

F

The Use of the Police Standards
and Goals As A Planning Tool

73-NI-03-0002
73-ED-03-0002



College of William and Mary

WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA

34081

READING ROOM

The Use of the Police Standards
and Goals As A Planning Tool

73-NI-03-0002
73-ED-03-0002

by

B. M. Gray II
Police Projects Director

Walter J. Diggles
Systems Projects Director

Metropolitan Criminal Justice Center
College of William and Mary

FEB 1974

The Use of the Police Standards
and Goals As A Planning Tool

By this time every police agency in the nation should have received a copy of the comprehensive Report on Police of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.

The preparation of that report is now history, but its impact will be felt by law enforcement agencies of all sizes for years to come. Its contents are already being analyzed, along with recommendations in the courts and correctional areas, by approximately forty states which have begun processes to establish statewide standards and goals which will directly affect the administration of police and other local criminal justice agencies. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, which provided funding support for the independent Commission, has consistently emphasized that the Commission's purpose was "to formulate for the first time national criminal justice standards and goals for crime reduction and prevention at the state and local level".¹ The police task force prepared their report to serve as a basis and guide for the development of similar standards and goals by state and local agencies; their recommendations are not in any respect mandatory.

The purpose of this article is to briefly describe one structured yet flexible approach to the consideration and use of the contents of the Report on Police as a planning tool for managerial strategies, policies and procedures. This process

is currently being utilized by the Portsmouth, Virginia, Police Department and is being considered by others, including Louisville, Kentucky. We will try, step by step, to briefly identify and summarize the analysis and planning considerations which we found necessary to lay the groundwork for the implementation of the myriad and often demanding standards and goals recommended by the Commission's Task Force on Police. The benefits to be gained by engaging in this process include, among others, the creation of a base for future decision-making, the identification of measurable goals and objectives, and the establishment of preliminary budgetary projections.

By following the ensuing suggestions a police agency, regardless of size, will be able to compare its organization, management and operations against the recommended standards and goals. By engaging in the requisite comparative analysis and deciding upon the department's acceptance or rejection, in whole or in part, of each recommendation, a department can determine for itself its strengths and weaknesses and develop short-, mid-, and long-range plans which are responsive to its current status.

USE IN PLANNING

Generally speaking, planning is a continuous process undertaken either to modify existing department activities or to establish new activities and is characterized by the correlation of activities with time frames and anticipated costs. (Crisis response, on the other hand, is the day-to-day solving of current problems requiring immediate attention.)

Planning approaches can be conveniently labeled as short-, mid-, or long-range. Short-range planning may be said to include problem study and resolution during a one-year period-- within a budget year for example; mid-range planning normally encompasses a time period of from one to five years in the future, with long-range planning consisting of the delineation of activities beyond five years.

The analysis and associated planning responses described in this article fall within the short- and mid-range spectrum. The principal planning element in relating the national standards and goals to be a department's current management and operation is in scheduling the achievement of acceptable standards and goals in an orderly, logical sequence which facilitates change without undue organizational strain.

ANALYSIS AND PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Commitment of the Police Chief

In order for this planning effort and the resulting recommendations for change to be seriously considered, the police chief must genuinely commit himself and his department to the planning process. If undertaken in a half-hearted manner, the process will not approach its full potential. Most city or county chief executives will be highly receptive to receiving a detailed plan on the direction of the department, especially one which includes budgetary projections, and therefore will normally support this administrative effort.

Determination of Approach

The police chief must determine what manner the planning effort is to be carried out. He is limited only by his imagination and resources as the possibilities include the use of planning unit personnel, reliance on an administrative assistant, assignment of selected individuals to each area being considered, formation of departmental task forces, or any combination of approaches. Good management dictates that one individual be designated as project director and be held responsible for supervising and coordinating the analysis and implementation activities. We also suggest that every department can accomplish this planning activity with its own personnel supplemented as needed by professional technical assistance, however, management consultants need not be utilized except for subsequent developmental activities requiring technical skills not normally found among police and other city/county personnel. Consultants may certainly be of value on this task-by-task basis but should not be retained to conduct the entire comparative analysis or to prepare the departmental plan unless there are unusual local conditions requiring their use.

Development of a Work Plan

Before any major effort can be undertaken, a work plan must be prepared and submitted to the Chief for his approval. The work plan should identify key activities and review points, make assignments to individuals or groups, and provide for time phasing of activities including the setting of target dates for their completion. A work plan, like any other plan, should be

a dynamic document which serves as a guide while remaining flexible and responsive to changing conditions. Development of a work plan assures that the distribution of work is reasonable and that individual assignments are understood and accepted by all concerned parties. The planning effort should also be coordinated with external requirements such as the development of a comprehensive city/county plan, the regional criminal justice plan update, and the budgetary cycle of the parent jurisdiction. A sample work plan is presented as Figure 1.

Development of Departmental Profile

A department profile should be prepared to acquaint the project manager and others with the scope, organization, and use of the department's resources and to serve as a data base for future evaluation. Some police executives may not be aware of basic facts such as how their budget growth (or lack of growth) compares to their parent jurisdiction's budget patterns, or the ranges and the median level of education of their officers. These are simplistic examples, but serve to illustrate that an adequate data base is requisite to proper planning. The development of a department profile will provide this inventory (which is almost certain, as well, to be valuable for other management decisions not directly associated with this particular effort).

At a minimum, the departmental profile should include:

- . Jurisdictional Ordinance Governing Department
- . Relationship to City/County Government
- . Fiscal Patterns (Jurisdiction v. Agency, Past Ten Years)
- . Organizational Recapitulation (Past Ten Years)

- . Calls for Service (Past Year)
- . Crime Rates (Past Ten Years)
- . Clearance Rates (Past Ten Years)
- . Civil Service Commission (Authority, Staffing)
- . Recruitment and Promotion Standards
- . Personnel Profile (Education, Training, Age, Etc.)
- . Manpower Allocation (By Function, By Time)
- . Vehicle Types and Distribution
- . Space Allocation
- . Other Departmental Resources (Auxiliary Police, Etc.)

COMPARISON OF DEPARTMENT TO THE RECOMMENDED
STANDARDS AND GOALS

In order to begin this analysis, a comparison of what exist vis-a-vis what is recommended in the Report on Police is in order. This is a demanding task but is necessary on a point-by-point basis in order to establish "where you are" and to point out both strengths and weaknesses. In order to perform this comparison it is best to "cut and paste" the black letter standards, goals and recommendations on large easel pad sheets (27" x 33") and list such columns as Present, 1st year, 2nd year, 3rd year, 4th year, remarks (See Figure 2).² The comparison chart is thus arranged so that personnel knowledgeable of the department's administration and operation can determine whether or not the department accepts and is meeting, in whole or in part, each recommended standard. If the standard is accepted the project manager should note the year in which he recommends that efforts requisite to its achievement should be

initiated. If the activity or policy has already been achieved or implemented appropriate review times should be planned and noted. Included in these considerations is the comparison of the recommendations of recent management surveys (both internal and external) to the recommended standards to determine which recommendations are the soundest for implementation, or to note the similarity of the various reports when they are essentially the same in content.

Establishment of Priorities by Year

After time phasing the specific topic areas over a five-year period (less if appropriate for your jurisdiction), it is necessary to prioritize all of the activities planned for the first year, the second year, etc. This not only allows for more specific time-phasing but also allows for re-examination of the total activity planned for each year. It will not be unusual to decide later that what was initially planned for the first year is either too much or too little based upon available resources and activities currently underway in the department. Timing must take into consideration current activities and new initiatives. Some rearrangement of the general time phasing will occur as a spin-off from this in-year priority setting.

The priority scale may be numerical or alphabetical and can be of whatever length desired. A 1-5 system is recommended because once a fifth-level priority is passed, the objective is likely to be ignored entirely.

The decision on priorities should be made by the chief after reviewing the recommendations of his staff. This recom-

mendation is basic since he is ultimately responsible for carrying through with implementation activities including, of course, the allocation of often scarce resources.

Area of Concern and Specific Tasks

Our experience indicates that the arrangement of material in the Report on Police is excellent for reading and for consideration of specific topics but is not, in its current form, readily useable for comprehensive planning purposes. Thus we identified six functional areas of concern: Administration; Personnel; Training; Operations; Supportive Services; and Extra-Departmental Cooperation and Coordination. Additionally fifty-eight specific topic areas were identified and grouped under the six basic concerns. These topic areas were grouped under the six basic concerns to provide the basis upon which priority setting, time-phasing, and cost estimates could be established. Departments using program budgeting techniques will find this arrangement to be valuable when setting program objectives. The six areas of concern with the fifty-eight topic areas are shown in Figure 3. All applicable standards are correlated to these topic areas in Figure 4.

In the Portsmouth effort, we found it necessary and helpful to develop task planning sheets which specify the area of concern, topic area, purpose, and anticipated products and which specify anticipated time frames, cost and additional resources (consultants, etc.). These task planning sheets were developed for each of the fifty-eight topic areas. A sample is shown as

Figure 5.

Departmental Participation

Throughout any process of change and improvement, the employees of an organization quickly become apprehensive of the unknown. The problems raised by this apprehension vary from department to department depending upon their past history, their personnel structures, and the nature of their informal organizational factors. The basic problem, however, remains the same; people want to know "What is going on?" and "What is it going to mean to me?".

At a minimum, officers and other personnel should be informed of plans in progress. At a maximum, they should have input into that process. Many police chiefs have found that grass roots involvement, when appropriately planned for and directed, benefits "management", especially in periods of analysis and change. The person, unit, or division to be affected often has good ideas on how to improve their function and is willing to present them when offered the opportunity to do so.

The Acting Chief of Police in Portsmouth, E. Ronald Boone, decided to involve as many members of his department as possible in the planning process. The task force approach was selected to assure that each area of concern to the department is fully examined and that changes are not only appropriate but optimal both conceptually and in addressing the "real world" problems of implementation. This decision was based upon local considerations and should be carefully considered before adoption. This

approach was supported by Phin Horton, the City Manager in Portsmouth, and is not recommended for initiation by other departments without such upper echelon support.

Each task force in Portsmouth is composed of a cross-section of sworn officers and departmental civilians, with the assistance, at appropriate points, of experts from outside the department, including personnel from other city agencies. For the most part outside resource personnel will consist of individuals from other police departments who have excelled in specific areas, as well as consultants under contract to accomplish work in areas requiring specific expertise, e.g. career path development. The term and activity of each task force depends upon the scope of the topics in its area of concern and the amount of fact-finding required. Different task forces will require varying types of data, some or all of which may have to be gathered and analyzed. The task forces will provide interim reports to a Standards and Goals Steering Committee which was recently formed and will, with the assistance of a Senior Police Planner designated as Task Force Coordinator, present final recommendations to that Committee through written reports and oral presentations.

The preparation, scheduling, timing, and coordination of the task force effort is the responsibility of the department's Planning and Analysis Unit (PAU). Each task force will be informed of the Standard and Goals Steering Committee's recommendations regarding their effort and the Chief's final disposition of the issue being addressed.

It is important to note that this process was selected in Portsmouth in order to assure acceptance of change and that it would not have been feasible without the existence of a Planning and Analysis Unit in the department. The PAU has the responsibility of coordinating this mid-range planning effort while continuing to undertake needed short-term planning tasks such as determining manpower allocation requirements, etc. Department management realized that this approach to departmental planning requires more time than the use only of PAU personnel but believes that involvement will aid the development of the officers and civilians in the process and enhance departmental acceptance of forthcoming changes. As a final note, we do not expect the department to "turn around" totally in a year or that all of the task force members will become research or management experts. Departmental management is confident, however, that they will contribute significantly to the overall improvement of the department.

Community Involvement

Every community experiences varying degrees of confusion and ignorance about the police function. While the problem can never be totally overcome its impact can be minimized if public opinion is based on an accurate understanding of the police role and of police policies regarding critical law enforcement issues. One manner in which this problem may be broached is through the involvement of representatives of the public in the planning process.

In Portsmouth, city and police officials considered citizen participation of great importance, as illustrated by the formation of a Standards and Goals Steering Committee which functions in an advisory capacity to the Chief of Police by reviewing and commenting upon the recommendations of the task forces. It does not make policy and does not change task force recommendations but comments upon them for consideration by the Chief. The Committee is made up of a delegate from each of the City's two civic league forums, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the Director of the College of William and Mary Metropolitan Criminal Justice Center, a representative of the Virginia State Criminal Justice Planning Agency and two ranking police officers. It has the personnel balance to function effectively and the potential of building a significantly stronger base of community support than previously existed.

Evaluation of the Standards and Goals Planning Process

Any effort worth undertaking warrants evaluation. Evaluation requires determining where you are in terms of staffing, organizational structure, resource utilization, manpower allocation, training, productivity, etc., for use as a base when determining if the activity has been of value and should be continued. There is nothing mysterious about evaluation as it is simply the process of determining whether or not what was planned has been carried out and if so, what changes, both positive and negative, have resulted from the effort.

An evaluation plan should include the development of the detailed department profile previously mentioned and should address the anticipated and desired changes to result from implementation activities. The techniques of evaluation range from simple comparison measurements to sophisticated attitudinal and victimization surveys. The techniques to be utilized depend upon the resources of the department and its past experience in evaluation processes. The selection of appropriate approaches depends upon the in-house capability of department personnel and the talent available in professional neighbors, such as other municipal agencies and local colleges or universities.

Summary

We have attempted to briefly describe a planning process based on the Standards and Goals recommended in the National Advisory Commission's Report on Police. It does not require their total acceptance but stresses their consideration and use in setting standards and goals for police departments based upon locally identified needs and priorities. The process requires time and commitment but will pay significant dividends in improving current and future departmental management and operations.

A detailed description of this approach including specific guidelines, copies of task sheets for all topics and areas of concern and a comprehensive analysis chart will soon be available through either the National League of Cities/U. S. Conference of Mayors or the LEAA in a document entitled

A Police Planning Handbook Based Upon the Recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals Report on Police (June 1974).³ A detailed description of the approach in action may be found in the Portsmouth Police Standards and Goals Developmental Program Plan, available from the Portsmouth Police Department, Portsmouth, Virginia. The authors will be happy to consider requests for technical assistance to departments considering this approach.

FOOTNOTES

1. See the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals' Report on Police, Introductory Message from Russell W. Peterson, Chairman (1/23/73).
2. The discussion accompanying each black letter standard, goal and recommendation should be reviewed in order to clarify specifically what is intended.
3. The authors will forward all requests to the appropriate agency as publication is now being negotiated.

Figure 1

WORK PLAN FOR STANDARDS AND GOALS PROGRAM

Step	Action	Weeks																		Responsibility
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	
1	Present work plan to command staff and chief police executive and obtain acceptance	X																		
2	Develop departmental profile: Identify data elements Gather and analyze data			—																
3	Compare department status to recommended standards and goals and time phase by year in order of implementation importance			—																
4	Review past management studies of department and isolate recommendations on functions of department (and compare to recommended standards and goals)				—															
5	Brief command staff on analysis and planning results and obtain acceptance of chief police executive to proceed																			X
6	Develop profiles of department +5* years +3 +4 +2 +1																			—

* The 5, 3, 4, 2, 1 sequence is correct since you determine where you want to be +5 and +3 thus +4 changes are easily identified, etc. for +2 and +1.

Figure 2

STANDARDS & GOALS	Present	1st Yr.	2nd Yr.	3rd Yr.	4th Yr.	5th Yr.	REMARKS

Figure 3

AREAS OF CONCERN AND TOPIC AREAS

<u>ADMINISTRATION</u>	<u>PERSONNEL</u>	<u>TRAINING</u>	<u>OPERATIONS</u>	<u>SUPPORT SERVICES</u>	<u>EXTRA-DEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION COORDINATION & ASSISTANCE</u>
Policy	-Policy	-Policy	-Policy	-Policy	-Policy
Procedure	-Procedure	-Procedure	-Procedure	-Procedure	-Procedure
Police Role	-Recruit & Select	-Program Development	-Patrol Deployment	-Information Systems	-Developing Community Relations
Organization Structure	-Personnel Development Promotion & Advancement	-Instruction Quality Control	-Specialization	-Property Systems	-Professional Assistance
Fiscal Management	-Classification & Pay	-Preparatory Training	-Criminal Investigation	-Communication Systems	-Diversion
News Media Relations	-Personnel Utilization	-Inservice Training	-Juvenile Operations	-Detention Systems	-Combined Police Services
Community Relations	-Education	-Police Training Academy & Criminal Justice Training Center	-Traffic Operations	-Personnel Equipment	-Community Physical Planning
Internal Discipline	-Employee Services	-Interpersonnel Communication Training	-Special Crime Tactical Forces	-Crime Laboratory & Evidence Technicians	-Inter CJ Agency Coordination
Inspections Systems		-State Legislation & Fiscal Assistance	-Vice Narcotics & Intelligence Operations	-Transportation	
Discretion		-Training for Unusual Occurances	-Team Policing		
Employee Relations					
Planning					
Unusual Occurances					

Figure 4

AREAS OF CONCERN	APPLICABLE STANDARDS
<u>ADMINISTRATION</u>	
Policy	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4(1), 1.7, 2.2 5.3, 5.7, 18.1, 18.4(2), 19.1, 19.5(6), 19.3(3)
Procedure	1.4(1), 18.1, 18.2, 18.3(1 b,e) 18.3(5), 19.1, 19.2, 19.4(1)
Police Role	1.1, 1.5, 2.1
Discretion	1.2, 1.3
Community Relations	1.4, 1.6
News Media Relations	1.7
Inspections	2.3
Organization	5.1
Fiscal Management	5.6, 5.7, 5.8
Employee Relations	18.1, 18.2, 18.3, 18.4
Internal Discipline	19.1, 19.2, 19.3, 19.4, 19.5, 19.6, Rec. 19.1
Unusual Occurances	7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5
<u>PERSONNEL</u>	
Policy	13.5(4), 13.6, 17.1
Procedure	8.2(2f), 13.5(4), 13.6(1), 14
Utilization	10.1, 10.2, 13.2(2)
Recruitment and Selection	13.1, 13.2, 13.3, 13.4, 13.5, 13.6, 20.1, 20.2, Rec. 13.1, Rec. 13.2
Classification and Pay	14.1, 14.2
Education	15.1, 15.2, 15.3, Rec. 15.1
Development, Promotion and Advancement	17.1, 17.2, 17.3, 17.4
Employee Service	20.3, 20.4, 20.5, Rec. 20.1

TRAINING

Policy	
Procedure	
State Legislation & Fiscal Assistance	16.1
Program Development	16.2
Preparatory Training	16.3
Interpersonal Commu- nications Training	16.4
Inservice Training	16.5
Instruction Quality Control	16.6
Police Training Academy & Criminal Justice Training Centers	16.7
Training for Unus- ual Occurances	7.6

OPERATIONS

Policy	8.1, 8.2, 9.2, 9.5, 9.6(4), 9.7 (6,a), 9.8(1), 9.9(1), 9.9(6), 9.10(5)
Procedure	8.2(2,i), 8.3(4), 9.2(1,6), 9.5 (3), 9.7(5), 9.7(6,a), 9.7(7,a), 9.8(1), 9.9(6), 9.10(5)
Team Policing	6.1, 6.2
Patrol	8.1, 8.2, 8.3
Specialization	9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4
Juvenile Operations	9.5
Traffic Operations	9.6
Criminal Investiga- tion	9.7

Special Crime Tactical
Forces 9.8

Vice, Narcotics and
Intelligence Opera-
tions 9.9, 9.10, 9.11

SUPPORT SERVICES

Policy 24.1(2)

Procedure 24.1

Crime Laboratory
Evidence Tech-
nician 12.1, 12.2, Rec. 12.1

Property System 12.3

Detention System 12.4

Personal Equipment 21.1, 21.2, 12.3

Transportation 22.1, 22.2, 22.3, Rec. 22.1

Communications 23.1, 23.2, 23.3, Rec. 23.1
Rec. 23.2, Rec. 23.3

Information Systems 17.5, 24.1, 24.2, 24.3, 24.4

EXTRA-DEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION, COORDINATION AND ASSISTANCE

Policy 4.1(2,b), 4.3, 4.4(1), 4.5

Procedure 4.2(1), 4.5

Developing Community
Resources
Crime Problem I.D. 3.1
Crime Prevention 3.2

Inter-criminal Justice
Agency Coordination 4.1, 4.2, 4.5, Rec. 4.2, Rec.
4.3, Rec. 5.1

Diversion 4.3, 4.4, Rec. 4.1

Combined Police
Services

5.2

Community Physical
Planning

5.5

Professional
Assistance

11.1, 11.2, 11.3

Standards and Goals Task Planning Sheet

Area of Concern: ADMINISTRATION

Topic: NEWS MEDIA RELATIONS

Applicable Standards:
News Media Relations

SAMPLE

Budget Program:

Purpose: To define and establish the relationship and communication flow between this department and the news media.

Products: Developed guidelines to establish liaison, cooperation, and coordination between this department and the news media including the dissemination of information within legal restraints and formulated policies and procedures.

Development Schedule

Implementation Schedule

Review Schedule

Priority

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year	5th year
Development Schedule	X				
Implementation Schedule	X				
Review Schedule		X	X	X	X
Priority	1	2	3	3	3

Fiscal Requirements

Technical Assistance

Contractual Support

Travel

Other

Total

Technical Assistance	\$200				
Contractual Support	\$200				
Travel					
Other					

\$400

AUTHORS

B. M. Gray, II, is Police Projects Director of the Tidewater Area, Virginia, Pilot City Program, College of William and Mary Metropolitan Criminal Justice Center, (Suite 311, Law Building, 147 Granby Street, Norfolk, Virginia 23510) and serves as a part-time instructor in the criminal justice program at Old Dominion University. He holds a M. S. degree in criminal justice from Eastern Kentucky University and a B. S. degree in law enforcement from Virginia Commonwealth University.

W. J. Diggles is the Systems and Management Projects Director for the Metropolitan Criminal Justice Center. He holds a M.B.A. from Babson College and a B. S. in Civil Engineering from the University of Rhode Island.



END

7 ables/more