

Crime Prevention Performance Indicators



The Team

- EDUCON Marketing and Research Systems
Sandra Gail Walker, Toronto, Ontario
Jason Walker, Ottawa, Ontario

- Jean Sauvageau, Assistant Professor
Saint Thomas University
Criminology Programme, Fredericton, NB

- Carol Johnson, Executive Director
Crime Concern, Toronto, Ontario

- ABCsolutions Inc.
Chris Walker, Toronto, Ontario



Table of Contents

Introduction	ii
Section A: The Literature	1
Section B: The Interviews	14
Experts	15
Police	17
Community	20
Business	22
Section C: Developing a Foundation for the Tool Kit	23
Appendices	28
Interview Guides	29
List of Contributors	34
References	38



Introduction

The final product of this project is the development of an evaluation ‘Tool Kit’ resource instrument for use by Canadian police services and community groups working with police to assist with evaluating their crime prevention and problem-solving initiatives. EDUCON Marketing and Research Systems of Toronto, Ontario, Canada is developing it and the project authority is the Ottawa-Carleton Police Service, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. Gail Walker, President of EDUCON, is the project manager. This project has been funded by the National Crime Prevention Centre, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

It is important however, to first consider the various performance indicators upon which the different programs will be assessed before embarking on the wider aspect of developing a fully integrated evaluation methodology and the resulting evaluation ‘tool kit’.

The Police have a key part to play in securing a safe and just society. Their aims are of considerable concern to us all, especially as they come under pressure to operate more efficiently and effectively. Therefore, it is important to know what the police are doing, in partnership with others, to deliver services that achieve those aims, and then assess how well they are doing it.

The intensive focus on numbers of crimes and arrests may lead police agencies to lose sight of other important goals, such as equity, fairness, or a spectrum of humanistic concerns that Mastrofski (1999) calls “Policing for People”.

This Report, entitled “Crime Prevention Performance Indicators”, completes the third of four phases towards the development of the ‘Program Evaluation Tool Kit’ and utilises the information gathered in Phases 1 & 2.

The objectives of this report are:

- To develop accurate performance indicators that capture the effectiveness of police work in the areas of crime prevention and problem solving.
- To develop measures that can reasonably and unambiguously attributes changes in crime, fear, and disorder, as well as their effects on the quality of life to community action.

Based on our interviews with ‘experts’, police, community and business representatives, our own knowledge of relevant crime prevention performance indicators, methodology, evaluation, and an extensive literature and Internet review, we will report our findings in three distinct sections.

Section A, The Literature, discusses the findings of the literature and Internet review.

Section B, The Interviews, provides a summary of the information about appropriate performance indicators taken from our interviews with:

- “experts”, nationally and internationally, in the fields of program evaluation, criminology, sociology, education, and community health;
- national and international police departments known for excelling in crime prevention and problem solving;
- community action groups representing grass roots community crime prevention programs; and
- a sampling of Board of Trade Directors and Association of Business Improvement Areas across Canada representing the business sector.

Section C, Developing a Foundation for the Tool Kit, is a synthesis of the information gathered in Sections A and B with a particular focus on identifying those performance indicators (PIs) most relevant and practical for inclusion in the Tool Kit.

A separate report, ‘Building Blocking Towards Program Evaluation’, focused on the literature and Internet review, interviews with police, community, business, and experts to determine the ‘state of the art’ for self-directed program evaluation tool kits/guides, and an analysis of the few crime prevention program evaluations submitted by police departments.



Section A:
THE
LITERATURE

The Literature

Community policing, with its emphasis on problem solving, crime prevention, and community restoration, significantly expands the police domain and demands that organizational performance be re-conceptualized. It is no longer sufficient to measure organizational crime-control prowess, now we must address crime control plus the expectations created under the principle of community policing.

Community policing is full-service policing. It embraces a number of ambitious goals: reducing crime and disorder, calming fears about the threats to public safety, and reducing the public's alienation from social institutions, such as the police. It is a way of more effectively delivering all of the services citizens need from police. At the core of the community-policing paradigm are two major tenets: (a) maximize problem solving; and (b) develop partnerships between the police and the community. The overall effectiveness, however, depends on the extent to which both the police and the community have been mutually reinforcing and have achieved collaboration with the individuals involved in crime prevention initiatives.

The planning, delivery, and evaluation of police services should be based upon a sound knowledge of customers' needs and expectations, with the emphasis being placed on solving community problems *with* the community *not for* the community. The important challenge for the implementation of the community policing approach is to engage in a



process to breakdown the artificial barriers between the police and the community and promote groups and individuals to empower and motivate themselves.

Police processes involve what police do when they police for people.

Community policing is hampered however, by the tools police currently use to measure crime and police performance. There is a gap between the current ways police organizations measure productivity and the kinds of help communities really want from their police. Levels of fear and disorder, evidence of mounting community tension, and, most importantly, information about the specific sources of such difficulties and the police response to them go officially uncounted. As Kelling (1992) writes:

“Can we quantify the soft indicators that really matter to communities? Or are we doomed, like the man who lost his keys in the alley but searches for them under the street light, to keep looking in the wrong place because it is too hard to turn our attention where it belongs?”

For additional reading on community policing, relevant references have been footnoted as a discussion on this topic is not the intent of this report (Trojanowicz (1990)¹; US Department of Justice, (1988)²; McElroy, (1993)³; Goldstein, (1990)⁴; Eck & Spelman (1987)⁵; Rosenbaum, (1986), (1992)⁶.

Measuring What Matters: Developing measures of what the police do

Most citizens today not only expect but also often demand that their police respond quickly to calls for service. As a result, this has been one of the traditional measures used to assess police

As Mastrofski (1996) noted more effort is put into recording UCR data (e.g., arrests, clearances, calls for service, response times, and reported crime) than any other indicators.

performance. Over the last fifteen years, however, there has been a gradual restructuring of police priorities to

¹ Trojanowicz, R. & Bucqueroux, B. (1990). Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.

² U.S. Department of Justice, (1988). Topical Bibliography: Community Policing. Washington, DC: NIJ/NCJRS.

³ McElroy, J, et al. (1993). Community Policing: The CROP in New York. Newbury Park, NY: Sage Publications.

⁴ Goldstein, H. (1990). Problem-Oriented Policing. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.

⁵ Eck & Spelman. (1987). Problem-solving: Problem-oriented policing in Newport News. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, NIJ.

⁶ Rosenbaum, D. (1986). Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work? Newbury Park, NY, Sage Publications. and Rosenbaum, D. (1992). The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications.

include more proactive or preventive strategies in the police practice of crime control. Furthermore, most performance indicators and evaluations currently used by police agencies emphasize only the crime control aspects of policing, typically consisting of compliance audits, statistical comparisons, or descriptive summaries of events, which still do not reflect all the work officers do.

We must develop new measures of performance. Measures more in line with what communities really need and want. Therefore, the following discussion does not dwell on whether performance indicators are desirable or undesirable per se. Instead, it takes the use of performance indicators (PIs) as a given, and considers its relationship to crime prevention effectiveness.

In thinking about what PIs to use in evaluating crime prevention programs, it is important to be clear about what they can and cannot do. *Performance indicators do not directly measure quality of performance but should relate to the intended outcomes of a program.*

The current absence of any satisfactory

A performance indicator is a pointer, it suggests a line for further investigation, it is not a direct measure.

performance indicators for police crime prevention is now widely recognised, as are the problems of devising indicators (Tilley, 1995; Ekblom, 1995). Some difficulties include:

- measuring the absence of events;
- random fluctuations in crime rates;
- national changes, notably in police policy;
- economic changes;
- the inability of crime surveys to pick out local patterns of change;

- variability in public reporting; and
- variability in police recording practices, to name a few.

Performance needs to be assessed against some kind of standard. Very commonly, when it comes to crime prevention, no standard can be identified other than the performance of other equivalent organisations. This approach can be misleading since the circumstances facing one group pursuing their objective will differ from those facing another.

PIs and their benchmarks should address the individual organization's anticipated results and the degree of achievement. They should point toward the ways to objectively measure the degree of success a program has had in achieving its stated objectives, goals, and planned program activities. They will move the evaluation process from "What was expected?" and "How did you conduct the activity?" towards the measurement of "What actually occurred?" and "What was actually accomplished?" Therefore, PIs and their benchmarks *need to relate as closely as possible to the intended outcomes* rather than outputs.

Outcomes refer to the results of what is done whilst outputs refer to the volume or amount of activity that has been generated.

Thus, PIs can constitute one vehicle for accountability of the police to the public they serve. Within public sector organisations, PIs can be used by management as a check on how well individual elements are functioning and suggest areas where change may be called for. There can be a feedback loop from objective setting to performance

measurement through PIs about organisational change.

Some challenges to developing Crime Prevention PI's

Contemporary Issues

1. The most traditional measure of police effectiveness is typically reflected in some assessment of the aggregate *crime rate* or the *breakdown into crime types* about which the public may be most concerned. When the crime rate increases, the police most often attribute this rise to demographic shifts or changing social conditions and not to police operations. However, when the crime rate is declining it is common for the more aggressive police officials to attribute that decline to the latest police operational innovation (e.g., street drug/youth unit, K-9 unit, etc.). Thus we have an important measurement dilemma and challenge regarding the effect of policing on crime, specifically, the asymmetric nature of police claims of credit or avoidance for explaining the control, or lack thereof, over crime cycles.

As we know, recorded crime rates, which depend on public reporting and police recording practices, may not accurately reflect changes in the volume of crime that is occurring. In some crime categories, police and public interest lie in increasing the rate at which incidents are reported, for example, domestic violence, and these may lead to apparent, though explicable, increases in *incidence rates* (crimes per 1000 potential victims).

Furthermore, citizen reporting and police recording practices together may work to the disadvantage of the poor and residents of higher crime areas, potentially disguising the effects of programs that might otherwise appear promising.

In addition, crime prevention programs that ask citizens to be “the eyes and ears” of police hopefully do increase reporting but higher crime figures could make those efforts look counterproductive even if the actual crime rate has not changed or has decreased.

The threat of looking worse as a result of doing better has made most evaluators aware of the difficulties of using reported crime figures to evaluate programs.

2. A second issue related to crime measurement is *arrest rates*, which result from onsite detection or witness/victim identification. Shifts in the arrest rate for any particular kind of crime, however, can also be affected by changes in police policy or practices. Therefore, it is important to distinguish the contribution associated with more effective policing policies and practices from those associated with shifts external to policing and beyond their control.

Many police services are developing a tighter feedback-measuring capability, which enables them to observe the influence of changes in tactics or strategy on crimes and arrests. This “total quality management” requires maintaining detailed and high frequency information on crime measures as well

as logs on police operations where there have been changes to standard practices or routines. This approach allows for better linkages between operational actions and their consequences.

Unfortunately, crime, arrest, and response rates not only fail to keep an accurate score but they also can confuse the community about the object of the game. For example, while low levels of recorded crime may conceivably reflect low crime rates, as mentioned previously they can also reflect under reporting of crime. For instance, only about half of all rapes are ever reported to the police. Consequently, the impact of crime prevention programs and intervention models is not accurately captured.

3. Although crime rates, incidences of crime, and arrests are certainly salient measures, police are responsible for other factors affecting the quality of life within a community. There is little question that anything that can be done to reduce the *fear⁷ of crime⁸* and *the perceived risk of victimization⁹* contributes to an improvement in the quality of life in the community.

There is corroborating evidence that measures of fear and of the perceived risk of victimization do not measure the same phenomenon. In short, fear is not

⁷ There is a lot of confusion over the meaning of **fear**, which seems to arise from a failure to recognize distinctions between perception, cognition, and emotion. Although fear may result from the cognitive processing or evaluation of perceptual information, FEAR is an EMOTION caused by an awareness or expectation of danger.

⁸ **Fear of crime** may be aroused by an immediate danger.

⁹ **Perceived risk of victimization** is the subjective probability of victimization and is a proximate cause of fear – not fear itself.

perceived risk; by all indications, it is its consequence. A reasonable assumption is that anxiety about future victimization is much more common among the general public than fear associated with actual encounters of crime. (Bandura, 1986; Baumer, 1985; Ferraro, 1995; Skogan, 1987). Therefore, this must not be overlooked when developing PIs to be used for evaluating crime prevention programs.

Furthermore, survey research on fear of crime is extensive but somewhat bewildering as a result of the variety of questions that have been used by investigators to measure fear of crime. Some questions ask about fear during the day; others, about fear at night. Some pertain to fear at home, whereas others question respondents about their fear in their own neighbourhood or in their city. Still others ask respondents about their fear when alone or with others. Such sensitivity to context is commendable but it is of little value unless such contextual variables are systematically varied and their effects evaluated. For example, when respondents report fear of crime in social surveys, what specific offences do they have in mind? Are those offences similar across individuals? We know that they almost surely are not. Fear of rape, for example, is very pronounced among women but presumably not among men.

Neighbourhood residents are concerned about a broad range of disorder problems that also impact on fear of crime, including, traffic enforcement, illegal dumping, building abandonment, graffiti, and teenage loitering. There are several theoretical and empirical investigations of how incivilities influence crime and fear at the

neighbourhood level (Hunter, 1978; Skogan, 1990; Wilson & Kelling, 1982).

Skogan, for example, labels signs of incivility as disorder and argues that disorder plays an important role in sparking urban decline.

“Disorder reflects the inability of communities to mobilize resources to deal with urban woes.... Physical and social incivilities engender a range of consequences that ultimately result in neighbourhood decline”.

Skogan , 1990

In terms of developing PIs, many of these quality of life activities connected with reducing fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization are indirect and may have no impact on the crime rate itself and therefore, are not captured in a data base.

When developing crime prevention performance indicators, it will be important to also use more unobtrusive measures of public fear (e.g., an increase in people using public spaces that were previously avoided because they were viewed as dangerous, or the removal of graffiti and garbage) compared to simply using the more traditional approaches, such as surveying. This type of measure also has the advantage of reflecting behaviour rather than attitudes; therefore, it is a better measure of the state of fear in a neighbourhood or community.

4. The British Home Office have studied *repeat victimization (rv)* since the early 1980's as a possible source for a PI for *particular* police crime prevention, such as, racial attacks, domestic burglary

(auto theft), residential burglary, individual street robbery, non-domestic burglary (schools, businesses), and domestic violence (Pease, 1998; Ferrell, et al, 2000; Farrell & Buckley, 1993; Farrell & Pease, 1993); Trickett, (1992).

As cited in Tilley (1995), the following reasons have been identified for the consideration of repeat victimization as a PI:

- there is an increase in the literature that identifies a greater risk of victimization is faced by those who have already been victimized;**
- the police already are encouraged to attend to repeat victimizations;**
- a focus on repeats would encourage concentration of crime prevention efforts on high crime areas, since that is where the higher repeats are found to occur; and**
- o rates of recorded repeat victimization should be calculable from data already routinely collected (in principle) and held by police. However, with many police agencies this information is not easy to extract or analyze.**

It is accepted that matters beyond the control of the police and the community partnerships are crucial in determining changes in overall crime rates. Yet these rates do affect the numbers of *expected* repeat victimization and also influence the proportions of incidents which may also be repeats. This must be taken into account when considering repeat

victimization as a PI. For example, a study of small businesses in parts of Leicester, England carried out for Crime Concern showed that:

- ✓ 17% of businesses suffered 69% of burglaries;
- ✓ 17% of businesses suffered 83% of fraud;
- ✓ 9% of businesses suffered 92% of threats, abuse and intimidation;
- ✓ 1% of businesses suffered 45% of robbery.
(Pease, 1998).

The commission of a crime boosts the likelihood of its repetition and is exactly parallel to the ‘Broken Windows’ thesis (Kelling, 1999) in which neglect of the first attack on a building or person means that no-one cares and that the attacks can continue with impunity. Therefore, the argument for ‘fixing broken windows’ is precisely the same as for preventing rv by changing what the offender first encountered.

Trickett et al (1992), indicated that crime prevention ‘success’ in rv terms would be indicated where a statistically significant alteration is made in the ratio of *expected* to the *observed* number of average victimizations per victim. For example, the police could specify in advance which crime or crimes are to be special targets for prevention (such as domestic burglary - auto theft) in the forthcoming year, and the repeat victimization PI could then be used to measure effectiveness. Crime prevention directed at re-victimization will thus lead to a focus on relatively high crime areas.

Pease (1998) found that 80% of repeat burglary victims are likely to have been re-victimized by the same offender. In each of the demonstration projects in

which rv was studied, an overall crime reduction was achieved by reducing the re-victimization of those places and people suffering the most crime. The advantages to using rv prevention as a strategy for crime control was clear.

Focusing on repeats:

- ❑ automatically concentrates effort on areas of highest crime;
- ❑ automatically concentrates on individuals at greatest risk;
- ❑ fuses the role of victim support and crime prevention, which have been historically separated;
- ❑ explicitly links the police tasks of prevention and detection;
- ❑ provides a way of targeting prolific offenders; and
- ❑ makes the clearance of a series of crimes more likely than when they were viewed independently.

A problem with using repeat victimization as a PI for crime prevention effectiveness is that victim surveys are poor at measuring repeat victimizations. Instead, it is suggested that survey measures of the *prevalence* of victimization, or the percentage of persons or households that have been victimized once or more be used instead. Then we only need to know that something happened to someone to categorize that person as a “victim”. Therefore, *prevalence rates* may increase, so it would be useful to measure prevalence as a secondary PI in order to capture pre-emptive crime prevention efforts and to acknowledge

that displacement may occur as a result of efforts to reduce repeats.

5. There are many other *community-related activities* the police engage in that may be seen as ends in themselves but also contribute to the improved ability to prevent crimes or solve them once they occur. This is one of the basic principles underlying *problem-oriented policing* and *community policing*. The connection to the community and its information networks provides important opportunities to learn the identity of the perpetrator of a crime and enhance the likelihood of an arrest. Enhancing the information-sharing practice represents a deterrent measure that clearly does impact on the effectiveness of police work, however it should be measured appropriately.

6. Another important issue facing the effective measurement of police performance centres on what police can expect of different communities and what the communities could expect in turn from the police, and the subsequent implications for community policing *partnerships*. A major difficulty in devising a partnership PI is the diversity of partnerships in which the police are involved. Two major types of partnerships may be discerned through which role the police play, for example, those working directly with the public in small sub-beat sized areas (e.g., Neighbourhood Watch) and those involving other agencies in more strategic work (e.g., Safer Cities, Crime Concern, and Business Improvement Areas).

It is necessary to define who is covered in police-community partnerships. A crime prevention partnership may be deemed to exist if a group (quorum) meets at least four times a year and the police are

involved by providing information on local crime patterns and advice on what could be done to reduce crime risks. An emphasis on crime prevention partnerships recognizes that the police need to work alongside others in statutory, private and voluntary organizations, as well as the public.

Tilley (1995) indicated that measurement of the relative effectiveness of a police-community partnership might be achieved by examining the degree to which they are able to minimize the mismatch between expected and observed rates of repeat victimization in relation to those crimes over which it is hoped that police-community partnerships can have an impact. It would also help police management identify successful and less successful practises and those instances where additional effort is needed.

How to address a salient community policing problem is also a challenge because police do not deal with one community only, but simultaneously with many publics, often with competing expectations and differing capacities for partnering in a community policing enterprise.

7. Police departments often follow a *set of contradictory*, or at least conflicting, *operating principles*. On the one hand, officers are expected to respond rapidly and shave seconds off response times to 911 calls, while, at the same time, the department is promoting the more strategic, *problem-solving model*. Police effectiveness, however, tends to be focused on the former. To attack crime, fear, and disorder problems at their roots, police officers and managers need to be fully familiar with the nature of the problems in a given area as the

cause of a crime pattern in one area may be quite different from the cause of a similar crime pattern in another area. Effective problem solving depends on knowing the territory and the people who reside and work there.

Obviously, it is imperative that sufficient numbers of police are available to make strategies workable, however, problem-solving models will ultimately reduce the amount of time spent in a reactive mode. This is evident given that some police departments have moved away from the practise of random preventive patrol (e.g., driving aimlessly or walking the streets) to more tactical strategic enforcement activities. Nevertheless, we cannot totally ignore the fact that visible police patrol leads to a heightened sense of public safety and security. Therefore, it can be a challenge for police to espouse the problem-solving model while, at the same time, trying to maintain police visibility. As a result, it is paramount that the problems be identified, analyzed, and the quality of resolution be evaluated.

8. It is a known fact that *crime prevention activities* contribute significantly to the workload of police, however at present these activities are untapped by traditional measures (CCJS, 1997). Performance indicators should accurately reflect the *content of the job*

Discretion comes into play not only in decisions to arrest but also in every situation in which the police make choices about doing something.

an officer working in crime prevention is expected to perform as well as the expected quality of the job performance. The complexity of police work has two dimensions: the complexity of the

situations or problems confronting crime

prevention officers, and the complexity of their responses to those situations. Panhandling is an example of how complex a seemingly simple act can be. Employees could be asked to provide feedback regarding the frequency and criticality of tasks associated with their respective crime prevention assignments, as well as projections about associated tasks for the future. It is also important that these PIs reflect the changing nature of the job.

The Houston Task Force based the creation of new performance criteria on the following tasks and activities officers performed in their neighbourhoods.

TASKS and ACTIVITIES

- learn characteristics of area, residents, businesses;
- become acquainted with leaders in area;
- make residents aware of who the officer is and what s/he is trying to accomplish;
- identify area problems;
- communicate with supervisors, other officers and citizens about the nature of the area and its problems;
- investigate/do research to determine sources of problems;
- plan ways of dealing with problems;
- provide citizen information about the ways they can handle problems (educate/empower);
- help citizens develop appropriate expectations about what police can do and teach them how to interact effectively with police;
- develop resources for responding to problem;
- implement problem solution;
- assess effectiveness of solution;
- keep citizens informed.

Oettmeier & Wycoff, 1999, pp. 383 –384.

9. When undertaking crime prevention programs/initiatives it is important to determine whether the police or community members involved have the requisite knowledge, skills and attitudes, ability, and willingness to do the job. In other words, PIs should be established that first measure if the police officers

The public judge police competence primarily in terms of the tangible things they can readily observe, not in terms of crime statistics.

have the **capacity** to do the crime prevention police work.

Once this is established, performance measurement might more reasonably focus on whether the officer effectively used his or her skills in the operation of the crime prevention program. For example, is the officer able to select the correct response to fit the service/program needs of the area for which he or she is responsible? To accomplish this the officer will need to seek more effective means of obtaining information from the community. Generally, the most significant form of citizen feedback has come in the form of complaints about improper police activity. Notwithstanding the importance of attending to citizen complaints, departments need to collect data about the crime prevention services citizens want and whether citizens believe their service needs are being met. Numerous departments have used community forums, meetings, and surveys for eliciting service needs and preferences. This approach places a focus on “*results*” and therefore appraisals would be less vulnerable to subjective influences.

10. Mastrofski (1999) identifies six characteristics that the public associate with “good service” from their police. These elements should be taken into account when developing performance indicators for evaluating crime prevention programs/initiatives as they show how well the police are providing services.

❑ **Attentiveness.** What appeals to the public about community policing and crime prevention is the promise that outreach programs will increase the public’s access to the police.

❑ **Reliability.** The public expect a degree of predictability in what the police do.

❑ **Responsive service.** The public want “client-centered” service.

❑ **Competence.** There is the expectation that the police know how to deal with the problem.

❑ **Proper manners.** Studies show that the most powerful predictors of citizen satisfaction with the police have more to do with HOW police treated the citizen, rather than what they accomplished.

❑ **Fairness.** The factor having the greatest impact on people’s feelings about the law and legal authority was their perception of a fair procedure, an impact greater than that of a sense of favourableness or fairness of the outcome.

A crude measure of attentiveness is the amount of time officers spend with citizens.

Framework for Developing PIs

According to Tilley (1995), the following desiderata for police crime prevention PIs represents an ideal standard against which other PIs can be assessed. However, “there will have to be some compromises when it comes to crime prevention” (p.6).

❑ **The PIs should relate directly and as accurately as possible to priority intended outcomes of crime prevention work.**

❑ **Efforts to attain success as measured through the PIs should not divert police efforts from the main task of crime prevention. More positively, the performance indicators selected should help focus attention on effective crime prevention work.**

❑ **Efforts to attain success as measured through PIs should not lead the police to compromise other ends they may wish to pursue.**

❑ **The indicators should be quantitative, and ratio measurement is to be preferred.**

❑ **The indicators should be easily understandable.**

❑ **The data used for the indicators should be collectable at minimal cost or, if not already available, the work in their assembly should also yield some benefit to policing practices to offset costs incurred.**

❑ **The PIs should relate specifically to police contributions to crime prevention.**

❑ **The measurement should be credible to the police and the public.**

❑ **The calculation of the PI should be unambiguous.**

Langworthy (1996) has stressed a need to develop measures that can routinely provide information to police that is meaningful to the people who use it. He has highlighted some performance concepts that might be employed to measure police performance.

- ❑ **The impact domain is a cluster of items that the police are supposed to affect – crime, fear of crime, and disorder.**
- ❑ **The organizational health domain deals with the nature and volume of police business and community support as well as the level of job satisfaction of police employees and their knowledge of the jobs.**
- ❑ **The process domain deals with fairness, civility, equitable service, and ethical service, while the community assessment domain deals with police abilities and ethical behaviour. Both address the way the police do their work.**
- ❑ **The community context domain involves social cohesion, informal social control, and political and social structures.**

Langworthy, (1996).
p. 221.

When compiling performance measures with appropriate evaluation methodology into a self-directed, program evaluation “Tool Kit”, thereby improving our capacity for “measuring what matters”, it is important to identify some of the issues and challenges facing such a project.

In **sum**, PIs must be developed that tell us what is being done to improve the neighbourhood, in addition to those that tell us what is done (or needs to be done) to improve the officer. When it comes to the measurement of police work, it is certainly important to address these aforementioned challenges in order to make the necessary improvements. Business, government, and academia have long admitted that any program is successful only if it effectively meets its stated goals and objectives. Failure to do so could bring into question the value of the program not only to those who deliver it but also to those who are the recipients of the services being provided.

The process of evaluation is not necessarily arduous or expensive. It does, however, require:

- a **commitment** to provide the resources to carry it out;
- maintaining scientific integrity;
- that the results not be oriented toward a public relations agenda; and
- a willingness to make improvements when the results indicate that such are warranted.

The end result must be a reliable process that is capable of measuring whether a program can efficiently and effectively meet the goals on which it is based. Programs that have built in assessment and evaluation processes are far more capable of demonstrating their value to the decision makers and the community being served by:

- providing a mechanism for accountability;

- providing a basis for informed decision making;
- indicating the areas that can be improved;
- driving change;
- achieving results; and
- sending a powerful message to the employees about what is important to the organization and the community.

There is a need to develop measures the police can routinely collect information on and make them meaningful to the people who use them. Measures should tend to be of the type that are easy, simple, inexpensive, and from which inferences can be made.



Section B:
THE
INTERVIEWS



The Experts

The interviews with substantive experts revealed that the choice of appropriate performance indicators of program success or failure were dependent upon a number of critical factors. Evaluators must consider the type of program, the implementation strategy, and the service-delivery model in order to determine which measures will accurately reflect a program's effect in a community. Respondents stated that it was necessary to establish a series of clearly defined, obtainable goals at the very beginning of program implementation that could then be used for evaluation purposes. As a result, program success would depend upon achieving these pre-determined goals.

Program success depends upon achieving pre-determined goals

Levels of fear are a critical PI

While recognizing the importance that has been traditionally placed on crime rates and statistics by police agencies, the media, and members of the public, the experts believed that there were inherent problems with relying on them as indicators of performance for crime prevention initiatives. First of all, respondents stated that an initial increase in crime rates was often the result of the implementation of crime prevention programs, as community members have a greater awareness of target issues and are more willing to report criminal activity to the police. Secondly, experts found it extremely difficult to isolate the effects of single programs on overall crime rates and other shared outcomes, as a wide variety of political, social, and economic factors contribute to changes in these statistics. This is further

complicated by the fact that these figures only capture those activities that are actually being reported, which fails to provide an accurate representation of the public's fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization. Respondents agreed that the perceived threat to personal safety in a community was equally important as the actual incidences of crime and, therefore, must be addressed in crime prevention programs. Although extremely difficult to accurately measure, especially in light of the influence of television and other media, changes in the levels of fear in a community was considered a critical indicator of program performance.

Signs of disorder and neglect contribute to concerns of safety

In many cases, experts believed that the visible signs of disorder and neglect within a given community significantly contributed its citizens' concerns for personal safety. Incidences of graffiti, vandalism, and homelessness were seen to increase the amount of stress on both individuals and social agencies, creating perceptions of fear. The effectiveness of those programs that target specific disorder issues could subsequently be measured by observing tangible reductions in the problem over time. Respondents emphasized the use of "unobtrusive measures" as a means of identifying

whether citizens feel afraid. Such issues as adequate lighting, access to public telephones, as well as the general maintenance of both public and private space could potentially be evaluated in terms of their contribution to the community's fear of crime.

A variety of survey and consultation methods were used to collect and quantify fluctuations in the public's fear of crime. While mail-out and telephone surveys were considered the most economical means of gathering this data, direct contact was seen to provide more reliable results. Calls for service were identified as an important source of information, however the experts stated that the criteria used to record and categorize these calls were often very broad with very little consistency between agencies. As a result, respondents stressed the importance of interacting with not only community members but also representatives from those agencies that have invested interests in that community (i.e. police, parole, social services, business associations, etc.). In fact, experts believed that inter-agency collaboration was quickly being recognized as a necessary component of effective crime prevention programming and thus should be evaluated as a measure of performance. Examining client trends in food banks, abuse shelters, youth support groups, and other related social service providers could provide valuable information regarding the effects of a program in a community.

Interview respondents indicated that the level of police involvement in community activities and organizations

should be evaluated as it could be directly linked to the commitment of police management towards crime prevention and community policing initiatives. Is crime prevention integrated into the operating principles and problem-solving model of the department? And, if so, to what extent? It was stated that the dedication of police resources for proactive, community-based activities was a good indicator that a particular department was willing to interact and work with the community to address specific problems. The experts focused on the level of community involvement in police decision-making and deployment as well actual participation in crime prevention initiatives and client satisfaction. Integrally linked to this commitment, is providing adequate training and resources, both financial and human, to deliver service in an effective and cost-efficient manner.

Commitment to crime prevention by police management is an important PI

The experts believed that inter-agency collaboration was important in crime prevention programming and should be a PI.

The Police

Crime rates and other related statistics (e.g. clearance rates, arrest rates, response times), as has traditionally been the case, were the performance indicators most commonly identified in the interviews with law enforcement professionals. Tracking these statistics over time was seen to provide a useable representation of the effectiveness of policing efforts and crime prevention activities within the community. Respondents did recognize, however, the inherent limitations with defining program success based solely on reductions in crime statistics, which reflect the sum total of all social, political, and economic factors within a given area. As a result, it would not be accurate to establish a causal relationship between one particular program and an overall reduction in crime without more in-depth investigation. The use of crime statistics as an indicator of performance is further limited by the fact that they reflect only those crimes that are being reported and do not take into consideration other social factors that contribute to fear and unrest in a community. In fact, respondents confirmed that effective program delivery often led to an initial rise in crime statistics, resulting from an increased awareness and willingness by the public to report incidents to the police.

Calls for service were also frequently collected and categorized as a means of measuring performance; however, respondents again indicated that the

Crime rates, calls for service, arrest rates, and incidences of repeat victimizations were viewed as important PIs.

implementation of additional crime prevention and community policing initiatives within a given area would likely lead to an increase in the number of calls.

Respondents saw value in examining fluctuations in arrest rates and incidences of repeat victimization to measure the effectiveness of those programs that targeted specific criminal activities. Police response time and the overall cost effectiveness, in terms of obtaining a positive return on funding and human resources, were also taken into consideration when assessing program performance.

One major obstacle facing police practitioners in the program evaluation of crime prevention initiatives was to accurately measure the performance of those programs that delivered a purely preventative service. The question of “How do you evaluate what is being prevented?” is a serious dilemma, particularly when a program must be held accountable for its expenditure of resources. As a result, respondents indicated that crime prevention programs must clearly define realistic goals within the scope of their overall operating principles, identifying from the onset what will be used to measure performance. In many cases, those delivering the programs are unable to develop operational measures because they are too vague in defining what it is they want to achieve. Respondents encouraged those delivering crime prevention programs to investigate and draw comparisons to acknowledged benchmarks and other indicators of

success found in comparable programs operating in other communities. This is difficult to do as programs vary greatly and no two communities are the same.

The interview participants identified changes in the level of fear of crime and the perceived risk of victimization within a community as critical measures of performance that must be examined during the evaluative process. Do people actually feel safer? Respondents indicated that the public's perceptions of crime could significantly affect behaviour, even if those fears were unjustified. Clearly, if the community continues to be fearful after a problem has been eradicated, then that must be addressed in the specific program. As a result, a tremendous amount of time and effort has been dedicated to gathering and assessing the public's opinions on a variety of crime, disorder, and safety issues. A variety of survey formats have been distributed by mail, telephone, and in-person in order to generate community feedback. Community meetings, the media, and the Internet were also utilized as means of collecting this information. The results of this inquiry typically revealed that serious crime, although significant, was not necessarily the main contributor to fear in the community. Incidences of disorder (graffiti, vandalism, vagrancy, etc.) that were encountered on a daily basis often lead citizens to believe that a more serious problem exists than may actually be the case. These signs of incivility can, however, be targeted by programs in the community, measuring performance through a visible reduction in the targeted problem. Respondents

Displacement must be accounted for when reporting the success of a program.

The police believed that inter-agency collaboration was important in crime prevention programming and should be a PI.

indicated that when assessing the performance of programs targeting particular disorder issues, it is important to assess whether or not the problem has actually been eliminated or has simply relocated in another community.

Recognizing that many of the factors contributing to criminal activity and a sense of fear in the community lay outside of traditional police mandates, police services have been placing increased emphasis on the development of proactive partnerships with those agencies that have invested interest in a community in consultation with the community itself. As a result, inter-agency collaboration is becoming a requirement that must be addressed in the program development process and is more frequently becoming a measure for evaluation.

Measuring client participation in arrest alternatives, shelters, outreach, and other social service initiatives could be used to track program performance over time. Police involvement in community events and the level of public awareness of crime prevention programs were cited as potential performance indicators. It is important to note, however, that in some instances success can be measured by a reduction in police involvement in community activities. Many police initiatives encourage the community to take ownership for their problems, often resulting in resolutions that do not require police intervention. Increases in community involvement in these

initiatives were generally considered a positive indicator of performance.

A number of interview respondents stated that the level of commitment by law enforcement management towards crime prevention and community policing activities would have a direct effect on their subsequent performance. Possible indicators to look at would be whether or not the department has unit or officers dedicated to community policing or crime prevention, as well as the amount of financial and human resources allocated for these activities. In order to have a positive effect in the community, the capacity must exist to accurately respond to the needs of its citizens, which involves providing program practitioners with specific information, training (language, cultural, etc.), and equipment. A lack of these resources was considered a likely indicator of poor program performance.

Commitment to crime prevention by police management is an important PI

Police services are aware that direct feedback from the public provides valuable indicators of their overall performance within the community. All policing professionals that were surveyed uniformly considered client satisfaction a priority.

Public feedback was encouraged and frequently was used to measure the effectiveness of crime prevention initiatives.

The Community

When asked to identify viable performance indicators that could be used in the evaluation of crime prevention programs, representatives from the community were quick to assert that measures of success were integrally linked to the overall goals and operating principles of each specific program.

Program evaluation must be introduced during the initial stages of program planning and development.

Respondents stated that the means of measuring success or failure must be defined during the initial stages of program development, thus providing evaluators with the tools to determine why a program did or did not meet expectations. The goal of servicing a specified number of clients over a given time period, for example, could be easily monitored and assessed. One must be careful, however, not to exclude client or community feedback that may not fit directly into program goals as it could provide valuable insight into community perceptions and effective service delivery.

While community representatives did recognize the value that is traditionally attributed to crime rates, there was tremendous concern that reductions in these statistics were frequently used as the sole measure of performance by a number of funding providers when evaluating performance. Respondents believed that a reduction in the crime rate could be significant but does not reveal the full story. Effective crime prevention programs often lead to an initial increase in crime rates as the

Crime rates do not give the full story.

general public are more aware of specific issues and become more willing to report crime to the police.

Furthermore, a decrease in the crime rate may signify that the number of criminal acts has decreased in a community but the severity of crime and violence may have increased. Reductions in re-victimization rates were used as indicators of positive program performance primarily in the United Kingdom, where specific attention has been paid to collecting that type of data.

Community members ultimately believed that crime statistics, although important performance indicators, did not accurately reflect changes in the fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization in a community. Public surveys and community consultation have revealed that instances of incivility and public disorder often contribute more to a community's sense of unrest, heightening perceptions of fear. Reductions in graffiti, vandalism, and vagrancy were seen as positive, easily identifiable indicators of program success that contributed to improvements in the community's sense of personal safety.

While the interview respondents understood that a reduction in the fear of crime within a community is a critical measure in determining program effectiveness, considerable challenges were faced when attempting to collect and quantify public opinions on crime and personal safety issues. The pressure to develop reliable performance indicators that can be applied to proactive and preventative initiatives has

intensified, community representatives believed, in light of fiscal restraints occurring at all levels of government. Many respondents were concerned that the dollar value is often looked at by funding providers without taking into consideration the full benefit or effect of the program.

Short-term funding criteria may not allow sufficient time to measure program outcomes and impacts with any rigor.

Furthermore, many grants are for a year only, consequently positive changes may just be in the initial stages and it would be very difficult to measure successful outcomes. Measuring citizen participation in community events, use of public parks and transportation, reliance on social agencies, as well as the economic growth of the area was cited as possible avenues for investigation during program evaluation.

In order to effectively reduce crime and the fear of victimization in a given community, respondents stated that it was necessary for the police and other social agencies to adopt a holistic approach towards problem solving, hopefully resulting in a coordinated commitment to establish goals within each agency as well as with other partners that have a stake in the community. Developing strong ties to the community and establishing working relationships with external agencies were considered indicators of positive program performance. Again, the measurement of performance must be directly linked to the intended outcomes of the program, where success may mean a reduction of police involvement resulting from improvements in community empowerment.

A holistic approach to problem solving that results in a coordinated commitment is an important PI.

Community representatives indicated that regardless of the approach used by evaluators to measure the effectiveness of crime prevention programs, success still very much relies on direct feedback and support from the community. Police, social service providers, and other community agencies to collect information on the performance of specific programs consistently utilized surveys, public meetings, media polls, as well as regular, informal contact. Respondents also stated that special attention must be paid to the amount and type of publicity crime prevention initiatives receive in the various media as they often either reflect or directly contribute to public perception and opinion.

Business

For Board of Trade members and other business sector representatives, reductions in targeted crime statistics and the overall crime rate within a specified commercial district were the most commonly identified indicators of program effectiveness. Incidences of disorder, such as graffiti, vandalism, vagrancy, panhandling and ‘squeegee kids’, were monitored and recorded as a means of evaluating the results of specific interventions and initiatives.

Many interview respondents stated that positive program performance would be directly reflected in the degree of economic growth and development within a specified area. Simply put, people tend to avoid areas where they don’t feel safe. Increases in not only the number but also the attendance at community events as well as consumer traffic after the implementation of a program were considered clear indicators of improvements in the public’s perception of safety for that area.

Awareness and visibility were identified by business sector representatives as important factors when attempting to measure the success of a program. First of all, is the community aware that the program exists? And, secondly, does the program have a visible presence within the community? Community participation in the implementation and delivery of a program in addition to the number of clients served were frequently used to measure performance.

For the most part, client feedback proved to be the most tangible and relied upon performance indicator utilized in program evaluation. The thoughts and opinions of program practitioners and clients, police, and the general public were regularly gathered to ensure that program goals and mandates accurately reflect the specific needs of the community. Surveys, whether being delivered by mail, telephone, FAX, or in person, were the most commonly used tool for obtaining this information. The existing information networks and regular meetings inherent with Board of Trade and Business Improvement Area membership facilitated the gathering and exchange of the necessary feedback to identify problems, establish realistic goals, and devise appropriate solutions.

Disorder and decay of a neighbourhood are important PIs.



Section C: Developing a Foundation for the Tool Kit



Developing a Foundation for the Tool Kit

The discussion throughout the previous sections has explored a broad range of issues relating to the methodologies best suited to evaluating crime prevention programs and the various performance indicators that best measure the programs' achievements. The concepts discussed have ranged from the relatively complex to those that reflect the proverbial 'KISS' principle.

It is clear from both the literature review and the summaries of the various police, expert, community, and business group interviews that we live in a world where both traditional (e.g., crime rates, calls for service, levels of fear of crime) and non-traditional indicators (e.g., increased public activity in areas that generated avoidance before, less graffiti) can be used to assess achievement. What becomes of concern is whether the various indicators are truly representative of what is being measured and can be collected in a relatively simple and cost-efficient manner.

This section of the report is faced with the challenge of drawing from this myriad of research findings, beliefs, practices, ideas, and observations those performance indicators that have the most pragmatic value when it comes to evaluating crime prevention programs. Furthermore, the eventual tool kit must factor in a number of basic issues if it is expected to be of value to those groups employing it. For example:

1. It must recognize that a meaningful evaluation is not an afterthought -- something that can be put in place well after a program is up and running.
2. The choice of performance indicators must be reflective of the various activities taking place within the program.
3. As much as possible, each PI must not be impacted by variables other than the one being measured, thereby ensuring the validity of the findings. For example, crime rates are never accurate measures of a crime prevention program's achievement since numerous variables can play a role in explaining why crime rates increase or decrease.
4. Data collection methods must be seen as both easy to implement and both cost and time efficient. Since community volunteer groups and front line police officers will use the tool kit, for the most part, simplicity is paramount to maximize their interest and participation.
5. Any program being considered for evaluation must have in place a clear set of goals and objectives against which outputs and impacts can be measured. Unless you clearly state what it is your

program is intending to do; using what methods; and hopefully generating what results --- any evaluation process, simple or complex, will have little opportunity to do what it is designed to do.

What Was Clear From the Findings?

The performance indicators discussed in the previous sections of this report have been reviewed and assessed as to their suitability for inclusion in the eventual tool kit. Specifically, each PI identified was rated against the factors listed above along with its relevance to the variety of crime prevention programs most commonly found across Canadian communities. The end result is a shortlist of PIs that in our opinion:

- reflect the structure and/or activities of an average community crime prevention program;
- can be measured using readily identified activities;
- can be measured with a reasonable, but limited, level of effort and cost;
- do not require extensive analysis to draw conclusions that represent the outputs and/or impacts of the program; and
- appear to be reasonably reliable when it comes to their application across different programs in different communities with different forms of program delivery.

Crime prevention programs really exist at two levels. First is the infra-structure of the program, which takes into

consideration such things as paid and volunteer staff, police officer secondments, advisory groups or boards of directors, equipment, work space, and training seminars, **and** secondly, the operational-structure represented by the various activities and events that make up what the program was set up to do. As such, we were able to isolate from our various research findings specific performance indicators at both levels. Indicators that we believe need to be considered when attempting to evaluate a community/police led crime prevention initiative.

Infrastructure Performance Indicators

1. Police Commitment

The success of a crime prevention program is very much influenced by the extent to which the local police service has committed resources to the operation of the program. Both the literature review and various interviews across all four groups (experts, police, business, and community) confirmed this. The assignment of staff on a permanent basis to crime prevention activities was a good indicator that the department was committed to the success of working with the community to solve problems. This commitment can be measured in several ways, including: number of resources assigned; hours of police officer involvement; financial resources put into the program by the department; level of community involvement in police decision making; and through the measure of overall citizen satisfaction with police involvement.

2. Community Participation

The degree and level of community participation in a crime prevention program was seen as clear evidence of the potential success of a program. The greater the number of community participants, along with a significant time commitment, the more potential for the program to achieve its goals. The number of people involved and the extent of their involvement measured in time were frequently cited as the best means for measuring performance in this area.

3. Community Awareness

A rather indirect way to measure program success is the extent to which the community at large is aware of its existence. Such knowledge, however, is more a reflection of how the program is structured and subsequently delivered rather than of direct crime prevention activity. As such, we have chosen to list it in the infrastructure category.

A real good example, one of the limitations of the Victoria Community Police Station (CoPS) Program, found during its three-year evaluation, was the clear lack of awareness about the local CoPS program when the citizen lived more than 10 blocks away from the actual station location. This was further confirmed by the fact that citizens living 10 blocks or further away were unable to describe the kinds of programs offered by the CoPS through its crime prevention programming.

Neighbourhood sidewalk surveys, the number of unsolicited requests for crime prevention assistance by neighbourhoods, and evidence of crime prevention programs being put into

action spontaneously could serve as clear indicators of the extent to which residents were aware of crime prevention programs operating within their community

4. Inter-agency Cooperation

The community policing paradigm stresses that the police are simply one of the players at the table when it comes to dealing with crime issues and putting in place crime prevention programming. As such, many crime prevention programs will have a multiplicity of partners both in their structure and in the program delivery. Consequently, it behoves any evaluation process to address partnerships and degree of cooperation as another key indicator of program success. It only makes sense that the stronger the ties and evidence of a clear willingness to work together towards the common goals of the program, the greater the potential for program goals and objectives to be maximized.

Operational Performance Indicators

1. Signs of Incivility and Disorder

There was almost universal agreement across all of our findings that a strong indicator of success with crime prevention programs targeted towards specific disorder issues would be the clear reduction in those issues over time. For example, a neighbourhood plagued by visible gang activity such as open drug deals, prostitution, the presence of

crack houses, and unwanted graffiti decides to join with the police to 'take back their neighbourhood'. Over time the signs of gang activity disappear and the citizens begin to move openly and freely around their streets again. The decrease in the negative and the increase in the positive can be used as clear indicators that the crime prevention program succeeded.

2. Levels of Fear

Both the literature review and many of those interviewed recognize the strong impact of fear on the perception people have about their own safety and that of their community. Consequently, a critical performance indicator to try to measure as part of an evaluation will be the impact of the crime prevention program on this fear. While surveys asking citizens to rate their fear before and after a program are the most common approach, the researchers designing the surveys are not always able to control for the variety of contexts within which the original fear surfaces. Fortunately, the tendency lately has been to use more 'unobtrusive measures' as indicators of success --- particularly those that monitor people's behaviours, which we can observe directly versus attitudes that require people to be truthful (not always a guarantee).

3. Repeat Victimizations

Most problem - crime areas in a community have one thing in common: the majority of the crimes are usually committed against the same small percentage of victims. As such, the drop in re-victimization rates is more frequently measuring the success of crime prevention programs in these areas

than any of the other standard set of indicators. When crime prevention programs are designed to address high-crime rate communities (for example, where burglaries are increasing dramatically), it behoves any evaluation of that program to gather data about repeat victimizations as a major indicator of the program's overall impact.

4. Community Feedback

Finally, both police and community respondents in our study see direct feedback from the community concerning crime prevention initiatives as one of the key indicators of program value. This information is retrievable through a number of direct methods (e.g., surveys, polling, public meetings) or indirectly through media publicity that is often representative of the general public opinion.

In Conclusion

The above eight Performance Indicators best represent some of the most current thinking about what factors best measure the success of crime prevention programming. We have chosen to focus on them because they are practical and can be measured through a variety of indicators. The latter is particularly important since the final tool kit design is expected to be readily applicable by front line police staff and/or community volunteers. Consequently, they have to be able to identify sources of data that can be readily collected, easily analyzed, and reported in a comprehensive and pragmatic way.



Section D: Appendices

Interview Guides

List of Contributors

References

Interview Guides

Development and Production of an Evaluation “Tool Kit” Resource Instrument for Police and Community Groups

Interview Guide for Experts

As we know, community policing and crime prevention initiatives are hampered by the tools police and community groups use to measure crime prevention and police performance. It would seem there is a gap between the current ways police organizations measure productivity and the kinds of help communities really want from their police. Levels of fear and disorder, evidence of mounting community tension, and, most importantly, information about the specific sources of such difficulties and the police response to such problems often go officially uncounted.

Our research TEAM is currently involved in developing an evaluation ‘Tool Kit’ resource instrument for use by Canadian police services and community groups working with police to use as a key resource in evaluating their crime prevention, problem solving, and community policing initiatives. It will assist the police services and community groups to measure performance that is more in line with what communities really need and want.

This project was awarded to EDUCON Marketing and Research Systems of Toronto, Ontario, Canada and the project authority is the Ottawa-Carleton Police Service, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. Gail Walker, President of EDUCON, is the project manager. This project has been funded by the National Crime Prevention Centre, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

As you are a recognized expert in the area of pragmatic research and evaluation we are requesting your assistance. We would like to conduct a *telephone interview* with you and will be calling you in the next couple of days to set-up an interview time. We hope you will agree to participate. In the meantime we would like to provide you with the **five questions** we will be asking. In this way you will have an opportunity to review them in advance. In the meantime, if you have any questions please do not hesitate to call Gail Walker at 416 466 0159.

In contemplating your responses, we would ask that you remember that the ‘Tool Kit’ is intended to be used by frontline police personnel and community groups.

1. Are you aware of **any** program evaluation “Tool kits”, guides or instruments that would provide assistance to police and community groups in evaluating their crime prevention initiatives? NO YES
2. If, YES would you please indicate the source(s) and how we can obtain a copy(ies)?
3. Can you direct our search for articles and/or materials that could provide us with assistance in developing suitable performance indicators against which police crime prevention/ community policing initiatives can be evaluated. NO YES
4. If, ‘YES’, please list sources/references:
5. In your opinion, what are the non-traditional and suitable performance indicators against which police crime prevention/ community policing initiatives could be evaluated and how might you measure them?

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Interview Guide for Police and Community Groups

As we know, community policing and crime prevention initiatives are sometimes hampered by the tools police and community groups use to measure crime prevention and police performance. It would seem at times there is a gap between the current ways police organizations measure productivity and the kinds of help communities really want from their police. Levels of fear and disorder, evidence of mounting community tension, and, most importantly, information about the specific sources of such difficulties and the police response to them often go officially uncounted.

Our research TEAM is currently involved in developing an evaluation ‘Tool Kit’ resource instrument for use by Canadian police services and community groups working with police as a key resource in evaluating their crime prevention, problem solving, and community policing initiatives. It will assist the police services and community groups to measure performance that is more in line with what communities really need and want.

This project was awarded to EDUCON Marketing and Research Systems of Toronto, Ontario, Canada and the project authority is the Ottawa-Carleton Police Service, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. Gail Walker, President of EDUCON, is the project manager. This project has been funded by the National Crime Prevention Centre, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

As your department/agency is a recognized leader in the area of community policing and crime prevention initiatives we are requesting your assistance. We would like to conduct a *telephone interview* with you and we hope you will agree to participate. We have provided you with the project objectives and **interview questions** we will be asking. In this way you will have an opportunity to review them in advance. In the meantime, if you have any questions please do not hesitate to call Gail Walker at 416 466 0159.

Project Objectives:

1. To combine performance measures with the appropriate evaluation methodology into a self directed program evaluation “Tool Kit” for use by police and community groups.
2. To determine the ‘state of the art’ for self directed program evaluation tool kits/guides.
3. To recommend appropriate methodology for the evaluation of Canadian police services in the areas of community policing, crime prevention, and problem solving.
4. To develop accurate performance indicators that capture the effectiveness of police work in the areas of crime prevention, community policing, and problem solving.
5. To develop measures that can reasonably and unambiguously attribute changes in crime, fear, and disorder, as well as their effects on the quality of life to community action.
6. To ensure that the “Tool Kit” will reflect the latest trends and thinking regarding evaluation for proactive crime prevention police programs.

Telephone Interview Questions:

In contemplating your responses, we would ask that you remember that the ‘Tool Kit’ is intended to be used by frontline police personnel and community groups.

1. In your opinion, what are the suitable performance indicators against which police crime prevention/ community policing initiatives could be evaluated and how might you measure them?2
2. Do you have need of a program evaluation tool kit? – Would you use it? NO YES
3. What are the essential topics that should be contained in the tool kit?
4. What format should it be available in (e.g., hard copy, Internet for download, both, other)?
5. Do you have a crime prevention program that should be evaluated? NO YES

6. Would you be willing to pilot the “tool kit” when it is completed (January, 2001) to actually measure one of your existing crime prevention programs or a program about to be implemented?
7. Has your police service/community agency conducted **any** program evaluation(s) of a crime prevention program/initiative in the last 5 years? NO YES
8. **If, YES can we obtain a copy(ies) of the results? [mail to: EDUCON Marketing & Research Systems, Gail Walker, Unit #3, 18 Doncrest Road, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M4K 1R8 or email: educon@sympatico.ca].**
9. If, YES have conducted an evaluation, but the results are not available:

Then ask the following:

- Name of **Crime Prevention program/ Community Policing Initiative?**
- Goal and Objectives of the crime prevention program?
- Objectives of the Program Evaluation?
- Year of program evaluation?
- Who evaluated the program? o inside o outside consultants
- Type of evaluation? o assessment/review o process o impact evaluation
- Research Design:
 - o One Shot o Pretest/Posttest o Control Group o Treatment group
 - o Time series – Panel
 - o Other _____
- Methodology /Approach?
 - o Mail –out Surveys o Telephone Surveys o Focus Groups
 - o Discussion Groups o Personal Interviews o Phone Interviews
 - o Crime Statistics o Other _____
- Target Group(s) (e.g., police constables, youth, volunteers)?
- Response Rate (e.g., to a survey)?
- Size of Sample(s)?
- Attrition of cases (e.g., if pre/post test or panel design)?
- Describe Instrument(s) (e.g., to measure police attitudes, job satisfaction, fear of crime, drug prevention - DARE)
 - o used established instruments? LIST? Reliability coefficient, if known?
 - o developed instruments? If so, what were they measuring? Were they piloted and by whom?
- Type of statistical test(s) used?
 - o descriptive – frequencies, means o t-test o Chi-square
 - o ANOVA o MANOVA o Correlations o Qualitative
- Statistical power to detect meaningful differences? o < 0.5 o <.001
- Evaluation Results - Recommendations?

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Interview Guide for Business – Board of Trade Representatives

Community policing and crime prevention initiatives are often hampered by the tools police and community groups use to measure crime prevention and police performance. It would seem there is a gap between the current ways police organizations measure productivity and the kinds of help communities/businesses really want from their police. Levels of fear and disorder, evidence of mounting community tension, and, most importantly, information about the specific sources of such difficulties and the police response to such problems often go officially uncounted.

Our research TEAM is currently involved in developing an evaluation ‘Tool Kit’ resource instrument for use by Canadian police services and community groups working with police to use as a key resource in evaluating their crime prevention initiatives. It will assist the police services and community groups to measure performance that is more in line with what communities/businesses really need and want.

This project was awarded to EDUCON Marketing and Research Systems of Toronto, Ontario, Canada and the project authority is the Ottawa-Carleton Police Service, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. Gail Walker, President of EDUCON, is the project manager. This project has been funded by the National Crime Prevention Centre, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

To date business leaders are not usually called upon to provide their input about crime prevention programs/initiatives. We believe however, that the perception by business owners about the safety of their communities is an important aspect to be considered when developing and funding crime prevention programs/initiatives. Consequently, we are turning to you as a key business representative for your community to request your assistance and insights with this project. We would like to conduct a *telephone interview* with you but in the meantime we have provided you with the **questions** we will be asking. In this way you will have an opportunity to review them in advance. In the meantime, if you have any questions please do not hesitate to call Gail Walker at 416 466 0159.

Project Objectives:

1. To combine performance measures with the appropriate evaluation methodology into a self directed program evaluation “Tool Kit” for use by police and community groups.
2. To determine the ‘state of the art’ for self directed program evaluation tool kits/guides.
3. To recommend appropriate methodology for the evaluation of Canadian police services in the areas of community policing, crime prevention, and problem solving.
4. To develop accurate performance indicators that capture the effectiveness of police work in the areas of crime prevention, community policing, and problem solving.
5. To develop measures that can reasonably and unambiguously attribute changes in crime, fear, and disorder, as well as their effects on the quality of life to community action.
6. To ensure that the “Tool Kit” will reflect the latest trends and thinking regarding evaluation for proactive crime prevention police programs.

In contemplating your responses, we would ask that you remember that the 'Tool Kit' is intended to be used by frontline police personnel and community groups.

1. Is the business sector in your community actively involved in crime prevention programs/initiatives?
NO YES
2. To the business sector what things (performance indicators¹⁰) would indicate to you that crime prevention programs/initiatives are working?
3. What are the signs that crime prevention programs/initiatives are not working?

Thank you very much for your assistance.

¹⁰ Performance Indicators is defined as: Ways to objectively measure the degree of success a program has had in achieving its stated objectives, goals, and planned program activities. Therefore as GOALS address philosophy; OBJECTIVES address actions; PERFORMANCE INDICATORS address anticipated results and degree of achievement.

List of Contributors

Experts:

- Dr. Paul Ekblom
Policing and Reducing Crime Unit
Home Office
London, England
- Dr. Dennis P. Rosenbaum
Department of Criminal Justice
University of Illinois
Chicago, Illinois
- Dr. Wesley Skogan
Institute for Policy Research
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois
- Ms. Judy Chong
Academic Accountability,
Toronto District School Board
Toronto, ONT.
- Dr. Barry Leighton
Federal Policing, Issues management Group
HQ, RCMP
Ottawa, ONT.
- Dr. Don Clairmont
Department of Sociology
University of Dalhousie
Halifax, NS.
- Dr. Jim McDavid
School of Public Administration
University of Victoria
Victoria, BC.
- Lode Van Outrive
Ecole de criminologie
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Leuven, Belgium
- Dominic Monjardet
Centre national pour la recherche scientifique
Université de Paris X
Paris, France

- Frederique Ocqueteau
Institut des hautes études de la sécurité intérieure
Paris, France
- Daniel Sansfaçon
International Center for the Prevention of Crime
(ICPC)
Montréal, Québec
- Maurice Chalom
Division de la planification
Service de police de la communauté urbaine de
Montréal
Montréal, Québec
- Dr. Martin Walop
Director, Urban Safety
Haarlem City Council
Haarlem, Netherlands
- Dr. Sohail Husain
Crime Concern
Swindon, Wiltshire,
England

Police:

- Insp. Alistair Buckley
Merseyside Police
Merseyside, Lancashire
England
- PC Michael Wright
Maidstone Police
Maidstone,
Kent, England
- Assistant Supt. Veronica Chan
Singapore Police Department
Singapore, Malaysia
- Major Guy Howie & Capt. Robertson
Ocala Florida Police Department
Ocala, FL.
- Sgt. Jeff Cohn
Dept. of Public Safety
Lakewood, CO.

- Lte. Dave Keneller
San Jose Police Department
San Jose, CA.
- Mr. Brian Ford (retired Chief)
Ottawa-Carleton Police Service
Ottawa, ONT.
- Mr. Bob Lunney
Police Executive Research Forum (PERF)
Washington, DC.
- Dr. Don Loree
OIC Research and Evaluation
RCMP, H.Q.
Ottawa, ONT.
- Carol Wynot
Senior Corporate Planner
Toronto Police Service
Toronto, ONT.
- Barry Horrobin
Director Planning & Physical Resources
Windsor Police Service
Windsor, ONT.
- Deputy Chief Peter Cople
Calgary Police Service
Calgary, AB.
- Insp. Stu Ruff
Victoria Police Department
Victoria, BC.
- Det. Sgt. Alex Williamson
OIC Community Policing
OPP
Orillia, ONT.
- Deputy Chief Buizer
Brandon Police Service
Brandon, MB.
- Deputy Chief Gary West
Delta Police Service
Delta, BC.
- Insp. Ward Clapham
Nanaimo RCMP Detachment
Nanaimo, BC.
- Barbara Ann Simmons
Coleharbour RCMP Detachment
Coleharbour, NS.
- Lte. Paolo del Mistro
Conseiller au commandant
Service de police de la Communauté urbaine de
Montréal
Montréal, Québec
- Capt. Claude Levac
Sûreté du Québec
Montréal, Québec
- Insp. chef Bernard Arsenault
Cabinet du Directeur général de la Sûreté du
Québec
Montréal, Québec
- Lieutenant-colonel David Yansenne
Directeur des opérations
Gendarmerie nationale Brussels
Brussels, Belgium
- Capitaine Frantz Denat
Police nationale français
Seconded to the International Centre for Crime
Prevention
Montréal, Québec
- PC Karen Austin
Merseyside Police ,
Lancashire, England
- Sgt. Peter Van Vree
Queensland Police Service
Queensland, Australia
- Chief Edgar MacLeod
Cape Breton Regional Police Service
Sydney, NS.
- Chief Superintendent Brian McCargo
Royal Ulster Constabulary
Northern Ireland
- Chief David Scott
Saskatoon Police Service
Saskatoon, SK.

➤ PC. Dennis Wright
Turo Police Service
Turo, NS.

➤ Toronto Police Service Crime Prevention & Community Officers Meeting with Toronto Crime Concern

15 officers in attendance:

- Cst. Rick McKnight
- Cst. Alison Slater
- Cst. John Courtney
- Cst. Al Benson
- Cst. Barry Clarke
- Cst. Phil Harris
- Cst. Joanna Teriault
- Cst. Ron Green
- Cst. Reg Eldridge
- Cst. Claudine Thomas
- Cst. Rick Richardson
- Cst. Gord Hayford
- Cst. Joseph Smith
- Cst. Austin Ferguson
- Cst. Ed Heinrichs

➤ Cst. Mark Legare
Fredericton Police Force
Neighbourhood officer
Fredericton, NB.

Community:

➤ Mr. Ray Wright
Neighbourhood Support
Wellington,
New Zealand

➤ Donna Blake Taylor
Homelessness & Urban Partnerships
Regional HQ BC/Yukon Region
HRDC
Vancouver, BC.

➤ Sharron Lyons
BCCPA
Surrey, BC.

➤ Michael Halls
Executive Director
Brampton Safe City Association
Brampton, ONT.

➤ John Bishop
ISCPP
Kesgrave, Ipswich
Suffolk, England

➤ Dr. Randy LaBonte
Consultant
Vancouver, BC.

➤ David Pepper
Director of Community Development
R. M. of Ottawa-Carleton
Ottawa, ONT.

➤ Anna Jacobs
Communications Facilitator
Ontario Healthy Communities Coalition
Toronto, ONT.

➤ Steve Jiggins
London Borough of Wandsworth
Watch Link
London, England

Business:

➤ Todd Letts
Toronto Board of Trade
Toronto, ONT.

➤ John Kiru
Toronto Association of Business Improvement Areas
Toronto, ONT.

➤ Manmohan Mand
Vancouver Downtown Business Improvement Areas
Vancouver, BC.

➤ Rick Joyal
Winnipeg Downtown Business Improvement Areas
Winnipeg, MB.

- Community Exchange 2000 Conference discussions.

Attended by Crime Concern Toronto. The Hon. M.P. Herb Gray introduced the guest speaker Dr. George Kelling. Approximately 50 participants representing grassroots community agencies, businesses, police, residents and politicians from Windsor, Oshawa, London, Toronto, Kitchener, Ottawa, Hamilton, and Caledon.

Performance Indicators

References

- Bandura, Albert. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewoods Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Baumer, Tom. (1985). Testing a general model of fear of crime: Data from a national sample. Journal of Research in Crime and delinquency, 22(3), 239 – 255.
- Bayley, David. (1998). Policing in America: Assessment and prospects. Ideas in American Policing, Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- Brodeur, Jean-Paul. (1998). How to recognize good policing. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (1997). Criminal Justice Indicators. Ottawa: Author.
- Cornell, Dewey. (1998). Designing safer schools for Virginia: A guide to keeping students safe from violence. Building blocks to Better Learning Series, Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia, School of Education.
- Couper, David. (1989). How to rate your local police. Washington, DC: PERF.
- Cusson, Maurice. (1998). La planification et l'évaluation de projets en prévention du crime. In André Normandeau (éd.), Une police professionnelle de type commautaire, tome II (pp. 214 –245). Montréal: Éditions du Méridien.
- Ekblom, Paul. (2000). Impact evaluation for practitioners: Making it easier and better. London, England: Home Office Research and Statistics Directorate.
- Ekblom, Paul. & Pease, Ken. (1995). Evaluating Crime Prevention. Pre-publication version – for a chapter in Crime and Justice. London, England: Home Office Research and Planning Unit.
- Ekblom, Paul. (1997). The evaluation of crime prevention: Problems, issues and context. Adapted from a paper presented for Journee d'études sur l'évaluation des politiques de prevention, Montpellier, France, 15 May 1992. London, England: Home Office Research and Statistics Directorate.
- Farrell, Graham, & Buckley, A. (1993). Repeat victimization as a police performance indicator: A case study of a domestic violence unit in Merseyside". Presented at the British Criminology Conference, University of Wales, Cardiff.

- Farrell, Graham, & Pease, Ken, (1993). Once bitten, twice bitten: Repeat victimization and its implications for crime prevention. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 46, London, England: Home Office.
- Farrell, Graham, et al. (2000). RV Snapshot: UK policing and repeat victimisation. Crime Reduction Research Series, Paper 5, London, England: Home Office Policing and Reducing Crime Unit.
- Halton Regional Police Service. (1999). Bringing into focus: Policing in Halton Region. Regional Municipality of Halton and the Halton Regional Police Service.
- Hoover, Larry. (1998). Police Program Evaluation. Washington, DC: PERF.
- Hoover, Larry. (1996). Quantifying Quality in Policing. Washington, DC: PERF.
- Hunter, A. (1978). Symbols of Incivility. In Ralph Taylor (1995), The Incivilities Thesis: Theory, Measurement, and Policy. Measuring what matters. Proceedings from the Policing Research Institute Meetings, Washington, DC: NIJ
- Kelling, George. (1999). Broken windows and police discretion. National Institute of Justice Research Report, Washington, DC: NIJ
- Kelling, G. (1992). Measuring what matters: A new way of thinking and crime and public order. City Journal, (2) (Spring): 21-34.
- Kemp, Charles, (1990). Current Issues in Criminological Research. British Criminology Conference 1989, 2, Bristol Centre for Criminal Justice.
- Langworthy, Robert. (1996). Meeting Two: Measuring what matters. Proceedings from the Policing Research Institute Meetings, Washington, DC: NIJ
- Loree, Don. (1996). Community policing assessment in the RCMP: A case study. Paper presented at the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Phoenix, Arizona.
- Mastrofski, Stephen. (1999). Policing for people. Ideas in American Policing, Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- Mastrofski, Stephen. (1996). Measuring police performance in public encounters. In L Hoover (Ed.), Quantifying quality in policing, (pp. 209 – 210). Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- Menacher, Julius, et al. (1989). School order and safety as community issues. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(1), pp. 39 – 40, 55 – 56.
- National Institute of Justice. (2000). Measurement and analysis of crime and justice. Volume 4: Criminal Justice 2000, Washington, DC: NIJ

- National Institute of Justice. (1995 – 1996). Measuring what matters. Proceedings from the Policing Research Institute Meetings (November 28, 1995, May 13, 1996, and December 4, 1996), Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS).
- National Institute of Justice. (1997). Measuring what matters. Part Two: Developing measures of what the police do. A Report from the Policing Research Institute, Washington, DC: NIJ and COPS.
- NCPC, Economic Analysis Committee. (1996). Evaluating community-based crime prevention projects: A checklist of approaches and options. Ottawa: National Crime Prevention Council.
- Oettmeier, Timothy & Wycoff, Mary Ann. (1999). Personnel performance evaluations in the community policing context. Washington, DC: Community Policing Consortium.
- OPP (2000). Performance measurement. Presentation to the Canadian Association of Police Boards, August, Fredericton, N.B. Orillia: Author.
- Pease, Ken. (1998). Repeat victimisation: Taking stock. Crime Detection & Prevention Series, Paper 90, London, England: Home Office Police Research Group.
- RCMP. (1999). Performance report. Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing.
- Read, Tim & Tilley, Nick. (2000). Not Rocket Science? Problem-solving and crime reduction. Crime Reduction Research Series Paper 6, London, England: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate
- Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton. (1997). Managers guide to performance indicators. Ottawa-Carleton: Office of the CAO, RMOC.
- Rosenbaum, Dennis, (1988). Community and crime prevention: A review and synthesis of the literature. Justice Quarterly, 5, 323-395.
- Rosenbaum, Dennis, (1986). Community Crime Prevention: Does it Work? London: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Sherman, Lawrence. (1998). Evidence-based policing. Ideas in American Policing, Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- Skogan, Wesley. (1990). Disorder and Decline: Crime and the spiral of decay in American Cities. New York: Free Press.
- Skogan, Wesley. (1987). The impact of victimization on fear. Crime and Delinquency, 33(1), 135 – 154.

- Stephens, Ronald. (1994). Planning for safer and better schools: School violence prevention and intervention strategies. School Psychology Review, 23(2), pp 204 – 216.
- Tilley, Nick, et al. (1999). Burglary prevention: Early lessons from the Crime Reduction Programme. Crime Reduction Research Series, Paper 1, London, England: Home Office Policing and Reducing Crime Unit.
- Tilley, Nick. (1995). Thinking about crime prevention performance indicators. Crime Detection & Prevention Series, Paper 57, London, England: Home Office Police Research Group.
- Trevethan, Shelly. (2000). Discussion paper: Factors affecting Justice data. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS).
- Trickett, A. et al. (1992). What is different about high crime areas? British Journal of Criminology, 32(1), pp. 81 – 89.
- Virginia Department of Education. (1997). School safety audit: Protocol, procedures, and checklists. Virginia: author.
- Walop, Martin. (1996). Improving the inner city: Exploiting the potential of the crime preventive instruments of a municipality. Presentation for the International Conference for Crime Prevention Practitioners, Vancouver, BC.
- Webb, Eugene, et al. (2000). Unobtrusive measures. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Weisburd, David & Greenspan, Rosann. (1997). Preventing crime and increasing justice through policing: A Research Agenda, Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- Weisel, Deborah. (1999). Conducting community surveys: A practical guide for law enforcement agencies (NCJ #178246). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and the (COPS).