

## 16th Session of the Committee of Experts on Public Administration (CEPA)

24 to 28 April 2017

### Written Statement by International Police Executive Symposium

*Agenda item 3: Ensuring effective implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals through leadership, action and means, (b) Institutional leadership and the Sustainable Development Goals*

Police Leadership: Integrating Performance Management and Community Partnerships

Institutional Leadership and SDG #16

Police are the most visible arm of the government and play critical roles with regard to crime control and provision of vital government services. How police treat people is the key to understanding government. Research and experience suggest that a performance management system coupled with community partnerships is best approach to achieving governmental goals of crime control, citizen satisfaction and improved quality of life in communities. Indeed, social scientists can examine and analyze police behavior to effectively gauge the health of a democracy.

In the free world the management of police officers was forever changed in 1994 with the introduction of a performance management system called Compstat (compare statistics). It started in New York City in 1994 under the Police Commissioner William Bratton. It has now been emulated throughout the democratic world. The Compstat system brings together all facets of a police department to accomplish its mission. As of this year crime is down 80 percent from its high point in New York City. Many attribute this success to Compstat.

Compstat has centralized meetings where all bureaus meet to tackle and problem-solve issues. When a problem is found, all avenues of addressing the problem are brought to the table. Innovative ideas that show promise can quickly be emulated throughout the department at these weekly meetings. Commanders of local precincts are held strictly responsible for any issues under their control. The four part mantra of Compstat is: accurate and timely intelligence, develop effective tactics, rapid deployment, and relentless follow-up and assessment. Ultimately, this is a performance management system based on numbers and strict accountability of commanders.

However, there is an underside to Compstat. Initially the system was healthy and led to enormous crime reductions. Innovative ideas were quickly dispersed to numerous commands who successfully emulated the tactics. As time went on more and more was demanded of the department. By 2002, crime was down 60 percent and a new mayor and police commissioner took office. They were not satisfied and began to demand more productivity from officers. Strict quotas were enforced. If officers did not meet their targets, they were reprimanded.

Eventually the system morphed into a numbers game. Officers would write summonses, conduct forcible stops and make arrests just to placate supervisors that than for any tactical reasons. Millions of stops of innocent New Yorkers took place event though crime was

already at historic lows. The performance management system morphed over time into a numbers crunching bureaucracy. The city was sued in two historic cases: *Floyd v. City of New York* and *Stinson v. City of New York*. The *Floyd* case ultimately decided that the policy was unconstitutional and racist. The city was violating numerous people's basic rights by stopping them without cause. The loss of this case meant the city had to work with a federal monitor on its police department among many other restrictions. The *Stinson* case was a class action lawsuit involving numerous complainants who got summonses. Many of the summonses were found to have been given to people innocent of the charges. The city settled this case for tens of millions of dollars. Both cases clearly demonstrate the performance management system gone wild.

Performance management had clearly run amok. Compstat became a top-down bureaucratic numbers game. Commanders went to meetings in fear of being berated. They would come with numbers, any numbers, to defend themselves. It became a "spectacle to watch the bloodletting at the games." Bosses became bullies as protecting Constitutional rights took a backseat to covering oneself. The department became less and less transparent. The *New York Times* had to sue to get basic misdemeanor crime data. Lost property figures were hidden for many years, released, and then hidden again.

It was clear that such a system had both positive and negative elements to it. On the positive side, accountability, a clear understanding of expectations and knowing quite well who is in charge. On the negative side was a failure of leadership, a failure to protect rights, hiding by lower level personnel of mistakes, and a management versus street cop mentality that permeated the department. Overall, it was a colossal mess and even basic crime numbers could not be relied on as commanders tried to protect themselves.

Compstat, and aggressive enforcement strategies in New York and many other jurisdictions have focused almost exclusively on crime control, aggressive enforcement strategies and a zero tolerance approach to "quality of life" issues and minor misdemeanors, often resulting in arrest, citation or summonses. Concern for police-community relationships, fair and respectful treatment of citizen and respect for the rule and spirit of the law declined. Recent events following the deaths of suspects in New York City, Ferguson, Missouri, Baltimore, Maryland, and elsewhere demonstrate the importance of improved communication, trust and relationships between the police and communities. There have been renewed calls to bring back community policing the origins of which date back to the 1980s and for which there is still no commonly accepted definition. Community policing developed slowly and gradually spread across the United States during the 1980's and 1990's, in an effort to improve police-community relationships and reduce crime. It was shaped, at least in part, by forces within particular jurisdictions related to local history, concerns, politics and problems. Community Policing is an ideal approach to achieving Sustainable Development Goal # 16 Promoting Peace, Justice, Inclusivity and Strong Institutions.

The mechanisms by which community policing can improve communication, trust and build relationships between police and communities are relatively clear. There is strong evidence to suggest that police-community relationships improved in New Haven, Richmond and many other jurisdictions which committed to community policing. However, the mechanisms by which community policing could reduce crime was less than clear and the results mixed. In many respects, Compstat, with its focus on crime control, filled this void. The decline in community policing largely coincided with the rapid growth and adoption of Compstat, The

potentially critical role of elected and appointed political officials in adopting both strategies is often overlooked.

The nature and extent of the role of police chiefs, commissioners and top police leadership in designing and implementing successful community policing efforts was truly extraordinary. The chiefs developed and articulated the philosophy and principles and values of their departments with varying degrees of outside input; established priorities for their departments; played a critical role in the process of implementation of community policing; designed key programs and activities; and strongly influenced changes in management mechanisms, organizational structure and training. In addition to the impact of the chiefs on all aspects of community policing, the chiefs' leadership styles were probably the single most important factor contributing to the organizational climate of their departments, resulting in greater or lesser degrees of "buy-in" or resistance.

Community policing demands visionary top leadership, demonstrated commitment and, arguably, a participatory management style to transform the organizational culture of police departments from the elite, enforcement-oriented values to the more inclusive values of community policing. Top leadership establishes and transmits key principles and values which determine the focus and goals of community policing for the agency, plays a critical role in creating police-citizen partnerships based upon mutual respect and interdependence, decides upon key programs and activities and makes the ultimate decision in shaping key aspects of community policing, including fundamental changes in management mechanisms, organizational structure and training.

Visionary leadership gives the organization and individual members direction and purpose and unites members to work toward a common goal. Central to the vision of community policing is the willingness of the chief to share power with the community in a collaborative relationship. This relates directly to one of the fundamental premises of community policing set forth by Skolnick and Bayley (1988), that the citizens are "co-producers" of public safety and order. That in return for community participation and efforts to prevent and reduce crime and improve quality of life, they are given a voice. However, power-sharing and partnerships involve risk, which is likely one of the key reasons that community policing was slow to develop.

Community policing like Compstat, is fundamentally a leadership and management intervention, albeit with a different focus. The challenge for police leaders is to incorporate the best aspects of both and integrate performance management, effective crime control, accountability, communication, cooperation and trust – both within police departments and between police and the community. In theory this is possible but in practice it has proven difficult due to the different goals, underlying assumptions with regard to the effective leadership and management styles and the emphasis of the approaches. By addressing these challenges and integrating Community Policing and Compstat, police leaders can make substantial progress toward achieving the targets for Sustainable Development Goal # 16, specifically: reducing of all forms of [crime], violence and related death rates; reducing abuse in all forms; promoting the rule of law; developing effective, accountable and transparent institutions; and ensuring responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels.