

NEIGHBORHOOD TEAM POLICING
IN THE UNITED STATES
AN ASSESSMENT
Product 4

WILLIAM G. GAY
H. TALMAGE DAY
JANE P. WOODWARD

NCJRS

MAY 21 1976

ACQUISITIONS

Submitted to:

THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
United States Department of Justice

January, 1976

Prepared under Grant Number 75 NI 99-0065 from the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice or the National Sheriffs' Association.



NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION

FERRIS E. LUCAS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
SUITE 320, 1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036 (202) 872-0422

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The National Sheriffs' Association has prepared this report, NEIGHBORHOOD TEAM POLICING: AN ASSESSMENT, under Grant Number 75 NI 99-0065, of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. It is one in a series of reports in the area of patrol operations and is part of the Institute's National Evaluation Program.

NEIGHBORHOOD TEAM POLICING: AN ASSESSMENT presents the results of a critical review of efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of Team Policing Programs in expanding the role of the patrol officer, combating crime and improving police-community relations. The information contained in this report relies heavily upon formal evaluations of Team Policing Programs in fourteen cities. The report provides a "snapshot" of the characteristics of Team Policing Programs, assesses the state of the knowledge about Team Policing and indicates what additional information is needed to fully evaluate Team Policing.

Our review of team policing programs indicates that several team policing programs have failed because of the inability of departments to implement the most basic components of the program. Where team concepts have been operationalized, however, several departments have demonstrated that team policing can improve the performance of patrol, investigative and community service activities. The most serious shortcomings in the

evaluation of team policing has been the failure of evaluators to carefully monitor the extent to which planned program activities have actually been implemented by team managers and officers. Because of this shortcoming it has not always been possible to determine whether the concepts of team policing or extraneous variables are responsible for the evaluation results reported.

The completion of this assessment would not have been possible without the assistance of the many law enforcement administrators and officers with whom we discussed Team Policing during our site visits and telephone interviews. Particularly helpful were personnel involved with the nineteen programs analyzed in this report. We wish to express appreciation to the members of our Advisory Board - Sheriff Michael Canlis, Joseph Lewis, Elinor Ostrom, Chief James Parsons, Chief Rocky Pomerance, John Stead, Victor Strecher and Eugene Zoglio - for their helpful comments and assistance during critical stages of our research. Thanks are due to Richard Barnes, Dave Farmer and William Saulsbury of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice who greatly facilitated our work, and to Carl Tucker and James O'Neil of the National Sheriffs' Association staff who provided valuable insights into patrol operations. We wish to thank Peter Bloch of the Urban Institute for reviewing much of our work and offering helpful suggestions and encouragement. And, finally, our thanks to Ellen Auerbach for her dedication and talent in preparing the manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page Number
PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	i
LIST OF TABLES.....	iii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY.....	1
Sources of Information.....	3
Assessment of Evaluation Reports.....	7
Assessment Limitations.....	15
CHAPTER 2: CHARACTERISTICS OF TEAM POLICING.....	17
The 1967 President's Commission on Law Enforcement.....	18
The 1973 Commission on Standards and Goals.....	20
Team Policing Goals.....	21
Team Organization.....	26
Team Coordination and Management.....	29
Team Responsibilities.....	33
Conceptual Framework.....	38
CHAPTER 3: OFFICER ROLE AND JOB SATISFACTION.....	41
Training for Team Policing.....	44
Officer Role Perception.....	47
Officer Job Satisfaction.....	51
CHAPTER 4: PATROL WORKLOAD MANAGEMENT.....	57
Stable Assignment to the Team Area.....	59
Scheduling Flexibility.....	62
Service Call Clearance.....	66
CHAPTER 5: INVESTIGATIVE EFFECTIVENESS.....	73
Officer-Investigator Coordination.....	77
Clearance Rates.....	79
Cases Prosecuted.....	87
Conclusions and Implications.....	89
CHAPTER 6: CRIME TRENDS ACCOMPANYING TEAM POLICING.....	93
Crime Trends as Evaluation Criteria.....	94
Reported Crime Data.....	96
Unresolved Problems.....	104

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page Number
CHAPTER 7: COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS.....	107
Community Service Activities and Outcomes.....	108
Community Related Effects of Team Policing.....	123
CHAPTER 8: SUMMARY ASSESSMENT.....	133
Program Implementation and Evaluation Results.....	133
Assessment of Program Types	137
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	 140

LIST OF TABLES

Table Number		Page Number
1	Characteristics of Programs Analyzed.....	5
2	Criteria for Assessing Evaluation Findings.....	8
3	Evaluation Report Summary.....	10
4	Data Assessment Format.....	14
5	Aspects of Team Organization.....	27
6	Aspects of Team Coordination.....	31
7	Program Aspects of Team Policing.....	34
8	Team Policing Conceptual Framework.....	40
9	Officer Role Change Goals and Measures.....	43
10	Pre-Start-Up Team Policing Training Programs.....	45
11	Summary Assessment of Officer Role Changes.....	50
12	Summary Assessment of Officer Job Satisfaction....	55
13	Workload Management Goals and Measures.....	58
14	Summary Assessment of Stable Assignment.....	62
15	Summary Assessment of Scheduling Flexibility.....	66
16	Summary Assessment of Service Call Clearance.....	71
17	Team Investigative Goals and Activities.....	74
18	Measures of Investigative Effectiveness.....	81
19	Team Clearance Rates - Rochester.....	82
20	Arrests/Man - Rochester.....	83
21	Summary Assessment of Clearance Rates.....	86
22	Summary Assessment of Investigative Effectiveness.	90
23	Crime Goals and Measures.....	97
24	Summary Assessment of Victimization Surveys.....	99
25	Summary Assessment of Reported Crime.....	103
26	Community Service Activities.....	109
27	Measures of Community Service Activities.....	112
28	Summary Assessment of Beat Knowledge.....	115
29	Summary Assessment of Team Offices.....	117
30	Summary Assessment of Non-Crime Service Programs..	121
31	Summary Assessment of the Blazer Uniform.....	123
32	Measures of Community Focus of Team Policing.....	125
33	Summary Assessment of Police Attitudes Toward the Community.....	127
34	Summary Assessment of Community Attitudes.....	131
35	Summary Assessment of Team Policing Programs.....	134

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION AND ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

In recent years neighborhood team policing programs have received considerable attention from the criminal justice community. Both the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice in its comprehensive report The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society and the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals have strongly recommended that law enforcement agencies consider the adoption of team policing programs. A National Strategy to Reduce Crime specifically recommended:

...that every police agency examine and test the team policing concept to determine its value in improving the agency's efforts to reduce crime, improve the quality of police service, and enhance police-community cooperation. (NACCJSG, 1973, p. 78).

The implementation of team policing programs has been aided by the publication of two planning guides by the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. The Institute's Prescriptive Package Neighborhood Team Policing (Bloch & Specht, 1973) and its more recent publication Full-Service Neighborhood Team Policing (Public Safety Research, 1975) have been designed as planning guides to acquaint the law enforcement administrator with the concepts of team policing and to describe procedures by which to implement a team policing program. Further, the Institute has held seminars throughout the country

to familiarize law enforcement officials with team policing and is currently funding six demonstration projects.¹ In addition to the Institute, the Police Foundation has supported the preparation of Team Policing: Seven Case Studies (Sherman et al., 1973) and has enabled several cities to develop, implement and evaluate team policing programs. These documents, published by the Institute and Police Foundation, are invaluable aides to officials planning team police programs.

Rather than merely describe team policing programs, this report represents an attempt to gather and assess information about the effectiveness of team policing. Our goal has been to provide law enforcement administrators and planners with a comprehensive assessment of team policing as a system designed to deliver patrol, investigative and community services. The information presented in this report represents a critical synthesis of formal evaluations conducted in fourteen cities which have implemented team policing. We think this assessment will enable criminal justice officials at the Federal, State and Local levels to make more knowledgeable decisions about the funding, planning and evaluating of team policing programs.

The remainder of this chapter describes the methodology used by the project staff in preparing this knowledge assessment. It includes a discussion of the:

¹For information about the implementation and evaluation of these demonstration projects in Boulder, Colorado; Elizabeth, New Jersey; Hartford, Connecticut; Multnomah County, Oregon; Santa Anna, California; and Winston-Salem, North Carolina, contact the Office of Technology Transfer of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

- Various sources of information that have been analyzed to assess team policing programs;
- Procedures used to analyze and assess the reliability of evaluation reports; and
- Basic problems inherent in assessing a complex program like team policing.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

A variety of methods has been used in gathering information for this state-of-the-art assessment. A review of law enforcement literature and published team policing materials was undertaken during the first phase of the project in order to develop a background understanding of team policing activities, relevant patrol and community relations issues, and the likely effects of team policing programs upon the delivery of basic law enforcement services. The report Issues in Team Policing presents the results of this literature review.

During the second phase of the study the project staff augmented its knowledge of team policing programs by reviewing and analyzing evaluation reports of fourteen team policing projects. In addition, the knowledge in these reports was supplemented by field site visits to twenty-one team policing programs. The site visits enabled the project staff to verify published descriptions of program activities and to gather information about the evaluation studies which had been conducted.

During the site visits, which lasted from three to five days, the research staff talked with a wide range of departmental officials

including program planners, middle managers, first-line supervisors and team officers. Whenever possible, the Sheriff or Police Chief was also interviewed. Ride-alongs and field observations of officers on patrol were features of most visits, and attempts were made to observe team meetings and roll-calls. Particular attention was given to observing crime analysis, dispatch procedures, data collection and records systems as well as to observing the type of management information routinely available to administrators, program managers and officers. Program documentation was collected and the findings at each site visit were recorded in a standard format.¹ On the basis of our site visits and a critical review of the evaluation reports, nineteen team policing programs were selected for extended analysis.

Table 1, Characteristics of Programs Analyzed, presents some background information about the team policing programs that have been analyzed in this report. The primary criteria for selecting a team program for analysis and assessment was the existence of program documentation and evaluation reports. All of the departments provided program documentation. Fifteen of the nineteen programs were formally evaluated, in most cases by a university or private consulting firm. Four programs were not evaluated but were included in this report because they represented distinct types of team policing programs that merit the attention of law enforcement planners and managers.²

¹The site visit reports and other background data and notes have been collected and prepared as a separate document for this project.

²A typology for describing team policing programs appears in Chapter 2.

Table 1
CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAMS ANALYZED

CHARACTERISTICS	CITY																				SUMMARY
	ALBANY/ARBOR	ALBANY/SOUTH	ALBUQUERQUE	CHARLOTTE	CINCINNATI	DAYTON	DETROIT	HARTFORD	HOLYOKE	LOS ANGELES	MENLO PARK	NEW YORK	N. CHARLESTON	PALO ALTO	RICHMOND	ROCHESTER	SAN BRUNO	SAN DIEGO	ST. PETERSBURG		
PROGRAM DOCUMENTATION																					
Program Description	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	19	
Quantitative Evaluation	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	15	
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS																					
Small Department (0-149)								•		•		•	•			•				5	
Medium Department (150-399)	•	•				•								•						4	
Large Department (400 up)			•	•	•		•	•		•		•			•		•	•		10	
Urban	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•		•	•		•	•		15	
Suburban										•		•	•			•				4	
GEOGRAPHIC SPREAD																					
Northeast	•	•						•	•			•				•				6	
Southeast				•								•							•	3	
Midwest					•	•	•													3	
West Coast			•							•	•			•	•		•	•		7	
FUNDING CHARACTERISTICS																					
LEAA or Private Grant	•	•	•		•	•		•	•	•							•	•		10	

The second criteria for program analysis was the size of the department. Earlier descriptions of team policing have tended to describe it as a phenomenon of larger cities. Our review of over sixty team policing programs indicated that team policing has been adopted by large, medium and small cities in approximately equal numbers. The tendency to disproportionately analyze the larger departments in this report reflects the fact that large departments have evaluated their programs more frequently. This is probably attributable to the fact that the larger departments have been more successful in attracting grants from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, State Planning Agencies or private sources like the Police Foundation to both implement and evaluate their programs. Eleven of the nineteen programs have had implementation grants. Although Detroit, New York and Rochester implemented their programs without outside support, their evaluation reports were funded by grants. Team programs have been implemented in both urban and suburban areas, and, although the Table does not reflect it, several sheriff's departments have also implemented team policing.¹ Finally, the programs selected for analysis represent all geographic areas of the United States.

¹Multnomah County, Oregon has implemented the program county-wide; while San Diego and San Joaquin Counties, California are using team policing in selected areas to service communities separated from major urban areas of the county.

ASSESSMENT OF EVALUATION REPORTS

The most extensive information about the outcomes and impacts of team policing programs can be found in evaluation reports. Twenty-three formal evaluation reports, which describe fifteen team policing programs, were analyzed in preparing this report. These reports vary greatly in type and quality, ranging from brief one-shot surveys to multi-year intensive research studies culminating in a series of reports. The evaluation reports assessed in this report can be divided into three types.

Case Studies - These reports contain primarily descriptive information rather than evaluative information about the team programs. They describe how the program was implemented and what changes were made. They also contain information about intermediate outcomes. The information is primarily qualitative, although quantitative departmental records are sometimes analyzed.

Case Study evaluations have been prepared for five projects - Albany/Arbor and South, Cincinnati, Holyoke and San Diego.

Ex Post Facto - These studies are initiated after a program has been implemented and must rely upon existing data sources for information. The reliability of an Ex Post Facto study is largely dependent upon the existence of departmental records that make it possible to analyze pre-post and experimental-control group data in order to examine causal relationships.

Ex Post Facto studies have been undertaken in Albany/Arbor and South, Albuquerque, Dayton, Detroit, Menlo Park, Rochester, San Bruno and St. Petersburg.

Quasi-Experimental - These studies, if properly executed, are the most valuable for testing causal relationships. Their extensive use of pre-post and experimental-control group data make it possible to link evaluation outcomes to program activities with a high degree of certainty.

Quasi-Experimental studies have been done in Charlotte, Cincinnati, Los Angeles, New York, Rochester, San Diego and St. Petersburg.

Despite the relatively large number of studies, there have been no cost-effectiveness studies and no comparative evaluations of two or more team programs.

In order to better assess the results reported by the twenty-three studies, a standard set of criteria was developed for assessing the various data sources in the evaluation studies. These criteria permitted us to judge, with some degree of confidence, whether the results reported by an evaluation were likely to be accurate and attributable to the particular team policing program. Table 2 lists the criteria used to assess the reliability of each evaluation report.

Table 2
CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING EVALUATION FINDINGS

CRITERIA CATEGORIES	QUESTIONS
Research Design	Pre-Post Data Collection Control Group Comparability Representative Sample Intervening Variables Controlled
Measures	Relevance Precision
Instrumentation	Pre-Tested Validated Standardized
Data Sources	Records Audited Subject Anonymity

It should be noted that the criteria were not given equal weight in evaluating a report's reliability. In general, the adequacy of the research design, particularly the comparability of control groups and the collection of pre-post data, was considered most important for a report to receive a high rating. In addition, because the different types of data used in a single report might vary in quality, we have assigned separate ratings to each data source. Most of the data have been grouped into four categories for this purpose.

Crime Records
Departmental Records (Personnel, Dispatch)
Officer Attitudinal Surveys
Citizen Attitudinal Surveys

Using the criteria in Table 2, the data sources in each report were assigned a rating of High, Medium or Low. In order for a data source to receive a High rating, the research design had to be complete, the measures appropriate, the instruments validated and the data sources audited. Only four sources received a High rating. These were the Officer and Citizen Surveys in Cincinnati; the Departmental Records used in the Study of Investigative Effectiveness in Rochester and the San Diego Officer Surveys. These sources have been relied upon most heavily in the preparation of this assessment. Fifteen data sources received Medium ratings. Most of the reports were rated as Low primarily because of inadequate research designs which made it difficult to judge whether or not the reported effects could be attributed to the team policing program. Table 3 lists the evaluation reports by cities and indicates the type of report and the rating assigned to each data source.

Table 3
EVALUATION REPORT SUMMARY

CITY	AUTHOR	TITLE	TYPE OF REPORT	RATING
Albany/Arbor	Cresap, McCormick & Paget, Inc.	Albany Police Department: A Management Evaluation of the Arbor Hill Neighborhood Police Unit.	<u>Case Study</u> Crime Records Department Records	Low Medium
	Forer & Farrell	The Impact of the Neighborhood Police Unit on the Arbor Hill Community of Albany, New York: A Sociological Evaluation.	<u>Ex Post Facto</u> Citizen Survey Department Records	Medium Low
Albany/South	Candeub, Fleissig, & Associates	Evaluation of Changes in Police and Resident Attitudes: Neighborhood Police Unit Project, Albany, New York.	<u>Ex Post Facto</u> Officer Survey Citizen Survey	Medium Low
	New York State Institute for Governmental Executives	Training Neighborhood Police: The Report on the Training Program - for the Albany Neighborhood Police Unit Conducted May 17-June 11, 1971.	<u>Case Study</u> Officer Survey	Low
Albuquerque	Sears & Wilson	Crime Reduction in Albuquerque: Evaluation of Three Police Projects.	<u>Ex Post Facto</u> Officer Survey Department Records	Low Low
Charlotte	Gill	Police Organizational Questionnaire (Memorandum Reporting Results of Administration of Questionnaire Evaluating Officer Attitudes).	<u>Quasi-Experimental</u> Officer Survey	Low

(Continued)

Table 3

(Continued)

CITY	AUTHOR	TITLE	TYPE OF REPORT	RATING
Cincinnati	Cincinnati Police Department	Report on Investigative Effectiveness: A Comparison of Three Investigative Models.	<u>Quasi-Experimental</u> Officer Survey Crime/Dept Records	Medium Medium
	Cincinnati Police Department	Community Sector Team Policing: An Examination of the Model's Operational Components Based Upon Six Months of Experience.	<u>Case Study</u> Officer Survey Crime/Dept Records	Medium Medium
	Cincinnati Police Department	Community Sector Team Policing: An Examination of the Model's Operational Components Based Upon Eighteen Months of Experience.		
	Schwartz et al.	Evaluation of Cincinnati's Community Sector Team Policing Program - A Progress Report: After One Year, Summary of Major Findings.	<u>Quasi-Experimental</u> Officer Survey Citizen Survey Department Records Victimization Survey	High High Medium Medium
	Schwartz & Clarren	Evaluation of Cincinnati's Community Sector Team Policing Program - A Progress Report: The First Six Months Summary of Major Findings.		
	Clarren & Schwartz	An Evaluation of Cincinnati's Team Policing Program.		
	Urban Institute	Urban Institute Evaluation Activities Associated with the Community Sector Team Policing Program in Cincinnati, Ohio: A Collection of Papers.		
	Schwartz et al.	Evaluation of Cincinnati's Community Sector Team Policing Program - A Progress Report: Baseline Data.		
	Schwartz et al.	Cincinnati's Team Policing Program: Eighteen Months of Evaluation.		

(Continued)

Table 3

(Continued)

CITY	AUTHOR	TITLE	TYPE OF REPORT	RATING
Dayton	Cordrey & Kotecha	Evaluation of the Community Centered Team Policing Program, 1971.	<u>Ex Post Facto</u> Officer Survey Citizen Survey Department Records Officer Interviews	Low Low Low Low
	Tortoriello & Blatt	Community Centered Team Policing: A Second Year Evaluation.	<u>Ex Post Facto</u> Citizen Survey Department Records	Low Low
Detroit	Bloch & Ulberg	The Beat Commander Concept.	<u>Ex Post Facto</u> Officer Survey Department Records	Low Low
Holyoke	O'Malley	Evaluation Report on the Holyoke Team Police Experiment of Holyoke Police Department.	<u>Case Study</u> Citizen Survey Department Records Officer Survey	Low Low Low
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Police Department	An Evaluation of the Team 28 Experiment.	<u>Quasi-Experimental</u> Officer Survey Citizen Survey Crime/Dept Records Security Inspection Survey	Low Low Medium Medium
Menlo Park	Feist & Luft	Menlo Park Community Attitude Survey Report.	<u>Ex Post Facto</u> Citizen Survey	Low
New York	Bloch & Specht	Evaluation of Operation Neighborhood	<u>Quasi-Experimental</u> Officer Survey Citizen Survey Department Records	Low Low Low

(Continued)

Table 3

(Continued)

CITY	AUTHOR	TITLE	TYPE OF REPORT	RATING
Rochester	Bloch & Bell	How Detectives Contributed to the Increased Effectiveness of Police Patrol Teams in Rochester, New York - Draft.	<u>Quasi-Experimental</u> Department Records Officer Survey	High Medium
	Bloch & Ulberg	Auditing Clearance Rates.	<u>Ex Post Facto</u> Department Records	Medium
San Bruno	San Bruno Police Department	4/40 - Basic Team Concept.	<u>Ex Post Facto</u> Department Records Officer Survey	Low Low
San Diego	Boydston & Sherry	Final Evaluation Report of the San Diego Police Department's Community Profile Project.	<u>Quasi-Experimental</u> Officer Interviews Citizen Survey Field Observation Department Records Crime Records	Low Low Medium Low Low
	Stamper et al.	Performance Assessment: An Analysis of Current Problems and a Proposal for Change.	<u>Case Study</u> Officer Interviews Citizen Survey Field Observation Department Records Crime Records	Low Low Medium Low Low
St. Petersburg	Murphy	Research Report: Impact of St. Petersburg Public Safety Team Adam.	<u>Ex Post Facto</u> Citizen Interviews	Low
	Vetere	Final Report: Comprehensive Police Improvement Project (Period of April 1972-April 1973).	<u>Quasi-Experimental</u> Citizen Survey Officer Interviews Crime/Dept Records	Low Low Low

The reliability rating assigned to each data source has been used to indicate our confidence in the changes evaluators attributed to the team policing programs. Data given a Low reliability rating have been reported as a Qualified Change, while data assigned a Medium rating have been reported as a Probable Change. If a data source had a High rating, it was reported without a qualifying word. Table 4 summarizes this system.

Table 4
DATA ASSESSMENT FORMAT

REPORT RATING	PROGRAM EFFECTS
Low	Qualified Change
Medium	Probable Change
High	Change

This system has been used to summarize all of the evaluation data presented in this report. In addition, in the summary assessment tables for each section we note whether the element being measured indicated the program was a success (+), no change (0) or a failure (-). If, for example, evaluators reported that team policing significantly improved police-community relations and the report had a High confidence rating, the result was reported as a success (+). If the confidence rating was Low or Medium, however, we reported the outcome as a Qualified or Probable Success.

ASSESSMENT LIMITATIONS

There are several limitations in the approach adopted to rate the reliability of the data sources in the evaluation studies and to assign a success/failure rating to each variable measured. First, the reliability rating system is not one of scientific precision. Although we have assessed the evaluation studies as objectively and systematically as possible, such ratings are somewhat arbitrary and relative. A "High" rating does not mean perfect and a "Low" rating does not mean the data is unusable. If, for example, several studies with a "Low" rating reach the same conclusion about a program, then it is reasonable to infer that the results are probably reliable. The reliability ratings should be considered as guides. They refer only to the degree to which outcomes can be attributed to the particular team policing program.

Second, the Success-Failure ratings assigned to each report do not take into consideration the degree of change reported by the evaluation study. This has been necessary because many of the evaluations neglect to report precise statistics or fail to assess the significance of those changes brought about by the team program. Wherever possible, however, we have indicated the magnitude and statistical significance of reported changes in the text of the assessment.

Finally, no attempt has been made to assess the reliability of site visit data or anecdotal information gathered during the literature review. We have considered this data to be of generally low reliability

unless confirmed by some type of quantitative assessment. The summary assessment information contained in this report is based almost exclusively upon quantitative evaluation data. Site visit and anecdotal information is used in this assessment only to discuss team policing assumptions and to supplement the discussions of evaluation results.

Chapter 2

CHARACTERISTICS OF TEAM POLICING

Both the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (1967), and the National Advisory Commission on Standards and Goals (1973), have recommended that police agencies study and evaluate the role team policing might play in their organizations. Unfortunately, much of the team policing information available to police administrators describes only the principles underlying team policing or the successes of individual programs, rather than their problems or failures. The purpose of this report is to present a balanced assessment of team policing, including both its positive and negative aspects.

When we initially examined team policing, it appeared to differ from more traditional approaches to law enforcement in degree rather than in kind. As the study progressed, however, it became clear that team policing could involve radical departures from the generally prevailing quasi-military style of traditional police organization. Because of the scope of the organizational changes implicit in team policing, a major problem in implementing a successful team policing program is the dynamic process by which change is brought about. Knowing what team policing is and how it relates to the solution of law enforcement problems is a prelude to devising strategies that can facilitate

implementation. In this report, we are concerned with describing the various elements of team policing and with assessing what impact team policing might have upon the delivery of law enforcement services, the officer and the community.

THE 1967 PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON LAW ENFORCEMENT

A major recommendation of the 1967 Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice was that team policing could overcome the problems created in most urban police agencies by centralization and task specialization. The Commission was particularly concerned with the isolation of patrol and investigative forces. It pointed out that the rigid separation of patrol and investigative branches not only led to conflict between the two groups but also hindered efforts to solve crimes.

The Commission suggested the creation of a team of agents, patrol officers and community service officers as a means to divide police functions more rationally and to provide better law enforcement services to the community. These teams of officers would be assigned to specific geographic areas or neighborhoods and be responsible to single commanders. The primary goals of this system were to foster cooperation between patrol officers and detectives and to create a career ladder that would attract more qualified recruits and reward the more competent personnel in the department. The implementation of this system in medium and large departments could be accomplished by creating three classes of police: agents, officers and community service

representatives. The tasks assigned to these officers would be based upon their skills and job performance.

The entry level position for this "team" would be the community service officer. He would assist the patrol officer and the police agent but would be primarily responsible for providing non-crime services to the community. As his education, skills and competence increased, the community service officer would become a patrol officer, responsible for law enforcement and minor investigative functions. The patrol officer would respond to calls for service, perform routine patrol functions and investigate traffic accidents. The police agent would be assigned to the most complicated and demanding police tasks. Although these agents would engage in investigative work, they would be assigned to a mixed team of patrol and community service officers (PCLEAJ, 1967, pp. 53; 121-125).

The assignment of investigative work as well as detectives to mixed teams of generalists and specialists has become an important element of most team policing programs. Departments have adopted this mode of operation and organization with the idea that increased officer-investigator contact and communication would streamline the investigative process and lead to a higher rate of crime solution. In addition, it has been argued that the incorporation of investigative functions into the basic patrol unit or team, would enlarge the job role and responsibilities of the patrol officer by providing an organizational context for officers to perform more complicated tasks as their experience increased.

THE 1973 COMMISSION ON STANDARDS AND GOALS

Although the 1967 Commission recommended that teams be assigned to neighborhoods, it was more interested in the impact the team would have upon the internal organization of the department - especially the impact of the team upon improved investigative work and officer job satisfaction. The 1973 Commission on Standards and Goals, on the other hand, emphasized the need to increase citizen-police cooperation. The report noted that in recent years, because of changes in community attitudes and police patrol techniques, "many police agencies have become increasingly isolated from the community" (NACCJSG, 1973, p. 154). Whereas the 1967 Commission's discussion of team policing focused upon changing the structure of the basic patrol unit, the 1973 Commission stressed the adoption of techniques to improve police-citizen cooperation as a means to prevent and control crime.

The basic rationale for team policing, as stated in the Standards and Goals report was "that the team learns its neighborhood, its people and its problems" (NACCJSG, 1973, p. 154). To accomplish this goal, the Commission recommended that patrol officers make a special effort to interact more with the people in their beat area. This interaction was to be stimulated by encouraging officers to leave their patrol cars periodically to walk and talk with people. The conversion of motorized beats to foot patrols was also recommended because increased citizen contact, spawned by foot patrols, would provide police with additional information resulting in increased apprehension rates. In addition, the permanent assignment of officers and teams to a specific geographic

area was recommended as a tactic to strengthen the police-community bond.

The 1973 Standards and Goals report also recognized the important role the implementation process plays in the development of a successful team policing program. Police administrators in a number of cities have learned that new organizational and service delivery systems cannot be implemented by administrative fiat. An undertaking like team policing demands that personnel throughout an agency reorient the way they think about and deliver police services to the community. The 1973 Commission cautioned administrators to include agency personnel in the planning process and to develop appropriate training programs to ease the transition from a traditional to the team policing method of operation (NACCJSG, 1973, p. 159).

The recommendation of the 1973 report on Standards and Goals that police agencies concentrate upon developing improved police-community cooperation as an effective tool in the war against crime has been an important element of team policing. However, like the 1967 Advisory Commission Report, the 1973 Standards and Goals has provided only a limited glimpse of team policing programs as they are being implemented across the country in both large and small communities.

TEAM POLICING GOALS

Both the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (1967) and the National Advisory Commission on Criminal

Justice Standards and Goals (1973) have attempted to define team policing by describing the types of law enforcement functions and responsibilities that teams might adopt. Both reports concentrated upon recommending measures that would increase cooperation between officers and investigators and between the law enforcement agency and the public. Although both of these features have been adopted by many of the team policing programs reviewed in this report, our analysis indicates that a more fundamental element underlies all team policing programs. Perhaps a statement of the goals of selected team policing programs will clarify this point of view. Team policing programs have generally adopted goals in the following areas:

- Organizational Development
- Officer Role and Responsibilities
- Traditional Law Enforcement Services
- Police-Community Relations

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The fundamental goal underlying all team policing programs has been in the area of organizational development. All of the programs reviewed have attempted to decentralize the delivery of law enforcement services to a team of officers. This has frequently also included responsibility for a clearly defined and relatively small geographic area. It has meant that police service delivery has been decentralized from city-wide operational bureaus to the team level. The extent of decentralization has varied considerably. In the most basic team programs, only the patrol division has been directly affected. However, other departments have chosen to decentralize patrol, investigative and community relations responsibilities to the team.

The decentralization of operational concerns to smaller units has also been accompanied by a downward shift of the point at which decisions are made. The tendency has been to increase the management and operational responsibility of team leaders (usually lieutenants) and first-line supervisors. In departments that have decentralized most operational responsibilities to the team level, the team leader not only plans and guides patrol operations but also assumes the same level of responsibility in regard to investigations and community relations.

The intent of team policing has been to establish accountability for operations at the lowest level possible. In pursuit of this goal, team programs have encouraged participant decision making and the involvement of patrol officers in planning, investigative and community relations activities.

OFFICER ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The organizational changes brought about by team policing have frequently generated a new set of goals for the patrol officer. The tendency has been to enhance the officer's role by expanding his responsibilities. As new functional responsibilities have been added to the team, the patrol officer has been expected to assume some of these responsibilities. Team policing programs have frequently tried to develop generalist officers who, although their primary responsibility may be responding to calls for service, perform some of the work traditionally assigned to specialists. Thus, team officers have sometimes engaged in follow-up investigative work, have taken responsibility for developing community relations contacts and have helped their sergeants

plan and coordinate team activities. The model for many team programs has been a more professional officer who can capably perform a variety of tasks with a minimum of supervision. Several team programs have attempted to upgrade the skills needed to implement a team policing program by providing officers with training in the areas of group dynamics, participant decision making, investigative procedures, crisis intervention and community relations.

The expansion of the patrol officer's role frequently has a two-pronged objective. First, some teams assign the officer more responsibility in an effort to increase the level of service delivered by the officer and the team. Second, enlarged job responsibilities have been viewed as a method by which to increase job satisfaction.

TRADITIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICES

Police administrators have been grappling with ways to more efficiently manage the patrol and investigative workload. Some have looked upon the decentralization of patrol and investigative activities to teams as a means of increasing the level of service delivered without appreciably increasing inputs. One of the most frequently stated objectives of team programs has been to reduce crime. Most teams have attempted to do this by demanding better quality preliminary reports, encouraging officer-investigator coordination and permitting patrol officers to engage in some investigative work. The general tendency has been to give patrol officers more responsibility for apprehending criminals operating in their beat area in expectation that crime rates might drop. A second objective of team administrators has been to more effectively manage

the patrol workload by improving manpower allocation, increasing the number of dispatch calls serviced and decreasing response time without increasing the number of personnel assigned to the team area.

POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

A final goal of most of the teams here has been to enhance the relationship between the police and the public. Team policing community relations objectives have usually included attempts to initiate crime prevention programs, improve police-citizen cooperation and encourage citizen involvement in and concern with public safety issues. Team policing administrators have attempted to improve police-community relations by making the patrol officer responsible for initiating police-citizen contacts and for carrying out activities designed to reduce police-citizen conflicts. The permanent assignment of officers to an area, for example, has enabled patrol officers to undertake an expanded community relations role. By eliminating the dispatch of officers throughout the city on radio calls, law enforcement administrators have found a way to familiarize officers with the community and make them responsible for initiating positive police-citizen contacts on their assigned beats.

In the following sections of this chapter an iterative process will be used to develop an analytical framework into which the universe of team programs can be grouped. The development of the framework involves a discussion of how teams are organized, how teams are managed and how functional responsibilities have been assigned to teams.

TEAM ORGANIZATION

Table 5, Aspects of Team Organization, describes the ways agencies have organized their officers into teams. The organizational structure of the team is an important criteria for dividing the various team programs into types and developing a conceptual framework. The temporal responsibility of the team and the permanent assignment of the team to a community are important elements of team organization.

The degree of temporal responsibility assigned to the team and the team leader is a critical element for designating different types of team policing programs. Departments have organized their officers into teams responsible for either an area within the city on a twenty-four hour basis or for a specific block of time during the day - usually an eight hour shift. Area Teams, responsible for providing law enforcement services around-the-clock and headed by a lieutenant were found in twelve of the nineteen cities described here. Twenty-four hour responsibility has meant that a single team leader can coordinate all patrol activities in the team area. It has usually facilitated cross-shift planning and coordination. In addition, it has usually allowed the team leader considerable flexibility in deploying officers according to the changing level of service demands experienced throughout the day. The Area Teams described here have from seventeen to forty-nine officers and are larger than teams organized by shifts.

The organization of teams by shifts has been implemented in seven cities. The Shift Teams are usually led by a sergeant or corporal and are

Table 5
ASPECTS OF TEAM ORGANIZATION

TEAM CHARACTERISTICS	SHIFT TEAMS														AREA TEAMS									
	ALBUQUERQUE	MENLO PARK	N CHARLESTON	PALO ALTO	RICHMOND	SAN BRUNO	SAN DIEGO	ALBANY/ARBOR	ALBANY/SOUTH	CHARLOTTE	CINCINNATI	DAYTON	DETROIT	HARTFORD	HOLYOKE	LOS ANGELES	NEW YORK	ROCHESTER	ST. PETERSBURG	SUMMARY				
TEAM ORGANIZATION																								
24-hour Responsibility								•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	12				
8-hour Responsibility	•	•	•	•	•	•	•													7				
Number of Officers	11	8	11	22	12	4	14	48	28	39	40	47	28	40	17	41	40	49	29					
Size Range	8 to 22							17 to 49																
Permanent Assignment	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	19				
Overlapping Beats				•		•				•								•	•	5				

smaller than Area Teams. The Shift Teams described here have from eight to twenty-two officers. Palo Alto and San Diego have adopted unique approaches. Palo Alto has organized all personnel, including civilians into three teams that are deployed by shifts. Although the largest Palo Alto team has thirty-seven members, this number includes sworn command positions not included in other team programs as well as non-sworn personnel who provide professional and clerical support services. The San Diego program has undergone some changes since it was evaluated. The original profile experiment did not involve a team organization although profile officers were responsible for a particular beat and were encouraged to provide additional community services. When the profile program was implemented city-wide, a team organization was adopted. Three Shift Teams of twelve to fourteen officers and a sergeant have been grouped and placed under the command of a lieutenant who is referred to as a team or platoon leader. This lieutenant is responsible for planning and coordinating the activities of the three squads in his platoon. Unlike the Area Team organization, no formal chain of command has been established to coordinate the various shifts serving a single area. The sergeant directing a shift team reports to a watch commander.

The permanent assignment of officers to the team is an important element in the decentralization scheme and has been a common feature of team policing programs. Team policing advocates have argued that permanent assignment within the team area permits the officer to become familiar with the residents as well as the characteristics of the community. Unlike traditional patrol systems where patrol officers are frequently dispatched throughout the city, team programs have attempted, not always successfully, to assign

most calls for service in the team area to team officers. Permanent assignment has led police administrators to hold team officers accountable for the delivery of law enforcement services in the team area. Because team officers work together for extended periods of time, it is also possible to better coordinate law enforcement activities throughout the team area.

All of the team programs described in this report feature permanent assignment, and most assign officers to a specific beat within the team area. The assignment to a specific beat has meant that the beat officer is responsible for preventive patrol in that beat and may participate in community relations, investigative and traffic activities in the same area. One of the more complete systems of beat accountability has been developed in San Diego's Community Profile Program. Officers in San Diego are assigned to a specific beat and must prepare a written profile of its demographic and structural characteristics, traffic patterns and criminal activity. With this information the profile officer is expected to develop a service delivery approach that will solve the problems encountered on the beat. Cincinnati, Rochester, Palo Alto, San Bruno and St. Petersburg have not assigned officers to a specific beat. In these programs officers are responsible for overlapping beats and routinely patrol throughout the entire team area.

TEAM COORDINATION AND MANAGEMENT

Team policing has frequently been accompanied by efforts to decentralize management and planning functions to the team level. Most teams have

made an attempt to establish procedures that would enable first-line supervisors and officers to plan and coordinate patrol strategies. Unlike traditional patrol systems, many team programs have also attempted to better coordinate patrol, investigative and community relations activities within the team area. Table 6, Aspects of Team Coordination, displays the various methods that have been developed to manage team activities.

The primary mechanism for planning and coordinating has been regular and periodic meetings of team members. In most cases the traditional roll call has been replaced by less formal gatherings where team members and first-line supervisors can discuss and plan activities for the team area. These meetings also provide a mechanism for team members to participate in decisions made by team leaders and first-line supervisors.

Team policing units have utilized two types of meetings to plan and coordinate team activities. The most common type is the daily roll call meeting, during which officers often sit around a table and discuss conditions on their beats and develop plans to solve beat problems. Five of the seven Shift Teams utilize this format. In addition, the daily roll call meetings for the San Diego Shift Squads are supplemented by monthly meetings designed to coordinate the efforts of the three squads which make up each platoon.

Area Teams with twenty-four hour responsibility have generally held two types of meetings. Roll call/shift meetings have been used in

Table 6
ASPECTS OF TEAM COORDINATION

TEAM CHARACTERISTICS	SHIFT TEAMS														AREA TEAMS																	
	ALBUQUERQUE	MENLO PARK	N CHARLESTON	PALO ALTO	RICHMOND	SAN BRUNO	SAN DIEGO	ALBANY/ARBOR	ALBANY/SOUTH	CHARLOTTE	CINCINNATI	DAYTON	DETROIT	HARTFORD	HOLYOKE	LOS ANGELES	NEW YORK	ROCHESTER	ST. PETERSBURG	SUMMARY												
TEAM COORDINATION																																
Shift Meetings/Roll Call		•	•	•	•		•		L	L		•	L		•	•	•		•													13
Team Meetings							•				•	•	L	L	•	•	•	•		•												10
Sgts/Officers Same Days Off	•		•	•		•	•					•																				.6
Participant Decision-Making		•		•	•		•		L	L	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	L	•												15
Officer Evaluation							•																									1

L = Limited

Cincinnati, Hartford, Holyoke, Los Angeles, Rochester and, on a more limited basis, Albany and Dayton. To coordinate the activities of officers over the entire twenty-four hour period, nine of the twelve Area Teams have also held periodic team meetings. These cities have held meetings of the day, afternoon and night watches approximately every four to six weeks.

All of the Shift Teams except Menlo Park and Richmond formed platoons of officers who worked exactly the same schedules as their first-line supervisors. With the exception of Dayton, the teams using this system have been organized by shifts. In these five cities, the "A" platoon in a Team Area was relieved by a "B" platoon during "A" days off. This system has enabled first-line supervisors and their men to become familiar with one another and has been used as a mechanism to strengthen team coordination and planning activities.

Fifteen of the nineteen teams have attempted to implement a system of management by participation. Most team policing programs have involved officers in planning team activities. Officers are expected to actively participate in team meetings and to suggest ways to solve problems encountered on their beats. The reliance upon the uniformed officer to help his sergeant and the team leader to plan activities is based upon the idea that the officer is a capable professional who possesses valuable information about his beat and its problems. In San Diego, for example, officers are expected to identify and develop solutions to community relations problems and traffic problems on their beats. In addition, they are provided with detailed crime information about their beats

so they can plan preventive patrol activities and, in some cases, institute stakeouts.

Although team policing programs have substantially altered the role of the patrol officer, only San Diego has developed new criteria for evaluating profile officers. The program directors in San Diego theorized that because the profile experiment changed the organizational setting in which the officer works and demanded so many changes in the officer's role, a new evaluation system had to be developed. The new system has evaluated the officers on how well they have carried out the specific goals of the department's profile program.

TEAM RESPONSIBILITIES

The organization and managerial aspects of team policing described in the previous section provide the base upon which departments have decentralized the delivery of basic law enforcement services to the field. The aim of most team programs has been to replace random roving patrol with patrol activities designed to achieve specific objectives. Teams have been assigned additional duties so that when officers are not responding to service calls they might be engaged in community relations, investigative or crime prevention activities.

We have developed a functional typology to describe the kinds of services that various team programs have provided to citizens. Table 7 Program Aspects of Team Policing, presents a visual display of the functional responsibilities that have been assigned to teams. In

Table 7
PROGRAM ASPECTS OF TEAM POLICING

TEAM RESPONSIBILITIES	BASIC PATROL				INVEST	COMMUNITY RELATIONS				FULL SERVICE TEAM POLICING														
													MULTI-SPECIALIST				GENERALIST							
	N CHARLESTON	RICHMOND	SAN BRUNO	ROCHESTER	ALBUQUERQUE	HARTFORD	NEW YORK	SAN DIEGO	ALBANY/ARBOR	CHARLOTTE	CINCINNATI	DETROIT	LOS ANGELES	PALO ALTO	ST. PETERSBURG	ALBANY/SOUTH	DAYTON	HOLYOKE	MENLO PARK	SUMMARY				
FIELD SERVICES																								
Investigations					•							•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•		12
Community Relations						•	•	•	L			•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•		15
Traffic	•	•				•	•		•			•	•	•					•	•		•		13
PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO TEAMS																								
Detectives					•							•	•	•	•	•	•							8
Community Relations Officers												•		•		•								3
Traffic Officers									•					•										2
Evidence Technicians		•										•			•									3
Generalist Officers																	•	•	•	•				4

L = Limited

addition, the Table indicates the type of officers and specialists that have been assigned to teams. Analysis of functional responsibilities of each team has made it possible to group the nineteen team policing programs into four categories:

- Basic Patrol Teams
- Patrol-Investigative Teams
- Patrol-Community Service Teams
- Full Service Teams

BASIC PATROL TEAMS

The simplest form of team policing has involved the reorganization of departments into teams responsible for basic preventive patrol, radio dispatch service and traffic duties. North Charleston, Richmond and San Bruno have adopted this organizational structure.¹ Each of these cities has viewed team policing as an organizational form which could more efficiently deliver basic patrol services to the community. In these cities improved manpower allocation, reduced response time and the clearance of service calls have been primary objectives. Unlike the other programs described in this report, the officers in the Basic Patrol Team do not have community relations or investigative responsibilities. Except for evidence technicians in Richmond, specialists have not been assigned to these teams. All three Basic Patrol Teams employ a shift organizational structure.

PATROL-INVESTIGATIVE TEAMS

The Patrol-Investigative Team combines the features of the basic patrol team with the assignment of follow-up investigative responsibilities to

¹Richmond is planning to eventually develop a Full Service Team program.

the team. The single example of this system is Rochester, where most investigative work has been decentralized. The Rochester reorganization has involved the transfer of approximately one-half of the centralized investigative bureau's detectives to teams. Although most of the team follow-up investigations are performed by detectives, patrol officers have been responsible for conducting more complete preliminary investigations and have occasionally been assigned investigative follow-ups. The Rochester team is an Area Team responsible for patrol and investigative duties around-the-clock.

PATROL-COMMUNITY SERVICE TEAMS

The Patrol-Community Service Team incorporates the features of the Basic Patrol Team with responsibility for community relations. By assigning community responsibilities to team officers, administrators have hoped to increase the level and kinds of service delivered to the community. The community relations focus of team policing has been an important step in replacing traditional reactive patrol with a more focused proactive patrol strategy.

Four of the surveyed departments, Albuquerque, Hartford, New York and San Diego, have adopted this approach. Team officers in Hartford and San Diego have also been assigned some responsibility for traffic services. Although each team has performed community relations activities, personnel from the centralized community relations units of these departments have not been reassigned to the teams. Even in San Diego, for example, which has extensively enlarged the role of the team officers' community relations responsibilities, community service

officers working in the team area are attached to the centralized community relations office and not to the team. Hartford, based on its satisfaction with team policing, has diminished the role of its centralized community relations units and has contemplated the transfer of community relations personnel to its teams. Albuquerque and San Diego implemented Shift Teams while Area Teams were implemented in Hartford and New York.

FULL SERVICE TEAMS

The most complex team policing programs have involved the decentralization of patrol, investigative and community relations responsibilities to the team. Eleven of the nineteen programs analyzed in this report have adopted this mode of team policing. A number of these programs have also decentralized some traffic duties to the team. The transfer of personnel from centralized bureaus to the team unit has usually involved detectives and to a lesser extent community relations and traffic personnel. The usual tendency has been to assign between three and four detectives to each team. Because of the relative size of the detective bureau in most agencies, the transfer of personnel from that bureau to the team has frequently had the most impact upon a department implementing team policing.

The Full Service Teams can be differentiated into two distinct groups by the types of specialist duties assigned to team members. Seven of the eleven teams, Arbor Hill in Albany, Charlotte, Cincinnati, Detroit, Los Angeles, Palo Alto and St. Petersburg have developed a Multi-Specialist approach. These agencies have deployed mixed teams of patrol officers

and specialists (detectives and community relations officers) who are under the direction of the team leader. Although team patrol officers frequently participate in investigative and community relations activities, the specialists assigned to the team have taken primary responsibility for these activities.

South End in Albany, Dayton, Holyoke and Menlo Park have adopted a Generalist approach to team policing. In these agencies all team officers have been expected to perform both basic patrol and specialist duties. When the Generalist mode has been adopted, the number of personnel and functions assigned to centralized bureaus has been severely reduced. With the exception of Menlo Park and Palo Alto, the Full Service Teams have been organized as Area Teams.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

An important goal of this project has been to develop a conceptual framework that would permit the grouping of team policing projects into categories or families. The expectation was that this conceptual framework would facilitate a critical assessment of the universe of team policing projects. Team policing has been implemented as a multi-dimensional program that defies easy classification. In fact, the number of variables involved in team policing makes an assessment of particular and isolated program activities virtually impossible. In spite of these difficulties, we have isolated three significant variables by which to classify team policing programs. These variables are:

- The temporal responsibility assigned to the team;
- The functional responsibilities of the team; and
- The functional responsibilities of individual team members.

The conceptual framework displayed in Table 8 was developed by cross-referencing the organizational structure (Shift or Area) by the functional responsibilities that have been assigned to each team. This system has made it possible to group teams with similar characteristics on two dimensions. This two-dimensional array has been further disaggregated by identifying which Full Service Teams have either patrol and specialist officers or generalist officers. By using this framework the nineteen teams analyzed in this report have been organized into eight discrete groups. The general tendency of the framework is to group the more complex team programs in the lower right quadrants.

In the chapters which follow we have attempted to use this framework as a means to assess the impact of programs with similar organizational and functional characteristics. The limited amount of data available on some programs and the inability of evaluators to link program activities to measurable outcomes have frequently frustrated this effort. However, whenever possible we have attempted to assess program outcomes within the scope of this conceptual framework.

Table 8
TEAM POLICING CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

FUNCTIONAL RESPONSI- BILITY ORGANIZATION	BASIC PATROL	INVESTIGATIONS	COMMUNITY RELATIONS	FULL SERVICE TEAM POLICING	
				MULTI- SPECIALIST	GENERALIST
SHIFT TEAMS	N CHARLESTON RICHMOND SAN BRUNO		ALBUQUERQUE SAN DIEGO	PALO ALTO	MENLO PARK
AREA TEAMS		ROCHESTER	HARTFORD NEW YORK	ALBANY/ARBOR CHARLOTTE CINCINNATI DETROIT LOS ANGELES ST. PETERSBURG	ALBANY/SOUTH DAYTON HOLYOKE

Chapter 3

OFFICER ROLE AND JOB SATISFACTION

A major element in team policing programs has been an attempt to re-define the role of patrol officers by expanding their job responsibilities. With the exception of Basic Patrol Teams, all of the departments reviewed in this report have used team policing as a vehicle to replace traditional reactive patrol strategies with proactive techniques designed to make the patrol officer responsible for the delivery of a wider range of services to the community. Many team programs have expanded the patrol function by encouraging officers to participate in planning, investigative and community service activities. Team officers in some departments have conducted follow-up investigations, participated in stakeouts and engaged in crime analysis. In the area of community service team officers have conducted security inspections, made referrals, attended community meetings, initiated more citizen contacts and made an effort to better understand the law enforcement problems of community residents.

Team policing supporters believe that expanding the patrol officer role will accomplish two objectives. First, because team officers are assigned specific service and investigative responsibilities, it was felt that team policing would enable an agency to deliver a higher level of

service to the community. Second, team policing has been viewed as a means to increase officer job satisfaction. Team policing planners have generally believed that permitting officers to participate in planning, investigative and community service activities would make the job more interesting and satisfying.

Table 9, Officer Role Change Goals and Measures, indicates which departments have adopted officer role change goals and which have attempted to measure the impact of team policing upon their officers.

In assessing the impact of team policing upon their officers, team administrators have been concerned with:

- How effectively patrol officers have been trained for their new roles;
- How officers have changed their orientation toward their jobs; and
- How team policing has affected officer satisfaction.

Thirteen programs adopted role change goals, but only seven have evaluated the extent to which changes actually occurred. Although several programs have implemented training programs, only San Diego has collected information on the effectiveness of its program. Four agencies have monitored changes in the way team officers both perceive and actually perform their jobs while six departments have measured officer job satisfaction.

CONTINUED

1 OF 4

Table 9

OFFICER ROLE CHANGE GOALS AND MEASURES

MEASURE CITY	GOAL	TRAINING	ROLE CHANGE	JOB SATISFACTION
BASIC PATROL				
N. Charleston				
Richmond	•			
San Bruno				•
INVESTIGATIONS				
Rochester	•			
COMMUNITY RELATIONS				
Albuquerque				
Hartford				
New York	•		•	•
San Diego	•	•	•	•
FULL SERVICE TEAM POLICING				
<u>Multi-Specialist</u>				
Albany/Arbor	•			
Charlotte	•			•
Cincinnati	•		•	•
Detroit				
Los Angeles	•		•	
Palo Alto	•			
St. Petersburg	•			
<u>Generalist</u>				
Albany/South	•			
Dayton	•			
Holyoke	•			•
Menlo Park				

TRAINING FOR TEAM POLICING

Because of the changes in the patrol function demanded by team policing programs, a number of departments have developed pre-start-up training programs to familiarize team leaders and officers with their new roles.

Table 10, Pre-Start-Up Team Policing Training Programs, indicates that nine cities developed training programs to acquaint their officers with team policing prior to implementation. The training has varied in duration from fifteen to 160 hours and has sometimes been supplemented by additional in-service training. The programs have generally provided training in the areas of team organization, investigations and community service. Recognizing that team policing frequently requires patrol officers to participate in planning and management activities, Albany, Cincinnati, Holyoke and San Diego have attempted to familiarize their officers with team organization, group dynamics and participative management skills. Team policing training has, however, more frequently provided additional skills training in the area of investigations and community service. Seven of the twelve teams with investigative responsibility have provided their officers with investigative training, while seven of the fifteen teams with a community service responsibility have provided training in that area.

An important element running through several of these team training programs has been an emphasis upon developing the ability of patrol officers to understand and make judgments about complex patrol

Table 10

PRE-START-UP TEAM POLICING TRAINING PROGRAMS

MEASURE CITY	HOURS	TEAM ORGANIZATION	INVESTIGATIONS	COMMUNITY SERVICE
BASIC PATROL				
N. Charleston				
Richmond				
San Bruno				
INVESTIGATIONS				
Rochester				
COMMUNITY RELATIONS				
Albuquerque				
Hartford	15			•
New York				
San Diego	40	•		•
FULL SERVICE TEAM POLICING				
<u>Multi-Specialist</u>				
Albany/Arbor	160	•	•	•
Charlotte			•	
Cincinnati	40	•	•	•
Detroit				
Los Angeles	40		•	
Palo Alto				
St. Petersburg	72		•	•
<u>Generalist</u>				
Albany/South				
Dayton			•	•
Holyoke		•	•	L
Menlo Park				

L = Limited

problems. This contrasts sharply with the emphasis in traditional programs upon departmental rules, procedures and technical skills. As a consequence, several agencies have contracted with behavioral science consultants and trainers to develop training programs geared to the demands of their individual team programs.

ASSESSMENT

San Diego has gathered feedback on its training program. Evaluation questionnaires, anonymously completed by participants, were generally favorable; however, program administrators doubted that the participants thoroughly understood the new approach to patrol that was being presented (San Diego Police Department, 1974 b, pp. 89-91). This, however, may be the case with any training program that presents new and complex ideas. Our site visit to San Diego indicated that officers there had a better concept of their program than officers in cities where training had not been provided. In addition, changes in the officers' perceptions of their roles and the value of community service activities, presented in other sections of this report, suggest that the San Diego training program achieved some of its objectives.

Because of the very limited data on team policing training, it is impossible to make an assessment. In view of the important role that training might play in facilitating program implementation, evaluative work in this area is critically needed.

OFFICER ROLE PERCEPTION

In recent years a number of law enforcement analysts have emphasized that crime related problems occupy only a small part of the patrol officer's time (American Bar Association, 1973, pp. 32-35; Ashburn, 1973, p. 6; Bittner, 1970, p. 29; Wilson, 1968, p. 19). The contemporary law enforcement officer has been called upon to provide a wide range of social services to the citizens in their communities. Some observers have referred to the police as a twenty-four hour social service agency capable of providing assistance when other agencies are not available. In spite of this recognition, patrol officers have sometimes been reluctant to abandon their crime fighter role perceptions and accept their job as encompassing the provision of many non-crime services.

The Community-Oriented and Full Service Team programs reviewed in this report have strengthened and legitimized the role of the law enforcement officer as a provider of a wide range of community services. In every team policing program an effort has been made to increase the officers' responsibility for traditional law enforcement functions and to add new responsibilities, primarily in the area of community service, to the patrol role. Team officers have, for example, assumed new responsibility for making referrals to other social agencies, doing security inspections, providing crime prevention information and conducting community relations work.

ASSESSMENT

Although Cincinnati, Los Angeles, New York and San Diego have provided some information about how the officers regard the new roles and the community, only San Diego has made an extensive assessment of the changes in role perceptions that have occurred among profile officers. San Diego planners assumed that any change in patrol operations could only come about if patrol officers changed their ideas about what the role of an officer should be. The San Diego training program was designed to acquaint participants with the importance of community service and community relations as a vital law enforcement function. Throughout the San Diego experiment officers developed methods to learn more about community problems and the resources available in the community to dissipate some of these problems. The results reported by the San Diego evaluators are generally favorable regarding the changes profile officers adopted towards their new roles.

The primary technique used by the San Diego evaluators to describe how profile officers changed their role perceptions was to have officers rate the importance of various patrol activities. When the attitudes of profile and control officers were compared, the evaluators found that profile officers regarded police-community relations as a significantly more important activity than did the control officers (Boydston & Sherry, 1975, p. 50). Profile officers also expressed significantly less agreement than control officers with the statement that "the police officer's role in society should be that of a crime fighter" (Boydston & Sherry, 1975, p. 58). An indication of the profile officers'

orientation towards community service and relations was the higher rating profile officers gave to the value of selected socio-economic information about the community. Profile officers also reported developing a significantly greater level of support from the community (Boydston & Sherry, 1975, p. 44).

According to officers' self reports, profiling brought substantial changes in their patrol methods and their orientation toward patrol. Their assessment of "roving patrol" declined significantly during this experiment as they adopted analytical techniques designed to facilitate the identification and solution of problems in the team area. When not responding to calls for service, profile officers frequently planned patrol strategies or engaged in proactive community relations activities (Boydston & Sherry, 1975, pp. 62-63).

Attempts to measure officers' role perceptions in other communities have been limited. Evaluators of Operation Neighborhood in New York found that officer role orientation changed in the opposite direction of what was predicted and desired. Team officers rated radio patrol more highly than did the control group, and the attitudes of the team officers toward community service deteriorated during the course of the evaluation. Moreover, team officers rated aggressive patrol tactics more highly than did officers in the control group (Bloch & Specht, 1973, pp. 67-75). In Cincinnati evaluators analyzed only one question dealing with officer role orientation. They found no significant change in the attitudes of ComSec officers towards support for referring citizens to social service agencies (Schwartz et al., 1975, p. 17). Our

impressions of officers' orientations toward their roles during a site visit suggest that ComSec officers had changed their role orientation only slightly.

Table 11, Summary Assessment of Officer Role Changes, indicates that only San Diego's Community Profile program has achieved success in altering the officers' perception of his role. A large part of the success in altering the officer role in San Diego may be attributable to that program's training component and the fact that profile officers were assigned specific patrol activities in order to implement the profile program. Profile officers kept logs and wrote beat reports that may have also heightened their sensitivity to the new community service activities in the program.

Table 11

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF OFFICER ROLE CHANGES

CITY	MEASURE	ROLE CHANGE	ASSESSMENT
New York	-		Qualified Failure
San Diego	+		Success
Cincinnati			Insufficient Data

OFFICER JOB SATISFACTION

Increasing the satisfaction of officers with their jobs has been a goal of most team policing programs. Team planners have assumed that the addition of new responsibilities to the patrol function would alleviate the boredom which many police officers consider characteristic of traditional preventive patrol. Variety and added responsibility have been injected into the patrol role by assigning officers responsibility for helping team leaders to plan patrol strategies, carry out community relations activities and participate more fully in the investigative process. Increased job satisfaction has been important not only for the officer but also for the department since it has been recognized as a critical element in increasing the efficiency and productivity of organizations.

The National Commission on Productivity has identified five techniques for measuring job satisfaction. Four of these measures are behavioral: job turnover, absenteeism, employee misconduct and the responsiveness of employers to their employees' suggestions. The final measure of job satisfaction is based upon attitudinal information gained from questionnaires and interviews (NCOP, 1973, p. 60). Five team policing programs have made an attempt to measure officer job satisfaction. With the exception of four programs which monitored sick leave, none of these programs has measured other behavioral indicators of job satisfaction. The tendency has been to rely upon questionnaires to collect attitudinal data.

ASSESSMENT

Four programs have presented comparative data about officer use of sick leave. Cincinnati and New York presented positive results. ComSec officers consistently used less sick time than officers in the control area, while officers in New York used only one half the sick leave of non-team officers in the precinct (Bloch & Specht, 1973, p. 99; TPIESCPD, 1974, p. 32). Evaluators of the Dayton program reported that there was little difference in the use of sick leave by team and control officers (Tortoriello & Blatt, 1973, p. 103). In Holyoke, although sick leave for both team and non-team officers rose dramatically, team members used less sick leave than other officers in the department (O'Malley, 1973, pp. iii-iv).

The most extensive analysis of officer job satisfaction has been performed by the Urban Institute in Cincinnati. Although the data is largely attitudinal, the Cincinnati evaluators constructed scales of officer independence, influence, freedom and satisfaction with work from a variety of questions asked in an officer survey. The survey was administered at the start of the program and then at six month intervals through the first eighteen months of the program. The results reported here reflect only the findings for the first year. ComSec officers felt that their independence to perform non-routine duties without direction from superiors had increased, that they had a greater ability than officers in non-team units to influence decisions affecting them and that their freedom had also increased. In spite of these changes, however, they did not report increased satisfaction with their work.

In fact, while expressions of job satisfaction declined slightly among ComSec officers, control officers expressed increases in their level of job satisfaction. The evaluators hypothesized that management decisions which violated the team's autonomy and flexibility may have accounted for the failure of ComSec officers to express greater satisfaction with their jobs (Schwartz et al., 1975, pp. 34-38).

Results similar to Cincinnati were also found in San Diego. Both profile and control group officers expressed less, but not significantly less, satisfaction with their assignments at the end of the experiment than at the beginning. There were no significant differences over time or between groups in the profile and control officers' levels of satisfaction with their opportunities for interesting work. Nor was there any difference in the group's perceptions of departmental support for the patrol force. Throughout the experiment the expressed levels of satisfaction remained at approximately seventy percent (Boydston & Sherry, 1975, pp. 46-52). Police Foundation reviewers of the program noted that morale was tested during a period when rumors abounded that the profile program would be abandoned at the end of the experiment.

The team policing program in Holyoke was implemented during a period of extreme departmental turmoil. As a consequence, it is difficult to attribute officer job satisfaction either to team policing or to general departmental conditions. Morale throughout the entire Holyoke department was quite low. In spite of innumerable departmental problems, team officers indicated they felt greater job satisfaction and increased

effectiveness as police officers than non-team officers. Evaluators attributed a drop in morale and job satisfaction during the second year of the program to the lack of monetary incentives and increasing departmental control over the team rather than team policing itself (O'Malley, 1973, pp. iii-iv).

Only the evaluators of the Charlotte program have reported positive changes in officer job satisfaction with team policing. Although team officers thought that getting ahead in the department was more difficult since team policing was implemented, they expressed slightly more interest in patrol work and substantial increases in their desire to stay on the job until retirement, satisfaction with the four/ten schedule and a belief in the value of police work (Gill, 1975, pp. 5-6). Of the five programs which surveyed officer job satisfaction, only New York reported negative results. Eighty percent of the Operation Neighborhood officers felt their jobs were getting worse (Bloch & Specht, 1973, p. 99).

Table 12, Summary Assessment of Officer Job Satisfaction, indicates that team policing programs have had only a limited impact upon the satisfaction of team officers with their jobs. Only Charlotte indicated officers were more satisfied with their work after team policing was implemented. Cincinnati and San Diego reported virtually no change while officers in New York expressed less satisfaction. Because of the conflicts within the Holyoke Department it is impossible to attribute reported measures of job satisfaction to the team policing program.

Table 12

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF OFFICER JOB SATISFACTION

MEASURE CITY	SICK LEAVE	ATTITUDINAL	ASSESSMENT
Charlotte		+	Qualified Success
Cincinnati	+	-	No Change
Holyoke	-	0	Uninterpretable
New York	+	-	Qualified Failure
San Diego		0	No Change

UNRESOLVED PROBLEMS

The indicators of job satisfaction discussed in the previous section have been very general in nature. None of the evaluators has attempted to ascertain the level of job satisfaction derived from the various functional responsibilities added to the patrol officer role. To identify the source of dissatisfaction in the officer role one would need to know more about the officer attitude toward:

- Participant decision-making and planning responsibilities;
- Investigative responsibilities; and
- Community service assignments.

Job satisfaction information about these topics would appear to be a valuable tool enabling planners not only to understand job satisfaction but also to achieve changes in the officers' role that are consistent with team policing goals.

Chapter 4

PATROL WORKLOAD MANAGEMENT

An important goal for seven of the nineteen team policing programs reviewed in this report has been improved management of the patrol workload. Because law enforcement is a highly labor intensive activity, program planners and administrators have been concerned with the impact team policing might have upon manpower utilization and patrol workload management.

Table 13, Workload Management Goals and Measures, indicates which teams have adopted workload management goals as well as which programs have attempted to measure the impact of team organization upon patrol operations. Only seven of the nineteen programs have evaluated any measures of workload management effectiveness. These programs have attempted to measure the impact of team policing upon the:

- Stable assignment of officers to the team area;
- Flexible scheduling of patrol officers;
- Ability of the team to manage service calls by evaluating changes in the number of calls serviced, response time and the amount of time spent on calls.

Most of this information has come from departments implementing the most complex team policing programs - the full service team. Because of the scarcity of the data, it has been particularly difficult to

Table 13

WORKLOAD MANAGEMENT GOALS AND MEASURES

MEASURE CITY	GOAL	STABLE ASSIGNMENT	FLEXIBLE DEPLOYMENT	SERVICE CALL CLEARANCE
BASIC PATROL				
N. Charleston				
Richmond	•			
San Bruno			•	
INVESTIGATIONS				
Rochester	•			
COMMUNITY RELATIONS				
Albuquerque				
Hartford				
New York	•	•		
San Diego		•		•
FULL SERVICE TEAM POLICING				
Albany/Arbor				•
Albany/South				
Charlotte	•			
Cincinnati	•	•	•	
Dayton				•
Detroit		•		•
Holyoke				
Los Angeles				
Menlo Park	•			
Palo Alto	•			
St. Petersburg				

utilize the program typology developed in the introduction to analyze the effects of the various programs upon workload management factors. In spite of these difficulties two team policing organizational characteristics appear to affect the workload capabilities of a team. The first is the amount of responsibility assigned to team leaders. The evidence suggests that team leaders with around-the-clock Area responsibility have been more successful in flexibly scheduling their officers. Second, the evidence also suggests that teams of generalist officers, because of their follow-up investigative responsibilities, significantly increase the amount of time needed to clear crime related service calls.

STABLE ASSIGNMENT TO THE TEAM AREA

The permanent assignment of an officer to a particular beat is designed to decentralize the patrol function and increase the officer's responsibility for a well defined area of the community. In support of permanent assignment departments have attempted to assign radio calls from a particular beat to the officer responsible for that beat and to limit the number of team calls handled by non-team units. Some programs have experienced difficulty in dispatching officers to their assigned beat. The evidence from program evaluations in San Diego, Cincinnati, New York and Detroit indicates that team officers can handle most service calls from the team area. However, the New York and San Diego evaluation found that beat officers were servicing only a portion of the calls from their own beats.

ASSESSMENT

Cincinnati and Detroit experienced considerable success in maintaining stable assignment of officers to the team area. An examination of Departmental Records in Cincinnati indicated that only ten percent of the calls in the team area were handled by non-team units (Watkins, 1973, p. 1). The Detroit experience suggests that effectively implemented dispatch procedures can minimize the problem of sending officers outside the team area on service calls. While approximately seventy-five percent of the traditional units were dispatched outside their assigned beats, the comparable figure for team units ranged from twenty to twenty-five percent. A computer analysis of the team cars dispatched outside the area indicated that other cars had been available in seventy-five percent of the cases. As a result of this analysis, new guidelines were prepared for dispatchers, and the number of outside runs declined to between five and ten percent (Bloch & Ulberg, 1972, p. 59).

Maintaining radio assignments within the team area, however, was a problem in New York. Team units were dispatched out of the team area on approximately fifty percent of their calls. In spite of efforts to modify dispatch procedures to limit the amount of out-dispatching of team units and the amount of in-dispatching of non-team units to the team area, little progress was made. The results in New York may have been affected by frequent changes in the area covered by the team and by the assignment of non-team areas to the team command. Radio assignments to these areas were sometimes recorded in department records as out-of-team dispatches (Bloch & Specht, 1973, p. 10).

Information about stable assignment in San Diego's Community Profiling program indicates that assigning officers to a single beat, rather than a group of beats may limit beat accountability. Whereas Cincinnati, Detroit and New York evaluated the extent to which officers were dispatched within the team area, San Diego evaluators developed a more stringent measure of stable assignment. San Diego's Community Profiling evaluation measured the extent to which an officer was dispatched to his assigned beat rather than to the entire team area. The San Diego program was designed to provide the officer with a strong sense of beat responsibility and accountability. Prior to Community Profiling, the officers regularly strayed from their beats in order to make their quota of traffic tickets or to realize other quantitative performance objectives. The profiling project was designed to eliminate that tendency and to encourage officers, instead, to remain in their assigned beats. Analysis of calls-for-service and officer activity indicates that although the profile program eliminated the tendency of officers to leave their beats to make their ticket quota, only thirty-three percent of the service calls were answered by the profile officer assigned to that beat (Boydston & Sherry, 1975, pp. 23-24). Given the low level of beat response, it is unlikely that profile officers were able to adequately use their knowledge about the beat to answer calls or initiate services. The good features of the profiling approach might be better utilized if officers were assigned responsibility for learning about and servicing several beats within the team area.

Table 14, summarizes our knowledge about stable assignment. Although New York experienced difficulty in implementing stable assignments,

the results from Cincinnati and Detroit suggest that dispatch procedures can be developed to assure that officers assume responsibility for and provide service to the team area. Evidence from San Diego suggests that stable assignment to a specific beat is extremely difficult. The stable assignment of officers to a patrol area requires that dispatchers recognize team boundaries and that team officers have responsibility for and work in a multi-beat area.

Table 14

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF STABLE ASSIGNMENT

MEASURE CITY	STABLE ASSIGNMENT		ASSESSMENT
	STABLE ASSIGNMENT TO TEAM AREA	STABLE ASSIGNMENT TO BEAT AREA	
Cincinnati	+		Probable Success
Detroit	+		Qualified Success
New York	-		Qualified Failure
San Diego		-	Probable Failure

SCHEDULING FLEXIBILITY

As part of their improved workload management goal some departments have looked upon team policing as a way to more effectively match manpower assignments to workload requirements. This is reflected in the fact that departments implementing team policing have frequently analyzed crime rates and dispatch records as a basis for assigning

manpower to a team area. Data evaluating what contributions team policing has made to flexible scheduling and deployment of officers is extremely limited. However, our site visits and literature review suggest that whether a team is organized on an area or shift basis is an important factor in determining the ability of the team leader to match manpower with workload demands. Area team leaders with twenty-four hour responsibility have a greater capability to allocate patrol resources in accordance with changing service demands than do leaders of shift teams.

Area teams appear to have several advantages over shift teams in achieving deployment flexibility for several reasons. First, area team leaders are responsible for the twenty-four hour period and can alter the schedule of individual officers to match service demands. In addition, area teams are larger than shift teams thus providing their leader with a greater manpower pool from which to draw. Finally, the decentralized decision-making authority of area team leaders permits them to deploy officers more closely to changes in service needs at different times of day and to anticipate the short-term changes in service needs created by special events.

ASSESSMENT

Prior to team policing, officers in Cincinnati were usually deployed evenly among three or four different shifts. With the advent of team policing, planning and deployment decisions were pushed down to the team level. As a result, team leaders have used their discretion and departmental information about service demands to deploy their officers

more flexibly. One team leader has used as many as ten starting times to achieve a better match up of officers and service demands. It also appears that the larger Cincinnati teams are better able to achieve flexible deployment schedules (TPIESCPD, 1974, pp. 20-24; Watkins, 1973, p. 19). Similar results were reported in Detroit where team commanders were able to deploy their men more efficiently. The result was that the team area generally had more units available for dispatch than did the traditionally organized patrols (Sherman et al., 1973, p. 95).

Our site observations indicate that departments organized into shift teams have been less able to accommodate even short-term changes in service demand, especially those generated by holidays and special events. Because all shift teams have less manpower than area teams and because members usually have the same schedule, it is impossible to change a shift's manpower without changing the number of personnel on the team. Administrators in Richmond indicated that to increase manpower on a shift, personnel had to be assigned from one team to another. This movement of personnel could easily disrupt the concepts of permanent assignment and beat accountability.

East Hartford, North Charleston, Palo Alto and San Bruno introduced the ten hour/four day week when team policing was implemented. Information gathered during one site visit indicates that the four/ten system will further complicate the ability of shift teams to deploy manpower in accordance with service demands. Although police administrators in North Charleston felt they had arranged schedules to overlap

during peak demand periods, the problem of altering schedules for short-term and unanticipated changes in service demand still remained. Evaluators in San Bruno noted that the patrol force was deployed at peak strengths at times unrelated to department service demands simply as a result of the rotation of officers' duty schedules (San Bruno, n.d. (1972), pp. 17-18). This same problem was noted in Palo Alto. In East Hartford the use of the four/ten system resulted in a double contingent of officers on duty one day each week. Although the overlap has provided East Hartford officers additional training opportunities, it has not contributed to the flexible deployment of patrol personnel.

Table 15 summarizes our knowledge of the impact of team policing upon the flexible scheduling of officers. Because the information is so limited, it is impossible to make any final judgments. Although the results in Cincinnati indicated that area teams can achieve some degree of flexibility in deploying officers, the evidence is not strong enough to support any generalizations. As the evaluation in Cincinnati noted, the tools to evaluate service demands are so limited that flexibility in scheduling does not imply the ability to match manpower with service demands (Watkins, 1973, p. 19). The anecdotal and evaluative information about shift teams indicates that they have a limited capability to meet changing service demands without altering the number of personnel in the team.

Table 15

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF SCHEDULING FLEXIBILITY

MEASURE CITY	SCHEDULING FLEXIBILITY	ASSESSMENT
<u>Area Team</u> Cincinnati	+	Probable Success
<u>Shift Team</u> San Bruno	-	Qualified Failure

SERVICE CALL CLEARANCE

The major activity of traditional patrol divisions has been responding to calls for service. Because this activity consumes so much of the patrol officers' time, police administrators have been concerned with the ability of their team officers to clear service calls and return to service as rapidly as possible. Some managers, contemplating a shift form of team operations, have questioned whether the added investigative and community responsibilities of the patrol officer might not impair the officer's ability to answer a call and then return to service in a reasonable amount of time. Others have hypothesized that an increase in the amount of time needed to complete calls might have an adverse effect on response time and the number of calls serviced by team members. Several evaluations have compared the impact of team

policing upon the number of calls serviced, time spent on calls and response time.

ASSESSMENT

The limited data suggests that the amount of responsibility assigned to team patrol officers, particularly in the area of follow-up investigations has a definite bearing upon the way service calls are handled. Teams of generalist officers who perform both preliminary and follow-up investigations will probably increase the amount of time required to complete service calls. Although four teams have adopted the generalist approach, only Dayton has attempted to measure the impact of generalist team policing upon all three dimensions of service call clearance.

Evaluators in Dayton reported that team officers spent an average of six minutes longer on dispatch calls than did officers in the control district. When selected Part I crimes of larceny, rape, auto theft and frauds/forgery were examined, however, the evaluators found team officers spending eighteen more minutes than control officers on each call. The evaluators attributed this difference to the fact that team officers, unlike control officers, carry out both preliminary and follow-up investigations which require more time. On calls not requiring follow-up investigation there was little or no difference in the amount of time team and control officers spent (Tortoriello & Blatt, 1973, pp. 105-107).

Even though team members assumed investigative responsibilities and did not receive an additional assignment of patrol officers, two independently conducted evaluations of the Dayton program discovered that team

members were responding to more service calls than officers in comparable non-team areas. The team comprised only twenty percent of the department's manpower; however, it was answering twenty-five percent of the department's calls for service. In a six month period during the team's second year, its members responded to 2,000 more calls than did the control officers (Cordrey & Kotecha, 1971, pp. 9-10). This high level of performance is particularly interesting, since few departmental supports were offered to the team. The team worked under conditions of constrained manpower and departmental hostility.

The evaluations of teams composed of patrol officers and specialists indicate that team policing does not impair the ability of officers to manage service calls. Albany, Detroit and San Diego attempted to compare the amount of time team and non-team officers spent on service calls. Unlike the results from the generalist program in Dayton, these teams were usually more efficient than non-team control areas in clearing service calls and returning to duty.

In Detroit, where team patrol officers were expected to collaborate in investigations with detectives assigned to the team, team patrol officers spent less time on dispatch calls and returned to service more rapidly after dispatch calls than did the units used for comparison. Evaluators attributed this outcome primarily to the fact that team officers were more likely to be in the vicinity of the incident and have less distance to travel (Bloch & Ulberg, 1972, p. 61).

Evaluators of the Arbor Hill unit in Albany found little significant difference in the average amount of elapsed time team and non-team members devoted to service calls (Cresap et al., 1974, p. G-2). The results of the San Diego experiment with community profiling indicate that patrol officers can be given greater responsibilities without impairing departmental ability to respond to radio calls. Profile officers were responsible for preventive patrol and radio dispatch as well as citizen contacts on a regular basis, developing written descriptions of social, crime and traffic conditions on their beats and referring citizens to social agencies for assistance. In spite of these added responsibilities profile officers in San Diego reported less out of service time than control officers even though the profile officers were assuming more initiative in community relations. In addition, the profile team responded to approximately the same number of calls for service as did officers in the control group (Boydston & Sherry, 1975, III 47-50). Analysts of the San Diego program have attributed the result partially to the fact that team officers had hand held radios and were more accessible to the dispatchers than the regular officers of the comparison group who had not been issued these radios (San Diego Police Department, 1974, pp. 69-70).

Although the response time of police patrols to emergency calls is a conspicuous feature of police interactions with the public and a common indication of police efficiency the empirical literature on team policing provides little insight into the effects of team patrol organization upon response times. Only Albany evaluators have collected

response time data. Significantly better response times were reported for the Arbor Hill units than for comparison patrol units elsewhere in Albany. The evaluators found that team units had an average response time of 2.7 minutes per call compared to an average time of 4.3 minutes for four non-team units (Cresap et al., 1974, p. E-2). However, because the data for this analysis was collected only for a three week period and no information is provided about the comparability of team and control beats, it is difficult to assess the significance of these findings.

All of the information reported in the calls for service section is piecemeal and refers to programs established under different organizational constraints and with different objectives. The lack of similar and comparable information about critical workload management outputs from more departments points up a critical shortcoming in the ability of agencies to monitor and evaluate patrol activities.

Table 16 summarizes our assessment of a team unit's ability to respond to calls for service. The results in Albany, Dayton, and San Diego are suggestive of what impact various configurations of team policing might have upon the amount of time officers need to clear service calls.

The Dayton results suggest that a department intending to assign generalist investigative responsibilities to patrolmen must anticipate some increase in the time required for officers to complete calls requiring an investigation. Where officers have not been assigned investigative responsibility, however, there has been little change in

the time required to clear calls. The results from San Diego and Dayton suggest that assigning officers additional responsibility does not impair the officer's ability to handle service calls. In both cities, team officers were responding to more calls for service than officers in traditionally organized control units. Finally, from the data presented, it is impossible to draw any conclusions about team policing and response times. The little information reported has not been accompanied with comparable information from control areas that would make an assessment possible.

Table 16
SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF SERVICE CALL CLEARANCE

MEASURE CITY	SERVICE CALL CLEARANCE			ASSESSMENT
	TIME SPENT ON CALLS	NUMBER OF CALLS	RESPONSE TIME	
COMMUNITY				
San Diego	+	0		Qualified Success
MULTI-SPECIALIST				
Albany/Arbor	+		Insuffent Data	Probable Success
Detroit	+			Qualified Success
GENERALIST				
Dayton	+	+	0	Qualified Success

Chapter 5

INVESTIGATIVE EFFECTIVENESS

Team policing advocates maintain that teams can be used to transfer investigative functions from highly centralized and specialized detective bureaus to more locally oriented teams of officers with generalist responsibilities. Twelve of the nineteen teams described in this report have used team policing to decentralize their investigative bureaus. With the exception of Rochester, all are Full Service team policing programs.

Table 17, Team Investigative Goals and Activities, indicates the extent to which the various departments have decentralized investigations. Although twelve teams have decentralized investigations, only Charlotte, Cincinnati, Palo Alto and Rochester have adopted improved investigative effectiveness as a program goal.¹ All of the teams with investigative responsibility have permitted the team leader to close cases, while most have also provided team patrol officers with crime analysis information.

Two general strategies have been developed by team programs to decentralize investigations. Both involve the degree to which investigative

¹Albuquerque adopted improved investigative effectiveness as a program goal but did not decentralize investigations.

Table 17

TEAM INVESTIGATIVE GOALS AND ACTIVITIES

CITY \ ACTIVITY	GOAL	CASE CLOSURE	CRIME ANALYSIS	INVESTIGATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES					
				JUVENILE	BURGLARY LARCENY AUTO THEFT	ROBBERY	BUNCO	VICE & NARCOTICS	HOMICIDE
BASIC PATROL									
N. Charleston									
Richmond		•							
San Bruno									
INVESTIGATIONS									
Rochester	•	•	•	L	•	•			
COMMUNITY RELATIONS									
Albuquerque	•								
Hartford				•					
New York			•						
San Diego			•						
FULL SERVICE TEAM POLICING									
<u>Multi-Specialist</u>									
Albany/Arbor		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Charlotte	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	
Cincinnati	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Detroit		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Los Angeles		•	•		•	•			
Palo Alto	•	•	L	•	•	•			
St. Petersburg		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
<u>Generalist</u>									
Albany/South		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Dayton		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Holyoke		•		•	•	•	•	•	
Menlo Park		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

cases have been assigned to team members. Investigative operations have been decentralized by the creation of Multi-Specialist or Generalist Teams.

Multi-Specialist Teams are composed of patrol officers and detectives who are supervised by the team leader. Although patrol officers conduct preliminary investigations and occasionally complete follow-up investigations, team detectives do most of the investigative work. Table 17 indicates that seven Full Service Teams plus Rochester have adopted the Multi-Specialist approach. These teams have usually had responsibility for investigating juvenile crimes, burglary, larceny, auto theft and robbery. Other criminal investigations, particularly homicide, bunco, vice and narcotics have not been decentralized as frequently to Multi-Specialist Teams.

Generalist Teams have been implemented by four Full Service team policing programs. These teams do not make any distinction between patrol and investigative officers. As a consequence, team officers are expected to have wide-ranging capabilities to perform both patrol and investigative work. Finally, Generalist Teams have usually assigned more investigative responsibility to the teams than have departments which have adopted the Multi-Specialist approach. In Albany/South, Dayton, Holyoke and Menlo Park, for example, all investigations have been performed at the team level.

A general belief underlying nearly all team programs is that the incorporation of investigative responsibilities into team patrol units will

coordinate patrol and investigative processes and develop a more effective departmental investigative capability. Team policing advocates believe that the assignment of patrol and investigative functions and personnel to teams has two advantages.

First, supporters maintain that team policing contributes to the breakdown of officer-investigator isolation and hostility found in many traditionally organized departments. Combining patrol officers, investigators and, in some cases, community relations personnel into cooperative teams has broken down the functional barriers that have separated these units in traditionally organized departments. Team policing can provide an organizational context in which officers and investigators coordinate their activities. Team meetings, for example, have encouraged officers and investigators to share information. Cincinnati, Dayton and Palo Alto have attempted to improve the information flow between officers and detectives by assigning coordinating functions to special officers within the team. In Cincinnati, for example, team information coordinators, called collators, act as crime analysts, develop patrol and investigative strategies and provide liaison support to investigative officers in different teams.

Second, since most crime is locally committed, it is only natural, according to team policing advocates, that officers and investigators who are permanently assigned to a small number of beats can acquire knowledge of the team area and its people that will increase investigative effectiveness. Acquiring information from victims, witnesses and informants is an important process. Without information from

citizens and the transmission of this information to those responsible for the investigation, many crimes would remain unsolved. By permanently assigning officers to a specific area, team leaders have attempted to create a situation where officers and citizens become familiar with one another and begin to share information about law enforcement problems in the community.

Evaluating the effectiveness of team policing upon investigations involves knowledge about the extent to which team policing has:

- Facilitated cooperation among officers and detectives and encouraged them to share and exchange information;
- Led to improved clearance rates; and
- Led to the prosecution of those arrested.

OFFICER-INVESTIGATOR COORDINATION

Although the information dealing with officer-investigator relationships is qualitative and fragmentary, it does suggest what might be expected in a team policing program. An extensive analysis of the investigative process in Rochester is currently being conducted by the Urban Institute.¹ In conversation with officers and officials in Rochester and with personnel working on the report, it would appear that an outcome of the Rochester program has been the development of mutual confidence among officers and investigators. As a result of officer-investigator cooperation, all preliminary investigations are

¹ Peter Bloch and Jay Bell of the Urban Institute are preparing a study of the Investigative Process in Rochester, New York for the Police Foundation.

being handled by patrol officers. In addition, the officer's preliminary report is used by investigators to decide which cases warrant a follow-up investigation and which cases should be suspended as unpromising.

Supporting evidence that team policing can contribute to increased officer-investigator cooperation has also been found in Palo Alto and Los Angeles. In Palo Alto one juvenile specialist commented during our site visit that his assignment to the team gave him close contact with the patrol officers and permitted him to follow-up immediately with the families of the juveniles involved in complaints. He noted that since team policing was dropped and investigators were again reorganized into a separate unit, that relationships between patrol officers and investigators had again become distant (Field Interview). Patrol officers in Los Angeles commented that since team policing was implemented it was no longer necessary to send messages up the patrol hierarchy in order to communicate with detectives. Since the detectives were assigned to the team, officer-investigator exchanges of information and joint problem solving efforts for the team were common occurrences. In addition, evaluators of the Los Angeles program noted that several officers and detectives indicated they had made some arrests because of information they received from other team members (Los Angeles Police Department, 1974, p. C-6; Field Interview).

Although mentioned only infrequently by evaluators, our site visits revealed that team policing may improve the investigative capabilities of patrol officers and the ability of officers and investigators to

coordinate field operations. In Cincinnati, Los Angeles and Rochester burglary stakeouts and other crime specific strategies were made possible because investigators and officers worked closely together to plan some team activities. A number of administrators mentioned that the working relationship between investigators and patrol officers in the teams enabled the latter to become more sensitive to investigative concerns, to upgrade their investigative skills and to produce better preliminary reports. Los Angeles administrators indicated that the quality of reports had improved slightly, and evaluators of the Albuquerque program believed that patrol officers became more knowledgeable about the preservation of crime scenes for investigation (Sears & Wilson, 1973, p. 51).

An important goal of team policing has been to break down the barriers which have separated officers and investigators. Because so few attempts to analyze this process have been made, it is impossible to make any assessment. Although both officers and investigators have reported incidents of cooperation, before a judgment can be made about the effectiveness of team policing as a tool to coordinate investigations, one would need to know more about the extent and magnitude of these cooperative efforts.

CLEARANCE RATES

The following section will discuss the impact of the various team structures in carrying out their investigative responsibilities. In evaluating investigative effectiveness we have chosen to report

information about the ability of team policing units to clear crimes by making arrests. Clearance rates, like crime rates, have a number of shortcomings as a tool to evaluate police productivity and effectiveness. The clearance rates reported here may be the result of assigning investigative personnel to teams, investigative case screening systems, more effective manpower allocation or other features of team policing. Aside from these conceptual problems, there are methodological problems associated with evaluating clearance rates. The denominator (total reported crime) in the clearance rate equation can be defined in a variety of ways and can be easily manipulated. Likewise the numerator (number of cases cleared by arrest) can also be artificially inflated. In spite of these difficulties, clearance rate information is provided for both Multi-Specialist and Generalist Teams.

Table 18, Measures of Investigative Effectiveness, indicates which teams have evaluated their investigative effectiveness. Although twelve teams have implemented investigative programs, only five have conducted an evaluation of these efforts. Three departments have compared clearance rates from team and non-team areas. Four teams have evaluated changes in the average number of arrests made by team and non-team members while four agencies have monitored the percentage of cases cleared by arrest that have been prosecuted.

MULTI-SPECIALIST TEAMS

Clearance rates for team policing programs in Cincinnati and Rochester have been carefully monitored. Both programs have reported encouraging results but it should be noted that along with team policing they also

Table 18

MEASURES OF INVESTIGATIVE EFFECTIVENESS

MEASURE CITY	CLEARANCE RATES	ARRESTS/MAN	CASES PROSECUTED
BASIC PATROL			
N. Charleston			
Richmond			
San Bruno			
INVESTIGATIONS			
Rochester	•	•	
COMMUNITY RELATIONS			
Albuquerque			
Hartford			
New York			
San Diego			
FULL SERVICE TEAM POLICING			
<u>Multi-Specialist</u>			
Albany/Arbor	•		•
Charlotte			
Cincinnati	•		
Detroit			
Los Angeles			
Palo Alto			
St. Petersburg			
<u>Generalist</u>			
Albany/South			
Dayton	•	•	•
Holyoke			
Menlo Park			

developed a system for screening out investigative cases with a low probability for solution. These screening systems probably contributed to the teams' investigative effectiveness.

An audit of clearance rates for burglary, robbery and larceny in Rochester revealed that both team and control areas increased their clearance rates. However, the teams were more successful in clearing burglary and larceny cases. Table 19 summarizes the changes in clearance rates experienced in team and control areas. The Rochester teams were much more successful than the control units in increasing the percentage of burglaries and larcenies cleared by arrests.

Table 19
TEAM CLEARANCE RATES - ROCHESTER

CRIME	UNIT	BEFORE TEST	DURING TEST	% DIFFERENCE
Burglary	Team	18.6	41.3	+22.7%
	Control	10.8	14.3	+ 3.5%
Robbery	Team	18.9	23.7	+ 5.5%
	Control	17.8	23.4	+ 5.6
Larceny	Team	2.9	12.5	+ 9.6%
	Control	2.1	4.1	+ 2.0%

In addition to implementing team policing, Rochester also developed a novel method for supervising detectives within one of its teams. The leader of Team C was an extremely able manager with considerable investigative experience. Rather than assign cases to a detective he assigned individual tasks of a case to different detectives and officers

and carefully monitored the progress being made on each case. Perhaps, because of this rigorous and innovative case management system, Team C was able to achieve higher clearance rates than its sister team policing unit. In Team C investigators and officers increased their arrests per man year substantially more than did their counterparts in the other team and the control areas. Investigators increased their arrests from 9.75/year to 25.25/year while arrests for officers in the team increased from 3.36/year to 8.62/year (Bloch & Ulberg, 1974, p. 9). Table 20 presents arrests/man year for the two Rochester team policing units and their control counterparts.

Table 20
ARRESTS/MAN - ROCHESTER

UNIT	BEFORE	DURING	% CHANGE
Team A	6.48	9.78	+ 51
Comparison A	6.50	9.30	+ 43
Team C	4.10	10.37	+153
Comparison C	3.06	5.00	+ 63

Although the data for the Rochester teams is largely positive, before final conclusions can be drawn one would want to know more about the differences in performance between Team C and the other Rochester teams. Why, for example, did Team C increase its arrests/man year substantially more than did the other team or the control area? Perhaps the case screening system and the method of task assignment in Team C accounts

for its effectiveness as much as team organization.

Cincinnati, like Rochester, also monitored clearance rates as a means to gauge investigative effectiveness. In the area policed by teams, District I, approximately twenty-four percent of all crimes were cleared by arrests compared to sixteen percent in other divisions of the department. The clearance rate for Part I crimes was 48.7 percent in the District I team area compared to 31.3 percent for the rest of the city which was serviced by the centralized criminal investigations division (ComSec Evaluation Section and The Urban Institute, 1974, pp. 2-3).

Cincinnati has experimented with two methods to decentralize investigations. One is team policing and the other is the assignment of detectives to districts which are larger than the team area. Although the teams reported the highest overall clearance rates, the investigators assigned to districts were more successful in clearing cases that required follow-up investigations than were their counterparts in the teams. The Cincinnati results also indicate that team officers who worked closely with investigators were more successful in clearing cases than were officers who were not working in team policing units. In fact, one can attribute the success of the ComSec teams in clearing cases to the superior productivity of team patrol officers rather than team investigators in making arrests (Cincinnati Police Department & The Urban Institute, 1973, pp. 2; 5; 7).

Limited information about clearance rates for the Arbor Hill team in Albany is available. A study of 239 cases investigated during 1973

indicated that 44.8 percent of the cases were cleared by arrest and that convictions were obtained in 33.9 percent of these cases (Cresap et al., 1974, p. IV-20). Because of the lack of comparative data, however, it is impossible to interpret the information. An earlier study of the Arbor Hill Team comparing team clearance rates with data collected prior to the implementation of team operations indicated no significant changes in the number of arrests made by the team (Forrer & Farrell, 1973, pp. 31-34).

Although the results reported from Albany are limited and largely negative, both Cincinnati and Rochester, on the basis of more extensive data and analysis, have indicated that team policing can contribute to a department's investigative effectiveness. Table 21, Summary Assessment of Clearance Rates, tabulates these results.

In the Cincinnati and Rochester teams clearance rates showed more improvement than did rates in comparable control areas. Equally as important is the fact that officers in both cities who worked with detectives in teams substantially increased the number of arrests they made. The method of case management used by Team C in Rochester where team members were assigned investigative tasks rather than entire cases deserves more attention and further study. The ability of Team C to outperform the other teams and traditionally organized units in Rochester in clearing cases and reducing crime is encouraging.¹ Before final conclusions are reached about team policing it will be necessary

¹Since Rochester adopted team policing city-wide in the spring of 1975, none of the teams have used the task assignment case management system developed by Team C.

to analyze the contribution of the systems which Cincinnati and Rochester have devised to eliminate follow-up investigations for cases that have a low probability of being solved. In both Rochester and Cincinnati over thirty percent of the investigative cases have not been followed up because of their case screening systems.

Table 21
SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF CLEARANCE RATES

MEASURE CITY	CLEARANCE RATES				
	BURGLARY	LARCENY	AUTO THEFT	ROBBERY	ALL PART I CRIMES
MULTI-SPECIALIST					
Rochester	+	+	0	0	
Cincinnati					+
Albany/Arbor					0

GENERALIST TEAMS

Of the four Generalist Teams only Dayton has collected information about clearance rates which would permit an evaluation of the team's investigative effectiveness. Evaluators in Dayton found no difference in clearance rates for the first six months of the team policing program compared to a corresponding period of the preceeding year in the same area. The evaluation noted, however, that the result was not necessarily an indication that team policing could not improve clear-

ance rates. For the periods compared, the team members were relatively inexperienced in conducted investigations and the program experienced budget cuts that affected investigative resources (Cordrey & Kotecha, 1971, pp. 32-36).

The second year evaluations of the Dayton project made an effort to compare clearances per man assigned to the team area and to a control district. The evaluators concluded that team officers were more efficient at clearing crimes than were officers in the control district (Tortoriello & Blatt, 1973, p. 124). Unfortunately, this conclusion is flawed by the artificiality of the comparison. The control district itself was a contrivance of the evaluators and not an administrative unit in the Dayton Police Department. Moreover, the method used to calculate the number of officers and investigators assigned to the control district was merely an arithmetic estimate of the actual number of personnel working in the control district.

CASES PROSECUTED

Making arrests is only one step in the process of adjudicating those suspected of committing a crime. For a department to successfully meet its goal of combating crime, care must be taken to insure that prosecutors view with merit the cases against those arrested. Evidence from Cincinnati and Holyoke suggests that it is probably an unreasonable expectation that officers without investigative experience can be expected to prepare cases as well as seasoned detectives without some training and case experience. In Cincinnati, it was the view of the

City Prosecutor that ComSec officers were less well trained to build court cases properly and that they did not do as good a job of following through on leads. His view was that cases had been lost through mishandling by the ComSec officers (Bloch & Weidman, 1975, p. 89). The Holyoke approach indicates, however, that officers can be trained to handle court cases competently. In Holyoke, when the first police team was formed, a number of the court-recognized "experts" were assigned to the team. Evaluators thought this contributed to the ability of Holyoke's Team 1 to assume generalist investigative responsibilities. The expert assistance may have had much to do with the judgments of the Clerk of Courts and the Prosecutor for the Holyoke District Court that that team members in Holyoke seemed to be functioning on a par with detective bureau personnel (O'Malley, 1973, pp. 175; 93).

Albany and Dayton evaluators have presented some quantitative information on the degree to which teams have made arrests that were eventually prosecuted. In Dayton the team record compared favorably with the previous record of the department. The evaluators noted that under team policing the percentage of processed cases that were dropped because of withdrawals, acquittals or dismissals had not changed (Cordrey & Kotecha, 1971, pp. 32-36). In Albany the number of arrestees who were eventually prosecuted dropped by more than ten percent (Forrer & Farrell, 1973, pp. 31-34).

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Evaluation of the investigative effectiveness of teams indicates that, at the very least, teams with investigative functions have performed as well as and, in some cases, better than non-team control units. Teams are not likely to detract from the investigative ability of a department. The failure of most teams to achieve spectacular results is not indicative of team policing failure, but is more a commentary on the investigative process. Little has been done to analyze that process or to develop methods by which to apprehend criminals more successfully. The innovative methods used by Team C in Rochester, for example, to assign parts of cases to investigators and the case screening systems used by teams in Rochester and Cincinnati may account for changes in the clearance rates.

Table 22 summarizes our assessment of the Investigative effectiveness of team policing. The Multi-Specialist Teams in Rochester and Cincinnati have reported the most positive findings. Teams in both cities have been quite successful in clearing cases within the team area and increasing the number of arrests made by both officers and detectives. The results from Albany, on the other hand, indicate that few changes have accompanied the implementation of team policing in that city.

The only Generalist Team to report results on investigative effectiveness has been Dayton. It is difficult, however, to attribute much credibility to the Dayton results since team officers were assigned

Table 22
SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF INVESTIGATIVE EFFECTIVENESS

<div>MEASURE</div> <div>CITY</div>	CLEARANCE RATES					ARRESTS/ MAN	CASES PROSECUTED	ASSESSMENT
	BURGLARY	LARCENY	AUTO THEFT	ROBBERY	ALL PART I CRIMES			
MULTI-SPECIALIST								
Rochester	+	+	0	0		+		Probable Success
Cincinnati					+	+		Probable Success
Albany/Arbor					0		-	No Change
GENERALIST								
Dayton						+	0	No Change

to four different platoons which rotated through three shifts every twenty-eight days. The scheduling of a five day weekend each month further complicated the ability of officers to complete an investigation in a timely fashion. Evaluators concluded that the shift rotation plan and the physiological problems the officers had in coping with their constantly changing schedules persistently limited the investigative potential of the team (Tortoriello & Blatt, 1973, pp. 85-87; 137-138).

Chapter 6

CRIME TRENDS ACCOMPANYING TEAM POLICING

An important rationale for the introduction of team policing has been its positive effects upon the ability of the police to control criminal activity. The reduction of crime by team policing programs has been linked to the two major components of team policing: improved police-community relations and greater cooperation between patrol and investigative personnel.

Advocates of team policing believe that improved cooperation between police and citizens will lower the level of crime in a community by providing the opportunity to develop citizen-oriented crime prevention programs. In addition, it is believed that since many crimes are solved by citizen information, team-community cooperation would greatly enhance the flow of information from the community to the police.

Advocates of team policing have also stated that the incorporation of investigative personnel and responsibilities into the team will streamline the investigative process and develop a more effective agency investigative capability. If the above beliefs are accurate and appropriate program activities are effectively implemented, then team policing should deter criminals, improve clearance rates, and reduce crime.

CONTINUED

2 OF 4

This chapter assesses the changes in crime levels which have been reported by departments implementing team policing. The authors of this report, unlike some team policing administrators, have not assumed that team policing will have an impact upon crime trends. Law enforcement activity is only one factor which affects the level of crime in a community. Changing social and economic conditions also play an important role in determining the level of criminal activity. This chapter provides some discussion of the difficulties of measuring crime and presents crime data reported by individual team policing projects. Finally, included are discussions of other important aspects of the crime problem which team policing evaluations have generally ignored: juvenile crime and the possible tendency of neighborhood team policing programs to either "export" or, perhaps, reduce crime in adjacent areas.

CRIME TRENDS AS EVALUATION CRITERIA

Perhaps no standard of team policing effectiveness is less satisfying than measurement of changes in crime levels. The level of crime is, in significant part, a function of social conditions, the economy and the effectiveness of other social services. It is unreasonable to expect that the police can single-handedly control the motivations of potential criminals and, hence, the level of crime in a community. Law enforcement represents only one technique of social intervention to control crime (Silver, 1967, pp. 10-12).

Team policing programs have sometimes promoted unrealistic goals in regard to crime control. Police activities are, for the most part,

directed toward the solution of committed crimes and the reduction of criminal opportunities. The prevention of crime is a far more complex problem which requires an understanding of criminal motivations which does not, as yet, exist among the police or students of human behavior (Schrag, 1971, pp. 32-109).

PROBLEMS IN MEASURING CRIME

Quite apart from these conceptual problems of linking program activities to impacts upon crime are problems in the measurement of crime itself. Most police agencies rely upon enumerations of recorded crimes as measures of their effectiveness. This measure of crime is affected by factors other than the actual level of crime in a community. Citizen judgments of the seriousness of their victimization, citizen confidence in police, citizen judgments of police ability to solve the particular crime, police internal recording practices, and the nature and scale of police deployment in a community are all factors affecting levels of reported crime.

Although police administrators are generally aware of the problem of assessing program effectiveness by measuring changes in reported crime rates, a frequent goal of team programs has been an impact upon the level of reported crime. Interestingly, however, the nature of the impact sought, has been variable. In some programs where the main emphasis has been upon improved community relations, administrators and evaluators have attempted to increase the willingness of citizens to report crime and have viewed a rising reported crime rate as an indication of program success. In most cases, however, team policing

goals have aimed for a decline in the level of reported crime and a change in the nature of the problems reported.

REPORTED CRIME DATA

Table 23, Crime Goals and Measures indicates which agencies have adopted crime reduction goals and which have attempted to monitor crime rates. All but four of the nineteen programs have adopted a reduction in reported crime as a major goal of their team policing program. In spite of these goal statements, only eight of these fifteen agencies have attempted to measure the attainment of their crime reduction goals. Two agencies have attempted victimization surveys while six evaluations have analyzed reported crime rates from team and control areas. Only Dayton has attempted to analyze team policing's impact upon juvenile crime and none of the cities have measured the displacement of crime from the team area to other areas of the community.

VICTIMIZATION SURVEYS

The use of victimization surveys, a recent innovation, appears to be the most reliable method for estimating the levels of actual crime in a community. Victimization surveys can limit the serious under-reporting found in more traditional methods of gathering crime data and provide reliable baseline and follow-up data. A time series of victimization surveys can enable the police administrator to distinguish between reported crime levels that are rising because of increased victimization and those that are rising because of the

Table 23
CRIME GOALS AND MEASURES

MEASURE CITY	GOAL	VICTIMIZATION SURVEY	REPORTED CRIME	JUVENILE CRIME	EXPORT OF CRIME
BASIC PATROL					
N. Charleston					
Richmond					
San Bruno	•				
INVESTIGATIONS					
Rochester	•		•		
COMMUNITY RELATIONS					
Albuquerque	•				
Hartford	•	•			
New York	•		•		
San Diego					
FULL SERVICE TEAM POLICING					
Albany/Arbor	•				•
Albany/South	•				•
Charlotte	•				
Cincinnati	•	•	•		
Dayton	•			•	
Detroit					
Holyoke	•		•		
Los Angeles	•		•		
Menlo Park	•				
Palo Alto	•				
St. Petersburg	•		•		

increased willingness of citizens to report crime. Unfortunately, although the victimization survey can supply reliable data, methods have not been developed by which to attribute changes in victimization levels to law enforcement programs or to changes in socio-economic conditions that might have had an impact upon criminal activity. The type of question program evaluators have not always answered is, "Did the level of crime change because of team policing or because improved economic conditions reduced the potential criminal population?"

Several communities have undertaken victimization surveys in conjunction with their team policing programs. The most extensive studies of criminal victimization in team police communities have been undertaken by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) and the Urban Institute in Cincinnati. However, differences in the levels of victimization found by each survey have made comparison difficult. As a consequence, the results from the Cincinnati surveys have not been reported (Clarren & Schwartz, 1975, pp. 5-17). Hartford, Connecticut has conducted a baseline victimization survey that will be repeated and should serve as a device to describe the changes in crime levels that have accompanied team policing. Tacoma, Washington also conducted a victimization survey prior to implementing team policing, but similar follow-up data for comparative analysis has, as yet, not been collected. Table 24 summarizes these efforts.

Table 24

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF VICTIMIZATION SURVEYS

MEASURE CITY	VICTIMIZATION SURVEY	ASSESSMENT
Cincinnati	Baseline Survey Not Reliable	
Hartford	Follow-up Survey Not Yet Conducted	
Tacoma	Follow-up Survey Not Yet Conducted	

CHANGES IN REPORTED LEVELS OF CRIME

A number of cities have collected and analyzed reported crime data to evaluate their team policing programs. The most methodologically sophisticated efforts have been the analyses of Team 28 in the Venice Division of Los Angeles, the Com-Sec program in Cincinnati, and the Rochester team police experiment. These evaluations collected crime information for periods before and during the program implementation as well as data from the team and control areas. Rochester carefully monitored and compared crime rates from both team and non-team areas. When crime rates for the teams were compared with similar data from the entire city, there was a significant difference in the areas of burglary and larceny - although robbery rate changes were smaller. Burglary rates declined by a third in the team areas, while they rose slightly in the rest of the city. Larceny dropped by 33% in the team areas but only 12% in the rest of the city. The Rochester results are not nearly

as clear cut when the two teams are compared with their respective control areas. One Rochester team area (Team C) consistently recorded significant decreases in the level of reported crime that were substantially greater than in the control. Rochester Team A, however, recorded smaller declines in burglary, robbery and larceny than its control area (Bloch & Ulberg, 1974, pp. 17-18).

Police department evaluators in Los Angeles used least squares regression to project a crime trend in the control and team areas as a base for comparisons. Data for crime considered repressible through police efforts, burglary, robbery, auto theft, theft from autos and fatal traffic accidents were normalized by city-wide crime levels. The normalized crime data was used to compute expected levels of crime in the control and team areas during the experiment. The effect of police activities in the team and control areas was then computed as the difference between expected and actual crime levels. To obtain a measure of the percent of reduction in crime achieved by police efforts in the two areas, this difference was divided by the expected value (Los Angeles Police Department, 1974, pp. 89-96).

The results in Los Angeles are among the most encouraging. Crime in the team area declined substantially. However, it must be remembered that crime throughout the city also declined markedly. Burglaries and thefts from autos declined more in the team area than in the rest of the city.¹ Although the team and control areas showed a similar

¹The use of considerable and inordinate overtime by officers to develop a burglary crime prevention awareness among citizens may account for some of the reported decline in burglaries.

decline in auto thefts, the control area experienced a substantially greater decline in robberies. Finally, traffic accidents increased less rapidly in the team area than in the rest of Los Angeles (Los Angeles Police Department, 1974, pp. 95-96).

Concerns of evaluators in Cincinnati have been with the statistical significance of reported changes in crime levels between the team and control areas (ComSec Evaluation Section & The Urban Institute, 1974, pp. 2-3; CPDTPIES, 1974, pp. 35-43; Schwartz et al., 1975, pp. 22-24).¹ The results in Cincinnati have not been as encouraging as those in Los Angeles and Rochester. The ComSec District reported an overall decline of 7.5% in index crimes during the first year of the program compared to 5.5% in the remainder of the city. Of all the cities using reported crime data to monitor their team programs, only Cincinnati has made an attempt to explore alternative explanations for any reported reductions in crime. While burglary, for example, has declined in the ComSec area, it has increased in the rest of the city. Evaluators have speculated that the decline in burglaries may be a result of a decline in the team area's residential population rather than a direct impact of team policing (CPDTPIES, 1974, p. 35). More information is needed concerning crime trends in Cincinnati before final judgements can be made about the effects of team policing. It is encouraging that Cincinnati evaluators are examining alternative hypotheses for changes in crime levels. Perhaps this analysis will encourage others to

¹A time series analysis of crime data in Cincinnati using an auto-regressive moving average approach is being conducted by the Urban Institute. However, the results of this analysis are not yet available.

examine crime trends as they relate to the interplay of police operations and general socio-economic change in a community.

Crime rate analysis of comparable rigor to that undertaken in Rochester, Los Angeles and Cincinnati has not been attempted in other cities. In only one other case has any effort been made to assess the statistical significance of changes in the crime levels. That effort was made in St. Petersburg, where evaluators found that team policing had no apparent effect upon crime levels in the community. The only significant change reported was a decline in armed robberies (St. Petersburg Police Department, 1973, pp. 187-190). Evaluators in Holyoke reported that crime declined in the team area while the rest of the city experienced an increase in crime rates. The evaluators in Holyoke, however, cautioned department officials that the decline in the team area could not be conclusively attributed to team policing (O'Malley, 1973, pp. 55-57). New York reported less positive results regarding crime trends in its team areas. The evaluators of New York's Operation Neighborhood were unable to conclude that the slightly greater decline in crime in the project areas was a result of the team program (Bloch & Specht, 1973, p. 14).

Table 25, the Summary Assessment of Reported Crime indicates that crime in Rochester, Holyoke and Los Angeles improved relative to the rate in control areas while Cincinnati, New York and St. Petersburg reported very little difference between team and control areas. More detailed examination of the projects reporting some level of success does not strengthen the argument that team policing will reduce crime. In

Rochester, for example, crime dropped substantially in one team area while the control area for the other team experienced a greater reduction in crime. Not enough is known about the Holyoke evaluation to attribute high reliability to the positive results reported in that city. Because Holyoke used the entire city as a control area, it is impossible to know how changes in crime rate in the team area might compare with those in a control area of similar characteristics. Because of contradictory evidence and the methodological problems in some of the studies analyzed here, it is impossible to assess the impact of team policing upon crime rates. More studies of team policing need to be conducted before a definitive positive or negative assessment would be appropriate.

Table 25
SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF REPORTED CRIME

MEASURE CITY	AUTO THEFT	BURGLARY	LARCENY	ROBBERY	INDEX CRIME	ASSESSMENT
Rochester	+		+	0		Probable Success
Los Angeles	+	+				Probable Success
Holyoke					+	Qualified Success
Cincinnati					0	Probable No Change
New York					0	Qualified No Change
St. Petersburg		0		+		Qualified No Change

UNRESOLVED PROBLEMS

JUVENILE CRIME

Because juvenile crime is so pervasive and such a significant contribution to levels of crime, one would expect the community emphasis of team policing to have some relevance for juvenile crime problems. The closer relations with other public and community agencies which team policing programs have sought to achieve, suggest that some effect upon the quality of police efforts to divert juveniles from criminal careers might be expected. During our site visits, several team leaders discussed attempts to implement juvenile programs and thereby reduce crime. However, only one evaluation has given any attention to assessing team policing impacts upon juvenile problems. That evaluation, conducted during the first year of the Dayton program, found no basis for any conclusion that team policing had changed police rapport with community youth (Cordrey & Kotecha, 1971, p. 43).

THE "EXPORT" OF CRIME

A suspicion among some police administrators has been the possibility that team policing might "export" the crime of that neighborhood to other locales. The history of team policing developments in Albany provides some support for this view. The establishment of the department's first neighborhood police unit in the South End produced a movement of the criminals formerly flourishing in that neighborhood to Arbor Hill, a comparable neighborhood in the northern part of Albany. This movement was one of the inspirations for establishing the Arbor Hill unit. Albany police administrators have since become concerned

about the increasing frequency of burglaries in a section of Albany midway between the two neighborhoods. The department now is using the team approach to form a burglary unit in the detective division to address that problem. Retrospectively, the evolution of the department's main crime problems appears to have been an outcome of the effectiveness of the particular team policing programs.

Establishing procedures systematically to predict such a phenomenon as an outcome of team policing would be difficult. A satisfactory design to evaluate this "export" effect would require an initial analytic effort to identify the areas contiguous to a neighborhood. Further, patrol quality in "contiguous" non-team areas, the intent of felons in the team area to transfer their geographic base of operations to another area and the methodological problem of assessing the impact of police programs upon crime rates are all factors which would confound any effort to evaluate the tendency of team policing to export crime.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

None of these results provide a satisfactory basis for conclusions about the effect of team policing upon levels of crime. Police administrators, like experimenters in other pure and applied areas, have a tendency to report only favorable or significant results. The results reported here have all concerned individual projects. The systematic comparative research which could provide a more satisfactory basis for conclusions has not been done. Finally, it should again be noted that not much is known about criminal motivations. Even less certain is the extent to which process understandings of criminal motives might impinge upon police practices.

Chapter 7

COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals suggested that the isolation of police from the community is one of the most serious problems confronting law enforcement agencies. The report goes on to describe team policing as a modern program to reduce police isolation and involve the community in solving law enforcement problems (NACCJSG, 1973, pp. 161; 154). Recognizing the crucial role of the community in effective law enforcement, most team programs have placed a strong emphasis upon improving police community relations. With the exception of the three Basic Patrol Teams and the Investigative Team in Rochester, all the teams analyzed in this report have adopted goals dealing with improved police-community service and relations.

A desire to improve police-community relations by providing additional services to the community is not, of course, unique to departments instituting team policing. What is unique is the context within which these activities have been conducted and managed. Team policing has generally implied the decentralization of community-related responsibilities to the team leader and to patrol officers. In more traditional departments these responsibilities have been in the hands of specialist units which provide service to the entire city.

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first part describes what team policing units have done to provide increased services to the community. Where possible, we have presented evaluation information on these community activities. The second section is largely a summary of citizen attitudinal surveys which describe how citizens have felt about team policing programs.

COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES AND OUTCOMES

Neighborhood team policing programs have experimented with a wide range of activities designed to increase the officer role in providing community-related activities. A particular emphasis has been on increasing opportunities for positive police-citizen contacts, with the concomitant goals of improving citizen attitudes toward the police (police-community relations) and encouraging the flow of information from the citizenry. With this rationale, neighborhood team policing programs have engaged in a wide variety of non-crime services. Table 26, Community Service Activities, indicates the services each department has implemented in order to achieve its team goal of improved police-community cooperation. The most obvious change has occurred in the way officers are assigned and dispatched. All the programs have featured the permanent assignment of teams and officers to a particular community as a means to increase officer accountability and responsibility for the community being served. Six of the teams have attempted to strengthen their ties with the community by opening team offices. These offices have served as coordinating centers for the team's community activities.

Table 26
COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES

MEASURE CITY	PERMANENT ASSIGNMENT	TEAM OFFICE	INFORMAL CONTACT	NON-CRIME SERVICES	CRIME PREVENTION	BLAZER UNIFORM
BASIC PATROL						
N. Charleston	•					
Richmond	•					
San Bruno	•					
INVESTIGATIONS						
Rochester	•					
COMMUNITY RELATIONS						
Albuquerque	•	•		•		
Hartford	•		•	•		
New York	•		•			
San Diego	•		•	•	•	
FULL SERVICE TEAM POLICING						
<u>Multi-Specialist</u>						
Albany/Arbor	•	•	•	•	•	•
Charlotte	•		•	•	•	
Cincinnati	•		•	•	•	
Detroit	•		•			
Los Angeles	•	•	•			
Palo Alto	•		•		•	
St. Petersburg	•		•			•
<u>Generalist</u>						
Albany/South	•	•	•	•	•	•
Dayton	•	•	•	•	•	•
Holyoke	•	•	•	•	•	•
Menlo Park	•		•	•	•	•

Increasing the number of contacts between citizens and team officers has been an important activity in fourteen team programs. Teams have usually supplied officers with portable radios so that they can easily leave their cars to walk portions of their beats, talk informally with citizens and attend community meetings. Team planners have expected these informal contacts to lessen police-citizen hostility and to lay the basis for police-community cooperation in a variety of law enforcement endeavors. Ten departments have tried to strengthen the bond between the police and the community by altering the way non-crime service calls are handled. In these departments, dispatchers have passed on to the team officers many non-crime service calls that had not been viewed as appropriate law enforcement activities and had previously been screened out.

Directly relating to crime problems, nine teams have implemented crime prevention programs. These programs have attempted to make residents aware of crime problems in their neighborhoods, particularly burglaries, and have sometimes provided home and business security inspections. Six departments have adopted informal blazer uniforms and specially marked patrol cars to increase the neighborhood awareness of their community team policing units. Finally, a survey of Table 26 indicates that Generalist Teams have engaged in more community-related activities than other types of team policing units.

Two problems arise in trying to assess these various community service activities. The first problem has been estimating the extent to which each of these activities has been implemented, and the second deals

with evaluating the impact the activity had upon the community and the team. Observations during numerous ride-alongs with team officers indicate some of the program activities, particularly efforts to stimulate increased officer-citizen contact and to provide crime prevention information, were not being implemented. Two factors may account for these omissions. First, most of the programs have redefined patrol officer responsibility without providing adequate training supports. Only nine programs have developed pre-start-up training programs to acquaint officers with the concepts and methods of community oriented team policing. Second, with the exception of San Diego, none of the programs altered the way in which officers were evaluated when new policing concepts and activities were adopted. Thus, although team officers were expected to change their job role, they continued to be evaluated by criteria that did not reflect the new emphasis in team patrol operations and responsibilities.

Table 27, Measures of Community Service Activities, indicates which teams have formally monitored and evaluated community service components of team policing. A review of the table indicates that most evaluators have not monitored these activities. Only Cincinnati and San Diego have attempted to evaluate the impact of permanent assignment. Although six teams set up community offices, only Albuquerque and Los Angeles monitored their use. Six teams evaluated their efforts to increase non-crime services and crime prevention activities, while only Holyoke and Menlo Park evaluated the informal blazer uniform.

Table 27

MEASURE OF COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES

MEASURE CITY	PERMANENT ASSIGNMENT	TEAM OFFICE	NON-CRIME SERVICES	BLAZER UNIFORM
BASIC PATROL				
N. Charleston				
Richmond				
San Bruno				
INVESTIGATIONS				
Rochester				
COMMUNITY RELATIONS				
Albuquerque		•		
Hartford				
New York				
San Diego	•		•	
FULL SERVICE TEAM POLICING				
<u>Multi-Specialist</u>				
Albany/Arbor			•	
Charlotte				
Cincinnati	•		•	
Detroit				
Los Angeles		•	•	
Palo Alto				
St. Petersburg				
<u>Generalist</u>				
Albany/South				
Dayton			•	
Holyoke			•	•
Menlo Park				•

PERMANENT ASSIGNMENT

One of the most conspicuous features of team policing has been the assignment of the team and its members to a specific area or neighborhood for an extended period of time. Permanent assignment has played an important role in team policing community relations. Team planners have assumed that if the team and its officers were permanently assigned to a community, they would increase their knowledge of the community and would be able to provide more effective enforcement and community services. In addition, team advocates have assumed that permanent assignment would improve officer knowledge of and sensitivity to community needs, increase officer-community ties and eventually foster greater community support for law enforcement activities.

ASSESSMENT

Although team planners have assumed that permanent assignment would enable a department to meet a number of community relations goals, few departments have attempted to evaluate its likely impacts. In another section of this report we have reported information about the ability of teams to consistently dispatch team officers within the team area.¹ These results indicate that assigning and dispatching officers within the team area is feasible.

Only Cincinnati and San Diego have systematically tested the relationship between permanent assignment and a community relations goal. The results from the San Diego evaluation suggests that permanent assignment,

¹See the discussion of Permanent Assignment in Chapter 4, Workload Management.

by itself, may not be sufficient to increase an officers' awareness of the community. In San Diego both control and experimental officers were permanently assigned to their beats. However, only the team officers increased their knowledge about community services. During the experiment, the number of profile officers who indicated knowledge about all the social services and resources in the community increased by forty-two percent compared to just five percent for the control officers. Profile officers also placed a higher value upon knowledge of community characteristics, like housing, race, income and recreational facilities than did control officers. However, the evaluators noted little change in the amount of interest profile officers had in crime information for their community (Boydston & Sherry, 1975, pp. 39-44).

The San Diego results suggest that permanent assignment by itself may not contribute appreciably to officer knowledge of the community. If permanent assignment were the critical factor in acquiring beat knowledge, then control officers would have increased their community knowledge. Rather than measuring the impact of permanent assignment, the evaluators were measuring the impact of the profile training program. The training program and the requirement that all profile officers had to write a description of their beats contributed to their knowledge of community social services and beat characteristics. The results from San Diego suggest that if an agency wants to increase officer beat knowledge, it should not only assign officers to that beat for a period of time, but more importantly, require them to formally analyze and describe conditions on that beat.

Rather than evaluate officer knowledge of particular community and crime characteristics, Cincinnati evaluators simply asked officers if their community knowledge had increased. A significantly larger number of team officers felt they recognized people who lived in their district, a change which did not occur in the control district (Schwartz et al., 1975, p. 17).

Table 28 summarizes our assessment of the impact of team policing upon an officer's beat knowledge. Because of the limited and contradictory information, we are unable to conclude that permanent assignment by itself will increase the officer's beat knowledge. Before a final assessment is possible, more information about the specific knowledge changes, like those monitored in San Diego, would be necessary.

Table 28
SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF BEAT KNOWLEDGE

MEASURE CITY	COMMUNITY SERVICE INFORMATION	CRIME INFORMATION	ASSESSMENT
San Diego	+		Success
San Diego		0	No Change
Cincinnati	+		Success

COMMUNITY OFFICE

A second way by which team programs have sought to increase their community outreach has been by establishing an office in the community. Of the nineteen programs reviewed, only the two Albany programs, Albuquerque, Dayton, Holyoke and Los Angeles established offices from which teams could conduct community service work. Although other law enforcement departments have opened offices in team areas, these offices were not used by team members to conduct community service work. Community offices in Cincinnati were not staffed by team personnel while offices in Charlotte, Hartford and Rochester were closed most of the time and were used primarily for report writing and roll calls.

The major assumptions underlying a team community office have been that it would create greater team visibility, would provide the community with easier access to law enforcement services and would result in improved police-community cooperation.

ASSESSMENT

Of the six programs which have utilized community offices as a focus for their team community service programs, only the effectiveness of the Albuquerque and Los Angeles offices was monitored by program evaluators. The Los Angeles evaluators reported that although the initial response to the community center was enthusiastic, after several months the center was used less frequently. As citizens and team officers lost interest in the center, its hours of operation were shortened and the center was eventually closed (LAPD, 1974, pp. 74-75). Evaluators of

the Albuquerque program noted an opposite effect but still recommended that the community office be closed. In Albuquerque the evaluators suggested that because of the lack of funding and planning supports for the office, civilian agencies might better meet the heavy demand for neighborhood social services (Sears & Wilson, 1973, pp. 57-60).

In both Albany programs the team office has been operated with success (McArdle & Betjemann, 1972, p. 10). Unlike the other team offices, the Albany teams have used their offices not only as a focus of community service but also as a basis for all team administrative and operational activities. Our site visits indicated that the Albany South End team office offered a variety of community services and appeared to be interacting with the community quite successfully.

Table 29 reviews the limited information about community offices. The results from Albuquerque and Los Angeles, as well as our observations in Albany, suggest that a team office is more likely to be successful if it is adequately staffed and is the basis for all team operations, not just community services. Before a final judgment is possible, more evaluative information is needed about the relationship between the functions of the team office and their viability.

Table 29
SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF TEAM OFFICES

CITY	MEASURE	COMMUNITY OFFICE	ASSESSMENT
Albuquerque		0	Insufficient Data
Los Angeles		—	Probable Failure

NON-CRIME RELATED SERVICES

Ten of the fifteen teams with a community focus have increased the responsibility of patrol units for non-crime services. These new responsibilities have ranged from security inspections to equipping patrol cars with jumper cables and flares. In many departments, the change to team policing has resulted in attempts to handle more non-crime related service calls, refer citizens to social agencies for assistance and implement crime prevention programs. Team planners have generally agreed that assisting citizens with their non-crime related problems would improve citizen attitudes toward the police and result in increased citizen cooperation with and support for law enforcement.

ASSESSMENT

The evaluators of Albany/Arbor Hill, Dayton and Holyoke have monitored the impact of their team programs upon non-crime service calls. Team officers in Albany, perhaps more than others, were encouraged to assist community residents with a variety of problems. As a result, calls for police service to the Arbor Hill team in Albany doubled over a two year period. Some of this increase was probably due to the opening of a team office in the community. Besides stimulating increased demands for services the Arbor Hill team had an impact upon the types of assistance the community was requesting. Prior to team policing, 70.5 percent of the calls from Arbor Hill were crime related. After the implementation of the neighborhood team, that proportion declined to 15.3 percent of all blotter entries. In addition to the "overwhelming"

increase in calls for assistance in interpersonal disturbances, there was an increase as well in calls for assistance in other non-criminal matters: auto accidents, towing automobiles and missing persons (Forer & Farrell, 1973, pp. 22-26).

Although Dayton and Holyoke had planned to increase non-crime services to the community, this policy was not reflected in a review of departmental calls for service. The number of calls for non-crime services such as transportation to hospitals or dog barking declined by approximately twenty-three percent while disturbance calls like drunkenness, trouble with youths and trespassing actually doubled. Holyoke evaluators attributed the rise in the number of disturbance calls to an increased willingness of citizens to call the police rather than an increase in community tensions (O'Malley, 1973, p. 67). Dayton evaluators reported no change in the type of dispatch calls serviced by the team units in spite of a commitment to expand community service. In both the team and control areas community service calls accounted for approximately twenty percent of all dispatch calls (Tortoriello & Blatt, 1973, pp. 111-113). The inability of the Dayton and Holyoke teams to increase service delivery may be partly attributable to budgetary restrictions and departmental problems unrelated to team policing.

Cincinnati and San Diego evaluators monitored programs to refer citizens with problems to social agencies for assistance. Both evaluations indicated that the programs were seldom used. Although team officers in Cincinnati expressed support for the referral program, evaluators found

that few referrals were being made (Schwartz et al., 1975, pp. 5-6; Watkins, 1973, p. 30). Evaluators in San Diego reported that team officers felt the available social services were of a poor quality. As a result, the team's use of referrals was similar to that of the control group and actually declined slightly over the course of the project (Boydston & Sherry, 1975, p. 4).

Although eight teams have implemented crime prevention programs, only the Los Angeles evaluators have attempted to assess the effectiveness of their programs. The evaluators carefully monitored the number of security inspections that were conducted by team members. They found that although most team officers felt the security inspections were of limited value, nearly fifty-three percent of the homeowners complied to some degree with the recommendations to target harden their property. In spite of this, Los Angeles evaluators concluded that security inspections were not cost effective and when the grant funds were spent the inspection program was dropped (Los Angeles Police Department, 1974, pp. 68-69).

Table 30 summarizes what little is known about how successfully non-crime service programs have been implemented and what impact they have had. The evaluations indicate that most programs have had almost no impact. Only Albany was able to increase its ability to handle non-crime service calls. Although referral of citizens to social agencies for assistance was an important focus in Cincinnati and San Diego, officer response to the program was limited. Finally, although the Team 28 experiment in Los Angeles was successful in conducting a large

Table 30

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF NON-CRIME SERVICE PROGRAMS

MEASURE CITY	SERVICE CALLS	REFFERALS	CRIME PREVENTION	ASSESSMENT
COMMUNITY RELATIONS				
San Diego		0		No Change
FULL SERVICE TEAM POLICING				
<u>Multi-Specialist</u>				
Albany/Arbor	+			Probable Success
Cincinnati		0		No Change
Los Angeles			+	Qualified Success
<u>Generalist</u>				
Dayton	0			Qualified No Change
Holyoke	0			Qualified No Change

number of security inspections and burglary rates dropped substantially, program administrators recommended that the security inspections be dropped because of their cost.

BLAZER UNIFORM

Efforts to change the symbolic image of the police have accompanied several team programs. Special vehicle marking and coloring schemes have been used in Albany, Dayton and Los Angeles. In addition, five agencies - Albany, Dayton, Holyoke, Menlo Park and St. Petersburg - have adopted civilian type blazer uniforms. Most of these experiments have been based upon the assumption that the informal uniform would increase citizen identification with the police, decrease citizen-police isolation and enhance police communication with the public.

ASSESSMENT

Only Holyoke and Menlo Park have attempted to evaluate the impact of the blazer uniform. Citizen surveys in both communities indicated an acceptance of the new style. A survey in Menlo Park found that sixty-six percent of those surveyed were aware of the uniform change and that eighty percent of these people had a favorable opinion (Fiest & Luft, 1974, p. 19). Citizens in Holyoke stated they felt more comfortable about the uniform and felt less intimidated by police officers (O'Malley, 1973, pp. 132; 134). None of the evaluators assessed how officers felt about the informal uniform. Our site visit to Albany, however, indicated that officers and citizens had adapted to and liked the informal attire worn by team members.

Table 31 summarizes our very limited knowledge about the blazer uniform. The data from Holyoke and Menlo Park and information gained during our site visit to Albany indicate that citizens have been receptive to the informal uniform.

Table 31

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF THE BLAZER UNIFORM

CITY \ MEASURE	BLAZER UNIFORM	ASSESSMENT
Holyoke	+	Qualified Success
Menlo Park	+	Qualified Success

COMMUNITY RELATED EFFECTS OF TEAM POLICING

The previous section discusses what has been done to measure the extent to which teams have actually implemented community-related activities and the impact that these activities had upon team members and the community. The information reported in this section is of a more diffuse nature. In the absence of clearly defined and tested behavioral measures to monitor the impact of team policing programs, evaluators have relied heavily upon attitudinal surveys. Most of the responses to these questionnaires cannot be linked to particular team policing activities. Rather, they are the result of how the community, and occasionally the officers, have generally felt about the entire team policing program.

None of the team programs used the same instruments to measure community attitudes in addition, only a few evaluators grouped questions measuring the same attitude or opinion into scales. In the absence of scales, we have attempted to group the various responses to survey questions into two categories:

Officer Attitudes About the Community
Citizen Attitudes About Team Policing

Table 32 indicates which team programs have attempted to measure these attitudes. Six programs have presented information about the team officer attitudes toward the community, while five programs have surveyed citizens about the team and its members.

POLICE ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE COMMUNITY

The most complete information about officer assessment of team impact upon community support for and involvement in law enforcement is available from San Diego and Cincinnati. Both programs reported positive effects. In San Diego profile officers developed a significantly higher level of confidence in having the support of the community than did control officers. The profile officers also reported significantly greater cooperation from citizens in their day-to-day patrol work (Boydston & Sherry, 1975, p. 53).

More than seventy percent of the team officers in Cincinnati agreed that ComSec increased the degree of community support and citizen involvement (Schwartz et al., 1975, p. 28). Although ComSec officers saw citizens as more cooperative and less hostile than did control officers, the difference was not significant (Schwartz et al., 1974,

Table 32

MEASURES OF COMMUNITY FOCUS OF TEAM POLICING

CITY \ MEASURE	POLICE ATTITUDES	COMMUNITY ATTITUDES
BASIC PATROL		
N. Charleston		
Richmond		
San Bruno		
INVESTIGATIONS		
Rochester		
COMMUNITY RELATIONS		
Albuquerque	•	
Hartford		
New York	•	•
San Diego	•	•
FULL SERVICE TEAM POLICING		
<u>Multi-Specialist</u>		
Albany/Arbor		•
Charlotte		
Cincinnati	•	•
Detroit		
Los Angeles	•	•
Palo Alto		
St. Petersburg		
<u>Generalist</u>		
Albany/South	•	•
Dayton		•
Holyoke		•
Menlo Park		

p. 13). Finally, ComSec officer feelings that they were doing a good job in improving police-community relations increased during the first year of the program and were significantly stronger than those of control officers (Schwartz, 1975, p. 36).

Evaluators of the Albany, Albuquerque, Los Angeles and New York programs did not explore officer feelings toward the impact of team policing upon the community as thoroughly as evaluators in Cincinnati or San Diego. However, with the exception of New York, team officers felt citizen attitudes toward the police had improved. Officers in Albuquerque felt the team program had created a beneficial sense of identification of officers with the community and this increased community trust of the police (Sears & Wilson, 1973, pp. 48-49). In Albany/South officers' attitudes toward the community improved significantly relative to the control group, and in Los Angeles team officers felt citizens were more involved with and committed to the law enforcement needs of the community (Candeub & Fleissig, 1972, pp. 22-23; Los Angeles Police Department, 1974, p. 64). Only in New York did team officers feel that citizen cooperation was declining (Bloch & Specht, 1973, p. 63).

Table 33 summarizes our assessment of officer attitudes towards the impact of the program upon the community. With the exception of New York, it indicates that officers generally felt the community was more cooperative with the law enforcement since team policing had been implemented.

Table 33

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF POLICE ATTITUDES TOWARD THE COMMUNITY

MEASURE CITY	POLICE ATTITUDES	ASSESSMENT
COMMUNITY RELATIONS		
Albuquerque	+	Qualified Success
New York	0	Qualified No Change
San Diego	+	Success
FULL SERVICE TEAM POLICING		
<u>Multi-Specialist</u>		
Cincinnati	+	Success
Los Angeles	+	Qualified Success
<u>Generalist</u>		
Albany/South	+	Qualified Success

COMMUNITY ATTITUDES

Improving police-community relations has been a goal of all of the teams in this report except the three Basic Patrol Teams and the Investigative Team in Rochester. Evaluators have attempted to assess attainment of this goal by surveying changes in citizen attitudes related to satisfaction with police services, and support for, or hostility towards, law enforcement. Cincinnati, Los Angeles, New York and San Diego have supplemented this attitudinal data with behavioral

information by monitoring citizen complaints and commendations of team officers. The results have been varied and difficult to interpret.

Albany and Los Angeles evaluators reported that community attitudes improved. In Albany/Arbor Hill, citizen attitudes were consistently more positive than the attitudes of citizens in the control area, particularly regarding police fairness, dependability and trustworthiness (Forrer & Farrell, 1973, pp. 50; 54). An evaluation of Albany/South, where no control group was used but where data was drawn from a large sample at three different points, indicates citizen attitudes became more favorable among both blacks and whites. Although there was no significant change in citizen willingness to cooperate with police, there were dramatic changes in the perception of team officers as being "nice" or as doing a good job of protecting people (Candeub & Fleissig, 1972, pp. 19-21). These results are consistent with officer comments and anecdotal information from Albany.

Evaluators of the Los Angeles Team 28 program found that citizen perceptions of police fairness and impartiality in enforcing the law improved during the program (Los Angeles Police Department, 1974, pp. 58-59). However, citizens did not feel their neighbors were involved with or supported law enforcement to any greater extent since team policing was implemented (Los Angeles Police Department, 1974, pp. 57-59; B-3). Evaluators in Cincinnati, Holyoke and New York found that team policing had no impact upon citizen attitudes.

One of the most credible team policing evaluations was that of the ComSec program in Cincinnati. After one year, citizen satisfaction and belief in the honesty of officers remained high, but did not increase as much as program planners had expected. There was also no significant change in citizen hostility toward police or their willingness to cooperate with police (Schwartz et al., 1975, p. 4). This lack of change may be attributed to several intervening variables. Many of the community-related activities, for example, had already been implemented prior to the collection of baseline data. In addition, citizen opinions toward the police were already high when the program began, leaving little room for significant improvement.

Although initial surveys in Holyoke indicated that community attitudes toward the police were improving, results over a two year period indicated no change in citizen perceptions of police quality (O'Malley, 1973, pp. 131-132; 152). Much of the early community satisfaction with the team program was attributed to their easy access to the police. The decline in citizen satisfaction can be explained by departmental budget cuts that eliminated many team community service activities and again isolated the police from the community (O'Malley, 1973, pp. 147-148). Finally, in New York there was no improvement in the community's general attitudes toward the police. The evaluators concluded that Operation Neighborhood had little success in reaching hostile citizens (Bloch & Specht, 1973, pp. 15; 95-96).

The community surveys in Dayton indicated that citizens became less satisfied with police service after team policing was implemented.

Dayton evaluators found either no difference between experimental and control citizen attitudes or a lower degree of satisfaction in the experimental district. Citizens in the control area were generally happier with police services and viewed officers as more help-oriented than did team area citizens (Tortoriello & Blatt, 1973, pp. 36; 38; 95). The disappointing nature of the Dayton results may be attributed in large part to the fact that many of the community-oriented activities were never fully implemented because of a severe manpower shortage.

The number of citizen complaints or commendations has been monitored by evaluators in Cincinnati, Los Angeles, New York and San Diego. However, because commendations are easily manipulated and represent such a small sampling of the population they are not the most reliable measures of general community attitudes. Evaluators of the New York program, for example, noted that complaints may have been handled informally and not recorded and that citizens were encouraged to submit letters of commendation. Because of these procedures it is difficult to attribute the decrease in complaints against team officers from 126 to ninety-one and the doubling of commendations to the team program (Bloch & Specht, 1973, pp. 88-89). In San Diego evaluators recorded that profile officers received 101 citizen commendations compared to only thirty-two for control officers. However, profile and control officers each received the same number of citizen complaints (Boydston & Sherry, 1975, pp. 37-38). Evaluators of Team 28 in Los Angeles found that letters of commendation for team officers increased significantly while complaints declined (Los Angeles Police

Department, 1974, p. 64). In Cincinnati the number of complaints received per team officer did not change significantly (Watkins, 1973, p. 61).

Table 34 summarizes our knowledge of citizen attitudes towards team policing programs. Citizen responses have been mixed. Evaluators of programs in Albany/Arbor and South, Los Angeles and San Diego have reported positive results. Holyoke and Cincinnati reported no changes

Table 34
SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF COMMUNITY ATTITUDES

CITY	MEASURE	COMMUNITY ATTITUDES	ASSESSMENT
COMMUNITY RELATIONS			
New York		0	Qualified No Change
San Diego		+	Probable Success
FULL SERVICE TEAM POLICING			
<u>Multi-Specialist</u>			
Albany/Arbor		+	Probable Success
Cincinnati		0	No Change
Los Angeles		+	Qualified Success
<u>Generalist</u>			
Albany/South		+	Qualified Success
Dayton		-	Qualified Failure
Holyoke		0	Qualified No Change

while Dayton and New York evaluators reported a decline in citizen satisfaction with the police. Care must be taken in interpreting these results. The programs in Dayton, Holyoke and New York were implemented during periods of stress through the department. In Dayton and New York the programs were implemented very quickly by new chiefs and with little planning. In addition, neither of these cities was able to successfully increase the level of crime and non-crime related services to the community. In Holyoke, although citizen attitudes improved initially, they dropped as many community-related grant-supported activities were curtailed at the end of the project's first year. Finally, the evaluators of the ComSec program emphasized that citizen attitudes toward the team did not improve because many team policing community activities had already been implemented when the baseline community survey data was collected. Although four programs failed to produce a favorable impact upon community attitudes, further analysis indicates their failures may have been the result of departmental problems that interfered with the full implementation of the team programs or, in the case of Cincinnati, a faulty survey research design.

Chapter 8

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

In the previous chapters we assessed the effectiveness of team policing programs by analyzing individual measures of police performance such as clearance rates, response times and crime rates as well as surveys of officer and citizen attitudes. In this chapter we will present an aggregate of what we currently know about team policing programs and what evaluators need to focus upon in order to present an accurate and full assessment of team policing. Table 35 summarizes much of the information reported in this assessment. The table also indicates the many gaps in our knowledge about team policing. The strategy in this chapter is to discuss the many gaps in our knowledge of specific team policing outcomes and then to use the conceptual framework developed in Chapter 2 to describe the impact of the five basic types of team policing programs.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION RESULTS

A review of Table 35 indicates that evaluation information has been collected in only a small number of categories for each team program. Two measure categories are particularly important for understanding the results achieved by the provision of community services. Unlike the other six measure categories, which assess program effects, the officer role

Table 35
SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF TEAM POLICING PROGRAMS

MEASURE CITY	OFFICER ROLE	JOB SATISFACTION	WORKLOAD MANAGEMENT	INVESTIGATIVE EFFECTIVENESS	CRIME CONTROL	COMMUNITY SERVICES	POLICE ATTITUDES	COMMUNITY ATTITUDES
BASIC PATROL								
N. Charleston								
Richmond								
San Bruno								
INVESTIGATIONS								
Rochester				Success (P)	Success (P)			
COMMUNITY RELATIONS								
Albuquerque*						Failure (Q)	Success (Q)	
Hartford								
New York*	Failure (Q)	Failure (Q)	Failure (Q)		No Change (Q)		No Change (Q)	No Change (Q)
San Diego	Success	No Change	Success (Q)			Success	Success	
FULL SERVICE TEAM POLICING								
Multi-Specialist								
Albany/Arbor			Success (P)	No Change (Q)		Success (P)		Success (P)
Charlotte		Success (Q)						
Cincinnati		No Change	Success (P)	Success (P)	No Change (P)		Success	No Change
Detroit*			Success (Q)					
Los Angeles					Success (P)	Success (Q)	Success (Q)	Success (Q)
Palo Alto*								
St. Petersburg*					No Change (Q)			
Generalist								
Albany/South							Success (Q)	Success (Q)
Dayton*			Success (Q)	No Change (Q)		No Change (Q)		Failure (Q)
Holyoke*					Success (Q)	No Change (Q)		No Change (Q)
Menlo Park								

*Departments which have discontinued team policing.

(P) Probable; (Q) Qualified

and community services measures were designed to monitor the extent to which planned program activities have actually been implemented. The tendency for program evaluators has been to assume that program activities have been implemented and then to measure, for example, the effects of the program upon job satisfaction, workload management, crime control and police and community attitudes. More attention needs to be given to monitoring the extent to which program activities have been implemented.

Knowing what has changed is essential for determining whether the concepts of team policing or extraneous variables are responsible for the evaluation results reported. In evaluating a program two questions need to be asked:

1. Have the planning program activities actually been implemented?
2. What has been the impact of these activities?

An analysis of the officer role and community service measures will illustrate the problem of attributing evaluation results to team policing.

Only two departments have attempted to assess changes in the role of the police officer. We think knowing how team policing changes the officer's role and knowing what the officer is doing in a team program is especially critical in determining whether the program or other factors are responsible for the results reported by evaluators. In San Diego where evaluators noted that profile officers have altered their job roles and were, in fact, implementing the planned profile activities the program was quite successful. Although measures of job satisfaction showed "no change" profile officers in San Diego improved their workload management, increased community services and adopted a more positive attitude towards the community.

However, in New York, where officers did not change their job roles and continued to police in a traditional manner, evaluators found decreased job satisfaction and workload management capabilities and no change in measures of crime control, community services and community attitudes. One can venture that the New York program failed not because team policing was faulty but because program administrators and officers failed to implement the most basic components of team policing.

An examination of the extent to which community services were implemented by the various team programs indicates that where community services were increased, police and community attitudes towards each other improved. Increased community service activities on the part of officers in San Diego, Albany/Arbor Hill and Los Angeles affected both the officers and the community in a positive way. In Dayton and Holyoke, however, where planned community service aspects of team policing were not implemented community attitudes towards the police remained largely unchanged.

Our review of the extent to which team programs have affected the officers' job role and the provision of community services should caution planners, administrators and evaluators to carefully monitor program activities to insure that planned changes are actually being implemented. One cannot assume that because a program has been planned and adopted by a department that it has also been operationalized. Knowing the extent to which a particular program has been implemented is a prelude to determining the effect of that program.

Some care must be taken in interpreting the results in Table 35. Three of the programs were notable failures - New York, Dayton and Holyoke. In

each case the departments were unable to operationalize the team program. We have already indicated that the New York program was not implemented. Although quantitative information was unavailable our field observations and evaluation reviews in Dayton and Holyoke revealed that these team programs were never implemented. In Holyoke budgetary and labor problems, internal department disputes and low officer morale undermined the program. Similar problems affected the Dayton program. The failure of the New York, Dayton and Holyoke departments to implement team policing was the result of general departmental problems that would have greatly hampered any effort to alter the way patrol, investigative and community services are delivered to the public.

ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM TYPES

BASIC PATROL TEAMS

None of the Basic Patrol Teams have collected the kinds of evaluative information which would make it possible for us to judge whether or not the program was effective. Only San Bruno conducted an evaluation, but its quality was so poor it virtually precluded its use in this report. A proper evaluation of the Basic Patrol Team would demand, at a minimum, that information be collected about changes in the officer's role and job satisfaction and the ability of the team to manage its workload. Since the Basic Patrol Team does not have investigative or community relations responsibilities, its impact in these areas need not be monitored.

INVESTIGATIVE TEAMS

Rochester was the only city to implement a team unit with an investigative focus. Evaluation of the Rochester program has provided the most reliable and complete information about investigative effectiveness. The teams have been successful in improving clearance rates and reducing crime.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS TEAMS

Three of the four Community Relations Teams have been evaluated, and the fourth, Hartford, has recently embarked upon a major evaluation effort. Albuquerque and New York have already discontinued their programs. In both instances the failures may have been the result of intervening variables and general departmental problems rather than the team policing program itself. Evaluation of the Albuquerque program indicated that although police attitudes towards the community changed, the team was unable to provide a higher level of community services. In New York the evaluators concluded that the teams failed in a number of areas. The New York program failed to change the patrol officers' role or increase their job satisfaction. In addition, the team appears to have had little impact upon police and community attitudes towards one another. Unlike Albuquerque and New York, the San Diego profile experiment operated with a high degree of success. Officers in San Diego adapted to their new role, delivered increased community services and improved their attitudes toward the community. The San Diego program is one of the more promising projects reviewed in this report.

FULL SERVICE TEAMS - Multi-Specialist

Three of the Full Service Teams - Albany/Arbor, Cincinnati and Los Angeles have been extensively evaluated and generally have received successful ratings. The Cincinnati program has been the most carefully and heavily evaluated team program. Its impact has been mixed. While indicators of workload management, investigative effectiveness and police attitudes towards the community have improved, there has been no change in officer job satisfaction and community attitudes. Although there was no change in the Albany/Arbor team's investigative effectiveness, the team provided additional community services and improved police-community relations. The Los Angeles program has been credited with lowering crime rates and improving police-community relations. The remaining cities in this group have not provided enough information to assess their programs. It should be noted that Detroit, Palo Alto and St. Petersburg have dropped their team policing programs.

FULL SERVICE TEAMS - Generalist

The limited evaluation of Albany/South has indicated the program succeeded in improving police-community relations. The programs in Dayton and Holyoke had only a minimum impact and were eventually abandoned. It should be noted that both of these programs were implemented during periods of departmental turmoil and under severely constrained budgets which contributed heavily to the failure of the team programs. The evaluative information and our reasoned judgment suggest that the Generalist concept is more difficult to implement and maintain than is the Full Service Multi-Specialist approach to team organization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abt Associates Inc. Exemplary project validation report: reserve deputy sheriff program - Los Angeles county sheriff's department: Neighborhood assistance officer program - Dayton police department. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Associates Inc., January 17, 1975.
- Albright, E., Baum, M.A., Forman, B., Gems, S., Jaffe, D., Jordan, F.C., Jr., Katz, R., & Sinsky, P.A. Evaluation in criminal justice programs: Guidelines and examples. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, June 1973.
- Allen, W.A. The police agent. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, October 1973, 2-6.
- American Bar Association Project on Standards for Criminal Justice. Standards relating to the urban police function (Approved Draft with Commentary). Chicago: American Bar Association, June 1973.
- American Bar Association Project on Standards for Criminal Justice. Standards relating to the urban police function (Special Reprint Edition). Chicago: American Bar Association, June 1974.
- Angell, J.E. The democratic model needs a fair trial: Angell's response. Criminology, February 1975, 12, 4, 379-384.
- Angell, J.E. Toward an alternative to the classic police organizational arrangements: A democratic model. In T.J. Sweeney & W. Ellingsworth (Eds.), Issues in police patrol: A book of readings. Kansas City, Missouri: Kansas City, Missouri Police Department, 1973, 223-238.
- Anthony, R. Closing the loop between planning and performance. Public Administration Review, May/June 1971, 388-398.
- Arrow, K.J. The limits of organization. New York: Norton, 1974.
- Balk, W.L. Communications models and social change. Journal of Comparative Administration, May 1971, 3, 1, 5-24.
- Bass, B.M. When planning for others. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, April/June 1970, 6, 2, 151-171.
- Betjemann, W.N. Innovation and social change: A review of the Albany police department neighborhood police concept. Albany, New York: Office of Crime Control, May 1975.
- Bittner, E. The functions of the police in modern society: A review of the background factors, current and possible role models. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

- Bittner, E. The quasi-military organization of the police. In T.J. Sweeney & W. Ellingsworth (Eds.), Issues in police patrol: A book of readings. Kansas City, Missouri: Kansas City, Missouri Police Department, 1973, 171-181.
- Blatt, S.J., & Tortoriello, T.R. An evaluation of the neighborhood assistance officer program. Dayton, Ohio: Communication Research Associates, June 1973.
- Blatt, S.J., & Tortoriello, T.R. An evaluation of the neighborhood assistance officer program: June 1973 to July 1974. Dayton, Ohio: Communication Research Associates, February 14, 1975.
- Bloch, P.B., & Bell, J. How detectives contributed to the increased effectiveness of police patrol teams in Rochester, New York - Draft. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, July 7, 1975. (Unpublished draft)
- Bloch, P.B., & Specht, D.I. Evaluation of operation neighborhood. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, December 1973.
- Bloch, P.B., & Ulberg, C. Auditing clearance rates. Washington, D.C.: The Police Foundation, December 1974.
- Bloch, P.B., & Ulberg, C. The beat commander concept. Police Chief, September 1972, 55-63.
- Bloch, P.B., & Weidman, D. Managing criminal investigations (Draft of unpublished manuscript prepared for LEAA). Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, April 15, 1975.
- Boer, B. L., & McIver, B.C. Human relations training: Laboratories and team policing. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 1973.
- Bordua, D.J. Comments on police-community relations. In G.T. Felkenes & P.M. Whisenand (Eds.), Police patrol operations: Purpose, plans, programs, and technology. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1972, 117-136.
- Bordua, D.J., & Reiss, A.J. Command, control and charisma: Reflections on police bureaucracy. In A. Niederhoffer, & A.S. Blumberg (Eds.), The ambivalent force: Perspectives on the police. San Francisco: Rinehart Press, 1973, 78-85.
- Boydston, J.E., & Sherry, M.D. San Diego community profile: Final report. Washington, D.C.: The Police Foundation, August 1975.
- Brock, B. A congressional view of program evaluation (Remarks before the WORC/TIMS Congressional Series). February 27, 1975.

- Caldwell, J.D., & Nehe, J.M. Patrol distribution in Arlington county. Police Chief, September 1974, 47-49.
- Campbell, D.T. Considering the case against experimental evaluations of social innovations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1970, 15, 1, 110-113.
- Campbell, D.T. Reforms as experiments. In C.H. Weiss (Ed.), Evaluating action programs: Readings in social action and education. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1972, 187-223.
- Candeub, Fleissig, & Associates. Evaluation of changes in police and resident attitudes: Neighborhood police unit project, Albany, New York. Albany, New York: Albany Police Department, August 1972.
- Cann, W. Our 4/40 basic team concept. Police Chief, December 1972, 39, 12, pp. 56; 58-60; 64.
- Carlin, J.L., & Moodie, C.L. A comparison of some patrol methods. Police, August 1972, 27-31.
- Chaiken, J.M., & Larson, R.C. Methods for allocating urban emergency units. New York: New York City Rand Institute, May 1971.
- Cincinnati Police Department COMSEC Evaluation Section, & The Urban Institute. Report on investigative effectiveness: A comparison of three investigative models. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, July 10, 1974.
- Cincinnati Police Department Team Policing Implementation & Evaluation Section. Community sector team policing: An examination of the model's operational components based upon six months of experience. Cincinnati, Ohio: Cincinnati Police Department, October 1973.
- Cincinnati Police Department Team Policing Implementation & Evaluation Section. Community sector team policing: An examination of the model's operational components based upon eighteen months of experience. Cincinnati, Ohio: Cincinnati Police Department, November 1974.
- Clarren, S.N., & Schwartz, A.I. Cincinnati's team policing program: 18 months of evaluation (Working Paper 3006-24). Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, August 8, 1975.
- Clarren, S.N., & Schwartz, A.I. An evaluation of Cincinnati's team policing program. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association's Convention in New Orleans, August 30, 1974. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, July 1974.

CONTINUED

3 OF 4

Coffman, J.A., & Feist, F. Evaluation of cooperative crime prevention program for southern San Mateo county. Menlo Park, California: Menlo Park Police Department, 1974.

COMSEC Evaluation Section and The Urban Institute. Report on investigative effectiveness: A comparison of three investigative models. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, July 10, 1974.

Coombs, C.H. A theory of data. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Cordrey, J.B., & Kotecha, K. Evaluation of the community centered team policing program, 1971. Dayton, Ohio: Community Research Inc., 1971.

Cordrey, J., & Pence, G.K. An analysis of team policing in Dayton, Ohio. Police Chief, August 1972, 44-49.

Cresap, McCormick & Paget, Inc. Albany police department: A management evaluation of the Arbor Hill neighborhood police unit. Washington, D.C.: Cresap, McCormick & Paget, Inc., April 1974.

Dallas Police Department. Five year plan. Dallas, Texas: Dallas Police Department, 1972.

Dart, R., & Lubans, V. Plan to increase police productivity: A report on the reorganization of the East Hartford police department. Bethesda, MD: Social Development Corporation, 1974.

Davis, E.M. Neighborhood team policing: Implementing the territorial imperative. Crime Prevention Review, October 1973, 1, 1, 11-19.

Day, H.T., & Gay, W.G. Monitoring and evaluating team policing programs (Products 5 and 6). Washington, D.C.: National Sheriffs' Association, January 1976.

Denhardt, R.B. The organization as a political system. Western Political Quarterly, December 1971, 24, 4, 675-686.

Eastman, G.D., & Eastman, E.M. (Eds.). Municipal police administration. Washington, D.C.: International City Management Association, 1969.

Elliott, J.F. Concept of an offensively deployed police force. Police, September/October 1968, 65-71.

Elliott, J.F. The crime control team. Syracuse, New York: GE Electronics Laboratory, May 1968.

Elliott, J.F. Crime control team: Final report. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse Police Department, 1970.

- Elliott, J.F. Crime control team and the police: How effective are they? Event, Spring 1969, 16-23.
- Elliott, J.F., O'Connor, J.F. & Sardino, T.J. The detection and interception capability of one- and two-man patrol units. Police, November/December, 1969, 24-26.
- Elliott, J.F. The police: How effective are they? Event, Fall 1969, 10, 1, 34-39.
- Elliott, J.F. Random patrol. Police, November/December, 1968, 359-365.
- Elliott, J.F., & Sardino, T.J. Experimental evaluation of the crime control team organization concept. Police, May/June 1970, 44-53.
- Etzioni, A., & Lehman, E.W. Some dangers in "valid" social measurement. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1967, 373, 1-15.
- Fiest, F.K., & Luft, R.F. Menlo Park community attitude survey report. San Mateo County, California: Menlo Park Police Department & Criminal Justice Council of San Mateo County, July 1974.
- Fisher, C.J., & Smith, R.L. Tampa selective deployment patrol system. Police Chief, June 1969, 52-57.
- Forer, R., & Farrell, R.A. The impact of the neighborhood police unit on the Arbor Hill community of Albany, New York: A sociological evaluation. Albany, New York: R. Forer & R.A. Farrell, n.d. (1973).
- Foskett, W.H., & Fox, H.W. Program evaluation: A manual for legislators and legislative staffs. Unpublished paper, 1975.
- Furstenberg, F.F., & Wellford, C.F. Calling the police: The evaluation of police service. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1970.
- Gas, S.I., & Dawson, J.N. An evaluation of policy-related research: Reviews and critical discussions of policy-related research in the field of police protection. Bethesda, MD: Mathematica, October 1974.
- Gay, W.G., Day, H.T., & Woodward, J.P. Issues in team policing: A review of the literature. Washington, D.C.: National Sheriffs' Association, June 1975.
- Gay, W.G., Day, H.T., & Woodward, J.P. Neighborhood team policing in the United States: Assessment summary. Washington, D.C.: National Sheriffs' Association, January 1976.
- Gill, D. Police organizational questionnaire (Memorandum reporting results of administration of questionnaire evaluating officer attitudes). Chapel Hill, N.C.: Institute of Government, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, January 15, 1975.

- Glaser, D. Routinizing evaluation: Getting feedback on effectiveness of crime and delinquency programs. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Mental Health, 1973.
- Glasgow, E.H., Green, R.P., Knowles, L. Arrest performance among patrolmen in relation to job satisfaction and personal variables. Police Chief, April 1973, 60, 4, 28-34.
- Goldstein, H. Police corruption: A perspective on its nature and control. Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation, 1975.
- Goodin, C.V. Effective personalized patrol. Police Chief, November 1972, pp. 18-19; 66.
- Gregory, E., & Turner, P. Unit beat policing in England. Police Chief, July 1968, 35, 7, 42-47.
- Guba, E.G. The failure of educational evaluation. In C.H. Weiss (Ed.), Evaluating action programs: Readings in social action and education. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1972, 250-266.
- Gulick, L., & Urwick, L. (Eds.). Papers on the science of administration. New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937.
- Guttentag, M. Subjectivity and its use in evaluation research. Evaluation, 1973, 1, 2, 60-65.
- Hage, J., Aiken, M., & Marrett, C.B. Organization structure and communications. American Sociological Review, October 1971, 36, 860-871.
- Hatry, H.P., Winnie, R.E., & Fisk, D.M. Practical program evaluation for state and local government officials. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1973.
- Igleburger, R.M., Angell, J.E., & Pence, G.K. Changing urban police: Practitioners' view. Criminal Justice Monograph in Innovation and Law Enforcement. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, June 1973, 76-114.
- Institute for Criminal Justice System Advancement. Final report: Albany police department South End neighborhood police unit. Reading, Pennsylvania: Institute for Criminal Justice Advancement, 1973.
- Kakalik, J.S., & Wildhorn, S. Aids to decision making in police patrol: An overview of study findings. Police, February 1972, 41-46.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. Organizational change. In J.M. Thomas & W.G. Bennis (Eds.), The management of change and conflict. Baltimore, MD: Penguin Books, 1972, 304-354.

- Kaufman, H. Administrative feedback: Monitoring subordinates behavior. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute, 1973.
- Kelling, G.L. Evaluation of neighborhood team policing in New York City. In J.G. Abert & M. Kamrass (Eds.), Social experiments and social program evaluation. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1974, 150-152.
- Kenney, J.P. Police administration. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1972.
- Kenney, J.P. Team policing organization: A theoretical model. Police, August 1972, 17-22.
- Kimble, J.P. Utilizing field personnel more effectively. Police Chief, March 1968, 35, 3, 12-15.
- The Knapp Commission. The Knapp Commission report on police corruption. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1972.
- Koverman, R.B. Team policing: An alternative to traditional law enforcement techniques. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 1974, 2, 1, 15-19.
- Kupersmith, G. High impact anti-crime program: A framework for assessing project-level evaluation plans. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement & Criminal Justice, June 1975.
- Levine, R.A., & Williams, A.P. Making evaluation effective: A guide. Santa Monica: Rand, 1971.
- Lewis, J.H. Evaluation of experiments in policing: How do you begin? (Four cases). Washington, D.C.: The Police Foundation, December 1972.
- Logan, C.H. Evaluation research in crime and delinquency: A reappraisal. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, September 1972, 63, 3, 378-395.
- Lorsch, J.W., & Lawrence, P. The diagnosis of organizational problems. In J.M. Thomas & W.G. Bennis (Eds.), The management of change and conflict. Baltimore, MD: Penguin Books, 1972, 271-283.
- Los Angeles Police Department. An evaluation of the Team 28 experiment. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Police Department, April 1974.
- Los Angeles Police Department. Basic car plan. In G.T. Felkenes & P.M. Whisenand (Eds.), Police patrol operations: Purpose, plans, programs, and technology. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1972, 78-83.

- Lyden, F.J. Does MBO work? Public Administration Review, July/August 1971, 458-459.
- Lynden, P. The Menlo Park police. Atlantic Monthly, 1973, 16-24.
- Madge, J. The tools of social science: An analytical description of social science techniques. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor, 1965.
- Madison Police Department. Community oriented policing (COP): Final report. Madison, Wisconsin: Madison Police Department, October 1974.
- Madison Police Department. Community oriented policing (COP): Interim report. Madison, Wisconsin: Madison Police Department, January 1974.
- Maltz, M.D. Evaluation of crime control programs. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, April 1972.
- Maltz, M.D. Introductory remarks. In J.G. Abert & M. Kamrass (Eds.), Social experiments and social program evaluation. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1974, 131-133.
- McArdle, E.C., & Betjemann, W.N. A return to neighborhood police. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, July 1972, pp. 8-11; 28.
- McNamara, J.H. Uncertainties in police work: The relevance of police recruits' backgrounds and training. In D.J. Bordua (Ed.), The police: Six sociological essays. New York: Wiley, 1967, 163-252.
- Menlo Park Police Department. Evaluation of cooperative crime prevention program for southern San Mateo county. Menlo Park, California: Menlo Park Police Department, 1974.
- Mintz, E., & Sandler, G.B. Instituting a full-service orientation to policing. Police Chief, June 1974, pp. 44-45; 48-50.
- Morehouse, T.A. Program evaluation: Social research versus public policy. Public Administration Review, November/December 1972, 868-874.
- Mulder, M. Power equalization through participation? Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1971, 16, 1, 31-39.
- Murphy, A.A. Research report: Impact of St. Petersburg public safety team Adam. In St. Petersburg Public Safety Agency, Final report: Comprehensive police improvement project (period of April 1972 - April 1973). St. Petersburg, Florida: St. Petersburg Public Safety Agency, 1973, 137-152.
- Murphy, P.V., & Bloch, P.B. The beat commander. Police Chief, May 1970, 16-19.

- Murphy, P.V. Cooperation in the criminal justice system. Crime and Delinquency, January 1972, 18, 1, 42-48.
- Myren, R.A. Decentralization and citizen participation in criminal justice systems. Public Administration Review, October 1972, 718-737.
- National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (NACCJSG). Police: Task force report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, January 23, 1973.
- National Commission on Productivity (NCOP). Report of the advisory group on productivity in law enforcement on opportunities for improving productivity in police services. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Productivity, 1973.
- National Institute for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (NILECJ). The change process in criminal justice. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, June 1973.
- National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (NILECJ). Evaluation in criminal justice programs: Guidelines and examples. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, June 1973.
- Ness, G.C. The evolution of community sector team policing in Cincinnati: An historical study. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, March 21, 1975.
- Newman, M.V. Police low visibility patrol operations: Equipment systems improvement program report. McLean, Virginia: Mitre Corporation, 1974.
- New York State Institute for Governmental Executives. Training neighborhood police: The report on the training program for the Albany neighborhood police unit conducted May 17 - June 11, 1971. Albany, New York: New York State Institute for Governmental Executives, 1971.
- Niederhoffer, A. Behind the shield: The police in urban society. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1967.
- O'Brien, G.E. Leadership in organizational settings. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1969, 5, 1, 45-61.
- O'Brien, J.T. The neighborhood task force in New Brunswick, New Jersey. Manuscript submitted for publication, 1974.
- Ohio Law Enforcement Planning Agency (OLEPA). Continuation of community centered team policing program (Discretionary Grant Progress Report). Dayton, Ohio: Dayton Police Department, March 1972.

- Olson, M. Public services on the assembly line. Evaluation, 1973, 2, 1, 37-41.
- O'Malley, H.C. Evaluation report on the Holyoke team police experiment of Holyoke police department. Holyoke, Massachusetts: Holyoke Police Department, June 1973.
- Osborn, W.C., & Harris, J.H. Evaluation of the Louisville experimental police district. Louisville, Kentucky: Human Resources Research Organization, October 1973.
- Ostrom, E. Community, public services and responsiveness: On the design of institutional arrangements for the provision of police services. Bloomington, Indiana: Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Department of Political Science, University of Indiana, 1974.
- Ostrom, E. The design of institutional arrangements and the responsiveness of the police. Bloomington, Indiana: Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Department of Political Science, Indiana University, 1974.
- Ostrom, E. On the meaning and measurement of output and efficiency in the provision of urban police services. Journal of Criminal Justice, 1973, 1, 93-112.
- Ostrom, E., Parks, R.B., & Smith, D.C. A multi-strata, similar systems design for measuring police performance. Bloomington, Indiana: Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Department of Political Science, Indiana University, May 1973.
- Ostrom, E., & Parks, R.B. Suburban police departments: Too many and too small? In L.H. Masotti & J.K. Hadden (Eds.), The urbanization of the suburbs (Vol. 7, Urban Affairs Annual Reviews). Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1973.
- Packer, H.L. The limits of the criminal sanction. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1968.
- Parks, R.B. Complementary measures of police performance. Bloomington, Indiana: Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Department of Political Science, Indiana University, 1974.
- Phelps, L.G., & Harmon, L. Team policing: Four years later. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, December 1972, 41, 12, pp. 2-5; 28.
- Phelps, L.G., Schwartz, J.A., & Liebman, D.A. Training an entire patrol division in domestic crisis intervention techniques. Police Chief, July 1971, 18-19.

- Phelps, L., & Murphy, R. The team patrol system in Richmond, California. Police Chief, 1969, 48-51.
- The Police Foundation. A conference on managing the patrol function. Washington, D.C.: The Police Foundation, April/May 1974.
- The Police Foundation. Experiments in police improvement: A progress report. Washington, D.C.: The Police Foundation, 1972.
- The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Task force report: The police. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.
- Reiss, A.J., Jr., & Bordua, D.J. Environment and organization: A perspective on the police. In D.J. Bordua (Ed.), The police: Six sociological essays. New York: Wiley, 1967, 25-55.
- Reiss, A.J., Jr. The police and the public. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.
- Reiss, A.J., Jr. Systematic observation of natural social phenomena. In H.L. Costner (Ed.), Sociological methodology 1971. New York: Josey-Bass, 1971, 3-33.
- Rhodes, W.R. A behavioral science application to police management. Police Chief, May 1970, 46-50.
- Ridgway, V.F. Dysfunctional consequences of performance measurements. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1956, 1, 240-247.
- Riecken, H.W. Memorandum on program evaluation. In C.H. Weiss (Ed.), Evaluating action programs: Readings in social action and education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972, 85-104.
- Sacramento Police Department. Community oriented police service. Sacramento, California: Sacramento Police Department, October 15, 1973.
- St. Petersburg Public Safety Agency. Final report: Comprehensive police improvement project (period of April 1972 - April 1973). St. Petersburg, Florida: St. Petersburg Public Safety Agency, 1973.
- San Bruno Police Department. 4/40 - basic team concept. Unpublished report, San Bruno, California: San Bruno Police Department, n.d. (1972).
- San Diego Police Department. Community profile development and police patrol final report of the community profile development project. San Diego: San Diego Police Department, October 31, 1974.

- San Diego Police Department. Community profile training program.
San Diego: San Diego Police Department, January 1974.
- Sardino, T.J. An experiment in management: The crime control team.
FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, May 1971, pp. 16-19; 30.
- Savord, G.H. Organizing for team leadership. Journal of California Law Enforcement, July 1973, 8, 1, 22-27.
- Schrag, C. Crime and Justice: American style. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Mental Health, 1971.
- Schulberg, H.C., & Baker, F. Program evaluation models and the implementation of research findings. In F.G. Caro (Ed.), Readings in evaluation research. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1971, 72-80.
- Schwartz, A.I., & Clarren, S.N. Evaluation of Cincinnati's community sector team policing program - a progress report: The first six months, summary of major findings (Working Paper 3006-4). Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, July 30, 1974.
- Schwartz, A.I., & Clarren, S.N. An evaluation of Cincinnati's team policing program (Working Paper 3006-11). Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, October 8, 1974.
- Schwartz, A.I., Clarren, S.N., Fischgrund, T., Hollins, E.F., & Nalley, P.G. Evaluation of Cincinnati's community sector team policing program - a progress report: After one year, summary of major findings (Working Paper 3006-18). Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, March 10, 1975.
- Schwartz, A.I., Clarren, S.N., Fischgrund, T., Hollins, E., & Nalley, P.G. Cincinnati's team policing program: 18 months of evaluation. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute. (This report has not been published, and no results are included in this study.)
- Schwartz, A.I., Clarren, S.N., Vaughn, A.M., & Marshall, C.W. Evaluation of Cincinnati's community sector team policing program - a progress report: Baseline data (Working Paper 3006-2). Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, August 15, 1973.
- Sears, P.M., & Wilson, S. Crime reduction in Albuquerque: Evaluation of three police projects. University Park, New Mexico: New Mexico University, 1973.
- Sherman, L.W. Middle Management and police democratization: A reply to John E. Angell. Criminology, 1975, 12, 4, 363-377.
- Sherman, L.W., Milton, C.H., & Kelly, T.V. Team policing: Seven case studies. Washington, D.C.: The Police Foundation, August 1973.

- Sherwood, F.P. Leadership, organizations, and time. In D. Waldo (Ed.), Temporal dimensions of development administration (Chapter 7). Durham: Duke University Press, 1970, 207-232.
- Silver, A. The demand for order in civil society: A review of some themes in the history of urban crime, police and riot. In D.J. Bordua (Ed.), The Police: Six sociological essays. New York: Wiley, 1967, 1-24.
- Simon, H.A. Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organization. New York: The Free Press, 1965.
- Skolnick, J.H. Justice without trial. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Sloan, A.P., Jr. My years at General Motors. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1964.
- Smith, L.E., & Greene, J.W. The Tacoma police team. Police Chief, April 1974, 42-45.
- Smith, D.C., & Ostrom, E. The effects of training and education on police attitudes and performance: A preliminary analysis. Bloomington, Indiana: Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Department of Political Science, Indiana University, 1974.
- Sourisseau, L.D. Diffusion of innovations: A study of Los Angeles county. Police Chief, August 1972, 20-26.
- Spencer, D.L. N.A.O. activity May 1975 (Memorandum to Lt. J.R. Solomon). Dayton, Ohio: Dayton Police Department, June 6, 1975.
- Spencer, D.L. The neighborhood assistance officer program. Dayton, Ohio: Dayton Police Department, January 23, 1975.
- Stahl, O.G., & Staufenberger, R.A. (Eds.). Police personnel administration. Washington, D.C.: The Police Foundation, 1974.
- Stamper, N., Rumbaut, R.G., Crook, P.L., & Brewer, J.W. Performance assessment: An analysis of current problems and a proposal for change. San Diego, California: San Diego Police Department, May 10, 1974.
- Stanley, D.T. How safe the streets, how good the grant? Public Administration Review, July/August 1974, 380-389.
- Suchman, E.A. Evaluative research: Principles and practice in public service and social action programs. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

- Suchman, E.A. The principles of research design and administration. In J.T. Doby (Ed.), An introduction to social research (2nd Ed.). New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1967, 307-326.
- Tansik, D.A., & Radnor, M. An organization theory perspective on the development of new organizational functions. Public Administration Review, November/December 1971, 644-652.
- Team Policing Implementation and Evaluation Section of Cincinnati Police Division (TPIESCPD). Community sector team policing: An examination of the model's operational components based upon eighteen months of experience. Cincinnati, Ohio: Cincinnati Police Department, 1974.
- Tenzel, J.H., & Cizancas, V. The uniform experiment. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 1, 4, 1973, 421-424.
- Thibault, F.D., & LeBaron, M.J. Organizational team building: The next generation of training. Journal of California Law Enforcement, October 1974, 9, 2, 71-80.
- Tortoriello, T.R., & Blatt, S.J. Client service...implications for organizational change. Police Chief, November 1974, 34-38.
- Tortoriello, T.R., & Blatt, S.J. Community centered team policing: A second year evaluation. Dayton, Ohio: Communication Research Associates, April 1973.
- Unit beat policing: An assessment: A survey of the northwest region of England in 1969. Police College Library reference B(S)P 12.
- Unit beat policing: The function of the collator: High speed service by computer (Survey conducted in 1968). Police College Library reference 3FBp.
- U.S. Department of Justice. Crimes and victims: A report on the Dayton-San Jose pilot survey on victimization. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, June 1974.
- Urban Institute evaluation activities associated with the community sector team policing program in Cincinnati, Ohio: A collection of papers. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, March 1974.
- Van Maanen, J. The process of program evaluation: A guide for managers. Washington, D.C.: National Training and Development Service Press, 1973.
- Vetere, C.A. Final report: Comprehensive police improvement project (period of April 1972 - April 1973). St. Petersburg, Florida: St. Petersburg Public Safety Agency, 1973.

- Waldron, J. Scotland Yard: A new look. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, February 1970, 39, 2, pp. 10-15; 22-23.
- Waller, J.D., MacNeil, D., Scanlon, J.W., Tolson, F.L., & Wholey, J.S. Monitoring for criminal justice planning agencies. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, August 1, 1974.
- Wasserman, R., & Couper, D. Training and education. In O.G. Stahl & R.A. Staufenberger (Eds.), Police personnel administration. Washington, D.C.: The Police Foundation, 1974.
- Wasserman, R., Gardner, M.P., & Cohen, A.S. Improving police/community relations (Prescriptive Package). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, June 1973.
- Watkins, D.D. Community sector team policing: An examination of the model's operational components based upon six months of experience. Cincinnati, Ohio: Cincinnati Police Department, October 1973.
- Webb, E.J., Campbell, D.T., Schwartz, R.D., & Sechrest, L. Unobstrusive measures: Nonreactive research in the social sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.
- Webb, K.W., Sowder, B.J., Andrews, A.J., & Burt, M.R. Phase I national evaluation of selected patrol strategies specialized patrol operations under the national evaluation program: Product 3 - project families, synthesis framework and measurement. Bethesda, MD: Institute for Human Resources Research, 1975.
- Weber, M. Bureaucracy. In H.H. Gerth & C.W. Mills (Eds.), From Max Weber: Essays in sociology. New York: Oxford, 1958.
- Weidman, D.R., Waller, J.D., MacNeil, D., Tolson, F.L., & Wholey, J.S. Intensive evaluation for criminal justice planning agencies. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, January 1975.
- Werthman, C., & Piliavin, I. Gang members and the police. In D.J. Bordua (Ed.), The police: Six sociological essays. New York: Wiley, 1967, 56-98.
- Wholey, J.S., Scanlon, J.W., Duffy, H.G., Fukumoto, J.S., & Vogt, L.M. Federal evaluation policy: Analyzing the effects of public programs. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1973.
- Wildavsky, A. The self-evaluating organization. Public Administration Review, September/October 1972, 509-520.
- Wilensky, H.L. The professionalization of everyone? American Journal of Sociology, 1964, 70, 2, 137-158.

Wilson, J.Q. The future policeman. In T.J. Sweeney & W. Ellingsworth (Eds.), Issues in police patrol: A book of readings. Kansas City, Missouri: Kansas City, Missouri Police Department, 1973, 207-221.

Wilson, J.Q. Innovation in organization: Notes toward a theory. In J.M. Thomas & W.G. Bennis (Eds.), The management of change and conflict. Baltimore, MD: Penguin Books, 1972, 239-266.

Wilson, J.Q. Varieties of police behavior: The management of law and order in eight communities. New York: Atheneum, 1968.

Wilson, J.V. Alternatives to military rank titles in law enforcement. Police Chief, April 1974, 41, 4, pp. 16-17; 82.

Wilson, O.W., & McLaren, R.C. Police administration (3rd Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Zurcher, J.A. The team management/team policing organizational concept. Police Chief, April 1971, 54-56.

END