U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
National Institute of Justice

National Institute of Justice
Research Report

Evaluating Patrol Officer Performance Under Community Policing

The Houston Experience

About the National Institute of Justice

The National Institute of Justice, a component of the Office of Justice Programs, is the research and development agency of the U.S. Department of Justice. NIJ was established to prevent and reduce crime and to improve the criminal justice system. Specific mandates established by Congress in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, and the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 direct the National Institute of Justice to:

- *Sponsor special projects and research and development programs* that will improve and strengthen the criminal justice system and reduce or prevent crime.
- *Conduct national demonstration projects* that employ innovative or promising approaches for improving criminal justice.
- *Develop new technologies* to fight crime and improve criminal justice.
- *Evaluate the effectiveness of criminal justice programs* and identify programs that promise to be successful if continued or repeated.
- *Recommend actions* that can be taken by Federal, State, and local governments as well as private organizations to improve criminal justice.
- *Carry out research on criminal behavior.*
- *Develop new methods of crime prevention* and reduction of crime and delinquency.

The National Institute of Justice has a long history of accomplishments, including the following:

- Basic research on career criminals that led to the development of special police and prosecutor units to deal with repeat offenders.
- Research that confirmed the link between drugs and crime.
- The research and development program that resulted in the creation of police body armor that has meant the difference between life and death to hundreds of police officers.
- Pioneering scientific advances such as the research and development of DNA analysis to positively identify suspects and eliminate the innocent from suspicion.
- The evaluation of innovative justice programs to determine what works, including drug enforcement, community policing, community anti-drug initiatives, prosecution of complex drug cases, drug testing throughout the criminal justice system, and user accountability programs.
- Creation of a corrections information-sharing system that enables State and local officials to exchange more efficient and cost-effective concepts and techniques for planning, financing, and constructing new prisons and jails.
- Operation of the world's largest criminal justice information clearinghouse, a resource used by State and local officials across the Nation and by criminal justice agencies in foreign countries.

The Institute Director, who is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, establishes the Institute's objectives, guided by the priorities of the Office of Justice Programs, the Department of Justice, and the needs of the criminal justice field. The Institute actively solicits the views of criminal justice professionals to identify their most critical problems. Dedicated to the priorities of Federal, State, and local criminal justice agencies, research and development at the National Institute of Justice continues to search for answers to what works and why in the Nation's war on drugs and crime.

Evaluating Patrol Officer Performance Under Community Policing

The Houston Experience

Mary Ann Wycoff
Timothy N. Oettmeier, Ph.D.

A Final Summary Report Presented to the National Institute of Justice
February 1994

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs

National Institute of Justice
Craig Uchida
Acting Director
Office of Criminal Justice Research

Lois Mock
Project Monitor

Mary Ann Wycoff is a project director of the Police Foundation. Timothy N. Oettmeier is acting director of the Police Training Academy in Houston, Texas.

This project was supported by grant number 87–IJ–CX0055, awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

NCJ 142462

Evaluating Patrol Officer Performance Under Community Policing: The Houston Experience

Creating a valid and effective means of measuring performance in the workplace is a continuing challenge in organizational life,[1] and it is not a new issue to policing. Recent interest in community and problem-oriented policing simply has refocused attention on longstanding concerns about performance analysis. In 1972, for example, a report from the Dallas Police Department stated:

> In the past, performance evaluation in the Police Department has been a largely meaningless bi-annual exercise in numerically grading employees with little thought to the true purpose of performance evaluation.[2]

Since then, Dallas has substantially changed its own employee performance evaluation process, but this same statement could be made in 1993 by a great many police agencies. This is not because the need for better evaluations has gone unrecognized. In fact, good performance evaluations are difficult to create. The process is time-consuming, expensive, and potentially divisive, especially for an occupation as broad as policing for which a performance evaluation may require establishing priorities within the patrol officer's multifaceted role. Further, the design of a dynamic evaluation process may be an unending task given the role shifts that accompany the changing needs of a society and the changing ability of a profession to meet those needs. Given the magnitude of the challenge, it is not remarkable that many police agencies have relied for years on outdated and inadequate performance evaluation processes.

This report describes a process of evaluating the performance of first line patrol officers created by a department that was attempting to develop a community-oriented style of policing. Evaluation of the project found that personnel performance measurement can enhance other organizational efforts to implement a new philosophy of policing.

The project developed and tested a new personnel performance evaluation process designed to support the philosophy of Neighborhood Oriented Policing (NOP) in Houston. Development and evaluation of the performance measurement process were supported by a grant from the National Institute of Justice in recognition of the broad interest in this topic among departments that are developing community-oriented approaches to policing.

The purpose of the project was to develop a model of performance evaluation that other departments could consider when designing their own performance measurement methods. The evaluation of it would determine whether performance measurement was, in fact, a means for supporting the reorientation of a police organization to a new style of policing. The evaluation sought to determine whether the department's new performance assessment process effectively communicated and legitimized the organization's management philosophy as expressed by the redefinition of roles, responsibilities, and relationships between and among patrol officers and supervisors (sergeants).

Highlights of Findings

Police officers who were evaluated under the new performance measurement process had positive attitudes toward foot patrol and were satisfied with the performance evaluation process and the recognition they received for their work. Moreover, they reported having initiated problem-solving activities and having discussed area problems with other department personnel more frequently than did officers in a comparison group who were evaluated with the department's established evaluation process.

They generally assigned a lower priority to traditional patrol functions under their current working conditions than did the comparison officers.

A telephone survey of burglary victims indicated that citizens served by officers evaluated in the new way were more likely to recall the names of the responding officers than were citizens served by officers evaluated in the traditional way. Moreover, officers evaluated with the new process were more likely to

give victims advice about getting help with their problems. These findings are discussed in more detail in the concluding pages of this report.

Purposes of Employee Performance Measurement

What is measured and how it is measured should depend on the reasons for collecting the data. One analysis[3] identified three principal reasons for measuring employee performance:

- Administration. To help managers make decisions about promotion, demotion, reward, discipline, training needs, salary, job assignment, retention, and termination.
- Guidance and counseling. To help supervisors give feedback to subordinates and assist them in career planning and preparation, and to improve employee motivation.
- Research. To validate selection and screening tests and training evaluations and to assess the effectiveness of interventions designed to improve individual performance.

To these three the Houston Police Department added three more:

- Socialization. To convey expectations to personnel about both the content and the style of their performance and to reinforce other means of organizational communication about the mission and the values of the department.
- Documentation. To record the types of problems and situations officers are addressing in their neighborhoods and the approaches they take to them. Such documentation provides for data-based analysis of the types of resources and other managerial support needed to address problems and allows officers the opportunity to have their efforts recognized.
- System improvement. To identify organizational conditions that may impede improved performance and to solicit ideas for changing the conditions.

In an organization that undertakes a shift in its philosophy about service delivery, as the Houston Police Department did, these last three functions of performance measurement are especially important. A philosophy that is articulated and reinforced through the types of activities or performances that are measured should be more readily understood by personnel than one simply espoused by (perhaps) remote managers.

This operational articulation provided by performance measurement is needed not only by the line personnel but by their supervisors as well. Sergeants and lieutenants who are first introduced to community policing as supervisors and managers will have less familiarity with the operational implications of the philosophy than will the officers they supervise. As much or more than their subordinates, supervisors may need the new performance assessment system as a guide to, or validation of, appropriate role behaviors for the employees they supervise. Indeed, a patrol officer in Houston suggested that his peers be tolerant of sergeants who initially did not know what was needed from them as supervisors of Neighborhood Oriented Policing officers. He pointed out that existing sergeants had never had the opportunity to perform the role they were now expected to supervise. Unavoidably, they had less understanding of the role than officers who were only now in the process of recreating and redefining it.

When the new service philosophy calls on officers to identify problems in the areas they serve, the systematic documentation of these problems will be the best data available for the guidance of management decisions about resources and other types of support officers may need.

The ability to identify impediments to improved performance is important at any stage in the life of an organization. Conditions, both internal and external, that can affect quality of performance can change constantly (if imperceptibly) and must be monitored regularly. But this need is perhaps never greater than when the organization is in the midst of a shift in its

service philosophy that will require deliberate realignment of organizational policies and practices if the philosophy is to be successfully implemented. Management must be able to determine what, if anything, is preventing employees from doing what is expected of them.

Requirements of Employee Performance Evaluation

There are at least five standards that an employee performance evaluation process should meet:

Validity. If the process is "valid," it accurately reflects the content of the job the employee is expected to perform, as well as the expected quality of the job performance.

Reliability. A "reliable" process results in the same performance being given the same evaluation across evaluators and across repetitions of that performance. It will not be a product of the personality or the mood of the evaluator.

Equity. An "equitable" process allows employees doing the same or similar work to receive equal evaluations. This is especially critical in an organization in which performance evaluations are used to determine pay, transfers, or promotions. In such organizations, it is not uncommon for one evaluation point or even a fraction of a point to separate the rewarded from the unrewarded employee. This is a difficult issue for a profession like policing in which the nature and frequency of task performance occur, to a large degree, in response to external conditions that vary by area of the city, time of day, and season of the year.

Legality. Legality typically turns on the validity of the performance evaluation; that is, the extent to which the evaluation accurately reflects the performance and is statistically predictive of the role (e.g., assignment) for which it determines entry. "Legality" is also an issue primarily for those organizations that use performance evaluations to determine rewards and punishments for employees. It is also an issue in departments for which certain requirements of the evaluation process are established by law—either State law, city ordinance, or civil service code.

Utility. "Utility" refers simply to the purpose for the evaluation. If nothing is done with it, if employees see no benefit from the evaluation for either the organization or for themselves personally, the process will be less than useless; it will breed employee contempt for management.

It is beyond the scope of this report to instruct the reader in the various means of meeting each of these standards. These topics are discussed extensively in other literature, and a list of recommended readings for agencies struggling with these issues appears at the end of this report.

Special Measurement Concerns for Community Policing

The issues that characterize performance analysis in a community policing context are much like those in any police setting. The requirements outlined above remain the same, regardless of the organizational philosophy. For neither community policing nor more traditional approaches are they easily met, and conflicts among them are not readily resolved. The goal of equity, for example, may conflict with the goal of validity. When jobs are as dissimilar as police patrol work may be across different assignments or different areas of a community, the need for equity may reduce the evaluated job dimensions to the most common elements of the role. The result is an evaluation that fails to reflect any officer's actual job.

Concerns for both legality and reliability have pushed departments toward quantifiable performance indicators. The greater emphasis the policing profession began to put on the crime fighting aspects of the police role in previous decades[4] also created pressure for quantifiable measures. Unfortunately, the most important indicators may be those that are the most difficult to quantify. The indicators that were most readily available were those associated (even if

spuriously) with crime fighting (e.g., rapid response, numbers of arrests) and with organizational regulations (e.g., tardiness, sick time, accidents.)[5] When important behaviors or activities cannot be counted, then the ones that are counted tend to become those that are considered important.[6] The emphases on the crime function and on quantitative assessments have led to performance assessments that overlook as much as 70 percent of the police role.[7]

The record of researchers is no better in this respect. Despite their disclaimers about the validity and reliability of such indicators, researchers continue to use recorded crime data, arrest data, and administrative data as indicators of performance and outcome because other indicators are unavailable or are too costly or time-consuming to create. This fact led one researcher[8] to call for "...a modest moratorium on the application of crime-related productivity measures" until the full range of the police role could be documented and decisions made about how to measure a much wider range of police activity.

Revision of performance evaluation to reflect the broad police role is something many police managers still need to accomplish in the 1990's, regardless of whether they have any interest in changing their organization's current approach to policing. Community policing, problem-oriented policing, and neighborhood-oriented policing all encourage officers to expand their role, exercise more discretion, and tailor responses to the needs of local communities. To a large extent, however, they encourage managers to acknowledge and support activities good officers have always conducted but which have gone officially unrecognized. The challenge is (as it always has been) one of

> ...finding ways to express quality as quantity, in other words, to make quality a countable commodity....the challenge is to identify quantifiable outcomes that truly relate to the job and to ensure that this does not corrupt Community Policing [or any other orientation to policing] into policing by the numbers.[9]

Community policing draws attention to other issues about employee performance evaluation:

- The means by which supervisors and managers can hold officers accountable for the greater discretion they are permitted.
- The inclusion of the community in the evaluation process.
- The evaluation of team, or unit, or organization as distinct from the evaluation of the individual officer.

There is also, of course, the need addressed by other researchers[10] to develop outcome or impact measures that correspond to the problems officers are trying to solve in communities. We do not deal with that issue in this discussion, since it is beyond the scope of the performance evaluation system designed and tested in this project.

Still other researchers[11] suggest that the paramilitary model of policing facilitates close supervision of the traditional role that is inappropriate for the broader, more discretionary role of the community police officer.[12] Discretion and the greater flexibility it gives an officer for how, when, and where to use time is not a new issue for supervisors. It has always been an issue for rural police departments and sheriffs' agencies in which officers and supervisors may never have occasion to meet after roll call (and, sometimes, not even at roll call). Researchers need to develop information about supervision in these types of agencies.

It is clear that community policing will require a reformulation of the sergeant's role that corresponds with changes in the responsibilities of officers. As officers continue to refine and improve their ability to react to service demands, they will be expected to become more involved in implementing proactive strategies. When time permits, officers will be expected to develop active partnerships with local residents and businesses as a means of addressing crime and noncrime issues. The net effect for sergeants is that they will be expected to become more

efficient managers, team builders, and group facilitators as opposed to devoting the majority of their time to supervision. A sergeant's ability or inability to perform these functions effectively will have a direct bearing on the successes or failures of his or her officers.

The inclusion of the community in the performance evaluation process is not commonly a goal of traditional departments, except insofar as the department attends to complaints from citizens about improper police activity. Community policing takes as a basic tenet the need to match police service to the perceived needs of citizens. This means that departments will need to collect data about what services citizens want and about whether citizens believe their service needs are being met. A number of means have been advocated for accomplishing this. Numerous departments have used community meetings as a forum for eliciting service needs and preferences. Some (e.g., Grand Rapids, Michigan, Houston, Texas, and Newark, New Jersey) have employed door-to-door surveys conducted by officers, and a few with substantial resources (usually provided by grants) have conducted scientific community surveys. For several years the Madison, Wisconsin, Police Department has routinely surveyed by mail a sample of all citizens who have received service from the department in an effort to measure satisfaction and to collect information about ways of improving service.

Another issue raised by community and problem-oriented approaches is that of the appropriateness of individual employee evaluations. Some departments are emphasizing a focus on the team or workgroup rather than the individual. Those that retain individual evaluations may abandon the evaluations as a means of differentiating among employees for the purpose of rewards and use the individual evaluations, instead, as a means of helping individual employees identify and meet their own career goals.[13]

The Madison and Houston police departments, for example, while having parallel goals of decentralization and community policing, have taken different approaches to individual performance evaluations. Madison has, at least for the present, abandoned them. Acknowledging the shortcomings of traditional performance evaluations, that department has eliminated them until a more appropriate process can be developed. In the meantime, the organization is emphasizing the improvement of organizational systems (including management) and the development of teamwork. Discussions of performance focus on the changes or improvements that need to be made in order to support the work of officers in the field. Employees evaluate managers. These assessments take the form of questions about the changes the manager needs to make in order for the employee to function more effectively. The critiques are for the purpose of information gathering rather than "grading," and they are used by managers for self-diagnosis.

Patrol officers in Madison's Experimental (South) Police District receive evaluations directly from citizens. The survey the department mails to service recipients is returned directly to the officer who delivered the service. The identity of the citizen is not known, but the officer has general information about the type of situation on which the evaluation is based. Officers decide whether to share their personal evaluations with peers and supervisors. After reading the evaluation, the officer removes his identification from it and gives it to the supervisor. The individual responses are then aggregated to determine whether the district as a whole is meeting citizen expectations.

At a similar stage in its own redirection of philosophy, the Houston Police Department invested significant effort in redesigning individual performance evaluations so they would reflect the job officers were being encouraged to perform. Houston, like many other departments, did not have the same legal latitude as Madison to eliminate individual perform-ance evaluations. More important, Houston managers viewed performance evaluation as a critical support system to be used to communicate and reinforce expectations about the new philosophy.

Like Madison, Houston included in the new performance evaluation process the means of having officers evaluate supervisors and of having citizens evaluate officers.

The appropriate role of employee performance evaluations in a community policing context (or perhaps any policing context) is an issue that is being explored. The answers for each department may depend ultimately on the uses the agency wishes to make of the evaluations. Perhaps, as agencies embracing the Edwards Deming philosophy of management argue,[14] there is no reason to "grade" individuals relative to each other. However, evaluations might still be a means of:

- Informing governing bodies about the work of the organization, accountability that will become ever more critical in the face of shrinking resources.
- Determining the nature of problems in various neighborhoods and the strategies that are more and less effective in dealing with them.
- Permitting officers to record and "exhibit" the work they are doing.
- Determining career objectives and progress for individual employees.

Some organizations may improve individual evaluations to better serve these purposes, and others may design alternative means of accomplishing these ends. One of the valuable consequences of the current interest in community policing may be a variety of new approaches to performance measurement.

The remainder of this report focuses on the experience of one city—Houston, Texas—in developing and administering a personnel performance evaluation instrument that took into account the new priorities required by community policing.

The Houston Performance Measurement Project

In the 1970's, the growth of the city of Houston led the department to begin planning for the physical decentralization of police services that would eventually be delivered from four command stations, each located in one quadrant of the city.

This perceived need to decentralize provided both impetus and opportunity to think about the style and structure of policing that would be provided in the new settings. In the 1980's, the department began to experiment with several approaches to policing that eventually would lead to a new view of the way in which police worked together and with the public. The department experimented with team policing (Directed Area Responsibility Team), community interaction (Positive Interaction Program), strategies aimed at reducing fear, and community revitalization tactics (Project Oasis). By 1986, through the combined lessons learned from these various projects, the department selected the Neighborhood Oriented Policing (NOP) concept as its new policing style.

Defined as an interactive process between officers and citizens for the purpose of identifying and addressing crime and noncrime problems, NOP established a philosophical foundation that has a direct bearing on managerial and operational practices. As a management philosophy, Neighborhood Oriented Policing provided managers with a conceptual framework to direct a multiplicity of organizational functions in a manner consistent with efficiently addressing citizen needs and demands. Operationally, the approach encouraged officers to assume direct responsibility for managing the delivery of services in geographic areas to which they were assigned. Special emphasis was given to identifying and addressing problems of crime and disorder.

Initial efforts to translate the NOP philosophy into police operations occurred at the Westside Command Station, the first of the decentralized facilities to be completed. In this early stage of the change process, many managers, officers, and investigators recognized that broad organizational change would be required if Houston's version of community policing was to represent a real and lasting change in the

nature and style of police service. Concerns were expressed about the need for broader-based training, more efficient management of calls for service, a comprehensive performance evaluation system, more effective management of patrol and investigative operations, a revamped disciplinary system, a redefinition of the investigative role, and expanded roles for citizens. It was predicted that without changes in these support systems, efforts to institutionalize the new philosophy would fail.

In responding to these concerns, the Houston Police Department developed a vision of organizational change that called for the examination and possible restructuring of many of the organization's support systems. Steps were immediately taken to address the management of the dispatch operation. The disciplinary system was revamped, and an Executive Session was held to examine how investigations and patrol could be integrated under Neighborhood Oriented Policing. The Executive Session was a working seminar attended by approximately 30 department personnel selected to represent all ranks and functions of the organization. The group met for one morning every 2 weeks over a period of 3 months to discuss philosophies or organizational aspects of NOP. Participants changed with the topic addressed.

Included among these organizational changes was the issue of performance evaluations. It was believed that if a new concept of policing was to be successfully implemented, a clear message of what was to be expected of officers, sergeants, and lieutenants needed to be developed. One of the tools available within the organization to accomplish this task was the performance evaluation. Houston managers viewed performance evaluation as a critical support system that could be used to communicate and reinforce expectations about a new philosophy.

The first step toward the total redesign of performance measurement was to be the development of new performance evaluation criteria, scaling methods, instrumentation, and processes for police officers. This report relates how this first step was taken and what occurred as a result.

Designing the New Performance Evaluation Process

A task force of officers and first line supervisors at the Westside Command Station began the task of analyzing the jobs of patrol officers and redesigning the performance evaluation in terms of Neighborhood Oriented Policing expectations. They felt officers should be responsible for managing the delivery of services within their areas, involve the community in problem identification and resolution, and when appropriate, assist in community organizational efforts. Their perceptions evolved from task force discussions as well as small group discussions between task force members and their peers and responses from a survey of a sample of patrol officers. Task force members also visited other police departments involved with community and problem-oriented policing to learn what these agencies were using for performance evaluations.

A second committee, consisting of police officer volunteers from each of Westside's three shifts, used the information gathered by the first group to develop the new performance evaluation methods. This process and the resulting instrumentation sought to build a bridge between existing roles and responsibilities and newly emerging ones associated with the NOP philosophy.

Performance Measurement Forms

The experimental performance evaluation instrumentation for patrol officers and their respective sergeants consisted of a packet containing six forms, which is included in this report as appendix A. Each form is described below:

Patrol Officer's Bi-Annual Assessment Report. This form is the primary instrument designed for the sergeant to evaluate officer performance across 22 different criteria. Space was provided for

commentary regarding work assignments, work progress, accomplishments, and special recognition. Officers were encouraged to provide written comments regarding their evaluation. The material contained within this instrument reflected the department's expectations regarding officer responsibilities under Neighborhood Oriented Policing.

Patrol Officer's Monthly Worksheet. This form was designed to serve as a tool to guide the officers' actions during their tour of duty. In completing this form, officers had an opportunity to have direct input into their own evaluation. Officers could identify the different types of projects, strategies, or programs they were working on for a specified period of time as well as the progress they were making.

Community Information Form. Officers sometimes spent a lot of time working with citizens in the community on various types of projects. This form was intended to be completed by the citizens who worked on projects with the officers. The information requested was quite specific and provided the sergeant with additional insight on what officers were trying to accomplish and how they were going about it. Officers had the option of determining whether they wanted to use the form.

Calls for Service—Citizen Feedback Form. The most frequent form of officer-citizen contact was during the handling of calls for service. This form was designed for the sergeant to use in obtaining information about the nature of that contact. The citizens were asked a few questions by the sergeants about the quality of the interaction. Sergeants were to use this form at least once a month during the test period.

Investigator Questionnaire. Each officer expected to conduct high-quality criminal investigations. This work was seldom reviewed by the officer's immediate supervisor, yet the information contained within the officer's report was essential to the investigative sergeant. The purpose of this form was to obtain information from the investigative sergeant about the officer's knowledge and performance in the handling of preliminary or followup investigations. Again, officers could determine whether they wanted to use the form.

Officer's Immediate Supervisor Assessment Form. Officers were given an opportunity to provide information about the performance of their sergeant on a number of different dimensions. Although cursory in nature, this information, when given to the sergeant's superior (the district lieutenant), could identify significant trends about the relationship between a sergeant and his/her officers. The officers were required to complete the form but had the option of signing their names to the document.

This assessment system represented a radical departure from the one then in use. The diversity of information that could be collected from a variety of sources was designed to provide the sergeant with a broad perspective on what the officer was accomplishing during each evaluation period.

Further descriptive information regarding the forms, the performance factors, and scaling criteria is contained in Appendix A of the Technical Report for this project.[15]

Evaluation Research

The new performance measurement process was evaluated experimentally to measure its impact on both officers and citizens. The overall question was whether a performance evaluation process could significantly reinforce efforts to move a police organization toward a new style of policing. The first goal of the research was to determine whether use of the new system gave officers a clearer understanding of their roles as neighborhood-oriented officers and whether attitudes toward their roles changed. The second goal was to determine whether citizens perceived any change in the quality of service they received as a result of implementation of the new evaluation process.

Four research areas were selected within two of Houston's patrol districts. One of the districts was Westside, where a management emphasis on the philosophy and practice of Neighborhood Oriented Policing already existed. The other district was one in which there had not yet been any special effort to move away from a more traditional style of policing. In both districts, one area was designated an experimental area and the other a control area. Officers in the two experimental areas were evaluated using the new performance assessment process three times within a 6-month period. Officers in the control areas were evaluated as Houston officers had been evaluated for 40 years.

Before the new process was implemented in the experimental areas, officers in all four areas were administered surveys that measured their attitudes toward the role, their attitudes toward the community, and their job satisfaction. At the same time, samples of citizens who had been victims of burglaries in each of the four areas were interviewed by telephone to measure their perceptions of service and levels of satisfaction. After the new performance process had been administered three times, the same officers in all four areas were surveyed again, and new samples of burglary victims in all four areas were interviewed.

Administration of the new evaluation process was monitored throughout the course of the project. At the end of the project period, officers, sergeants, lieutenants, and captains who had participated in the implementation of the new process were interviewed about their experiences with the process and their opinions about both the old and the new systems.

Research Findings

For patrol officers, participation in the new performance evaluation system was positively and significantly related to:

- Their belief in the value of foot patrol.
- Their perception that managers increased the priority they assigned to the management of uncommitted time by officers.
- The frequency with which they reported conducting problem-solving activities.
- The frequency with which they said they initiated problem-solving activities.
- The probability that they said they identified problems in their areas in the previous 2 months.
- Their reports of the number of Patrol Management Plans written.
- Their reports of the frequency with which they discussed area problems with other department personnel.
- Their level of belief in the decency of human beings.
- Their satisfaction with the performance evaluation process.
- Their satisfaction with the recognition they received for work.
- Their satisfaction with supervision.

Participation in the new process was unrelated to:

- Their belief in a problem-solving function.
- Their belief in knowing about citizens in their area of assignment.
- The priority they believed their managers assigned to traditional patrol functions.
- The priority officers would assign to traditional patrol functions under "ideal" organizational conditions.
- The priority they would assign to expanded functions under current working conditions.
- The frequency with which they reported conducting crime-related activities.
- The frequency with which they reported engaging in conversations with citizens.
- The frequency with which they reported having contact with detectives.

- The frequency with which they reported participation in followup investigations.
- The frequency with which they reported self-initiation of patrol activities.
- Their perception of the quality of the relationship between the public and the police.
- Their satisfaction with the organization.

Participation in the new evaluation process was *negatively* and significantly related to:

- The priority they assigned to traditional patrol functions under current working conditions.

This last effect could be considered affirmation of the impact of the new system since it acknowledges the fact that other functions were included in the evaluation. The old form of performance evaluation stressed traditional functions almost exclusively.

The goal of Neighborhood Oriented Policing, however, is not to devalue traditional patrol functions. Rather, it is to acknowledge and support a broadened range of functions and to place the value of traditional functions within the broader objective of problem-solving. Activities are not valued as much for the sake of activities themselves but because they are intended to serve an identified purpose.

This is a substantial list of impacts from the use of a new performance assessment process for a period of only 6 months. These outcomes exceeded the expectation of evaluators who believed the test period was too short to permit a measurable program effect.

A final observation can be made about the performance measurement process. While officers and supervisors liked the new process better than the one it replaced, they were little more than neutral in their attitudes toward it. This was true despite the fact that the new process was the product of a task force consisting largely of patrol officers. It simply may be the case that while performance evaluation is useful, it may never be a process that anyone embraces with enthusiasm. If done well, it requires considerable effort on the part of supervisors. For officers, it always holds the potential for bad news and reminds them of the organizational status that leaves judgments about their work to someone with higher status.

The method of performance measurement evaluated by this project *was* more work than the traditional process for the sergeants who implemented it. Only for the purposes of research were these sergeants asked to use the process three times within 6 months; normally they would use it once in this same time period. Even if used once every 6 months, the new process would require more effort than the old one. Recognizing this, the task force recommended that the new process be used on the anniversary date and at subsequent 6-month intervals for each officer. This means that a sergeant would conduct only two or three evaluations each month. An additional benefit of this arrangement is that it would cause performance evaluation to be an ongoing rather than a periodic concern of supervisors and managers.

It should be emphasized that the measured outcomes were self-reported attitudes, perceptions, and activities of officers. Because there were no objective measures of the types or amounts of activities officers engaged in during the test period, it remains possible that the new process simply sensitized officers to what they should say in their questionnaires. Even if this was the case, it is, nonetheless, an indication that the process was delivering a message to which officers were responding.

It is also theoretically possible that had the officers in the control group been evaluated three times in 6 months with the traditional evaluation forms, they would have registered the same changes measured for officers in the experimental group.

For citizens, program effects were less apparent. The analysis of the survey of burglary victims offers some slight evidence that the nature of the performance evaluation process can have an impact on the way officers relate to victims. Across 14 outcome measures, a significant program effect was indicated for

one, and a near significant effect was indicated for a second one. It was determined that burglary victims in the experimental areas were significantly more likely (p=.02) to recall the name of the responding officer than were victims in the control areas. A second measure, whether officers gave victims advice about how to seek assistance with their problems, approached significance at .08. This is a small number of effects; however, researchers considered it unlikely that *any* differences would be detected over the brief 6-month program period. A longer test period and a different citizen survey instrument (see discussion below) might have produced a greater number of significant effects.

Although not related to the performance process, three other police activities occurred with notable frequency across all groups. Among all respondents, in either condition, at either time, in both districts, an average of 59 percent said that the officer discussed what was likely to happen with the case. A total of 62 percent said the officer offered advice about how to make the home more difficult for someone to break into, and 51 percent said the officer told them about marking their property so that it could be returned in the event of another burglary. While there is room for an increase in any of these activities, the figures seem relatively high. It would be useful to know how these figures would compare to those for a department that had not emphasized improved service to citizens. (It would also be interesting to know the extent to which the figures may be inflated by the fact that respondents knew the interviewers were police cadets).

An item for which the results were less impressive was the one that asked whether the officer had inquired about other problems or situations in the neighborhood that the police should know about. An average of 32 percent of the respondents reported that the officer made this kind of inquiry. There was no program effect on this measure, but there appears to have been a district effect. An average of 37 percent of respondents from the district where community policing had been emphasized said officers asked about problems in the area; 27 percent of respondents from the district where it had not been as strongly emphasized said they did. It seems clear, however, that most officers in both districts were passing up an opportunity to learn about their areas and to demonstrate their interest to citizens.

The questions that asked about the officer's style (courtesy, concern, willingness to listen) were scored so highly by all groups at Time 1 that there was little room for improvement at Time 2. The same was true for the question about the respondent's level of satisfaction with the police response to the burglary.

Citizen Survey

A survey such as the one used for this project has a very important place in any department committed to delivering better service and to monitoring its efforts. It has an especially important role to play in an organization committed to community policing. For these reasons, attention should be given to the development of a more sensitive survey instrument.

The survey used for this evaluation was limited in its utility by the number of questions for which a "ceiling effect" was registered in the Time 1 responses. These included the questions about officer style, whether the officer gave the respondent the case number, and the general level of satisfaction with the service. While these questions would be important to an organization for baseline descriptive data and for monitoring purposes, the initial high scores make these items useless for the purpose of hypothesis testing.

The eight questions about officer activity (e.g., "Did the officer discuss with you what is likely to happen with your case?") were all answered in this survey with a simple "yes" or "no." These items would be more sensitive to statistical analysis if the response categories provided more variance; the question about case outcome, for example, might be asked as "How much information did the officer give you

about what might happen next with your case?" and the answers might range from "none," through "some" and " a moderate amount" to "a great deal." A question such as "To what extent did the officer answer your questions about this case?" might have had responses ranging from "not at all" to "completely." This format would create a lengthier survey but would have the potential of generating more variance for analysis.

The content of the questions should also be examined—and should be considered separately for each department interested in using a similar process. The specific questions asked should correspond to the expectations for officers dealing with the kinds of incidents on which the survey is focused. For two reasons the survey should be constructed or reviewed by both the officers who will be responding to these calls and the citizens who will be the recipients of the service. In the first place, such a process should increase the likelihood that all the potentially relevant questions have been included. In the second place, such a process would give "ownership" of the process to both officers and citizens. If they worked together as a committee, it would enhance the idea of police-citizen cooperation in the policing process. Officer involvement could reduce officer concern about the nature and purpose of such a survey.

Officer participation was not used for the development of this instrument because the instrument was to be used for testing program effects. Circulating information about it would open research findings to the alternative explanation that officers were deliberately trying to affect the results by emphasizing certain types of behaviors when responding to a call.

However, in a nonresearch situation, it would be preferable to have officer input in the development of the instrument. The instrument could also be circulated to every member of the organization with an explanation of its intended use, a description of the process of developing it, and a request for suggestions about additional items or other changes in the instrument. This would be another means of sharing with all officers the expectation that there should be followup on calls and a means of communicating to officers—through the nature of the questions asked—their expected performance when handling a particular kind of call.

Conclusion

Findings from the officers' survey indicate that a personnel performance measurement process designed to reflect and reinforce the functions that officers are expected to perform can provide structural support for a philosophy of policing and can be a valuable aid in the implementation of organizational change.

It is important to recognize that the performance measurement process developed and tested in this project was but a first step toward performance measurement for community policing. When the new performance evaluation forms were developed, the Houston Department was still in the process of learning what Neighborhood Oriented Policing could mean operationally, given existing constraints of budget and manpower shortages and the existence of an organizational structure that was designed for a reactive style of policing. As with community policing in most cities, the practice of Neighborhood Oriented Policing in Houston was being created by officers who were feeling their way without a map through new challenges, responsibilities, and authority.

As the practice of community policing becomes more clearly defined, it will be appropriate to refine performance measurement processes to reflect more articulate operational definitions of the new style of policing. But this does not mean that a department should wait until there is consensus before attempting to reshape performance measurement. The process of creating a new approach to performance assessment helped task force members better understand the potential of Neighborhood Oriented Policing. And, as this study shows, even as a first stage revision, a new performance measurement system can facilitate a

philosophic shift among officers. The process of revising performance measurement should be dynamic and proceed as new roles become more fully defined and understood.

Whatever the style of policing to which a department is committed, a performance evaluation process that remains unchanged for many years probably does not reflect the changing needs of the community and the changing skills and abilities of an organization's personnel. Any department's approach to measuring the performance of personnel ought to be one that reflects this change.

But there is a larger sense in which this project represents only a first step. There remains the need to develop measures of the *impact* (effect or outcome) of an officer's performance, the performance of managers, the performance and impact of units or teams, and the performance and impact of the organization as a whole. The intent, when this project began in Houston, was that it would lead to the development of performance measurement for sergeants, lieutenants, and captains. To stop the process at the level of the first line officer is to ignore the important ways in which other roles must change in the organization if community policing is to be successfully implemented.

Not only is this project simply an initial step in a broader program of performance evaluation, but performance evaluation is itself only *one* step among many organizational revisions that must be made if community policing is to be successfully implemented. Other changes could include role redefinitions for personnel in all functions and levels of the organization, orientation and training for these new roles, and organizational restructuring to support the mission of community policing. Examples of this last change include physical decentralization, redrawing of beat boundaries to reflect neighborhoods, integration of personnel in various functions into neighborhood work groups, and determination that organizational functions serve the mission of community policing rather than their own ends. The use of the new performance measurement process within the context of these other changes almost certainly would produce a larger impact on employee attitudes and behaviors than would only the use of new performance evaluation procedures.

One final note. For purposes of economy and efficiency, Houston police cadets were trained to conduct the telephone interviews with burglary victims. As anticipated, the cadets were quite competent and, because of their status, eager to do good work. But there were unanticipated benefits as well:

- Cadets learned that seeking feedback from citizens is an appropriate practice.
- They gained confidence in talking with citizens.
- Cadets learned that citizens, despite their victimization, had positive feelings about the service they received. They found that citizens did not have unrealistic expectations about the ability of the police to solve the crime or recover their property. This is an early lesson that should help keep young officers from developing a "we-they" feeling toward citizens.
- Cadets learned about victims. They learned that many burglary victims are so traumatized by the crime that they change or unlist their phone numbers or even move soon after their victimization.
- They learned about quality of report writing. Because they had to take information from the incident report before making the call to the victim, they quickly became alert to differences between well-written and poorly written reports. The simple fact that another cadet could one day be scrutinizing their own reports might have a positive effect on the quality of their report writing.
- They learned about research and its relationship to their profession, both from having had the project explained to them and from asking questions during the course of conducting the survey. Were this kind of process to become part of the academy curriculum, the benefit of it would be increased if the supervisor were someone who could discuss research with the cadets as their questions arose.

This type of survey experience would be beneficial to a cadet or recruit in any police organization. In a community policing agency, it could be a valuable tool for shaping performance expectations, skills, and attitudes consistent with this approach. And, of course, an ongoing survey process would be an additional means of linking the department with its community.

For More Information

The full technical report for this project, *Evaluating Patrol Officer Performance Under Community Policing: The Houston Experience, Technical Report,* contains a detailed description of the process of developing the new performance measurement approach, including detailed descriptions of the research process, analysis, and findings. It is available from the Police Foundation, 1001 22d Street N.W., Suite 200, Washington, DC 20037.

Notes

1. Gabor, Andrea. 1992. "Take This Job and Love It." *The New York Times,* January 26.

2. Dallas Police Department. 1972. *Five Year Plan.* Dallas: Dallas Police Department, pp. III–23, III–24.

3. Mastrofski, Stephen D., and Robert C. Wadman. 1991. "Personnel and Agency Performance Measurement." In William A. Geller (ed.) *Local Government Police Management.* Washington, D.C.: International City Managers Association.

4. Kelling, George L., and Mark H. Moore. 1988. *The Evolving Strategy of Policing* (NIJ Perspectives on Policing series). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice and John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

5. Kelling, George L. 1992. "Measuring What Matters: A New Way of Thinking About Crime and Public Order." *The City Journal,* Spring.

6. Wycoff, Mary Ann. 1982. "Improving Police Performance Measurement: One More Voice." *The Urban Interest,* Spring 1982.

7. Wycoff, Mary Ann. 1982. *The Role of Municipal Police: Research as Prelude to Changing It.* Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.

8. Kelling, George L. 1978. "The Role of Research in Maximizing Productivity." In Peter Engstad and Michele Lioy (eds.) *Report of the Proceedings, Workshop on Police Productivity and Performance.* Ottawa, Canada: Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.

9. Trojanowicz, Robert, and Bonnie Bucqueroux. 1992. *Toward Development of Meaningful and Effective Performance Evaluations.* East Lansing, Michigan: National Center for Community Policing, Michigan State University.

10. See, for instance, Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, op. cit.; and Wadman, Robert C., and Robert K. Olson. 1990. *Community Wellness: A New Theory of Policing.* Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.

11. Weisburd, David, Jerome McElroy, and Patricia Hardyman. 1989. "Maintaining Control in Community-Oriented Policing." In Dennis Jay Kenney (ed.) *Police and Policing: Contemporary Issues.* New York: Praeger.

12. See also Goldstein, Herman. 1979. "Improving Policing: A Problem Oriented Approach." *Crime and Delinquency,* 25; and Bittner, Egon. 1972. *The Functions of the Police in Modern Society.* Rockville, Maryland: National Institute of Mental Health.

13. Gabor, op. cit.

14. Scholtes, Peter R. 1987. "A New View of Performance Evaluation." Paper presented to William G. Hunter Conference on Quality. Joiner Associates Inc., Madison, Wisconsin.

15. Wycoff, Mary Ann, and Timothy N. Oettmeier. 1993. *Evaluating Patrol Officer Performance Under Community Policing: The Houston Experience, Technical Report.* Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.

Additional Reading

Bieck, William H. 1990. "Operationalizing the Management Philosophy of Neighborhood Oriented Policing Through Performance Criteria." A concept paper prepared for the Houston Police Department.

Whitaker, Gordon P., Stephen Mastrofski, Elinor Ostrom, Roger B. Parks, and Stephen L. Percy. 1982. *Basic Issues in Police Performance.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Wycoff, Mary Ann. 1982. "Improving Police Performance Measurement: One More Voice." *The Urban Interest,* Spring, pp. 8–16.

Wycoff, Mary Ann. 1982. *The Role of Municipal Police: Research as Prelude to Changing It.* Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.

Appendix A:

Houston Police Officer Experimental Performance Evaluation Instruments

HOUSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT

Patrol Officer's Bi-Annual Assessment Report

OFFICER INFORMATION	ACTIVITY PERIOD BASED ON DATE OF ENTRY
NAME:_____ *Last* *First* *MI*	FROM:(m/d/y)_____
EMPLY.NO.:_____ SHIFT:_____ DISTRICT/BEAT:_____ NEIGH.:_____	TO:(m/d/y)_____
COMMAND/BUREAU/DIVISION:_____	

SECTION I

WORK ASSIGNMENT	List any changes in work assignment, responsibilities, or work environment which affect an officer's ability to complete assigned tasks.
PROGRESS	Describe status of and progress made toward attaining objectives set forth in previous monthly assessments.
ACCOMPLISHMENTS	List successful completion of specific projects, notable actions taken, and any other significant deed(s) initiated by the officer.
SPECIAL RECOGNITION	List any awards, letters of commendation, or recognition for activities performed by the officer.

SECTION II

DIRECTIONS: From the following scale, circle the response which most closely describes the quality of work demonstrated by the officer. Following each response, a written explanation of each choice is necessary. If the performance criterion is not observed by the supervisor or not verified through other means (i.e., survey questionnaires), circle the "Not Observed" (N.O.) response.

STATEMENTS and EXPLANATIONS	SCALE					
	Not Observed	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Average	Agree	Strongly Agree
PROFESSIONALISM						
1. Consistently exhibits a professional appearance. Explanation: _____	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Displays adaptability and flexibility. Explanation: _____	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Shows initiative in improving skills. Explanation: _____	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Exercises prudent care and use of equipment. Explanation: _____	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
KNOWLEDGE						
5. Demonstrates working knowledge of laws. Explanation: _____	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Demonstrates working knowledge of General Orders/SOPs. Explanation: _____	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Demonstrates working knowledge of patrol tactics. Explanation: _____	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Demonstrates proper knowledge of completing routine forms. Explanation: _____	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5

STATEMENTS and EXPLANATIONS	SCALE					
RELATIONSHIPS	Not Observed	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Average	Agree	Strongly Agree
9. Effectively expresses oneself verbally. Explanation: _____	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Successfully interacts well with other officers. Explanation: _____	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Establishes and maintains constructive rapport with citizens. Explanation: _____	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
PATROL MANAGEMENT						
12. Efficiently manages uncommitted time. Explanation: _____	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Identifies problems and concerns in his/her area. Explanation: _____	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Formulates appropriate plan(s) of action. Explanation: _____	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Effectively implements plan(s) of action. Explanation: _____	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Efficiently manages calls for service. Explanation: _____	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Consistently completes acceptable offense reports. Explanation: _____	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Conducts quality follow-up investigations. Explanation: _____	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5

STATEMENTS and EXPLANATIONS	SCALE					
SAFETY	Not Observed	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Average	Agree	Strongly Agree
19. Exercises proper judgement when handling requests for service.	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
Explanation: _____						
20. Uses caution when handling suspects/prisoners.	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
Explanation: _____						
21. Maintains self-control in stressful situations.	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
Explanation: _____						
22. Proficiently uses communications equipment.	N.O.	1	2	3	4	5
Explanation: _____						

SECTION III

OFFICER COMMENTS: This section is reserved for officer's comments relative to his/her interpretation of this assessment.

SECTION IV

This report is based on my observation and/or knowledge. It represents my best judgement of the officer's performance.

Rated by: _____ Date: _____
(Signature of Immediate Superior Officer) *Title*

Received by: _____ Date: _____
(Signature of Higher Superior Officer) *Title*

Approved by Department Head: _____ Date: _____

Report Furnished to Civil Service Commision: _____ Date: _____

I certify this report has been discussed with me. My signature indicates that I ❑ Agree ❑ Disagree with this assessment.

Officer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

HOUSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT

Patrol Officer's Monthly Worksheet

EMPLOYEE INFORMATION

NAME:_____
Last *First* *MI*

EMPLY.NO._____ SHIFT:_____ DIST/BEAT:_____ NEIGHBORHOOD:_____

DATE:_____

SECTION I: Objective Setting / Reporting

OBJECTIVE #1 ❑ NEIGHBORHOOD ❑ BEAT ❑ DISTRICT

PROGRESS/STATUS: ❑ COMPLETED ❑ ON-GOING ❑ MODIFIED ❑ DEFERRED ❑ CANCELLED

OBJECTIVE #2 ❑ NEIGHBORHOOD ❑ BEAT ❑ DISTRICT

PROGRESS/STATUS: ❑ COMPLETED ❑ ON-GOING ❑ MODIFIED ❑ DEFERRED ❑ CANCELLED

OBJECTIVE #3 ❑ NEIGHBORHOOD ❑ BEAT ❑ DISTRICT

PROGRESS/STATUS: ❑ COMPLETED ❑ ON-GOING ❑ MODIFIED ❑ DEFERRED ❑ CANCELLED

OBJECTIVE #4	❑ NEIGHBORHOOD	❑ BEAT	❑ DISTRICT

PROGRESS/STATUS: ❑ COMPLETED ❑ ON-GOING ❑ MODIFIED ❑ DEFERRED ❑ CANCELLED

SECTION II - Community Contacts

RESIDENTIAL/CIVIC ASSOCIATION:	BUSINESS/OTHER ORGANIZATIONS:
1. Name:_____	1. Name:_____
Phone No._____	Phone No._____
2. Name:_____	2. Name:_____
Phone No._____	Phone No._____
3. Name:_____	3. Name:_____
Phone No._____	Phone No._____
4. Name:_____	4. Name:_____
Phone No._____	Phone No._____
5. Name:_____	5. Name:_____
Phone No._____	Phone No._____

SECTION III - Special Project Assignment

SECTION IV - Officer Comments / Suggestions

HOUSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT

Community Information Form

OFFICER'S NAME:_____ DATE:_____

SHIFT:_____ DISTRICT:_____ BEAT:_____ NEIGHBORHOOD:_____

According to the records of Officer_____, you have had an opportunity to interact with this officer. In order to help us with our evaluation of this officer's performance, we would appreciate you taking a few minutes to complete this questionnaire. Your input is sincerely appreciated.

COMMUNICATIONS / RELATIONSHIPS:

1. Based on your observations, how does the officer effectively interact with you or your organization? Explain.

_____

_____

_____

2. To the best of your knowledge, does the officer attend community meetings?

_____

_____

_____

3. How does he/she actively participate in those meetings? Explain.

_____

_____

_____

4. How was the officer able to help you or your organization? Explain.

_____

_____

_____

_____

PROBLEM SOLVING:

1. How did the officer participate with you or your organization in identifying neighborhood problems? Explain.

2. To the best of your knowledge, how was the officer involved in developing and/or implementing a plan of action to address a particular type of problem?

3. Did the officer keep you advised of the status of the plan? Explain how this was done.

4. Please identify any crime prevention suggestions the officer has presented that would improve your neighborhood.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

NAME:_____ DATE COMPLETED:_____

ORGANIZATION:_____ DATE RECEIVED BY SUPERVISOR:_____

HOUSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT

Calls For Service - Citizen Feedback

OFFICER INFORMATION

NAME:_____
Last *First* *MI*

SHIFT:_____ DISTRICT/BEAT:_____ NEIGHBORHOOD:_____

DATE OF CALL:_____ LOCATION OF CALL:_____

SECTION I - Assessment Criteria

1.) He/she was courteous/polite to me.	☐ Agree	☐ Disagree
2.) He/she was knowledgeable in addressing my problem.	☐ Agree	☐ Disagree
3.) He/she offered advice on how to address my problems.	☐ Agree	☐ Disagree
4.) He/she demonstrates concern while attempting to address my problem.	☐ Agree	☐ Disagree
5.) He/she handled the call in a professional manner.	☐ Agree	☐ Disagree

SECTION II - General Comments

COMPLAINANT'S NAME:_____ SUPERVISOR'S NAME:_____
(Employee No.)

DATE COMPLETED:_____ DATE RECEIVED:_____

HOUSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT

Investigator Questionnaire

OFFICER'S NAME:_____ EMPLY.NO.:_____ DATE:_____

SHIFT:_____ DISTRICT:_____ BEAT:_____ NEIGHBORHOOD:_____

According to divisional records, Officer _____ has had an opportunity to interact and work with you on a number of occassions. In order to assist this officer's immediate supervisor in his/her assessment of the officer's performance, please take a few minutes to complete this questionnaire.

1. How well does the officer communicate and cooperate with you or other investigators? Explain.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. How well does the officer communicate through his written reports (e.g., accuracy, content, thoroughness, legibility, etc.)? Explain.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. What type of working knowledge of the proper procedures does the officer have regarding the filing of charges, filing hold cards, and conducting F-6 checks? Explain.

4. When provided the opportunity, does the officer show initiative in following-up on investigations? Explain.

5. Please identify any area(s) in which this officer should attempt improvement.

INVESTIGATOR'S NAME:_____ EMPLY.NO.:_____ DATE COMPLETED:_____

HOUSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT

Officer's Immediate-Supervisor Assessment Form

SGT.'S NAME:_____

SGT.'S SHIFT:_____ SGT.'S DISTRICT:_____

ACTIVITY PERIOD

FROM:(m/d/y)_____

TO:(m/d/y)_____

1. My supervisor is knowledgeable about departmental rules and procedures.
   _____Strongly Disagree _____Disagree _____Neutral _____Agree _____Strongly Agree
2. He/she fairly and consistently applies and enforces these guidelines
   _____Strongly Disagree _____Disagree _____Neutral _____Agree _____Strongly Agree
3. He/she tries to accommodate my requests when possible.
   _____Strongly Disagree _____Disagree _____Neutral _____Agree _____Strongly Agree
4. He/she encourages me to perform well or to do a good job.
   _____Strongly Disagree _____Disagree _____Neutral _____Agree _____Strongly Agree
5. He/she sets a good example for top performance.
   _____Strongly Disagree _____Disagree _____Neutral _____Agree _____Strongly Agree
6. He/she lets me know when I have done something well.
   _____Strongly Disagree _____Disagree _____Neutral _____Agree _____Strongly Agree
7. He/she demonstrates concern for me as an employee.
   _____Strongly Disagree _____Disagree _____Neutral _____Agree _____Strongly Agree
8. He/she assists me in resolving problems in my beat.
   _____Strongly Disagree _____Disagree _____Neutral _____Agree _____Strongly Agree
9. He/she is readily available when needed.
   _____Strongly Disagree _____Disagree _____Neutral _____Agree _____Strongly Agree
10. He/she treats me with respect.
    _____Strongly Disagree _____Disagree _____Neutral _____Agree _____Strongly Agree
11. He/she is too lenient.
    _____Strongly Disagree _____Disagree _____Neutral _____Agree _____Strongly Agree

12. I could benefit from more leadership from my supervisor.

_____Strongly Disagree _____Disagree _____Neutral _____Agree _____Strongly Agree

13. He/she makes decisions that affects my ability to perform my duties in a timely manner.

_____Strongly Disagree _____Disagree _____Neutral _____Agree _____Strongly Agree

14. He/she affects my morale positively.

_____Strongly Disagree _____Disagree _____Neutral _____Agree _____Strongly Agree

15. He/she conducts effective monthly performance meetings.

_____Strongly Disagree _____Disagree _____Neutral _____Agree _____Strongly Agree

16. He/she helps me resolve difficulties I encounter in the performance of my duties.

_____Strongly Disagree _____Disagree _____Neutral _____Agree _____Strongly Agree

17. He/she is an overall effective supervisor.

_____Strongly Disagree _____Disagree _____Neutral _____Agree _____Strongly Agree

COMMENTARY:

Please put any comments or suggestions you may have about your supervisor and the way in which he/she conducts his/her job that you feel would be beneficial on the remainder of this page. For example, you might give specific suggestions on how your supervisor could be more effective with you or others. Also, add any comments you might have about this form, or questions and areas you think should be included on it.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

OPTIONAL:

OFFICER'S NAME:_____ DATE:_____

☆ U. S. Government Printing Office: 1994 - 301-174 (14291)

For more information on the National Institute of Justice, please contact:

National Criminal Justice Reference Service
Box 6000
Rockville, Maryland 20850
800–851–3420

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
National Institute of Justice

Washington, D.C. 20531

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use $300

BULK RATE
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOJ/NIJ
Permit No. G–91

Evaluating Patrol Officer Performance Under Community Policing: The Houston Experience