



IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION
OF PROTOTYPE RULES
AND PROCEDURES FOR POLICE DISCIPLINE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE, INC.
Eleven Firstfield Road
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20760

69604

Memorandum

**Subject**

The Status of the Report Entitled "Implementation and Evaluation of Prototype Rules and Procedures for Police Discipline; Project # 76-NI-99-0104

Date

July 29, 1980

To

NCJRS Acquisitions

From

Janine Jones
NLJ

For now, neither document produced under this grant will be printed by GPO. Instead, an SNI will announce that the documents are available on-loan. The Reference Service will microfiche the documents as well. If the SNI generates a heavy demand for the products, then consideration will be given to printing them through GPO.

69604 Pending and held to
Ever since June 20 and
is concerned SN/avail
M/F.

Make sure they are M/F

EJ

8/20/80

NCJRS

AUG 5 1980

National Institute of Justice

PUBLICATION/DISSEMINATION REVIEW FORM

ACQUISITIONS

Implementation and Evaluation of Prototype Rules and Procedures for Police Discipline; Executive Summary and full report.

76-NI-89-0104; International Association of Chiefs of Police; Bjorn Pederson.

For now, neither document produced under this grant will be printed by GPO. Instead, an SNI will announce that the documents are available on-loan. The Reference Service will microfiche the documents as well. If the SNI generates a heavy demand for the products, then consideration will be given to printing them through GPO.

Number of copies: n/a

Cost Estimate: n/a

Director, Reference and Dissemination Division, ODTD

Kent Starn

Director, National Institute of Justice

DB

1. Grant Managers Assessment Report

Provide a narrative assessment not to exceed 200 words describing the following: problem addressed and major objectives, accomplishments, activities undertaken, principal findings and documents produced. This report will be entered into the LEAA Grant Profile File (PROFILE) to be used by criminal justice planners and LEAA management and staff. For further clarification of the requirements, see LEAA Handbook HB Procedures for Administration of Categorical Grants, chapter 6.

The intent of this study was to evaluate the implementation process and impact of the prototype rules and procedures for police policy developed under a previous NILECJ grant (74-NI-99-0019). The implementation was undertaken primarily in two sites (Albuquerque, N.M. and Lansing, MI) with partial implementation in a third (Denver, CO). The specific goals were: a) to develop the modified system according to the needs of each site with minimum dilution of the quality and character of the prototype; b) to implement the system; c) to maintain and monitor the system for 12 months; d) to make measurements designed to detect possible improvements in the operational effectiveness of the new system, compared to the previous system; and e) to make measurements designed to detect possible improvement in officer attitudes toward discipline. In general, the study showed that a new system could be implemented and could result in improvements with regard to the administration of discipline and officers' attitudes toward it.

The final report is entitled: Implementation and Evaluation of Prototype Rules and Procedures for Police Discipline - International Association of Chiefs of Police. An Executive Summary of this report is also available.

2. Detail the major findings and recommendation..

The general hypotheses examined by the study and the results were:

- H-1 UNDERSTANDING OF THE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEM REPORTED BY PERSONNEL WILL BE INCREASED AFTER PROJECT INTERVENTIONS - a general finding re this hypothesis was an apparent increase in understanding based on the results of the baseline and final questionnaire.
- H-2 FAIRNESS OF THE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEM AS PERCEIVED BY PERSONNEL WILL BE INCREASED AFTER PROJECT INTERVENTIONS - in both field sites the questionnaire items related to this hypothesis represented a mixed response. A more supportive finding, however, was that during the trial year disciplined officers resorted to the appeal process outside of the new system only 3 out of 11 times in Lansing and not at all in Albuquerque.
- H-3 QUALITY OF SUPERVISORS' PERFORMANCE IN THEIR DISCIPLINARY RESPONSIBILITIES AS PERCEIVED BY PERSONNEL WILL BE IMPROVED AFTER PROJECT INTERVENTION - although the data show some interesting results about the changes in the amount of first-line supervisors' use of training and counseling instead of formal discipline, the evidence to support this hypothesis is weak in Lansing and not present in Albuquerque.
- H-4 FORMAL CHARGES OF MISCONDUCT MADE AGAINST PERSONNEL WILL BE UPHELD IN INTERNAL APPEALS.
- H-5 SANCTIONS RECOMMENDED IN FORMAL CHARGES OF MISCONDUCT WILL BE UPHELD IN INTERNAL APPEALS.

Of the 12 cases appealed during the trial year in Albuquerque, in only two cases were the original charges and sanctions upheld intact. In an additional six cases, the charges stood but sanctions were reduced. In an additional four cases, charges were reversed and sanctions reduced or revoked. Overall moderate support was claimed for this hypothesis in this site.

Over a comparable test period in Lansing, officers requested trial board appeals in 11 cases. In four of the cases, the original charges and sanctions were left standing. In an additional four cases the charges stood but sanctions were reduced. Only in three cases were charges reversed and sanctions reduced or revoked. In this site also, moderate support of the hypotheses is claimed.

- H-6 THE INCIDENCE OF EXTERNAL APPEALS MADE BY PERSONNEL WILL BE REDUCED AFTER PROJECT INTERVENTION.

2. Detail the major findings and recommendations (cont.)

H-7 FORMAL CHARGES OF MISCONDUCT MADE AGAINST PERSONNEL WILL BE UPHELD IN EXTERNAL APPEALS.

H-8 SANCTIONS RECOMMENDED IN FORMAL CHARGES OF MISCONDUCT WILL BE UPHELD IN EXTERNAL APPEALS.

The data captured during the project period for these hypotheses was inconclusive. Unexpectedly, Albuquerque had no external appeals and Lansing had only three. In these three, the external appeal board upheld the findings in all three cases and the sanctions in two. In the third appeal the sanction was increased.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Use the prototype (described in Managing for Effective Discipline) as a basis, giving close attention to city charter considerations, state law, and local collective bargaining agreements.
2. Recognize that the process of creating and implementing an effective, new disciplinary system is a time-consuming and frustrating task.
3. Get the support of local government and civic groups.
4. Involve the police employee organizations.
5. Publicize the new system.
6. Use the group working committee concept representing the important segments and levels of the department.
7. Treat the effort as management focused, not discipline focused.
8. Preach documentation.
9. Provide sufficient training to make various actors comfortable in their new roles.
10. Give first-line supervisors special attention.
11. Develop and permanent policies and procedures review board.
12. A tight disciplinary system will enhance management's ability to deal with disciplinary matters.

NCJRS

AUG 5 1980

ACQUISITIONS

IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION
OF PROTOTYPE RULES
AND PROCEDURES FOR POLICE DISCIPLINE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



This project was supported by Grant Number 76-NI-99-0104 awarded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.



INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE, INC.
Eleven Firstfield Road
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20760

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration reserves the right to reproduce, publish, translate, or otherwise use, and to authorize others to publish and use all or any part of the copyrighted material contained in this publication.

Copyright © 1980 by the
International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

Table of Contents	i
List of Tables	ii
Preface	iii
A. Scope of the Initial Study	1
B. Provisions for Evaluation	2
C. Methodology	3
1. Specification of goal and objectives	3
2. Site selection	4
3. Implementation plan	6
4. Monitoring and evaluation plan	8
5. Intervention steps	10
a. Collection of baseline data	10
b. Revision of rules and procedures	12
c. System implementation	12
6. Monitoring and evaluation	13
D. Findings and Analysis	14
E. Conclusions and Recommendations	33

LIST OF TABLES

Executive Summary

Table 1	Comparison of Pre/Post Responses to Test the Hypothesis on Understanding - Albuquerque Police Department	16
Table 2	Comparison of Pre/Post Responses to Test the Hypothesis on Understanding - Lansing Police Department	17
Table 3	Comparison of Pre/Post Responses to Test the Hypothesis on Fairness - Albuquerque Police Department	18
Table 4	Comparison on Pre/Post Responses to Test the Hypothesis on Fairness - LPD	20
Table 5	Comparison of Pre/Post Responses to Test the Hypothesis on Supervisory Performance - Albuquerque Police Department	22
Table 5A	Comparisons of Additional Pre/Post Responses on Supervisory Performance - Albuquerque Police Department	24
Table 6	Comparison of Pre/Post Responses to Test the Hypothesis on Supervisory Performance - Lansing Police Department	26
Table 7	Summary of Results of Appeals Against Departmental Actions - APD	27
Table 8	Summary of Results of Appeals Against Departmental Actions - LPD	29
Table 9	Disciplinary Actions Appealed Outside the Police Department - Albuquerque Police Department	31

PREFACE

As the research center of LEAA, the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice tests and evaluates new approaches to improving criminal justice. One such project was to study the effects of a revised disciplinary system in two law enforcement agencies. The results of this effort are summarized in this evaluation report.

The work reported here constitutes the third phase of a study of police discipline that has been in progress since 1974. This effort, as a whole, is probably the most extensive study ever conducted concerning this issue in law enforcement. It was designed to result in a set of recommendations helpful to departments of all sizes in dealing fairly and effectively with their personnel on questions of rules of conduct and corresponding sanctions.

The original work which preceded the evaluation reported here was based on the simple premise that if common police disciplinary practices could be comprehensively analyzed from various perspectives, it would be possible to identify real or perceived desirable and undesirable conditions in disciplinary systems for the police. This would enable IACP researchers to develop a new disciplinary system which would maximize the desirable conditions and minimize those conditions viewed as undesirable.

The objectives of the project were rather straightforward and simply stated:

1. To identify within the 17 study agencies those conditions which are perceived to have a positive or negative effect on police discipline.
2. To identify rules of conduct and discipline procedures which are or may be subjected to legal challenge, and to revise those rules and procedures found to conflict with judicial decisions or which cause police officers substantial concern.

3. To develop a manual which offers guidance in establishing or improving police disciplinary practices.

The result of the 17-department study was a prototype disciplinary package which addressed several issues. First, a set of rules and regulations was developed which more succinctly stated the essence of the rule. Second, the IACP drafted a set of procedures which assured the officer an opportunity for an internal due process appeal hearing. Third, major issues relating to the police department's responsibility when receiving citizen complaints were addressed.

The IACP published a manual entitled Managing for Effective Police Discipline: A Manual of Rules, Procedures, Supportive Law and Effective Management, based on the results of the 17-agency study. In 1976, NILECJ contracted with the IACP to study and evaluate the effects of the prototype disciplinary system in several police agencies. The purpose of the study was to implement the new disciplinary system in several study agencies and evaluate the degree of success in an operational situation. Further, the IACP identified the factors involved in implementing such a system as well as drew conclusions as to minimizing these disruptions.

The conclusions are based on analyses of a very extensive body of quantitative and qualitative data. The data, the analytic results, and their implications are presented fully in a 150-page report. This summary is a brief overview of the program, its outcomes, and the conclusions and recommendations contained in the full report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background of Disciplinary Study Nature and Scope

A. Scope of the Initial Study

In 1974, the IACP began a 24-month study of police disciplinary practices in 17 police agencies. This endeavor was funded by the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (NILECJ) of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). The purpose of the project "was to give insights into the determinants of effective discipline management and to provide practitioners with useful recommendations for understanding and improving their disciplinary practices."

It was found in the initial study that the same concerns with discipline were common to nearly all departments regardless of size or location, or whether the department's officers were represented by a union. Likewise, these concerns were shared by groups and individuals with differing key roles in the disciplinary process: city attorneys, police administrators, legal advisors, police association officials, and police officers.

Given any one of these situations or viewpoints, the issues of clarity, legality, fairness, consistency, and workability of discipline rules and procedures were shown to be of vital importance, according to questionnaire and interview results. To be sure, some differences among departments were noted. In departments with active unions, for example, specific department practices, such as the levying of inconsistent penalties, had been challenged. Unions had the financial ability to retain lawyers to defend accused officers. In some cases, this pressure caused management to reconsider the discipline system and make changes to reduce the grounds for complaint. Sometimes, however,

management became more committed to its views, and positions became bitterly entrenched. Thus, the level of sophistication of the department, in terms of legal expertise and unionization, had an effect on the discipline system as observed. However, the underlying issues had universal relevance. The implication is that there is no specific set of criteria limiting the range of departments to which the study of these issues relates.

The full report of this effort was published in a manual entitled Managing for Effective Police Discipline: A Manual of Rules, Procedures, Supportive Law and Effective Management. Given the fact that a new disciplinary system had been developed which, in the opinion of the IACP, was superior to any existing system, the next logical course of inquiry was whether its implementation in the real world would have a beneficial impact. In 1976, shortly after completion of the initial study and publication of Managing for Effective Police Discipline, NILECJ and the IACP negotiated another agreement to study and evaluate the effects of the prototype disciplinary system in two agencies.

As stated in the NILECJ grant award project summary:

The primary objective of this effort is to field test the prototype rules of conduct and disciplinary procedures developed during the course of Grant #74-NI-99-0019. Based upon field research in 17 law enforcement agencies, procedures and rules were developed that are felt to reflect a rational, fair and legal approach to a system of discipline for law enforcement agencies. The overriding question to be addressed is: What is the degree of success of the prototype rules and procedures in an operational situation?

B. Provisions for Evaluation

This project was structured as research, with the objective of learning to what degree the prototype rules and procedures could be successfully implemented. The context was clearly experimental and not merely a matter of providing consulting or technical assistance to the selected departments.

To ensure the use of proper study techniques and appropriate data gathering and analysis, a research methodology was developed. Hypotheses were stated about the impact of the model on primary departmental output or performance variables, and means were specified to measure changes from baseline levels. The measurement system was also aimed at process description; a secondary objective was to learn how the departments accommodated the implementation and its results. This focus included measurement of input associated with the research. The methodology thus provided an adequate plan for project guidance and evaluation in order to give technically sound support to a final statement of results.

C. Methodology

1. Specification of goal and objectives. The goal of the work was to evaluate the prototype rules and procedures by implementing them in study departments and measuring the results. To operationalize the task, these objectives were adopted:

- (a) To develop the modified system according to the needs of each site department with minimal dilution of the quality and character of the prototype.
- (b) To implement the system.
- (c) To maintain and monitor the system for 12 months.
- (d) To make measurements designed to detect possible improvement in the operational effectiveness of the new system, compared to the previous system.
- (e) To make measurements designed to detect possible improvement in officer attitudes toward discipline.

The outcome objectives refer to the effect the prototype system had on several important aspects of a typical police department's performance and condition regarding discipline issues. Some of the selected aspects related

to basic "bottom-line" discipline events; e.g., the tendency for formal charges against personnel to be upheld upon independent review. Others concerned more subjective, attitudinal phenomena; e.g., the fairness of the system as perceived by officers. Some of these were stated as hypotheses about potential change, when it was likely that the measures could be quantified, and sufficient data was available for analysis. Some of the subjective measures were analyzed statistically, using questionnaire data; others were expressed through analysis of the results of interviews and observation. The proposed general hypotheses were:

- H.1 Understanding of the disciplinary system reported by personnel will be increased after project interventions.
- H.2 Fairness of the disciplinary system as perceived by personnel will be increased after project interventions.
- H.3 Quality of supervisors' performance in their disciplinary responsibilities as perceived by personnel will be improved after project interventions.
- H.4 Formal charges of misconduct made against personnel will be upheld in internal appeals.
- H.5 Sanctions recommended in formal charges of misconduct will be upheld in internal appeals.
- H.6 The incidence of external appeals made by personnel will be reduced after project interventions.
- H.7 Formal charges of misconduct made against personnel will be upheld in external appeals.
- H.8 Sanctions recommended in formal charges of misconduct will be upheld in external appeals.

2. Site selection. Two sites were originally selected for the implementation and evaluation of the IACP prototype disciplinary system. Denver, Colorado, and Albuquerque, New Mexico, both had sufficient problems with their existing disciplinary system and a desire to become "experimental agencies." (Unfortunately, legal problems with the new system as it related to the city charter developed

in Denver, and that site was replaced with Lansing, Michigan.) It was critical that each experimental site agree to the following conditions:

- the assignment of an employee with appropriate skills and influence to act as project coordinator for one-half time during the project;
- the assignment of a Staff Working Committee composed of several carefully selected members who would be released from other duties regularly to contribute their personal skills and organizational influence to development and implementation needs;
- provision to IACP staff of access to all needed data sources, and to department employees for interviews and questionnaire completion;
- provision to IACP staff of office space, incidental printing, and clerical assistance;
- provision of trainers and personnel to be trained as needed; and
- reasonable assurance of the cooperation of the employee organization.

An especially important site selection criterion was the willingness of the department to disclose project results. While it was reasonable that certain data relating to individuals had to be controlled to prevent possible damage to personal reputation, need for disclosure was critical as a general ground rule of the project.

Commitment by key site personnel also had to be secured with regard to certain substantive issues. While the prototype to be tested had to be tailored to fit each department, there were certain concepts which were of primary importance, based on previous work. It was therefore of high priority in this phase of the work to be able to test these concepts. Every effort had to be made to achieve the following conditions in the selected department:

1. To establish a functioning Internal Affairs Division which exercised control over all investigations;
2. To implement a set of rules and procedures which were legally sound;

3. To develop a mechanism for due process hearings, and an informal review group for hearings concerning complaints against officers;
4. To devise a mechanism for the affirmative receipt of civilian complaints against officers; and
5. To establish a program to control supervisors' discretionary power in disciplinary actions.

Commitment to these five areas had to be reasonably assured before accepting a department as a study site.

3. Implementation plan. The implementation of the model took the form of interventions by IACP and site staff into department activity, in the form of inquiry, observation, direction, and training. The first of these planned interventions was the collection of baseline data. The determination of baseline conditions served two major purposes. First, existing conditions could be assessed to help decide what interventions would be necessary or productive in reaching the project objectives. While the project objectives were assumed to be appropriate for any agency which might participate in the project, some may not have been appropriate for both sites, and others not foreseen may have been generated (e.g., no significant problem may have existed regarding illegal or unclear rules, but there may have been a lack of effective procedures in certain areas). The assessment of baseline conditions provided a basis for these decisions. In addition, these data were needed to prioritize interventions in order to best allocate project resources.

Second, a clear identification of certain existing conditions was necessary to establish the "pre-test" point from which change could be measured after project interventions (e.g., attitudes of officers toward supervisors' performance). Post intervention measures were then compared with these results to evaluate the impact of project activity.

Data was gathered in three broad areas: administrative, legal and attitudinal. In the administrative analysis, structured interview forms, case analysis guidelines, and data summary forms were used for inquiring into the

existing management process of the study agency. By analyzing the existing functions and relationships of Internal Affairs, Inspections, Training, Planning and Research, the Legal Advisor, and other key organizational units, it becomes possible to identify areas which might need improvement to increase disciplinary effectiveness. To carry out the legal review, the research team was to identify those existing rules and procedures which were illegal and issues on which further study was needed. Included in the legal analysis was a study of existing activities (procedures and other actions by management and officers) and documented rules, regulations, ordinances, laws, etc., affecting the discipline process. The third method of determining existing conditions was to solicit the opinions of agency personnel by means of questionnaires designed to focus on the important issues identified by the administrative and legal analyses and through the agency Staff Working Committee. Perceptions were also studied through interviews and case analyses of certain disciplinary events.

The assessment of baseline conditions suggested priorities for the other project tasks in each department, guiding the design of those interventions which were judged to result in greatest efficiency in the use of project resources.

An independent and objective view of the department and its needs had to be taken at the outset, and for this reason, the baseline assessment was made primarily by the IACP staff. However, the role of the department project staff (Project Coordinator and Staff Working Committee), already important as supportive in data gathering, was expanded in this stage of intervention development.

It was a project principle that these changes must be seen to have come largely "from within," if they were to have the necessary support by individuals at all levels in the department. In addition to this need for philosophical commitment,

there was a need for sharing of task responsibility and "hands-on" activity. The project concept and budget were designed on the assumption that agency staff would undertake tasks such as the detail design and provision of officer training.

An important aspect of this agency involvement was that it should cut across lines of authority (management-officer), function (staff-line), and loyalty (management-union). The Staff Working Committee was constituted to encourage this participative approach, as were groups which might have been given assignments outside the committee. For example, such a group could have been appointed to draft alternative versions of certain rules or procedures for review by the Staff Working Committee and IACP staff.

4. Monitoring and evaluation plan. The monitoring task was addressed to two aspects of the project: (1) developing and making operational the modified prototype; and (2) experiencing the effect of the new system. Information could thus be learned about how a major police management innovation can be designed and adopted with department-wide participation. Also, the effect of the system in terms of contribution to department goals could be documented.

The outline below describes the scope of the monitoring task, with types of measures.

1. Related to project input activities

a. Develop the system;

Site staff time; IACP staff time

b. Implement the system

Site and IACP staff time; Effectiveness of training of supervisors and other personnel; Provision of new written directives

c. Maintain the system

Site staff time; Site union and officer personnel time

2. Related to project outcomes

a. Effectiveness

- (1) Pre-implementation: Incidence of charges and findings on appeals in the baseline period (e.g., 1975-77)
- (2) Interim: Quarterly incidence and findings on appeals
- (3) Post-implementation: Questionnaire and interview results

The specific purposes of the interim monitoring were:

- (1) to maintain the planned format and enabling conditions of the implementation, e.g., to insure that printed materials such as rules and regulations are available to officers;
- (2) to collect data periodically for later evaluation;
- (3) to note "environmental" changes during the period; e.g., changes in city political structure, changes in legislation, or changes in departmental management staffing;
- (4) to design and implement any necessary system changes to preserve project integrity.

Monitoring was designed and conducted by IACP staff, who made visits to each site for this purpose during the period. Day-to-day monitoring, including the gathering of interim data, was the responsibility of the Project Coordinator, briefing IACP staff by telephone regularly between their site visits, and accumulating data summaries for review during site visits.

Project monitoring forms were developed to capture data to make the chain of events associated with each discipline case "visible," by requiring documentation of the decision-making process. Data to be captured included information on the intake of complaints, investigation, recommendation and review of sanctions, and appeals.

The project's evaluation plan was aimed at determining the nature of any changes in discipline related events and conditions during the treatment period, and how these changes may have been related to the interventions.

The task of evaluation of research, because of its great importance, has been the subject of considerable study both conceptually and in operational terms. An interesting scheme to guide evaluation efforts has been proposed by Suchman,¹ and discussed by Maltz.² Suchman designates five kinds of evaluation which might be characterized as answering these five questions about a research project:

1. What did we put into it? (effort)
2. How well did we do? (performance)
3. Was it good enough? (adequacy of performance)
4. Was it worth it? (efficiency)
5. Why did it come out that way? (process)

5. Intervention steps. From the time of the first IACP contact with the experimental agency, the inevitable "grapevine" or rumor mill had undoubtedly been active. With the more formalized meetings and interviews occurring during the site selection process, culminating in the appointment of the SWC, it is important to recognize the impact created by the presence of the "outsider" IACP staff. Already, comments were being heard about the likely outcome of the project, some hopeful, some cynical. These activities, then, all had to be viewed as "interventions," introducing some element of change and reaction into the routine dynamics of the department.

a. Collection of baseline data. Among the first significant formal interventions were the activities generated at the first SWC meeting for the respective departments. After a point-by-point orientation to the project, the SWC members were given a five-part questionnaire for the purpose of identifying problems, to be completed as a group, and the results reported at the next meeting. The questionnaire served as the first formal source for developing baseline project data.

1. Suchman, E.A. Evaluative Research. New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1967.
2. Maltz, M.D. "Evaluation of Crime Control Programs," National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, April 1972.

This questionnaire seemed to be very efficient in bringing out a rich variety of comment, consensus, and dissenting opinions from the SWC members. Much comment centered on lack of understanding by personnel of their rights, and the function of the Internal Affairs Units (IAUs), concerning discipline. Other concerns were expressed about lack of training, supervisors' inconsistency, lack of objectivity of internal review, and inadequacy of records.

In the following three-month period, three additional site meetings were held involving the SWC and IACP staff jointly or separately. The purposes of these meetings were:

- (a) to make an initial evaluation of existing rules and procedures
- (b) to have the SWC become familiar with the prototype
- (c) to compare departmental rules with prototype rules and procedures
- (d) to develop a general questionnaire for all department personnel
- (e) to interview selected site personnel in key positions
- (f) to collect additional baseline information
- (g) to examine quarterly summaries of IAU activities for several years prior to the experimental period
- (h) sample log entries of complaints received by the agencies by telephone

The draft questionnaires for general use throughout the departments were submitted to the SWC for comment, and refined according to suggestions received. This questionnaire was administered to a random stratified sample of personnel in their respective departments. Several techniques were used to maximize cooperation among the personnel in filling out the questionnaire. First, all personnel were briefed about the project as a whole. At these briefings, personnel were informed that their personal opinions and participation were earnestly solicited, and that one means of achieving this would be by the general questionnaire to be administered as described above.

Another principle adopted to encourage candid responses was to assure confidentiality. To make this credible, and to minimize inconvenience for personnel filling out the questionnaires, small groups were met by IACP staff as they came on duty over a period of several days. They were assured that only IACP staff would handle the questionnaires, and that only statistical summaries would be reported back to the department. In addition, personnel were told that if they wanted to express themselves beyond the confines of the questionnaire format, they could have a confidential interview with IACP staff, either on or off their duty time. All indications are that these measures worked well. Personnel appeared to take the questionnaire seriously.

Baseline data were thus available in adequate quantity and variety to make a detailed assessment of what changes were needed to make the prototype operational in the sites selected for study, as well as to provide measures for comparison when assessing results at the end of the project. The next task was to develop the specific new system elements which would be implemented.

b. Revision of rules and procedures. The revision of the formal systems as codified in the written directives of the study departments proved to be one of the most difficult and time consuming tasks of the entire project. As indicated above, this process was started with reviews by the SWCs of general orders or rules and procedures, comparing them with the prototype. Several meetings between IACP and departmental staff were held to resolve differences in both principle and detail on the many sensitive issues addressed by the system. A final draft for comment was circulated to SWC members and other key personnel. After revisions, the replacement sections of the Standard Operating Procedure manual were printed and distributed within each department.

c. System implementation. The target date for implementation was selected in each department, at which time the revised SOP would become effective.

In reality, it was inevitable that some significant implementation events had to occur somewhat before and after that date. Training in the revised system was designed and presented to personnel of the rank of sergeant and higher prior to implementation. Subject matter was:

"A Basic Overview of the Concept and Final Program"

"Modified Rules of Conduct"

"Discipline System: Its Processes and Functions"

IACP staff attended as observers, and also responded to questions on legal and procedural points. Similar instruction for all remaining sworn and civilian personnel was given in identical sessions. These sessions were two hours in length, consisting of a videotape of abbreviated versions of the presentations given to the previous groups, and a question-and-answer session with SWC members as resources.

6. Monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring measures were designed to assess inputs and outcomes of the project. One input clearly devoted to the project was the cost of the time of the SWC members in attending meetings and preparing material. These costs were recorded by department staff and reported periodically to IACP staff. Another cost was the reprinting and distribution of SOP material. While this was required by the project, it is also true that the likelihood of some SOP revision during the course of two years is high; therefore, attributing the whole cost to the project may not give a fair representation. Another input was training development and presentation. Costs were estimated, and training effectiveness was measured by means of a questionnaire for supervisory level and above, and another for nonsupervisors. Other

input costs were those incurred by IAU staff in assembling and conducting trial boards, and the time of the deliberation of trial board members.

Project outcome data were also gathered from several sources. Details of complaints, charges, appeals, and final disposition of cases were recorded by IAU staff on a special project form. Measures of attitude of personnel to the system were made, using questionnaires, and interviews at two interim points, and at the end of the monitoring year.

Evaluation of the monitoring data, including comparisons with baseline data, was done in quantitative terms when the nature of the data was appropriate. Much of the data from questionnaires was in the form of Likert scale responses. For these data, SPSS (Statistical Programs for the Social Sciences) computer programs were used to generate summaries. Statistical significance of differences in sets of response frequencies was determined by standard tests.

D. Findings and Analysis

In developing the methodology for this study, eight statements of possible outcomes were set forth as hypotheses. Each statement described a positive, favorable result which it was hoped might flow from the strategies of change which were implemented in the two study agencies. These hypotheses and the degree to which they were realized are thoroughly discussed in the main report and summarized below.

H.1 Understanding of the disciplinary system reported by personnel will be increased after project interventions.

In order to test this hypothesis, five questions relating to understanding were analyzed. These questions were posed to members of both departments as follows:

I have a good understanding of appeal procedures on disciplinary actions outside of this department.

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Uncertain ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

I have a good understanding of the procedures that are used by this department to record citizen complaints of misconduct.

☐ Definitely Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Uncertain ☐ No ☐ Definitely No

I have a good understanding of the procedures that are used by this department to investigate citizen complaints of misconduct.

☐ Definitely Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Uncertain ☐ No ☐ Definitely No

I have a good understanding of the responsibilities of this department's internal affairs unit.

☐ Definitely Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Uncertain ☐ No ☐ Definitely No

I have a good understanding of the process that is used for internal review of disciplinary actions taken.

☐ Definitely Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Uncertain ☐ No ☐ Definitely No

The numerical responses to the questions before and after intervention are presented in Table 1 (for Albuquerque) and Table 2 (for Lansing).

A general finding on this hypothesis was an apparent increase in understanding for the five questionnaire items, from baseline to final administrations.

H.2 Fairness of the disciplinary system as perceived by personnel will be increased after project interventions.

In Albuquerque this hypothesis was tested by first examining the questionnaire items comprising the "fairness" factor, shown in Table 3. In support of the hypothesis, Item 40 shows a sizable shift in opinion toward the view that initial disciplinary actions are reviewed more fairly under the new procedures. For three other items having a raw-data change consistent

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF PRE/POST RESPONSES TO TEST
THE HYPOTHESIS ON UNDERSTANDING
ALBUQUERQUE POLICE DEPARTMENT

Question Number	Topic	Sample Measuring Occasion	Responses, percent			Level of Statistical Significance of Difference ¹ (p < value)
			Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	
17	Understand outside appeal procedures	Baseline	39	24	37	.01
		Final	41	25	34	
18	Understand procedure to record citizen complaints	Baseline	40	22	38	.01
		Final	50	19	30	
19	Understand procedure to investigate citizen complaints	Baseline	39	20	41	.05
		Final	50	17	33	
30	Understand responsibilities of IAU	Baseline	47	19	34	not significant
		Final	50	19	31	
32	Understand internal review process on actions.	Baseline	29	27	44	not significant
		Final	31	31	38	

1. See Appendix 26 on the testing of statistical significance.

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF PRE/POST RESPONSES TO TEST
THE HYPOTHESIS ON UNDERSTANDING
LANSING POLICE DEPARTMENT

Question Number	Topic	Sample Measuring Occasion	Responses, percent			Level of Statistical Significance of Difference ($p < \text{value}$)
			Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	
14	Understand outside appeal procedures	Baseline	37	26	37	n.s.
		Final	43	29	28	
15	Understand procedure to record citizen complaint	Baseline	22	20	58	.001
		Final	58	18	24	
20	Understand procedure to investigate citizen complaints	Baseline	24	20	56	.01
		Final	37	28	34	
29	Understand responsibilities of IAU	Baseline	34	20	46	.01
		Final	44	30	26	
33	Understand internal review procedures	Baseline	23	27	50	.001
		Final	38	37	26	

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF PRE/POST RESPONSES TO TEST
THE HYPOTHESIS ON FAIRNESS
ALBUQUERQUE POLICE DEPARTMENT

Question Number	Topic	Sample Measuring Occasion	Responses, percent			Level of Statistical Significance of Difference ($p < \text{value}$)
			Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	
28	Chief usually follows staff recommendations	Baseline	49	40	11	.001
		Final	35	40	25	
33	Personnel can get a "fair shake" in internal review	Baseline	33	41	26	not significant
		Final	36	40	24	
34	Internal review is consistent regardless of rank	Baseline	16	26	58	not significant
		Final	19	27	54	
40	Actions are reviewed fairly via internal procedures	Baseline	24	45	31	.05
		Final	32	44	24	
41	CAO appeals are fair	Baseline	22	64	14	not significant
		Final	24	63	13	
42	Internal decisions are reasonably speedy	Baseline	49	35	16	not significant
		Final	45	40	15	

with that shift (33,34, and 41), the change did not approach statistical significance. For Item 42, about the speed with which disciplinary review decisions are made, the apparent negative change was likewise not significant. For Item 28, substantially fewer people agree that the chief follows staff recommendations. It does not seem proper to interpret this result as meaning that there is widespread feeling that the chief acted counter to the recommendations sent to him, in view of the fact that during the trial year there are only three recorded instances of the chief overturning a recommendation developed within the standard disciplinary procedure. It is more likely that Item 28 on the final questionnaire was confusing, some respondents reasoning that since the trial board mechanism was now available, the question of individual staff recommendations, especially those disputed by the accused, being sent to the chief for approval did not arise routinely. Therefore, a number of respondents may have disagreed with the statement simply on this procedural basis.

While the evidence in possible support of this hypothesis is somewhat mixed, that on the positive side is strengthened by the important "bottom-line" finding that in the trial year, not a single case was appealed outside the department to the readily-available city personnel (CAO) appeal procedure. APD officers had made liberal use of the outside appeal in 1975 and 1976, although the three cases heard in 1977 were few by comparison. In the absence of any other clear causal factor for this lack of use of the outside appeal provision in 1978, it is suggested that the internal system was viewed as adequately fair, and the hypothesis is supported by the data as a whole.

For the Lansing Police Department the pre/post changes in response to the questions relating to fairness are shown in Table 4. The result for Item 26 can be interpreted to mean that while officers were originally uncertain whether the chief acted on staff recommendations, they then tended to

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF PRE/POST RESPONSES TO TEST
THE HYPOTHESIS ON FAIRNESS—LPD

Question Number	Topic	Sample Measuring Occasion	Responses, percent			Level of Statistical Significance of Difference ($p < \text{value}$)
			Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	
26	Chief acts on staff recommendations	Baseline	29	62	9	.001
		Final	27	40	31	
32	Internal review is fair	Baseline	30	22	48	.001
		Final	42	34	24	
34	Internal review is fair by rank	Baseline	31	14	55	.01
		Final	42	21	35	
38	Personnel must go outside for fair review	Baseline	51	32	17	n.s.
		Final	42	34	24	
39	Decisions are speedy	Baseline	48	30	22	n.s.
		Final	47	35	16	

disagree, knowing that a Trial Board finding had been injected into the system. This finding was the dominant factor which the chief had to consider in deciding whether to concur with staff recommendations. Items 32 and 34 show a large shift in opinion. The positive change concerning rank and fairness is especially important as a project outcome, as this is one of the "hard-core" issues affecting officer confidence and acceptance in any police discipline system. Although Item 38 is nonsignificant, the direction of change is consistent with increased confidence in the internal system. Item 39 does not indicate any conclusive change in officers' views of speed of the system.

Again, the bottom line in perceived fairness of the new system is the extent to which disciplined officers appeal outside the department. Of the eleven cases heard by the trial board in Lansing, only three cases were appealed outside. Unfortunately, we were unable to establish the number of outside appeals prior to project implementation so comparisons cannot be made. The Lansing Police Department simply did not maintain summary records of this type of activity. However, it was believed by individuals within the agency that the number of outside appeals had decreased after project intervention.

Overall, the hypothesis is well supported.

H.3 Quality of supervisors' performance in their disciplinary responsibilities as perceived by personnel will be improved after project intervention.

In Albuquerque, of the six questionnaire items relating to supervisory performance shown in Table 5, the three that have statistically different responses across the trial year point to a perceived decline in important supervisory behaviors of consistent treatment of officers, explanation of rules, and fairness. This finding is somewhat in conflict with the positive

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF PRE/POST RESPONSES TO TEST
THE HYPOTHESIS ON SUPERVISORY PERFORMANCE
ALBUQUERQUE POLICE DEPARTMENT

Question Number	Topic	Sample Measuring Occasion	Responses, percent			Level of Statistical Significance of Difference ($p < \text{value}$)
			Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	
4	Supervisor is consistent in enforcing SOP	Baseline	69	13	18	.01
		Final	57	22	21	
5	Supervisor explains rule changes well	Baseline	64	16	20	not significant
		Final	56	18	26	
16	On issue, supervisor explains SOP well	Baseline	45	12	43	.01
		Final	32	17	51	
25	Supervisor is fair in determining facts of case	Baseline	72	15	13	.05
		Final	63	19	18	
26	Supervisor does not show favoritism in determining facts	Baseline	61	18	21	not significant
		Final	54	22	24	
27	Supervisor uses counseling and retraining	Baseline	47	29	24	not significant
		Final	43	29	28	

finding of fairness discussed above, and may indicate that it is the total system that produces an overall fair result, even in the face of supervisory performance that is not seen as improving. It should be noted, however, that on two of the three items, a majority of respondents spoke favorably of their supervisors. One of the issues within this factor, Item 27 on use of counseling and retraining, showed no change statistically, and very little in raw score terms. This issue is of interest because of the pattern of other available data, and because of the attempts made to introduce the idea of a positive discipline approach in supervisory training. One of the major thrusts of the prototype is the reshaping of the disciplinary concept and system to remove the emphasis from threat and reactive punishment, replacing it with open communications, counseling, and training. It can be seen in Table 5A, Part A, that responses to Item 27 on the two interim measures showed substantial percentage shifts out of the disagreement and uncertainty categories toward more agreement. However, these interim samples were small, and even the large percentage differences do not reach statistical significance (although chi-square values of 2.12 and 3.38 were reached, with 2d.f.). One additional piece of hard data on this issue is found in responses to the introductory questionnaire item, "Check the one answer. . . that best describes what the term 'discipline' means to you, based on your overall experience in this department in the past year." In Table 5A, Part B, gains are shown over baseline for both "training or counseling to improve police officer performance," and "an attitude which causes officers to obey police standards of conduct." Corresponding declines are seen in the choices of "punishment for officer misconduct," and "behavior according to police standards of conduct." This shift, which is significant and of worthwhile size, is consistent with the objectives of the project activity in the APD. Again, it is difficult to attribute the shift to a specific cause, but the fact that the effect is present

TABLE 5A

COMPARISONS OF ADDITIONAL
PRE/POST RESPONSES ON SUPERVISORY PERFORMANCE
ALBUQUERQUE POLICE DEPARTMENT

A. Pattern of Interim Responses:

Question Number	Topic	Sample Measuring Occasion	Responses, percent			Level of Statistical Significance of Difference ($p <$ value)
			Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	
27	My present supervisor uses training and counseling	Baseline	47	29	24	not significant
		April Interim (N=50)	59	19	22	
27	My present supervisor uses training and counseling	Baseline	47	29	24	not significant
		April Interim (N=35)	49	37	14	

B. Reported Meaning of Discipline as a Concept:

Topic	Sample Measuring Occasion	Meaning chosen, responses, percent				Level of Statistical Significance of Difference ($p <$ value)
		Behavior to Standards	Attitude to Obey	Training or Counseling	Punishment for Misconduct	
"Discipline means to me. . ."	Baseline	27	15	17	41	.05
	Final	21	22	22	35	

after the course of a full year, and that "training and counseling" normally occurs between the first-line supervisor and the officer, some evidence can be given to the claim that supervisory behavior has changed in this respect. Overall, although the data include some interesting results, the evidence to support this hypothesis is weak.

In Lansing this hypothesis was tested by comparing responses on the six items shown in Table 6. Items 4, 22, and 23 on fairness and consistency show moderately large percentage shifts toward a more positive view of supervisors by officers (although in some cases this is signified only by "less disagreement" with the statement). The level of statistical significance is lower than for the previous results, but is acceptable at .05. A fourth item, Number 24 on use of counseling, nearly reached significance (chi-square 4.09, 2 degrees of freedom) with an apparent shift in a positive direction. There was no improvement, however, in perceptions of supervisors' explanations of new rules and rule changes. Overall, there is sound evidence of support for the hypothesis, although not as convincingly as the previous key hypotheses.

H.4 Formal charges of misconduct made against personnel will be upheld in internal appeals.

H.5 Sanctions recommended in formal charges of misconduct will be upheld in internal appeals.

These hypotheses were proposed as the "acid test" of the new discipline system, reasoning that if the rules were fair, the investigations of any infraction were fair, and the resulting sanctions were imposed consistently and fairly, then any "fair" appeal procedure would tend to uphold the original findings and actions. This premise makes for an exacting and severe test, since a breakdown at any point in the chain of factors leads directly to an adverse result. Table 7 shows the appeal results for 12 cases in which trial

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF PRE/POST RESPONSES TO TEST
THE HYPOTHESIS ON SUPERVISORY PERFORMANCE
LANSING POLICE DEPARTMENT

Question Number	Topic	Sample Measuring Occasion	Responses, percent			Level of Statistical Significance of Difference ($p < \text{value}$)
			Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	
4	Supervisor is consistent	Baseline	51	12	37	.05
		Final	64	14	21	
5	Supervisor does a good job of explaining	Baseline	61	15	24	n.s.
		Final	63	19	18	
13	Supervisor explains new rules well	Baseline	45	18	37	n.s.
		Final	39	25	36	
22	Supervisor is fair in determining facts	Baseline	54	24	22	.05
		Final	54	35	11	
23	Supervisor does not show favoritism	Baseline	46	24	30	.05
		Final	48	34	18	
24	Supervisor uses counseling and re-training	Baseline	28	32	40	n.s.
		Final	35	40	25	

TABLE 7

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF APPEALS AGAINST DEPARTMENTAL ACTIONS-APD

CASE NUMBER	DEPARTMENT ACTION	TRIAL BOARD ACTION	CHIEF OF POLICE ACTION ON REVIEW
1	3 day suspension + 5 day suspension which was held in abeyance from prior disciplinary action	Upheld	Chief upheld trial board
2	1st charge - 1 day suspension 2nd charge - 3 day suspension	Reduced to letter of reprimand Reduced to 2 day suspension and transfer to another area	Chief upheld trial board
3	2 day suspension with option to work	Charge #1 reduced to verbal reprimand; charge #2 dismissed	Chief overruled trial board imposed original sanction
4	2 day suspension with option to work	Reduced to 1 day suspension with option to work and 1 day suspension held in abeyance for 6 months	Chief upheld trial board
5	10 days suspension - no take home car for 5 years, and incur 50% of damages to police motorcycle	Sustained all charges, modified sanction to officer not have to pay for damages to police motorcycle and officer given option to work 5 or 10 day suspension	Chief overruled trial board imposed original sanction
6	3 day suspension; denied assignment to cycles, no take home car for 5 years; pay 50% of damages to police motorcycle	Upheld charges - modified sanctions 10 day suspension with option to work 5 days; no take home car for 5 years; no motorcycle assignment for 5 years; incur 50% of damages to police motorcycle	Chief upheld trial board
7	3 day suspension	Modified sanction to 3 day suspension with option to work 2 days	Chief upheld trial board
8	10 day suspension	Modified to 3 day suspension/with 7 days held in abeyance	Asst. chief upheld trial board
9	Letter of reprimand	2 charges sustained; recommended letter of reprimand; 1 charge not sustained	Asst. chief upheld trial board
10	Letter of reprimand	Charges dismissed; no disciplinary action	Asst. chief overruled trial board imposed original sanction
11	Letter of reprimand	Charges dismissed; no disciplinary action	Asst. chief upheld trial board
12	Suspension	Upheld	Chief upheld trial board

boards were requested in Albuquerque. In only two of the cases were the original charges and sanctions left standing intact. In an additional six cases, the charges stood but sanctions were reduced. In an additional four cases, charges were reversed and sanctions reduced or revoked. These findings are especially interesting because it was not possible to predict the extent to which a new "peer review" potential would result in leniency, or an outlet for the rank-and-file simply to try to frustrate management. In one sense, the moderate level of decision reversal shown in the cases above is very positive and encouraging evidence that the innovative and sensitive concept of peer review in discipline can work in a typical department not known for a particularly mild or trouble-free labor-management climate. Note also that in the three cases in which the chief or assistant chief reversed the trial board finding, no additional outside appeal attempt was made. This pattern suggests that ultimately, a satisfying process was felt to exist within the internal system. Overall, in the context of a 12-month trial period with a procedure as radical (for this department) as the trial board, moderate support can be claimed for these hypotheses.

Table 8 shows the appeal results for 11 cases in which trial boards were requested by Lansing officers. In four of the cases, the original charges and sanctions were left standing intact by the trial board. In two of the aforementioned cases, the accused officer appealed the trial board's decision to the Police Board. In one of the cases the officer resigned prior to the Police Board convening, and the Police Board upheld the findings of the trial board in the other. In an additional four cases the charges stood, but sanctions were reduced. In an additional three cases, charges were reversed and sanctions reduced or revoked. Overall, in eight of the eleven cases, the department charges were sustained.

TABLE 8

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF APPEALS AGAINST DEPARTMENTAL ACTIONS-LPD

CASE NUMBER	DEPARTMENTAL ACTION	TRIAL BOARD ACTION ON APPEAL	CHIEF OF POLICE ACTION ON REVIEW	POLICE BOARD ACTION
1	1 day suspension without pay	Sustained charge; reduced sanction to written reprimand	Agreed with Board finding	None
2	Written reprimand	Sustained charge; reduced sanction to filing charge in officer's personnel folder	Agreed with Board finding	None
3	10 day suspension	Sustained charge; reduced sanction to 1 day suspension	Appealed to Police Board	Sustained charge; increased sanction to 5 day suspension
4	Terminated	Upheld	Agreed with Board finding	Upheld
5	30 day suspension	Dismissed charge	Appealed to Police Board	Appeal withdrawn; officer resigned
6	10 day suspension	Upheld	Agreed with Board finding	None
7	10 day suspension	Upheld	Agreed with Board finding	None
8	Written reprimand	Dismissed charge; removed written reprimand	Agreed with Board finding	None
9	Loss of driver's job; 1 day suspension	Sustained charge; reduced sanction to loss of driver's job	Agreed with Board finding	Upheld
10	Written reprimand	Dismissed charge	Appealed to Police Board	Appeal Withdrawn
11	5 day suspension	Upheld	Agreed with Board action	None

In one sense, the moderate level of reversed decisions shown in the cases above is very positive and encouraging evidence that the innovative and sensitive concept of peer review in discipline can work in a department that has a strong labor organization. In another sense, these data can be interpreted to conclude that the IAU will tighten up its disciplinary operations knowing that the internal investigations, charges logged, and sanctions handed out are subject to "peer review." Further, the data suggests that the officers were moderately satisfied with the new internal review system. Overall, in the context of a 12-month trial period for this procedure, support can be claimed for these hypotheses.

- H.6 The incidence of external appeals made by personnel will be reduced after project interventions.*
- H.7 Formal charges of misconduct made against personnel will be upheld in external appeals.*
- H.8 Sanctions recommended in formal charges of misconduct will be upheld in external appeals.*

The complete absence of external appeals by APD personnel in 1978 (see Table 9) was unexpected, and, in the context of these hypotheses, suggests marked improvement in the APD internal system. Presumably, aggrieved personnel were satisfied with the trial board and the chief's review. As an alternative explanation, it might be suggested that a trend had developed in recent years against use of the CAO hearing (considering 1977 experience, Table 9) but this argument cannot be convincingly supported by the frequency data, nor by any attitudinal trends or contextual events noted in the study.

In the case of Lansing, the external appeals are to the Board of Police Commissioners. Of the 11 cases heard by the trial board, three were appealed to the Police Board by the accused officer. Additionally, one officer grieved his sanction after the chief had appealed the trial board's findings to the Police Board and the Police Board had increased the trial board's sanction.

TABLE 9

DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS APPEALED
OUTSIDE THE POLICE DEPARTMENT
ALBUQUERQUE POLICE DEPARTMENT

Year	Case No.	Departmental Action Being Appealed	CAO Committee Action	Personnel Board Action ¹
1975	1	Suspension	Reduced in length	Rescinded CAO action - Upheld original action
	2	Suspension	Upheld	Upheld
	3	Demotion	Upheld	Reversed
	4	Suspension	Upheld	
	5	Suspension	Upheld	
	6	Suspension	Reduced in length	
1976	1	Suspension	Modified to letter of reprimand	Upheld
	2	Dismissal	Modified to suspension	Upheld
	3	Dismissal	Upheld	Upheld
	4	Suspension	Upheld	
	5	Suspension	Reversed	
	6	Suspension	Upheld	Upheld
	7	Dismissal	Upheld	Upheld
	8	Suspension	Upheld	Upheld
1977	1	Dismissal	Upheld	
	2	Dismissal	Upheld	
	3	Dismissal	Reversed	
1978	No Cases	--	--	--

1. If blank, no second-level appeal was made to the Personnel Board. "Upheld" or "Reversed" refers to CAO action.

Unfortunately, these figures do not indicate a trend nor does this data prove or disprove the hypotheses in question. As mentioned earlier in this report, Lansing had no filing system as to charges, dispositions, and appeals prior to project implementation. Consequently, the fact that there were three external appeals during the project test period does not aid in proving or disproving this hypothesis. However, Lansing personnel familiar with the IAU strongly believe that the number of external appeals had in fact been reduced subsequent to implementation of the trial board and new disciplinary system.

Hypotheses 7 and 8 state that both the formal charges against personnel and the recommended sanctions will be upheld in external appeals. As above, the data received during the test period is inconclusive. Of the three external appeals brought by officers, two have been heard by the Police Board, and the other was withdrawn because the appealing officer resigned from the department. The Police Board upheld the trial board's finding in each of these cases.

The chief of police appealed trial board action in three cases. Of the three appeals, two were withdrawn because the accused officers resigned; and in the third, the Police Board sustained the charge and increased the sanction handed down by the trial board. This data does not provide sufficient evidence to prove or disprove in the absolute the hypotheses in question.

Although this data is inconclusive due to the insufficient quantum of data, there is support for the hypotheses in that the Police Board did uphold the trial board's findings in all cases and sanctions in two of the three external appeals. In the third appeal, the Police Board increased the trial board's sanction.

E. Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of this project was to test a new disciplinary system and evaluate the system's process and procedures. It was shown that a new system could be implemented and could result in improvements with regard to the administration of discipline and officers' attitudes toward this sensitive management responsibility. The recommendations supported by the findings are presented below. They are written in a direct advisory style, addressed to key decisionmakers in police departments. They are applicable to any department whose management can identify with the issues and situations described throughout this report. It is our belief that this advice will help them work efficiently toward a valuable objective—a system of discipline that is fair and consistent, and serves as a cornerstone of good police management.

1. Use the prototype as a basis. The prototype system described in Managing for Effective Police Discipline proved generally sound as a basis for system design in three departments. The manual gives both detailed operational rules and procedures, the rationale behind them, and the legal issues raised in the drafting, implementation, and enforcement of disciplinary rules and regulations. The prototype system spelled out then can be modified to suit a variety of conditions. Attention must be given to city charter considerations, state law, and collective bargaining agreements at the outset. If this step is neglected, or affirmative approval is not received at the outset by the legal office concerned, problems may develop as were seen in Denver. A step-by-step review of all applicable provisions is necessary as the disciplinary system is developed and drafted.

Collective bargaining agreements do not necessarily create an insurmountable obstacle to a revision of rules and regulations or the adoption to a system that simulates the prototype found in Management for Effective Police Discipline. Both the Albuquerque Police Department and the Lansing Police Department were saddled with collective bargaining agreements as the study began. As reported in the study, a new set of rules and regulations were drafted and implemented with difficulty, and the process proved time consuming. The manual serves as a comprehensive checklist and sourcebook, greatly reducing (but certainly not eliminating) the groundwork needed to create a tailored program for a specific department.

2. The process of creating and implementing a new disciplinary system is a time-consuming and frustrating task. Although the prototype disciplinary system found in Managing for Effective Police Discipline proved to be a valuable base from which to begin, it must be remembered that the prototype needs to be adopted to local conditions. Obtaining agreement to process and procedures by management and Staff Working Committee members was one of the most frustrating and time-consuming tasks in this project. Seemingly endless meetings and controversies were experienced before agreement could be reached on disciplinary concepts, procedures and rules. The lesson to be learned from this experience is that patience is needed by anyone planning to revise disciplinary rules and procedures.

3. Get the support of local government and civic groups. Police discipline is not just the business of police commanders. In some communities, citizen groups take an active interest, sometimes in a positive and supportive mode, sometimes not. City legal codes may be controlling as was found in Denver,

or city government officials may have an important role. There may be a requirement for the police system to be compatible with the city personnel or civil service grievance system. Traditionally, police are answerable to the public in many ways. One of the most sensitive interfaces concerns police conduct, the rules which govern it, and the mechanism for applying those rules.

4. Involve the police employee organizations. Employee organizations often find themselves defending a member in an appeal of a disciplinary action. However, unions, POA, and FOP units are interested in operating within a viable, consistent system of discipline. They, like management, have many other priority tasks and goals from which the constant appealing of discipline cases diverts resources. Union leaders, through interest and orientation, tend to have knowledge and insight about disciplinary matters which can be channeled into producing workable joint solutions.

This recommendation cannot be overemphasized. In Albuquerque, the concept of the trial board procedure was so well received by the POA that it was implemented into the Albuquerque disciplinary system through contract negotiations prior to the project implementation.

During the monitoring period in Lansing, the chief of police amended certain procedures of the disciplinary system (as mentioned in the report). These changes created an uproar within the FOP, resulting in arbitration of the issues in question, which are still unresolved, as well as causing emotional strain within the agency.

5. Publicize the new system. Keeping the revision of the discipline system quiet is neither possible nor productive. Many groups both inside and outside

the department have a stake, interest, or curiosity which can be put to work for the department's good. To take the initiative in examining and revising the system is a proactive management action which is to be admired. If it is true that police must live and work in a "fishbowl", it is better for management to take the initiative than outside groups, which has happened in this context.

6. Use the Staff Working Committee (SWC) concept. The formation of a SWC to spearhead the system development was consistently effective in the three study sites. By appointing a group of 6 to 12 able individuals representing several important segments and levels of the department, not only are knowledge, imagination, and a range of viewpoints brought to bear, but "ownership" of the new system is spread throughout the department by this network of informal leaders. Further, as was witnessed in the test sites, this concept will aid in providing the "rumor mill" with accurate information. A well organized and involved SWC will be able to answer many of the questions that are posed by the other individuals within the agency.

7. Treat the effort as management-focused, not discipline-focused. Discipline is not an independent entity, "tacked-on" to management. The administration of discipline is intertwined with the entire range of supervisory and management principles and techniques. Management's prerogatives can and should be retained, while at the same time encouraging the SWC and others to consider how best to integrate the requirements of good discipline into all of the tasks, techniques, and responsibilities of supervisors and managers.

8. Preach documentation. Disciplinary issues are perhaps more demanding than other facets of management in that keeping records is of crucial importance. From a legal point of view, records of the actions of every party

to an incident, be it citizen, supervisor, officer, witness, or commander, are essential. Personnel records are vital. System records are particularly important when the new procedures must be tracked and compared over time periods to determine where and how improvements can be made.

If this recordkeeping function is not performed, agencies will be unable to compare new or modified systems with prior systems. This problem was faced in Lansing as the project staff attempted to compare the number of pre and post implementation external appeals, as well as whether the police board upheld the charges and sanctions a larger percentage of the time after implementation. Due to the lack of records in Lansing, these hypotheses could not be proved conclusively. Further, any cost analysis involving financial and manhour resources will be impossible.

9. Provide sufficient training. A smoothly functioning system depends on everyone in the department having the same basic information, knowledge, and understanding of the system. Added to this various individuals with special roles need as much training as will make them comfortable with that role, especially including supervisors, IA personnel, and trial board members. All test sites recorded a marked improvement in understanding, upon completion of the initial training of the new systems to be implemented. It was found, however, that this preimplementation training, although successful upon completion, was not sufficient. As the monitoring period progressed, a marked decrease in understanding was recorded. Therefore, it is necessary to continue training at intervals to maintain an adequate understanding of disciplinary rules and regulations.

10. Give first-line supervisor's special attention. Discipline successes and failures start between the sergeant and the officers. The supervisor needs

all the help the system can provide, plus an unusual degree of personal skill in order to counsel and retrain officers to help them avoid disciplinary action. The supervisor does not often master the mechanics of the system and these special skills in the course of whatever ordinary supervisory training may be given. Special intensive training is needed, with follow-up support. This can include routinely keeping the supervisor in the picture on all departmental processing of his or her cases, and providing regular supervisor peer group meetings to work out ways of interpreting rules and procedures consistently department-wide. Fairness and consistency in handling disciplinary cases should also be stressed. One of the overriding concerns of officers in the test sites was the fact that superiors were seen as inconsistent and unfair. Many officers believed that the intensity of the investigation and grade of sanction hinged upon the identity of the alleged errant officer. Many officers also felt that some inconsistency was present due to the different views that various supervisors had toward discipline. Although this is inevitable, supervisors should be counseled to minimize inconsistencies.

11. Develop a permanent policies and procedures review board. Given a management responsibility as complex and challenging as discipline, it is not reasonable to expect that the perfect system, in all its detail, will be developed the first time out, and never need to be changed. By setting up a policies and procedures review board which meets to hear suggestions and complaints about the system, management will be responsive to officers, and will be in a position to develop improvements in a gradual, controlled, coordinated manner. Another function this board could serve is to act as a standardized training resource for trial board members, especially when a rotating, or "one-time" (when a new board is convened for each hearing) system is used.

12. A tight disciplinary system will enhance management's ability to deal with disciplinary matters. One of the most significant outcomes of this project was an improved internal affairs function. In both Albuquerque and Lansing, the Internal Affairs Units developed a keen awareness respecting details. Although staff assigned to the IAU in both agencies had a general idea of their responsibilities, the new system forced the units to become more "paper conscious." The records were providing answers to questions such as "How many complaints has the department received;" "Which officers are showing a trend or proclivity toward certain behaviors;" and "Which supervisors are in need of increasing supervisory skills." The new system became a true organizational sensor which could uncover undesirable conditions and identify problems to be resolved by discipline (positive and negative), training, policy and procedural changes.

END