.1	13	100
total	**count**	**23**	**13**	**3**	**39**
	% age	**59**	**33.3**	**7.7**	**100**

Data Table 14: **Crosstabulation: has a performance measurement system? * has an evaluation specialist? (n=39)**

Q.112-has a performance measurement system?		Q.59-has an evaluation specialist?		total
		no	yes	
no	count	14	2	16
	% age	87.5	12.5	100
yes	count	11	12	23
	% age	47.8	52.2	100
total	**count**	**25**	**14**	**39**
	% age	**64.1**	**35.9**	**100**

Of the 23 organisations represented in the responses (n=39) that reportedly have a performance measurement system to determine how well their organisation is performing, 21 of these use community surveys. Seventeen (81%) of those that use surveys reportedly also measure the fear of crime **(Data Table 12).** On the other hand, 16 of the participating organisations (41%) report that they do not have a performance measurement system, yet twelve of these conduct community surveys **(Data Table 12).** These findings suggest that while 17 of the police organisations (n=39) might have moved towards a contemporary performance measurement culture, many might not have yet realised the need to change. Viewed from another perspective, of the 23 organisations that reportedly have a contemporary performance measurement system, only nine employ a performance measurement specialist **(Data Table 13),** and only twelve report that they employ a specialist to evaluate programs **(Data Table 14).** While not conclusive evidence, these findings suggest that because many of the surveyed organisations are not systematically measuring performance and using the relevant expertise, they might not be managing performance well. Further research is necessary to

determine if this is the situation or whether it is a capacity issue for the respective organisation.

Because the focus of contemporary police organisations should be on the result of all activities – the outcome - the seventh group of findings looked at the indicators of performance the organisation used, or did not use, to measure organisational success. Therefore, respondents were provided with a list of performance indicators, both traditional and non-traditional, and were asked to identify:

> *which of the following indicators of performance (performance indicators) does your police organisation use to measure how well your organisation is performing overall?"* **(Question 73).**

It was intended that this would provide an indication of whether the organization tended to collect traditional output data, or non-traditional performance indicators – outcome data – when determining how well they are meeting needs of the community.

Data Table 15: Data used by police organisations to determine how well they are performing (n=39)

Item	data used (**indicates mandatory data collection required by UCR survey)	frequency (% age)		n
		yes	no	
1	# of incidents of disorder reported to police**	26/66.7	13/33.3	39
2	# of reported criminal offences**	34/87.2	5/12.8	39
3	# of charges laid**	29/74.4	10/25.6	39
4	clearance rate of reported crime**	37/94.9	2/5.1	39
5	population per officer**	25/64.1	14/35.9	39
6	crime rate per "x" population**	26/66.7	13/33.3	39
7	amount of traffic enforcement[162]	35/89.7	4/10.3	39
8	# of school presentations	21/53.8	18/46.2	39
9	# of community presentations	24/61.5	15/38.5	39
10	# of public complaints about officer conduct	36/92.3	3/7.7	39
11	# of arrests made	29/74.4	10/25.6	39
12	case load per officer	22/56.4	17/43.6	39
13	# of calls-for-service	35/89.7	4/10.3	39
14	# of problem solving projects initiated	23/59.0	16/41.0	39
15	# of calls for service per officer	20/51.3	19/48.7	39
16	# of incidents of inappropriate use of force.	28/71.8	11/28.2	39
17	response time to 911 calls-for-service	28/71.8	11/28.2	39
18	response time to non-911 calls-for-service	25/64.1	14/35.9	39
19	# of criminal offences NOT reported to police	7/17.9	32/82.1	39
20	# of incidents of disorder NOT reported to police	4/10.3	35/89.7	39
21	# of arrests per officer	15/38.5	24/61.5	39

Output data identified as items 1-6 in Data Table 15, which are those collected by police to satisfy UCR requirements, were used by most of the respondent organisations to determine how well they are performing **(Data Table 15).** The output data, subject of items 7-18 in Data Table 15, which are not required by the UCR, were also used by most organisations. On the other hand, it is interesting that the majority of the surveyed organisations did not factor in the extent of unreported criminal offences (82.1%) **(Item 19, Data Table 15)**, or the extent of incidents of disorder not reported to police (89.7%)

162 Only Criminal Code traffic enforcement such as impaired driving and dangerous driving are reported through the UCR survey. The enforcement of provincial statutes and municipal bylaws is not reported through the UCR survey.

(Item 20, Data Table 15) when making a determination of how they are performing. Given the apparent continued reliance by the surveyed organisations on performance indicators such as the *clearance rate* of crime, the *crime rate* and the *caseload per officer* **(Items 4, 6, & 12, Data Table 15)**, the unreported incidents should be of relevance.

Public trust and confidence are essential for successful contemporary policing. It can be argued that if the community is not reporting incidents of crime and/or disorder, it is because they might have insufficient trust and confidence that police will take the complaint seriously and take action even if it is reported. The extent of the unreported incidents, whether of crime or disorder, could, therefore, be taken as an indicator of public trust and confidence and should, consequently, be of relevance to the organisational measurement of contemporary policing. By not considering this as important, the question arises: is the organisation operating strategically and working to achieve the outcome of policing – a safe community free from a fear of crime in which the community has trust and confidence in the police? Overall, although these findings as presented might not be definitive indicators of whether an organisation is output or outcome focused, they do provide some assistance in that it is clear many organisations still use data such as the crime rate and the case load per officer, yet relatively few organisations take into consideration the amount of unreported crime and disorder **(Data Table 15).**

Of further interest is that 64% of the respondent organisations (n=39) reportedly still use the time taken to respond to a non-emergency call-for-service **(Item 18, Data Table 15)** as an indicator of their performance. While additional research is required to determine how and why they use this output data, it appears that it is being used despite

research cited by Bayley[163] which pointed out those who call for police service in other than an actual emergency are not concerned about receiving a quick response but are concerned about police responding within a promised time frame. Overall, based on the responses of the surveyed organisations, police continue to use a wide range of outputs, most of which are traditional outputs, to determine how well they are performing **(Data Table 15).** However, it was outside the scope of this study to determine if, or how, they aggregate this output data to measure outcomes.

The final group of findings to assist with the determination of whether a police organization has a contemporary performance focus relate to due process, fairness and equity with respect to the management of the organization and the delivery of services. From the literature, the defining characteristics of good and democratic government are due process, equity, fairness, accountability and quality with respect to the delivery of public services. In particular, the use of the authority of the state, which includes the use of force, must be used sparingly, effectively, efficiently and with justice and fairness. Given that this is a fundamental of democratic policing, it is, therefore, of interest whether police organisations include an assessment of this in their determination of how well they are meeting the needs of their community. This critical category might not traditionally have received the appropriate attention and consideration. Consequently, respondents were asked in Question 11 whether they considered the measurement and evaluation of due process, equity and fairness in the delivery of police services to be important. The responses to this question were cross-tabulated with responses to Question 113, which asked respondents whether:

---

163 Bayley, *Police for the Future*.

in assessing the success of [their] police organisation in meeting community needs, [their] police organisation formally measures the extent to which services are delivered with "due process, equity and fairness"

The purpose for this was to see whether there was a difference between practice and what police leaders considered appropriate. In addition, because the inappropriate use of force can be considered as an example of the absence of due process and fairness, respondents were also asked whether, from their perspective as a police executive, their police organization should measure the number of incidents of inappropriate use of force as a means of determining how well the police organisation is serving the community **(Question 4[u]).** These responses were then cross tabulated with the responses to Question 73[u] which asked respondents if their police organization actually uses the number of incidents of inappropriate "use of force" by their police officers when determining how well their police organization is performing **(Question 73[u]).**

Data Table 16: Crosstabulation: how important in assessing police performance are due process, fairness and equity * does your organisation measure due process, fairness and equity of service delivery? (n=39)

Q.11-how important in assessing police performance are due process, fairness and equity		**Q.113-does your organisation measure due process, fairness and equity of service delivery**			**total**
		don't know	**no**	**yes**	
slightly important	count (% age)	2 (28.6)	4 (57.1)	1 (14.3)	7 (100)
important	count (% age)	1 (4.8)	12 (57.1)	8 (38.1)	21 (100)
very important	count (% age)	0 (0)	8 (72.7)	3 (27.3)	11 (100)
total	**count (% age)**	**3 (7.7)**	**24 (61.5)**	**12 (30.8)**	**39 (100)**

Data Table 17: **Crosstabulation: should the inappropriate use of force be measured to determine how well the organisation is serving the community? * do you measure the inappropriate use of force? (n=39)**

Q.4(u)-is measuring the inappropriate use of force important when considering organisational success?		Q.73(u)-measures the inappropriate use of force		total
		no	yes	
not important	count (% age)	7 (43.8)	9 (56.3)	16 (100)
important	count (% age)	4 (17.4)	19 (82.6)	23 (100)
total	**count (% age)**	**11 (28.2)**	**28 (71.8)**	**39 (100)**

While all respondents (n=39) considered the measurement of due process, equity and fairness of service, as important to at least some degree (21/39 considered it important, 11/39 very important and 7/39 slightly important) **(Data Table 16)**, 24 (61.5%) respondents (n=39) reported that their organisation did not measure the extent to which service is delivered with due process, fairness and equity. Only twelve organisations (n=39) reported that they measure this and consider it when assessing organisational performance. Of particular interest, considering the criticality to democratic policing, is that 28 respondents (n=39) considered due process, fairness and equity to be less than "very important" when assessing police performance **(Data Table 16).**

The responses to the questions about the use of force **(Questions 11 and 113)** are interesting. Whereas only 23 (n=39) respondents rated the measurement of the inappropriate use of force to be important when assessing organisational success, 28 respondents reported that their organisations measure this to determine how well their organisation is performing overall **(Data Table 17).** This might be because provincial statutes and the policies of governance authorities usually require no more than a

numerical accounting of incidents of the inappropriate use of force. What is of concern, however, is that 16 of the police leaders (n=39) who responded said that they did not consider the measurement of the inappropriate use of force to be important when considering success (**Data Table 17**). However, police must be responsible not only for the results they achieve, but also for ensuring that their resources are distributed equitably. Traditionally, a measure of due process, fairness and equity has not been factored into the assessment of organisational performance. Nevertheless, the literature tells us that in a democratic society it should be. The findings suggest that, at best, only a few organisations factor this into their organisational assessment. How they do this effectively, requires further research.

CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSION

Historically, police organisations have been paramilitary and bureaucratic organisations that have been socially isolated from the community. This traditional police culture made it difficult for organisations to adapt their strategies and structures in response to the dynamic environment and, thus, to be able to effect necessary organisational change. Police departments were closed systems, which used defensive strategies and tended to ignore developments in their external environment. Moreover, because traditional indicators of performance dealt primarily with inputs and processes, it was difficult to understand the actual achievements of policing and, consequently, the outcome of policing was usually not addressed. Overall, traditional policing cast the community as passive participants and the police as the active participant. It emphasized efficiency over effectiveness and stressed quantity rather than quality.

However, starting in the 1960s, and gaining momentum during the public sector reform movement of the 1980s and 1990s, some observers and practitioners of policing, as well as some community leaders, realised that traditional policing was not achieving the sought-after safe communities. They realised that the real success of policing is built on internal and external relationships, and shared values through co-operation and collaboration. They noted that this requires consultation, accountability, decentralization of authority, the sharing of power, both internally and externally and a primary focus on results as opposed to attention to just processes and outputs. Consequently, the contemporary model of policing slowly emerged. However, although community-policing first arrived in Canada in the mid-1970s, the culture change from traditional policing to the contemporary model of community-policing is still incomplete.

The literature suggests that this is perhaps because some police organisations are not led and managed strategically and are still relying on traditional performance indicators instead of the strategic results-based performance measurement required in the contemporary environment. For instance, the literature is clear that community-policing must be the organisational strategy of a police organisation if it is to be successful, and to be able to achieve the desired goal of a safe community. That is, it must not be just a program added on to an otherwise traditional structure. This means that community-policing must be implemented and managed strategically if police are to establish the critical trust and confidence of the community, and to contribute to the required positive difference in communities. It is a strategic and results-based approach to policing that will provide the necessary organisational structures to target resources and activities such that they contribute to the improvement of the quality of community life.

The environment with respect to the public sector, of which policing is but one part, has changed substantially during the past 20-30 years in that the public now not only has increased expectations of receiving quality and value from their public sector agencies but has an increased demand for accountability in general. As a result, the public now expects to know what is achieved by their police organisation as well as knowing whether the resources they provide for it are used wisely. This has led to increased attention to the outcomes of what is achieved by all policing activities. In this regard, there is no difference in the expectations of consumers irrespective of the service provider.

Consequently, in addition to the necessity for a strategic approach to service delivery, there is a need to measure, evaluate and then communicate the progress made

towards achieving the desired result of policing activities – safe communities that are free from a fear of crime. This places the onus on police leaders and managers to strategically lead and manage policing by strategically measuring and managing performance: a substantial departure from traditional policing that was adept at counting outputs generated through activities, but often paid little attention to how well it was contributing to community safety and thus whether it was providing value for the resources expended.

This raises the question: how far have Canadian police organisations progressed on their journey to community-policing? To answer this, seventy-five Canadian police leaders were surveyed to provide insight into the extent that police organisations in Canada have actually implemented strategic management and performance measurement, so that they operate as strategic and outcome-focused organisations and, thus, operate congruent with the successful contemporary public and private sectors. To understand the status of the participant organisations, the responses from the thirty-nine leaders who participated in the study were broken down into eight groups for discussion.

The first group of findings suggest that only a few (7) of the 39 respondents understood that "community-policing must be an organisational strategy" (**Data Table 3**). This understanding is important if their organisation is to be a strategic organisation. While it is encouraging that seven understood this, this represents only 18% of those who participated in the study. On the basis that an organisation with a corporate plan or a business plan, is more likely to be a strategic organisation, the second group of findings addressed the issue of whether the participant organisations had a corporate plan or a business plan and how that related to the respondents understanding of "organisational strategy." While 34 organisations reported that they had a corporate plan or a business

plan, 17 of these respondents did not seem to understand what is meant by "organisational strategy." A further 13 demonstrated at least a partial understanding (**Data Table 4**). This suggests that these 30 respondent organisations might not be led and managed strategically even though they have a corporate plan or a business plan.

Because the bottom-line – the outcome – of policing is important to contemporary policing, the third group of findings tried to determine whether the leader who responded to the survey understood the concept of the bottom-line, how their organisation collected potential outcome data and for what purpose the respective organisation used performance data. Although 29 participants seemed to understand the concept of the bottom-line – "community safety" and "community trust and satisfaction" – and 25 of these surveyed their communities directly, only five of those who surveyed the community reported that they used performance data to determine "community safety" and "community trust and satisfaction." While this requires further exploration, it suggests that only a few of the participant organisations are collecting data from the community that they then use to determine outcome performance. The inference that can be made, based on these findings, is that most of the organisations might not be entirely strategic and outcome focused. The fourth group of findings looked at whether the mission statement of the participating organisation was written such that it was easily measurable. Although, all respondents reported that their organisation had a mission statement, a review of the submitted statements indicates that 15 are not in easily measurable language. A further 22, although classified by the author as being measurable, tend to be a blend of a vision statement and vague objectives. The absence

of a clearly measurable mission statement is an indicator that the respective organisations might not be totally strategic and outcome focused.

Because, in the contemporary environment, performance data is used to make management decisions, the fifth group of findings looked at how performance data is used by the participant organisations. It also looked at whether they employ a strategic analyst, and whether they train their managers and leaders how to manage strategically as well as how to use data to make management decisions. The rationale for enquiring about whether the organisation employed a strategic analyst and whether the appropriate training was provided for managers and leaders was that it could help understand how the organisation use performance data. For instance, the likelihood of actually operating strategically is increased when employees understand strategic management and how organisational data can be processed and used effectively. The presence of a strategic analyst can be seen as tangible evidence of a commitment to a strategic approach. Thirty of the 39 respondents reported that their organisations use performance data to make decisions, yet of these 30 organisations only 17 employed a strategic analyst, only eight trained their leaders and managers how to use performance data in their decision-making, and only 17 trained them how to plan and manage strategically. While it is encouraging that some organisations have a strategic analyst, and train their staff how to manage strategically and how to use performance data, overall, the majority of the organisations tended not to do this. This brings into question their commitment to strategic management, and, in particular, their commitment to strategic performance management.

The sixth group of findings was concerned about the systems used by the organisations to measure how well they are meeting the needs of their communities, and

whether they use expertise to assist them to do this. Twenty-three organisations reported that they had a performance measurement system (n=39) and 21 of these reported that they used surveys of their communities in this regard. Because the fear of crime in a community is related to the quality of community life and can be considered as a contemporary indicator of outcome performance, it is encouraging that 17 of those that used surveys also measured the fear of crime. This suggests that these organisations might be progressive. The findings in this group, overall, indicate that although 23 of the organizations (n=39) might have implemented a contemporary performance measurement system, only nine of the 23 employed a performance measurement specialist, and only twelve of the 23 employed a program evaluation expert.

The seventh group of findings looked at the indicators of performance used by the participants to determine how well they are meeting community needs. This group, while useful to the overall assessment subject of this study, requires some caution when interpreting the results in that the use of output data without further examination does not necessarily mean that the organisation is not outcome focused. However, it does have value from the perspective of learning which contemporary indicators of performance some of the respondents are not using. For example, only 18% of respondents reported that they use the number of criminal offences "not reported to police" when determining how well they are performing and only 10% use the number of incidents of disorder "not reported to police." This is of interest because the majority reported that they use traditional data, such as the number of reported criminal offences, the clearance rate of reported crime, the number of incidents of disorder reported and the crime rate, as indicators of performance. The value of these data is questionable if the rate of the non-

reporting of crime and disorder is not also measured and factored in. While on the face of it, the findings in this group imply that most of the organisations still focus on traditional output indicators, additional research is necessary to clarify this. What is apparent, though, is that only a small percentage of the participants are tending to look at performance holistically and might, thus, be outcome focused.

The eighth, and final, group of findings looked at whether police organisations use a measurement of the due process, fairness and equity with which services are delivered when they are determining how well they are meeting community expectations. This has not traditionally been included in the measurement of organisational performance. All respondents advised that they considered this as important to at least some degree; however, 61.5% of them did not actually measure this important category of data. Of particular interest, considering the criticality of due process, fairness and equity to a democratic society, and thus to democratic policing, is that only eleven of the 39 participants in the study (28%) considered it as very important. Of further interest is that 16 of the police leaders (n=39) did not consider the measurement of the inappropriate use of force as important when determining organisational success. The issue of being accountable for the appropriate use of force is a good example of the necessity to be responsive to the external environment. Increasingly, the public expects police to identify and rectify shortcomings with respect to due process, fairness and the use of force. An apparent failure by some police organisations that participated in this study to accept this responsibility, and thus factor it into an assessment of organisational performance, suggests that these organisations might not have yet embraced the philosophy of the contemporary policing model.

While most of the Canadian police leaders who responded to this study described their organisations as community-policing organisations, which suggests they have rejected the business practices of traditional policing and have embraced those of contemporary policing, the situation does not appear to be so straightforward. When considered in aggregate as well as individually, the findings of the eight groups show that some police services were clearly more progressive than others by being strategic and outcome-focused to at least some degree. What is of interest, however, although it varies a little between each group of findings, is that despite community-policing having been present in Canada for 30 years and that each respondent organisation considered itself to be a community-policing organisation, indications are that many do not appear to have fully embraced strategic management and might still be primarily output, instead of outcome, focused. That is, the findings suggest that many of the surveyed police organisations have yet to make the culture shift to contemporary policing. For instance, while most respondents (74%) **(Data Table 5)** seem to understand the concept of the bottom-line of policing, there are indications from the study that more than a few police leaders, instead of using a strategic approach to leading and managing their organisations, have not sufficiently – and in some cases possibly not at all – implemented contemporary policing as an organisational strategy. Without an organisational strategy with which to guide the organisation, it is unlikely that the organisation has a strategic performance management system that is really focused on the bottom-line. Even if they do have a performance measurement system, without taking a strategic approach that system will exist in an organisational vacuum and thus probably will not have a true outcome focus.

Police organisations are entrusted with two important resources – the authority of the state and financial resources – with which to maintain or improve community safety, and thus the quality of life of those living and working in our communities. It is incumbent upon police leaders to use these resources wisely such that the police organisations are effective, efficient and abide by the rules of a democracy while striving to achieve the desired outcome of policing. This can only be achieved by taking a strategic approach to the application of resources so that the goals of the organisation are clearly identified through collaboration with their respective communities and the accomplishment of these important goals is achieved through a structured and systematic process. Moreover, the progress made in achieving the desired goals must be constantly monitored and measured so that not only is it demonstrated that resources are used prudently but that necessary corrective decisions can be made to improve performance. The literature is clear that contemporary policing will not succeed and achieve what is intended if it is not implemented as an organisational strategy. The literature tells us also that when contemporary policing has been implemented as an "add-on" program to a traditional structure, it is likely to fail or at least not be as effective and efficient as it should be.

Having identified signs that many Canadian police organisations have yet to be sufficiently strategic and establish the appropriate systems to measure and report on outcomes, further research is necessary to determine the actual performance indicators that will afford an assessment of the achievement of outcomes and, thus, whether a police organisation is delivering value-for-money. Overall, given the responses to the survey represent organisations that employ 56% of all Canadian police officers, the results of

this study help to understand the state of contemporary policing in Canada. If, through its methodology and findings, the study has raised the awareness and understanding of police leaders about the value of strategic management, and the necessity to focus on the outcome of police activities, then it has contributed to the essential discussion that is necessary to complete the evolution of contemporary policing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adebanjo, D. and D. Kehoe. "An evaluation of quality culture problems in UK companies." *International Journal of Quality Science*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (1998): 275-286.

Albrecht, K. and R. Zemke. *Service America.* Homewood, IL: Dow-Jones Irwin, 1985.

Alpert, G. P. and M. H. Moore. "Measuring Police Performance in the New Paradigm of Policing. In *Critical Issues in Policing: Contemporary Readings. 3rd Edition,* eds. R. G. Dunham and G. P. Alpert. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1997: 265-281.

Ammons, D. N. "Overcoming the inadequacies of performance measurement in local government: the case of libraries and leisure services." *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 55, No. 1 (January-February 1995): 37-47.

Ammons, D. N. "A Proper Mentality for Benchmarking." *Public Administration Review,* Vol. 59, No. 2 (March 1999): 105.

Ammons, D. N. *Municipal Benchmarks: Assessing Local Performance & Establishing Community Standards, 2nd Edition.* London: Sage Publications, 2001.

Auditor General of Canada. (1997). *Report of the Auditor General of Canada. Moving Toward Managing for Results.* October. Chapter 11. [online] www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/domino/reports.nsf/html/ch9711e.html [2005, August].

Bates, J. G. *Managing Value for Money in the Public Sector.* London: Chapman & Hall, 1993.

Bayley, D. H. *Police for the Future.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Bayley, D. H. "Measuring Overall Effectiveness: or Police Force Show & Tell." In *Quantifying Quality in Policing*, ed. L. T. Hoover. Washington: PERF, 1996: 37-54.

Bieck, W. and D.A. Kessler. *Response Time Analysis.* Kansas City, MO: Board of Police Commissioners, 1997.

Blumstein, A. "Measuring what matters in Policing: The police and measurement of their impact." In *Measuring What Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Meetings,* ed. R. H. Langworthy. Washington: US Department of Justice - National Institute of Justice, 1999: 5 – 9.

Brancato, C. K. *New Corporate Performance Measures.* New York: The Conference Board, 1995.

Brandl, S. G., J. Frank, R. E. Warden and T. S. Bynum. "Global and Incident Specific Attitudes toward the Police: Disentangling the Relationship." *Justice Quarterly*, Vol. 11 (1994): 119-134.

Bratton, W. J. and W. Andrews. "Leading for Innovation & Results in Police Departments." In *Leading for Innovation and Organizing for Results,* eds. F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith and I. Somerville. New York: Jossey Bass, 2002: 251-262.

Brown, L. P. "Community Policing: A Practical Guide for Police Officials." *Principles of Good Policing: Avoiding Violence between Police & Citizens.* Washington: U.S. Department of Justice - Community Relations Service, 1993.

Brown, R. E. and J. B. Pyers. "Putting teeth into the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Public Services." *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 48 (May/June 1988): 735-742.

Butler, T. "Managing the Future: A Chief Constable's View." In *Core Issues in Policing: 2nd Edition.* eds. F. Leishman, B. Loveday & S. Savage, S. Harlow, England: Pearson Education, 2000: 313.

Carter, D. "Politics and Community Policing. Variables of change in the political environment." *Public Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (1995): 6.

Carter, D. L. "Measuring Quality: The Scope of Community Policing." In *Quantifying Quality in Policing*, ed. L. T. Hoover. Washington: PERF, 1996: 73-94.

Carter, N., R. Klein and P. Day. *How Organisations Measure Success: The Use of Performance Indicators in Government.* London: Routledge, 1992.

Chatterton, M. R., P. Langmead-Jones and J. Radcliffe, *Use of Quality of Service Surveys. Police Research Series: Paper 23.* London: Home Office - Police Research Group, 1997.

Chung, L. H., P. T. Gibbons and H. P. Schock. "Performance Metrics, Parenting Style and Control: A study of MNC subsidiaries in four countries." In *Performance Measurement & Management Control: A Compendium of Research,* eds. M. J. Epstein and J. F. Manzoni. Oxford, U.K: Elsevier Science, 2002: 109 – 128.

Cohen, S. and R. Brand. *Total Quality Management in Government: A Practical guide for the Real World.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1993.

Coleman, T. *A Study of the Relationship between Strategic Human Resource Management in Canadian Police Services and the Evolution of Contemporary Policing.* Unpublished Paper. Regina, SK: University of Regina, 2002.

Common, R., N. Flynn and E. Mellon. *Managing Public Services: Competition and Decentralization.* Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1992.

Cordner, G. "Evaluating Tactical Patrol." In *Quantifying Quality in Policing,* ed. L. T. Hoover. Washington: PERF, 1996: 185-206.

Corriera, M. E. *Citizen Involvement: How Community Factors Affect Progressive Policing.* Washington: PERF, 2000.

Cortes, E. *Reweaving the Fabric: The Iron Rule and the IAF Strategy for Dealing with Poverty through Power and Politics. Working Paper No. 56.* Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research, 1993.

Crime in the United States 1998: Uniform Crime Reports. Federal Bureau of Investigation. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice - Government Printing Office, 1999.

Daley, D. M. "Pay for Performance, Performance Appraisal, and Total Quality Management." *Productivity and Management Review,* Vol. 16, No. 1 (1992): 39.

Dantzker, M. L. *Police Organisation & Management: Yesterday, Today & Tomorrow.* Boston: Butterworth Heinemann, 1999.

Deming, W. E. *Out of Crisis.* Cambridge: MIT Center for Advanced Engineering Study, 1986.

Denhardt, R. B., J. Vinzant-Denhardt and M. P. Aristigueta. *Managing Human Behaviour in Public and Non Profit Organisations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2002.

Drucker, P. F. *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities and Practices.* New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

Duffee, D. E., R. Fluellen and T. Roscoe. "Constituency Building and Urban Community Policing." In *Measuring What Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Meetings*, ed. R. H. Langworthy. Washington: United States Department of Justice - National Institute of Justice, 1999: 91 – 199.

Duffee, D., D. McDowell, D. L. G. Mazerolle and S. D. Mastrofski. "Measurement & Analysis of Crime & Justice: An Introductory Essay." In *Measurement & Analysis of Crime and Justice: Criminal Justice 2000 – Volume 4,* ed. D. Duffee. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice - National Institute of Justice. NCJ182411, (July 2000): 1 – 31.

Fay, B. *Critical Social Science: Liberation and its limits.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987.

Fay, B. *Social Theory and Political Practice.* London: George Allen & Unwin Publishers, 1984.

Flynn, N. *Public Sector Management: Third Edition.* Toronto, ON: Prentice Hall/Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1997.

Friedman, W. and M. Clark. "Community Policing: What is the Community and What Can it Do?" In *Measuring What Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Meetings,* ed. R. H. Langworthy. Washington: United States Department of Justice - National Institute of Justice, 1999: 121 – 131.

Garrity, R. B. "Total Quality Management: An opportunity for high performance in federal organisations." *Public Administration Quarterly,* Vol. 16, No. 4 (1993): 430.

Gates, S. *Aligning Strategic Performance Measures & Results: Report R-1261-99-RR.* Conference Board, October 1999.

Geller, W. A. and G. Swanger. *Managing Innovation in Policing: The Untapped Potential of the Middle Manager.* Washington: PERF, 1995.

George, S. and A. Weimerskirch. *Total Quality Management: Strategies & techniques proven at today's most successful companies: 2nd Edition.* Toronto: John Wiley & Sons, 1998.

Goldstein, H. *"The New Policing: Confronting Complexity."* Presented at Conference on Community Policing. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice - National Institute of Justice (24 August 1993): 12.

Gore, A. *Creating a government that works better and Costs Less: A Report of the National Performance Review.* New York: London House, 1993.

Griffiths, C. T., B. Whitelaw and R. Parent. *Canadian Police Work.* Scarborough: IPT Nelson, 1999: 134.

Gunther, J. and F. Hawkins. eds. *Total Quality Management in Human Service Organisations.* New York: Springer, 1996.

Hammer, M., and J. Champy. *Re-engineering the Corporation: A Manifesto for Business Revolution.* New York: Harper Collins, 2001.

Harris, J. *Maine's Guide to Performance Measurement.* Bureaux of the Budget and State Planning Office. (May, 1999) [online] Available: http://ditl.state.va.us/dpb/pm/perfmeas/.htm. [February, 2006]

Hatry, H. P. "The status of productivity measurement in the public sector." *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 38 (January – February 1978): 28 - 33.

Hatry, H. P. *Performance Measurement: Getting Results.* Washington: The Urban Institute Press, 1999.

Hoover, L. T. "Translating Total Quality Management from the Private Sector to Policing." In *Quantifying Quality in Policing,* ed. L. T. Hoover. Washington: PERF, 1996: 1-22.

Kaydos, W. *Operational Performance Measurement: Increasing Total Productivity.* Washington: St. Lucie Press, 1999.

Keehley, P. "Does TQM Spell: 'Time to Quit Merit'?" *Public Productivity & Management Review*, Vol. 16, No. 4 (1993): 387.

Kelling, G. L. "Order Maintenance, the Quality of Urban Life & the Police: A line of Argument." In *Police Leadership in America: Crisis and Opportunities,* ed. W. A. Geller. Chicago: American Bar Foundation & Praeger Publishers, 1985: 296-308.

Kelling, G. L. "Defining the Bottom Line in Policing: Organizational Philosophy and Accountability." In *Quantifying Quality in Policing*, ed. L.T. Hoover. Washington: PERF, 1996: 23-26.

Kelling, G. L. *"Broken Windows" and Police Discretion.* Washington: U.S. Department of Justice – National Institute of Justice, (October 1999).

Kelling, G. L. and M. H. Moore. *"The Evolving Strategy of Policing." Perspectives on Policing. No. 4.* Washington: National Institute of Justice & Harvard University. Vol. 1, No. 16 (1997).

Kelling, G. L., T Pate, D. Dieckman and C. E. Brown. *The Kansas City Preventative Patrol Experiment: A Summary Report.* Washington: Police Foundation, 1974.

Kennedy, D. M. and M. H. Moore. "Underwriting the Risky Investment in Community Policing: What Social Science Should be doing to Evaluate Community Policing." In *Critical Issues in Policing: Contemporary Readings. Third Edition,*

eds. R. G. Dunham and G. P. Alpert. Prospect Heights: Waveland, 1997: 469 – 488.

Kenney, D. J. "Developing the Capacity for Crime and Operations Analysis." In *Quantifying Quality in Policing,* ed. L. T. Hoover. Washington: PERF, 1996: 55-72.

Kernaghan, K., B. Marson and S. Borins. *The New Public Organisation.* Toronto: IPAC, 2000.

Kettl, D. F. *Reinventing Government: A Fifth Year Report Card.* Centre for Public Management. Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1998.

Kinlaw, D.C. *Continuous Improvement & Measurement for Total Quality: A team based approach.* Homewood, IL: Pfieffer, 1992.

Klockars, C. "Some Really Cheap Ways of Measuring What Really Matters." In *Measuring What Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Meetings,* ed. R. H. Langworthy. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice - National Institute of Justice, 1999: 195 – 214.

Knowling, Jr., R. E. "Leading with Vision, Strategy & Values." In *Leading for Innovation and Organizing for Results,* eds. F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, and I. Somerville. New York: Jossey Bass, 2002: 177 – 183.

Langworthy, R. H. "What Matters Routinely?" In *Measuring What Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Institute Meetings*, ed. R. H. Langworthy. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice - National Institute of Justice, 1999: 215 – 224.

Lawler III, E. E. *The Ultimate Advantage: Creating the High Involvement Organisation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.

Leishman, F., Loveday, B. and Savage. S.P. "Introduction: Core Issues in Policing Revisited." In *Core Issues in Policing: 2nd Edition.* eds. F. Leishman, B. Loveday and S. Savage. Harlow: England, Pearson Education: 2000.

Lovelock, C. H., G. Lewin, G. S. Day and J. E. G. Bateson. *Marketing Public Transit.* New York: Praeger, 1987.

Lipsky, M. *Street Level Bureaucracy.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1980.

Lynch, R. C. and K. F. Cross. *Measure Up! How to Measure Corporate Performance: 2nd Edition.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1995.

MacDonald, J. *But we are different: Quality for the Service Sector.* Didcot, UK: Management Books, 1994.

Maguire, E.R. & Uchida, C.D. "Measurement & Explanation in the Comparative Study of American Police Organizations." In *Measurement & Analysis of Crime and Justice. Volume 4.* Washington: U.S. Department of Justice - National Institute of Justice. Office of Justice Programs: 2000: 491-557.

Martin, L. L. *Total Quality Management in Human Service Organisations.* London, UK: Sage, 1993.

Mastrofski, S.D. "Measuring Police Performance in Public Encounters." In *Quantifying Quality in Policing,* ed. L. T. Hoover. Washington: PERF, 1996: 207-241.

Mendoza, C. and S. Saulpic. "Strategic Management & Management Control: Designing a new theoretical framework." In *Performance Measurement & Management Control: A Compendium of Research*, eds. M. J. Epstein and J. F. Manzoni. Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science, 2002: 131 – 158.

Moore, M.H. *Recognising value in policing: The challenge of measuring police performance.* Washington: PERF. 2002.

Moore, M. H. and M. Poethig. "The Police as an Agency of Municipal Government: Implications for Measuring Police Effectiveness." In *Measuring What Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Institute Meetings,* ed. R. H. Langworthy. Washington: National Institute of Justice, 1999: 151 – 167.

Moore, M. H. and D. W. Stephens. *Beyond Command and Control: The Strategic Management of Police Departments.* Washington: PERF, 1991.

Moore, M., D. Thacher, A. Dodge and T. Moore. *Recognizing Value in Policing: The Challenge of Measuring Police Performance.* Washington: PERF, 2002.

Moore, M. H. and R. C. Trojanowicz. *Corporate Strategies for Policing. Perspectives on Policing, No. 6.* Washington: Harvard University & National Institute of Justice, 1988.

Morgan, C. and S. Murgatroyd. *Total Quality Management in the Public Sector.* Bristol, UK: Open University Press, 1994.

Morley, E., S. P. Bryant and H. P. Hatry. *Comparative Performance Measurement.* Washington: The Urban Institute Press, 2001.

Morris, P. and K. Heal. *Crime Control and the Police: A Review of Research.* London: Home Office, Research Study 67, 1981.

Murphy, C. *Contemporary Models of Urban Policing Shaping the Future.* Ontario: Ministry of the Solicitor General, 1991: 2.

Nancoo, S. E. "The Future: Trends & Issues in Community Policing." In *Community Policing in Canada,* eds. J. Chacko and S. E. Nancoo. Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press, 1993: 347-362.

Nyhan, R. C. and H. A. Marlowe, Jr. "Performance Measurement in the Public Sector: Challenges & Opportunities." *Public Productivity and Management Review.* Vol. 18. No. 4, 1995: 333 – 348.

Osborne, D. and T. Gaebler. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector.* Don Mills, ON: Addison-Wesley, 1992.

Peak, K. J. and R. W. Glensor. *Community Policing & Problem Solving: Strategies & Practices.* Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1999.

Percey, S. "Response Time & Citizen Evaluation of the Police." *Journal of Police Science and Administration,* Vol. 8 (1980): 75-86.

Peters, T. J. and R. H. Waterman Jr. *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best run companies.* New York: Harper & Row, 1982.

Poister, T. H. and G. T. Henry. "Citizen Ratings of public and private service quality: a comparative perspective." *Public Administration Review,* Vol. 54, No. 2 (March-April 1994): 155-160.

Police Resources in Canada, 2004. Ottawa: Statistics Canada – Canadian Centre for Statistics, 2004.

Police Resources in Canada, 2005. Ottawa: Statistics Canada – Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2005: 11.

Porter, M. E. "What is Strategy?" *Harvard Business Review.* HBR ON – Point No 4134 (November-December, 1996).

Posner, B. G. and L. R. Rothstein. "Re-inventing the Business of Government: An interview with Change Catalyst David Osborne." *Harvard Business Review,* (May-June 1994).

Reiss, A.J., Jr. *The Police & the Public.* New Haven. CT: Yale University Press, 1971.

Reiss, A.J. Jr. "Police Organisation in the Twentieth Century" In *Modern Policing,* eds. M. Tonry and N. Morris. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Rohm, H. (December, 1996). *Public Sector Performance Management in the USA. The Foundation for Performance Measurement.* [online] Available: http://www.fpm.com/script/UK/Dec96/961206.htm. [2006, January].

Schachter, H. L. *Reinventing Government or Reinventing Ourselves.* Albany, NY: State University of NY Press, 1997.

Scharitzer, D. and C. Korunka. "New Public Management. Evaluating the success of total quality management and change management interventions in public services from the employees and customer's perspectives." *Total Quality Management.* Vol. 11. No. 7, 2000: 941.

Self, P. *Econocrats and the Policy Process.* London: Macmillan, 1975.

Sheingold, S. A. "Constituent Expectations of the Police & Police Expectations of the Constituents." In *Measuring What Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Institute Meetings*, ed. R. H. Langworthy. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice - National Institute of Justice, 1999: 183-192.

Skogan, W. G. "Community Organisations and Crime, Crime and Justice: A Review of Research" *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research. V.10,* ed. M. Tonry and N. Morris. Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1988.

Skogan, W. G. *Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in America's Neighbourhoods.* New York: The Free Press, 1990.

Skogan, W. G. "Measuring What Matters: Crime, Disorder & Fear." In *Measuring What Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Institute Meetings*, ed. R. H. Langworthy. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice - National Institute of Justice, 1999: 37 – 43.

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

Sower, C. *Community Involvement.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press. 1957.

Stephens, D. W. "Community Problem – Oriented Policing: Measuring Impacts." In *Quantifying Quality in Policing,* ed. L. T. Hoover. Washington: PERF, 1996: 95-129.

Stivers, B., T. Covin, W. Hall and S. Smalt. "How Non-Financial Performance Measures are used." *Management Accounting* (February 1998): 45-49.

Swanson, C. R., L. Territo and R. W. Taylor. *Police Administration – Structures, Processes, and Behaviour.* Toronto: Prentice Hall, 1998.

Swiss, J. E. *"Adapting Total Quality Management (TQM) to Government." Public Administration Review*, Vol. 52, No. 4 (July-August 1992): 356-362.

Taylor, R.B. "The Incivilities Thesis: Theory Measurement, & Policy." In *Measuring What Matters: Proceedings from the Policing Research Institute Meetings,* ed. R. H. Langworthy. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice - National Institute of Justice, 1999: 65 – 88.

Trojanowicz, R. and B. Bucqueroux. *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective.* Cincinnati: Anderson, 1990.

Trojanowicz, R. and B. Bucqueroux. *Community Policing: How to Get Started.* Cincinnati: Anderson, 1994.

Vinzant, J.C. and D.H. Vinzant. "Strategic Management Spin-offs of the Deming Approach." *Journal of Management History*, Bradford, Vol. 5, No. 8 (1999): 516.

Walker, S. *Sense & Nonsense about Crime.* Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1989.

Warren, R. L. *Social Change and Human Purpose: Toward Understanding and Action.* Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

Weingart, S., F. Hartmann and D. Osborne. *Case Studies of Community Anti-Drug Efforts. Research in Brief.* Washington: U.S. Department of Justice - National Institute of Justice. NCJ149316, 1994.

What Works: Management Applications of Performance Measurement in Local Government. Washington: ICMA (International City/County Management Association) Centre for Performance Measurement, 2001.

Wholey, J. S. and H. P. Hatry. "The Case for Performance Monitoring." *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 52, No. 6 (1992): 604-610.

Wisniewski, M. and A. Dickson. *Hello, hello, hello! What's going on here then? Measuring Performance in Dumfries & Galloway Constabulary. Research Paper No. 2001/5. Management Science: Theory, Method and Practice.* Glasgow, Scotland: Strathclyde Business School, 2001.

Zhao, J. *Why Police Organisations Change: A Study of Community-Oriented Policing.* Washington: PERF, 1996.

Appendix A:

Survey

A STUDY OF ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS IN CANADIAN POLICE ORGANISATIONS

PURPOSE

This anonymous questionnaire, which is divided into two Parts, is **designed to be completed by an executive member** of your police organisation to assist in the identification of the performance measurement and performance management systems of your police organisation. It is particularly important to the researcher that if a chief of police is unable to complete the entire survey that **at least Part I is completed by a chief of police or a police executive. Another representative of your organisation can then complete Part II of the survey**.

In recognition of numerous demands on your time, the questionnaire has been designed so that most responses **only require a tick or a circle and thus should only take approx 30 minutes to complete.**

Note: It may be that you do not have, or do not know, the information requested in any particular Question. If that is so, please respond as "Don't Know". That response, under these circumstances, is also useful to the researcher.

I am confident that the outcome of this study **will be helpful to police organisations when evaluating and optimizing or even validating their systems for the measurement and management of organisational performance. Your assistance and cooperation is sincerely appreciated. If you would like a report of the completed study, please contact me at: colemant@uregina.ca.**

I acknowledge the numerous demands on your time, however if you could **return this to me in 30 days or less,** I would be very grateful. I have enclosed a stamped and addressed envelope for your convenience.

Please Note: ***This project was approved by the Research Ethics Board, University of Regina. If you have any questions or concerns about your rights or treatment as a subject of this study, please contact the Chair of the Research Ethics Board at 306-585-4775 or by email at: research.ethics@uregina.ca. Completion of this questionnaire, which is voluntary, implies your consent to participate in this study. You may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.***

Upon completion, please mail to:

Terry G. Coleman

T. G. Coleman

Survey Identification # _____

A STUDY OF ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT/MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

PART I

The researcher would appreciate if the chief of police or a deputy chief of police would complete Part I on behalf of your police organisation.

Q 1. From my perspective as a **police executive,** I understand "community-policing" to be: *(Please briefly describe what "community - policing" means to you.)*

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q 2. From my perspective as a **police executive,** "community-policing" is: *(Please circle one.)*

a. a proactive policing program.
b. a policing program.
c. a reactive policing program.
d. an organisational strategy.
e. a vision.
f. a philosophy.
g. none of the above.
h. don't know.
i. other_____
(Please describe)

Q 3. The "bottom line" in private business can be considered as the profit/loss of the business or the return on a shareholder's investment. From your perspective as a **police executive,** what is the **"bottom line" of policing**?

_____

_____

_____

Several Questions in this Survey concern "disorder." For the purpose of this Study, "disorder" includes, but is not necessarily limited to, illegal dumping, traffic issues, abandoned buildings, loitering youth, vandalism and graffiti, abandoned cars, garbage, public drug use, and broken street lights. "Disorder" violates widely shared norms about public behavior, such as how people should behave in relation to their neighbors or while passing through the community.

	Q 4. *From your perspective as a* ***police*** *executive, which of the following indicators of performance (performance indicators) should a police organisation measure as a* ***means of determining how well the police organisation is serving the community.*** ***In Column 1, please check all that apply*** ***In Column 2, please rank in order of importance from your perspective as a police leader***	**COLUMN 1** **Tick all that apply** √	**COLUMN 2** ***Of those you have selected in Column 1,*** **from your perspective as a police leader, please rank in order of importance with 1 as the most important**
a.	the number of incidents of ***disorder*** **reported** to your police organisation		
b.	the number of criminal offences **reported** to your police organisation		
c.	the amount of traffic enforcement generated		
d.	the number of arrests made in total		
e.	the number of charges laid in total		
f.	the clearance rate of reported "crimes"		
g.	the number of calls-for-service received in total		
h.	the number of presentations made to schools		
i.	the number of presentations made to the community by your police officers		
j.	the number of complaints made by the public about police officer misconduct		
k.	the time taken to respond to 9-1-1 calls-for-service		
l.	the time taken to respond to calls-for-service that are not 9-1-1 calls		
m.	the number of criminal offences **not reported** to police		
n.	the number of incidents of ***disorder*** **not reported** to police		
o.	the case load per police officer		
p.	the population per police officer		
q.	the number of problem-solving projects initiated by police officers		
r.	the number of arrests made per police officer		
s.	the number of calls-for-service per police officer		
t.	the crime rate per "x" number of population		
u.	the number of incidents of inappropriate "use of force" by your police officers		
v.	other _____ _____ _____ *(Please describe)*		

Several questions in this survey are about "strategic management" and "operational management". Strategic policing, through "strategic management", takes the "big picture" - the systems - perspective and provides the foundation for focused and successful operational management. "Operational management" is what we have probably been the most familiar with. It is about our daily activities - the "tactics and programs" of our organisation that are derived from our strategy(s). This is where service delivery takes place.

Question *In your professional opinion as a **police executive,** when considering all factors and the public's expectations of your police organisation, **how important are the following when assessing how well you are policing your community;***	**don't know**	**not important**	**slightly important**	**important**	**very important**
Q **5.** the extent of the "fear of crime" in the community?					
Q **6.** the number of complaints made by the public about police conduct?					
Q **7.** the number of incidents of inappropriate "use of force" by your police officers?					
Q **8.** performance measurement data to assist the making of policy decisions?					
Q **9.** performance measurement data to assist the making of *strategic management decisions*.					
Q **10.** performance measurement data to assist the making of *operational management decisions* about the programs we deliver.					
Q **11.** the measurement and evaluation of **due process, equity and fairness** in the delivery of police services?					
Q **12.** the strength of the relationships between your police organisation and your community?					
Q **13.** the strength of community trust in and support of your police organisation?					
Q **14.** your organisation's capacity to implement and manage change?					
Q **15.** the application of innovation and creativity in your police organisation?					
Q **16.**teamwork in your police organisation?					
Q **17.** the time taken to respond to an emergency call-for-service?					
Q **18.** the time taken to respond to a non-emergency call-for- service?					
Q **19.** the community's perception of the visibility of your police officers in their community?					

Question (continued) *In your professional opinion **as a police executive,** when considering all factors and the public's expectations of your police organisation, **how important are the following when assessing how well you are policing your community;***	**don't know**	**not important**	**slightly important**	**important**	**very important**
Q **20.** the extent of co-operation, collaboration and consultation between your police organisation and the community?					
Q **21.** the satisfaction of the community with the service delivered by your police organisation?					
Q **22.** the decentralization of authority and decision-making in your police organisation?					
Q **23.** the extent to which participative leadership is the predominant style of your supervisors and managers?					
Q **24.** the measurement of the goals of your organisation as articulated in your mission statement?					
Q **25.** the cost per "complaint" [call-for-service] received?					
Q **26.** the number of proactive police officer and "citizen" contacts?					
Q **27.** the number of repeat calls-for-service for the same situation whether by place or person(s)?					
Q **28.** the extent of *disorder* in public places in your community?					
Q **29.** the crime rate per "x" number of population in your community?					
Q **30.** the amount of "sick time" taken by employees?					
Q **31.** the demographics of your community such as employment rate, income levels, education levels, gender, age, and family composition?					
Q **32.** consultation with your community(s) to identify what they consider as being the attributes of quality and valued service delivery of your police organisation?					
Q **33.** consultation with and input from your community(s) to determine the goals of your police organisation?					
Q **34.** the performance of your police organisation compared to another similar police organisation?					

Q	35. In my professional opinion as a **police executive**, the ***best indicator*** of the overall success of a police organisation is:	**Tick only one**
a.	a high rate of arrests made	
b.	a high rate of charges laid	
c.	a high clearance rate of reported crime	
d.	no public complaints about police officer misconduct	
d.	none of the above	
e.	don't know	
f.	other *(Please describe)* _____ _____	

Question In my professional opinion as a **police executive**		**don't know**	**agree strongly**	**agree**	**neither agree/disagree**	**disagree**	**disagree strongly**
Q 36	UCR Survey/Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics data are the **most important** data in determining how well a police organisation is performing						
Q 37	the time taken to respond to a "call-for-service" is a good measure of successful policing						
Q 38	the greatest value of measuring performance is to be able to demonstrate to the public, news media and governance authority how the police organisation is performing						

Q.39. In your professional opinion as a **police executive**, **which is more important**? *(Circle one)*

a. the timeliness of a police officer's response with respect to the time of attendance promised by the police? **OR**

b. the time taken by police officers, from the time the call is initially received, to respond to a call-for-service?

Thank you for completing Part I

PART II

SECTION A

Responses to Questions in Section A are for learning about your police organisation in order to establish a context for subsequent responses.

Q 40. My police organisation has: *(Please respond to **all that apply**)*

1. A Mission Statement. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___
2. A Vision Statement. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

If YES to one or both of the above, please provide the relevant information in Q 41 & Q 42 inclusive otherwise please go to Q 43.

Q 41. The Mission Statement of my police organisation is: *(Please insert below - to maintain anonymity you should remove any reference to the identity of your police organisation)*

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q 42. The Vision Statement of my police organisation is: *(Please insert below - to maintain anonymity you should remove any reference to the identity of your police organisation)*

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q 43. The organisational strategy of my police organisation is:
(Please identify)

_____

_____

	Question	Yes	No	Don't Know
Q 44.	My police organisation has a formal corporate plan/business plan.			
Q 45.	If **YES** to **Q44,** does the corporate plan/business plan include clearly identified measurable goals?			
Q 46.	If **YES** to **Q45,** does your police organisation measure the goals articulated in your corporate plan/business plan?			
Q 47.	My police organisation is a "community policing" organisation.			
Q 48.	If **YES** to **Q47**, is "community-policing" the **work of all police officers** in your police organisation? **OR**			
Q 49.	If **YES** to **Q47**, is "community-policing" the **work of specialized units** in your police organisation?			

****

SECTION B

Responses to the Questions in Section B are intended to identify the processes and tools your organisation uses with respect to the assessment of the performance of individual police officers

	Question	Yes	No	Don't Know
Q 50.	In my police organisation, the criteria for the performance measurement of individual police officers are directly developed from, and linked to, the organisational strategy			
Q 51.	In my police organisation, the training/development of personnel is directly linked to the organisational strategy			
Q 52.	My police organisation collects data to determine the relationship between the training and development delivered to our personnel and the resulting performance of our personnel			
Q 53.	My police organisation measures and tracks "sick time" of employees **for the purpose of assessing how well our police organisation is functioning**			

The following two Questions are about the "turnover rate" of your employees. In any organisation, employees resign, retire and are sometimes discharged. This necessitates the hiring of replacement employees. The rate at which employees leave your organisation, thus necessitating replacement, is the "turnover rate".

	Question	Yes	No	Don't Know
Q 54.	My police organisation measures and tracks the "turnover" rate of employees **for the purpose of assessing how well our police organisation is functioning**			
Q 55.	My police organisation calculates the financial cost of the "turnover" of police officers			

Question	don't know	agree strongly	agree	neither agree/disagree	disagree	disagree strongly
Q **56.** Do you agree with the following statement? ***"My police organisation measures and rewards the performance of teams/work groups rather than the performance of individual police officers in the teams or workgroups."***						

Q **57.** The salary/wages of police officers in my police organisation are:		Yes	No	Don't Know
a.	**job based** (i.e., a police officer is paid based on the job/position he/she holds).			
b	**performance based** (i.e., a police officer is paid based on the quality of work/ performance).			
c.	**skill/knowledge based** (i.e., a police officer is paid based on skills acquired, and/or education completed).			
d	a combination of a & b.			
e.	a combination of a & c			
f.	a combination of b & c			
f.	a combination of a, b, & c			
g.	other _____ *(Please describe)*			

Q **58.** My police organisation measures/assesses the **total activity of each "patrol" officer** by measuring:		Tick all that apply
a.	the number of arrests made by the police officer	
b.	the number of charges laid by the police officer	
c.	the number of proactive contacts made by the police officer with people in the community	
d	the amount of traffic enforcement generated by the police officer	
e.	the number of files concluded by the police officer	
f.	the number of "human sources" cultivated by the police officer	
g	the number of presentations made to the community by the officer	
h	the number of formal compliments received by the officer from the community	
i.	the number of formal public complaints received about the officer from the community	
j.	the number of incidents of inappropriate "use of force" by the officer	
k	none of the above	
l.	other *(Please describe)*_____ _____	

SECTION C

The Questions in Section C are intended to determine the processes and tools you use to determine the performance of your police organisation [organisational performance].

Question		Yes	No	Don't Know
Q 59.	My police organisation employs an evaluation specialist(s) who conducts evaluations of the services/programs we deliver			
Q 60.	If **YES** to **Q59**, is that person(s) a police officer?			
Q 61.	My police organisation employs a *tactical* analyst(s)			
Q 62.	If **YES** to **Q61,** is your *tactical* analyst(s) a police officer(s)?			
Q 63.	My police organisation employs a *strategic* analyst(s)			
Q 64.	If **YES** to **Q63**, is your *strategic* analyst(s) a police officer?			
Q 65.	My police organisation employs a person(s) whose primary job is to measure and assess the performance of our police organisation			
Q 66.	If **YES** to **Q65** is that person(s) a police officer(s)			

Q 67. If **YES** to **Q65**, to what position does this work area **directly** report?		**Tick only one**
a.	chief	
b.	deputy chief	
c.	superintendent	
d	inspector	
e.	staff sergeant	
f.	sergeant	
g.	don't know	
h.	other *(Please describe*_____	

Q 68. My police organisation conducts formal employee satisfaction surveys		**Tick only one**
a.	once per year	
b.	twice per year	
c.	every two years	
d.	doesn't conduct employee satisfaction surveys	
e.	don't know	
f.	other *(Please describe)* _____	

Question		Yes	No	Don't Know
Q 69.	My police organisation uses a periodic customer/client (community) satisfaction survey(s) to assist with measurement of organisational performance			
Q 70.	If **YES** to **Q69,** the survey(s) of the community are scientific and use statistically sound sampling.			

Q 71. If **YES** to **Q69,** the frequency of the survey is:		**Tick only one**
a	every two years	
b	annually	
c.	twice per year	
d	monthly	
e.	weekly	
f.	ongoing (i.e. daily)	
g.	don't know	
h	other *(Please describe)*_____	

Q 72. My police service uses **organisational performance data** for the **primary** purpose of:		**Tick only one**
a.	learning information such as the number of arrests made, the number of cases cleared and the amount of traffic enforcement	
b	determining the degree of success of a police program(s)	
c.	assisting in determining which new program(s)/service(s) to deliver	
d	assisting in determining which program(s)/service(s) to discontinue	
e.	determining how safe the community is	
f.	providing information to the public	
g.	providing information to the governance authority of my police organisation	
h	determining the degree of community satisfaction with my police service	
i.	none of the above	
j.	don't know	
k.	other *(Please describe)* _____	

Q	73. *Which of the following indicators of performance* (performance indicators) does your police organisation use to measure how well your organisation is performing overall? ***In Column 1, please tick all that apply*** ***In Column 2, please rank those you have selected in order of importance from your perspective as a police leader***	**COLUMN 1** **Tick all that apply** √	**COLUMN 2** ***From your perspective as a police leader,* starting with 1 as the most important, rank in order of importance those you have selected in Column 1**
a.	the number of incidents of ***disorder* reported** to your police organisation. *Note: Please apply the definition of "disorder" found on Page 3 of this Survey*		
b.	the number of criminal offences **reported** to your police organisation		
c.	the amount of traffic enforcement generated by your police officers		
d.	the number of arrests made in total by your police officers		
e.	the number of charges laid in total by your police officers		
f.	the clearance rate of reported "crimes"		
g.	the number of calls-for-service received in total		
h.	the number of presentations made to schools by your police officers		
i.	the number of presentations made to the community by your police officers		
j.	the number of complaints made by the public about police officer misconduct		
k.	the time taken to respond to 9-1-1 calls-for-service		
l.	the time taken to respond to calls-for-service that are not 9-1-1 calls		
m.	the number of criminal offences **not reported** to police		
n.	the number of incidents of ***disorder* not reported** to police *Note: Please apply the definition of "disorder" found on Page 3 of this Survey*		
o.	the case load per police officer		
p.	the population per police officer		
q.	the number of problem-solving projects initiated by police officers		
r.	the number of arrests made per police officer		
s.	the number of calls-for-service per police officer		
t.	the crime rate per "x" number of population in our community		
u.	the number of incidents of inappropriate "use of force" by your police officers		
v.	other *(Please describe* _____		

Questions 74 and 75 are about the "uncommitted" time of "patrol" officers.

"Uncommitted" time is the total time of a "patrol" officer's shift, less the time taken responding to calls-for-service, follow-up investigations, dealing with "on view complaints", administrative activities and taking breaks such as lunch. It is theoretically, at least, the time a "patrol" officer should have available to establish relationships with the community and work directly with community members to solve and/or identify neighborhood crime and disorder problems and thus improve service delivery.

Question		Yes	No	Don't Know
Q 74.	My police organisation calculates/keeps track of *"uncommitted time"*			
Q 75.	If **YES** to **Q74,** does your police organisation routinely use data with respect to *"uncommitted time"* to make decisions about the deployment of resources?			

Question **My police organisation:**		Yes	No	Don't Know
Q 76.	conducts periodic surveys of the community to determine the extent of **actual** "crime and disorder" and compares the results to the "crime and the disorder" **that has been reported** to my police organisation			
Q 77.	routinely uses the performance measurement data we collect to make *strategic management decisions* ***[Refer to definition of strategic management on Page 4]***			
Q 78.	routinely uses the performance measurement data we collect to make *operational management decisions* about the programs we deliver ***[Refer to definition of operational management on Page 4]***			
Q 79.	routinely uses the performance measurement data we collect to assist in the making of policy decisions			
Q 80.	conducts *Activity Based Costing* to determine how well the organisation is performing			
Q 81.	conducts periodic victimization surveys of our community			
Q 82.	uses data from victimization surveys of our community conducted by Statistics Canada			
Q 83.	measures our organisation's capacity to implement and manage change			
Q 84.	measures the extent we are innovative and creative in our police organisation			
Q 85.	measures the extent of teamwork in our police organisation			
Q 86.	measures the extent of the decentralization of authority and decision making in our police organisation			
Q 87.	measures the time taken to respond to a **non-emergency** call-for- service			
Q 88.	measures the time taken to respond to an **emergency** call-for- service			
Q 89.	measures the community's perception of the visibility of police officers in their community			
Q 90.	regularly provides reports with respect to performance data to the police board or equivalent			
Q 91.	regularly shares performance data with the public			
Q 92.	regularly shares performance data with the news media			
Q 93.	measures the goals of my organisation as articulated in our mission statement			
Q 94.	measures the extent to which participative leadership is the predominant style of our supervisors and managers			
Q 95.	calculates the cost per "complaint" [call-for-service] received			

Q 96.	measures the number of repeat calls-for-service for the same situation whether by place or person(s)			
Q 97.	compares the performance of our police organisation to other similar police organisations to determine how well we are performing			
Q 98.	measures and collects data that are **not used** for *strategic management* decisions			

Q 99. If **YES** to **Q98**, which collected information is not used for strategic management decisions and why is it collected? *(Briefly list the data and explain)*

Question My police organisation:		Yes	No	Don't Know
Q 100.	provides leaders and managers with specific training in how to use performance data to make decisions			
Q 101.	provides leaders and managers with formal training *in strategic planning and strategic management*			
Q 102.	conducts formal internal audits to determine compliance with policies and procedures			
Q 103.	routinely formally evaluates *reactive* programs we have implemented			
Q 104.	routinely formally evaluates *proactive* programs we have implemented			

Questions 105 to 109 inclusive are about the data collected and disseminated by the Canadian Center for Justice Statistics. This is the UCR Survey data your police organisation is obliged to collect and submit to the Canadian Center for Justice Statistics and is subsequently published by them in the Canadian Crime Statistics and Police Resources in Canada reports:

Question My police organisation:		Yes	No	Don't Know
Q 105.	**relies primarily** on the UCR Survey/Canadian Center for Justice Statistics data to determine how well it is policing the community			
Q 106.	**relies primarily** on the UCR Survey/Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics data to make *strategic management decisions*			
Q 107.	**relies primarily** on the UCR Survey/Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics data to make *operational management decisions*			
Q 108.	when formally assessing the performance of my organisation, records and **uses data other than the UCR Survey data required by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics**			

Q 109. If **YES** to **Q108**, what **other data** do you record and use? *(Please briefly list)*

Question		Yes	No	Don't Know
Q 110.	Are you satisfied your policies and procedures are congruent with your organisational strategy?			
Q 111.	When formally assessing your organisational performance, do you measure the extent of community trust and support for your police organisation?			
Q 112.	Do you have a performance measurement system to determine how well you are meeting the needs of your community?			

The following Question is about the "due process, equity and fairness" of the service delivered to your community by your police organisation:

Question	Yes	No	Don't Know
Q 113. In assessing the success of my police organisation in meeting community needs, my police organisation **formally measures the extent to which services are delivered with "due process, equity and fairness"**			

Q **114.** If **YES** to **Q113,** how do you **formally measure** the *"due process, equity and fairness"* of your service delivery? *(Please briefly describe)*

_____

_____

_____

Question	Yes	No	Don't Know
Q 115. My police organisation formally measures/assesses the "fear of crime" in our community(s)?			

Q	116. If **YES** to **Q115,** how does your organisation periodically measure the "fear of crime" in your community:	Tick all that apply
a.	in general?	
b.	with respect to specific categories of offences?	
c.	with respect to the time of day?	
d.	with respect to the age of the person/group?	
e.	with respect to the gender of the person/group?	
f.	none of the above	
g.	other *(Please describe)* _____ _____ _____	

	Question	Yes	No	Don't Know
Q 117.	For the purpose of making strategic management decisions, does your police organisation formally compare the performance of your organisation with the performance of another police organisation(s) to determine how well your organisation is performing?			
Q 118.	When formally assessing your organisational performance in comparison to other police organisations, does your organisation formally consider, and factor in, the demographics of your community such as employment rate, income levels, education levels, gender, age, and family composition?			
Q 119.	When formally assessing your organisational performance, does your police organisation measure the strength of your organisation's relationship(s) with your community(s)?			

	Question *Please tick one*	none	some	much	don't know	not applicable
Q 120.	To what extent does your police organisation consult with your community(s) to determine **the goals of your police organisation?**					
Q 121.	To what extent does your mission statement reflect the goals as shared with you by the community(s)?					
Q 122.	To what extent does your police organisation consult with your community(s) to identify **what the community considers as being the attributes of quality and valued service delivery of your police organisation?**					

Q	**123.** If **YES** to **Q122**, what processes does your organisation use to involve the community in identifying the criteria you then use to determine whether the services you deliver are of quality and value?	**Tick all that apply**
a.	focus groups?	
b.	community surveys?	
c.	town hall meetings?	
e.	don't know	
f.	none of the above	
g.	other *(Please describe)*_____ _____ _____	

SECTION D

NOTE: Completion of all, or part, of the following information about the person completing this survey and the respondent's organisation is optional, but would be of assistance to the researcher in identifying any differences, or similarities, with respect to the police organisations represented in this study.

Q 124. **Part I** was completed by the: *(Please circle **one**)*

a. chief of police.
b. other.

_____

(Please describe)

Q 125. **Part II** was completed by the: *(Please circle **one**)*

a. chief of police
b. other.

_____

(Please describe)

Q 126. The size of my police organisation is: *(Please circle **one**)*

a. under 50 police officers.
b. 51 – 100 police officers.
c. 101 – 300 police officers.
d. 301 – 500 police officers.
e. 501 – 1,000 police officers.
f. 1,001 – 3,000 police officers.
g. 3,001 + police officers.

Q 127. The population of the community policed by my police organisation is:

*(Please circle **one**)*

a. <5,000
b. 5,000 - 14,999
c. 15,000 – 49,999
d. 50,000 – 99,999
e. 100,000+

A response to Question 128 would assist the researcher in collating data, however please do not respond if you feel that doing so would compromise your desire for anonymity.

Q 128. My police organisation is in the province of _____

Thank You

Your assistance is very much appreciated.

I am confident the results of this Study
will be of value to you
and, therefore, invite you
to contact me at
phone: (306) 692-0095
or
fax: (306) 694-7654
or
e-mail: colemant@uregina.ca

if you would like any information or clarification about this research.

Appendix B:

Ethical Clearance

UNIVERSITY OF REGINA

OFFICE OF RESEARCH SERVICES

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 10, 2005

TO: Terry G. Coleman

FROM: J. Roy
Chair, Research Ethics Board

Re: **A Study of Organizational Performance Measurement & Performance Management in Canadian Police Organizations (94S0405)**

Please be advised that the University of Regina Research Ethics Board has reviewed your proposal and found it to be:

☑ 1. ACCEPTABLE AS SUBMITTED. Only applicants with this designation have ethical approval to proceed with their research as described in their applications. The *Tri-Council Policy Statement on Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* requires the researcher to send the Chair of the REB annual reports and notice of project conclusion for research lasting more than one year (Section 1F). **ETHICAL CLEARANCE MUST BE RENEWED BY SUBMITTING A BRIEF STATUS REPORT EVERY TWELVE MONTHS.** Clearance will be revoked unless a satisfactory status report is received.

☐ 2. ACCEPTABLE SUBJECT TO CHANGES AND PRECAUTIONS (SEE ATTACHED). Changes must be submitted to the REB and subsequently approved prior to beginning research. Please address the concerns raised by the reviewer(s) by means of a supplementary memo to the Chair of the REB. Do not submit a new application. Please provide the supplementary memorandum**, or contact the REB concerning the progress of the project, before **August 10, 2005** in order to keep your file active. Once changes are deemed acceptable, approval will be granted.

☐ 3. UNACCEPTABLE AS SUBMITTED. Please contact the Chair of the REB for advice on how the project proposal might be revised.

Dr. Joan Roy

c. K. Leyton-Brown, History, supervisor

JR/r/ethics2.dot

** supplementary memorandum should be forwarded to the Chair of the Research Ethics Board at the Office of Research Services (AH 505) or by e-mail to research.ethics@uregina.ca