

COMMUNITY POLICING: **EVALUATION PROGRAMS**

May 2005

By

David H. Bayley
Distinguished Professor
State University of New York at Albany

For the Civilian Police Division,
Department of Peacekeeping Operations, United Nations.

(This document may not be published, copied, quoted or
used in any way without the permission of the United
Nations)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. The Importance of Evaluation
3. Principles of Evaluation
4. Program for Evaluating the U.N.'s Community Policing Activities
5. Program for Evaluating the Institutional Impact of Community Policing on Local Police
6. Program for Evaluating the Success of Community Policing in Local Communities
7. Simplifying Evaluation

Further Reading

INTRODUCTION

This manual provides guidance for evaluating the United Nations' programs promoting community policing in peacekeeping contexts. The evaluation programs presented here address three questions:

(1) How well has UNCIVPOL implemented its community policing programs?

(2) How successful have local police been in incorporating UN-sponsored community policing into their operational programs?

(3) How successful has UN-sponsored community policing been locally in improving crime control and prevention and in improving relations between police and the public?

The manual also discusses the importance of undertaking evaluations and recommends several principles for constructing them. It concludes with a short discussion about minimizing the costs of evaluation without sacrificing rigor.

THE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION

It is important to evaluate public policies, such as the UN's encouragement of community policing, for several reasons.

(1) Evaluation shows whether investments of time, money, and effort are achieving desired results?

(2) Such demonstrations are important in order to persuade stakeholders as well as participants to continue to support new and innovative programs.

(3) Evaluation provides information for improving the administration of programs, allowing them to be adjusted so that their chances of succeeding improve.

(4) Evaluation is the basis for learning what works and what doesn't. It is the means by which "best practices" are discovered, so that planning for similar ventures in the future can be done more expertly. Without evaluation, the experience of the past is wasted.

PRINCIPLES OF EVALUATION

Although the benefits of evaluation are generally recognized, they are not commonly undertaken in governmental organizations. One reason is the defensiveness of program managers. They fear that results may be disappointing and their programs put at risk. Another reason is that evaluation seems intellectually complex and difficult. This concern is mistaken. Constructing a program of evaluation is largely a matter of common sense. Here are several principles for developing effective, reliable, and consumer-friendly programs of evaluation.

(1) The choice of criteria for judging the success of any program should be based on the goals of the program to be evaluated. Meaningful evaluation begins with clarification of the goals that planners hope to achieve. Choosing evaluation criteria is not a technical matter that can be delegated to experts. In the case of community policing, the goals for UNCIVPOL will be the development of its four basic strategies - responsiveness, consultation, mobilization, problem-solving - in the operational practices of foreign police. For foreign police, the goals will be improving crime control and prevention through collaboration with a willing public.

(2) Evaluation should focus on what programs achieve (outcomes) rather on what they do (outputs). Although programmatic activity must be carefully charted, described, and measured so that corrections can be made in delivery, activity is not an end in itself. Success should be measured in terms of what programs achieve rather than how much money has been spent, people deployed, locals trained, or equipment provided.

(3) Because goals are often complex and multi-faceted, evaluators should use multiple performance indicators. The more performance criteria the better, provided that each one closely reflects an important aspect of the goal.

(4) Performance criteria should be chosen that appear reasonable as measures of success to the people most involved. In other words, they should make sense to program practitioners and program clients. If they do not, evaluation will lose credibility, and thus its ability to influence the implementation of programs.

(5) Performance criteria should be as simple and easy to understand as possible. Avoid measures that require a great deal of expert interpretation. Complexity is not a virtue.

(6) Evaluations should not be undertaken before programs have had a chance to succeed. Premature evaluation

is a wasted exercise and does a disservice to the programs being evaluated.

(7) Evaluations should not be undertaken as an afterthought when programs are already in the field. Planning for them should be a part of program development, so that requirements for information can be foreseen and provision made for documentation during implementation. When this is not done, essential information is often found to be unavailable.

**PROGRAM FOR EVALUATING THE DELIVERY OF THE
UN'S COMMUNITY POLICING PROGRAMS**

Three programs for evaluating the UN's efforts to develop community police are presented here. Each one represents a different level of implementation activity, and hence a different set of goals.

(1) Evaluation of the delivery of community-policing programs by the Civilian Police Division in peacekeeping missions.

(2) Evaluation of the impact of the UN's community policing programs on local police institutions and practices.

(3) Evaluation of the effect of UN-sponsored community-policing activities by local police on public safety and community relations.

Guidelines for the construction of evaluations for these levels are presented in three charts, each with three columns. Column 1 lists the goals of the program being evaluated; column 2, the performance indicators to be used in determining whether goals have been achieved; and column 3, the sources of information for each performance indicator.

The programs represented in the three charts should not be considered exhaustive. Depending on the context,

other measures may be more appropriate and some of the ones listed here may not be relevant. In particular, as the mandates governing UN actions shift from situation to situation, so too must the performance criteria and sources of information.

In chart 1, guidelines are presented for evaluating the U.N.'s efforts to develop community policing in peacekeeping missions. Referring to the principles of evaluation in the previous section, this is a program for evaluating the "output" of UN community-policing programming, not for measuring its impact. The following two sections address the "outcomes" of UN-sponsored community policing, namely, their impact on local police practices and their consequent effect on public safety and community relations.

Referring to chart 1, the Civilian Police Division promotes community policing through three sorts of activity: training, advising, and providing resources. Because doing each of these well is the initial goal of the UN's community-policing program, they are listed as program goals in column 1.

CHART 1
U.N. Implementation of Community Policing

Goals	Performance Indicators	Sources
1. TRAINING		
(a) CIVPOL personnel		
	Quality of curricula	Curriculum documents
	Quality of delivery	Selective observation
	CIVPOL officers' knowledge of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • doctrine • process of implementation • process of local assessment 	Written tests and interviews with students
(b) Local police at three levels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Induction • Advance • In-service • Force-wide 		
	Quality of curricula	Curriculum documents
	Quality of delivery	Observation
	Officers' understanding of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • doctrine • process of implementation • local assessments needed 	Written tests and oral interviews of students
2. ADVISING		
	Evidence of a written UN-mission plan for advising	Mission documents
	Assignment of responsibility for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • delivery • monitoring of the advising plan 	Same
	Whether the plan for locating advisors reflects "best practices"	Same

	Frequency of interaction between advisors and local officials	Internal reports and selective observation
	Quality of interaction	Self-assessments and selective observation
3. RESOURCING		
	Amount of mission resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • personnel • equipment • material • support services 	Mission documents
	Judgments about the adequacy of mission resources for developing community policing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission documents • External evaluations • Interviews with mission personnel and local officials
	Response of the international community to mission requests for development assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UN documents • Interviews with mission personnel and local officials
	Relevance of resource requests from local police to the goals of community policing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission documents and external evaluations • Interviews with mission personnel

**PROGRAM FOR EVALUATING THE INSTITUTIONAL IMPACT
OF U.N. COMMUNITY-POLICING PROGRAMS ON LOCAL POLICE**

The goals of the UN's program are the institutionalization of the core strategies of community policing in local police. The core strategies are responsiveness, consultation, mobilization, and problem solving. (See UN, Community Policing: The Doctrine) They are listed in column 1 of chart 2. Success, however, does not mean that these strategies are simply tried and then forgotten. It means that they become the customary practices of local policing. That is what is meant by "institutionalization." Because institutionalization is an explicit goal of UN programs and because it requires unique performance indicators, it is listed as a fifth category of goals in column 1.

CHART 2

Institutionalization of Community Policing in Local Police:

Goals	Performance Indicator	Sources of Information
I. Responsiveness		
	% change in telephone requests for service	police statistics
	% change in walk-in requests for service	police statistics
	% change in on-street requests for service	police statistics
	Change in nature of requests for service: increase in minor and non-criminal requests	police statistics
	Quality of telephone reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • public survey • supervisor call-backs • observation
	Quality of reception at police stations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public survey • observation
	Quality of access to police facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • public survey • observation
	% of police officers assigned to uniformed patrol	police documents
II. Consultation		
	Evidence of an inventory of potential consultative groups by the police	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police documents • Public officials and leaders
	Evidence of documentation of the groups police have regular contact with	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police documents • Public officials and leaders
	Frequency of police meetings with consultative groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police documents • Interviews with group leaders
	Number of dedicated police liaison personnel	Police documents
	Inventory of local community crime-prevention programs	Police documents
III. Mobilization		
	Inventory of crime prevention materials prepared	Police documents
	Number and nature of	

	persons/groups receiving crime prevention materials	
	Procurement, distribution, and installation of protection equipment under police guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police documents • Public surveys
	Number and nature of volunteer citizen street patrols	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police documents • Interviews with members
	Number and composition of community crime prevention groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police documents • Interviews with members
	Inventory of crime prevention activities undertaken by community groups with police support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police documents • Interviews with members
	Longevity of community crime prevention groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police documents • Interviews with members
IV. Problem-solving		
	Knowledge of problem-solving process among local police	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written tests • Interviews
	Understanding of police problem-solving among local population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written tests • Interviews
	Number and nature of problems identified and worked	Police documents
	Community evaluation of problem-solving	Public survey
	Evidence of internal system for sharing problem-solving "best practices"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observation • Interviews with police
	Reduction in calls-for-service as a result of problem-solving	Police documents
	Cooperative actions undertaken jointly with other government agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police documents • Interviews with police and other government officials
V. Sustainability of community policing		

locally		
	Demonstrated commitment of senior police leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy directives • Interviews with senior officers
	Demonstrated commitment by government officials and political elites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of formal agreements • Interviews
	% police budget dedicated to community policing	Police documents
	Assignment of command responsibility for community policing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police documents • Interviews
	Presence of strategic plan for the development of community policing	Police documents
	Evidence of a multi-year training program in community policing for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruits • In-service • Civilian employees 	Police documents
	Organizational plan for implementing community policing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police documents • Observation of practice
	Evidence of regular evaluation of community policing programs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • by police • by groups outside the police 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police documents • Interviews
	Development of criteria for performance evaluations of community police officers	Police documents



**PROGRAM FOR EVALUATING THE SUCCESS OF UN-SPONSORED
COMMUNITY POLICING IN LOCAL COMMUNITIES**

The goal of community policing is to encourage the public to assist the police as willing participants in the task of controlling and preventing crime. (UN, COMMUNITY POLICING: THE DOCTRINE) Accordingly, the goals to be evaluated are reductions in crime, especially the sort of crime that police activity can reasonably affect, and the public's fear of crime and sense of security. Because these crime-related goals are to be achieved through changing the orientation of the public toward the police, it is also appropriate to evaluate the public's experience with and attitudes toward the police. Finally, it is important to explore the effect of community policing on the police themselves, especially their morale in the face of change and their perceptions of whether public attitudes toward them have changed. All of these appear in column 1 as goals to be evaluated.

CHART 3

Local Effectiveness of Community Policing

Goals	Performance Indicators	Sources of Information
I. Crime		
	% change serious crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reported crime • Victimization survey
	% change police-preventable crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reported crime • Victimization survey
	% change in crime clearances	Police documents
	Assessments of the reliability of reported crime statistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with police • External assessments
II. Fear of Crime		
	Public's sense of security: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at home • in the neighborhood • at work • traveling • in public places 	Public survey
	Perception of the orderliness of the environment: are things in control?	Public survey
	Vitality of local business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sales statistics • Survey of business people • Business start-ups • Selected interviews
	Sense of security among selected stakeholders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • business owners • media 	Targeted surveys

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> representatives • medical personnel • social service providers 	
	Public's assessment of public safety in the future	Public survey
	Changes in local property values	Government documents
	% changes in insurance rates	Insurance companies
III. Public attitudes toward police		
	Confidence in the police	Public survey
	Respect for the police	Public survey
	Assessment of the prevalence of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • corruption • brutality 	Public survey
IV. Public interaction with police		
	Willingness to contact the police	Public survey
	Public satisfaction with treatment received in contacts with the police	Public survey
	Victim's satisfaction with police response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public survey • Call-backs by police supervisors to victims
	Public's willingness to work with the police in crime-prevention programs	Public survey
	Willingness to work cooperatively with police in local crime prevention activities	Public survey
	Satisfaction with consultative process	Survey of public participants in

	<p>with police:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did police listen? • Did police incorporate community suggestions into local policing plans? 	consultative groups
V. Police Attitudes		
	Change in morale of police officers	Police survey
	Changes in police perception of the public's respect for them	Police survey
	Attitudes toward community policing	Police survey
	Perception of changes in police knowledge of local communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police survey • Observation
	Perception of changes in useful criminal intelligence coming from the public	Interviews with criminal investigation personnel
	Morale of designated community police officers	Police survey

SIMPLIFYING EVALUATION

Collecting the sort of information described in the three evaluation programs can be costly, time consuming, and complicated. Moreover, interpretation of such data can be controversial. People may disagree about whether the changes that have occurred are enough to constitute success and whether the changes can be attributed to police actions as opposed to other factors. These problems, added to the disinclination of program planners and managers to be evaluated at all, reduce the likelihood that public agencies will devote much attention to evaluating their programs' success.

There is, however, a short cut that can produce reliable judgments more quickly and at considerably less cost. The alternative is to create panels of independent, experienced experts to observe operations in the field and to report on their quality, impact, and likely sustainability. A panel of 3-5 experts with experience in similar programs can make sound, insightful, qualitative judgments in short periods of time. Their evaluations will be based on the study of program documents, interviews with participants, and observations in the field. Being qualitative does not mean that such evaluations are exercises in thoughtless subjectivity. They must specify

the evaluation criteria in advance and develop a reliable methodology that is followed consistently in the field. It is especially important that the panelists be capable of independent judgment. They cannot be permanent employees of the contracting agency, in this case the United Nations, or have a financial stake in the future of the program being evaluated.

The major benefit of this approach, assuming the panelists are carefully chosen from knowledgeable experts unconnected with the employing agency, are evaluations that are insightful, easy to understand, timely, and persuasive with stakeholders. The major costs involved are salaries, travel, and maintenance rather than complicated data-collection procedures. At the same time, it would be enormously helpful if money is provided for surveys of public opinion and experience. Indeed, given the goals of community policing, such surveys should be part of the implementation plan of local police.

FURTHER READING

- Bayley, David H. 1996. "Measuring Overall Effectiveness."
In Larry T. Hoover, Quantifying Quality in Policing.
Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum).
- Bayley, David H. 2005. Changing the Guard: Developing
Democratic Police Abroad. New York, NY: Oxford
University Press.
- Chinchilla, Laura, and Luis Salas. 2001. UNDP Security
Sector Reform Assistance in Post-Conflict Situations:
Lessons Learned in El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti,
Mozambique, Somalia, and Rwanda. Draft Report. New
York, NY: UN Emergency Response Division.
- Home Office, "Policing Performance Assessment Framework"
(www.policereform.gov.uk/psu/ppaf.html)
- Office of the Oversight Commissioner, Report 2 - September
2001. Belfast, Northern Ireland: Office of the
Oversight Commissioner. www.oversightcommissioner.org.
- Vera Institute of Justice, 2003, "Measuring Progress Toward
Safety and Justice: A Global Guide to the Design of
Performance Indicators Across the Justice Sector."
www.vera.org/indicators.