In Dennis P. Rosenbaum (ed). *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises.* Sage Publications, 1994

Community Policing in Madison

An Analysis of Implementation and Impact

MARY ANN WYCOFF

WESLEY G. SKOGAN

BETWEEN 1987 AND 1990 the Police Foundation, with funding from the National Institute of Justice, observed the process by which the Madison, Wisconsin, Police Department fostered community policing. This chapter reports observations on the change process and presents significant findings about the impact of the process and the products of that change effort on both the officers in the department and the citizens served by it.

After an implementation period of 2 years, it was determined that:

- a new, participatory management approach was successfully implemented in the experimental area;
- employee attitudes toward the organization and toward their work improved; and
- physical decentralization was accomplished.

For citizens, these changes were associated with:

- a reduction in citizens' perceptions that crime was a problem in their neighborhood, and

AUTHORS' NOTE: Preparation of this chapter was supported in part by Grant 87-IJ-CX-0062 to the Police Foundation from the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions expressed in this chapter are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the U.S. Department of Justice or the Police Foundation.

- an increase in the belief that police were working on problems of importance to people in the neighborhood.

Quality Policing in Madison

The importance of Madison's undertaking and of the research conducted there rests in substantial part on the fact that Madison was one of the first agencies to assert that there must be an internal foundation for the successful external application of community policing, or "Quality Policing,"[1] as the concept is known in Madison.

Since 1987 the Madison department has believed three conditions are necessary for the development of Quality Policing. The first is the implementation of a new management approach that supports employee participation in organizational decisions. The management philosophy is known as "Quality Leadership," an approach that emphasizes the role of managers as facilitators whose job it is to improve systems, involve employees in decision making, employ databased problem-solving approaches, promote team work, encourage risk-taking and creativity, and give and receive feedback from employees.

The second necessary condition is a healthy work environment for employees. In Madison this means treating employees as "internal customers" whose problems should be identified and resolved. Quality Leadership is the means of creating the healthy workplace and is defined in Madison by the department's Twelve Principles of Quality Leadership.

1. Believe in, foster, and support *teamwork.*
2. Be committed to the *problem-solving* process; use it and let *data,* not emotions, drive decisions.
3. Seek employees' *input* before you make decisions.
4. Believe that the best way to improve the quality of work or service is to *ask* and *listen to* employees who are doing the work.
5. Strive to develop mutual *respect* and *trust* among employees.
6. Have a *customer* orientation and focus toward employees and citizens.
7. Manage on the *behavior* of 95% of employees and not on that of the 5% who cause problems.
8. *Improve systems* and examine processes before blaming people.
9. Avoid "top down," *power-oriented* decision making whenever possible.
10. Encourage *creativity* through *risk-taking* and be tolerant of honest *mistakes.*
11. Be a *facilitator* and *coach.* Develop an *open* atmosphere that encourages providing and accepting *feedback.*
12. With teamwork, develop with employees agreed-upon *goals* and a *plan* to achieve them.

Physical decentralization is the third necessary condition. A small work group (the consequence of physical decentralization) is viewed as essential to being able to identify and improve conditions in the workplace. At the same time, the closer physical proximity to citizens resulting from decentralization is necessary in order for police to know citizens and be aware of their problems.

The relationship of these three conditions to the goal of Quality Policing is reflected in the motto of the Madison department:

> CLOSER TO THE PEOPLE:
> QUALITY FROM THE INSIDE, OUT

The operational relationship among these ideas was to be developed and tested in what Madison called its Experimental Police District (EPD), one sixth of the department that was established in 1987 as the organization's laboratory for new ideas. Its initial charge was to promote innovation and experimentation in three areas:

1. employee participation in decision making about the conditions of work and the delivery of police service;
2. management and supervisory styles supportive of employee participation and of community-oriented and problem-oriented policing; and
3. the implementation of community-oriented and problem-oriented policing.

The EPD was to work through the problems of physical decentralization and create closer relationships with area residents for the purpose of solving problems in the community.

The Experimental Police District

Planning Process

In 1986 Chief David Couper proposed creation of the Experimental Police District.[2] Following an open departmental meeting to discuss the EPD idea, a selection committee of interested employees chose 10 members of the organization to serve as a planning team that represented all functions and ranks of the department. The Chief appointed a coordinating team that consisted of the Chief, four captains, and the president of the officers' union.[3]

The planning team selected an area that constituted approximately one sixth of the city[4] to serve as the project area. The group designed a facility to be built in the district and determined the numbers of personnel to work in the EPD, the means by which they would be selected, their basic responsibilities, and guidelines for their management.

The team identified organizational problems in need of correction, such as lack of meaningful involvement with the community, lack of teamwork and/or team identity among officers, inflexible management styles and resulting loss of creativity, and lack of communication and information exchange among ranks. Team members then met in small groups with all department employees to hear what they felt needed to be done.

To get citizens involved, the team held eight community meetings in the EPD area, two in each alderperson's district. Citizens were asked about their knowledge of and satisfaction with police services, neighborhood problems and concerns, and how they felt police could work with them in responding to problems. At each meeting the problems identified were rated by priority.

EPD Personnel

Officers and sergeants who wanted to work in the EPD bid for the assignment and their shift on the basis of seniority during the department's annual bidding process. More than enough officers bid for the 22 patrol assignments. This was not the case among detectives, who generally were opposed to being decentralized; at least three of the six original EPD detectives were assigned on the basis of their low seniority (i.e., inexperience). The lieutenant and captain for the EPD were chosen from among the applicants for these jobs by a vote of the project team and the personnel who had elected to work in the area.

The Experimental Police District opened for business in April 1988 with 40 sworn employees: 22 patrol officers, 3 neighborhood officers,[5] 6 detectives, 3 parking monitors, 4 sergeants, 1 lieutenant, and 1 captain. The captain has responsibility for all patrol and investigative operations at the station. He reports to the department's deputy chief of operations but has substantial flexibility in running the EPD. In addition to the sworn personnel, the EPD has a civilian stenographer and makes occasional use of volunteers and student interns.

EPD Training

All members of the department received Quality/Productivity training. In addition, EPD personnel received four additional days of training. Professor Herman Goldstein, from the University of Wisconsin Law School, spent a day discussing problem-oriented policing with the group. Much of the rest of the training focused on decentralization issues and the development of a team approach. Trainers also discussed the use of data for problem analysis and ways of measuring success at problem resolution.

One of the advantages of the EPD, resulting from the ease of making arrangements in a small work group, has been the frequency of in-service training. Training sessions are held whenever necessary to address issues that arise. Alderpersons from the area and personnel from other agencies may be invited to attend. Occasionally, the EPD invites personnel from the department's central station to attend training sessions dealing with problems between EPD and other department personnel. Although the formal training function will continue to be based in the central station, EPD managers feel that having their own training sessions facilitates teamwork and the handling of area problems.

EPD Facility

The building is visible and accessible on a heavily traveled, primarily residential street, a block from the main artery through the EPD area. Its external appearance is more like that of a professional office than a traditional police facility.

In the report to the National Institute of Justice on the evaluation of the EPD (Wycoff & Skogan, 1993), the building is described in detail because the evaluators concluded that the size and design of the work space played a central role in creating a sense of "team" at the EPD—an opinion shared by several officers and managers. A large briefing room serves multiple formal and informal functions, and its location in the center of the work space requires personnel of various functions and ranks to pass through it to reach the exit or other offices. It is a comfortably appointed area in which officers gather before their shift and where they can be found after shift conversing with colleagues who are coming to work. It functions as the EPD "family room" as well as the core operations space.

Observations of the use of this building suggest that other organizations planning to encourage closer working relationships among employees should give serious consideration to the design of the workplace.

EPD Management Style

The principles of Quality Management outlined previously have influenced managers throughout the Madison department but, during the evaluation period (1988-1990), were given greater emphasis in the EPD where the captain and lieutenant clearly viewed themselves as facilitators of officers' efforts to identify and solve problems. They reported their goal to be that of becoming coaches and teachers who allow and encourage creativity and risk-taking among officers. They gave officers substantial latitude to decide their own schedule, determine their work conditions, and decide how to address neighborhood problems. They sought and considered the input of employees before making managerial-level decisions.

EPD managers encouraged problem solving by offering ideas, information, and alternatives to traditional work schedules. They avoided directing officers to do specified neighborhood problem-solving activities. Initially, the EPD project team had planned for EPD personnel to work together to develop community policing strategies and plans for the station. However, it was decided after the station opened that EPD officers should individually, or in small teams, identify neighborhood problems and plan responses. Although things moved slowly at the beginning, by 1989 the managers reported an increased use of problem-solving approaches among officers.

Officers who identified problems were free to consult other officers and their supervisors to make arrangements for the necessary time and resources to address the problems. (This means ensuring that enough people are working, enough cars are available, etc.) Several officers worked cooperatively, switching days off or changing schedules to accommodate colleagues. Managers provided support by arranging teamwork across shifts and coordinating the efforts of officers who wanted to address the same problems.

To help arrange time for problem solving and for shift meetings, the sergeants, lieutenant, and captain occasionally would work the streets. EPD managers called their street work "management participation" (rather than participatory management) and felt that this involvement contributed to the team spirit.

Supervision and discipline deliberately were more informal at the EPD than in the rest of the department. Managers attempted to accept honest mistakes as mistakes. As indicated previously, officers were given wider latitude for carrying out problem-solving activities and were encouraged to seek innovative solutions and take risks. To support this, managers were more likely to begin a disciplinary case by examining it to determine whether it involved honest operational mistakes or blatant wrongdoing. In the case of apparently honest mistakes, they would attempt reconciliation between citizen and officer.

By sharing decision making with officers, managers appear to have fostered supervision among peers. Rather than always depending on sergeants to handle problems among officers, EPD officers were more likely to handle issues through informal discussions and through group discussions at briefings.

Work in the EPD

Although the research project included no systematic observations of officers, some of them reported in conversations with researchers their increased levels of interaction with citizens. When answering calls for service, officers might ask citizens if there were problems, other than the subject of the call, about which officers should be aware. Officers also might make more efforts to talk informally with citizens, visit businesses and schools, and attend neighborhood meetings. These activities reflected an emphasis on what managers at the EPD and in the rest of the department call "value added service." Basically, this means going the extra distance to do a good job: spending more time at calls; making follow-up visits or calls to problem addresses; analyzing calls for service to identify problems and proactively contacting those involved to seek a solution; and, in general, taking more time to understand the problems and concerns of citizens.

Officers from the EPD cooperated with a neighborhood association, for instance, to correct a speeding problem in one of the district's neighborhoods. In a community meeting with EPD officers, area residents had identified speeding on a particular street as a significant concern. Together officers and some citizens spent a day stopping cars speeding in the area. Instead of issuing tickets, officers issued warnings to the speeders and residents delivered personal pleas to them. The drivers were given a flyer explaining the speeding problem and displaying the fine that could have been levied.

Patrol officers at the EPD were allowed to develop individualized patrol strategies. Getting officers involved in problem solving was a gradual process; managers encouraged problem solving but did not require it. Some EPD officers requested their assignment for reasons other than eagerness to do community-oriented policing (e.g., the chance to work a better shift), but more active problem-solving officers did, in several instances, draw these other officers into community-oriented work by asking for their help on specific projects.

The flexibility given EPD officers to pursue interests and to work as teams was the major force motivating changes in service delivery. If, for example, a patrol officer wished to work plainclothes on a burglary problem, she or he was free to work out the arrangements with the supervisor and any other officer who might appropriately be involved in the effort. In another police setting, such a request from a patrol officer might be denied out of concern for the precedent it would set. At the EPD, this *was* the desired precedent.

Research Design and Methodology

There were three objectives of the Madison evaluation:[6]

1. document the process of developing the Experimental Police District;
2. measure the internal effects of change on officers; and
3. measure the external effects of change on citizens.

Objective One: Document the Implementation Process

Over the 3-year period of the evaluation, the Project Director, who was off site, monitored the implementation process through regular review of reports,

memos, and newspaper articles; through direct observation of the EPD during site visits; by frequent telephone contact with EPD managers; and conversations with two University of Wisconsin faculty members who are long-term observers of the relationship between the department and the community.

Three annual administrations of a police personnel survey provided opportunity for numerous informal conversations with personnel throughout the organization concerning the perceptions of the change process.

During the summers of 1988 and 1990, the Project Director, assisted by George Kelling, conducted lengthy interviews with all members of the department's management team and, in 1990, with 14 lieutenants and eight detectives.

Objective Two: Measure the Internal Effects of Change

It was expected that successful implementation of Quality Leadership and the orientation of the department to community- and problem-oriented policing would have an impact on personnel that would be reflected in their attitudes toward:

- the organization, management, and supervision;
- the nature of the police role; and
- the role of the community in policing.

It was further expected that change in employee attitudes during the evaluation period would occur primarily in the Experimental Police District. The design for testing this assumption was a quasi-experimental one in which changes in attitudes of EPD employees would be compared over time with attitude changes of employees in the rest of the department. Exposure to the impacts of the changes in the EPD was to be controlled by analyzing changes for employees who had been in the EPD for the entire evaluation period of 2 years in comparison to those of employees who were never in the EPD during this period.

The conditions of a true experiment did not exist because the program site (the service area of the Experimental Police District) was not randomly selected but was selected by the department, based on a number of indicators of need. Officers were not randomly assigned to work in the EPD but were allowed to bid for assignment there just as they annually bid for other assignments.

Personnel Survey

Employee attitudes were measured by the administration of a written survey to all commissioned personnel three times during the evaluation period: December 1987, prior to the opening of the Experimental Police District; one year later in December 1988; and again in December 1989. Survey participation rates ranged between 97% in 1987 and 86% in 1989. The participation rate for the panel, on which most of the analysis is based, was 79%.

Analysis of Personnel Survey Data

Both within-group analysis and regression analysis were conducted. Within-group analyses were used to determine whether statistically significant change occurred *among* EPD officers and *among* Non-EPD officers; this was of interest because change clearly was occurring throughout the department. Regression analyses were conducted in which group assignment (EPD or Non-EPD) was the independent variable and the pretest score was controlled. These regression analyses are the most stringent measures of program effect.

Objective Three: Measure the External Effects of Change

Citizen Survey

It was expected that residents of Madison who were served by EPD officers would, over time, interact more frequently with police, perceive that they were receiving better service, and believe that police were addressing problems of concern to the community. These assumptions were tested using the quasi-experimental design that compared attitudes and perceptions of residents in the EPD service area with those of residents in the rest of the city. The same respondents were surveyed twice. The first survey was conducted in person in February and March 1988, just prior to the opening of the EPD station; the second was conducted by telephone in February and March 1990.

The total number of completed interviews at Time 1 was 1,170. The response rate in the EPD area was 77.8%; it was 75.1% in the rest of the city. For the posttest (1990) survey, 772 interviews were completed for a panel completion rate of 66.2%. Attrition analysis found the main outcome measures to be unrelated to attrition, either in general or within the program and comparison areas. In addition, there were no consistent differences between the areas in how rates of attrition were related to social and demographic factors.

Analysis of Citizen Survey Data

As with the officer data, analysis of the citizen surveys involved both within-group and regression analysis of the panel data. In the regression analysis, the

following covariates were controlled: area of residency, number of adults in household, whether employed, education, residency in Madison in 1988, gender, U.S. citizenship, length of time in Madison, months lived in current residence, number of children in household, student status, race, whether employed full or part time, home ownership, income, whether living alone or as a couple, number of adults in household over 60 years of age, and respondent's age. Whenever appropriate, multiple items were used to measure a given construct.

The Findings

The Implementation Process

Observations and interviews confirmed that decentralization was accomplished successfully and that Quality Management was implemented in the Experimental Police District. Officers interacted as members of a team and participated with their supervisors and managers in work-related decisions.

The Internal Effects of Change

The following outcomes were considered important possible effects for employees of the efforts at internal change:

- *sense of participation in organizational decision making
- sense of cooperation among employees
- *feedback about work from other officers
- *frequency of contacts between officers and detectives
- *frequency of officer participation in investigations
- availability of time for proactive work
- *ease of arranging time off
- *perceived availability of backup support
- *satisfaction with physical working conditions
- satisfaction with kind of work on job
- *satisfaction with department as place to work
- *satisfaction with supervision
- sense that job is significant
- sense of wholeness of task
- *sense of autonomy in job
- satisfaction with potential for personal growth

- belief in working on neighborhood problems
- belief in citizen involvement in problem solving
- belief in noncrime problem solving
- belief in strict enforcement
- *belief that patrol function develops community support
- sense that citizens have high regard for police
- belief that people are altruistic
- belief that people are trustworthy
- *belief in benefits of change
- willingness to support change
- *belief in decentralization

In analyzing the effects of the changes on officer attitudes and reported behaviors, within-group analyses were used to assess the magnitude and patterns of change and regression analyses were conducted to test the strength of the proposition that the observed changes are the result of the approaches to management and operations used in the Experimental Police District.

Among these variables were 14 outcomes for which the regression coefficient was significant ($p < .05$), indicating that the outcome was positively and significantly associated with assignment to the Experimental Police District. These significant outcomes are indicated in the list above with an asterisk (*).

The within-group analyses produced a picture across these 27 outcomes of the entire department, moving generally toward goals of the change program. On 15 of these measures, scores for each group indicated movement (although not always statistically significant) in the direction of positive program effects. For 8 of these outcomes the regression coefficient was not significant, suggesting that the lack of demonstrated program (EPD) effect on these outcomes may have been the result of both the program and the control groups moving in the same direction over time. This finding of positive movement in both groups is a highly desirable result for an organization that is attempting a department-wide reorientation toward police service; it is a problem only for the evaluators who are looking for the measurable differences. In addition to showing that the entire department is moving toward goals of the change program, the data indicate that efforts made in the Experimental Police District are producing the desired changes to a greater extent or, perhaps, at a faster rate.

Insofar as it can be determined from attitudinal questionnaires, the data used to assess the internal effects of the change process strongly suggest that substantial progress has been made in the Madison Police Department, and especially in the Experimental Police District, toward the implementation of Quality Leadership.

The attitudes toward management and working conditions (the internal aspects of the job) changed more dramatically than did attitudes toward community involvement and the nature of the role. Nevertheless, there was a pattern of

change within the EPD toward greater belief in community policing and problem-oriented policing. The apparently greater strength of the organization-related attitudes suggests support for the two-stage model of change in Madison that calls for creating greater quality on the inside of the organization before it is manifested on the outside.

The External Effects of Change

The variables used in the citizen survey to measure the effects of the change process on the community included:

- seeing an officer in the area in past 24 hours
- *seeing an officer walking patrol in past week
- seeing an officer engaged in friendly conversation with neighborhood people in past week
- police came to door to inquire about problems
- *citizen attended meeting at which officer was present
- belief that lack of police contact is a problem
- citizen knows name of officer
- satisfaction with most recent citizen-initiated contact

Police perceived as . . .

- . . . attentive in last contact
- . . . helpful in last contact
- *. . . working with citizens to solve problems
- . . . spending enough time on right problems
- . . . good at preventing crime
- . . . good at keeping order
- . . . controlling speeding and careless driving
- . . . good at helping victims

Belief that . . .

- *. . . robbery or attack are problems (decreased)
- . . . adult drug use/sales is a problem
- . . . residential burglary is a problem
- . . . speeding and careless driving are problems
- . . . police are police
- . . . South Madison is a good place to live

- *. . . crime is a problem in South Madison (lower in EPD)
- . . . feeling of being unsafe in neighborhood at night

Worry about . . .

- . . . being robbed
- . . . burglary
- . . . theft outside at night

Having experienced . . .

- . . . robbery
- *. . . burglary (decreased)
- . . . knowing a burglary victim

There is some evidence among these external outcomes that the work of EPD officers is having a positive impact on residents in the area. Among the 30 outcomes listed above, there are 7 for which a significant regression coefficient suggests that improved attitudes or conditions may be attributable to the EPD efforts. These outcomes are marked with an asterisk (*).

Undesirable outcomes associated significantly with residing in the EPD service area are:

- increased belief that drug use and sales are big problems in the area, and
- increased belief that the violation of parking rules is a big problem.

It is the case that the external benefits are not as numerous as the internal benefits that were measured, and there are not as many that are as clearly attributable to community policing as the department had hoped. Constraints listed below (and discussed in detail in Wycoff & Skogan, 1993) may have limited the ability to find more evidence of community benefits. These include:

- the possible inadequacy of measures of impact. More development and testing of appropriate outcome measures specifically designed for community-oriented and problem-oriented policing needs to be done.
- the fact that community policing began to emerge late in the test period. The two-stage process of change in which the EPD was involved required more time and energy for the first stage (internal change) than had been anticipated; the second stage (improved external service) was not sufficiently developed at the time of measurement to show as much impact as had been expected when the evaluation was designed.
- too many changes were occurring at once. Ironically, the process of developing Quality Leadership, a goal of which is better service for the customer, may have

interfered initially with efforts to create a new external orientation. To guarantee that they were not being traditional, order-giving commanders, EPD managers began their new roles by taking a position of "allowing" community policing to occur rather than directing that it occur. Over time they realized that some officers were motivated by the sense of permission while others were more comfortable when receiving more explicit direction. Quality Management, like any effective management approach, may need to be tailored somewhat to each employee.

- attitudes of the EPD managers toward research. They knew what could be done to produce positive outcomes in the citizen surveys (e.g., door-to-door contacts just prior to the second survey) but deliberately chose not to induce an artificial effect, preferring the long-term benefits of changes that grew naturally out of the process of "permitted" or "facilitated" change.
- characteristics of the personnel who were the first members of the EPD. Because of seniority rules, some of those most interested in community policing and problem-solving policing worked the late shift where they were least able to work on problems with the community.
- citizen satisfaction levels already so high that efforts to raise them would have to be dramatic before changes would register as statistically significant. This was the case for several measures of citizen satisfaction with police service.
- the EPD was not changing in isolation from the rest of the department. The entire organization was being affected by the transition to Quality Leadership and was exposed to the ideas of community policing and problem-oriented policing.

The impacts of these various conditions cannot be measured and cannot be teased apart. They can only be noted as possible alternative explanations for findings or the lack of significant findings.

The most serious constraint may have been the time frame within which the evaluation had to be conducted. In any department, community policing is a slow organizational sea change from which measurable external effects perhaps should not be expected in less than several years. In the case of Madison where the change process was a two-stage one, the internal moves to decentralization and Quality Management required more time than initially had been predicted. The department was beginning to concentrate on the external changes at about the time this study had to be completed. Crime data and informal reports from the department 3 years later indicate that the magnitude of the external effects continues to grow.

Discussion

Surely the most dramatic finding indicated in this chapter is that it *is* possible to "bend granite" (Guyot, 1979); it is possible to change a traditional, control-oriented police organization into one in which employees become members of work teams and participants in decision-making processes. The Madison Police Department has changed the inside to the benefit of employees. This research suggests that associated with these internal changes are external benefits for citizens, including indications of reductions in crime and reduced levels of concern about crime.

Are these relationships causal? Or do they occur together in these data because they result from a variety of efforts, all of which were undertaken in the Experimental Police District at the same time? It is impossible to say. What can be said is that it is possible to implement participatory management in a police department, and that doing so is very likely to produce more satisfied workers.

Is the Quality Leadership approach a necessary condition for community-oriented and problem-oriented policing? This research cannot say with certainty that it is. Many managers and employees in Madison believe that it is, as do some theorists who write about these approaches to policing. Employees who are treated as internal customers, the logic goes, are better able to understand what it means to treat citizens as external customers. Employees whose input is valued learn to value the input of others (e.g., citizens). Employees who are invited to work in team relationships to solve internal problems learn in this way to work with citizens in team relationships to solve problems. People closest to the problems (officers and citizens) have the most information about those problems, and their input is critical for problem definition and resolution. Finally, students of change have long argued that organizational change is more readily accepted by employees who participate in the process of creating it. All of these arguments appear to have been supported in the Experimental Police District. If our data cannot prove a necessary relationship between the management style of Quality Leadership and the new approaches to policing, they do indicate that they were highly compatible in the Experimental Police District.

The data *do* indicate that officers' attitudes can shift from more traditional views of policing to ones that are more in line with police-community involvement in problem identification and resolution, even among officers with many years of service.

The data also cannot prove that decentralization is a necessary condition for community-oriented policing. Madison Police Department managers now tend to agree that it is. As observers, we believe that decentralization contributed significantly to the creation of the new management style. It also contributed to the development of team spirit and processes, conditions that should facilitate problem-solving policing. Officers who work in the EPD believe the decentralized station enhances relationships with the public; they report increased numbers of contacts with citizens in the community and an ever-increasing number of citizens who come to the station for assistance.

The scale on which decentralization occurred was important. The small physical space of the EPD station and its floor plan made close interaction among officers, detectives, supervisors, and managers unavoidable.

Our data also cannot prove that changing one part of the organization before proceeding with department-wide implementation is the best way to move

toward decentralization and community policing. However, after more than 3 years of experience with this approach to change, the managers of the Madison Police Department, all of whom have experienced the various costs of changing in this way, tend to agree that this way *is* the right approach. Further, as the data indicate, special attention to one part of the organization did not block change elsewhere.

Finally, it must be emphasized that the changes that occurred in the Madison Police Department did not begin within the time frame of the study reported here. This study was a window into one relatively brief period in the much lengthier process of change. This research project did not begin at The Beginning, and we have no idea when to expect the full impact of the changes that are under way. The changes that are documented here have occurred and are occurring in a context of organizational history and community culture that may determine, to some unmeasured degree, the ability to implement the changes and the magnitude of the impact of the changes. The department began the change discussed in this chapter after nearly 15 years of ongoing experimentation with new ideas and the development of a commitment to seek better ways of conducting policing. Also, during this same period, continual efforts were made to recruit educated officers whose backgrounds, life experiences, and attitudes may increase their tendencies to support these changes. This observation is offered merely as a caution against unrealistic expectations for departments in which change is attempted in a different context.

Notes

1. "Quality Policing" is, for the Madison department, a broad concept that encompasses community policing. It is a philosophy that emphasizes quality of service delivery based on responsiveness to the customer, quality of life in the community, quality of life in the workplace, the Quality/Productivity/Quality Leadership processes advocated by Edwards Deming, and the Madison department's commitment to continual improvement. The link to "community policing" is the belief that, although the commitment to constant improvement means the department may one day work to implement other approaches to police service than ones now used, these will evolve out of current efforts to develop a community orientation to police service.

2. This discussion is indebted to the work of Chris Koper, a doctoral student at the University of Maryland in summer 1989 when he worked on this project as an intern with the Police Foundation.

3. The historical context of this planning effort is important. It was not the first time employees of all ranks had participated in organizational decision making. In 1981 the Officers' Advisory Council (OAC) was created. Twelve peer-selected employees who meet monthly with the Chief advise the management team about problems that need to be addressed and then participate in decisions about these issues. The OAC has selected both vehicles and weapons for the department. In 1984 a Committee on the Future of the department, broadly representative of the department, was created to establish long-range organizational goals. This study of Madison's change process, conducted between 1987 and 1990, provides only a narrow window onto a process that occurred over a 20-year period that began with Chief Couper's appointment in 1973 and continued after the evaluation project ended.

4. The project area has a diverse population including whites, blacks, Asians, Native Americans, and Hispanics. In 1986 the EPD area accounted for 20% of the city's reported crimes. It received 15,761 calls for service, which were 16% of total calls to the department.

5. In Madison, neighborhood officers are patrol officers who have responsibility for a neighborhood area that has been identified as needing more intensive service. Not required to respond to calls for service (although they often do), these officers have more time for community organization activities and problem identification and resolution than do other officers. At the time of this study, there were eight such officers in Madison, three of whom were assigned to the EPD area.

6. The detailed discussion of the methodology, analysis, and findings and the data collection instruments are available in the technical report for this project (Wycoff & Skogan, 1993).

References

Guyot, D. (1979). Bending granite: Attempts to change the rank structure of American police departments. *Journal of Police Science and Administration, 7*(3), 253-384.

Wycoff, M. A., & Skogan, W. G. (1993). *Community policing in Madison: Quality from the inside out. An evaluation of implementation and impact* (Tech. Rep.). Washington, DC: Police Foundation.