

1-1-2000

# Meaningful and Effective Performance Evaluations in a Time of Community Policing

Meghan S. Stroshine

Marquette University, [meghan.stroshine@marquette.edu](mailto:meghan.stroshine@marquette.edu)

---

Published Version. *Journal of Community Policing*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (2000): 7-24. [Publisher link](#). © 2000  
Oklahoma Regional Community Policing Institute.

Meghan Stroshine was affiliated with Michigan State University at the time of publication.

# MEANINGFUL AND EFFECTIVE PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS IN A TIME OF COMMUNITY POLICING

Meghan S. Chandek, M.S.

## ABSTRACT

*It is well recognized that the success of community-policing initiatives may be dependent on a variety of organizational changes, such as decentralization, increased officer autonomy and discretion, and permanent or stable geographic assignments. What is equally important, yet often overlooked, is the importance of a revised performance evaluation system that reflects the work to be performed in a community policing atmosphere. In a community policing context, performance evaluations do far more than simply evaluate police behavior; they serve as important vehicles for increasing awareness and understanding, conveying organizational expectations, and rewarding behavior concordant with a broadened police role (Oettmeier & Wycoff 1997). This manuscript suggests a step-by-step process for administrators interested in devising an evaluation system that will accomplish these goals.*

## INTRODUCTION

Community policing entails a fundamental change in the roles and responsibilities of the police. Police are no longer mere "crime-fighters;" instead, police are alternately "problem-solvers," community organizers, coordinators, planners, and mediators. This more-inclusive or enhanced police role is designed to facilitate the

accomplishment of several goals: preventing crime and disorder, reducing fear of crime, improving a community's quality of life, among others. Several organizational changes are touted as critical to the success of community policing and the accomplishment of its goals: increased autonomy and discretion, and decentralization, to name a few. Equally important, but often overlooked, is a

performance evaluation system that supports the role changes inherent in the shift to community policing.

In order to learn more about performance evaluations utilized by departments practicing community policing, Michigan State University's (MSU) Regional Community Policing Institute (RCPI) surveyed several police departments across the country. At the time of this study, all departments surveyed had changed their evaluation systems to reflect the broadened police role associated with a new way of doing policing. Using information gleaned from these departments, this manuscript will outline some key changes that must occur if police departments are to develop meaningful and effective performance evaluations of police officers.

### THE NEED FOR NEW PERFORMANCE MEASURES IN AN ERA OF COMMUNITY POLICING

Measures of police performance have been in need of revision for quite some time. For decades, the police have relied on quantitative measures to assess police effectiveness. These measures, often referred to as "hard" performance indicators (Bayley 1994), are those behaviors or activities that are easily counted, such as arrest rates, clearance

rates, and response times. Despite their popularity and extensive use, these measures have been criticized on several grounds: they place undue emphasis on the "bottom-line," thereby encouraging "policing for and by the numbers" (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux 1992), measure outcomes largely out of the control of the police (e.g., crime rates) (Allen & Maxfield 1983), make outcomes (e.g., arrests) "ends" in and of themselves (Wilson & Kelling 1989), and fail to capture the work the police really do (Oettmeier & Wycoff 1997).

Perhaps the most noteworthy criticism is that, since the majority of current evaluation systems only recognize and reward behaviors related to the crime control mandate of the police, these are the behaviors encouraged in officers. By the same token, behaviors not measured in traditional performance assessments, such as problem-solving or developing ties with the community, are discouraged (or even penalized). This is particularly problematic for departments operating under a community policing paradigm, as it discourages the very behaviors community policing intends to promote. If police departments desire police officers to perform the work associated with a new philosophy of policing, then it is imperative that officers are evaluated on that basis. In the absence of an evaluation and

reward system that encourages community policing behaviors, community-oriented programs are likely to fail (Butler 1976; Manning 1989). The following section of this manuscript suggests a step-by-step process to devise an evaluation system that will encourage the behaviors desired in community policing officers.

### STEPS TO REVISING POLICE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEMS

#### Step One: Decide On the Purpose(s) of Evaluation

One of the first decisions that police administrators must make is to decide the purpose(s) to be served by an evaluation system, as the purpose(s) will ultimately dictate both what and how behavior is measured (Oettmeier & Wycoff 1996). Performance evaluations are typically viewed as an administrative tool; however there are many other possible purposes, including guidance and counseling, and research, as suggested by Mastrofski and Wadman (1991) Oettmeier and Wycoff (1997) offer three additional purposes particularly relevant in a community policing context—socialization, documentation, and system improvement.

These purposes of evaluation are not exhaustive, nor will they be the same for every department. What

is universal, however, is the need to achieve consensus regarding the purpose(s) among those who will be affected by a new performance evaluation system. A consensus among officers, mid-level managers, and administrators is crucial to the success of a revised evaluation system, and is necessary before moving to the next step—identifying performance criteria.

#### Step Two: Identify Performance Criteria

As stated earlier, traditional measures of police performance do not capture the entirety of the community policing officer's role. As a result, it is crucial that new performance evaluations more accurately reflect the work performed by police or, more importantly, the work desired by police administrators. Alpert and Dunham (1989) argue that if performance evaluations are to receive the support of officers, then they must reflect the mission and role of the police. A department might determine the work performed by officers (or that desired by administrators) in any one of several ways.

One means of assessing the work police perform (and, by extension, identifying performance criteria) is a job analysis. A job analysis entails the identification of tasks typically performed by an employee. Some of the tasks

regularly performed by community policing officers might include "learns the characteristics of beat, area residents, and business owners," "identifies area problems," or "devises means of dealing with problems."

After identifying tasks regularly performed, it is necessary to identify activities that might be performed to accomplish the relevant tasks. For example, activities for the task "Identifies area problems" might include attending community meetings, analyzing crime data, and contacting area residents and business owners (Oettmeier & Wycoff 1997).

There are no set "rules" regarding how a job analysis should be performed. Approaches for identifying tasks and activities include, but are not limited to: requiring officers to keep diaries or logs of work performed, appointing individuals to observe officers and the work they perform, or obtaining the assistance of a third party (e.g., consultant, researchers). It is not necessary to limit the sources from which this information is gathered, so long as it is accurate and reliable.

While a job analysis is a practical and effective means of identifying performance criteria, it is limited in one important respect: it assumes officers are already performing in the desired manner. This would clearly not be the case

for a department just beginning to implement community policing. When officers are not yet performing in the manner desired by administrators, it may be necessary to develop an entirely new set of performance criteria for officers; in essence, to "start from scratch."

Oettmeier & Wycoff (1997) outline the process used by a department making the shift to a community policing-based philosophy of policing to develop a new set of performance criteria. Police administrators created a task force (consisting of eleven patrol officers, an investigator, and two sergeants) responsible for developing a set of performance criteria that would reflect the values and goals of the department's "vision" of community policing. The task force met regularly over a period of six months. During this time, task force members made several site visits to police departments across the country to observe and learn about their approaches to community policing, particularly the work performed by officers. Drawing on the experiences of these departments, the task force developed a list of tasks, roles, and skills that were to be performed by community policing officers in their department.

While the aforementioned options are valuable means of collecting information on the work police perform, it can and should be augmented by other data sources,

such as the feedback of community residents. Citizens are not only capable of providing feedback regarding police performance in particular neighborhoods, but also of specifying the type of police services they expect or want. This information may be obtained in a variety of ways—by attending community meetings, conducting formal surveys, or through informal discussions with area leaders.

For example, one of the departments surveyed in this study conducted door-to-door surveys to assess citizen perceptions and prioritization of problems, solicit feedback on how to handle those problems, and introduce officers to the communities they serve. This may be a popular tactic, with other departments across the country (e.g., Newark, NJ, and Grand Rapids, MI) conducting similar surveys to learn the preferences and needs of community members (Oettmeier & Wycoff 1997). Other departments involved in this study took a less formal approach, using community meetings as a chance to solicit citizen input. No matter what the strategy employed for gaining citizen feedback, citizens can be a solid source of information regarding both what the police do, and what a particular community expects their police to do.

### Step Three: Define "Effective" Behavior

Once performance criteria have been identified, it is necessary to define what will constitute "effective" police performance. This is perhaps the greatest challenge in developing or revising a performance evaluation system in an era of community policing. For example, what will constitute effective problem-solving—a decrease in the frequency or seriousness of incidents a problem creates, or the total eradication of a problem (Goldstein 1990)? What will constitute effective community partnerships—the number of relationships, or the quality of relationships?

This is a challenge with no easy solution, and it is ultimately the responsibility of each department to define "effectiveness." However, some have suggested that a definition of "effectiveness" requires realistic expectations regarding what the police are capable of achieving, a consideration of the interests to be served, an understanding of the short- and long-term impact of certain activities, and the goals of the department (Goldstein 1990; Oettmeier & Wycoff 1996). In this respect, it may again be necessary to call upon several constituencies—in this case, to learn what "effective" policing in a time of community policing means to different groups.

Depending on the form (e.g., department-wide, unit-based) and

emphasis (e.g., problem-solving, developing ties with community) of community policing in a department, "effectiveness" may be defined in many different ways. Consequently, it is critical that police administrators, particularly those who have defined the department's "vision" of community policing, be intimately involved in this process. Administrators must ensure that the mission, goals, and values of the department are effectively manifested in the behavior of officers on the street.

It may be advantageous to obtain the assistance of police officers and supervisors in the task of defining effectiveness. If a definition of "effectiveness" is dependent, at least in part, on realistic expectations of what police can accomplish and the short- and long-term impact of activities, then police officers and their supervisors are a logical source of such information. To be sure, there may be no one in a better position to inform administrators of what police are capable of achieving, and the foreseeable consequences (both short- and long-term) of particular activities. Further, it is recognized that involving officers in the implementation of community policing may well be important to its success (Alpert & Dunham 1989). Thus, engaging officers in the process of defining "effectiveness" provides administrators with an excellent occasion to make officers feel

"involved" and a part of the process.

Finally, police administrators may again want to consider obtaining the input of the community. In fact, gaining citizen input might be viewed here as mandatory rather than optional, given the "consumer" approach advocated in community policing. As the recipients of police service, it is reasonable to assume that citizens have clear expectations of that service and the manner in which it is delivered (Parks 1984; Percy 1986). As such, citizens may play a valuable role in defining what constitutes "effective" police performance.

#### Step Four: Decide Who Should Be Evaluated

Traditional performance measures have measured individual police officer performance with the assumption that officers work alone. While this may have been the case in the past, this assumption is being challenged as community policing evolves. Today, several officers and supervisors may be held jointly responsible for a particular geographic area or beat, and therefore may be expected to work as a "team" to solve problems in that area or beat. When designing performance measures, police administrators need to consider the extent to which officers are working in teams or groups.



Depending on the nature of work relationships, it may be appropriate to evaluate teams or work groups in addition to, or in place of, evaluating individual officers. If it is desirable to evaluate teams or work groups, police administrators need to consider whether to develop performance criteria more befitting these larger "units of analysis" (Oettmeier & Wycoff 1997).

One of the departments examined in this study evaluates work group performance as a supplement to officer performance evaluations. In this department, a "work group" is comprised of all individuals responsible for a given geographic region, regardless of shift or rank. Interestingly, the work group evaluation used by this department is a self assessment, and involves two evaluative components. First, all work group members assess the progress the group (as a whole) is making toward its stated goals and objectives. Second, work group members rate their own performance in relation to the group—providing an indication of how their performance might be improved to further the attainment of the group's goals and objectives. Performance evaluations used in this manner can serve to facilitate teamwork, foster a sense of "ownership" of an area, and encourage officer and work group growth through continual self-evaluation.

### Step Five: Decide Who Will Participate in the Evaluation Process

A single performance indicator that captures the totality of the work performed by police does not exist. Not surprisingly, then, many have argued for a multiple-indicator approach to evaluation (Ostrom 1973; Parks 1975; Reisig 1999). This is all the more important in an era of community policing, when police are expected to serve multiple constituencies who may possess a multiplicity of expectations and therefore evaluate police performance differently. Further, due to the varied nature of work assignments in community policing, a "one size fits all" approach has ceased to be a realistic approach to performance evaluation. Rather, it is quite likely that performance indicators will not apply equally to all officers, and that the measures used will need to vary across time and space.

Oettmeier and Wycoff (1997) suggest that many different constituencies may provide input to the evaluation of community policing officers. Of course, as with traditional performance systems, supervisors should likely remain the primary source of evaluation. However, the traditional span of control for supervisors (i.e., 8-12 officers) may need to be reduced, because it is often the case that supervisory roles and



responsibilities change under community policing. For example, to render more accurate evaluations of subordinates, it is often necessary that police supervisors become much more attuned to the areas that his or her officers patrol, problems in those areas, and what officers are doing to remedy those problems (Oettmeier & Wycoff 1996).

In addition, due to the short-term and dynamic nature of the responsibilities of officers practicing community policing (e.g., problem-solving), many departments have decided that it is necessary to conduct more frequent performance evaluations of officers. This was the case for two of the departments surveyed—one conducts performance evaluations every six months, and the other assesses police performance every three months.

Citizens are another obvious source of evaluative information (Mastrofski 1984; Parks 1984; Percy 1986; Stephens 1996). As "consumers" of police services, they may be in the best position of all to provide feedback regarding police performance. Police supervisors may utilize citizen feedback to evaluate many aspects of officer performance, such as officer attendance at community meetings, contacts with citizens, the nature of those contacts, and success in solving neighborhood problems. Evaluations solicited

from citizens can be either formal or informal. Typically, citizen feedback is used informally, as a means of providing supervisors with greater knowledge of an officer's work. For example, in one of the departments we studied, supervisors and senior police officers meet with community residents on a monthly basis. These meetings are used as an opportunity to learn how officers are handling problems, whether citizens are satisfied with police service and how officer performance might be improved. However, departments may also use citizen feedback in a more formal fashion; some departments evaluate citizen satisfaction with the police through the use of brief postcards, questionnaires, and even scientific surveys (Stephens 1996). One of the departments involved in this study includes letters from area residents and business owners in officers' performance files.

As a complement to supervisor evaluations, Oettmeier and Wycoff (1997) also suggest allowing individual officers to evaluate themselves. It is not realistic to assume that police supervisors will possess all the requisite knowledge to render informed evaluations. By providing officers with the opportunity to contribute to their own evaluations, supervisors may obtain information that they would not have learned otherwise. One of the departments in this study has had

success with this method. In this case, supervisors use officer self-assessments as an additional data source to conduct evaluations of officers. Supervisors in this department are responsible for eight to twelve officers, who are often spread across several shifts. As a result, supervisors often lack first-hand knowledge of an individual officer's performance. Using officer self-assessments allows officers to "showcase" their performance, thereby informing their supervisors of activities of which they may not have otherwise been aware. In addition, this method allows supervisors to obtain candid feedback on that area (or those areas) where an officer feels he or she needs improvement.

Finally, another evaluation strategy worth considering is 360-degree feedback, which has been widely implemented in the corporate arena. The key to 360-degree feedback is that individuals below, equal to, or higher in rank provide evaluations of an employee's performance. The underlying rationale is that managers (or supervisors) only see limited "snapshots" of subordinate performance. By involving more individuals in the evaluation process, it is more likely to obtain accurate assessments of employee performance.

This system has a distinct advantage for police agencies operating with a community

policing philosophy. If police departments were to utilize 360-degree feedback, police officers would provide performance evaluations of their supervisors. This would provide the department with an important opportunity to learn how officers are (or are not) being supported in their community policing endeavors by their supervisors, and by extension, the department at large. More specifically, supervisors can learn the types of resources and support officers need to perform effectively in a community policing context.

This method was unsuccessfully implemented by one of the departments we examined in this study. The experience of this department offers valuable insight into the difficulties associated with 360 degree feedback. This police department stopped using 360-degree feedback after supervisors became frustrated with the lack of honest officer feedback—according to one official, there were "too many glowing comments." Officers were apparently afraid to offer honest assessments of their supervisors. However, this problem is not insoluble, as demonstrated by the experiences of another department we studied. In this department, officer evaluations of supervisor performance are anonymous. This department has enjoyed great success with this method, and one official suggested that the feature of anonymity appears to have

been the key to its success. Officer feedback has been used to ensure that officers are receiving the support and resources needed to perform effectively.

#### Step Six: Develop or Revise Instrumentation and Rating Scales

The final step involved in developing or revising a performance evaluation system is the development or revision of performance evaluation instruments and rating scales. Perhaps the most challenging feat in this step is determining how to "measure" particular behaviors. This concern is particularly applicable to departments engaging in community policing, as much of the work performed by police is of a qualitative nature and therefore not easily reduced to numbers.

However, an example might offer some direction in this regard. Figure 5 depicts ways in which police departments might quantify some rather common community policing "behaviors," such as communications and innovation. As Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1992) demonstrate, it is possible to evaluate a community policing officer's behavior in a numerical fashion—by counting the number of events attended, the length of time spent on particular projects, etc.

Although this example provides

some guidance, it fails to rectify the problem of evaluating the quality of particular activities or behaviors. This is not a new problem; researchers have long lamented the difficulty in trying to "quantify quality" (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux 1992). In this regard, we offer an excerpt of a community policing officer performance evaluation obtained from one of the police departments in this study. This evaluation employs a 5-point scale, which ranges from "substantially below expectations" to "substantially exceeds expectations." Several performance criteria often associated with community policing are shown here: quality of work, knowledge of work, initiative and enthusiasm, and relationships with others. All of these performance criteria may be considered to possess a rather qualitative component, yet this department has devised a means of capturing that behavior in a numerical fashion. For ease of use, supervisors are provided with a "translation" of the 5-point scale for each criterion. An officer's final score is an "average" of the many different criteria upon which he or she is graded. Each criterion is weighted the same.

This was not the case in another department surveyed. The

performance evaluation system used by this department weighted criteria thought to be directly related to the community policing philosophy (e.g., problem-solving, relationships with public) more heavily than other criteria (e.g., attendance). By placing greater "weight" on these behaviors, the performance evaluation system serves to encourage (and reward) officers who engage in community policing behaviors.

### CONCLUSION

Revising any performance appraisal system is a challenging task, plagued with technical and practical difficulties. This is certainly the case for police administrators interested in revising police performance evaluations. However, in a community policing context, performance evaluations do far more than simply evaluate police behavior; they serve as important vehicles for increasing awareness and understanding, conveying organizational expectations, and rewarding behavior concordant with the broadened police role inherent in community policing. In this way, altering police performance measures may well be critical to the success of community policing.

### ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Meghan S. Chandek, M.S.  
Michigan State University  
School of Criminal Justice  
560 Baker Hall East Lansing,

Michigan 48824-1118 Meghan Stroshine Chandek is a doctoral student in the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University. She has been involved with several studies involving citizen perceptions of the police, and has published in this area. Her current research interests include evaluations of the police, community policing, first-line police supervision, and domestic violence.

### REFERENCES

- Allen, D.N., & Maxfield, M.G., Judging police performance: Views and behavior of patrol officers. In R.R. Bennett (Ed.), *Police at work: Policy issues and analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1983.
- Alpert, G.P., & Dunham, R.G., Community Policing. In R.G. Dunham & G.P. Alpert (Eds.), *Critical issues in policing: Contemporary readings*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1989.
- Bayley, D.H., *Police for the Future*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Butler, A.J.P., *A Study of the Occupation Perceptions of Police Officers*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Faculty of Law, University of Birmingham, 1979.
- Goldstein, H., *Problem-Oriented Policing*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1990.

Manning, P.K., Community Policing. In R.G. Dunham and G.P. Alpert (Eds.), *Critical issues in policing: Contemporary readings*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1989.

Mastrofski, S.D., Surveying clients to assess police performance: Focusing on the police-citizen encounter. In G.P. Whitaker (Ed.), *Understanding Police Agency Performance*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, 1984.

Mastrofski, S.D., & Wadman, R.C., Personnel and agency performance measurement. In W. A. Geller (Ed.), *Local Government Police Management*. Washington, D.C.: International City Management Association, 1991.

Oettmeier, T.N., & Wycoff, M., *Personnel performance evaluations in the community policing context*. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum, 1997.

Oettmeier, T.N., & Wycoff, M., Police performance in the nineties: Practitioner perspectives. In G.W. Corder and D.J. Kenney (Eds.), *Managing Police Organizations*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson, 1996.

Ostrom, E., On the meaning and measurement of output and efficiency in the provision of urban police services." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 1, 93-112, 1973.

Parks, R.B., Sources and limitations of data in criminal justice

research. In J.A. Gardiner & M.A. Mulkey (Eds.), *Crime and criminal justice*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1975.

Parks, R.B., Citizen surveys for police performance assessment: Some issues in their use. In G.P. Whitaker (Ed.), *Understanding police agency performance*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, 1984.

Percy, S.L., In defense of citizen evaluations as performance measures. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 22(1), 66-83, 1986.

Reisig, M.D., *Measuring performance in the era of community policing*. East Lansing, MI: Regional Community Policing Institute, 1999.

Stephens, D. W., Community problem-oriented policing: Measuring impacts. In L.T. Hoover (Ed.), *Quantifying quality*. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum, 1996.

Trojanowicz, R.C., & Bucqueroux, B., *Toward development of meaningful and effective performance evaluations*. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Community Policing, Michigan State University, 1992.

Wilson, J.Q., & Kelling, G.L., Broken windows. In R.G. Dunham & G.P. Alpert (Eds.), *Critical issues in policing: Contemporary readings*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1989.

## Figure 1: Purposes of Performance Measurement

**Administration** - to help managers make decisions about promotion, demotion, reward, discipline, training needs, salary, job assignment, retention and termination.

**Guidance and Counseling** - to help supervisors provide feedback to subordinates and assist them in career planning and preparation, and to improve employee motivation.

**Research** - to validate selection and screening tests and training evaluations, and to assess the effectiveness of interventions designed to improve individual performance.

**Socialization** - to convey expectations to personnel about both the content and style of their performance, and to reinforce other means of organizational communication about the mission and values of the department.

**Documentation** - to record the types of problems and situations officers are addressing in their neighborhoods and the approaches they take to them. Such documentation provides for data-based analysis of the types of resources and other managerial support needed to address problems and allows officers the opportunity to have their efforts recognized.

**System Improvement** - to identify organizational conditions that may impede improved performance and to solicit ideas for changing the conditions.

Source: Oettmeier, T.N., & Wycoff, M. (1997). *Personnel performance evaluations in the community policing context*. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum, p. 12.

## Figure 2: Sample Tasks and Activities

1. Learn characteristics of area, residents, businesses
  - a. Study beat books
  - b. Analyze crime and calls-for-service data
  - c. Drive, walk area and make notes
  - d. Talk with community representatives
  - e. Conduct area surveys
  - f. Maintain area/suspect logs
  - g. Read area papers (e.g. "shopper" papers)
  - h. Discuss area with citizens when answering calls
  - i. Talk with private security personnel in area
  - j. Talk with area business owners/managers
  
2. Become acquainted with leaders in area
  - a. Attend community meetings, including service club meetings
  - b. Ask questions in survey about who formal and informal area leaders are
  - c. Ask area leaders for names of other leaders
  
3. Make residents aware of who officer is and what s/he is trying to accomplish in area
  - a. Initiate citizen contacts
  - b. Distribute business cards
  - c. Discuss purpose at community meeting
  - d. Discuss purpose when answering calls
  - e. Write article for local paper
  - f. Contact home-bound elderly
  - g. Encourage citizens to contact officer directly

Source: Oettmeier, T.N., & Wycoff A (1997). *Personnel performance evaluations the community policing context*. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum, p. 22



### Figure 3. Defining Effectiveness

#### Initiative and Enthusiasm

Maintains an enthusiastic, self-reliant, and self-starting approach to meet job responsibilities and accountabilities. Strives to anticipate work to be done and initiates proper and acceptable direction for the completion of work with a minimum of supervision and instruction.

#### Relationships with Others

Shares knowledge with supervisors and staff for mutual and Department benefit. Contributes to maintaining high morale among all employees. Develops and maintains cooperative and courteous relationships with employees and managers in other divisions, representatives from organizations, and the public so as to maintain goodwill toward the Police Department and to project a good public image. Tactfully and effectively handles requests, suggestions, and complaints. Emphasizes the importance of maintaining a positive image. Interacts effectively with higher management, professionals, and the public.

## Figure 4: Quantifiable Community Policing Activities

### Communications

*Community meetings* - How many, what kind, number of people in attendance. Did officer attend, organize, or both?

*Newsletter* - Size, frequency, number of readers.

*Organizing* - Number and type of block/watch groups formed; monthly and annual trends; number of other kinds of groups and project forms number of participants, \* time spent.

*Speeches* - Number, kind of group, size of audience, time spent.

*Home and business visits* - Number, type, time spent.

*Personal contacts* (on the street, drop-ins at office) - Number, type, time spent.

### Social Disorder

Number and types of individual efforts undertaken by the officer aimed at problems of social disorder.

Number and type of group projects aimed at the problems of social disorder; number of people involved, demographics of participants (race, income, etc.); participation of youth, area businesses; public agencies (Social Services, etc.), non-profit groups (Salvation Army, etc.).

### Referrals

Number and type of referrals; number and types of agencies involved number of referrals per agency.

### Innovation

Documentable incidents where the Community Officer has demonstrated an imaginative approach toward problem solving, through new projects, new use of technology, etc.

List specific proactive initiatives: educational, athletic, and social activities for youth and families, etc.

Source: Trojanowicz, R.C., & Bucqueroux, B. (1982). *Toward development of meaningful and effective performance evaluations*. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Community Policing, pp.25-27.

Figure 5: Sample Community Policing Officer Performance Evaluation

Rating Scale:

(1) Substantially Below Exceeds Expectations	(2) Below Expectations	(3) Meets Expectations	(4) Exceeds Expectations	(5) Substantially Expectations
--	------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------

Quality of Work

*Meets quality goals/standards - Goals or end results are met and the standards for quality are met*

- (1) Seldom does work that meets goals/standards.
- (2) Inconsistently does work that meets goals/standards.
- (3) Usually does work that meets goals/standards.
- (4) Rarely does work that does not meet goals/standards.
- (5) Always does work that meets goals/standards.

Knowledge of Work

*Interpersonal - Knows how to work with others, knows who to work with and what information to share.*

- (1) Shows little understanding of interpersonal requirements of job.
- (2) Shows moderate understanding of interpersonal requirements of job.
- (3) Shows good understanding of interpersonal requirements of job.
- (4) Shows exceptional understanding of interpersonal requirements of job.
- (5) Shows expert understanding of interpersonal requirements of job.

Initiative and Enthusiasm

*Enthusiasm - Shows interest in work; does not complain about work*

- (1) Seldom approaches work with enthusiasm.
- (2) Occasionally approaches work with enthusiasm.
- (3) Usually approaches work with enthusiasm.
- (4) Rarely approaches work without enthusiasm.
- (5) Never approaches work without enthusiasm.

Relationships with Others

*Customers/Public - Shares information; exercises appropriate public relations; provides quality service.*

- (1) Works with and communications poorly with customers/external parties
- (2) Works with and communicates fairly well with customers/external parties
- (3) Works with and communications well with customers/external parties
- (4) Works with and communicates exceptionally well with customers/external parties
- (5) Serves as a model for working and communicating with customers/external parties

NOTE: Each broad category (e.g., Initiative and Enthusiasm; Relationships with Others) is accompanied by a space for supervisors to provide comments on: a) justification for the rating and b) goals for improvement.

## Figure 6: Benefits of a New Performance Evaluation System

- Enhance officers' and supervisors' knowledge of community policing;
- Clarify officers' and supervisors' perceptions of their respective behavior under community policing;
- Redefine productivity requirements to include changes in the type, amount, and quality of work to be performed;
- Build consensus between and among officers and supervisors regarding each other's work responsibilities;
- Improve officers' levels of job satisfaction with department operations, and
- Measure citizen's perceptions of the way in which police deliver service to the community.

Source: Oettmeier, T.N., & Wycoff & A (1997). *Personnel performance evaluations in the community policing context*. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum, p.21.