

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

**Community Policing: A Model For Change in
Service Delivery in the Public Sector**

Stephen Covey

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

Political Science

**Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Masters of Public Policy and Public Administration
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada**

April 2001

© Stephen Covey, April 2001



**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-59260-X

Canada

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Organizational Change and Service Delivery in the Public Sector	4
	1. Transformation of Democratic Democracies	4
	2. The Impetus for Change	8
	3. What is “Better”?	13
	4. Factors of Change	15
	a. Internal Environment	16
	b. External Environment	24
	5. Approaches to Improving the Delivery of Services to Citizens	27
	a. TQM	27
	b. Marketization of the State	29
	c. Professional Management Model	30
	d. Democratization of Administration	32
	6. Conclusion	33
III.	Organization Reform in the Police Sector	35
	1. Introduction	35
	2. A Historical Perspective of Police Service Delivery	37
	3. A Historical Review of Police Management Models	41
	a. Traditional Management Model	41
	b. Scientific Management Model	42
	c. Human Relations & Participative Management Model	44
	d. Behavioural Management & Systems Management	45
	e. Proactive Management	46
	4. The Impetus for Reform	47
	a. External Motives	47
	b. Internal Motives	49
	5. Conclusion	49
IV.	The Concept of Community-Based Policing	51
	1. From Bureaucracy to Community-based Policing	51
	2. What is Community-based Policing?	52
	3. Definitions of Community-based Policing	53
	4. The Components of Community-based Policing	55
	5. Community Policing versus Traditional Policing	56
	6. Reactive, Proactive and Interactive Policing	59
V.	Managing Change: Management under the Community-based Policing Model	65
	1. Coping with Organizational Change	65
	2. Preparing for Change	66
	a. Values and Culture	66
	b. Goals	67

c. Structure	67
d. Climate	68
e. External Environment	68
3. Structural / Organizational Accommodation in Community Policing	69
a. External Values	70
b. Internal Values	72
c. Goals	72
d. Structure	75
e. Environment	77
f. Climate	80
VI. Community Policing in the RCMP	81
1. Introduction: The RCMP Example	81
2. Interactive Community Policing	82
3. "CAPRA": the Implementation of Interactive Community Policing in the RCMP	83
4. "CAPRA" is....	85
5. The Uniqueness of "CAPRA"	89
VII. Managing Community Policing: The RCMP Experience	90
1. Managing Community Policing Organizations	90
2. The RCMP Experience	90
a. Mission, Values, and Values	91
b. Mission Statement of the RCMP	93
c. Participative Management	94
d. The Alignment Initiative	95
e. Human Resource Systems	96
f. Communication	99
g. Alternative Dispute Resolution	99
h. Empowerment / Risk Management	102
VIII. Conclusion	104
Community-based Policing: A Model for Public Service Reform	104
1. The Goal of Public Service Reform	104
2. The Criteria of Public Service Reform	105
3. Community Policing as a Model of Change for the Public Service	107
Bibliography	110

I. Introduction

I am a second generation police officer in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP). My father joined the RCMP in the 1940's. He is now retired and when I talk to him about the "new direction" of policing in the RCMP, he smiles and tells me a story of what "real" community-based policing is. My father policed a region of New Brunswick alone; the next officer was several miles away. There were no shifts to work; he was simply part of the community and his role was that of "police officer". He didn't play the role eight hours a day, five days a week; rather, he was always on duty and when someone needed help, they called "Gerry", night or day, and he put on his boots and responded to the call. More than that however, he knew his environment. He knew all of the families in the community and he knew who to see when an offense was committed (who had probably carried out the crime or who could tell him who did). He was also an integral part of the community: he played sports, coached, went to church, helped out with community events, etc., etc. He knew who he could trust, and the community trusted him.

Today, the RCMP detachment at Hartland, New Brunswick has over twenty police officers. The population of the region hasn't increased that much, but society and policing have changed dramatically. Police forces strayed from the type of community-based policing which my father employed, adopting a much more "professional", "paternalistic", and "segregated" type. Yet many police forces are once again reverting back to proactive, community-based policing. Those departments which have not yet realized the need to provide a service which is more responsive to the needs of the community it serves, are finding themselves bearing the brunt of increased controversy and scandal and inevitably, will be forced to change. A police force which does not represent the social fiber and reflect the values of the community it serves, is ultimately rejected by that community.

Canadians in general are increasingly demonstrating their discontent with the direction in which the delivery of public services (including policing) has been headed over the past few decades. The professional / paternalistic approach to the provision of public services is not restricted to policing only, rather it is a sign of the direction of public service delivery throughout our government; at all levels.

The underlying theme of this thesis as a whole is an attempt to identify an effective manner in which public organizations may adapt their present way of doing business so that it

will better reflect the needs of today's society while at the same time, preparing itself for the future.

The thesis will especially treat this topic as it applies specifically to reforming the delivery of police services. However, while a great portion of the thesis will draw upon policing practices, it will also address the applicability of organizational reform of police services, to service delivery in the public sector as a whole.

To be more precise, I will demonstrate to the reader that some police organizations have made a conscious effort to restructure their organizations and the means used to deliver security services so as to be more responsive and attentive to the particular needs of the communities they serve. I will describe to the reader the extent of these reforms, discuss their "raison d'etre", and address their level of success. All of this will be done under the umbrella of public service reform as a whole in liberal-democratic societies.

The thesis will begin with a literature review on organizational change and service delivery in the public sector. This theoretical discussion will treat this subject as it relates to liberal democracies in general, and the Canadian context as a whole. The subsequent chapter, entitled "Organizational Reform in the Police Sector", is aimed at providing the reader with an understanding of current and historical practices in the field of policing as they pertain to police service delivery as well as management models in police organizations. It will also serve to introduce the reader to the reasons why there is a perceived need for change in the field of policing. The next chapter, entitled "The Concept of Community-based Policing" will provide the reader with an in-depth understanding of a relatively new approach to policing - concentrating on the approach to the delivery of service by police organizations to the communities they serve. The following chapter, "Managing Change", will look into the managerial reforms that are required by police organizations who adopt the service delivery model of community policing. I will attempt to demonstrate to the reader that the model of community policing cannot possibly succeed under traditional models of police management. The entire organization must necessarily change if we are to expect improvements in the delivery of services to the public. The following two chapters, "Community Policing in the RCMP" and "Managing Community Policing: The RCMP Experience" use the Royal Canadian Mounted Police as a tangible example of how the community policing model is applied at both the service delivery and managerial levels. Finally, the conclusion will discuss

the success of “Community Policing” as a model for public service reform, given the concerns and expectations of the Canadian public as described in the opening chapters of this paper.

II. Organizational Change and Service Delivery in the Public Sector

The goal of the literature review is to provide the reader with an understanding of current thought in academic literature with respect to the following issues: a) a firm comprehension of the concept of change in the public sector; b) a discussion of the impetus for change: from where is it derived and what are the specific concerns; c) the identification of goals which public sector organizations should strive for in order to meet the challenge of their current dilemma; d) the identification of factors which must be taken into consideration by organizations wishing to effectively implement positive change (both internal and external environmental conditions); and, e) a review of various approaches or mindsets as to how public sector organizations should implement effective change.

Once these steps have been properly treated, I believe that it will provide the reader with a firm understanding of the problem at hand, as well as significant insight as to how the problem may be approached.

The Transformation of Democratic Bureaucracies

There is little doubt that we are witnessing significant transformation in virtually every liberal democracy with respect to public management and service delivery in the public sector. The emerging buzz words are: “reengineering”, “clients”, “partnerships”, “empowerment”, “innovation”, and “accountability”, to name but a few.

According to the vast literature on this salient topic, it would appear that each liberal democracy is implementing its own transformation process based on the particular needs and ideology of its people. For instance, a citizen’s charter, establishing the principles of public service for the United Kingdom has been established in that country based upon the ideological beliefs of that particular democracy concerning the role of government, the services it should provide, and the way in which those services are to be delivered to the public. New Zealand has also undergone a significant transformation of its public sector through the implementation of fundamental structural changes such as commercialization, privatization, and the separation of advisory and administrative functions - all in the name of *efficiency and enhanced performance*¹ and based upon the beliefs and convictions of the New Zealand population. Australia, who is equally committed to improving the efficiency of its public sector, has implemented a series of

“management reforms with strong political sponsorship rather than a fundamental restructuring of the public sector.”² In each of these examples, the *modus operandi* for implementing the reform of each public service is quite different. There may be several reasons for these differences in approach: one reason may simply be that each country is faced with (different problems which must be addressed in order to ameliorate the efficiency of its bureaucracy; the other reason is undoubtedly based on the fact that each liberal democracy possesses different views with respect to the role of its government and this will play a significant part in the way in which each democracy will define “efficiency” and “enhanced performance” of its public service. Therefore, the methods used for obtaining “proper” reform for each liberal democracy will be influenced by the underlying ideology of the people; or of the government who has taken upon itself to implement these changes on behalf of its citizenry.

Canada is hardly an exception to this rule. We have witnessed a variation of attempts at public service reforms depending upon the government of the day. Under Mulroney’s Conservatives, the operational plan bore the name *PS2000* and sought to improve service to Canadians through a new management approach. Mulroney had accused the Canadian civil service of being “unresponsive, costly, and largely ineffective.”³ His “*neo-conservative approach*” was founded on the principle that *the public sector should emulate the private sector*. Some of the changes advocated by the PS2000 Task Force were: 1) that each department appraise its own organizational *culture* and develop organizational *goals*; 2) that departments establish client-oriented *service standards*; 3) that those who actually deliver the service (*front-line workers*) be involved in the formulation of these service standards; 4) that such service standards be made public; and, 5) that a *monitoring process* be created within individual departments to ensure that service standards and the actual delivery of these services correspond to one another.⁴ This, of course, was coupled with a serious “down-sizing” plan which reduced the number of Canadian civil-servants and their budgets significantly.

The commitment of the present Chrétien government is to transform our public service into one which is cheaper, yet raises the quality of service provided to its clients. The Liberals have implemented two initiatives: one related to *service standards*, and the other directed at

¹ F” Leslie Seidle, *Rethinking the Delivery of Public Services to Citizens*, (Montreal: IRPP, 1995), pp. 53 - 74.

² *Ibid.* p. 53.

³ Donald Savoie, *Thatcher, Reagan, Mulroney: In Search of a New Bureaucracy*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), p. 10.

⁴ Seidle, *Rethinking the Delivery of Public Services to Citizens*, p.80.

promoting *quality services*. With respect to the former, the government issued to the Canadian public, a declaration of service delivery standards by underlining its commitment to ensuring client satisfaction by abiding by principles such as:

- providing accessible, dependable and timely service;
- being clear and open, by providing explanations of rules, regulations and decisions;
- rendering fair and respectful treatment;
- affording good value for the tax dollars of Canadian citizens;
- and, being responsive and committed to improvement.⁵

With respect to the elaboration of *quality services*, the Chrétien government provided guides to its departments on areas such as: client consultation; measuring client satisfaction; working with unions; creating a supportive learning environment; recognizing the work of individuals and teams; implementing employee surveys; developing service standards; bench marking and best practices; and improving organizational communications.⁶

The important point being made here is that several liberal democracies have recognized a similar problem within their respective public sectors: that being the inefficiency (or at least the perception of inefficiency) of the bodies responsible for providing services to their publics. However, the approaches used by respective governments to treat this quandary will ultimately vary depending upon the prevalent ideological underpinning of the society in each country at the time of the proposed changes. For instance, societies vary to different degrees as to the types of services they expect as well as the responsiveness of their government with respect to the provision of such services. The obvious example of such a key difference in the role of government may be found when comparing Canada with the United States; Canadians expecting a more active role of their governments than do Americans. Such fundamental beliefs of a society vis-à-vis its government will ultimately play a significant role as to the approach adopted by a government and its departments when undergoing such deep-rooted changes such as those being examined in this study.

Of equal importance however, is the fact that the winds of change are not solely restricted to national ideologies. Within countries such as Canada, the reform of public management may also be influenced by regional conditions which may dictate varying needs and wishes from one region to another. Regional characteristics which may ultimately play a role in

⁵ Treasury Board Secretariat, Quality and Affordable Service for Canadians: Establishing Service Standards in the Federal Government, (Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, 1995), p. 14.

any attempts at restructuring the public sector include: social indicators (such as the education of the workforce, linguistic considerations, age make-up of the population, etc.); economic considerations (predominant industries, employment indicators, tax-base, the degree of dependency of the regional government on the federal government, etc.); political considerations (a conservative government's approach versus a more socialistic approach, or a centralist approach versus a separatist approach, etc.); or, historical considerations (such as a region's will to break away from perceived relationships of the past as demonstrated in Quebec's *révolution tranquille*). What is important to note here is the fact that in a country such as Canada, the ability of a federal government to implement efficient change across the board is met with a serious challenge: the ability to effectively respond to a plethora of ideas, values and conditions from several regions. I believe this to be a key reason as to why Canadians perceive their local/provincial governments as being more sensitive to their needs and being able to more effectively provide services to their public than the federal government. The fact is that the closer a government is to its clients (i.e. a municipal government vs. a federal government), the less diversity that government has to deal with and the easier it is to identify the precise needs of that community. Conversely, when a federal government attempts to implement a program nationwide so that it may provide a minimum service in a given policy area to all of its constituents, the implementation and delivery of that service is affected by regional considerations. As a result, any attempts to reform the federal public sector must take into consideration, and respect, regional diversity.

One other element which will ultimately affect the implementation of managerial and structural change in any public service is the varying nature of the services which are being provided and the needs of individual "clients" in each policy/service area. For instance, the complexity of national health care versus the relative simplistic nature of municipal garbage collection dictates that the same approaches to the reform of these two services may not be appropriate in each case. Or, two equally complex programs which are very different in the way in which they are delivered (i.e. Unemployment Insurance versus the CBC) may also require very different approaches to administrative and service delivery reform. Once again, the point being made here is that although there may be an underlying societal ideology which lays the foundation for the types of services to be delivered and a general understanding as to how these services are provided, a federal government cannot simply dictate a single reform plan on

⁶Seidle, *Rethinking the Delivery of Public Services to Citizens*, p.89.

all of its departments which will solve all of the perceived problems in each policy/service domain. Certainly, we would expect this to be the very foundation of this new dogma - the idea that government must be responsive to the needs and wishes of citizens; or, using our new terminology, to its "clients". As such, each Ministry, Department and organization is held responsible for meeting the exigencies of the people it serves in the most efficient and effective manner.

It is no longer acceptable for public organizations to dictate the types of services which they will deliver to the community nor the way in which these services shall be delivered (although resistance to this ideal continues to exist in certain circles). What is now expected is that each organization tailor its structure and service delivery mechanisms to fulfill the fundamental expectations and needs of the clients it serves; taking into consideration the diverse perspectives of the varying communities within the overall population. The ramifications of this is, of course, tremendous. Such a transformation involves issues like human resources (such as the "stress" caused by such fundamental change; recruiting, and training); structural reorganization; issues related to organizational culture; and accountability.

The Impetus for Change

An essential element which must be studied if we are to fully understand the ramifications of change in the public sector is the question of "why are liberal democracies in the process of implementing fundamental reforms to the delivery of services to their citizens?" In other words, what is the impetus for such change and where is this stimulus coming from?

How many of us have stood in line at a government office waiting to be "served"? Once at the front of the line, we explain the "special circumstances" of our situation only to be replied by the public official in the following manner: "I fully understand your predicament, and I sympathize with you. Furthermore, I agree with your argument. **HOWEVER**, the rules are very explicit and I am not allowed to stray from them - they must be followed to the letter and in this case" You feel like screaming and you are certain that the employee simply did not understand the "special" circumstances of your situation - you know the reason why the "rules" do not really apply to your case. So you ask to speak to the supervisor who, after listening attentively to your arguments, replies to your concerns much in the same manner as the preceding employee. You leave the office frustrated and very negative to the insensitive manner

in which you were treated and the ineffective, cumbersome machinery we refer to as "bureaucracy".

What caused public sector organizations to treat us this way; as if they were an insensitive "machine"? Well, there were actually some very valid reasons for governmental departments adopting this approach when dealing with their clients. First of all, such organizations sought to use stringent rules and regulations to ensure consistency and fairness when dealing with the citizenry as a whole. The logic being that all clients would be subjected to the exact same rules and standardization would persist. Secondly, such regulations encourage the prudent use of public funds, discourage cheating, and adhere to the principles of ministerial responsibility. Finally, barring any unforeseen environmental changes, such machines may function quite efficiently due to the peg-holing approach to dealing with clients (i.e. this client meets these criteria; therefore the "answer" to their "problem" is x).⁷

As most of us have come to realize, this machine-like approach to dealing with clients comes at a great cost. Our bureaucracies, by attempting to enforce this one policy - one rule approach to us all, have ill equipped themselves to deal with extenuating circumstances, and more importantly, to prepare themselves to meet the rapidly changing demands of modern society.⁸ As government is faced with new and more complex issues, we are quickly realizing that this machine-like approach will not work. Adaptability and innovation are key concepts which must be incorporated into the every day functioning of modern bureaucracies.

From this previous example, I believe that we may confidently conclude that a significant impetus for change therefore finds its roots with the citizenry - the "users" of the system no longer find the organizations who provide their services to be "user friendly". We may also conclude that in many cases, the bureaucracy itself has recognized the limits of its own effectiveness in these ever-changing conditions of post-modernity. Technological advancements, demographic changes, global interaction, and an increased gap between private-sector service delivery and those provided by the public sector are all factors which have caused bureaucratic organizations to look inward and rethink the way they do business.

Anna Yeatman identifies three "contemporary dynamics" to which public management reform is designed to respond:

- increased social and cultural complexity;

⁷ See: James L. Armstrong, "Innovation in Public Management: Toward Partnerships" in Optimum, vol. 23, no. 1, Summer 1992, pp. 17-26.

- increased uncertainty or, to put it differently, a requirement that we develop the capacity to adapt to ongoing change of kinds which we cannot predict or plan for; and
- increased democratic expectations of government and all kinds of service where individuals and/or their particular communities of interest ask that they get to participate in the design and delivery of the service.⁹

In effect, Ms. Yeatman has taken my previous argument two steps further. For one, she has acknowledged that change is not only necessary so that the public sector will be in a position to cope with today's social reality; but also to enable governments to handle future changes which we may not even comprehend at present. Obviously hard-fast rules would not permit easy adaptation to unforeseen situations/environments. But more interestingly, Yeatman has also identified another point which I feel deserves further study: this being the idea that we are witnessing "increased democratic expectations" with respect to the delivery of public services.

Why are citizens demanding more from their government bureaucracies? First of all, there is a general feeling in several liberal-democratic societies that citizens feel as though they are "entitled" to a better quality of service and service-delivery from their respective governments.¹⁰ There is actually a debate over this very issue. On the one hand, there is a liberal approach to this argument which recognizes the rights of citizens and the responsibilities of government to provide efficient services to the people. On the other hand, the conservative perspective may be described as one of questioning the practicality of such enhanced "responsibilities" of government in these tough economic times. Despite this debate as to the degree of responsibilities of government, there remains, a resounding agreement among virtually all citizens with respect to the idea that government must effectively provide those services for which it is responsible. In other words, whatever the government decides to do, it better do it well! There is strong consensus that citizens are entitled to an effective, efficient government.

The second reason why citizens are demanding a better quality of service delivery from their governments is directly related to the first: the recognition of the need for government to

⁸ Ibid., p. 17-18.

⁹ Anna Yeatman, "The Reform of Public Management: An Overview" in Australian Journal of Public Administration, vol. 53, no. 3, September, 1994, pp. 289.

administer itself in an economically responsible fashion.¹¹ Citizens have watched their own taxes rise dramatically over the years in virtually every liberal democracy. Citizens are virtually unanimous in their will to freeze or even decrease the level of taxes they pay and they are extremely cognizant of the direct relationship to the amount of taxes which they pay, to the level of government spending. This may seem to be a rather elementary concept, but the fact is that many people do not see the economic effects of an inefficiently run government until it impacts directly upon their own pocket-books. As a matter of fact, governments themselves are playing on this very concept in several publicity campaigns aimed at sensitizing the public at large as to the negative effects of "cheating the system"; whether it be "working under the table" (and not paying taxes), or claiming benefits for which they are not entitled. The point here is that citizens are insisting that government get its own house in order before considering placing any further financial burdens on its taxpayers. Errors and inefficiencies are costly and must be corrected.

However, the implementation of any initiatives to address such concerns imply a significant investment at the outset. Yet, as it was pointed out in a British Treasury guide, any such investment will be directly offset by diminishing the costs of errors over the long term: "The cost of correcting mistakes, repeating work, and providing supervision and checking where quality of service is low, can be considerable. These costs reduce dramatically as quality of service is improved."¹² In other words, although an initial investment is required, the result will guarantee a significantly more effective government which will provide a higher quality of service; minus costs related to errors.

Finally, citizens are demanding a better quality of service delivery from their governments because they are simply more "aware".¹³ People are more knowledgeable of the issues which affect them and they are more cognizant of the ways in which policies are developed and implemented. As a result, citizens seek a system which is responsive to their needs and they insist on being given a chance to provide input to those who can make a difference; namely, to the service deliverers.

¹⁰ . Leslie Seidle ed. Rethinking the Delivery of Public Services to Citizens. (Montreal: IRPP, 1995), p. 10.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 12.

¹² HM Treasury, Executive Agencies: A Guide to Setting Targets and Measuring Performance. (London: HMSO, 1992), p. 15.

¹³ Seidle, Rethinking the Delivery of Public Services to Citizens, pp. 13-14.

Knowledge is a fundamental element of the success of the public sector. It is imperative that public organizations recognize their limits with respect to knowledge. If indeed the public sector wishes to improve upon its service delivery, it must tap into the insight of the people it serves. External resources are vast and powerful. Whether they be found in private institutions, interest groups, or are simply users of the system with a unique perspective not available to those who are trapped in the everyday functioning of the organization as a whole. The creation of partnerships and the implementation of interactive consultative techniques will provide invaluable resources to these institutions.

Indeed, many organizations themselves have come to recognize that any successes in the future will be based on their ability to be anticipatory, flexible, responsive, inquisitive, innovative and adaptive. The only way for organizations to accomplish this goal is for them to be aware of their “external environment”. To be effective at this, organizations (either public or private) must:

- scan their external environment to capture relevant signals;
- interpret the significance of outside events; and,
- take appropriate actions within the organization to align it with anticipated environmental conditions.¹⁴

What is important to note here is that organizations cannot allow themselves to simply “consult” their clients. Too often, governments have sought the input of the public without heeding to the signals which they received throughout the process, resulting in public cynicism. The public sector, if it is to be successful in the future, must continually consult their clients and be responsive to their needs. To do anything less would be inefficient and ultimately lead to further public discontent; undermining the entire public-reform process which we are witnessing.

Virtually all of the relevant material which I reviewed with respect to the need for change in the administration of the public sector revolved basically around the same issues. By way of summary for this portion of my thesis, I will refer to a Canadian “Round Table on

¹⁴ Paul G. Thomas, “Coping With Change: How Public and Private Organizations Read and Respond To Turbulent External Environments”, in Rethinking Government: Reform or Reinvention, Leslie Seidle, ed. (Montreal: IRPP, 1993), p. 31.

Alternative Organizational Forms” which identified “four critical pressures which must be addressed”. They are:

- demands for increased service to the public as well as demands of stakeholders to be more involved;
- pressures for greater involvement and participation of staff;
- the need to adjust to the changes of new technology; and,
- the necessity to provide essential public goods and services at a lower cost.¹⁵

I conclude that the need for significant reform in the public sector is not based simply on a shift in ideological beliefs throughout liberal democracies. Rather, the impetus for such change, based on my review of the current literature in the field, as well as my own personal observations, is founded in the realization of the public and government for the need to respond to new dynamics. The world is no longer what it was: economies are intertwined and competitiveness is fierce; populations are highly mobile and national demographics are volatile; technological advancements are rapid and far-reaching; and publics are insisting on playing a more active role in government with respect to the provision of services. All of these truisms are set in a background of difficult economic times and a willingness of governments and their respective populations to deal with substantial debts. Although the political ideology of a population will dictate the precise role of its government, the demand for an effective and responsive government remains constant across all liberal democracies given the conditions to which I have referred.

“If the rate of change outside the organization is greater than the rate of change inside, then we are looking at the beginning of the end.”¹⁶

What is “Better”?

Now that we have identified a general movement in liberal democracies which strives for a *better* way to serve its citizens, I believe that it would be appropriate at this point to

¹⁵ John Edwards and Nick Mulder, “Round Table on Alternative Organizational Forms” in Optimum, vol. 23, no. 1, Summer 1992, pp. 3-5.

identify what “better” would be. Or, put differently, to what end should governments strive in order to achieve a public service which is more suitable to the needs of citizens?

Having reviewed extensive literature on this very topic, I must admit from the outset that I strongly favor a very practical approach to this particular question. That is to say that some of the literature which defines a “better” public service deals more with this subject in abstract terms. The attempt of some authors was to try to change the underlying ideology of a people in order to create a more effective public service¹⁷. This, in my opinion, is contrary to the approach we should be seeking. Rather than seeking to change the people to fit a new state system, we should be seeking a system that responds to the will and the needs of the people.

One author developed a list of criteria which public organizations must meet in order to be able to provide quality public services¹⁸. The author has divided these criteria into three broad categories:

1. *Responsiveness*: This refers: i) to the “response-time” which it takes for a citizen to receive service from the corresponding public servant; ii) to the “politeness and regard” with which the citizen is treated during the “transaction” of services; and, iii) to whether or not the public servant is attentive and considerate to the individual needs of the clients or to the potential uniqueness of the client’s situation.

2. *Accessibility*: This category pertains to: i) the flexibility of operating hours so as to account for the varying needs of all potential clients (due to work schedules, personal engagements, schooling, etc.); ii) the approximation of service access points to clients so that they are “reasonably” accessible to all; iii) the equality of access to those clients who are physically handicapped; iv) the reduction (or elimination) of the duplication of services - allowing citizens the chance to conduct several “transactions” with government from one single

¹⁶ Royal Canadian Mounted Police Discussion Paper. People: The Foundation for Change in the RCMP. (Ottawa: Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1996), p. 7.

¹⁷ For instance, see Gregory Albo ‘et al’ eds., A Different Kind of State? Popular Power and Democratic Administration, (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1993). I would argue that, as the title would suggest, the theme of this book is to modify the entire approach of the state as whole: its politics; its service delivery; the role of the citizen; etc. While it is indeed very attractive in theory, I am not entirely certain that this could be “sold” to the people. Secondly, I do not believe that this entire package could be implemented in an effective manner - it is too idealistic. Finally, it would be next to impossible to “undo” centuries of ideological underpinnings of a society and its government in the hopes of creating a more responsive state system. Rather, I believe that it would be much more responsible to build upon the foundations of a proven system, and to make it more amenable to the conditions of our society - all the while recognizing that change is permanent and any “improvements must account for this fact.

¹⁸ Scidle, Rethinking the Delivery of Public Services to Citizens, p. 11.

access point (i.e. single window delivery which will be discussed later); v) suitable diversification for contact which gives clients several means (where feasible) to contact the service providers and/or conduct transactions (i.e. info-lines, web sites, e-mail, fax, mail, etc.); and, vi) the adequate dissemination and provision of appropriate information material as well as proper access to the necessary materials required to complete a transaction (i.e. obtaining proper forms from the post office or via e-mail, etc.).

3. *Reliability*: This final subset of criteria relates to: i) whether or not the services are made available in the way in which they are advertised; ii) the precision with which these transactions are performed (i.e. free from errors); and, iii) whether or not the service providers are living up to the standards which they have promised they would keep to the client population.

This in my opinion, accurately sums up the type of service which citizens are seeking from their governments (or any other organization for that matter). I am sincerely convinced that any government organization which lives up to these standards will ultimately gain the confidence and respect of the population(s) it serves. If we recall the reasons to which I referred earlier outlining the impetus for change, I believe that all of the motives for change are covered in this outline for the “quality delivery of public services”. As such, I suggest that these criteria constitute a “better” way of doing business.

What we must now look at are the factors which an organization must take into consideration before/while implementing change.

Factors of Change

Until now, the theme of this paper has been centered around the realization that public organizations must make themselves more adaptable to their environments whether these be internal or external conditions which have matured beyond the capacities of the organizations themselves. I have also suggested what I believe to be the ultimate goal of such organizations: that they become responsive, accessible and reliable in the delivery of their services to clients. In order for me to complete my argument (which is to explain the logical path of organizations from their present state to the attainment of their desired goals), two steps remain: a) to identify specific factors in the environments of these organizations which must be monitored during the transformation process; and, b) to identify specific approaches which have/are been used to implement change in the public sector. This portion of the paper will deal with the former. In

order to properly organize this portion of the paper, I will divide the environmental components into two distinct categories: internal and external factors.

Internal Factors

The first condition which I would like to discuss is *leadership*. I feel that it is very appropriate to deal with this element first due to the key role of the leadership function in organizational change.

I will begin the discussion on leadership by first addressing the role of the leader during the transformation process. In order to do this effectively, it is important that I begin with a definition of what a “leader” is. This is particularly important because I believe that in many organizations, leaders confuse their own roles with that of “managers” and in uncertain times (i.e. when extensive change is taking place in an organization), it is imperative that a leader *lead* well.

A very famous expert on leadership has addressed the very point of distinguishing the roles of leaders and managers through the use of an allegory.¹⁹ The illustration goes something like this: An organization was tasked with cutting a large path through a densely thick jungle. The workers were provided with the proper tools to do the job, given adequate instructions, and pointed in the right direction. From the very beginning, the workers took this challenge to heart and diligently set out to meet the diary date which had been given to them to complete the task. The managers were equally dedicated to the success of the project. They had created effective schedules for the workers; implemented plans to ensure that the machetes were properly cared for and sharpened; ensured that the workers were well fed and cared for, including physical training sessions to improve upon their strength; and they quickly resolved any disputes among workers with respect to territory, etc. The leader on the other hand, decided to climb to the top of the highest tree in that particular jungle. Once at the top, he looked all around and studied the entire surroundings. Once he had satisfied himself that he had accurately attained the “big picture”, he called down to his managers in a loud voice and yelled: “Wrong jungle!!” The mangers quickly replied: “Shut up, we’re making progress!!!”

There are several lessons which one may learn from this story. The first is the necessity to realize that it is extremely easy to get caught up in the minor details of a project (management issues) and forget about the “big picture”. If no one climbs to the top of the tree to verify the direction of the organization, then all of the work may be for naught (even if the entire organization is very dedicated and efficient). In the case of public organizations, even if the organization is well managed and run efficiently (from an internal/managerial perspective), if the clients are not satisfied with the service being provided, then the organization has simply lost its direction. So the first lesson is that the leader must ensure that the organization is adhering to a proper “vision”/direction. How the vision of an organization is determined will be the subject of further discussion later in this thesis. However, what is important to remember is that the leader must make sure that the entire organization is aware of this vision, and must continually monitor the performance of the organization as a whole to keep it on the right path.

Secondly, when faced with change, the leader must instigate such change “with the end in mind.”²⁰ This means that in the present context, leaders of public organizations must determine exactly where their particular organizations must go, and then set the course for the organization to attain that vision. Change is a very strenuous exercise for most - it implies the unknown and makes most people in the organization quite nervous and anxious. However, if leadership prevails and clear direction is provided, the entire process is less ambiguous from the outset and the end result will be attained more quickly, and with greater ease.

Finally, by climbing to the top of the tallest tree, the leader ensures that the entire environment of the organization is appropriately scanned and considered. This is not to suggest that the leader accept full responsibility for completing the environmental scanning function of the entire organization (to say so would be contrary to what I have proposed). However, it is the role of the leader to be aware of the overall environment of the organization so that he may ascertain whether or not the organization is heading in the proper direction.

All of this implies therefore, that in order for the transformation process to be successful, it is imperative that the leadership be convinced of the need for change, and that it provide clear direction for the entire organization with respect to the goals of change. This is absolutely key to the implementation process.

¹⁹ Stephen R. Covey, The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1989), p. 95. *Note: This is not the same person as the author of this thesis.

²⁰ Ibid.

“Tomorrow’s leaders must be agents of change. They must be good at communicating their objectives, listening to advice and explaining their decisions. And most of all, they must be good at motivating their employees, even in difficult times.”²¹

The second element which I would like to address is the *human factor*. An organization is only as good as its people. The human side of any organization represents its very foundation. From a purely economic standpoint, salaries account for the large majority of an organization’s budget. This fact alone should place an extremely high priority on making sure that the human resources of the organization adapt well to the transformation process and remain motivated and effective throughout. From a service delivery perspective, an organization counts on its individual members to act professionally and according to the standards of the organization. If one person is disgruntled, uninformed, or incompetent, his/her performance will likely impact upon the reputation of the organization as a whole. As a result, any attempt to change an organization must first take into consideration its key resource; the people.

The stress related to change in an organization must be calculated and appropriately addressed throughout the process. In these hard economic times, change has often been associated with “downsizing”, physical moves (transfers of head offices and personnel), and “doing more with less”. In many cases, these fears are valid and such realities are a significant sign of the times. To add to this stress, organizations are attempting to introduce new service-delivery concepts; they are changing the structures of their organizations; and they are trying to incite the employees to be imaginative and creative in finding solutions aimed at serving the “clients” (who used to be referred to as “users”, “taxpayers”, or simply “citizens”). In sum, the employee’s environment, mindset, and workload has changed drastically. Even the terminology has changed! Therefore, the impact of such substantial change could be fatal to some employees (thus hurting the organization itself), or it could be stimulating and “life-changing” for most employees (thus invigorating the organization as a whole) - depending on how the organization treats the human factor in the transformation process.

²¹ Ruth Hubbard, Leadership and Tomorrow’s Public Service. (If can’t find precise reference - use RCMP paper, p. 7.

What can organizations do to make the transformation process as least stressful and even invigorating for its employees? First of all, as I have already alluded, clear direction must be afforded. Leadership is key. "Employees expect to be consulted. They expect their ideas to be sought out and their contributions to be valued. The leaders of tomorrow must therefore show open mindedness and an ability to arrive at innovative solutions. This means restoring confidence in the work place, promoting team work and inspiring others to follow you where they fear to go."²²

Secondly, the "end vision" must be communicated to the entire organization. Lack of clarity can lead to rumors and disgruntlement. Information must be clearly communicated and a means must be established to provide for feedback from the employees.

Thirdly, employee consultation must be implemented. As referred to in the previous quote, today's employees expect to be consulted, and they expect to have their concerns addressed. This certainly is not to say that the organization should simply "give in" to all of the wishes of the employees. However, such suggestions should be seriously considered and a reply (positive or negative) supplied to the employees providing the rationale for the decision.

Fourthly, employee training is of great significance. An organization cannot simply expect to change its entire way of doing business without adequately providing training for those who are responsible for the implementation of the new methodology. Training may take on different forms. For instance, in some cases, employees may have been forced to follow directives through manuals all of their careers. Now, they are expected to utilize imaginative, proactive measures in problem solving. A form of training which shows employees how to expand their horizons and identify new problem solving techniques (i.e. alternative dispute resolution training) may be appropriate. In other cases, specific training may be required for the utilization of more effective tools (i.e. computer programs) or for the implementation of new service-delivery programs. Or, in the transformation process, some employees may be requested/required to perform completely unrelated tasks to those which they had previously fulfilled. In these cases, training is obviously primordial. So whether the training be at a macro or micro level, the point being made here is that knowledge and information are necessary tools for the success of any transformation process. If an organization expects to perform in a more efficient manner while subjecting its employees to substantially different conditions, proper training will be a must.

²²

Ibid.

Through the transformation process, the organization must instill a sense of positive challenge in its employees. When employees feel as though they are a valued asset in the organization, and when they are provided with the necessary support and skills required to become more responsive, more accountable, and more innovative, then everyone is a winner: the employees themselves, the organization as a whole, and most importantly, the clients.

The third internal element which must be considered during the transformation process is *organizational culture*.

An organization's culture is an expression of its "personality": its characteristic way of doing things. An organization's culture reflects the things its staff value, the goals they collectively pursue, and the way they prefer to operate and to manage themselves.²³ Obviously, an organization's culture may hamper attempts to implement change as this would be viewed as a direct threat to existing "preferences" (regardless of the validity and effectiveness of the way things were done).

I see organizational culture as consisting of two key ingredients: 1) "structural culture" - the culture instilled into its employees by the organization itself (i.e. forcing a viewpoint or way of doing things upon employees over an extended period of time); and, 2) the preferences of employees (such as described in the preceding paragraph).

It is important to note that two types of organizational culture exist for a couple of reasons. First of all, in the context of some public organizations, employees have been told to strictly adhere to the rules and policies of the organization throughout their careers. Now, organizations are requesting that this previous culture be completely disregarded and request that their employees initiate change, be proactive, and use common sense in all service-delivery functions. The second point I would like to make here is that in the present context, management has recognized the ineffectiveness of the culture it has created in its organization and has unilaterally decided to change this. As a result, the employees are expected to adapt to this decision and to relinquish their own cultural cleavages (i.e. their preferences of job performance). Finally, once management has accepted the need to change, the modification of the "structural culture" is virtually automatic - the new culture is basically imposed on the employees. What remains is to win the employees over - again, by providing the proper support

²³ N. A. Jans, and J. M. Frazer-Jans, "Organizational Culture and Organizational Effectiveness" in Australian Journal of Public Administration, vol. 50, no. 3, September, 1991, pp. 333-346.

and skills which will remove any fears of what is to come, and by demonstrating the ineffectiveness of old preferences, and the advantages of new ones.

The fourth internal element which I will now discuss is *communication*. As I have already mentioned, it is of the utmost importance that all employees be made aware of the goals which the organization has established (the desired end result). This is fundamental if we expect employees to come on board and be effective under difficult circumstances.

There are five fundamentals in communication which must be respected during the transformation process.²⁴ The first is that *messages should be linked to the strategic purpose of the change initiative*. In other words, when the organization is communicating to employees that service delivery needs to be improved, it should also clearly identify the reasons for the identified change, what the new standards will be, the benefits of attaining the desired goals, and who will benefit from these changes.

The second is that *communications should be realistic and honest*. It is imperative that the entire organization believes and understands that the decisions have been made openly, and by considering all possible factors - both good and bad. It is not sufficient to simply identify the positive effects of a decision, but rather to communicate discussions centered around possible negative results in a meaningful manner.

Third, *communications must be proactive rather than reactive*. Communications must be an integral part of the planning process and not just an afterthought aimed at damage control. Proactive communications will help to avoid the need for a defensive position and will confirm the sincerity of the organization's openness and honesty to its employees.

Fourth, *messages should be repeated consistently to the employees through various channels*. For example, a message from management is often misinterpreted because people often have a tendency to "read into" a message that which they want to hear (especially when that message is unpopular). Repetition of a message through various channels of communication will solidify the message and leave it less to misinterpretation.

Finally, *avenues of two-way communication are essential* to help ensure successful implementation of the changes. In effect, consultation with employees should also be proactive. Employees want to be heard and the sincerity of consultation will likely be questioned if it is done as a reactive measure or only to obtain consent for a pre-approved action. Furthermore, if consultation with employees is indeed implemented, it is imperative that the organization

respond to any suggestions, criticisms, or comments. Whether such response is positive or negative, the entire process will lose credibility if employees do not feel that their input is being seriously considered and evaluated.

For all of the reasons previously stated, change causes uncertainty and stress. It is therefore critical to implement a sound communication plan which will help to provide clear direction, avoid ambiguity, and offer a means of exchange of information between management and the employees of the organization. Such a plan must be thought out in advance and implemented from the very beginning. If successful, it will also create a foundation for further communication links once the transformation has been completed.

The fifth internal element which must be considered in the transformation process is related to *structural change*. Obviously, it is important to choose an organizational structure which will reinforce the goals of the new service-delivery approach. For instance, to set up service client teams, eliminate management layers, centralize or decentralize work as needed, and to avoid any duplication of tasks.

In the present context, public organizations should choose structures which:

1. *Supports empowerment*: a) by being non-hierarchical and by decentralizing decision-making; b) by allowing reporting to be informal and based on trust; c) by being flexible in the assignment of roles and tasks; d) by providing good internal communications; e) by fostering experimentation and innovation; and, f) by promoting effective use of information technology.²⁵

2. *Supports teamwork*: a) providing clients with "one-stop shopping; and, b) consisting of multi-disciplinary or cross-functional teams.

In order to accomplish this, the organization must first take a very close look at what it is doing and how it operates at every level. Once that has been completed, it would be wise to seek input from all levels to obtain the greatest number of alternatives as possible. Then, the most effective solution may be chosen based on a well informed decision that has considered all possible avenues.

²⁴ Timothy J. Galpin, *The Human Side of Change*. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996), pp. 39-41.

²⁵ David Wright, "Structural Innovation in Government Organizations" in *Optimum*, vol. 23, no. 1, Summer 1992, pp. 29.

The final element which must be considered in the transformation process is the issue of *empowerment*. This will undoubtedly be a major consideration when realigning the structure of the organization.

What is empowerment? The term can be referred to with varying degrees of specificity. At its broadest level, it can be viewed as “ a growing phenomenon involving demands by people all over the world to be recognized, consulted and valued.”²⁶ In the specific context of manager-employee relations, the term empowerment revolves around the concept of “enabling employees”.

*In a command and control management culture, delegation is usually understood to involve handing over tasks to employees who follow guidelines, avoid taking risks and who carry out duties in traditional, sanctioned ways. Empowerment, by contrast, encourages managers, supervisors and employees to try new ways of achieving goals, motivating them to be creative and innovative in improving the service they deliver. Empowerment asks the employees to be accountable for their actions within an environment which accepts a degree of risk-taking and acknowledges intent as well as results.*²⁷

Empowerment is not concerned with how managers can get employees to act as managers would like; rather, it is concerned with what managers can do to foster individual and collective action by employees to the benefit of the organization, its managers and its employees. The objective is to make the best possible use of employees' knowledge and skills.

While this idea may be quite attractive on paper, the reality of the situation is that there is a significant amount of resistance to it. First of all, some managers are not at ease with “giving up” a significant portion of their “power”. Others are perfectionists who insist on having a hand in the most insignificant of tasks. On the other hand, some employees are uncomfortable with assuming more responsibility and unions are wary that empowerment is simply a ploy to place responsibility on employees when things go wrong.

The fact of the matter is that there is some risk involved in devolving power to lower levels. However, risks versus advantages must be considered and when it is deemed that the benefits outweigh the risks, the empowerment of employees should be seriously contemplated.

²⁶ Kenneth Kernaghan, “Empowerment and Public Administration: Revolutionary Advance or Passing Fancy?” in *Canadian Public Administration*, vol. 35, no. 2, Summer 1992, pp. 195.

²⁷ Public Service 2000, *Service to the Public Task Force Report*, (Ottawa: Privy Council Office, 1990), pp. 51-52.

Keeping in mind that the ultimate goal is to provide services in an efficient, responsive and innovative fashion, the devolution of power can only enhance the chances of this happening.

The External Environment

The first element of the organization's external environment which I would like to address is *accountability*. Under the present system, the ultimate accountability in the public sector lies on the shoulders of respective ministers. Ministers are responsible to the House of Commons for the administration of the decisions of their departments and the actions of public servants falling under their jurisdiction. As such, if there is a "problem" in the department, the minister ultimately has to answer to the people (indirectly through Parliament).

However, there is another dimension to accountability in the public sector which, in my opinion, is much more relative to the question of fundamental change in the delivery of service to the public. This dimension revolves around placing the emphasis of the organization's responsibility from "accountability up", to "accountability down".²⁸ In other words, if public organizations are genuinely interested in providing a service to clients which is responsive, accessible and reliable, then accountability must be directed downwards - to the clients themselves. Of course there remains a dimension of accountability towards the ultimate power of the nation - Cabinet and Parliament. For instance, budgets, laws and general policies must be respected. However, the improvement of service delivery can only be attained if the entire organization shifts its sense of accountability downwards. I stress the word "entire" because this shift in accountability does not simply rest with field workers becoming responsive to clients overnight. It also involves managers providing the necessary tools, skills and encouragement to front line workers so that they may be more responsive to the needs of the clients. Furthermore, organizational leaders must ensure that the organization is structured, and that it functions in a way which is accountable to the needs of the clients. And finally, ministers must recognize that "the buck stops with clients" and amend the goals of their departments in recognition of this fact.

In effect, the entire accountability process needs to be reversed. No longer should field workers be working for managers, who work for leaders, who work for Ministers. Rather, Ministers should be amending their programs so that leaders may give clear direction to

²⁸ James R. Mitchell, "Accountability" in Optimum, vol. 23, no. 1, Summer 1992, p. 14.

managers to empower their field workers so that they may be more responsive to the needs of the clients.

The second element of an organization's external environment is *diversity*. A public organization faces several unique challenges, not the least of which is immense diversity. Diversity with respect to its various tasks: advising government; negotiating with other governments, clients and the private sector; providing a vast array of services; and dealing with a wide range of client backgrounds and concerns which are often contradictory, one with the other. In the past, the federal government has tried to maintain universal solutions for all of its organizations. The result is the crisis which we face today.

By recognizing diversity, the federal government and its public service have taken the first step to attaining the ultimate goal to which I have referred earlier in this paper. Diversity implies that no universal solutions exist which allow an organization to treat the unique needs of individual clients responsively and effectively. Therefore, we need unique organizational solutions geared to respond to: the types of services each organization delivers; the particular needs of the clients each organization serves; environmental changes; and, the needs of other stakeholders who may provide assistance/input into the delivery of a more effective service.

This brings us to a third external element: *partnerships*. An organization may find itself better equipped to deal with situations if it forms partnerships with other stakeholders. There is extensive literature on this particular subject at present and I will be discussing it in much greater detail in a later chapter of this paper. However, what I would like to identify here are some of the advantages that a public organization may be afforded by entering into appropriate partnerships with other stakeholders.²⁹

1. *Understanding the clients needs:* Outside organizations are useful in providing pertinent input at the policy development stage. Often they have extensive understanding of the client groups and their needs. The added dimension of various perspectives often proves to be quite effective.

2. *Special expertise:* These partnerships allow government to tap into outside technical or intellectual expertise. This may provide a lot of potential for stimulating innovation in public organizations.

3. *Infrastructure:* Partners have infrastructure which the government can use to help deliver its programs and services. For instance, police organizations may use local schools,

arenas, or YMCA's to promote youth programs and reduce youth-related crimes in a neighborhood.

4. *Resource pooling*: Partnerships can help prevent duplication. Rather than providing similar services which are in effect competing against one another, organizations may pool their resources, allowing them to improve upon existing programs or offer other services which they were not able to provide due to lack of resources.

5. *Operational flexibility*: Some partnerships are created for the sole purpose of providing greater flexibility in services offered (due to the removal of the political factor). For instance, in the township of Cumberland, Ontario, the local community center is owned by the township, yet fully operated by a private organization. As such, it is run precisely as a private organization that is geared fully to the needs and desires of clients (the taxpayers).

6. *Resourcing flexibility*: Many government programs are faced with fluctuating demands for their services. Partnerships can provide a key source of temporary help in times of high demand.

7. *Integrated delivery*: Outside partners may help to coordinate the delivery of several public sector programs. "one stop shopping" is a term which has gained a lot of recent enthusiasm and it will be discussed at greater length later in this paper.

8. *Leverage for tax dollars*: Partnerships often help the government to acquire extra funds or resources from outside sources in the form of voluntary contributions or private sector investment. For example, some police departments may form partnerships with local merchants to give discounts to children who do not have safety bells on their bicycles. After all, the goal is to make the environment as safe as possible for children.

There are however some risks associated to partnerships. These include: *legal risks* due to the lack of a proper legal basis when the partnership is formed; *political risks* stemming principally from the loss of "control" which may result in the subordination of the public interest to the interests of partners, may complicate accountability, and may weaken communications between the clients and the public organization; and, *financial risks*, however proper use of partnerships may help to significantly stretch tax dollars.

As we can see, there are significant advantages to promoting and forming partnerships. Indeed, we are witnessing this type of networking more and more. I am confident that this is not

²⁹ Armstrong, James L. "Innovation in Public Management: Toward Partnerships" in *Optimum*, vol. 23, no. 1, Summer 1992, pp. 21-24.

simply a fad, but a legitimate method of augmenting the responsiveness, accessibility, and responsibility of service delivery in the public sector.

These are the internal and external factors which public organizations must consider before implementing an operational plan for change. The identification and proper treatment of these factors will play a significant role as to the success or failure of the transformation process.

Approaches to Improving the Delivery of Services to Citizens

This section will deal with various methods which have been attempted to implement change in the public sector. Some of these methods have been more successful than others. The goal is not to evaluate the success or failure of each method but rather to introduce the reader to different philosophies and approaches to change in the public sector. In a later chapter, I will provide the reader with a comprehensive example of organizational change which will be the basis for my understanding of what an efficient implementation plan should be. What should be remembered is that no one model is perfect. They may be used interchangeably or elements from each may be extracted in order to attain maximum results - depending upon the specific needs of each organization.

Total Quality Management

Total Quality Management (TQM) is a new trend in public management which is designed to place the client/buyer/beneficiary at the focal point of the organization and its process.³⁰ Despite some skepticism, it is largely felt in the managerial field that TQM is not just a fad, but rather that it is here to stay, for two reasons: a) because of a far-reaching belief for the need of an urgent response to the poor record of the public service as previously referred to in this paper; and, b) due to the fact that many organizations feel that this response requires a holistic approach (i.e. TQM) and not an ad hoc proposal. What is needed is an approach which will profoundly alter the way things are done in the public sector.

³⁰ Francine Séguin, "Service to the Public : A Major Strategic Change" in Canadian Public Administration, vol. 34, no. 3, Autumn 1991, pp. 465-473.

The implementation of TQM implies a complete organizational make-over. It requires three things:³¹

1. *The primacy of the client* (of which there are two types):

- *external clients:*
 - i) the direct beneficiaries of public services (i.e. those who receive family allowances); and,
 - ii) the population at large - with respect to the enforcement of the Act and its regulations
- *internal clients:*

at all levels; from the Minister to employees of other ministerial organizations (partners).

When considering the primacy of the client, the organization who utilizes the TQM method must begin by identifying the degree of client satisfaction it aims to attain as well as the expectations of those clients. Once these goals have been clearly identified and communicated throughout the organization, a clear strategy may be implemented.

2. *Employee satisfaction:* TQM aims to ensure the satisfaction of those who produce the goods and provide the service to the clients through: “participatory management”; employee involvement in decision-making; partnerships between various groups in the organization; etc. Throughout the process, it is important to identify and monitor indicators which allow managers to measure employee satisfaction.

3. *Involvement of top managers:* a) top managers must have a clear vision of what “quality service to the public” means; b) they must be convinced of the importance of that goal; c) they must be able to communicate that vision to the other levels of the organization; and, d) they must devote time to implementing TQM principles.

The “TQM strategy” involves several elements.³² First of all, managers must favor *consultation with the clients* in order to identify their needs and expectations. Furthermore, the consultation process must be linked to a problem solving mechanism. In other words, consultation for its own sake is not acceptable. If a problem is identified or a suggestion is made, a pre-established mechanism must be in place to deal with it. Secondly, managers must emphasize *employee consultation* for the simple fact that it is they who are in direct contact

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² *Ibid.*

with the internal and external clients. In order to accomplish this task, participatory devices must be established from the outset. Third, management must ensure that *hiring, promotion and pay systems are in line with total quality objectives*. The organization must seek to hire people who will be responsive to clients and their needs. This also implies merit-based pay systems which will recognize the performance of individual employees. Fourth, TQM requires a *cultural change* in organizations. The significant difference will be a shift from a bureaucratic structure to one that is much more flexible. It may also require a move from autocratic leadership to participatory management. Furthermore, it will necessarily imply that the organization move away from an approach which is inward-looking, to one that is outward and proactive. The most effective way to implement this paradigm shift is through a strategy, not a program. In other words, posters and slogans are nice, but actions and a firm establishment of trust are what is required. Fifth, *employees must be trained*. Employees must be oriented to TQM. This includes tools, processes, communication, interpersonal relations, and teamwork skills. Finally, a *change of structure* is required in a way that management becomes a means of support for the front line workers.

My literature review indicates that there is strong support in several Canadian public organizations for the TQM approach. It certainly appears to be the most popular at present. There are still too few studies on organizations who have attempted to implement the TQM philosophy. However, TQM has definitely captured the interest of several top managers in the Canadian Public Service.

The Marketization of the State

The Marketization of the State approach is one which is associated to the neo-conservative ideology. In effect, it draws heavily from the "public choice theory": "markets are the only alternative to the inefficiencies of bureaucratic administration - the public should have choices."³³ In other words, it is an attempt to reproduce market like conditions in the public sector based on the belief that by providing "choices" to the public, it "empowers" citizens. The new right believes that this will lead to a decentralized, pluralistic, and more flexible state administration.

³³ Albo, Gregory, Langille, David, and Panitch, Leo, eds. *A Different Kind of State? Popular Power and Democratic Administration*. (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 23.

The marketization of the state approach was heavily implemented in the 1980's and early 90's in several western democracies. In Canada, the approach was advocated by PS 2000, a review of government management and services. This project proposed a flatter organizational structure and flexibility in service delivery. Furthermore, the delivery of services would be contracted out to competing units who agreed to meet set standards; managers would have more flexibility in determining staff deployment and pay levels; and emphasis would be placed on responsiveness to clients based on the empowerment of employees. The underlying theme to these proposals was that "competition is essential to innovation."³⁴

Several scholars have argued however that the marketization approach has not met its intended goals. Rather, fiscal pressures have led to extensive downsizing and the contracting of services has become a practice which has led to more difficulties than originally believed. For instance, the coordination of a multitude of service providers has created a nightmare for service delivery managers. Treasury and management boards have had to significantly increase the number of directives they use so that they may effectively monitor the issuance and implementation of contracts. In some cases, contracting-out has led to a decrease in service standards because private firms have realized that they cannot meet their performance contracts and turn a profit. Finally, clients have little or no input as to the delivery of services for the duration of a given contract since there is little incentive for service deliverers to seek added responsibility and expense when their only requirements are to respect the word of their contract. Besides, private contractors often remain in a monopolistic position so the move to offer a choice to citizens is highly unlikely. In essence, there is little or no accountability to elected officials on the part of private contractors once their contract has been signed with a line department.

There remains a strong following of managers, politicians and citizens who believe in the marketization approach. Despite massive opposition from the left, it remains an option to provide a more responsive, accessible and responsible service to citizens.

The Professional Management Model

Succinctly put, the Professional Management Model is an approach which endorses the belief that greater efficiency can be attained as a direct result of employing better qualified staff to provide services. As a result, there would be less need for "rigid" controls due to the

³⁴

Ibid.

accentuated competency of the organization as a whole. According to the promoters of this approach, if a problem arises, the experts will know how to get the people out of it. Therefore, there would be little or no need to empower the people themselves.

Such an approach would require limited organizational change. In effect, control and accountability would continue to be from the bottom-up. In fact, the entire organizational structure could remain the same. The whole model is based on the premise that the reason for inefficient service provision is due to blatant incompetency in the work force. Hiring technical experts in their fields would promote a more efficient service due to the fact that the employees (being much more knowledgeable) could be empowered to find solutions to the problems at hand. In order to accept this approach, one must believe that sound professional judgment is indispensable to bureaucratic efficiency and that these professionals know what is best for citizens.

Would such an approach address the problems which I have referred to earlier in this paper? Would it also allow an organization to attain the goals which we have identified as being a more responsive, accessible and responsible service delivery? There are a few problems with this model which should be identified.³⁵ a) First of all, this model does not address the question of accountability. Citizens are convinced that their concerns are not being addressed. In Professional Management Approach, the organization conserves the bottom-up model of accountability. Clients would have no more input into the way in which services are provided than they do at present. b) Secondly, it is not necessarily true that professionals will provide a "neutral competency" to service delivery. Ultimately, the human factor will enter into the picture and citizens cannot be guaranteed that this process will afford them a service which is more responsive to their needs. c) Finally, technical knowledge may in fact breed contempt for traditional knowledge and involvement. Professionals who would be hired due to their expertise may very well assume that they know what is best for the public based solely on their technical qualifications. However, this may preclude them from being able to put aside their technical information and concentrate on the clients *needs*. Once again, this problem is concerned with the ability of the organization to be responsive to the needs and wishes of the population.

The Professional Management Model is an option that was relatively popular in the public service a few years ago. Unfortunately, this model appears to be more of a band-aid approach rather than one which attacks the heart of the problem. Nonetheless, skill and

³⁵ Ibid., p. 27.

knowledge in the public service are definitely issues which must be addressed if we are to provide a more efficient service to the public. However, the reasons behind having a more knowledgeable staff may be slightly different than those presented in this particular model.

The Democratization of Administration

The democratization of the administration of the public sector is a model which requires fundamental change in the public service - not just in the organizations themselves, but in the entire bureaucratic structure. This model is especially supported by a group of academics who readily admit that it will probably not obtain a lot of support from politicians, senior bureaucrats, or anyone else who has a vested financial interest in the public sector.³⁶

The entire process is centered around citizens. The bureaucracy is not a tool for elites to get richer, nor for politicians to invoke policies which they prefer; rather, its *raison d'être* is to give citizens what they need and want. Keeping this in mind, Democratic Administration advances the idea that citizens must have direct control over their bureaucracy.

The following is a discussion of some of the components of Democratic Administration as identified by its authors:³⁷

- a) *Shifting power at the center*: the authors believe that power must be shifted from the administrative executive to elected officials. This involves two initiatives: i) that ministerial staff must be brought in line with this new agenda; and ii) that a central planning and review board be established to oversee the coordination of the entire bureaucracy and provide a vision to state services rather than managing by crisis.
- b) *Leveling the organizational hierarchy*: The idea here is to bring the decision-making level as close to the people as possible. It is believed that a flatter organization will: i) push decision making to lower levels; ii) multiply points of citizen access; iii) decentralize services; iv) allow individual communities to amend services to a form which is more suitable to their needs; v) permit freedom of information and public deliberation; vi) bring in fresh ideas from outside the state; and, vii) provide organizational flexibility by delayering the bureaucracy.
- c) *Producers and users*: The supporters of this approach would like to create "equality" between the users of the service, and those who provide it. They would like to see this done by first retraining front line workers (making them more respectful of users rights and needs), and then by enhancing the rights of access of users. The latter may be afforded by enhanced convenience of use; but it also may mean allowing a form of appeal to users through ombudsmen and advocacy bodies.
- d)

³⁶ Ibid., p. 28 - 30.

Develop self-management capabilities: This idea is premised on the belief that a long-term improvement of service delivery is contingent upon input from user groups which will create and maintain innovation in bureaucracy. In order to promote this belief, user groups should be encouraged to develop their own plans; they should be provided with “right to initiate” powers; and the workplace should be “democratized”. e) *The creation of a redistributive state:* the supporters of this model are recognizant of the fact that if these ideas are indeed implemented, then the cost of service delivery will necessarily rise due to an increase in quality and use of these services. They are equally aware of the fact that citizens can not support an increase in taxes to pay for such reforms. They believe therefore that the only way to finance these improvements is if the tax burden is shifted more towards the wealthy.

An entire paper could be written on this particular approach. Once again, the purpose of this portion of the paper is not to lament on all of the pros and cons of such models. Rather, I wish only to provide the reader with the knowledge of the existence of such approaches so that we may draw upon them later when discussing the best possible solution to our present predicament. Suffice it to say that the Democratic Administration Model certainly addresses many of the issues we have previously identified; however its implementation will undoubtedly face significant resistance and may ultimately cause other substantial problems.

The preceding provides an understanding of several current approaches to public service reform. Each has its merits and its faults. It is hoped that this has provided a broad basis on which we may proceed to understand a complex problem, and arrive at an eventual conclusion as to how public organizations may implement change in a way which allow them to meet their identified objectives.

Conclusion

Based upon the review of literature concerning the reform of the public sector and service delivery, the following conclusions are warranted:

1. *That the traditional bureaucratic emphasis on hierarchy and accountability relationships has outlived its usefulness.* The public will no longer accept an public service which is not responsive to its concerns, nor one that is incapable of adapting to an array of needs and challenges.

2. *That no one solution may be applied to all service delivery organizations in the public sector.* Due to variance in the complexity of services provided, as well as the specific nature of the services in question, each organization must identify its specific needs and react accordingly.

3. *That there are several approaches to organizational reform.* The only limit to choices for reform are in the imagination of the population as a whole. In the present context, innovation is encouraged and one must believe that if a solution makes sense, it may very well be adopted.

4. *That the human factor is critical.* From an external perspective, clients want to be treated in a manner which responds to their personal needs. Internally, organizations must realize that change is a very stressful paradigm. Human resources must be treated accordingly so as to augment the chances of successful reform.

5. *The motivating factor behind organizational reform must be the attainment of a service delivery mechanism which is responsive, accessible, and responsible.* This must be made clear to the public and the employees of the organization through words and actions.

6. *The application of concepts such as empowerment and accountability will create certain risks.* Trust and cooperation between management, employees, and the public will be primordial. Furthermore, structural reforms will thus be required so as to minimize these risks.

As Canadians seek a public service which is better equipped to face the challenges of today and tomorrow, we find that several options lay at our disposal. The key to sound reform is to identify our goals; evaluate all possible options according to our specific needs; and consider all of the pertinent factors during the implementation process.

III. Organization Reform in the Police Sector

The preceding chapter has dealt with the issue of public sector reform in liberal democracies. We delved into a series of significant factors which must be considered in an era which appears obsessed with the transformation of democratic bureaucracies. Some of the broad topics treated in the previous chapter were: the various elements which are behind the impetus for public sector reform; a definition of what citizens are seeking by way of change in the public sector; the identification of factors which are essential elements of reform; and, a review of approaches which have been /are being used to implement change in the public sector.

The topics which I have enumerated above dealt with public sector reform in a very general manner. These ideas were referred to in the context of change in the entire public service, in all democratic bureaucracies. While I have mentioned on several occasions that not *all* reform methods may be applied to *all* areas of the public service, nor in *all* liberal democracies, the purpose of the present chapter is to begin a discussion on how the ideas, elements and approaches which we have previously identified, relate to a very specific area of the public service: *the police*.

I have been a police officer for over nineteen years. The timing of my career has been actually quite crucial to the development of my perceptions and understandings of reform in the police service sector, as well as the public sector as a whole. I joined the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in 1981, and since then, I have had the opportunity to witness a virtual *transformation* of one of the most respected police organizations in the world.

My first days as a member of the RCMP were filled with a lot of mixed emotions. There was the obvious pride of being selected as a new recruit in an organization of which many Canadian children once dreamed. After all, this was *the* RCMP; the one of which films were made, books written, and many a tale told. There was also the feeling of wonder: what was in store for me; where would I go (when we signed up, we could be transferred to any province or territory, without a word of consultation nor consideration of our wishes); and what line of work would I be doing when I arrived in the field? However, without a doubt, the primary sentiment I recall as a young recruit arriving at our Training Academy in Regina, Saskatchewan, was *fear*. Upon my arrival at the Academy, my life changed completely. My hair was shaved off (almost literally), I was herded into a single room with 32 beds (to be known as “home” for the next six months), given a recruit’s uniform, yelled at continually, and “confined to barracks” on an

occasion or two. For the next six months, with 31 strangers, I ran, swam, fought, shot, studied, polished, cleaned, ate (when there was time), and slept. Oh, and if I forgot to mention the punch line, these were the “ideal” conditions under which we were expected to “learn” how to become police officers. It was pretty much a “boot camp” whereby instructors *commanded* respect. The goal was not to ensure that young recruits knew “why” things were done in a certain way, rather all that was needed was for the recruit to know what he/she needed to do in any given circumstance. We were not required to understand these potential situations, only react to them in the appropriate manner. The “why” would be left up to management and their policy writers. If I heard this expression once at the Academy, I heard it a thousand times: *There are three ways to do things: the right way, the wrong way, and the RCMP way.* Without a doubt, this exemplified the type of training and organizational culture to which RCMP recruits were subjected for over a century. Command and control, execution of policy without exception, and “the RCMP way”.

I have had countless opportunities to work with police officers from other organizations and jurisdictions. What I have learned from these exchanges is that the RCMP was certainly not an isolated police force who imposed the organization’s values and procedures on its members. Indeed, it is apparent that this culture was (and continues to be in some organizations) a common thread across the entire police community. The uniform, the rank structure, the nature of the work being performed, the judicial exigencies in various jurisdictions, and the very “raison d’être” of a police force (to maintain law and order), are all contributing factors to the nature of the organizations themselves.

However, things are changing. The RCMP and other lead organizations are rapidly transforming: externally and internally. Externally, police organizations in democratic bureaucracies are responding to the new needs and expectations of the citizens for whom they were sworn to serve and protect. In most cases, the entire approach to service delivery has become much more flexible and acquiescent to the specific needs of an ever-changing population. Internally, some police organizations have recognized the need to review their administrative methods in order to bring them more in line with the “accommodating” approach to service delivery.

The goal of this chapter is: 1) to provide an overview of the evolution of policing in Canada so as to better understand from where this profession has developed, and to better appreciate the magnitude of the transformation of the delivery of this service; and 2) to provide

the same type of overview with respect to the development of management approaches in police organizations during the same time period. I feel that it is of great importance to compare the two developmental processes and to fully understand the inter-relations between the evolution of the service delivery aspect of policing vis-à-vis the organizational/managerial maturation process. This is especially significant due to the fact that I contend in this thesis that the two processes did not develop on equal footing. In fact, I would suggest that one progressed *as a result* of the other. It was only when police organizations attempted to provide a more responsive service to their public, that they realized that this could only be accomplished if their internal culture / administrative techniques were equally transformed. In other words, police administrators realized that they could not expect their police officers to provide a service which was responsive to the ever-changing needs of their communities, if their own internal practices did not provide any flexibility / responsibility to the front line workers who were dealing directly with the public.

A Historical Perspective of Police Service Delivery

At first glance, it would appear that the concept of police service delivery has come full circle, for the idea of “community policing”, which is ever so popular at present, can hardly be considered a new approach. In fact, *community policing* has been around since the early 1800’s and the dawn of “organized policing”. Sir Robert Peel, founder of the first metropolitan police force of London, England, based the services of his “Bobbies” on 9 principles of policing which closely match modern ideas of *community policing*. Peel claimed that the police have no power without the approval and cooperation of the public, and that police are simply members of the public who are paid to devote their full-time attention to community welfare.³⁸

Yet these basic principles of a “community-based” policing approach did not necessarily remain as a constant throughout law enforcement agencies. As a recent televised series on the Arts and Entertainment network, entitled “Policing” suggests, there are several reasons for this. For example, police forces in the United States during the early 20th century were largely based on “beat cops” - police officers who patrolled a given territory on foot. These officers knew their neighborhood and the citizens who lived and/or participated in that community and were in constant contact with these people. However, as the A&E report

³⁸ Rebecca Johnson, Back to Basics (Ottawa: Community and Aboriginal Policing, RCMP, 1993), p. 2.

suggests, in the mid-20th century, several factors evolved which changed the face of policing in many urban centers across the U.S.. For instance, the series notes that some police forces were used as “strike-breakers” during a period of turbulent labor relations. Some of the violent clashes between police and labor were viewed by the public in a negative light and the citizenry never really trusted their police forces as they once had.

Another point raised by this series was the fact that in several urban centers around the U.S., corruption was rampant (largely due to the effects of prohibition). Not only did this detract from public perception of police forces, but managers of police departments, in order to deter further corruption, attempted to decrease the amount of contact which police officers had with members of their community. This led to the abandonment of foot patrols which were replaced by patrols in police cruisers.

According to the A&E report, this had dire consequences. For one, it segregated the police from the community - ultimately leading to a “police sub-culture” whereby the police and community were no longer one - rather, the police “enforced” the law in the way it saw fit. Secondly, the segregation of police and community meant that the emphasis of policing became one of “solving crimes” - cleaning up the mess after it had taken place instead of working with the community to identify its fundamental problems and reacting to them; thereby curbing criminal activity before it actually took place.

In Canada, the circumstances were perhaps less draconian than those of our neighbors to the south; yet the results were actually quite similar. Our modern RCMP grew out of the North West Mounted Police; an organization which was much more than a simple police force. Other than law enforcement and crime prevention the NWMP acted as customs officers, assisted with treaty payments to Native peoples, fought prairie fires, served as magistrates, ensured orderly development when required (i.e. in Yukon during the Klondike gold rush), provided veterinary assistance and advice; and, provided relief supplies to destitute settlers.³⁹ By the time the RCMP came to be, the organization had developed into a modern, “professional police force” who was responsible for federal law enforcement nation-wide. The RCMP experienced a period of rapid growth and change, adopting specialized services (crime laboratory, identification services, marine and air sections, etc.) aimed at improving its capabilities and services to the community.

³⁹ See: Royal Canadian Mounted Police: Community and Aboriginal Policing Branch, *The Evolution of Policing in the RCMP* (Ottawa: RCMP), 1994.

However, by the mid-20th century, Canada was also experiencing several fundamental social changes. There was a marked increase in population and in the diversity of that population; urban centers were rapidly developing; there was an emergence of a national consciousness as a result of WWI and the subsequent creation of national entities such as CNR, CBC, Air Canada, etc.; and there was a radicalization of Canadian politics (comparatively speaking; with an increased labor movement, left-wing governments, etc.).

From a technological point of view, the first half of the 20th century in Canada led to marked improvements in communications and transportation which meant that information spread more quickly and efficiently; national and international issues reached more people more quickly; and travel between communities was much easier.

These types of societal and technological changes in Canada during the first half of the 20th century meant that the police had several new challenges: larger communities; greater diversity; new attitudes; new issues; and more information to manage.

In as much as the first half of the 20th century was a difficult period of adjustment, the 60's and 70's were even more so for Canadian society and our police forces. This was a period of tremendous urbanization, social expansion and unrest. Canadian society became increasingly multicultural. Special interest groups, women, and minorities began to demand recognition and equal treatment. Crime rates grew as the drug culture emerged, cities expanded, and social problems increased. Social values and expectations evolved, and people began to closely examine the balance between individual rights and the protection of society.⁴⁰

This period probably had the greatest impact on policing in Canada. From a law enforcement point of view: the police now had to deal with fighting the drug culture; there was more violence; police forces had to develop specialized units such as drug squads, economic crime sections, etc.; there was much more concern with individual rights; it was a period of more social disorder and the police was simply tasked with "handling it"; and, television meant that regional, national and global events became immediate - for instance, the way the police in Chicago handled a particular riot would ultimately affect the reputation of Canadian police forces and the attitudes of communities towards them.

There was a general anti-establishment attitude developing throughout the nation. It was not just the police who were mistrusted, but the entire judicial and government system. Canadians had always placed 100% trust in their police officers. By the 70's, people no longer

⁴⁰ Ibid.

trusted the police implicitly. In fact, there was mistrust on both sides. The police responded with a “fortress mentality” - it meant that in Canada as well, police and community became segregated: two separate entities, no longer working in unison.

During this turbulent period, the police were getting busier, responding to an increasing number of calls. Not only did the number of investigations increase, but the complexity of these investigations intensified as well. In order to justify a larger police force, “statistics” became the new buzz word. It was felt that if the police could prove the number of calls it had to respond to, as well as the increased amount of time needed to be spent on each call, then the government would necessarily react to this “proof” and hire a sufficient number of police officers needed for the job. This is exactly what happened; police forces across the nation augmented their personnel in record fashion. Of course, as these police forces grew in size and responsibility, paperwork, policy, administration, and bureaucracies for these agencies were increasing as well.

The simultaneous increase in bureaucracy and public mistrust resulted in the creation of extremely detailed policies. These policies were developed for every possible scenario of law enforcement and its administration. All decisional power was taken away from police officers - if they deviated in any way from written policy - they were reprimanded. This not only led to a very stringent enforcement of the law, but it also sucked every bit of innovation from line officers who were not allowed to help members of the community in any other way than was written in the books.

Finally, new legislation, such as the Charter of Rights and Freedoms of 1982, Access to Information, and the Young Offenders Act took away even more freedom and flexibility for police officers. One could argue that this too was every bit as much a response to public mistrust of government as it was a response to a new liberal outlook of society. However, it is simply one more element which affected policing in Canada and led to a very suspicious law enforcement community.

From a communications point of view, police forces remained weary of the public and the media. Police forces gave up little or no information as to why it acted in a given fashion. This was the “no comment” era - the only justification for any action could be found in the law books. While this was a response to police departments’ suspicion of any inquiry into their affairs, this attitude only encouraged further mistrust from its public.

Canadian society then went through another stage in its evolution. By the time the late 80's rolled around, crime rates and public fear were still growing along with public dissatisfaction and police frustration. No matter how hard the police worked, the "problems" did not go away. Crimes were being solved and criminals were going to jail, but the number of victims was not decreasing. As a result, the public began demanding more accountability, expecting more services and more results from their police departments. At the same time, economic recession and public belt-tightening increased pressure on police. The time had come when police forces recognized the need for a new approach to policing - one that is more effective, and one which provides "true results".

A Historical Review of Police Management Models

As we have witnessed, police service delivery to the public has gone through a wide array of changes and transformations throughout its history. The various tasks of police officers, technological advances, crime waves, and social factors have all contributed to the evolution of policing in democratic societies.

What is of equal interest to my thesis, is the historical maturation of management practices in police forces around the world. The purpose of this portion of the paper therefore, is to provide the same type of overview of police management models throughout history⁴¹, much in the same way as I reviewed the evolution of police service delivery to the public in the previous segment. While many of the management models which I will discuss in the upcoming portion of this paper may sound very familiar to scholars of administration, their application to police organizations are unique. The following is an overview of each management model and an explanation as to how each model pertains to police organizational practices.

The Traditional Management Model, 1750 - 1900

Many police organizations in North America were created during the reign of the Traditional Management Model, which is contributed largely to the Metropolitan Police of London. One of the major management principles of the Metropolitan Police Act that appeared in the original 1829 duty manual was Principle 9: *the test of police efficiency is the absence of*

crime and disorder and not the visible evidence of police action in dealing with them. Without a doubt, this principle placed the emphasis on *results*. As a result, the Metropolitan Police attempted to determine, in as logical a fashion as possible, the relationship between disorder and crime in each section of London as well as the necessary personnel required to deal with it. In the initial years of this force, it was constantly engaged in all-night battles with rioting mobs and it was also under the constant threat of being eliminated by the government. However, strong leadership coupled with an excellent command structure and semi-military organizational model brought order to the streets of London along with diminished evidence of crime in general. Not only was this model deemed a success in London, it was extended throughout England, and eventually to North America.

Another important element of this model was the principle of local control. As such, each police force in England was established under local authority (such as town or city councils). There was no one central authority for all police forces nor was there a “Minister of Police”. The British were very proud of their local control of their police forces and eventually exported this concept to America. As a result, the selection of constables and the election of Sheriffs in the United States have been strictly controlled and zealously guarded by their respective communities. The fear of an oppressive centralized police state has severely curtailed the creation of a countrywide or metropolitan police agencies in the United States. The fact that this principle remains important to Americans, even in light of modern-day economics, is a major factor to be considered by governments and police organizations of today.

Scientific Management Model, 1900 to Present

Scientific Management is the “machine model”, where the emphasis is on efficiency, orderliness, and output. Frederick Taylor is often credited with providing the four basic principles of this approach⁴²:

1. The division of labour and specialization;
2. Unity of command and centralization of decision-making;
3. One-way authority;
4. Narrow span of control.

⁴¹ Edward A. Thibault, Lawrence M. Lynch, and R. Bruce McBride, Proactive Police Management (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall), 1995.

⁴² *Ibid.*

This, along with the organized bureaucracy developed by Max Weber, became the basic conceptual structure for "Scientific Management". As such, the emphasis was on rationality, predictability, impersonality, technical competence, and authoritarianism. This model fits very well with the already existing semi-military model of police organization, where the manager was definitely in charge of the organizational machinery.

This management model, which was very popular in all public service circles, had a profound effect on police organizations. To underline the significance of this era in police management, I will use the examples of two influential individuals in the police profession and the way in which they implemented this model.

The first individual is O.W. Wilson who, after an illustrious career in law enforcement, became the reform-minded Chief of Police for Chicago from 1960 to 1967. Wilson wrote *Police Management (1950)*, which became the most influential management textbook for police managers in the United States. Basically, Wilson promoted:

1. A professional police department divorced from politics;
2. Rigorous police personnel selection and training processes;
3. Use of the latest technological innovations available for law enforcement (i.e. patrol cars, radio systems, computerization of record-keeping, etc.).

Yet Wilson, while being committed to professional policing, was very much opposed to civil service. He felt that civil service testing and seniority rules hampered the police chief in selecting the most qualified personnel for law enforcement and promotion to leadership positions. He was also opposed to external (civilian) review boards. Rather, he felt that the police leadership should be held accountable for all officers' actions. He felt that matters such as punishment related to the use of excessive force should be treated internally - it was a police management problem.

Wilson placed high priority on *planning* - which would serve to bind an organization together, to implement the policy underlying its aims and purposes, to direct its efforts into the proper channels, and to guide in performance.⁴³ He also placed an emphasis on *leadership* - which was "the ability to obtain from each member of the force, the highest quality of service that he is capable of rendering."⁴⁴

⁴³ Orlando Winfield Wilson, *Police Administration* (New Jersey, Prentice Hall), 1977.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

The second individual is William H. Parker. Parker worked closely with Wilson throughout his career, and eventually became the Chief of the Los Angeles Police Department (1950 - 1968), which he completely revamped during his tenure.

Parker was known for his strong stand on effective law enforcement, accountability, technocratic innovations, and commitment to police professionalism. Parker insisted that recruits have IQs of 110 or above, undertake a closely supervised one-year probation period, and undergo a thorough psychiatric examination. He also created an exhaustive method of procedure file made up of over 2 million cards, developed one of the finest police laboratories in the world, and a planning and research division that used state-of-the-art computer technology. Internally, Parker instigated *organizational innovations* (such as the Planning and Research Division, creation of rehabilitation centres for alcoholics); *revamped procedures* (such as one-man patrols, paperwork reductions, and a lower ratio of police officers to population); and accomplished some *widely acclaimed results* (such as lower incidence of crime, strict narcotics controls, and fewer traffic deaths). Under Parker, the LAPD became a model for police organizations in terms of standards of excellence for police personnel recruitment and training, sophisticated planning, and a solid image for professional law enforcement.

Human Relations and Participative Model, 1925 to Present

Basically, this model is not completely implemented in any one police department. Rather, it may form a part of an existing management model which exists already in an organization. It is generally considered as a means of dealing with stress, which is so prevalent in law enforcement agencies.

The human relations approach considers the police executive to be a team leader who creates a cooperative effort among line officers through the use of a management team. Under this model, the executive (chief) helps to fulfill the social security, self-esteem, and autonomy needs of the personnel in his / her department. The manager, is then responsible for motivating personnel and developing talent. Organizationally speaking, this is done by having the manager create opportunities and provide guidance so that all members can realize their own potential in contributing to the organization. As such, management becomes group-centered which would operate based on two premises:

1. The manager defines the limits within which the group makes a decision;

2. The manager and group jointly make a decision within the limits defined by organizational constraints.

Widely known throughout the police community as “team policing”, this approach replaces the traditional autocratic manager, with one who is considered “first among equals”.

How does this relate to stress management? Generally speaking, a police officer needs to feel that his/her career will develop along a reasonable path (promotions) and that his or her job is relatively stable and free from “capricious” management.⁴⁵ Personnel grievances as well as promotion matters play as large a role in producing stress on the job as does the work on the streets. With the strong perception of danger and the need to remain alert to deal with the unexpected in the field, police officers have a special drive and a need for security on the job. These are problems related to the “human side” of management with which traditional, autocratic and scientific management often fail to adequately address.

Until very recently, the participatory model is adhered to more in name than in substance. Police executives are fearful of losing their authority and autonomy, especially in lieu of the significant inroads which police unions have made vis-à-vis managerial prerogatives. Still, elements of this model exist in many police departments, however the autocratic, traditional model dominates much of police organization.

Behavioral Management, 1945 to Present
and Systems Management, 1960 to Present

These approaches have had their major impact in the area of fiscal organization, day-to-day budgeting, and short-range and long-range planning. Although often viewed as competing with the human relations approach (due to their simultaneous development), the systems-behavioral approach compliments much of the human relations approach in that it has developed mechanisms for accountability through the establishment of quantitative measures for both fiscal and human behavior goals.

A behavioral goal has three components:⁴⁶

1. A goal is to be stated an empirical manner (must be scientifically measurable);

⁴⁵ Edward A. Thibault, Lawrence M. Lynch, and R. Bruce McBride, *Proactive Police Management* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall), 1995.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

2. A criterion of success that is normally less than 100 percent;
3. A context in which to measure the goal developed in empirical terms.

The obvious types of performance indicators which developed under this approach were quotas (giving tickets); number of arrests being made per shift; number of patrols required in a given area per shift, etc. Under these guidelines, the officer knew exactly what was expected of him/her, however it did not allow for any flexibility to the officer to respond to unique situations or needs of a community on his or her own initiative. Also, while such behavioral tools can develop into excellent tools of accountability for management, there is also the risk that they may create goals that are too detailed and involve an inordinate amount of paperwork as compared with that needed to get the job done (i.e. extensive recording and reporting of statistical information for each task accomplished on shift).

Several systems grew out of the behavioral-systems approach which arguably allowed for greater accountability, planning, and fiscal organization. Such systems include: "Management by Objectives"; "Program evaluation and review techniques"; "Programming, planning and budgeting"; "Organizational development"; and, "Zero-based budgeting". While each of these systems may have had a very valid *raison d'être* for managerial reporting practices, their impact may have been adverse to the effectiveness of the delivery of services to the community and to the responsiveness of individual needs.

Proactive Management, 1980 to Present

The Proactive Management Model will be the subject of another chapter in this thesis. However, I would like to highlight the most significant elements for the reader at this stage of the paper:

1. The objective of policing is crime prevention;
2. A strong commitment to community involvement;
3. A modern bureaucracy, range of control techniques;
4. A full-service department with multi-specialist teams;
5. Full use of modern communication models (both technological and human resource/relations techniques);
6. Modern budgeting and accounting systems in full use;
7. Great emphasis on forward planning;

8. Consultative management approach;
9. Optimal use of modern technology;
10. Emphasis on the front line.

Each approach which we have looked at in this portion of the chapter have had something useful and of operational and theoretical utility to modern police organizations. The proactive approach is a synthesis of what is “good” in each of the other approaches. Some of the proposals which have developed out of the Proactive model are: “Community Oriented Policing”; “Problem Oriented Policing”; and “Total Quality Management”, which are being applied to police operations in several forces today.

The Impetus for Reform

As previously discussed in the first chapter of this thesis, the Canadian public became increasingly disenchanted with the services provided by its government. In the case of police services, this was no exception. In fact, one could easily infer that the exact same reasons for change, which were enumerated in the first chapter, apply equally to police organizations: citizens feel that they are entitled to a better quality of service; police organizations must administer themselves in an economically responsible fashion; and, citizens are generally more knowledgeable of the issues surrounding them.

The purpose of this section of the chapter is to itemize a series of motives which are specifically related to the need for a change in police service delivery, given the evolution of that service area and its ensuing consequences. Therefore, I will attempt to enumerate such motives in both the sphere of service delivery to the public, as well as with respect to the internal administration / organization of police agencies.

External Motives for Change

The reasons for the recognition of the need for change on the part of police departments across the country are multi-fold.⁴⁷ First of all, from a social point of view, Canadians are better educated. They know their rights and they are able to recognize whether or not their

⁴⁷ Ibid.

police department is doing an “effective” job. Mass communication allows immediate access to information around the world. This means that Canadians are able to view other societies around the world. It allows them to know what they want, and what they don’t want. Canadians want a safe neighborhood; they don’t want “Rodney King” incidents and the ensuing riots.

A second set of forces behind the drive for change in police methods are of an economic nature. Canadians expect a cost efficient service from their police department and they want value for their money. Canadians are paying more taxes than ever before and yet they have the feeling that they are not receiving *better* services. When they see more police officers on the street, and more criminals being sent to jail, yet crime is not on the decline, this signals a fundamental problem: the wrong method is being used. Citizens want the police to tackle the underlying problems of crime - not the symptoms.

Finally, police forces are being challenged by an entirely new prospect: private policing and security companies are encroaching upon the territory and mandate of police departments everywhere. Furthermore, with all of these government cutbacks, other government agencies are attempting to justify the existence of some of their departments. As a result, increased competition between government agencies as to who should provide what service, has arisen. For instance, should Customs Canada conduct investigations on smuggling organizations or should this be the responsibility of the RCMP? At present, there is a duplication of activity in this sphere.

The RCMP and other police forces therefore came to a point in their existence whereby they had to take a step back and evaluate their options. They could either maintain the status quo, or they could find a more acceptable and efficient approach to policing which would meet the needs and concerns of the communities they serve. For instance, in the case of the RCMP, if it was to opt for the status quo it could conceivably lose: contracts (municipalities and provinces who contract their services could opt for a more efficient police force); positions (due to the loss of contracts and government downsizing); morale; resources; freedom to make its own decisions; respect; confidence of clients, partners and employees; and public image.

In the words of the present Commissioner of the RCMP, this organization is at the point where it can “change or be changed, or just be shown the door!”. The options are slim, and the answer is apparent. The RCMP and many other police forces across Canada have chosen to

adopt a new approach to policing; one that is more respondent to the wishes of the communities they serve, in a more efficient way.

Internal Motives for Change

Police forces are therefore facing the challenge of convincing their ranks to buy into this new approach to policing - one whereby the front line police officer looks at problems with the community members as opposed to going solo. However, while police forces are expecting their officers to adopt this new mind-set, they are quickly realizing that they themselves are faced with an internal challenge of handling their own matters in an *alternative* way. In other words, if management expects their line officers to be innovative in his/her role with the community at large, it becomes necessary that the same police force rethink its own organizational structure which will allow its officers to be treated in the same way - thus creating a climate which will promote the aspired mind-set throughout the force. Simply stated, the rule becomes "put up or shut up"! If the officers are expected to give an innovative service, then they expect to be treated the same way and to be given the freedom and responsibility to develop / implement innovative solutions to community problems.

Conclusion

Police organizations have evolved from a very rigid, semi-military model of the late nineteenth century to a more flexible approach which emphasizes the human factor (both internally and externally). As we have seen, proactive police managers have developed an organizational model which incorporates contributions from all previous administrative techniques so as to provide the best possible service to their clients, in a way which effectively addresses the concerns of the organization itself, and its employees.

From the traditional model, a finely honed sense of organization was adopted (which was obviously required at the time of the creation of police forces) - hence the creation of a hierarchical organization. The scientific management period provided a focus on goals and planning to best forecast trends or situations for which the organization was not yet prepared. While the human relations model tended to overemphasize the importance of democratic management, an emphasis on the significance of human relations and personnel skills

contributed largely to the modern police administration. One could certainly highlight the recognition of this approach to provide human-relations skill training for middle managers and supervisors so as to effectively persuade the front line workers to do their jobs with the utmost efficiency. Finally, an effective manager will be able to firmly ground him/herself in achievable practical behavioral objectives so as to best anticipate and plan all aspects of police management - personnel, fiscal, and community.

This chapter has provided an historical outlook on policing and police management techniques. From this base, we will move forward to a discussion on how policing services are delivered and managed in today's context.

IV. The Concept of Community-Based Policing

From Bureaucracy to Community-based Policing

In the early 1900's, German sociologist Max Weber articulated a management model of "bureaucracy". This model was based on the following principles:

- "Organizations should be built around a clear system of hierarchical relationships, with greater discretion in decision making as one moves up the hierarchy and with an established chain of command as the primary mechanism for coordination.
- Organizations should be governed by a clear and consistent set of written rules and procedures covering all positions, both operational and managerial.
- Job holders should be qualified to perform their assignments; therefore, technical competence should be the basis for filling jobs and promotions."⁴⁸

In their book, "Reinventing Government", David Osborne and Ted Gaebler point out that over fifty years ago, it was effective for centralized institutions to use Weber's model. Information technologies were primitive, communication between different locations was slow, and the public workforce was relatively uneducated. Information was collected at the "bottom" of the organization, and there was plenty of time for that information to flow up the chain of command, and for the ensuing decisions to flow back down.⁴⁹ However, Osborne and Gaebler went on to say that in modern day, information is virtually limitless, communication between remote locations is instantaneous, many public employees are well educated, and conditions change with blinding speed. There is no time anymore to wait for information to go up the chain of command and for the decisions to come back down. Under these conditions, things simply work better if those working in public organizations have the authority to make many of their own decisions.⁵⁰

Throughout recent history, most large police forces in North America have been organizationally structured in the typical "bureaucratic" model which Weber had preferred - a classical hierarchical pyramid in which many, if not most functions were highly centralized. Crime-fighting was accomplished in a very reactionary way through retrospective criminal investigations, quick responses to calls from the public for service as well as random and/or directed patrols. There was effective discipline and control through an elaborate set of rules and

⁴⁸ H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (Translators), From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, (Oxford University Press, 1946) p. 112.

⁴⁹ David Osborne and Ted Gaebler, "Reinventing Government", (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1992): pp. 250-251.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 251.

close supervision. The goal was to insulate police departments from political influence and corruption. While this model may have very well accomplished that goal, it also created a situation whereby police forces alienated themselves from the communities they were supposed to serve.⁵¹

Since the early 1990's, the Community-based Policing Model, which generally seeks to encourage customer satisfaction, continuously improve the organization, empower the employees, and remove excessive levels of management; has proven to be a serious challenge to the traditional bureaucratic model of management to which Police Forces have grown accustomed. Many major police organizations have already begun to apply these new principles and are doing away with the old institutions and models of command and control. This has resulted in a major shift in policing from both an operational and administrative perspective. A shift which has been embraced by most, but continues to be refuted by some.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the concept of "Community Policing". In the process, I will explain why it was conceived and what it hoped to accomplish; offer some definitions of the Community policing model and identify its key elements; and finally, I will attempt to demonstrate the depth of change which has occurred in the adoption of this model over the traditional style of policing which reigned for decades in the sector.

What is Community-Based Policing?

In recent years, one may notice a new trend in law enforcement; one which more and more police forces have implemented with striking success. This new approach is in effect quite proactive in nature in that it establishes two-way communications with client groups throughout the community in order to identify salient issues of particular concern. Rather than simply solving crimes and arresting perpetrators after the offense has already been committed, proactive law enforcement places emphasis on community-based "crime prevention". In this sense, police forces seek to identify (with the help of the entire community) social problems which may be the cause of the crimes being committed. For instance, instead of arresting young offenders for defacing public and/or private property throughout the community; the police force, along with the community may identify the cause of the problem and create youth

⁵¹ Charles F. Dinse, "How Will Large Police Organizations Be Structured By The Year 2002?",

programs which provide activities aimed at redirecting the energy of this population; hence preventing a series of crimes from ever being committed. The accent is no longer placed on the number of arrests being made; rather, it is placed on preventing crimes from happening in a first instance. In other words, success of a police force is measured in terms of the level of security provided in the community; not on how busy the court system is nor the occupancy rate of the prisons.

Proactive community-based policing also suggests that the entire community recognizes that “security” is the concern of all participants of the community. This may lead to the implementation of programs such as “Community Watch”, or even having private companies provide sponsorship for athletic teams, community centers, and the like. It is important that the community realize that their police force is not a separate entity from themselves; they are one in the same and in order to increase the level of security and the quality of life of all participants of these communities, everyone must get involved in their own way.

Some police forces are now at the stage where they are recognizing the advantage of “interactive” policing. Police forces are placing a premium on interaction with the community at large and letting the various client groups in on the decision-making process. The agenda is no longer set by the police force, but by the community as a whole. The emphasis is placed on participation; the police make a true attempt at “understanding” the concerns of all client groups; and “law enforcement” techniques become innovative and responsive rather than stagnant and paternalistic.

Definitions of Community Policing

Community policing has become the subject of numerous studies in both policing and academic fields. From a policing perspective, this “radical” new approach is so different from the traditional model that police forces continue to study its successes and perceived pitfalls prior to adopting the all encompassing changes that are required to complete its full implementation. From an academic point of view, the model is very interesting because its implications are far-reaching in a number of fields including: administration, law, sociology, psychology, and other behavioral sciences. As such, there are a wide range of definitions of “community-based policing” available in today’s literature:

- “Community Policing is a philosophy of full service personalized policing, where the same officer patrols and works in the same area on a permanent basis, from a decentralized place, working in a proactive partnership with citizens to identify and solve problems.”⁵²
- “Community Policing comprises two main strategies. The first involves community service strategies which consolidate a proactive approach, based more on persuasion than on the use of force, a broadening of the police mandate through individual actions such as police-community newsletter or contacts with victims. A second gives greater importance to collective action strategies by developing a network of citizens and businessmen or setting up citizen’s committees or yet again by providing greater police visibility via foot patrols or opening storefront offices.”⁵³
- “Community Policing requires that a department wide philosophical commitment to involve average citizens as partners in the process of reducing and controlling the contemporary problems of crime, drugs, fear of crime and neighborhood decay; and in efforts to improve the overall quality of life in the community”.⁵⁴
- “We define community policing as a partnership between the police and the law-abiding citizens to prevent crime; to arrest those who choose to violate the law, to solve recurring problems where we tend to go back to the same places over and over again, and to evaluate the results of our efforts. The whole objective is to improve the quality of life in the neighborhoods throughout our city”.⁵⁵

Such snapshots can hardly provide the reader with a true understanding of what the concept of community policing is. What these definitions are useful for however, is to demonstrate to students of the subject, just how diverse the concept really is and what it means to different people. In fact, as we delve deeper in to the concept, we will soon recognize that

⁵² The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, “Community Policing for Law Enforcement Officers”, University of Illinois at Chicago, 1995, p.5.

⁵³ LeBeuf, Marcel-Eugene, “Accountability and Community Policing in Canada: An Assessment of Experiences”, Canadian Police College, 1993, p. 3

⁵⁴ Peter C. Kratcoski and Duane Dukes, “Issues in Community Policing”, Anderson Publishing Co., Cincinnati, 1995, p. 5.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p.6.

this very fact is what makes community policing so effective: its very nature allows it to be flexible and adapt to the individual needs of all communities. In this way, “community policing” may have as many definitions as the number of communities participating in the initiative; or indeed, as many definitions as there are participants involved in the exercise.

The Components of Community Policing

At this juncture, we may find a more complete “definition” of community policing by listing its components. One extensive study on the concept of Community Policing has identified the following list as integral components of all community policing initiatives ⁵⁶:

- A problem-solving, results-oriented approach to law enforcement;
- Articulation of police values that incorporates citizen involvement;
- Accountability of the police to each neighborhood;
- Decentralization of authority;
- Police-community partnership and sharing of power;
- Beat boundaries that correspond to neighborhood boundaries;
- Permanent assignment of patrol officers (continuity and ownership);
- Empowerment of patrol officers to show initiative;
- Coordination of investigations at both neighborhood and jurisdiction-wide levels;
- New roles for supervisors and managers, as supporters of patrol rather than as evaluators of patrol officers;
- Changes in the content of training at all levels;
- New systems of performance evaluation, placing much less emphasis on “production” of quantified activities;
- New approaches to “demand management”, the response of the police agency to calls for service.

Each of these components are essential to a successful implementation of the community policing model. From both an operational and administrative / organizational

⁵⁶ Elizabeth Watson, Alfred Stone, and Stuart DeLuca, “Strategies For Community Policing”, Prentice-Hall International, 1998, p. 48.

perspective, these components will completely transform a police organization, from the traditional model of “law-enforcement”, to an interactive model of police services whose aim is to ameliorate the quality of life of the community it serves.

Community Policing vs. Traditional Policing

We have seen some definitions of community policing, as well as identified the key components needed to successfully implement the community policing concept in a police organization and in a community. In order to demonstrate to the reader the far-reaching implications of these changes in a police force, I would like to briefly outline the differences between the “old model” of policing versus the community policing model. These differences become most obvious when the underlying assumptions of the two models are compared.

The following list represents what I believe to be the most widely shared assumptions of community policing as they are compared to the traditional model of policing which has been so prevalent in recent history:

- Under the community policing model, the primary purpose of the police is to assist the public in establishing and maintaining a safe, orderly social environment. *Under the traditional model, the goal was to protect the law-abiding public from criminals* ⁵⁷ ;

- The goal of community policing is accomplished by providing a variety of services to the community. Identifying and apprehending the criminals is one of those services - indeed an important one. But it is not necessarily more important than the other services. *Under the traditional model, the most effective means of accomplishing the goal of the police was to identify and arrest the criminals, collect evidence and ensure that the perpetrators are punished through incarceration or other methods* ⁵⁸;

⁵⁷ Skolnick and Bayley, “Community Policing: Issues and Practices Around the World” , (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), p.3.

⁵⁸ Frank J. Remington, “The Limits and Possibilities of the Criminal Law” in University of Notre Dame Law School, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, (New York: DaCapo Press, 1971), p. 56.

•Under community policing, it is not possible for the police nor any other agency to completely eradicate all crime. Crime is simply a manifestation of social disorder, which is in turn, a product of complex social interactions. *Under the traditional model, the public could not afford the resources necessary to eradicate all crime. Therefore, it was more efficient for the police to concentrate its limited resources on the eradication of serious crimes, those that cause the most disruption, injury, loss of life, and property damage, and are accorded the most severe punishment under law* ⁵⁹;

•The community policing models asserts that some serious crimes are committed by inherently “bad” people, lifetime criminals who prey on the innocent. However, some serious crimes are also committed by normally law-abiding individuals who are indistinguishable from the general population because they are the general population. *Under the traditional model, there were “good guys” and “bad guys”; criminals and law-abiding citizens. The distinction was always quite clear* ⁶⁰;

•According to the community policing model, people commit crimes for all sorts of reasons, many of which arise directly out of their social relationships. Some other reasons for criminal behavior include financial desperation, emotional illness, limited mental capacity, intoxication, and the influence of peers. Treating all violators indiscriminately as “bad people” is both unjust and ineffective. *Traditionally, “bad people”, in order to avoid punishment, employ various means to make themselves indistinguishable from law-abiding citizens* ⁶¹;

•Community policing demonstrates that some law enforcement services require the extensive training and expertise of specialists and technical experts. However, by far, the greater part of policing involves services that are performed by generalists, usually the patrol force. *Under the traditional policing model, the identification and apprehension of criminals*

⁵⁹ George Kelling and Elizabeth Watson, “Creativity with Accountability” in Hoover ed, Police Management, pp. 141 - 142.

⁶⁰ Parviz Saney, Crime and Culture in America, (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1986), p. 11.

⁶¹ Henry S. Ruth, “To Dust Shall Ye Return?” in Notre Dame Law School, The Challenge of Crime, p. 18.

*requires the use of sophisticated techniques and highly trained, skilled specialists who employ the best available scientific devices and methods*⁶²;

•In recent years, the quality of the of the personnel recruited and hired as patrol officers has increased and they have been provided with more and better training. Thus it is reasonable to expect patrol officers to have the skills necessary to perform the demanding services expected of them. *Under the old model: specialists couldn't be everywhere. Therefore, the functions of the generalists were twofold: first, to prevent and discourage crime from their mere presence; and second, when a crime was committed, to provide the specialist with a minimum amount of assistance and information on what had transpired - then the specialist would take-over*⁶³;

•The community policing model increases the range of services being performed by generalist patrol officers, and expects a higher level of performance, thus increasing the job satisfaction felt by the officers, and their motivation to do superior work. *Conversely, under the traditional model, generalists were highly supervised and guided by an extensive series of policies and procedures that were designed to minimize their mistakes. The generalists were expected to know and obey these policies and procedures unquestioningly and without exception*⁶⁴;

•Community policing asserts that, in every community, citizens need the police to perform various services to help control misbehavior, not all of which is specifically criminal; and to help maintain social order. These needs are not always obvious; often they must be discovered through the cooperative efforts of the police and citizens. *Under the old model, it was believed that the vast majority of law-abiding citizens wanted nothing from the police except protection from criminals. Constitutional and ethical imperatives demand that the*

⁶² George Kelling and Mark Moore, "The Evolving Strategy of Policing" in Perspectives on Policing, no. 4 (November, 1988), p. 11.

⁶³ James Q. Wilson, Thinking About Crime, rev. ed. (New York: Basic Books, 1983), pp. 111 - 112.

⁶⁴ Bureau of Justice Assistance, Understanding Community Policing, (Washington: U.S. Department of Justice), 1994, p.48.

*law-abiding public be left strictly alone except when they become victims or there is evidence that they have committed a crime*⁶⁵;

•Under the community policing model, citizens not only make demands on the police, but they also must take an active role in promoting social order. Ultimately, there must be a close and collaborative relationship between the police and the communities they serve. *Conversely, the traditional model of policing viewed law abiding citizens who were neither suspects nor victims as having no business interfering with the legitimate work of the police since their ignorance of the intricacies of the law and of the sophisticated techniques used by the police are likely to hinder the police in their essential duties.*⁶⁶

Reactive, Proactive, and Interactive Policing

As we have witnessed, police forces have traditionally implemented a reactive approach to law enforcement. Traditional “reactive” law enforcement means: 1) *It is incident oriented*: responding to particular incidents, calls, cases or events; not to the underlying problems they often represent. 2) *It has a reactive orientation*: the focus of operations are primarily oriented to responding to events as they arise. 3) *It provides limited analysis*: analysis and information gathering is limited to specific incidents or events and not to an analysis of the problems which precipitated the event. 4) *It is a narrow response*: there is limited or no room for innovation and emphasis is placed on standard law enforcement strategies. 5) *It places emphasis on the means over the ends*: an emphasis on response efficiency means little room for emphasis on the actual impact of policing strategies; efficiency is valued over effectiveness.⁶⁷ Therefore, the traditional model of “reactive policing” was very limited in terms of effectiveness as a strategy for solving or managing basic and recurring policing problems in the community.

However, faced with a new socio-political reality, many police departments in Canada chose to reunite with the communities they serve and implement a proactive approach to

⁶⁵ Patrick V. Murphy, “Organizing for Community Policing”, in John W. Bizzack, ed., *Issues in Policing: New Perspectives* (Lexington: Autumn House, 1991), p. 113.

⁶⁶ Gary Sykes, “Stability Amid Change”, in Larry T. Hoover, ed. *Police Management: Issues and Perspectives* (Washington: Police Executive Research Forum, 1992), p. 165.

⁶⁷ Christopher Murphy, *Problem-Oriented Policing* (Ottawa: Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, 1992), pp. 4-5.

providing security and a better quality of life for its citizens. In the words of a prominent supporter of proactive policing:

“Problem oriented policing focuses on solving problems rather than responding to and reporting incidents, by viewing incidents as symptoms of problems. Our goal is therefore to achieve Community based policing by applying the strategies and tactics of Problem oriented policing. Police will act as community team leaders in identifying problems that damage the quality of life, then work through the community as a whole to find and apply solutions to those problems.”⁶⁸

Proactive community-based policing resembles to a great extent the type of proactive issues management which many corporations have also chosen to implement in light of the new social reality. Jon Johnson, describes this new approach to issues management as: “identifying, evaluating, and responding to social and political issues which may impact significantly upon the “organization”.”⁶⁹ He incorporates six steps in this proactive approach to issues management: 1) scanning and monitoring the environment; 2) identifying and prioritizing the issues; 3) analyzing the issues; 4) making a decision as to how to respond to the issue(s); 5) implementing the plan of attack; and, 6) evaluating the issue and the organization’s response.⁷⁰

Let us now look at how this relates to the newly-adopted, proactive approach to policing.⁷¹

1) *Scanning and monitoring*: in addition to scanning and monitoring the general public, the media, thought leaders, and the government in order to establish what is happening in the community; police departments must also scan and monitor the information obtained from their own internal sources (intelligence reports, statistical information, incident reports, etc.). Scanning and monitoring may be effective in several instances. For instance, graffiti in a particular neighborhood or an increase in vandalism or thefts in a particular rural community may be the signs of an underlying “problem”. Incidents are simply signs of a cause and it is the “cause” which the community must necessarily deal with.

2) *Identification and prioritization of issues*: this means first sitting down with all of the client groups in the community and seeking their input as to what the issues are. Internal sources include patrol officers, investigators, crime analysis units, victim units, community

⁶⁸ Supt. D.A. Cassels, The City of Edmonton Police Department Neighborhood Foot Patrol Project: Preliminary Report, (Edmonton: City of Edmonton Police Service, 1988).

⁶⁹ Jon Johnson, “Issues Management: What Are the Issues?” in Business Quarterly, Vol. 48, No. 3, 1983, p.22.

⁷⁰ *Ibid*, pp. 23-26.

relations personnel, and information management systems. Again, the emphasis should be placed on identifying root causes of incidents rather than simply identifying the incidents themselves.

Herman Goldstein⁷² suggests that it is possible to relate incidents by focusing on four key characteristics: a) *behavior*: common behavior involved (i.e. vandalism, sexual assault, etc.); b) *territory*: incidents related by location; c) *persons*: incidents which affect a specific group or type of people (offenders, complainants, or victims); and d) *time*: incidents related by time, season or day of the week.

Prioritization means recognizing the limited resources of the community and the police force, and assigning some type of priority to the identified problems. Goldstein recommends the following factors should be considered during the prioritization process: a) the *impact* of the problem: how "big" is the problem and how many people are affected?; b) the *seriousness* of the problem: how much danger, damage, public concern and political visibility is involved? What are the consequences?; c) the *complexity* of the problem: how complex is it and what are the resource implications for the department?; d) the *solvability* of the problem: what degree of impact will police efforts have on the problem?; and, e) the *interest* in solving the problem: even though the issue is valid, there must be an interest by both the community and the police for resolving the problem.

3) *Analysis of the problem*: investigating the problem by gathering and interpreting diverse and comprehensive information. Sources of analysis may include: crime research material; police information management sources; other police officers; other police forces; and of course, the community.

4) *Decision-making* (developing a strategy): problems which police departments have to deal with are often specific and require specific strategies as a response. The objectives of the strategy should respond to the precise criteria of the problem at hand. Depending on the problem, a series of options are available:⁷³ a) *focused strategies*: are those which are focused on those who are at the core of the problem (i.e. repeat offenders or addresses). Strategies that focus on this core population will have a more pronounced effect than broader based strategies. b) *Inter-agency strategies*: a coordinated response with community agencies and institutions that are involved in similar problems (i.e. the RCMP and Canada Customs sharing resources

⁷¹ Murphy, 1992.

⁷² Herman Goldstein, *Problem-Oriented Policing*, (Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1990).

⁷³ Murphy, 1992.

and information in combating the flow of drugs into the country - or at a specific entry point).

c) **Mediation strategies:** in some instances, the police may be in a position to mediate a response to a problem (i.e. noise from a fraternity house). d) **Communication and education strategies:** educating the public with respect to the dangers of a particular situation. e) **Community mobilization strategies:** where possible, the community should play a role in the problem solving strategy (i.e. neighborhood watch programs). f) **Encouraging community control:** parents, teachers and building owners all have some type of authority over children, employees or properties. g) **Use of non-criminal laws and regulations:** creative use of private and public regulations, laws or statutes (i.e. hours of use for parks, etc.). h) **Crime prevention strategies:** development and use of proven crime prevention strategies.

5) **Implementation:** development of an implementation plan for the strategy chosen for a given problem. It is always a good idea to provide a written statement of the goals, objectives, strategies and time frames involved in order to facilitate an evaluation of the strategy. Wherever possible, the clients which have participated in the development of the strategy, should participate in its implementation. At the very least, interested clients should be provided feedback with respect to the progress of the implementation plan.

6) **Evaluation:** an evaluation of a strategy and its implementation is useful in that it allows a community to determine whether or not the strategy is having any effect on the problem for which it was developed to handle. Evaluation is also important in that it helps one determine whether this strategy could be used in other situations of a similar nature.

As we can see, proactive community-based policing, as it is practiced in several communities around the world, resembles very much the issues management process of many modern corporations: it identifies, evaluates and responds to the underlying issues which will ultimately affect the police department in the performance of its service.

Without a doubt, all of the elements listed above are very important to providing a more effective and efficient police force, while assuring the security and quality of life of the community it serves. However we need to take this process even one step further. We need to transform *proactive policing* into *interactive policing*. Rather than simply "using" the community as a source of information or as a tool for helping to solve a given problem, all actors (internal and external) must become an integral part of the decision-making process. *Why?* First of all, we have already discussed the fact that the role of the police is to enhance the

security and overall quality of life of the community it serves. Police departments provide a service to the community who should therefore have a say as to which issues are important, what should be done, and whether or not the strategies used are effective. Second, interaction with the community will enhance the credibility of the police department as well as the methods used by the department in tackling the underlying problems. Third, interaction will enhance the amount of innovative input into the decision-making process. Fourth, interaction with the community will help to ensure that the community and the police department remain as one entity and that they share a common goal and vision. Finally, interactive policing will convince all participants of the community that “security and quality of life” are everyone’s concern. This will ultimately lead to a more effective and efficient implementation of security methods.

In order for interactive policing to be truly effective, both the community and the police department must necessarily buy into the plan. This is not always a given. As we have already discussed, suspicions persist on both sides of the coin with respect to the “real” intentions of the other. Citizens may feel afraid or “used” as simple police informants. Police officers, many of whom were taught not to be creative, may feel alienated or “used” by politicians in a new police “fad”. Some may feel that their jobs are at stake and that this is simply another attempt by politicians to cut positions and save money at their expense.

In order for the full implementation of an interactive community-based policing model to take place, everyone must “buy in”: the community, the field officers, their supervisors, and management. If one link in this chain is missing, the circle cannot be closed and the key element of “interaction” in community based policing cannot be reached.

We have identified in this chapter what the community policing model is and how it differs from the traditional model which was used for the past several decades. The differences between the two models are such that the transition to an interactive community-based model will require changes in all facets of the police organization and the communities they serve. The best way to describe this change would be to use the term of “a complete transformation of the mind-set of the organization.” It has to become a philosophy, a way of doing things, not simply an organizational model. The perspective of each individual involved in the community and the security of that community will necessarily have to change; so too will the perspective of the police organization as a whole, a perspective which will have to allow for, and encourage its

members to adopt this entirely new mindset. The next chapter will deal with the organizational changes required by police agencies in order to complete the transformation to the interactive model of community-based policing.

V. Managing Change: Management Under the Community-based Policing Model

Coping With Organizational Change

In the previous chapter, we have looked at the stunning changes which the policing community has witnessed over the last decade; a complete transformation of the way in which police forces interact with the communities they serve. They have transformed from a hierarchical pyramid of high supervision and authoritarian policies and procedures, to one of proactive interaction with the community, and empowerment of the front line workers. Such fundamental change cannot possibly be implemented in such a short span without some growing pains. Definitely, it cannot be effectively put into place without a well planned, comprehensive management strategy.

Under the Community Policing concept of “interaction”, the challenges of management are not only at the “chain of command” level. The direct contact between front line police officers and the community will also be subject to new management problems. Community policing may become very frustrating for the police and the community until the roles become defined under the new “rules”. The community, although wanting to be consulted and involved in the priority-setting process of the police, will continue to expect the police to quell neighbourhood problems; stop abusive spouses; arrest criminals; give traffic tickets; and patrol in visible, marked police units. Failing to understand the change process as long-term, ongoing, and somewhat chaotic will doom community policing if considerable effort is not given to maintaining a level of traditional perceptions of the police.⁷⁴

From a human resource perspective, changes in police recruitment, selection, training, and promotional standards will also need to be considered. Management will ultimately have to work with police officer representation, civil service boards, and maybe even other outside entities in order to find the right “mix” for all parties concerned.

In short, the process of change, although relatively rapid, will suffer serious growing pains. One cannot expect the front line officers to undergo a complete gestalt shift in their operational mindset overnight. Management cannot expect front line workers or line officers to suddenly embrace a new “warm” sense of empowerment and innovation, without some doubt or suspicion. Nor can we expect the community to automatically trust a new approach of policing

⁷⁴ Charles Swanson, Leonard Territo, and Robert Taylor, Police Administration: Structures, Processes, and Behavior, (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1998), p. 39.

from an organization from which they have been estranged for so long. Finally, management must “manage” itself. Indeed, they are a fundamental key to the success of the concept of community policing. If management does not provide a learning environment, one susceptible to innovation and interaction; if they do not provide the tools and support needed to implement this new approach; if they do not themselves embrace (not just in words, but also in their actions) the principles which they expect their front line workers to use when dealing with the public; then the exercise is doomed to fail.

The present chapter will explore how to manage the change process in police organizations. In order to accomplish this task, I will begin by discussing elements which management will need to consider during the transitional stage. Then, I will identify managerial requirements, and an organizational structure which is required for the sustenance and support of the concept of community policing .

Preparing for Change

An organization, police or otherwise, which is going through fundamental transition, must first look inwardly and identify key areas of change. The following is a list of organizational / structural areas ⁷⁵ which under the implementation of community policing, will necessarily require lengthy perusal and consideration by management so as to determine: where they are; where they want to go; and how they are going to get there.

- ***Values and Culture:*** At the core of an agency is a set of values - an underlying philosophy that defines its reason for existence. The values of community policing (including problem solving, partnerships and customer service) must drive the organization - it must be adopted at all levels as the “mindset” of the organization. The police department’s culture reflects these values in its structure and management. Members of the organization, including front line workers and line officers, learn what actions are important to the organization through these values. In other words, the “old” police culture was based on the set of values of the traditional model of policing. With the transformation to community policing, management must identify and instill a “new” set of values on which the “new” organizational culture will be formed.

⁷⁵ Ibid., pp. 40 - 41.

The onus lies squarely on the shoulders of management to identify the new values of the organization, and to successfully mold these values into an organizational culture. It will not be acceptable for management to simply identify a new set of values for “the rest of the organization”, and then not change their own behaviour. *Culture is established by members of the organization observing how things are and then drawing conclusions about their organization’s priorities. This element of the transformation process has to start at the top.* If management truly hopes to succeed in changing the fundamental culture of their organization, it is essential that they “talk the talk” and “walk the talk”. Anything less will ultimately result in failure.

- **Goals:** “Organizational goals are articulated values”⁷⁶. They describe what the organization is striving for and they delineate how the results will be attained. Goals explain the way in which the values of the organization are to be accomplished. For example, a goal of community based policing will be that the police force will make concerted efforts to involve community members and organizations in the identification and solution of community problems (it may even be more precise by offering specific suggestions as to how to accomplish this - i.e. “citizen’s forums”, regular meetings with town council, etc). This goal reinforces underlying values of empowering the citizens; sharing security concerns; and a rapprochement of police and community.

The role of management in the goal-setting stage is to make sure that the goals are reflective of the values of the organization; make sure that all of the various units of the department are involved in the goal setting process and are implementing them; ensure that the goals in the different units are consistent (coordination); allocate necessary resources to allow each unit to implement their goals; and, evaluate the success of the goals as an indication of the success of the implementation of the values of the organization.

- **Structure:** There are five main structural areas in a police organization: officer - front line worker relations; communication patterns; decision-making procedures; accountability; and reward systems.⁷⁷ Under the traditional model of policing, these five structural areas were heavily centered on a top-down, command and control approach. Officer - front line worker relations were cold and formal; communications meant information flowed upwards, and orders flowed backed down; decisions were only made at the top (any decision

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 42.

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 41.

made at a lower level was based on policy which had been formulated at the top); accountability meant that front line workers were accountable for their actions vis-a-vis their adherence to policy and procedures; and rewards (often in the form of promotions) were based on a member's ability to respect and follow procedure, and to achieve targeted goals based on statistics (reflecting the values of traditional policing - i.e. the number of arrests, traffic tickets, seizures, etc.).

Obviously, these structural systems are not conducive to a community-based approach to policing. Each of these five structural areas will have to be completely revamped so as to respect the new values; and facilitate the achievement of the goals of the organization.

- *Climate:* An organization's climate is a direct product of its structure. It is made up of the beliefs and assumptions of members of the organization which can be identified, but are never written anywhere. It includes such things as trust between the front line workers and management; support; competition; freedom; stress; conflict; and morale. If you could sum it up in one word, I would say "perception" - the perception of the members of the organization vis-a-vis its organization.

A department's climate is dependent upon its structure, values, and goals. If the values and goals of the organization are voiced, but the structure does not afford the tools, nor the procedures to implement them, then the climate will be poor. Conversely, if the department has a structure which allows for the free flow of ideas and open relations between management and front line workers, but the values and goals are not clearly stated, then once again, the implementation of the community policing model will fail.

- *External Environment:* Obviously, since the role of a police department is to promote security and afford protection to the community it serves, then it is a natural assumption that the external environment will have an impact on the police department and the way it conducts its business.

Under the traditional model, the police force established the community's priorities with respect to security and protective issues. Under this model, the external environment had a lesser degree of influence on the establishment of goals and priorities of the police force - except to react to new trends in criminal activity. With respect to the internal functioning of the organization, the external environment had even lesser influence on the department.

With community policing however, the external environment becomes a key element in the decision making process at all levels. If not monitored properly, this can cause a

perception of instability within the ranks; it can affect the department's ability to accomplish its goals; and it can blur the fundamental values of the department. It is imperative therefore that the police department maintain a clear pulse on its community; that it monitor and understand the elements of its surroundings; and that it remain the "expert" in public security matters while at the same time being sensitive to the needs and wishes of the various community groups which it serves. *A police force must remain focused on its core values - and ensure that any changes to the goals that it has associated to those values are both necessary, and remain reflective of those core values.*

We have spent the last few minutes identifying structural / organizational areas which must be carefully managed during the transition from a traditional model to a community-based model of policing. The remainder of this chapter will be a discussion on how each of these elements must be implemented under community policing. In other words, what is the end product that is required in each of these structural elements that will ensure a smooth transition and successful implementation of the community policing model.

Structural / Organizational Accommodation in Community Policing

When a law enforcement agency embraces community policing, all members of the organization become oriented to provide customer service and work toward a community-wide effort to prevent crime. These same officers may be hampered by the existing hierarchical structure and policies that maintain decisions at the top, limit the amount and type of information dispersed, and require all actions to go through the chain of command. Such inconsistencies between values, goals and structural systems may often cause internal conflict that will impede the implementation of the community based policing mindset that the organization is striving to attain. It will only add to the "natural" tendencies of some members of the organization who will distrust change; have little confidence in management and the direction they are taking; and will be cynical with respect to newly adopted "reward systems".

It is absolutely imperative that the police department itself change in order to reflect the new direction which it expects its employees to take vis-a-vis the community. Community policing requires structural and organizational change, period. This portion of the chapter will now reexamine each structural / organizational area that we identified above, and discuss what

is required in order to facilitate the changes associated to the community - based policing model.

Values

We stated earlier that values are at the core of an organization - it is the underlying philosophy that defines its reason for existence. It stands to reason therefore, that a police organization which has adopted the community-based policing model, must use the values associated to community policing as its driving force.

What are the values of an organization committed to community policing? I believe that we could break these values into two groups: the first are the values of the organization with respect to the community (external); and the second are the values of the organization associated to its members.

- *The External Values of Community Policing*

The “external values” of a police organization can be defined as the principles which will lay the foundation for the relationship between the police department and the community it serves. Under the model of community policing, such values will necessarily reflect an “interactive” relationship; one that rejects the traditional model of segregation of the two entities; and one which will embrace active participation of the community in security issues.

It is difficult to define a set of external values that would be applicable to all police departments - the term community policing means that there are no hard-fast rules - the police department becomes responsive to the particular needs of the community it serves. However, there are some general values which may be applicable in all cases:

- *Mutual problem solving* - involving the community in the identification of problems in policing issues, setting priorities, and identifying solutions in an efficient manner.
- *Open and honest communication* - essential to creating a sense of trust between the police department and the community, it is necessary to re-establish open lines of communication. The communication should be at the front line, as well as at the management level. Communication under the community policing model must be two way - and above all, honest.

- *Cultural sensitivity* - a police department who adopts the community-based policing model must be sensitive to the particular needs of a community, and the various cultures which may exist in that community. A commitment to cultural sensitivity by the department means that efforts will be made to address specific concerns of a community and to understand problems which are unique to their circumstances. Often, police forces will make concerted efforts to hire police officers who are from the various cultural groups which make up the community they serve. An entire paper could be written on this initiative in itself, but there are several difficulties associated to their attempts and the success rate appears to be minimal.

- *Unbiased and respectful treatment of all people* - this is self explanatory. I should comment however that it should be a value of any police department - even those still under the traditional model of policing. The difference here may lie in the fact that there will be a different approach to the public under the community-based policing model. The public is no longer segregated into "good" and "bad"; crimes are treated as societal problems and solutions which will address these problems (not just the symptoms), will be sought by the community as a whole.

- *Accountability* - to the community. This is quite radical in the sense that under the traditional model, the police dictated the role of its organization in the community. It was certainly accountable - to the government - but accountability was measured in different terms - statistics, etc. Now, the term "accountability" means working with the community to identify the role of the organization, define problems, and seek solutions. Accountability, under community policing, is measured in terms of the improvement of overall security and quality of life in the community.

- *Effective and Efficient Use of Resources* - which, under the community policing model, means that the resources will be used as per the priorities defined by the department, in consultation with the community. Once again, I will stress that the police must be committed to consulting the public and identifying community priorities. However, resources are finite and they will remain that way. Also, there may be conflicting accounts of priorities by

different factions of the community. Therefore, it is ultimately up to the police, who remain the experts in community security, to ensure that their limited resources are used effectively and efficiently.

- ***The Internal Values of Community Policing***

The internal values of a police department committed to community policing deals with the principles on which the foundation is laid for the relationship between the organization and its employees. Such values must ensure that management treats the front line workers with the same respect it expects them to deal with the public; it must instill a sense of trust on the part of front line workers towards management and the new direction in which they are leading them; and it must be a guide which management themselves will follow - a way to ensure that they “walk the talk” as well. Some examples of internal values may be described as:

- *Bilateral communication* - which is open and honest and promotes a sense of ownership to the front line workers - they belong to the organization and are essential elements to its success.
- *Accountability and Empowerment* - when an officer is given responsibility for particular outcomes, it is essential that the authority to make decisions and to take action accompanies this responsibility. Just as it is important that the officer is held accountable for his or her actions.
- *Providing the Proper Tools* - dedicating sufficient resources to priority issues, providing proper training to the employees, ensuring officer safety...
- *Managing Human Resources through Consultation* - transfer of personnel, promotional systems, reward system, dealing with high and low performers, compensation, recognizing and encouraging innovation, job security: seeking the input from front line workers as to how these issues should be handled, what are the problems, and what can be done to solve them - it is applying community policing principles to their own people.

Goals

As previously stated, the goals must be indicative of the values they represent. They should identify concrete objectives which will seek to implement and maintain the values of the organization.

Examples of goals with respect to the external environment could be:

- the creation of “community consultative groups” in which members of the community and of the police department meet in order to discuss problems together, identify solutions, and above all (certainly in the initial stages of the implementation process) offer a forum for dialogue and open communication between the police department and its public.

- seek to identify and approach specific groups in the community who have not been represented traditionally, and who have specific concerns which are not being addressed, or which are not perceived by these groups as being addressed. Seek to identify and promote activities that will help to establish a bond between these groups and the police. For instance, creating and organizing a hockey league for youth groups; holding ball games between the police department and a church group; going to the schools to show a human side to the uniform; etc. all of these activities are steps to demonstrate that the police is part of the larger community - they are approachable, and they are there to assist the public in a wide range of issues.

- if an incident occurs whereby an officer is accused of disrespectful treatment of a citizen, then ensure that the matter is dealt with expeditiously. Make sure that a fair investigation is held (this is owed to the community and to the accused officer) and once it is completed, contact the complainant to inform him/her of the findings. There must be complete transparency. The public needs to know that such actions (if founded) are not acceptable. The officers on the other hand, also need to know that it is not acceptable for them to treat community members in a bias or unprofessional manner. They also need to know that public complaints will be handled swiftly and fairly, and if it is unfounded, that they will be supported.

- the police force needs to set goals and programs that makes them accountable to the public. They need to attend public meetings and in an open and honest manner, discuss their failures and successes. If an incident occurs whereby the police are responsible for a bad judgment call, then they need to take the responsibility for that action and tell the public what action they have taken to prevent it from happening again. The police should account for their resources, and tell the public what they have done to address the concerns that they identified together. The police force also needs to keep the public informed. Events and investigations that are of public interest should be related to the community. Of course there will be some legal and investigational restrictions as to what can be said, but in as much as possible, the department should be open with the community.

With respect to the internal environment, some key goals should be:

- the establishment of internal communication systems which will allow for the exchange of information among the various levels of the organization. Just as in the external environment, consultation and knowledge are primordial to the success of the community policing initiative internally. Regular e-mail messages to the members informing them of important matters is efficient and very quick. The creation of a newsletter which will advise the members of success stories, changes in the organization, tools which are available, etc. can be a wonderful tool in matters of less urgency, yet nonetheless interesting to the members. An occasional open discussion between top management and the front line officers whereby the members are allowed to ask questions directly to the chief is a very good idea. So is holding regular meetings between line officers and front line workers. Both of these forums allow management to know first hand the concerns of the members, and it also allows them to quell rumours and provide the membership with a "why" between a particular decision that was made. Information is essential - sharing it is critical.

- goals must be identified which will ensure that front officers are given the responsibilities and empowerment that they were intended to receive under community policing principles. Also, information sessions need to be held to ensure that the front line workers understand exactly what their new roles are and what is expected of them. Training programs could be set up to review community policing values and goals and front line workers should be guided in the initial stages (and as necessary) to be certain that they are operating in the right vein. Progress can be monitored through performance evaluations, reward programs could be implemented for innovation, and information may be distributed to reinforce positive behaviour in community policing techniques.

- the organization will have to set goals to ensure that resources are being focused in priority areas. The organization has a commitment to the members to provide the tools that are necessary to get the job done safely, and in a manner which reflects the values of the organization. To this end, goals may be set to: create an operational plan for the organization - including priorities and resources to be deployed in each area; when resources are not available for essential programs, seek alternative means of obtaining the necessary resources (private sponsorship, fund raising, etc); install programs which will monitor resources and their

deployment effectively; and, ensure that spending is justified and fits in with the priorities of the organization and the community.

- In consultation with the membership, management must set realistic goals that will create systems more suitable to the principles of the community policing model, in the areas of human resource management. Not all police forces are the same size, nor do they have the same human resource concerns. Therefore, Committees may be set up to identify several human resource management models, and then select the one that is most appropriate for that particular organization. Goals to implement a rewards system(to encourage innovation and commitment to the values of community policing); personnel transfers (to get the right people in the right jobs); promotional systems (no longer based on seniority - but on capability), compensation (to reward officers with particular qualifications), etc., will all have to be addressed. This is consistent with community policing values and will have to be implemented internally.

Structure

As we have seen previously, the structure of police organizations under the traditional model were hierarchical and focused on information flowing from the bottom-upwards, and decisions flowing downwards.

The community policing model requires an organizational structure which allows for a two-way flow of information, and for decisions to be made at the lowest possible level. In contrast to the traditional model, here is a brief description of how each of the five structural areas should look under community policing:

- *commander - officer relations* - under the community policing model, managers and front line workers will have to be able to communicate openly. Front line workers will have to first understand what is expected of them under the new guidelines, and what it means to be empowered and accountable. Commanders (management) will have to learn to assign projects and provide the necessary tools to the front line workers to get the job done. He or she will have to encourage innovation, and empower front line workers with the decision-making power to implement the new ideas. Front line workers on the other hand, will have to understand that there is a responsibility that goes with this new "freedom". That they will be held accountable for their actions. They will be asked to inform their commanders of any problematic situations and seek suggestions and advice when they feel overwhelmed or incapable of handling a situation. Should this need arise, then the commander will counsel the front line officer and

help him/her through it step by step rather than telling or ordering the individual what to do. In this way, the front line worker will be better equipped in handling a similar situation on his/her own in the future.

- *structural communications* will have to be very open and honest within the organization. In the beginning, there will be uncertainty as to the roles of each individual. There will also be a level of distrust in management and in change itself. This is a normal symptom of every process of change (especially one of this magnitude). The internal communications of the organization will therefore have to be very clear: management will have to clearly state its expectations to all levels of the organization. The communications will have to be swift: in an age where information travels so quickly, the organization will have to ensure that it can relay vital information to its rank and file on an equally rapid basis. The communications will have to be two-way: management also needs to know what is going on - if the decision levels have been appropriately dealt to the lowest possible levels, then management can become out of touch with its organization very quickly. It is essential that they keep the information lines open. This is also necessary to be able to identify problems in the transition process, and to keep in touch with the community. Keeping in mind that the organization is responsible for providing the front lines with the tools necessary to conduct their work, this is impossible if the information is not flowing continuously.

- *decision-making procedures* will have to be very well defined. The goal is to delegate as much authority as possible to the lowest possible levels. Obviously, not all decisions can be made on the front lines. Therefore, each level will need to know exactly what is in their realm of authority. Also, a system will have to be in place which will allow a review of authority levels. This constant review will identify decision-making situations which may be lowered even further, or which may require referral to a more senior level for specific reasons. The key here is that decision-making is no longer top-down, rather, it is to be delegated to the lowest possible level.

- *accountability* under the community policing model will take on a totally new face. It is no longer associated to simply being able to follow orders. Rather, front line workers are now accountable to: 1) the public in working with them to identify and solve problems using initiative and innovation; and 2) the organization in respecting the values of the police department and carrying out their job in a manner which reflects those values. Management remains accountable to the government and community they serve, however they are no longer

measured on statistical evidence. Rather, their success is based on an improvement in the quality of life in the community. Management also becomes accountable to the front line workers: they are accountable for respecting the values of the organization as well (internal and external), and for supplying the front line with the tools they require to get the job done.

- *rewards* will also take on a much different form under the community policing model. Generally in the form of promotions, rewards were given to high performers based on criteria of the traditional model (i.e. statistical data of arrests, tickets, hours worked, number of cases handled, etc..). Under the community-based policing model, rewards will be given to members of the organization who demonstrate initiative, innovation, and a devotion to the values of community policing. Rewards will also be afforded to those who demonstrate special skills or take the initiative to develop themselves professionally through secondary schooling. Those who become involved in the community at a personal level will also be recognized for their efforts. The rewards themselves will also take on a new face. Promotions will still be given to those who deserve them, but they will not be limited to just that. Recognition in other forms such as medals or prizes for community relations (i.e. national coaching awards), special initiatives or innovations may all be recognized in a variety of forms. Internal newsletter articles which recognize a particular job, articles on successful investigations, or a simple congratulations and thank you from a high ranking officer should be the norm under the community policing model. There doesn't always have to be a cost involved to recognize someone's efforts, and when they are recognized in one form or another, the positive reinforcement goes a long way to encourage that person to continue in the same vein.

Environment

The external and internal environments of the organization are extremely important to the community policing model. They are important because this model places so much emphasis into relations with the external environment; and success of the model is contingent upon proper functioning of the internal environment of the organization.

Interaction with the external environment must be a primary concern / function of the community -based policing department. Since the success of the model depends so heavily on the organization's ability to interact with the community, a very clear strategy must be followed:

- *Scanning and monitoring*: in addition to scanning and monitoring the general public, the media, thought leaders, and the government in order to establish what is happening in the

community; police departments must also scan and monitor the information obtained from their own internal sources (intelligence reports, statistical information, incident reports, etc.).

Scanning and monitoring may be effective in several instances. For instance, graffiti in a particular neighborhood or an increase in vandalism or thefts in a particular rural community may be the signs of an underlying “problem”. Incidents are simply signs of a cause and it is the “cause” which the community must necessarily deal with.

- *Identification and prioritization of issues*: this means first sitting down with all of the client groups in the community and seeking their input as to what the issues are. Internal sources include patrol officers, investigators, crime analysis units, victim units, community relations personnel, and information management systems. Again, the emphasis should be placed on identifying root causes of incidents rather than simply identifying the incidents themselves.

Herman Goldstein⁷⁸ suggests that it is possible to relate incidents by focusing on four key characteristics: a) *behavior*: common behavior involved (i.e. vandalism, sexual assault, etc.); b) *territory*: incidents related by location; c) *persons*: incidents which affect a specific group or type of people (offenders, complainants, or victims); and d) *time*: incidents related by time, season or day of the week.

Prioritization means recognizing the limited resources of the community and the police force, and assigning some type of priority to the identified problems. Goldstein recommends the following factors should be considered during the prioritization process: a) the *impact* of the problem: how “big” is the problem and how many people are affected?; b) the *seriousness* of the problem: how much danger, damage, public concern and political visibility is involved? What are the consequences?; c) the *complexity* of the problem: how complex is it and what are the resource implications for the department?; d) the *solvability* of the problem: what degree of impact will police efforts have on the problem?; and, e) the *interest* in solving the problem: even though the issue is valid, there must be an interest by both the community and the police for resolving the problem.

- *Analysis of the problem*: investigating the problem by gathering and interpreting diverse and comprehensive information. Sources of analysis may include: crime research material; police information management sources; other police officers; other police forces; and of course, the community.

⁷⁸ Herman Goldstein, *Problem-Oriented Policing*, (Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1990).

- *Decision-making* (developing a strategy): problems which police departments have to deal with are often specific and require specific strategies as a response. The objectives of the strategy should respond to the precise criteria of the problem at hand. Depending on the problem, a series of options are available.⁷⁹
 - a) *focused strategies*: are those which are focused on those who are at the core of the problem (i.e. repeat offenders or addresses). Strategies that focus on this core population will have a more pronounced effect than broader based strategies.
 - b) *Inter-agency strategies*: a coordinated response with community agencies and institutions that are involved in similar problems (i.e. the RCMP and Canada Customs sharing resources and information in combating the flow of drugs into the country - or at a specific entry point).
 - c) *Mediation strategies*: in some instances, the police may be in a position to mediate a response to a problem (i.e. noise from a fraternity house).
 - d) *Communication and education strategies*: educating the public with respect to the dangers of a particular situation.
 - e) *Community mobilization strategies*: where possible, the community should play a role in the problem solving strategy (i.e. neighborhood watch programs).
 - f) *Encouraging community control*: parents, teachers and building owners all have some type of authority over children, employees or properties.
 - g) *Use of non-criminal laws and regulations*: creative use of private and public regulations, laws or statutes (i.e. hours of use for parks, etc.).
 - h) *Crime prevention strategies*: development and use of proven crime prevention strategies.

- *Implementation*: development of an implementation plan for the strategy chosen for a given problem. It is always a good idea to provide a written statement of the goals, objectives, strategies and time frames involved in order to facilitate an evaluation of the strategy. Wherever possible, the clients which have participated in the development of the strategy, should participate in its implementation. At the very least, interested clients should be provided feedback with respect to the progress of the implementation plan.

- *Evaluation*: an evaluation of a strategy and its implementation is useful in that it allows a community to determine whether or not the strategy is having any effect on the problem for which it was developed to handle. Evaluation is also important in that it helps one determine whether this strategy could be used in other situations of a similar nature.

This process, if adhered to will ensure that the police organization maintains a pulse on its external environment, and that it is attuned to the needs and values of the community it serves.

⁷⁹ Murphy, 1992.

From an internal point of view, a similar system may be applied within the organization. Management will need to continuously scan and monitor the internal situation of the department. This is ultimately done by encouraging communication between management and the front line. In this way, problems will surface as they develop. Once they have been identified, the problems may be addressed jointly with management and a solution which is acceptable to all may be selected. The monitoring process continues as an evaluation of the process occurs, and we have come full circle.

Climate

There is little that one can say with respect to the climate of the organization under the community policing model. Suffice to say that if the values of the organization are well defined, in line with the community, and respected by management, then this will go a long way to setting the climate of the organization positively. If the goals of the organization are also in line with its values, and workers are provided with the tools they need to get the job done, then this will also lead to a positive environment. If the organization's structure allows for good communication, clear decision-making procedures, proper accountability, fair reward systems, and clear relationships between management and the front line which encourage cooperation and a sense of ownership to all, then this too will help to instill a good organizational climate. Finally, if the organization is able to deal adequately with its internal and external environments, then this should ensure an atmosphere which has accustomed itself very well to change and to the new model of community policing.

In essence, the climate of the organization is a sum of all of the components previously mentioned. If management is careful to manage change as presented earlier, and if the end result is an organization which respects the internal and external values of the community policing model, then the transformation will have gone smoothly, and the organizational climate of the new organization will be optimized.

VI. Community Policing in the RCMP

The RCMP Example

Throughout the previous chapters of this paper, we have discussed the need for change in the public sector with respect to service delivery. One area of public service which has been greatly affected by this philosophical change is found in “policing”. We have discussed the new “mindset” which police forces across North America are attempting to embrace and we have looked at the impact which the implementation of this new model, so different from its predecessor, has had on the police organizations themselves.

The next two chapters of this paper will demonstrate, the practical implications of such changes in a police organization. I will do this by using a particular police force as an example, and I will outline the changes it has implemented in order to create the new mindset associated to the community-based model of policing. This chapter will illustrate how the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) has put into practice, from an external / operational point of view, the principles of community policing. The following chapter will deal with the execution of the community policing model within the RCMP (administrative / managerial perspective). The reason for dealing with these two concepts in separate chapters is in order to underline the roles of each of these elements in the overall service delivery model. I contend that the only way the community policing model may work on the front line is if the same type of innovative environment exists within the organization itself. In other words, if management expects the front line workers to innovate and interact with the public, then it is primordial that management provide an atmosphere which is conducive to such experiences. If traditional policing techniques are out, then so must traditional management models. Therefore, chapter VI will demonstrate how the RCMP has operationalized community policing at the service delivery level. Chapter VII on the other hand, will outline specific managerial programs which have been implemented by the RCMP in support of the community policing model.

Before commencing, a brief explanation as to why I chose the RCMP as my example should be provided. Obviously, one reason is that since I am a member of this organization, I may have quick access to information related to this subject. Also, since I have been a member of this organization for the last nineteen years, I have seen it function under the traditional policing model, I have witnessed first hand its “transitional stage”, and I continue to be a part of it as the community policing principles have become common place throughout the organization. Also, I have dealt with countless other police organizations from dozens of

countries, and I have come to realize that the RCMP is one of the most respected police forces around the world. It is certainly one of the most modern - not only from an equipment / resource point of view, but also in its approach to policing / management techniques. Finally, I believe that the RCMP is one of the few major police organizations around the world that has made a firm commitment to community policing and has taken the necessary steps to implement its values fully, and create a mindset which is congruent to those principles. The transition is certainly not complete - there have been some growing pains without a doubt, but for an organization with over 20,000 employees spread across thousands of kilometers, the progress which has been made so far indicates to me that the RCMP is totally committed to this philosophy, and that it will succeed eventually.

“Interactive Community Policing”

As we have already witnessed, the traditional model of policing was very “reactionary” to events and circumstances. When a crime was committed, the police investigated and attempted to put closure to that particular incident by catching the perpetrator and having him / her punished accordingly.

Some people describe the community policing model as being “proactive”, associating the model to crime prevention. Rather than solving a crime after the fact, emphasis is placed on preventing it from ever happening, through public awareness campaigns, involvement of the community, etc. Certainly this is a key component to the idea of “community policing”.

However, if implemented properly, I believe that the true goal associated to the values of community policing is for the police force to become “interactive” with the community it serves. Rather than the police force just implementing crime prevention techniques, or simply “using” the community as a source of information or as a tool for helping to solve a given problem, all actors (internal and external) must become an integral part of the decision-making process. *Why?* First of all, we have already discussed the fact that the role of the police is to enhance the security and overall quality of life of the community it serves. Police departments provide a service to the community who should therefore have a say as to which issues are important, what should be done, and whether or not the strategies used are effective. Second, interaction with the community will enhance the credibility of the police department as well as the methods used by the department in tackling the underlying problems. Third, interaction will

enhance the amount of innovative input into the decision-making process. Fourth, interaction with the community will help to ensure that the community and the police department remain as one entity and that they share a common goal and vision. Finally, interactive policing will convince all participants of the community that “security and quality of life” are everyone’s concern. This will ultimately lead to a more effective and efficient implementation of security methods.

In order for interactive policing to be truly effective, both the community and the police department must necessarily buy into the plan. This is not always a given. As we have already discussed, suspicions persist on both sides of the coin with respect to the “real” intentions of the other. Citizens may feel afraid or “used” as simple police informants. Police officers, many of whom were taught not to be creative, may feel alienated or “used” by politicians or management in a new police “fad”. Some may feel that their jobs are at stake and that this is simply another attempt by politicians to cut positions and save money at their expense. Keeping this in mind, the next section of this paper will show how the RCMP has taken the principles of proactive policing and are attempting to create a new mind-set throughout the communities it serves, as well as throughout its own ranks, in order to maximize the effectiveness of “proactive” techniques through “interaction”.

‘CAPRA’: Interactive Policing in the RCMP

CAPRA is a model which was developed by the RCMP as a way of “operationalizing” community-based policing practices. It is a simple model which demonstrates to all employees of the RCMP how they may involve themselves in the process; why they should do so; and the accomplishments they will attain if everyone does his/her part. The model emphasizes⁸⁰:

- the importance of *developing and maintaining partnerships and trust* within communities/the workforce to establish priorities for service delivery and problem solving;
- the importance of *understanding the RCMP’s client’s perspectives* on work-related matters for establishing priorities and potential partnerships in service delivery; and,

⁸⁰ RCMP Community and Aboriginal Policing Branch, CAPRA Problem Solving Model, (Ottawa: RCMP, 1996).

- the importance of *encouraging ongoing feedback for continuous improvement*.

In one sense, CAPRA is not new in that it simply restates the same principles of community-based policing which have been enumerated previously and which have been in practice by the RCMP for a few years now. CAPRA is unique in two ways however:

1) CAPRA is unique because it is an attempt at instilling the community-based police culture into the everyday life of police officers and managers throughout the RCMP. CAPRA is not simply a catchy acronym which will provide coordinators of neighborhood watch programs with a new way of marketing their product. Rather, CAPRA is the RCMP's way of indoctrinating the mind-set of interactive policing throughout its ranks. In the words of the organization:

“<CAPRA is a learning map> designed to assist the police officer or other members of the work force to anticipate problems and to prevent problems from arising, where appropriate, in consultation with partners, as much as it is to resolve problems through multidisciplinary, inter-agency and consultative processes. It applies to enforcement as much as it does to prevention. It applies to every aspect of police internal organizational service delivery.”⁸¹

Two points may be drawn from this quote: The first is that CAPRA is an attempt to teach community-based policing practices to everyone in the organization; and, the second is that this new mind set not only applies to crime fighting; but it applies to absolutely every aspect of problem solving whether it be within the organization itself, or involving external players/factors.

2) CAPRA is also unique because it describes an entire organizational structure. As previously mentioned, the goal of CAPRA is not just a new way of presenting community-based policing principles to the public at large nor to the employees of the RCMP. It is an *organizational state-of-being*. The RCMP has adopted this model and is adhering to it on both an individual basis, and as an organization as a whole. For instance, the RCMP has more or less done away with its old training practices. Until just recently, when an investigator went on a course to learn techniques of investigating “money laundering” crimes; he was taught the law, he was taught known techniques used by criminal organizations to launder money, and he was taught the “best” known methods for detecting and prosecuting these types of activities. Now, when an investigator takes this same course, he is asked to read the law before he gets there, he is placed in a group with other investigators, they are given case scenarios, they are asked to

⁸¹ Ibid.

analyze the situation and come up with a series of solutions, and then they report to the entire class on the way they see the problem and how it should be handled. What is the difference between these two training methods? The first method is paternalistic; it suggests that the instructors know all of the methods used by criminal organizations to launder money (and subliminally teaches the investigators to only look for these methods); and, it suggests that the “best” techniques for detecting these crimes are already developed. The second method, based on CAPRA, teaches investigators to analyze a problem on their own; build upon their own experience and that of others; seek innovative solutions; and to learn together in groups. The idea here is that if the RCMP is able to have its employees use this approach in every aspect of their work routine; it will eventually become second nature.

CAPRA is...¹²

C = Clients

There are two types of clients referred to in the CAPRA model: a) Direct clients: people with whom employees come into contact on a regular basis in service delivery or in problem-solving situations and include individual citizens (suspects, victims, witnesses, concerned citizens, etc.); concerned citizen groups; internal clients (branch policy centers, regions, divisions, individual employees, etc.); and various agencies and departments. b) Indirect clients are those who are affected by the outcome of an employee’s efforts: for example, business communities (where a series of thefts have occurred); interest groups (like women’s groups where a series of sexual assaults have occurred); cultural groups (where discriminatory practices have occurred in the workplace); and, taxpayers (who insist upon efficient and effective service).

The RCMP wants its employees to know and understand their clients. Furthermore, it is important that they understand that their decisions affect “indirect” clients as well as those with whom they come face to face. The more one knows one’s clients, the more efficient one becomes. You know what expectations you are facing and can therefore more effectively address their concerns. Such knowledge helps you plan your resources and allows you to develop appropriate strategies from a well informed perspective.

¹² Ibid.

A = Acquire/Analyze Information

Why does the RCMP need to acquire and analyze information?

- *to fully understand what the problem is, what the issues are, who is involved, where and when the situation occurred and how it might best be addressed - given the direct and indirect client's perspectives;*
- *to identify competing interests (needs, demands and expectations);*
- *to place oneself in the best position to manage the competing interests in a manner that will ensure that all participants feel that the situation was handled fairly;*
- *to determine who your primary client should be; and,*
- *to determine what your options are and what the best solution might be.*

Where does this information come from? It must come from all clients (internal and external). Police officers must *continually consult* with direct and indirect clients in order to maintain a feel for the community and its needs. This sounds like a laborious job but in all actuality, it simply means listening to the people they meet everyday: neighbors, friends, other parents at your child's soccer game, people in restaurants, banks, school, etc. Remember, if the RCMP is successful, this will all become a way of life for all of its employees.

P = Partnerships

"Partners" are individuals or groups who may assist a police officer in providing quality service. They may be *internal* (colleagues, specialized unit experts, or union representatives) or *external* (witnesses, community groups, school principal) to the RCMP. Partnerships are *established on trust* - people who feel that they have been treated fairly in the past will not hesitate to help you in the future.

Partnerships should be established *before a problem arises* and contingency plans may be established to address the most typical kinds of work related situations that arise. Above all, partnerships *must result in a mutual benefit*. This is key to the "interactive" approach to

policing - police forces must not enter into these “partnerships” to simply use a partner as a tool for success - mutual assistance and mutual benefit is the key to successful interactive policing.

The CAPRA model suggests that employees of the RCMP approach partnership establishment in the following fashion:

- identify the *potential roles of the partners* in police/work-related matters;
- identify *shared interests* and concerns;
- *prioritize* your concerns;
- *establish the benefits* of working together with that partner;
- *establish contingency plans* or an action plan with that partner;
- *establish evaluation criteria* with the partner to assess mutually agreed directions; and,
- agree to *provide continual feedback* to ensure continuous improvement.

The word “partnership” suggests “interaction”. It is important to note however that this particular stage of the CAPRA model is indeed one of great importance. RCMP employees are encouraged to interact with their community and work with these clients in order to find innovative solutions to mutual problems.

R = Response

The key to the success of this stage of the CAPRA model is “understanding”. RCMP employees are encouraged to understand: the factors that contribute to a problem; the perspective of those who are involved; the perspective of those who may help resolve the problem; and the environment in which the police force functions. The more an officer understands these elements, the better the chance for success.

Once these factors are understood, the police officer should then *sit down with the appropriate partners and create response options*. The “best” response is the one which is *mutually agreed upon* as being the most effective response to the problem at hand, *respecting the expectations of both partners*.

The CAPRA model suggest several types of responses that are available (but not limited to):

- *Service*: assistance to clients; provision of information and training; referral to partners; etc.
- *Protection*: of the public interest, victims, or individuals or groups affected by the problem.
- *Enforcement and Alternatives*: one of the important roles of the police is to uphold the law. While “law enforcement” does not always get to the heart of the problem by itself, it still is a necessary option. We may educate drug traffickers of the dangers of using drugs, but there will ultimately be a few who will continue. Innovation should prevail, but “enforcement” of the law may necessary.
- *Prevention*: preventing the problem from occurring or escalating by addressing contributing factors to the broad problem.

Depending on the goals of the strategy which can range from problem elimination or reduction; reduction of harm/impact; improvement of response and reallocation of responsibility, an officer can use any combination of these four types of responses.

A = Assessment of Action Taken

With respect to this stage of the model, “communication” is the key. The *maintenance of communication* between the police and its community, as well as internal communication between individual officers, units and regions are of the utmost importance. *Continuous feedback* helps to ensure that you are indeed delivering services that the community needs and wants. *Evaluation* seeks to avoid the maintenance of services which are not effective and/or do not meet the expectations and needs of the community. Interaction and evaluation seeks to ensure that the police are constantly up to date with the ever-changing environment within which it functions.

According to the CAPRA model. Some key points of assessment are:

- to *establish agreed criteria for evaluation* that address value added and quality service;
- to compare service delivered to internally and/or externally agreed to *standards*;
- to ensure that clients are included in the *feedback* loop;

- *to assess performance and possible areas for improvement;*
- *to identify trends and opportunities for prevention.*

The Uniqueness of "CAPRA"

What makes the CAPRA model unique is the fact that it is an attempt at taking proactive policing one step further - it is trying to create a mind-set throughout the entire organization so that it becomes second nature for all employees at all levels of command; and so that it becomes a way of functioning for the organization itself. The manuals are used as a standard, or a guide; not as a rigid statement of rules which must be followed at all costs. Procedure no longer is the most important component of the decision-making process - attainment of the organizational goals, while respecting its values, is now primordial.

As a result of the CAPRA model, employees are encouraged:

- to think and to be innovative;
- to understand their environment;
- to acquire and analyze all information related to a problem;
- to encourage the creation of internal and external partnerships to more effectively solve problems and respond to the needs and desires of the community;
- to ensure that their responses are effective and mutually acceptable to the community and the law; and,
- to assess the implementation of specific strategies and their impact in order to accurately reflect the changing society.

VII. Managing Community Policing: The RCMP Experience

The preceding chapter dealt with the operationalization of community policing at the service delivery level within the RCMP. I will now outline specific managerial programs which have been implemented by the RCMP in support of the front line workers. Such programs are necessary in order to create the proper environment which is conducive to innovation throughout the organization.

Managing Community Policing Organizations

Management is key to any organization. It sets the climate of the organization by identifying the values that the organization stands on; the goals which will reflect those values; and by providing a structure and resources which will allow the members of the organization to individually and collectively respect and achieve the principles of the organization.

Management during change is even more crucial. In a period when uncertainty and mistrust are prevalent, management must play a key leadership role in order to demystify the transformation process and clearly demonstrate to the membership the end product to which they aspire and their own commitment to the new mindset.

In the early 1990's, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) stated its commitment to the values of community-based policing. Since then, it has made a conscious effort to incorporate managerial and operational changes within the organization in order to apply the values of the community policing mindset throughout the force. The purpose of this chapter is to identify what changes the RCMP has made with respect to managerial / internal under the community policing initiative.

The RCMP Experience

In this chapter, I will identify a series of experiences and program initiatives which have been implemented in the RCMP and which I believe to be a direct result of the adoption of community-based policing principles in the force. I will attempt to show how each of these initiatives support the values of community policing and how they seek to create a climate which is indicative of an organization modeled after community policing.

1. Mission, Vision, Values

The RCMP developed a “Mission, Vision, Values” statement through a process which involved the participation of over 4,000 employees over a five month period in 1996 (“Shared Leadership”). The result of that process is a statement which was presented to the RCMP Commissioner and which has become the “bible” of the organization. It is posted in virtually every detachment of the RCMP as a reminder of the fundamental principles of the organization. The following is a direct extract of the statement:⁸³

Mission

The RCMP is Canada's national police service. Proud of our traditions and confident in meeting future challenges, we commit to preserve the peace, uphold the law and provide quality service in partnership with our communities.

Vision

We will:

- Be a progressive, proactive and innovative organization;
- Provide the highest quality service through dynamic leadership, education and technology in partnership with the diverse communities we serve;
- Be accountable and efficient through shared decision-making;
- Ensure a healthy work environment that encourages team building, open communication and mutual respect;
- Promote safe communities;
- Demonstrate leadership in the pursuit of excellence;

Core Values

Recognizing the dedication of all employees, we will create and maintain an environment of individual safety, well-being and development. We are guided by:

⁸³ “Mission, Vision, Values Statement” of the RCMP as found on the RCMP’s Internet site, www.rcmp-grc.ca

- **Accountability:**

There are two components of accountability. The first is the process of rendering an account to those from whom we derive our authority of what we did, why we did it, how we did it and what we are doing to improve performance or results. An important element of this component is accepting the personal consequences of our actions. The second component of accountability is one of “answerability” - the obligation to provide information to others in our communities of interest with respect to our decisions, actions and results in light of clear, previously agreed upon understandings and expectations. For example, we inform our communities about our actions, but we must render account of our actions to our direct supervisors. In this organization authorities can be delegated, but accountability cannot.

- **Respect:**

Is the objective, unbiased consideration and regard for the rights, values, beliefs and property of all people.

- **Professionalism:**

Is having a conscientious awareness of our role, image, skills and knowledge in our commitment to quality client oriented service.

- **Honesty:**

Is being truthful in character and behavior.

- **Compassion:**

Is demonstrating care and sensitivity in word and action.

- **Integrity:**

Is acting consistently with our other core values.

As discussed in previous chapters of this paper, the values of the organization must necessarily become the cornerstone of its existence. Everything that an organization does must be built upon the values that it has adopted as its own. By creating such a document and making it public, I believe that the RCMP has taken an extremely important step. Once such a document has been accepted, then the organization is bound to respect and uphold these principles. To do the contrary would mean that the organization and its management would lose all credibility.

2. **Mission Statement of the RCMP**

The same process of “Shared Leadership” identified a mission statement for the RCMP: a commitment of the RCMP to its community, and of the organization to its membership.⁸⁴

Commitment to our communities

The employees of the Royal Canadian Mounted police are committed to our communities through:

- Unbiased and respectful treatment of all people;
- Accountability;
- Mutual problem solving;
- Cultural sensitivity;
- Enhancement of public safety;
- Partnerships and consultation;
- Open and honest communication;
- Effective and efficient use of resources;
- Quality and timely service;

Commitment to the employees of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police

In the spirit of shared leadership and recognizing all employees as our greatest asset, we commit to:

- Open, honest and bilateral communication;
- Demonstrating leadership through accountability and responsibility at all levels;
- Treating all employees with equal respect and consideration;
- Ensuring the safety of our employees by developing and enforcing minimum resourcing standards;
- Training that is timely, specific to the needs and relevant to the job requirements;
- Effective and efficient management of human resources through consultation, teamwork and empowerment at all levels;
- Ensuring a safe and harassment-free work environment;
- Encouraging and recognizing innovation and creativity;
- Fair and equitable systems to deal with;

⁸⁴ Ibid.

- Recognition for good performers;
- Compensation and entitlements;
- Financial hardship caused by employees' work site;
- Consistently poor performers;
- Discipline and discharge;
- Promoting health, safety and well-being;
- Ensuring adequate human, financial and material resources;
- Enhancing job security through aggressive marketing of our services.

I believe that the creation of the Mission Statement is another important step for the RCMP. Much in the same way as the Mission, Vision, Values statement, this document clearly demonstrates to the public and to the employees of the RCMP, what is to be expected under the new community-based policing mindset. Once again, by publicly decreeing such goals, management is committing itself to the values of the organization - a commitment which cannot be reversed. Both the community and the employees will hold management to these stated values.

3. Participative Management

Aside from consulting with the general membership in the creation of a Mission Statement for the organization, participative management, called "shared leadership" in the RCMP, is an initiative which links all levels of the organization together in broad managerial decision-making.

The RCMP has recognized that under the community-based policing model, the one key element to its success is the front line officer. After all, it is that person who interacts with the community each and every day. It is the front line officer who are the eyes and ears of the organization in the field - the person who "scans" the external environment and has first-hand knowledge of the community and its individual components. As such, it is primordial that management listen to the front line officers and that they maintain continuous, open communication.

In a recent interview with RCMP Commissioner Philip Murray, he summed it up in the following manner:

“...The most important thing is for managers to learn to listen. They need to be seen responding to employees needs, and responding to the input they provide. I think also it’s really important that the management be seen doing what they say they’re going to do, in other words, to use that old adage, walking the talk.... Those are the elements that come to mind in creating this shared leadership vision that I have, which essentially means in my mind, the more people involved in making the decision, the better. First of all it will be a better decision, and secondly, and probably more importantly, everyone buys into it and are prepared to implement it, as opposed to the command and control model, where the boss is always right, management by dictum, and employees are expected to just blindly follow...”⁸⁵

In a number of instances, the RCMP has demonstrated its commitment to “shared leadership”. Lengthy consultation with the membership goes in to decision-making at all significant levels. Some recent examples were extensive consultation processes into restructuring the RCMP (regionalization); the promotional process (still ongoing); alignment initiatives (priority setting); etc. But most importantly, management has shown, I believe, a real commitment to listening to the membership with respect to everyday issues. Of course, each manager has his/her own style and this is something which will need time to overcome. But generally speaking, I have witnessed an overall tendency by management to “listen” and to respond to the views of their front line workers.

4. The Alignment Initiative

In chapter four of this paper, I identified the core values associated to the community-based policing model. Two of those values which I discussed were “Accountability” and “Effective and Efficient Use of Resources”. The RCMP’s “Alignment Initiative” relates directly to those two values. It is essential that the RCMP be accountable to the Government, to the public, and to its employees. With respect to the Government, the RCMP must respect the values of the government - it must also be “aligned” with its priorities as Canada’s national police force. The RCMP must also be accountable to the public it serves and identify security related priorities in concert with the communities. Finally, the RCMP must ensure that it provides its employees with the tools and an organizational structure which is compatible with the values of the force. Accountability in these three areas must be coordinated in line with the effective and efficient use of resources. One goes in hand with the other - it is impossible to be fully accountable to these three main client groups if there is not a conscious effort to align the limited available resources to the identified priority areas.

⁸⁵ Pony Express interview with Commissioner Philip Murray, 1999.

As a result, in 1998, the RCMP created an “Alignment Task Force” (ATF). Its mandate was to coordinate the initiatives of eight steering committees and their working groups to:

- align RCMP priorities with those of government(s)⁸⁶, clients and communities;
- align the RCMP’s allocation of human and financial resources with its priorities;
- align its organizational structure with its service delivery objectives;
- align RCMP technology strategies with current and future needs;
- align human resource systems with the RCMP Mission, Vision and Values;
- align individual performance/accountability with corporate goals.⁸⁷

As a result, the RCMP is now examining everything it does: “We must review our programs... to determine what to strengthen, where we can streamline, and where we should share responsibilities with existing or new partners. We must realign our resources to support our priorities, to enhance quality, and to maximize support to the front line.”⁸⁸

The implementation of this initiative is a crucial one. In an organization the size of the RCMP, with a mandate as broad as theirs, coordination is absolutely essential. There is no way for an organization such as the RCMP to respect its commitments to its three main client groups without an exercise such as this. Given the interactive nature of the community policing concept, it will be necessary for this initiative to continue so that the organization, at its highest decision-making level, remains sensitive and responsive to its accountability and efficient use of its resources.

5. Human Resource Systems

In a document entitled: “People: Foundation for Change in the RCMP”, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police has outlined four areas of human resource management which are crucial to the transition from the traditional model of policing to the community-based policing model:

⁸⁶ Keeping in mind that the RCMP is Canada’s national police force with a federal mandate. However, it also contracts its services to most provincial and territorial governments (except Quebec and Ontario) and to countless municipalities of all sizes. As a result, the RCMP must interact and align itself with the values and principles of several governments Canada-wide.

⁸⁷ Royal Canadian Mounted Police, “RCMP Alignment Task Force Fact Sheet”, 1999.

⁸⁸ RCMP Commissioner Philip Murray, “1998 Commissioner’s Directional Statement”, 1998.

- Maintaining a qualified workforce:
 - A workforce which is able to adapt and develop to the new mindset;
 - A workforce which is “representative” of the community;
 - A workforce which possesses the necessary knowledge, competencies and attitudes.
- Developing and maintaining a productive workforce:
 - One which delivers quality service to the community;
 - One which is cost-effective;
 - One which strives for continuous improvement.
- Creating an enabling workforce:
 - A structure which reinforces good working relationships;
 - A structure which fosters respect, diversity, and effective communication;
 - An environment which is safe, fair and free of discrimination;
 - A structure which provides professional development and growth of each employee.
- Maintaining a sustainable workforce:
 - Recognizing that people are valued assets of an organization;
 - Investing in human resources;
 - Providing continued renewal of essential competencies.⁸⁹

Whereas, “all the (RCMP Human Resources Directorate) did in the past was manage human resource data, now (they) are managing human resources.”⁹⁰ As a result, key changes took place in the Directorate. It has now been broken down into the following branches:

- “Honours and Recognition” - designed to develop on a continual basis an evolving recognition program to meet the needs of the RCMP in fostering an environment where employee contributions are acknowledged and recognized appropriately.
- “National Health Services Policy Center” - designed to promote health, safety and fitness among the members.

⁸⁹ Royal Canadian Mounted Police, “People: Foundation for Change in the RCMP”, 1995.

⁹⁰ Insp. Dave Gordon, “Merging onto the alignment Highway” in, The Pony Express, November, 1998, p. 22.

- “Internal Affairs” - to promote public confidence in the integrity of the RCMP by developing organizational standards that ensure competence and professionalism throughout the organization.
- “Public Service Staff Relations” - to develop and maintain a positive relationship between management and employees and their representatives.
- “Official Languages and Diversity Management” - to institute policies and procedures for the achievement of institutional bilingualism and to implement effective strategies to deal with the many issues arising out of Canada’s dynamic social, demographic and cultural diversity.
- “Organization Design and Job Evaluation” - to evaluate all jobs in the RCMP to ensure that they are classified fairly and equitably
- “Management Information Centre” - to develop and maintain a system which will provide speedy and up-to-date human resource information to the people who require it.
- “Research” - to provide the RCMP with studies required to improve present human resource management systems and to provide a look into future human resource requirements.
- “Learning and Development” - to foster a continuous learning culture within the RCMP and to facilitate access to modern, cost-effective learning/training opportunities.
- “Human Resource Strategic Planning” - to ensure that human resource strategies are aligned with the RCMP corporate business strategy.
- “National Staffing and Personnel Policy Centre” - provide policy in the area of personnel administration.
- “National Compensation Policy Center” - to keep the membership informed of policy changes and benefits.⁹¹

The complete revamping of the Human Resources Directorate of the RCMP is, in my opinion, a reflection of this organization’s commitment to align community-based policing values to the way it treats and manages its membership. The changes which have been implemented demonstrate a true pledge to creating a new mindset in the organization which is congruent to the values of community policing, and to providing the necessary tools and

⁹¹ Ibid., pp.16 - 25.

organizational structure to the membership which will allow them to achieve the goals of the force.

6. *Communication*

The RCMP has several communication tools at its disposal under the community-based policing model. First and foremost, it continuously encourages open dialogue between managers and front line workers. Certainly the "shared leadership" program is an example of this communication strategy. But the same principle is encouraged at all levels. There are regular publications such as "The Pony Express"; the Division Staff Relations Representative's National Newsletter entitled "D.S.S.R. Perspective"; and Divisional Newsletter's; all which attempt to inform employees of national or regional issues throughout the force. There is the annual Commissioner's Directional Statement which outline's the priorities for the RCMP.

Externally, the RCMP encourages and trains its members on ways to communicate openly with the members of the communities they serve. In 1998, the RCMP developed tool kits for members to use in their marketing/communication initiatives. Training is provided in effective communication and presentation skills. Community Consultative Groups are encouraged force-wide and have provided the organization with a very effective tool of getting its concerns across to the public (education) as well as receiving input from the communities on local issues of concern.

7. *Alternative Dispute Resolution*

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) is an initiative of the RCMP to address conflict in the workplace. A "grievance" system has existed for years in the force but it is based on a confrontational (me vs. them) procedure which resembles a courtroom style process. The grievance system is very procedural-oriented with a precise set of rules, delays, and formalities. It is quite rigid and is not easily adaptable to special circumstances. The grievance system is a very long process and extremely expensive to administer.

Any conflict management expert will tell you that flexibility is key to solving existing or potential struggles. As a result, the RCMP implemented the ADR program which gives members of the organization an alternative to the grievance system. Under ADR, all parties of the conflict must agree to its use and may opt out at any time. The goal is to avoid a costly,

procedural-based conflict resolution system in search for a more flexible alternative which will seek to identify the ultimate response through compromise and fairness.

As a result, the ADR plan was implemented in four stages according to Jennifer Lynch, coordinator of the program.⁹² The first phase is referred to as the “*Planning, buy-in and commitment phase*”. This was an attempt at providing all stakeholders with sufficient information so as “not to catch them by surprise”. It also meant setting up an advisory committee consisting of several volunteers of the various stakeholder groups who worked out a budget, determined training needs, and assessed the problems indigenous to the RCMP. The second phase was called the “*design phase*”. A design group of about 30 people came together for a three day facilitated design workshop. However, due to the size and geographical region covered by the RCMP, it was decided at the outset that no one “plan” would be forced upon all regions of the force. Each “division” (an organizational structure which generally speaking, corresponds to provincial boundaries), were encouraged to develop the process which it felt would work best within its own context. The third stage was the “*implementation phase*”. This consisted of extensive training and communication throughout the various levels of the RCMP. ADR approaches such as mediation were explained to the participants. Finally, the fourth stage, which is still ongoing, is the “*transition phase*”. Although Ms. Lynch’s duty as developer and implementer of the ADR program is coming to an end, the RCMP has shown its commitment to this project by creating a National ADR Coordinator’s position. This person will “ensure the growth of the process as it becomes the way business is done within the RCMP.”⁹³

Some of the “tools” which were provided to the various divisions for consideration and implementation (where deemed worthy by each division) are the following:⁹⁴

- 1) *Negotiation* - a voluntary, non-adjudicative, and informal format which allows the parties to discuss the issue, discover commonalities, and arrive at a satisfactory conclusion to the conflict.
- 2) *Mediation* - described as “assisted negotiation”, an impartial party selected from either inside the RCMP or externally, will assist in clarifying the issues, identifying underlying causes, and arriving at acceptable solutions. It may either be done in a

⁹² Jennifer Lynch, “*Labour Management Dispute System Design: The RCMP Experience*” in *Canadian Arbitration and Mediation Journal*, Summer, 1997, p. 7-9.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁹⁴ Refer to: “*ADR Facts*” in *The Pony Express*, February, 1996.

formal setting or the mediator may shuttle back and forth from one party to another. The process is confidential, voluntary, and is not binding.

- 3) *Early Neutral Evaluation* - a member can request to have a highly respected, neutral third party listen to both sides and offer an opinion on the issue. Again, the neutral party may come from inside or outside the force and the opinion is not binding. However, since the person offers an objective opinion, people involved in the dispute are inclined to listen to the advice given.
- 4) *Peer Review Panels* - Peers of members are randomly selected to hear both sides of the issue and advise each of the merits of the case. According to the coordinators of the RCMP's ADR program, such panels often provide an incentive to resolve the issue through negotiation or mediation even before the panel is convened.
- 5) *1-800 numbers* - a confidential number is set up for members seeking advice on a given situation.
- 6) *Organizational Ombudsman* - this person may serve as a counselor, facilitator, formal mediator, informal fact finder, upward feedback mechanism, consultant, problem prevention device, and change agent. This persons office is located outside ordinary line management structures.
- 7) *Fact-finding or investigation* - a neutral fact finder investigates a case either formally or informally and may or may not include a recommendation.
- 8) *Non-binding Arbitration* - a neutral third person advises the parties involved in a conflict on a fair settlement based on their presentation of the facts and positions.
- 9) *The Mini-Trial* - gives the parties a chance to hear the other side's point of view and attempt a negotiated settlement. The panel who hears the "case" is chaired by a neutral, jointly selected party. The neutral person recommends a specific outcome and the other members of the panel then attempt to negotiate a resolution.

The key to the ADR approach to conflict resolution in the RCMP is in providing a series of tools to the membership so as to expeditiously resolve a conflictual situation in the most efficient means possible. If ADR is successful, it means that all parties to the conflict have accepted the results of the process - there is no winner / loser and a compromise prevails. Therefore, in the end, the parties feel vindicated and the conflict is resolved once and for all. Only then can the employees go on with their work in a proper atmosphere.

The RCMP's commitment to ADR is another example of how it is providing tools to its employees which are conducive to the principles of community policing and creating a new creative mind set in dealing with problems in the force.

8. Empowerment / Risk Management

Under the concept of community policing, the RCMP is empowering its employees by giving decision-making responsibilities to the lowest possible level. Front line workers who in are constant contact with members of the community, are often the best informed persons to be able to make on the spot judgment calls without approval from their supervisors. Their first-hand knowledge of the situation, coupled with their day-to-day interaction with the community, makes them the most qualified individuals to handle certain incidents.

The delegation of such decision-making powers has several implications in the RCMP:

- First of all, it means that managers in the RCMP are having to give up some of their authority and delegate accordingly.
- It also means that managers have a responsibility to ensure that the employees to whom this new responsibility is bestowed, understand that they also become accountable for the decisions which they will be making.
- Conversely, the RCMP has had to deal with a deep sense of skepticism and mistrust from employees who feel that "empowerment" is simply a way of management trying to pass-the-buck; when something goes wrong, they will blame it on the front line workers.
- It means that managers have to give adequate tools and support to the front line workers so that they are well equipped to make the proper decisions - things like proper training, guidance, supervision, information, and motivation.
- Managers will still reserve the right to veto decisions which they feel are not appropriate, but they must trust and encourage their employees to try new and innovative approaches even though they are not always successful.⁹⁵

The RCMP has created a culture which is moving more and more to the decentralization of decision-making. By leading through example, management is encouraging its line officers to follow suit and to place trust in the front line - those who deal with the public

⁹⁵ Rebecca Johnson, Managing Change. Changing Management, 1994, pp. 5 - 6.

regularly and who should have the expertise to deal with many decisions in the field. It is very difficult for many managers to switch from a command and control atmosphere to one of trust and empowerment. Furthermore, a balance needs to be found and managers still need to monitor and supervise the employees for whom he / she is ultimately responsible. These are matters which will need time to work themselves out. The important point to note here however is the fact that the RCMP has created an atmosphere which is conducive to empowerment and is encouraging its employees to adopt the mindset associated to community policing values.

The above mentioned programs and initiatives are examples of how the RCMP is implementing community-based policing principles within the organization. I believe that such examples demonstrate the commitment of the organization to the values associated to the community policing model and to its key client groups. Coupled with the "CAPRA" problem-solving model, it is clear to me that the RCMP is well on its way to creating the desired mindset throughout the organization and to setting an example of "interactive service delivery" to the Canadian public sector.

VIII. Community-based Policing: A Model for Public Service Reform

In the literature review of this thesis, I identified a basic list of criteria which public sector reform aimed to address. I also discussed a series of approaches of reform which may be used by the public sector in order to attain its optimal goal of *efficiency and enhanced performance*⁹⁶. The purpose of my conclusion will be to determine whether or not the "Community Based Policing Model" appropriately and successfully addresses the aims of public service reform in Canada.

The Goal of Public Service Reform

As previously discussed, I believe that the ultimate goal of public sector reform in Canada is to be able to respond to three related contemporary dynamics:

- increased social and cultural complexity;
- increased uncertainty or, to put it differently, a requirement that we develop the capacity to adapt to ongoing change of kinds which we cannot predict or plan for; and
- increased democratic expectations of government and all kinds of service where individuals and/or their particular communities of interest ask that they get to participate in the design and delivery of the service.⁹⁷

How does Community Policing respond to these dynamics? With respect to the first point, Community Policing, by its very nature, creates an environment (internal and external) which is recognizant and responsive to a wide range of social and cultural interests. By continuously "scanning" its environment, the police force is invariably updated on the concerns of the citizens of each of the communities it serves. In Canada, social and cultural complexity is of particular importance due to the way in which our country was formed, our immigration policies, and the geographical vastness of our land. A national police force such as the RCMP must develop a means of continuously being abreast of a wide array of cultural and social interests in the

⁹⁶ F. Leslie Seidle, Rethinking the Delivery of Public Services to Citizens, (Montreal: IRPP, 1995), pp. 53 - 74.

⁹⁷ Anna Yeatman, "The Reform of Public Management: An Overview" in Australian Journal of Public Administration, vol. 53, no. 3, September, 1994, pp. 289.

hundreds of communities it serves. The community based policing model affords such a police force the flexibility required to identify and respond to these cultural / social needs.

Pertaining to “increased uncertainty”, community policing addresses this dynamic once again through its inherent characteristic of adaptability. Continuously being aware of the organization’s surroundings, the police force is able to identify changes in criminal patterns, community concerns, and internal problems. The constant evaluation of its efforts and consultation with its clients gives a community based police force the tools it needs to proactively forecast and react to changes in the community as well as within.

Finally, I believe that the democratic expectations of a community vis-à-vis its government, is the cornerstone of community based policing. Community consultative groups are but one example of how this may be achieved. However, I would suggest that the sheer fact that an organization who successfully implements a community police “mindset” throughout its force, will automatically reap the benefits of fulfilling this particular dynamic. Such an organization, whose employees will view their work in a totally new light, will automatically listen to the community they serve and will be sensitive to those needs. In my mind, the community-based policing model is a perfect example of community participation in the public service sector.

The Criteria of Public Service Reform

In my literature review, I identified a list of criteria which public organizations must meet in order to be able to provide quality public services⁹⁸. Let us now see how the community-based policing model respects these criteria.

Responsiveness: As the reader may recall, “responsiveness” refers to the time which it takes for a citizen to receive service; the regard with which the citizen is treated; and, whether or not the public servant is attentive and considerate to the individual needs of the client. I am not certain that the community-based police model will improve on the response-time to a client’s request. It is possible that this may happen however based on the fact that the organization’s resources should be more adequately focused on the needs of the community as they were previously identified by the community prior to individual complaints. For example, if the level of vandalism is particularly high in one area of a community and the community has identified this as a priority, then the police should already address this issue “proactively” and hopefully

⁹⁸ Seidle, Rethinking the Delivery of Public Services to Citizens, p. 11.

prevent further complaints from being reported. At the very least, an action plan on the part of the police should be in place to respond to prioritized issues. Also, response-time may be improved by the fact that more resources are allocated into the community - less time in the office and more time in contact with the public. With respect to the way in which the public is treated, it seems obvious to me that community policing is much less of an enforcement / confrontational approach to policing than the traditional model, and due to its responsiveness to the public's needs, is much more "user friendly" for the community. Finally, the community policing approach certainly provides a community service which is adaptable to the individual needs and situations of clients. Hard-fast rules and policies are remnants of a previous approach to policing and flexibility is much more prevalent.

Accessibility: As we may recall, this category of criteria pertains to: the flexibility of operating hours; the approximation of service access points to clients; the equality of access; the reduction (or elimination) of the duplication of services; suitable diversification for contact; and the adequate dissemination and provision of appropriate information.

Undoubtedly, community-based policing renders the police force much more accessible to its public. First and foremost, there is a much greater diversification of contact between the community and the police. Under the traditional model, we may recall that such contact was even discouraged for a variety of reasons. Now, police officers are asked to blend with the public in an informal manner, and formal forums of exchange are encouraged (i.e. community consultative groups). Such an intensification of contact between the community and the police automatically leads to a greater dissemination of information in both directions. Furthermore, under the community policing model, dissemination of information to the public is seen as a tool to combat crime - previously, the police were very weary of such an exchange of information - preferring to keep the information to themselves.

The community-based policing model certainly brings service access points closer to the public. Community policing walk-in-centers in shopping malls and downtown areas (or even in remote communities) allow better accessibility to the community. Even more importantly, the fact that police officers are now back on the streets and in regular contact with the community is the key change to community accessibility under this new policing model.

Finally, there is much less duplication of services. Community policing encourages dialogue between the community's citizens and its groups. When a problem arises in a community, the idea is for all concerned parties to identify a plan of attack against the

phenomenon. Roles for each group are decided upon collectively and a joint-plan is put in to place. As such, we should see much less of the situation whereby the police and other community groups are attacking a problem in their own individual way - often being counter-productive, one to the other. Also, under community policing, police forces themselves are much more apt to cooperate between themselves - once again preventing ineffective allocation of resources on common problems.

Reliability: With respect to policing, I believe that reliability refers to: the police force's ability to respond to the community's needs; and the success of the police force in ameliorating the quality of life in the community. In this sense, I believe that the "reliability rating" of the police force is subjective. It is the individual communities who will ultimately decide whether the police force has lived up to its promises. However, under the concept of community policing, the community itself must accept a portion of the responsibility of the success of this model. Certainly the police play the lead role in winning over the confidence of the citizens and establishing the framework for the model. However, the ultimate success of community policing relies as much on the participation of the citizens as it does on the police force itself. If reliability is determined by the ability of the police to respond to the community's needs, then the community must help to identify their needs to the police. If "quality of life" is the measure of success for community policing, then certainly the public must share responsibility in attaining that goal. Community policing means that the police must offer a environment / structure which allows for community involvement in security issues. The community itself must then play its essential role in assuring that the police remain on the right track in addressing their needs.

Community Policing as a Model for Change in the Public Sector

I strongly believe that the Canadian population wants change in their public sector. Furthermore, I believe that they want a say in how services are to be delivered to them - and why shouldn't they? In a country such as ours, that is so big and so diverse, how can a public organization possibly expect to deliver a service in exactly the same way, coast to coast, in so many communities. The security needs of our fishing villages on the coast of Newfoundland are so different from those in the Jane / Finch district of Toronto which are drastically different

from the security needs in rural Saskatchewan. A police force must be adaptable - it must be aware of these differences and it must be able to respond to them.

The question to be addressed here is whether or not these same criteria apply to all federal public services? First of all, let me begin by stating that I am fully aware that this discussion could digress into one on the decentralization of government. My goal here is only to concentrate on the delivery of services in the public sector. As such, I believe that I have sufficiently addressed the issue of the adaptability of the delivery of security services to the individual needs of communities across the country. Certainly the federal government has a role to play in assuring a basic level of security for its entire population. However, we have also discussed at great length the fact that such needs vary from community to community. There is no reason why the special needs of a community cannot be considered during the implementation of this service.

I believe the same to be true with respect to the delivery of all public services. Within the parameters of necessary managerial constraints (i.e. cost; practicality; etc.) I believe that the same conditions may apply to issues such as unemployment insurance; public housing; and welfare assistance. Furthermore, I do not believe that this practice should be limited to federal services. The need for reform in Canada also applies to provincial governments. Certainly health and education requirements may vary throughout communities (rural vs. urban for example). In some provinces, the social composition of their population is as diverse as that of the Canadian population. This may also apply to municipal governments - certainly in the policing field; but also in areas such as parks; municipal regulations; parking; garbage collection. The public should have a say.

I do not want to limit my argument only to the issue of "diversification" of the population. Certainly this is central to the theme, but it is not the only issue that has been identified in this paper. If we recall, the Canadian public wants a public service which is responsive, accessible, and reliable. Each of these three points are intertwining. In order for the service to be responsive to the needs and concerns of the community, it must be made completely accessible to the public. It can only be considered reliable if the first two conditions have been met. I believe that the Canadian public wants, and expects, these criteria to be applicable to all public services at all levels of government.

The community-based policing model is one which I believe, meets the criteria of public demands in this new era. To take this even further, I believe that it is a model which also meets

organizational needs as well as those of the members of these organizations (i.e. the public service). The viability and credibility of today's governments depend on these issues.

The Canadian population has stated its demands for an acceptable public service. I believe that the field of policing is an example where these demands have been met with considerable success. As a result, the way in which Canadians and their police services now measure success is based on the overall well being of the community's citizens. That can't be a bad way to do things!

Bibliography

- Adie, Robert and Thomas, Paul G. Canadian Public Administration. Toronto: Prentice-Hall, 1987.
- Albo, Gregory, Langille, David, and Panitch, Leo, eds.. A Different Kind of State? Popular Power and Democratic Administration. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Armstrong, James L. "Innovation in Public Management: Toward Partnerships" in Optimum, vol. 23, no. 1, Summer 1992, pp. 17-26.
- Borins, Sandford. "The New Public Management is Here to Stay" in Canadian Public Administration, vol. 38, no. 1, Spring 1995, pp. 122-132.
- Bryce, Robert. Maturing in Hard Times. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1986.
- Campbell, Peter and Wright, Susan. Diriger À L'Heure du Changement. Ottawa: Ministère du Solliciteur général du Canada. 1993.
- Cordner, Gary W. and Kenney, Dennis J., eds. Managing Police Organizations. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing, 1996.
- Covey, Stephen R. The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1989.
- Covey, Stephen R. Principle Centered Leadership. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1992.
- Cuervo-Lorens, Ralph. "Reinventing Democracy: The Challenge for Liberalism in Canada" in Policy Options, April, 1994, pp. 26-29.
- Doern, G. Bruce, ed. The Road to Better Public Services: Progress and Constraints in Five Canadian Federal Agencies. Montreal: IRPP, 1994.
- Edwards, John and Mulder, Nick. "Round Table on Alternative Organizational Forms" in Optimum, vol. 23, no. 1, Summer 1992, pp. 3-5.
- French, Richard D. "Postmodern Government" in Optimum, vol. 23, no. 1, Summer 1992, pp. 43-51.
- Galpin, Timothy J. The Human Side of Change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.
- Gibeau, John Joseph. Beyond Community Policing in Canada. Simon Fraser University, 1994.
- Gow, James Iain. Learning From Others: Administrative Innovations Among Canadian Governments. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, 1994.

- Hoggett, Paul. "A New Management in the Public Sector?" in Policy and Politics, vol. 19, no. 4, 1991.
- Huebener, Alrick. "Facts, Myth and Money: Consultation Today" in Policy Options, April, 1994, pp. 30-33.
- Jans, N. A. and Frazer-Jans, J. M. "Organisational Culture and Organisational Effectiveness" in Australian Journal of Public Administration, vol. 50, no. 3, September, 1991, pp. 333-346.
- Johnson, Rebecca. Managing Change, Changing Management. Ottawa: Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1993.
- Kernaghan, Kenneth. "Empowerment and Public Administration: Revolutionary Advance or Passing Fancy?" in Canadian Public Administration, vol. 35, no. 2, Summer 1992, pp. 194-214.
- Langdon, Steven; Rebick, Judy; and Warskett, Rosemary, eds. In the Public Interest: The Value of Public Services. Ottawa: Voyageur Publishing, 1995.
- Lindquist, Evert A. Public Managers and Policy Communities: Learning to Meet New Challenges. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, 1992.
- Massé, Marcel. Partners in the Management of Canada: The Changing Roles of Government and the Public Service. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, 1993.
- McMillan, Bill and Murgatroyd, Stephen. Opening the Door. Edmonton: Dark Horse Books, 1994.
- Mitchell, James R. "Accountability" in Optimum, vol. 23, no. 1, Summer 1992, pp. 12-16.
- Morley, David. "The Human Side of Organizations" in Optimum, vol. 23, no. 1, Summer 1992, pp. 37-41.
- Nicholls, Jonathan. Police Force Reorganisation: Getting It Right. Middlesex: Donnelly-Pindar, 1996.
- Painter, Chris. "Public Service Reform: Reinventing or Abandoning Government?" in The Political Quarterly, vol. 65, no. 3, Summer 1994, pp. 242-262.
- Patterson, R. Anne; Lohin, Rod A.; and Ferguson, D. Scott. Consultation: When the Goal is Good Decisions. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, 1992.
- Phillips, Susan. "Fuzzy Boundaries: Rethinking Relationships between Governments and NGOS" in Policy Options, April, 1994, pp. 13-17.
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police Discussion Paper. People: The Foundation for Change in the RCMP. Ottawa: Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1996.

Savoie, Donald J. "Public Service Reforms: Looking to History and to Other Countries" in Optimum, vol. 23, no. 1, Summer 1992, pp. 6-11.

Savoie, Donald J. "Reforming Civil Service Reforms" in Policy Options, April, 1994, pp. 3-7.

Scott, Cynthia D.; Jaffe, Dennis T.; and Tobe, Glenn R. Organizational Vision, Values and Mission. Menlo Park, California: Crisp Publications, 1993.

Séguin, Francine. "Service to the Public : A Major Strategic Change" in Canadian Public Administration, vol. 34, no. 3, Autumn 1991, pp. 465-473.

Seidel, Leslie. "Improving Service to the Public: Lessons and Lures" in Policy Options, April, 1994, pp. 7-12.

Seidle, Leslie. "Reshaping the Federal Government: Charting the Course" in Policy Options, July-August 1993, pp. 24-29.

Seidle, Leslie. ed. Rethinking the Delivery of Public Services to Citizens. Montreal: IRPP, 1995.

Seidle, Leslie. ed. Rethinking Government: Reform or Reinvention? Montreal: IRPP, 1993.

Shepherdson, David. Meeting the Challenge: Managing Change in the Nineties. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, 1995.

Stanford, Joseph. Negotiation: Redefining Success. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, 1994.

University of Illinois. Community policing for Law Enforcement Managers. Chicago: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 1995.

Varette, Sharon and Phillips-Beaudan, Eric. Upward Feedback in the Public Service. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, 1994.

Walker, Sandra Gail. RCMP Community Policing: Blending Tradition With Innovation. Ottawa: Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1992.

Wright, David. "Structural Innovation in Government Organizations" in Optimum, vol. 23, no. 1, Summer 1992, pp. 27-36.

Yeatman, Anna. "The Reform of Public Management: An Overview" in Australian Journal of Public Administration, vol. 53, no. 3, September, 1994, pp. 287-295.

Zhao, Jihong. Why Police Organizations Change: A Study of Community-Oriented Policing. Police Executive Research Forum, 1996.