New Perspectives in Policing

JULY 2012

HARVARD Kennedy School
Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management

NIJ
National Institute of Justice

Police Leadership Challenges in a Changing World

Anthony W. Batts, Sean Michael Smoot and Ellen Scrivner

Executive Session on Policing and Public Safety

This is one in a series of papers that will be published as a result of the Executive Session on Policing and Public Safety.

Harvard's Executive Sessions are a convening of individuals of independent standing who take joint responsibility for rethinking and improving society's responses to an issue. Members are selected based on their experiences, their reputation for thoughtfulness and their potential for helping to disseminate the work of the Session.

In the early 1980s, an Executive Session on Policing helped resolve many law enforcement issues of the day. It produced a number of papers and concepts that revolutionized policing. Thirty years later, law enforcement has changed and NIJ and Harvard's Kennedy School of Government are again collaborating to help resolve law enforcement issues of the day.

Learn more about the Executive Session on Policing and Public Safety at:

NIJ's website: http://www.nij.gov/topics/law-enforcement/administration/executive-sessions/welcome.htm

Harvard's website: http://www.hks.harvard.edu/criminaljustice/executive_sessions/policing.htm

Introduction

Effective police leaders become adept at responding to challenge. Like other organizations, police agencies must balance constancy and predictability with adaptation and change. Even as they strive to standardize operations, most police leaders recognize the fluid context in which their agencies operate. They also understand that there are forces to which police organizations must adapt and evolve in order to remain effective in a changing world. It is those forces that drive organizational change and create new models for conducting the business of policing.

Several of the papers written in conjunction with the Executive Session on Policing confront these forces for change. Bayley and Nixon (2010) describe "the changing environment" for policing, including the rise of terrorism, new patterns of immigration, and increased accountability for police. Gascón and Foglesong (2010) describe the new budget realities that shape police agencies and challenge the premise of public policing. Other papers confront the changing dynamic between the police and research (Weisburd and Neyroud, 2011; Sparrow, 2011) and the idea

of a "new" police professionalism to respond to changes in the context for policing today (Stone and Travis, 2011; Sklansky, 2011).

This paper builds on the discussion of forces for change in police organizations. Our central thesis is that policing, like other industries, faces an urgent need for a new way of managing and leading police agencies that is being driven by two interdependent shifts in the world of work: the rise of a "new generation" of police officers; and significant opportunities — and challenges — in the availability of new technology. These two factors are linked to other changes within the broader context of policing, such as globalization, heightened budget concerns, the changing nature of crime, and the other forces that bear on the work of policing. By focusing our attention on these two key related changes in the work and management of policing, we hope to shed light on the broader challenges that confront police leaders and police organizations.

Beginning with a brief review of the rise of the traditional organizational model, we examine the new generation of "contemporary employees" and the related use of emerging technology that is integral to the lives of this new generation. We examine their impacts on multigenerational police organizations and conclude with lessons from other management fields as well as suggestions for preparing police leaders to confront the challenges of a changing world within the police environment.

The Growing Irrelevance of Traditional Organizational Models

The way in which many police leaders manage is linked to the way police agencies are organized. Like most modern work structures, police agencies trace their roots to the first industrial revolution and the industrial organizations that were the foundation of manufacturing industries. Platoons of officers, organized under shift sergeants with a command staff above them, bear a striking resemblance to industrial manufacturing plants and the organization of work on the shop floor. Even the rise of police unions parallels the rise of industrial trade unions, shop stewards and organized labor in other industries. Like the auto assembly plants of Henry Ford, traditional police agencies are characterized by a hierarchical authority structure that clearly distinguishes decision-makers from line staff, emphasizes adherence to principles of structure over flexibility, and prizes uniform operations and interchangeability across staff positions.

Police organizations are further constrained by their reliance on a paramilitary model (Geller and Swanger, 1995) that does not adapt well to external demands for change or accountability. Police unions add to this mix of outdated priorities through work rules and contractual requirements that can be unyielding. Thus, despite substantial gains by police in crime fighting, there is still a widespread tendency to adhere to outdated and ineffective management practices. For example,

Cite this paper as Batts, Anthony W., Sean Michael Smoot and Ellen Scrivner, *Police Leadership Challenges in a Changing World.* New Perspectives in Policing Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, 2012. NCJ 238338.

even the way a department's overall effectiveness is traditionally measured and tracked — typically some aspect of response time or fulfillment of calls for service — lacks relevance to current expectations of and for police.

As police agencies continued to incorporate the management models of the industrial age, the world of work began to shift away from these models. Starting in the late 20th century, driven in part by the need to compete in a global economy, manufacturing organizations have increasingly abandoned the traditional industrial work model and have sought new work structures that maximize efficiency (and profitability) and provide a more flexible structure that is less shackled to antiquated notions of work and management. Capitalizing on a 21st century workforce with skills and expectations that are as novel as the manufactured goods they produce, these new management models pay less tribute to the bureaucratic hierarchy of the old industrial plant and more attention to the inclusion of workers in a broader range of operations and policies. Senge and colleagues (2008) frame this transition as realistically questioning the wisdom of protecting the ways of the past in contrast to creating a different future.

As business and industry have moved away from older industrial systems built on hierarchies, traditions, and formal rules and procedures better suited to another era, police agencies in the 21st century are in need of a similar revolution in their organization, leadership and management models. Two sweeping changes serve as primary drivers for this revolution in policing: the new generation of police officers and an expanded use of technology innovations.

New Generation Officers and Technology Innovations: Drivers of Change in Policing

New Generation Police Officers — Contemporary Employees

Popular literature describes generational cohorts in different ways. Although there tends to be general agreement on the Baby Boomer cohort, labels applied to younger cohorts vary from Generation X and Generation Y to Millennials, Gamers or the Net Generation. Given that all of these cohorts may exist simultaneously within a police department, in this paper, we elected to use the term "contemporary employee" as a way to capture distinctions between this latest generation of officers and all those in the organization who preceded them. Those who hire, train, supervise, manage and lead them comprise the established organization of the police agency made of a mix of earlier generations. Together, these earlier generations have blended fairly successfully within the traditional industrial style of police organizations. Not so the generation of contemporary employees.

Beck and Wade (2004) and Hicks and Hicks (1999) describe contemporary employees as conscientious, unselfish and independent in their thinking while also more tolerant of differences than those of other generations. In contrast to descriptions suggesting that contemporary employees are self-centered with a sense of entitlement, Alsop (2008) describes them as altruistic, wanting to make the world a better place, and interested in making a positive impact in their world. He also characterizes them

as highly collaborative, team-oriented, and as having a "hands on" attitude, wanting to be involved and wanting to "give back." Some of their strongest skill sets include the abilities to multitask, articulate career values, understand the capacities of technology and appreciate diversity as strength. We also examined studies from the Pew Research Center (2007) whose findings demonstrate that groups born in the 1980s and early 1990s are more accepting than their elders of issues such as affirmative action, immigration and the appropriate scope of government, as well as far more supportive of an ethnically diverse workforce and responsive to concerns of diverse communities. We see these characteristics as extremely desirable for police officers but the challenge is whether current police organizations can capitalize on these attributes.

Despite desirable attributes, both research and practice describe contemporary employees as often lacking certain essential work attributes. For instance, they may need help with focusing on single issues and seeing projects through to the end. As such, they are strong candidates for mentoring, coaching and training to help them see and reinforce how their place in the organization can help meet their personal goals and objectives. In this regard, meeting their early work development needs will require approaches that are quite different from those of their multigenerational supervisors. Yet, the supervisory group will be key to retaining this younger cohort in the organization by creating a work environment that allows their attributes to flourish. Their retention will be important to the stability of the organization and to future organizational leadership.

Beyond differences in personal characteristics, the contemporary employee also brings lifestyle changes to the workplace that may conflict with traditional law enforcement practices and present challenges to the commitment to 24-7 public safety coverage. These changes include: placing a greater value on balancing work and family, experiencing comfort with questioning authority and challenging the traditional chain of command, demanding ongoing performance feedback, expecting transparency and timely outcome measures that show what is working, and relying on instant feedback from electronic communication and social networking. All these set contemporary employees apart from those who have long subscribed to, or accepted, the paramilitary organizational model and a lifestyle that prioritized work over other elements of their lives.

One way this dynamic can be observed is in the context of collective bargaining. Both unions and managers face a new prioritization of issues and demands based upon the desires of today's younger workforce. Rather than emphasizing the traditional "meat and potatoes" bargaining issue of wages, public safety collective bargaining agreements now often hinge on issues that relate to scheduling, hours of work and overtime. For example, the most recent labor agreements between the city of Chicago and its police unions hinged on the adoption of new scheduling language that incorporated both 10-hour workday

and 8.5-hour workday provisions (Rozas, 2008).[1] Similarly, one of the most contentious issues in public safety bargaining across the country has recently become whether, and to what extent, police officers will be compensated for overtime work with time off in lieu of cash. Within the limited context of this issue, a strong difference can be observed between more senior employees' preference for pay versus younger employees' desire to be compensated with time off instead of cash. Further, in response to younger officers' demands for some, if not greater, control over their work schedules some departments have adopted "flexible time" scheduling. Such a concept was unheard of in American policing even 10 years ago.

As would be expected, this new generation differs considerably from those in the ranks at the time of previous Executive Sessions. Whereas we accept that other generations brought new challenges to their organizations, the challenges today seem to be reverberating throughout the private and public sectors, and even the federal government is feeling the impact. Rein (2010) writes that almost one in three new federal workers being hired is 29 years of age or younger and is part of the texting generation. Government personnel specialists see these younger workers as questioning the status quo and reshaping the bureaucracy. They seek to make a difference and to help the government do better, citing response to disasters as but one example.

The full impact of contemporary employees currently remains uncertain and is a topic ripe for research. However, it is clear that they present challenges to police leadership that raise questions as to their influence. Will the new generation, like those before it, need to change in order to fit into the prevailing police culture, or will the traditional structure and the culture of policing need to change? Within that context, does the new generation of contemporary employees present a crisis for policing or an opportunity for fundamental change?

Driver of Change — Technology Innovations

We identify the second primary driver of change in policing as the rise of technology and its influences on organizational behavior, crime trends, individual work behavior and personal life styles. Beyond trends in the economy and shifts in industrial management, changes in American policing are further embedded in social transitions that have been facilitated by innovations in technology. Some examples are seen in the closures of certain types of businesses such as bookstores, record stores, and camera shops; failures of major newspaper companies; and the significant downsizing of U.S. Postal Service operations — all reflecting changes in communication brought about by technology. Other changes have become familiar symbols of modern life such as social media, instant messaging

[1] See Chicago Police Directive E02-01, Work Day Duty Schedules, effective Jan. 6, 2011, which provides for three primary workday duty shifts for sworn officers, an 8.5-hour shift, a 9-hour shift, and a 10.5-hour shift. All shifts include 30 minutes for lunch. Available online: http://directives.chicagopolice.org/directives. See also *In the Matter of Arbitration Between the City of Chicago and Fraternal Order of Police, Chicago Lodge No. 7,* Case No. Arb. Ref. 09.281 (Interest Arbitration 2007 Agreement), April 16, 2010, pp. 137-146 (Memorandum of Understanding for Work Day Schedules, amended Nov. 13, 2009, effective Jan. 6, 2010).

and blogs, along with Twitter, YouTube, MySpace and Facebook. Conversely, the latter impact systems and present complications for police, as seen in the already strained broadband demands brought about by the marriage of cell phones, televisions, computers, and an inventory of hand-held, portable Web-connected devices that respond to desires for flexibility, speed, miniaturization and electronic efficiencies — trends that are becoming familiar constructs of modern society and embedding technological change into our way of life. But, we also see their influences in other trends such as the recent Occupy Movement activities in cities across the country.

Policing needs to be thinking about how to use these shifts to further its operational and organizational strategies and how to take advantage of the new skill sets brought to the workplace by the cohort of contemporary employees who are comfortable in the "tech" world that is revolutionizing the way people live and communicate. Already we are seeing some organizational changes, such as some police departments now conducting virtual rollcalls where officers obtain pre-shift briefing information via email or mobile data computers. This mode of information transfer, when offered as an alternative to an in-person rollcall, is often the choice of younger officers who are accustomed to, and in some cases more comfortable with, the tech-based mode of communication. But the "electronic" influence goes much further. For instance, three years ago the Los Angeles Police Protective League (LAPPL), the union for the Los Angeles Police Department's rank and file officers, pioneered a Web-based communication system that enabled the union to hold "virtual" membership meetings. The LAPPL created its electronic communication system to engage its younger officers. Several other police organizations that are experiencing the challenge of engaging contemporary employees have followed suit. Other departments have assigned their contemporary employee officers to help manage social media for the department, a phenomenon which becomes even more critical at a time of large demonstrations and major events. Inevitably, departments are seeing the need to develop social media policies that govern the appropriate use of social media by the officers themselves. Creating the right balance of preserving evidence and information while protecting the rights of free speech is becoming a new challenge in many departments.

In the area of crime control, we again see change driven by technology. Internet crime, identity theft, and cyber influences on crimes such as fraud, stalking, bullying and child pornography represent one way that technology is influencing crime trends. Websites that offer ways to access police scanners through live audio feeds to cell phones, and social media used to agitate groups such as flash mobs represent others. Technology is also impacting changes in traditional street tactics and investigations, along with alterations in traditional crime control and prevention activities. For example, although street robberies may decline when people carry less cash, bank online, use debit cards, or buy and sell on websites such as Amazon and eBay, the increasing use of cell phones and other hand-held communications

and technological devices presents new targets for street robberies. On the upside, police departments are using their own media outlets to get information to the public about developing crime trends or to seek the public's assistance in solving a problem. Other major developments relate to property crime, which is reported to be decreasing because of these trends. The changes in the investigation of property crimes are particularly apparent in the use of cellular and GPS technology to track and recover stolen cars. In addition, the now familiar presence of surveillance cameras enhances the potential for identifying suspects in many types of crimes as well as their locations, which makes it more difficult for perpetrators of organized criminal activity to operate when they run a greater risk of detection. The converse is the evidence suggesting that future crime trends will demonstrate less localized crime and far greater incidence of crimes perpetrated by international organizations based in foreign countries such as Russia and China (Clarke and Knake, 2010).

As crime goes global, technology will be a primary driver in responding to issues that are far more complex than anything we see today. Accordingly, the generation of the contemporary employee may be central to understanding the changes needed to respond to the shifts we have outlined, shifts that will impact organizations, the nature of crime and work behavior. The most recent developments in technology have been an integral part of the lives of the generation of workers now entering policing. They bring with them a sophisticated understanding of how technology could enhance policing, communications and crime control. Their familiarity with technology may hold the promise of new, more effective strategies to combat an array of both old- and new-style crimes and to promote citizen engagement with the police. However, they could also create new demands on multigenerational police organizations and on police leaders. As drivers of change, the cohort of contemporary employees and the seemingly never ending ways to use technology will result in new ways to think about how police organizations function in a changing world.

Managing Drivers of Change in a Multigenerational Workforce

Many police executives and union leaders developed their careers in earlier times and were influenced by norms established by traditionalist and Baby Boomer cultures. Although these cohorts have initiated enormous change over the past 40 years and are not resistant to tactical and strategic change, tampering with age-old organizational structures, benchmarks for performance, or benefit and reward systems may be hard pills to swallow. Further, in contrast to the private sector, there is no financial incentive to drive changes to traditions. Because they have been trained and educated to survive in a society shaped by industrial markets, some police leaders may question the relevance, as well as the wisdom, of supporting change to fundamental organizational structures based on command and control or initiating practices that prioritize the needs of contemporary employees. Common themes noted when discussing contemporary

employees with multigenerational police managers include seeing the new generation as "whiners" who lack understanding of the business and have unrealistic expectations. Leaders often see more negatives than positives and ask whether they are simply babysitting kids who just need to grow up.

We acknowledge that similar comments have been made about previous generations of police officers. However, Harrison (2007) describes the gap between those in charge and those who follow as wider than it has ever been. As a police consultant, he calls on astute police executives to seek ways to bridge that gap and to learn flexibility. His thinking is consistent with what Sullivan (2004) refers to as "clash points" that result from applying traditional work standards to employees who have divergent viewpoints about autonomy and supervision. The focus of these discussions generally applies to new recruits, who are definitely different from those of yesteryear, but whose differences are further compounded by personal lifestyle changes as well as changes in the world around us. All present challenges that need to be considered in order to effect a successful transition to this new era.

Law enforcement has completed one successful transition through their response to the shrinking of quality applicant pools, and those efforts provide an apt illustration of the adage that crisis presents opportunity for change. Applicant shortages documented by Koper, Maguire and Moore (2001) spawned dramatic changes in police recruitment strategies including: use of cutting-edge advertising, marketing and branding new images of law enforcement as seen on the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) website, providing signing bonuses and financial assistance for relocation expenses, and the proliferation of a variety of Web-based recruiting inducements. Because recruiting a diverse, talented, appropriate future workforce has required new methods, some agencies are loosening rigid acceptance criteria and adopting the framework of a "whole person" approach to evaluating candidates (Scrivner, 2005). The next challenge will be to retain those hired in the system and to prevent their being driven away by rigid traditions and fixed structures.

Beliefs that current hiring challenges will diminish because of economic conditions and threats of job loss are becoming less common. Thus, law enforcement will need to maintain a focus not only on recruitment but also on how to retain a new generation of officers within a multigenerational environment. Profiles of contemporary employees sharply contrast with those of the generational cohorts who supervise and manage police departments and, based upon the authors' collective observation and experience, attempts to embed them in a culture that is out of step with their values and needs only tends to alienate them. There is a need to examine further how the police culture can adapt and become more agile while still responding to the ongoing challenges that accompany the expanding complexity of the local law enforcement portfolio. How can it meet demands for calls for service while still engaging the new generation to contribute their knowledge and accept different levels of responsibility? These are not easy tasks because of the

multigenerational differences in work ethic and the values endemic to the various generational cohorts that fill police ranks.

Profiling the Multigenerational Workforce

Distinctions of a multigenerational workforce are described in the following profiles of the American worker (1920-1990) (table 1). The profiles show a distinct contrast between earlier generations and contemporary employees.

The profiles suggest how respective values may play out in day-to-day functioning on the job. Although those represented in the traditional profile have long since retired, their ideas and pervasive influence remain embedded in many of the structural and operational parameters of paramilitary public safety agencies. This influence is quite prevalent within police unions, which sometimes struggle to define their value to younger workers who enter the workforce with little, if any, historical perspective regarding wages, rights and working conditions. In fact, one of the greatest challenges facing police labor organizations today is recognizing the assumptions new members have (i.e., that they will receive fair pay, good working conditions and protective rights).

In comparing the generation of contemporary employees with those of the traditional and Baby Boomer groups in policing, it is clear that current generational issues involve more than absorbing new employees with different value systems and learning how to motivate them.[2] Rather, they affect the entire organization and

Table 1. Profile of American Workers (1920-1990)

Traditionalists: Parents born in the 1800s	Baby Boomers: Parents born in the early 1900s	Contemporary Employees: Parents born in the 1950s-1960s
• ***Privacy*** — The silent generation. • ***Hard work*** — Believed in paying your dues. • ***Trust*** — My word is my bond. • ***Formality*** — Formal organizational structure and formal values. • ***Authority*** — Respect for authority. • ***Social order*** — A belief in traditional class structure.	• ***Hard work*** — Value hard work; workaholics. • ***Competitive*** — Value peer competition. • ***Change*** — Thrive on possibilities. • ***Teamwork*** — Embrace working in social settings. • ***Will fight*** — They will fight for a cause.	• ***Entrepreneurial spirit*** — Invest in their personal development rather than that of the organization, yet have a service mentality. • ***Independence and creativity*** — Prefer self-management based on ongoing performance feedback framed as constructive criticism — how to do better in contrast to what you are doing wrong. • ***Information*** — They value lots of information and seek ongoing feedback. • ***Quality of life*** — Hard workers, but would rather find quicker, more efficient methods that give them time for a life outside of the job. • ***Communication methods*** — Social networks, emails, text messaging, short soundbites, and blogs are part of their day-to-day existence. • ***Creativity*** — Creative problem solvers but also see the value of analytic skills to bolster creativity. • ***Skills*** — Adaptable to change and computer literate, research focused, naturally inquisitive, and community oriented.

Sources: Rogler, 2002; Sullivan, 2004; Tulgan, 2000.

[2] This point deserves a good deal of consideration within the context of retention, as contemporary employees tend to place greater emphasis on their individual families, friends and hobbies over work and give far more weight to their own professional development and career advancement than they place on organization or employer loyalty.

challenge those at all levels of supervision and management. Many of the new generation start their careers with higher levels of education than their superior officers, either by holding college degrees or meeting the requirement for two years of college now in place in many agencies. Certainly, top police executives are also better educated and have greater savvy in managing organizations and providing leadership than at any other time in our history. However, in many organizations first-line supervisors and mid-level managers, probably the most multigenerational group in the organization, have not kept educational pace with their superiors or subordinates. These middle managers often remain married to the paramilitary and command-and-control approaches with employees and can present significant barriers to change.

Consequently, as hiring processes and training academies begin to change to meet the needs of the new generation, supervision practices, movement within the organization, and leadership also will need to change. Those changes may be more challenging because they require not only change in practices but also a level of organizational flexibility that has not been part of the command-and-control model embedded in the American policing culture. Although significant progress has been made in police strategies and tactics, American policing still struggles with a 20th century assembly-line mentality that is dominated by command and control and a rules and procedure approach to performance. As such, organizational flexibility is often not considered an asset and may in fact be interpreted as disarray —an easily understood anathema to most police commanders and their political bosses.

It may be easier for multigenerational managers to criticize characteristics and differences in work habits than to come up with constructive ideas on how to respond to the new generation of contemporary employees and the challenges they present. Criticisms that focus only on what is "wrong" may be short on facts and miss the point that contemporary employees bring a lot of what is "right" to the workforce. As such, their strengths need to be acknowledged, rather than trying to force them to adapt to a culture that worked for their predecessors but does not fit for them. In fact, that culture may no longer fit 21st century law enforcement practice or community and citizen expectations. Acknowledging strengths, however, may require first confronting existing perceptions.

A few examples of how perceptions can be altered come from participants of the Executive Session and other forums where the new generation was discussed. The following significant questions were framed as follows:

- Are they a generation that expects to be empowered and makes too many demands for information and feedback? Or, is it equally likely that they are seeking clarification of roles and responsibilities but in ways that are perceived as challenges that make supervisors uncomfortable?
- Do they want an easy, lucrative ride? Or, are they seeking meaningful work and the opportunity to advance?

- Are they risk averse and hesitant to go "hands on"? Or, are they using sensible risk management?
- Do they expect ongoing accolades for work? Or, are they seeking honesty and authenticity from superiors?
- Does their questioning of rules mean actual resistance? Or, do they want to understand the rules and learn the history as to why the rule exists?
- Are we experiencing a knowledge drain due to Baby Boomer retirements? Or, does the new generation bring an infusion of new and diversified knowledge that needs to be exploited?

Focusing on negative laundry lists of what may actually be misperceptions is not productive in any analysis. Instead, police leadership must position itself in a way that affords every opportunity to tap into valuable new knowledge that contemporary employees bring to the workplace. Failure to recognize these opportunities is likely to lead to situations that will impact their retention and could risk losing the best of the next generation of leadership. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the area of how technology is changing policing.

Rethinking Police Organizations and Accommodating Drivers of Change

We have established how new police officers are different from their predecessors and how they have a level of comfort with, and reliance on, technology that can advance the work of the police. How all this merges within the context of an organizational mindset is another matter and presents an important opportunity to begin to rethink police organizations for the future in order to accommodate drivers of change. Within that context, valuable lessons can be drawn from private industry.

Private Industry "Lessons Learned"

The need for support to change organizational mindsets and supervisory practices to accommodate the contemporary employee can be gleaned from recent "lessons learned" in the private sector.

In a Center for Creative Leadership (CCL) survey of those in leadership positions, 74 percent of the leaders believed that the generation of employees currently entering the workforce will place unique demands on their organization. Survey findings strongly suggest that contemporary employees will require businesses to go beyond current organizational norms and to develop "innovational" cultures and changes to business practices that are compatible with changing communication patterns and skills developed in the technology sector (Criswell and Martin, 2007).

Erickson (2010) discusses the need for a new generation of leaders in the private sector and contends that they will face unpredictable challenges in an environment of constant change. She identifies "context creating" leadership activities that reflect core values of the contemporary employee and which future leaders will need to adopt. "Context creating" includes increasing

collaborative capacity and working through networks, asking compelling questions to better frame the challenges, embracing complexity and welcoming disruptive information, shaping organizational identity, and appreciating diversity. Although her work addresses leadership needs in the private sector, it is not unrealistic to consider how, as these values begin to shape leadership throughout private industry, they will also influence policing, and how unique conflicts may occur when the core values of contemporary employees begin to intersect with those of others in the multigenerational workforce.

Other private sector lessons relative to organizational change and driven by the contemporary employees include:

- New skills brought to the job have the potential to change organizations. For example, an automotive survey (KRC Research, 2009) of "millennials" examined how they get and use information in their day-to-day lives (social networking, instant messaging, websites, blogs, instant mobile alerts). Survey findings suggested that consumers' desire to be technologically connected has a significant impact on how automobiles need to be marketed to this group in contrast to the types of approaches that were used with their parents.
- Multigenerational supervisory personnel will need to learn how to communicate with contemporary employees, especially about performance-based issues, if they are to be successful in changing behavior.
- Many private companies are implementing supervisor training directed at developing listening and critiquing skills, as well as how to provide more frequent performance feedback and not always at the one-to-one level.
- IBM is urging supervisors not to wait for an annual performance review to give employee performance information. Rather, they encourage supervisors to create ongoing dialogue with employees and to listen to them while using open-ended questions and letting them know what you are learning from them.
- Both IBM and Accenture Ltd. have developed training programs focused on interactive dialogue as part of critiquing skills.
- Ernst & Young has created online "Feedback Zones" where employees can request feedback at any time. They also assign mentors to new employees (Hite, 2008).
- Google is providing online "office hours" where any employee can pitch new ideas. They have also created an "idea listserv" where any employee can suggest or comment on an idea. This, they believe, is moving their organization towards virtual leadership (Criswell and Martin, 2007).

Another CCL online survey of 1,131 global leaders addressed the changing nature of leadership and primary challenges faced by management consumers.

- Among other findings, 65 percent of the respondents believed that there will be a talent crisis in the next five years and identified

talent acquisition and talent development as primary needs.

- Also cited were needs for greater emphasis on collaboration for developing a capacity to deal with change and for building effective teams (Martin et al., 2007).

The above are only a few of the examples that show how private sector industries are changing practices to respond to changing needs. Obviously, they do not function within the confines of civil service agencies so some of their more subjective undertakings may not be feasible within the public sector. However, policing can benefit by adopting some of these progressive ideas, particularly those relating to supervisory training and communication skills. Within that context, IACP is starting to include courses on managing this new generation in their training offerings.

Clearly, the best and the brightest of the new generation of contemporary employees need to be retained and groomed for leadership. The case can be made that American policing faces challenges similar to those of the private sector, and that police leadership needs to confront these issues to avoid a critical shortage of effective leaders in the not too distant future. In fact, some police executives have started to do just that and are introducing change in their organizations.

Promising Practices From Police Executives

Despite a dearth of research that specifically addresses this type of organizational change in policing, American policing is not taking a backseat in this new era. In fact, some police leaders have started to make changes that address both the needs and the talents of the new generation, such as involving them in community engagement and problem solving and encouraging use of social media to get realtime information to the public. For example, online electronic communication tools such as YouTube, Facebook and Twitter are being integrated into many government agencies and police organizations and provide new avenues for interacting with the public (Hermann, 2009).

At the administrative and operational levels, substantive changes were described in a Roundtable Discussion on New Generation officers that took place in Seattle in October 2008, sponsored by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice. Of the 25 police executives who participated, many expressed growing awareness of the need to change their systems not only to accommodate employees but also to create more effective organizations. Many are trying new approaches that would have been unheard of just a short time ago.

Police executives participating in that discussion agreed on the following practices:[3]

- Creating new processes for recruit orientation that devote significant time to the "front end" of the system similar to college and professional "first-year experience" programs designed to prevent attrition.

[3] This information has now been summarized in a document funded by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, *Practitioner Perspectives: Community Policing in a Democracy* (Scrivner, 2010).

- A statewide law enforcement training program is currently testing a two-week residential pre-academy orientation that involves team-building exercises, leadership, ethics, fiscal integrity and physical fitness. Although this represents a sizable investment in upfront staffing, the program reports that those who are unsuited for the career generally self-select out before they begin the expensive process of training and completing the probationary year only to walk away from the job.
- Finding ways to allow creative officers to do their best work and encouraging them to use problem-solving approaches and to experiment with technological tools to create more efficient and effective law enforcement responses.
- Examples of initiating internal changes so that the department is more responsive to line officers are reflected in the following:
    - Developing targeted training programs to expose officers to specialized training early in their careers.
    - Creating what one department called "renaissance" officers by equipping them with knowledge, and eventually experiences, in a range of different specialties.
    - Enhancing new officer awareness as to how law enforcement is evolving and the challenges it will present, as well as the opportunity to make a difference.
    - Creating new and different types of jobs within the profession such as predictive analytics or cybercrime units.
    - Providing early and in-depth career exposure to the skills that officers will need to develop to function in those new jobs as well as others.
- Changing discipline systems so that a goal of behavior change is achieved in contrast to the traditional "days off" model and with a stronger emphasis on strategic discipline — which emphasizes strategies to change and correct behavior rather than simply imposing a penalty.
- Making employees part of the choice to change their behavior and grooming them to accept greater responsibility.
- Teaching value-based decision-making at the academy rather than focusing only on rule-bound curricula.
- Incorporating value-based review boards that examine violations through the lens of department values in contrast to violations of specific rules or policies.
- Creating a different mindset at the executive level and requiring leadership development that stresses the need for different command-level thinking in order to facilitate progress.
- Pushing leadership down throughout the organization as opposed to being controlled solely by senior staff.

Drivers of Change: Challenge or Opportunity for Police Leadership?

Modern police leadership continues to evolve and is introducing new business models that address some of the issues important to a workforce impacted by the contemporary employee cohort and their emphasis on using technology in unprecedented ways. Many police leaders recognize that balancing complex demands is but one role of the modern leader and that multilayered bureaucratic police departments will have to learn to keep pace with information and data that move at the speed of light and with the new technologies that are changing how they do business. Just as private sector entities are being transformed to adjust to their environment, American policing will need to do the same in order to operate in ways that are consistent with the needs of the contemporary employee. This is particularly noted in the instance of union officials, who previously relied on monolithic models of power in negotiation, starting to adopt interest-based negotiation models that allow for win-win bargaining. The result of this shift in bargaining process has given employees (union members) more ownership in the terms and conditions of employment. In these situations, where healthy labor relations exist, a shared process in organizational planning is becoming the cornerstone of progress quite in contrast to past union business models.

Many police leaders also have developed an appreciation for how organizations can be informed by research that supports different types of law enforcement approaches. Departures from the past include current references to intelligence-led, evidence-based or predictive policing that attempt to introduce greater efficiencies and enhance effectiveness. These also may incorporate new skills brought to the workplace by contemporary employees or could integrate civilian personnel to reduce the cost impact of sworn officers. Further, the wave of the future for the modern police organization may be reflected in the development of new skill sets such as stronger analytic capacity, information technology specialists, forensic computer experts, strategic planners and change management specialists, many of which are consistent with the interests and skills of the contemporary employee. Other adaptations will be reflected in changes in police discipline systems, signifying a shift from harsh punishment that research tells us does not stop dysfunctional behavior to systems based on values, logic and behavior modification. Finally, the mentality of "do as I say," which once worked in factories and paramilitary settings, no longer hits the target, particularly as recruits with high potential whom leaders seek to mentor and retain come into the workforce.

We reiterate that a successful response to the changes and challenges we have discussed also will need to start with a change in the middle management (or first-line supervisory) dynamic and build from there. Increasingly, police leadership has veered away from hiring blind, paramilitary followers of decades past and now seeks to attract employees with a strong interest in problem solving, often but not always autonomously. These employees have different

expectations and anticipate that they will be mentored and given the dignity, authority and discretion to solve problems. But in many police departments, little or no investment is made in training first-line supervisors in the art and method of mentorship or coaching. Successful organizational leadership in an agency focused on community-oriented or problem-solving policing must incorporate a break from complacent first-line supervision and officer evaluation processes that measure job performance based on activity statistics or ticket quotas. Instead, a real investment must be made in training for supervisors that emphasizes guidance through mentoring. Leadership through instruction, education, logic, and persuasion are the "power tools" of contemporary police leadership … not "do as I say" … and they are consistent with the needs of the new generation of contemporary employees.

Preparing Police Leadership for the Future — Requisite Skills

Given our emphasis on police leadership challenges being driven by the growing cohort of contemporary employees and the expansion of technology in the world around us, the question follows: What type of leadership skills will be needed for law enforcement agencies of the future? The following provides a brief profile of how we see a modern police leader and the requisite skills that will be needed to advance the organization and meet challenges. Some of the information is derived from organizational theorists; some comes from discussions with Executive Session participants and other police leaders. All of these skills and characteristics have strong implications for the future of police management training.

- **Global perspective.** In an era where technology, financial institutions and terrorist threats are constructed on global landscapes, a greater awareness and knowledge of global history, and connectivity to global issues and their impact on crime, will all be necessary in that crime of the future will also be global and supported by a strong technological base (Clarke and Knake, 2010).

- **Creativity.** Leadership authority Ronald Heifetz (1994) contends that problems that are outside the norm necessitate a thought process that demands creativity and the total re-engineering of new concepts. Future police executives will need to adapt that type of thinking and be creative to an extent not needed in the past. They will need to be "big picture" executives.

- **Change management and adaptivity.** Because the next two decades will be driven by dynamic changes to the traditional concepts of policing, future police executives will need to be aware of global shifts and technology trends and have the ability to adapt and move organizations to end points, more so than those of the past. As with other organizations, globalization, new technology and greater transparency have combined to "upend the business environment" (Reeves and Deimler, 2011). Hence, management training will need to focus on the skills needed for big picture thinking and change management in order to

prepare leaders to function in the changing environment.

- **Comfort in the midst of independence.** Effective future leaders will need to be at ease in an organization where workers demand autonomy and opportunities to be creative, signature requirements of the new generation of contemporary employees. Hence, police organizations will need to flatten to allow for creating the balance between creative autonomy and the formality of traditional culture.
- **Strong oral and written communication.** Because change will be so rapid, the contemporary executive will need to develop strong oral communication skills in order to explain complex theories in simple forms. Persuasion methods should be encouraged for purposes of allowing input and developing logical dialogue. This fine art of communication will be required in a culture where attribution questions are focused on those in authority.
- **Mastering technological trends.** The future police executive will need to anticipate how current changes in technologies will intersect with constitutional law and must prepare the agency to respond appropriately (i.e., the ability to see through walls and the concurrent impact on illegal searches and seizures; managing access to multiple databases to solve crimes while protecting sensitive information). Given these trends, it is likely that the very nature and fundamental concepts of what law enforcement does will continue to be vigorously questioned and debated. Police leadership will need to be prepared to respond appropriately to concerns raised by these practices.
- **Architect of change.** The contemporary leader will need to be a trendsetter and innovator. Taking lessons learned from other industries will be important to creating and using societal and organizational shifts in law enforcement in ways not previously contemplated.
- **An understanding of research methods.** Successful contemporary leaders must become comfortable with research analysis and interpretation. Basic criminological theory and understanding should be supplemented by exposure to other fields of study, which may include holding progressive and advanced degrees. Moreover, stronger partnerships with colleges and universities will be required to facilitate ongoing, in-depth empirical research on operational methods and decision-making.
- **Striking a balance: Integrating strategy, culture and political influences.** The nexus of strategy, culture (both internal and external) and political influences was identified as critical to contemporary leadership by a group of prominent police executives. They framed this nexus as key to the executive mindset that is needed for solving problems, circumventing obstacles to performance, and moving organizations forward in a changing world. Considering new police strategies, reviewing use of best practices, managing community-police crises, and retaining new

talent brought by the contemporary employee to the organization all can be considered within this intersecting, dynamic framework. It provides something of a roadmap that incorporates strategy, culture and political influences into an executive model to help clarify where the organization needs to go to accomplish its mission; or, in other instances, what an organization needs to do to recover from crisis (Scrivner, 2008).

Conclusions

The profession of policing and public safety continues to confront new challenges that also present a wealth of opportunities for initiating substantive change. As evidenced by the work of the Executive Sessions, police leadership today may be better positioned to address them in ways that benefit the field and that maintain American police leaders' position at the forefront of the profession.

Today's police leaders were trained to operate in an ingrained bureaucratic structure. This training, the resulting organizational culture and fixed attitudes present conditions similar to those in the auto industry a few short years ago. Many police leaders, however, have seen the need to alter these traditions in favor of becoming more flexible and adaptive to the world we currently live in and to the people with whom we work. Their efforts will be the key to preventing systemic failure in policing similar to what has occurred in some segments of the private sector. Today's leaders and tomorrow's visionaries will continue to need a strong foundation anchored in the values of credibility, truth, high ethical standards and sound morals. Further, leaders will always be selected for their abilities to make sound, cogent and well-thought-out decisions. Answering the wakeup call to continuously adapt and improve the profession will be one of those decisions.

References

Alsop, Ron. 2008. *The Trophy Kids Grow Up.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bayley, D.H., and C. Nixon. 2010. *The Changing Police Environment, 1985-2008.* New Perspectives in Policing Bulletin. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. NCJ 230576.

Beck, J., and M. Wade, 2004. *Got Game: How the Gamer Generation Is Reshaping Business Forever.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Clarke, R.A., and R.K. Knake. 2010. *Cyber War: The Next Threat to National Security and What to Do About It.* New York: HarperCollins.

Criswell, C., and A. Martin. 2007. *10 Trends — A Study of Senior Executives' Views on the Future.* A CCL Research White Paper. Greensboro, N.C.: Center for Creative Leadership.

Erickson, T.J. 2010. "The Leaders We Need Now." *Harvard Business Review* (May): 62-66.

Gascón, G., and T. Foglesong. 2010. *Making Policing More Affordable: Managing Costs and Measuring Value in Policing.* New Perspectives in Policing Bulletin. Washington, D.C.: U.S.

Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. NCJ 231096.

Geller, W.A., and G. Swanger. 1995. *Managing Innovation in Policing.* Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.

Harrison, B. 2007. "Gamers, Millennials, and Generation Next: Implications for Policing." *Police Chief* 74 (10) (October).

Heifetz, R.A. 1994. *Leadership Without Easy Answers.* Boston: Harvard University Press.

Hermann, P. 2009. "Baltimore Police Twitter a Shooting." *Baltimore Sun* (March 20). Available online: http://weblogs.baltimoresun.com/news/crime/blog/2009/03/baltimore_police_twittered_a_s.html.

Hicks, R., and K. Hicks. 1999. *Boomers, Xers, and Other Strangers.* Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House.

Hite, B. 2008. "Employers Rethink How They Give Feedback: In Response to Young Workers' Demands, Companies Are Beginning to Provide More Detailed Guidance on Job Performance." *Wall Street Journal* (October 13).

Koper, C.S., E. Maguire and G.E. Moore. 2001. *Hiring and Retention Issues in Police Agencies: Readings on the Determinants of Police Strength, Hiring and the Retention of Officers and the Federal COPS Program.* Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.

KRC Research. 2009. "Millennials in Automotive Survey, 2009." Survey prepared for Microsoft by KRC Research. Washington, D.C.: KRC Research.

Martin, A., with P. Willburn, P. Morrow, K. Downing, and C. Criswell. 2007. *What's Next? The 2007 Changing Nature of Leadership Survey.* A CCL Research White Paper. Greensboro, N.C.: Center for Creative Leadership.

Pew Research Center. 2007. *How Young People View Their Lives, Futures, and Politics: A Portrait of Generation Next.* Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center.

Reeves, M., and M. Deimler. 2011. "Adaptability: The New Competitive Advantage." *Harvard Business Review* (July-August): 135-141.

Rein, L. 2010. "Next Gen Finds Its Place in Federal Workforce." *Washington Post* (August 7): A1-A4.

Rogler, L.H. 2002. "Historical Generations and Psychology." *American Psychologist* 57 (12): 1013-1023.

Rozas, A. 2008. "Random Alcohol Testing Proposed for Chicago Police Officers Who Fire Their Weapons." *Chicago Tribune* (June 14).

Scrivner, E. 2005. *Innovations in Police Recruitment and Hiring.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Scrivner, E. 2008. *Public Safety Leadership Development: A 21st Century Imperative*. New York: John Jay College of Criminal Justice.

Scrivner, E. 2010. *Practitioner Perspectives: Community Policing in a Democracy,* ed. A.A. Pearsall and J.E. Beres. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Senge, P., B. Smith, N. Kruschwitz, J. Laur and S. Schley. 2008. *The Necessary Revolution*. New York: Broadway Books.

Sklansky, D.A. 2011. *The Persistent Pull of Police Professionalism*. New Perspectives in Policing Bulletin. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. NCJ 232676.

Sparrow, M. 2011. *Governing Science*. New Perspectives in Policing Bulletin. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. NCJ 232179.

Stone, C., and J. Travis. 2011. *Toward a New Professionalism in Policing*. New Perspectives in Policing Bulletin. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. NCJ 232359.

Sullivan, B. 2004. "Police Supervision in the 21st Century: Can Traditional Work Standards and the Contemporary Employee Coexist?" *Police Chief* 71 (10) (October).

Tulgan, B. 2000. *Managing Generation X*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Weisburd, D., and P. Neyroud. 2011. *Police Science: Toward a New Paradigm*. New Perspectives in Policing Bulletin. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. NCJ 228922.

Author Note

Anthony W. Batts, D.P.A., is a research fellow with the Harvard Kennedy School of Government and former Chief of Police, Long Beach and Oakland, Calif. Sean Michael Smoot is Director and Chief Legal Counsel, Police Benevolent and Protective Association of Illinois. Ellen Scrivner is National High-Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Director, Office of State, Local, and Tribal Affairs, Office of National Drug Control Policy, and former Deputy Director, National Institute of Justice.

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

Washington, DC 20531

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use $300

PRESORTED STANDARD
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOJ/NIJ
PERMIT NO. G–91

MAILING LABEL AREA
(5" x 2") DO NOT PRINT THIS
AREA (INK NOR VARNISH)

Members of the Executive Session on Policing and Public Safety

Chief Anthony Batts, Oakland Police Department

Professor David Bayley, Distinguished Professor, School of Criminal Justice, State University of New York at Albany

Dr. Anthony Braga, Senior Research Associate, Lecturer in Public Policy, Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University

Chief William J. Bratton, Los Angeles Police Department

Chief Ella Bully-Cummings, Detroit Police Department (retired)

Ms. Christine Cole (Facilitator), Executive Director, Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University

Commissioner Edward Davis, Boston Police Department

Chief Ronald Davis, East Palo Alto Police Department

Chief Edward Flynn, Milwaukee Police Department

Colonel Rick Fuentes, Superintendent, New Jersey State Police

Chief George Gascón, San Francisco Police Department

Mr. Gil Kerlikowske, Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy

Chief Cathy Lanier, Washington, D.C. Metropolitan Police Department

Dr. John H. Laub, Director, National Institute of Justice

Ms. Adrian Nicole LeBlanc, Visiting Scholar, New York University

Professor Tracey Meares, Walton Hale Hamilton Professor of Law, Yale Law School

Chief Constable Peter Neyroud, Chief Executive, National Policing Improvement Agency (U.K.)

Ms. Christine Nixon, Chair, Victorian Bushfire Reconstruction and Recovery Authority (Australia)

Chief Richard Pennington, Atlanta Police Department

Mayor Jerry Sanders, City of San Diego

Professor David Sklansky, Professor of Law, Faculty Co-Chair of the Berkeley Center for Criminal Justice, University of California, Berkeley, School of Law

Mr. Sean Smoot, Director and Chief Legal Counsel, Police Benevolent and Protective Association of Illinois

Professor Malcolm Sparrow, Professor of Practice of Public Management, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University

Chief Darrel Stephens, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department (retired)

Professor Christopher Stone, Guggenheim Professor of the Practice of Criminal Justice, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University

Mr. Jeremy Travis, President, John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Mr. Rick VanHouten, President, Fort Worth Police Association

Professor David Weisburd, Walter E. Meyer Professor of Law and Criminal Justice; Director, Institute of Criminology, Faculty of Law, The Hebrew University; and Distinguished Professor, Department of Criminology, Law and Society, George Mason University

Dr. Chuck Wexler, Executive Director, Police Executive Research Forum

Learn more about the Executive Session at:

NIJ's website: http://www.nij.gov/topics/law-enforcement/administration/executive-sessions/welcome.htm
Harvard's website: http://www.hks.harvard.edu/criminaljustice/executive_sessions/policing.htm

NCJ 238338