

## **V – GOAL SETTING, PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION**

This chapter presents study issues and recommendations relating to establishing goals and priorities, planning, and resource allocation. The three sections into which this chapter is organized correspond with the three major topics discussed.

### **A – GOALS AND PRIORITIES**

#### **CURRENT SITUATION**

##### **The Dallas Police Department Lacks Clearly Defined Goals And Priorities**

Although the police department has a mission statement that defines in broad terms the objectives it is trying to accomplish, neither the department as a whole nor individual units within the department have established clearly defined goals and priorities against which success in serving the citizens of Dallas can be evaluated. The absence of goals and priorities contributes to an overall lack of direction that pervades the department. This lack of direction is reflected in the results of the employee survey. More than four out of five survey respondents indicate that they are neither familiar with the department's direction for the future (82.9 percent) nor understand that direction (83.2 percent).

This lack of direction prevents the department from effectively leveraging its resources. Because department employees do not work together to achieve a common set of objectives their efforts often lack the critical mass needed to effectively address a problem or challenge facing the department. In addition, without a shared understanding of what they are working to accomplish, it is difficult to establish a strong cooperative spirit within the department. In interviews, employees could discuss individually what they felt was important but few could articulate what the department felt was important.<sup>1</sup> These findings are supported by the results of the employee survey. 44.1 percent of employees disagree or strongly disagree that they understand the role their unit plays in achieving department priorities, goals and objectives and 37.1 percent disagree or strongly disagree that they understand how their job contributes to achieving these priorities, goals and objectives. Only 5.8 percent and 6.7 percent of survey respondents respectively strongly agree with these statements.

In addition, to the extent goals and objectives are articulated they are perceived by many employees to be knee-jerk reactions to short-term political imperatives rather than a systematic assessment of citizen needs. Slightly less than half the respondents to the employee survey (49.8 percent) disagree or strongly disagree that department priorities, goals and objectives do not change dramatically over the course of the year. Only 2.4 percent strongly agree.

---

<sup>1</sup> Responding quickly to calls-for-service was identified most often as a priority by employees but by no means was even this priority consistently identified by employees in interviews.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### The Department Should Develop A Systematic Methodology For Establishing Priorities, Goals And Objectives

A key to improving department performance will be establishing realistic priorities, goals and objectives that can be used to hold department leaders and managers at all levels accountable for their performance. A systematic methodology for establishing these priorities and goals should be established both to ensure consistency in how goals and objectives are set from year to year and to ensure that the broad range of service needs the police department is expected to address are reflected in its performance objectives. In addition, the methodology should be structured to facilitate a discussion about the tradeoffs and choices that must be made as part of any priority setting process. A discussion of a recommended methodology for establishing priorities, goals and objectives for the Dallas Police Department follows.

**Precepts.** A number of precepts guide the suggested approach to evaluating the Dallas Police Department's performance. First, the methodology assumes that at the core the police department serves two primary purposes:

- Ensure the safety of citizens
- Maintain order and create an environment in which citizens feel safe and secure

The recommended methodology also takes as a given that the performance measures that are used to evaluate police department performance should reflect quantifiable outcomes relating to these primary goals. (While interim goals which can be used to assess the success of various policing strategies should be established, the department's overall objectives should reflect the ultimate ends it is trying to achieve.) In addition to these "bottom line" goals the methodology assumes that three additional factors should be considered when evaluating police department performance.

- **Cost.** Police departments should be evaluated in terms of the cost-effectiveness of strategies and operational approaches employed. Where appropriate, cost-effectiveness measures should be linked to outcome measures.<sup>2</sup>
- **Quality.** The overall quality of the services provided by the police department should also be considered when evaluating its performance. For the purposes of this discussion, quality encompasses issues relating to the professionalism and courteousness of police department employees and the overall satisfaction of citizens with their interactions with police department employees.
- **Employee needs.** The legitimate needs of employees – particularly on issues relating to officer safety – should be balanced against the need to achieve police department goals as cost-effectively as possible.

---

<sup>2</sup> When evaluating the cost-effectiveness of various policing strategies and approaches care should be taken to ensure that the analysis is performed over an appropriate time frame. Some types of proactive activities may yield few results initially but may be quite productive over a longer period.

**Identifying performance categories and measures.** The specific measures that will be used to evaluate department performance should be linked to the overall purposes the department exists to address (e.g., ensuring the safety of citizens and maintaining order and creating an environment in which citizens feel safe and secure). Suggested ways of evaluating the department’s success at ensuring citizen safety are presented in the following table.

Performance Category	Measure
Response time to emergency calls-for-service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Duration between the time an emergency call is received by the communications center and an officer arrives at the incident scene</li> </ul>
Crimes reported	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Part I violent crimes per thousand population</li> <li>■ Part I non-violent crimes per thousand population</li> </ul>
Crime solution rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Percent of reported crime cleared by arrest or exception               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ Part I violent crimes</li> <li>➢ Part I non-violent crimes</li> <li>➢ Part II crimes</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Traffic accidents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Injury accidents per thousand</li> </ul>
Priority arrests <sup>3</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Arrests for priority crimes per thousand population excluding those resulting from a follow-up investigation<sup>4</sup></li> </ul>

Suggested approaches to evaluating the department’s performance against its ultimate objectives of maintaining order and creating an environment in which citizens feel safe and secure follow.

<sup>3</sup> The Dallas Police Department does not distinguish between felony and non-felony arrests in its current reporting system. Since information on felony arrests was not available a definition of priority arrests was developed for this analysis. These arrests included those for aggravated assault, arson, auto theft, burglary, opium/cocaine derivative, embezzlement, family offenses, forgery/counterfeit, fraud, gambling, marijuana, murder, negligent traffic death, prostitution/commercial vice, rape, robbery, sex offenses, stolen property, synthetic narcotics, other narcotics, theft and weapons.

<sup>4</sup> Arrests resulting from follow-up investigations will be captured in department clearance rates.

Performance Category	Measure
Response time to non-emergency calls-for-service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Duration between the time a non-emergency call is received by the communications center and an officer arrives at the incident scene</li> </ul>
Perceptions of safety and security among citizens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of respondents to citizen survey who agree or strongly agree that the City of Dallas is a safe community</li> </ul>
Level of trust and confidence in the police department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of respondents to citizen survey who agree with statements related to trust and confidence</li> <li>Percentage of respondents to survey of citizens who have had interactions with the police department who agree with statements related to trust and confidence</li> </ul>

As noted, in addition to ensuring the safety of citizens and creating an environment in which they feel safe and secure, an overall assessment of department performance should consider cost, quality and risk management (i.e., officer safety). The following table presents examples of measures that can be used to assess department performance on these dimensions.

Performance Category	Measure
Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cost effectiveness measures should link output (defined in terms of specific “bottom line” performance objectives achieved) and resources<sup>5</sup></li> </ul>
Quality and satisfaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of respondents to citizen survey who are overall satisfied with the police department’s performance</li> <li>Percentage of respondents to survey of citizens who have had interactions with the police department who are satisfied with department performance on several dimensions related to quality</li> </ul>
Risk management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of days lost due to work related injuries</li> </ul>

**Establishing specific performance measures.** Once performance categories and the types of measures that will be used to evaluate performance have been determined, approaches to developing the specific measures that will be used to evaluate performance should be established. The approach that will be used to evaluate performance and set performance expectations will vary depending on the specific measures being developed. In addition, where practical, cost-effectiveness measures that are linked to overall output measures should be established.

Exhibit V-1 summarizes the suggested approaches to developing performance measures for each of the performance categories previously presented. As this exhibit indicates, some measures will be established based on comparisons with the

<sup>5</sup> Specific cost-effective measures will be presented later in this section.

performance of police departments in other jurisdictions. Citizen surveys and surveys of individuals who have had interactions with the police department provide a baseline for evaluating department performance on other dimensions of service.

**Weighting performance measures.** A key challenge for department managers is to determine how best to allocate their management attention and the department's resources among competing needs. After the measures that will be used to evaluate the department's performance have been determined,, important decisions must be made about how these measures should be weighted. As a starting point, a survey of a representative sample of Dallas citizens can be conducted to assess the importance to citizens of various aspects of police department performance. If all aspects of performance receive the same score it makes sense to weight each performance area equally. On the other hand, if some measures receive higher importance scores than others they should receive higher weights.

It should be noted that weighting performance objectives is primarily important for activities for which department leaders and managers must make decisions about where to focus their resources and attention. For example, if responding to emergency calls for service receives a higher weight than reducing the number of injury accidents then department managers should focus relatively more emphasis on response to emergency calls. Establishing weights for other performance objectives (e.g., enhancing perceptions of safety and security, increasing trust and confidence, controlling cost, enhancing overall citizen safety, and managing risks) is less important because, for the most part, improving performance on these measures does not require reallocating resources but rather requires focusing attention on how police services as a whole are provided. For example, addressing issues relating to the trust and confidence of police officers does not require allocating significant resources to this effort<sup>6</sup> but rather requires consistent leadership and supervisory attention. Roughly the same resources are needed to provide leadership and supervision whether or not adequate attention is focused on addressing issues relating to trust and confidence.

### **The Information Gathered As Part Of This Engagement Should Provide A Starting Point For Establishing Specific Measures To Evaluate The Police Department's Performance**

The development of specific performance measures to evaluate the performance of the Dallas Police Department was beyond the scope of this study. However, the results of the benchmarking and citizen survey combined with information on the department's workload and performance can provide a sound starting point for developing needed performance measures.

This analysis is presented in three parts. First, preliminary performance measures and goals are presented based on an analysis of the information gathered throughout this study. Second, the weighting of these performance goals is described. The final section summarizes preliminary performance goals and priorities.

---

<sup>6</sup> Some resources may be needed to support training and management systems, however.

**Performance measures.** The following subsections present the analysis used to develop preliminary performance measures for the Dallas Police Department.

- **Response to emergency calls-for-service.** The survey of a representative of Dallas citizens indicates that citizens expect an immediate response to emergency calls-for-service and certainly no less than a five minute response. (99 percent of the survey respondents indicated that they would be willing to wait no more than five minutes for response to the emergency calls described in the survey.<sup>7</sup>) Using the methodology presented in Exhibit V-1 a weighted performance score can be calculated for the department’s current response to emergency calls-for-service.

Response	Number Of Calls <sup>8</sup>	Weight	Weighted Calls
Within response time goal	7,664	1.0	7,664.0
Within one minute of response time goal	1,760	0.8	1,408.0
Within two minutes of response time goal	1,596	0.6	957.6
Within three minutes of response time goal	1,364	0.4	545.6
Within four minutes of response time goal	1,168	0.2	233.6
More than four minutes after response time goal	6,251	0.0	0.0
Total	19,803		10,808.8

The department’s overall performance in responding to emergency calls-for-service within five minutes can be calculated by dividing weighted calls by the total number of calls received. The department’s current performance in achieving a goal of a five minute response to emergency calls for service therefore is .55 (10,808.8 weighted emergency calls divided by 19,803 emergency calls received equals .55).

It should be noted that establishing a goal of five minute response times to emergency calls-for-service is a very aggressive standard. Indeed, of the ten cities on which benchmark information was collected only two jurisdictions had average response times that met this standard. Consequently, the Dallas Police Department should not be viewed as ineffective if this standard is not immediately met – rather this standard should reflect the ultimate goal to which the police department aspires.

An efficiency measure for response to calls-for-service can be calculated by dividing the total number of weighted calls by the total number of patrol officers<sup>9 10</sup> whose primary responsibility it is to respond to calls. However, because patrol officers

<sup>7</sup> For the purpose of this analysis “in progress” and Priority 1 calls are grouped together. Analysis of citizen survey results suggests that citizen response time expectations for both types of calls are nearly identical.

<sup>8</sup> Only calls for which a response time was recorded are included in this analysis.

<sup>9</sup> Over time, the total number of patrol officers whose primary responsibility it is to respond to calls should be adjusted to reflect overtime costs incurred by these officers.

<sup>10</sup> To the extent that civilian employees are used to support patrol response efforts (either through an expeditor unit or by handling assigning PSOs to handle calls) these staff should be incorporated into the calculation of patrol officers who are primarily responsible for responding to calls. A patrol officer FTE equivalent can be calculated by dividing average compensation for a civilian public safety officer and expeditor employee by the average compensation for a sworn patrol officer.

respond to both emergency and non-emergency calls the total number of weighted calls must include both emergency and non-emergency calls. (A single efficiency measure for response to emergency calls alone cannot be calculated.) To calculate a total number of weighted calls, the weighted calls for emergency and non-emergency calls must be adjusted to reflect the relative importance to citizens of fast response to emergency and non-emergency calls-for-service. The results of the citizen survey suggests that the importance to citizens of response to emergency calls for service is 4.96 on a five point scale, so a factor of .99 factor (4.96 divided by 5.00 equals .99) is used to adjust weighted emergency calls. The importance of fast response to non-emergency calls was rated 4.11 on a five point scale so a factor of .82 (4.11 divided by 5.00 equals .82) will be used to adjust weighted non-emergency calls.

Type Of Calls	Number Of Calls <sup>11</sup>	Weighted Calls	Adjustment Factor	Weighted Calls After Adjustment
Emergency	19,803.0	10,808.9	.99	10,700.7
Non-Emergency	549,265.0	280,526.7	.82	230,031.9
Total				240,732.6

An overall efficiency measure for patrol services can then be calculated by dividing weighted calls after adjustment by the total number of patrol officers whose primary responsibility it is to respond to calls. Given that 1,218 patrol officers are currently deployed<sup>12</sup>, the overall effectiveness measure for patrol response is currently 197.6 (240,732.6 weighted calls after adjustment divided by 1,218 patrol officers equals 197.6).

- **Crime reported.** The current number of Part I violent crimes per thousand population in Dallas is 13.93 while the average number of violent crimes in the three benchmark cities with the lowest number of Part I violent crimes per thousand population (Austin, Mesa and San Jose) is 4.58. The department’s current effectiveness in controlling violent crime therefore is .33 (a goal of 4.58 divided by actual performance of 13.93 equals .33). The ultimate objective for this measure is to achieve an effectiveness level of 1.0 or higher).

The current number of Part I non-violent crimes per thousand population in Dallas is 80.94 while the average number of Part I non-violent crimes in the three benchmark cities (San Jose, Los Angeles and Philadelphia) with the lowest number of Part I non-violent crimes per thousand population is 33.01. The department’s current effectiveness in controlling non-violent crime therefore is .41 (a goal of 33.01 divided by actual performance of 80.94 equals .41). The ultimate department’s ultimate goal for this measure is to achieve an effectiveness level of 1.0 or higher.

<sup>11</sup> Only calls for which a response time was recorded are included in this analysis.

<sup>12</sup> For the purposes of this example only sworn patrol officers are considered when calculating this cost-efficiency measure. When the department develops the cost-effectiveness measure it will use to evaluate performance a sworn officer FTE equivalent for expediter staff (who handle calls by phone) and for civilian public safety officers who handle calls should be included in this number.

The cost-effectiveness of crime reduction efforts can be calculated by dividing the total number of staff who focus on crime reduction by the reduction in crime (weighted to reflect the fact that reducing violence crime is somewhat more important to citizens than reducing non-violent crime). The first step in making this calculation is to identify staff whose primary job is to support crime reduction efforts. Both sworn and civilian<sup>13</sup> staff (for example, crime analysts) should be considered when making this assessment. (As discussed later in this chapter, the budget process should be structured to clearly identify resources that are devoted to crime reduction efforts.) Next, the overall reduction in crime should be adjusted to reflect the fact that reducing violent crime is somewhat more important to citizens than reducing non-violent crime. The citizen survey conducted as part of this engagement indicates that reducing violent crime (which receives an importance rating of 4.96 out of five) is only slightly more important to citizens than reducing non-violent crime (which receives an importance rating of 4.92 out of five). To reflect these modest differences the reduction in the number of violent crimes should be multiplied by .99 (4.96 divided by five is .99) and the reduction in non-violent crimes should be multiplied by .98 (4.92 divided by five is .98). These two products should then be summed and used to calculate the efficiency measure (crime reduction per staff member).

It should be noted that the primary use of this efficiency measure should be to evaluate the impact of crime reduction efforts on the margin. If, for example, increased resources are devoted to crime reduction efforts, this measure can be used to assess the relative effectiveness of these additional resources on a crime reduction per staff member basis.

- **Crime solution rates.** The police department's current solution rate for Part I violent crimes is 32.3 percent while the average solution rate for the three police departments with the highest solution rates for violent crime (Philadelphia, Mesa and Austin) is 41.9 percent. If the Dallas Police Department had achieved this clearance rate it would have solved 7,071 violent crimes as compared to the 5,455 that were actually solved. The department's effectiveness rate relating to solving violent crimes therefore is .77 (5,455 cases solved divided by a goal of 7,071 cases is .77).

With regard to non-violent crime the Dallas Police Department's solution rate actually exceeds that of the three benchmark police departments with the highest solution rate of non-violent crime (Philadelphia, San Jose and Mesa). The department's solution rate for non-violent crime is 15.3 percent while the average solution rate for the three benchmark police departments with the highest solution rate for non-violent crime is 14.4 percent. Because the number of non-violent crimes solved by the police department (14,957) exceeds the number that would have been solved if the performance of the benchmark organizations had been matched (14,114) the department's effectiveness measure for solving non-violent crimes is 1.06 (14,957 cases solved divided by a goal of 14,114 is 1.06).

---

<sup>13</sup> The number of civilian staff should be adjusted to a sworn officer equivalent that reflects the average total compensation of a sworn officer and the average total compensation of relevant civilian employees. Making this adjustment is necessary because the cost of employing civilian employees is so much less than the cost of employing sworn officers.

The relative cost-effectiveness of crime solution efforts can be measured by dividing the total number of investigators focused on conducting follow-up investigations by the number of cases solved.<sup>14</sup> Both the number of Part I and Part II cases solved should be included when calculating this cost-effectiveness measure since investigators do not limit themselves to conducting follow-up investigations of Part I crimes. The types of cases solved should be weighted to reflect their relative priority to citizens. While the citizen survey results suggest that violent crimes should be weighted somewhat more highly than non-violent crimes – citizen survey results suggest that violent crimes should be given a weight of .99 and non-violent crimes should be given a weight of .98 – it seems reasonable that the solution of Part II crimes should be given a lower weight than the solution of Part I crimes.<sup>15</sup> For the purposes of this analysis solution of Part II crimes is given a weight of .50. The following table presents the suggested weighted number of cases solved by the department in 2003.

	Cases Solved	Weight	Weighted Cases Solved
Violent Crime (Part I)	5,450	.99	5,396.1
Non-Violent Crime (Part II)	14,996	.98	14,697.5
Part II Crime	36,816	.50	19,308.0
Total			39,940.6

Since the department currently employs 215 follow-up investigators<sup>16</sup> the number of investigators per weighted case solved is 185.8 (39,940.6 weighted cases solved divided by 215 follow-up investigators equals 185.8).

- Traffic accidents with injuries.** The City of Dallas experiences a higher rate of vehicular accidents involving injuries than the benchmark cities. The number of vehicular accidents involving injuries in Dallas is 10.62 per thousand population while the number of vehicular accidents involving injuries in the three benchmark cities with the lowest level of injury accidents per thousand population (San Jose, Los Angeles and Mesa) was 5.37. The department’s current effectiveness in controlling injury accidents therefore is .54 (the goal of 5.37 injury accidents per thousand

<sup>14</sup> Civilian staff whose primary responsibility is to support investigations should also be included in this number. However, the number of civilian staff should be adjusted to sworn officer equivalents – based on the average total compensation of a sworn officer and the average total compensation of a civilian employee – to reflect the fact that it is much less expensive to employ civilian employees than sworn officers.

<sup>15</sup> The citizen survey conducted as part of this engagement did not ask citizens to assess the importance of solving Part I versus Part II crimes.

<sup>16</sup> For the purposes of this example only sworn police officers and senior corporals assigned to the patrol, general investigations and crimes against persons units were used in making this calculation. When the department calculates the efficiency measure it will use to evaluate its performance all civilian staff who support follow-up investigations (e.g., clerical support staff and crime scene evidence technicians) should be included in the number of total investigators based on the equivalent number of sworn officers that would be employed if the cost of employing these civilian personnel were used to employee sworn officers.

population divided by the current level of performance of 10.62 accidents per thousand population is .54). The ultimate objective for this performance measure is an effectiveness level of 1.0 or higher.

The cost-effectiveness of efforts to reduce the number of injury accidents can be calculated by dividing the total number of staff<sup>17</sup> who focus on traffic enforcement and response to traffic accidents by the reduction in the number of injury accidents. The first step in making this calculation is to identify staff whose primary role it is to improve traffic safety. Officers whose primary focus is selective enforcement and response to traffic accidents should be included in this calculation while officers whose primary responsibility is to investigate vehicular crimes should not. In addition, civilian staff who support traffic enforcement efforts by, for example, entering information on traffic accidents and complaints into data bases should be included in this number (although the number of civilian staff should be converted to sworn officer equivalents to reflect the fact that employing civilian staff is much less expensive than employing sworn officers). The cost effectiveness measure can then be calculated by dividing the reduction in injury accidents by the number of enforcement staff.

As with the efficiency measures used to evaluate the impact of crime reduction efforts, this efficiency measure will be of greatest use in evaluating the impact of traffic enforcement and control efforts on the margin. If, for example, increased resources are devoted to traffic enforcement efforts, this measure can be used to assess the relative effectiveness of these additional resources on a reducing injuries on a per staff member basis.

- **Priority arrests.** The number of “priority” arrests in the city (excluding arrests relating to Part I crimes that are already reflected in solution rate statistics) is 7,500 or 6.19 per thousand population. The department should track these numbers and work to increase the number of felony arrests both on an absolute basis and in terms of the number per thousand population.

From a department level perspective attempting to evaluate staffing per priority arrest is problematic – making arrests in some units is more difficult than in others and, depending on department priorities, arrests in some units may be relatively more important than arrests in others. Nonetheless, calculating staffing per priority arrest for selected units within the department – especially those responsible for conducting pro-active investigations – can be useful in assessing the relative effectiveness of various initiatives undertaken by the units.

- **Response to non-emergency calls-for-service.** The results of the citizen survey suggest that two levels of response time expectations should be established for response to non-emergency calls-for-service. The survey results suggest that Priority 2 calls<sup>18</sup> should be responded to within eight minutes, Priority 3 calls should

---

<sup>17</sup> Costs associated with automated approaches to controlling traffic are not reflected in this calculation. To address this problem, the annualized costs associated with automated traffic control efforts should be converted to an FTE (for the purposes of this analysis) based on the average total compensation of a traffic enforcement officer.

<sup>18</sup> For the purposes of this analysis, priority 1 calls are grouped with emergency calls.

be responded to within 14 minutes and priority 4 calls should be responded to within 25 minutes.<sup>19 20</sup> Using the methodology presented in Exhibit V-1 a weighted performance score can be calculated for the department's current response to emergency calls-for-service.

Response	Number Of Calls <sup>21</sup>	Weight	Weighted Calls
Within response time goal	203,183	1.0	203,183.0
Within one minute of response time goal	19,674	0.9	17,706.6
Within two minutes of response time goal	18,580	0.8	14,864.0
Within three minutes of response time goal	18,085	0.7	12,659.5
Within four minutes of response time goal	17,052	0.6	10,231.2
Within five minutes of response time goal	16,058	0.5	8,029.0
Within six minutes of response time goal	14,877	0.4	5,950.8
Within seven minutes of response time goal	13,846	0.3	4,153.8
Within eight minutes of response time goal	12,864	0.2	2,572.8
Within nine minutes of response time goal	11,760	0.1	1,176.0
More than nine minutes after response time goal	203,296	0.0	0.0
Total	549,265		280,526.7

The department's overall performance in responding to non-emergency calls-for-service can be calculated by dividing weighted calls by the total number of calls received. The department's current performance in achieving a response time goal of eight minutes to Priority 2 calls, 14 minutes to Priority 3 calls and 25 minutes to Priority 4 calls therefore is .51 (280,526.7 weighted non-emergency calls divided by 549,265 non-emergency calls received equals .51).

As discussed, an overall efficiency measure for patrol response that incorporates response to both emergency and non-emergency calls for service can be developed. The current efficiency measure for patrol response is 197.6.<sup>22</sup>

- **Citizen perceptions of safety and security.** As part of the citizen survey conducted during this engagement, citizens were asked to assess the extent to which they agree that Dallas is a safe community. On a five point scale where "1" indicated the respondent "strongly disagreed" with the statement and a "5" indicated the respondent "strongly agreed" the average score was 4.09. This is the measure the department can use as a benchmark to set goals for improvement and monitor success in enhancing citizen perceptions of safety.

<sup>19</sup> This response time expectation was determined by multiplying the percentage of respondents who indicated they think it is reasonable to wait a given amount of time for response to a call included in that category times the response time expectation and then summing the totals to calculate a weighted average.

<sup>20</sup> As will be discussed in greater detail in the chapter on patrol operations, the current prioritization of calls does not match citizen response time expectations. This analysis should be repeated after priorities have been modified to better reflect citizen response time expectations.

<sup>21</sup> Only calls for which a response time was recorded are included in this analysis.

<sup>22</sup> The calculation of this efficiency measure is presented in the section on response to emergency calls-for-service.

- Level of trust and confidence.** Exhibit V-1 presents the five factors that should be considered when assessing the trust and confidence of citizens in the police department. The citizen survey asked citizens to consider the extent to which they agreed that the police department exhibits desired characteristics using a five point scale (where “1” indicated the respondent “strongly disagreed” and a “5” indicated the respondent “strongly agreed”). An overall assessment of the level of trust and confidence can be calculated by averaging the composite citizen score over each of the five dimensions of trust and confidence. As the following table shows, a score of 4.50 results.

Characteristic	Composite Score
Police officers are fair	4.54
Police personnel are unbiased in their dealings with citizens regardless of the citizen’s sex, race, ethnic background or sexual orientation	4.48
Police officers use their authority appropriately in their dealings with the citizens of Dallas	4.48
Police officers use only the amount of force necessary to accomplish their tasks when dealing with the citizens of Dallas	4.59
Police officers are honest	4.43
Average	4.50

This score is a measure the department can use as a benchmark to set goals for improvement and to monitor success in enhancing citizen perceptions relating to their trust and confidence in the police department.

In addition to assessing the overall level of trust and confidence the Dallas community has in the police department, the department should also assess perspectives relating to trust and confidence of individual who have had direct interaction with the department. This can be accomplished by surveying a sample of such citizens (or by giving citizens a survey form after their contact with the department and asking them to return it). Conducting such a survey was beyond the scope of this engagement so an initial assessment of the department’s performance in this regard cannot be completed.

- Citizen satisfaction.** The citizen survey asked citizens to assess their overall satisfaction with the performance of the police department using a five point scale where “1” meant the citizen was “very dissatisfied” and “5” meant the citizen was “very satisfied.” The average satisfaction score for all survey respondents was 3.91. This is a benchmark the department can use to set goals for future improvement.

In addition to assessing overall satisfaction, the satisfaction of citizens who have had direct interactions with the police department should also be assessed. As with gauging perceptions of trust and confidence in the police department, this assessment can be made by surveying a sample of citizens who have had direct interactions with the police department (or by giving them a survey form after their

contact with the department and asking them to return it). Conducting such a survey was beyond the scope of this engagement so an initial assessment of the department's performance in this regard cannot be completed.

- **Risk management.** The department's success in ensuring employee safety can be calculated by dividing total work days lost due to workplace related injuries and accidents by the total work hours available. While precise information on work days lost is not currently available, the department estimates that on average 45 officers are not working due to injury on any given day. This represents 1.52 percent of the total number of the 2,960 officers employed. While this is a good initial estimate of department performance, in the future the department should develop systems to calculate work days lost as a percentage of total capacity more precisely and should include both sworn and civilian employees in this calculation.

**Weighting performance goals.** As previously discussed, weighting performance objectives is primarily important for activities for which department leaders and managers must make decisions about where to focus their resources and attention. In the context of this analysis weighting performance goals to develop an overall performance index makes sense for the following types of performance measures: response time to emergency calls-for-service; violent Part I crime reported; non-violent Part I crime reported; violent Part I crime solution rate; non-violent Part I crime solution rate; and injury traffic accidents. Citizen survey results can be used to determine the relative weights that should be assigned to each of these performance areas based on the relative importance citizens assign to each performance category. The following table shows the average citizen importance scores for each performance category using a five point scale where a score of 1 indicates the category is "not at all important" and a score of 5 indicates that the category is "crucially important." In addition, the weight that should be assigned to each category is presented. (The weight for each performance category is calculated by summing the importance scores for each performance category and then calculating the percentage of the overall total accounted for by the importance score for each category.)

Performance Category	Importance	
	Score	Weight
Speed with which the department responds to emergency requests for assistance from citizens	4.96	0.15
Speed with which the department responds to non-emergency requests for assistance from citizens	4.11	0.12
Efforts to reduce the level of violent crime	4.96	0.15
Efforts to reduce the level of non-violent crime	4.92	0.15
Efforts to solve violent crime <sup>23</sup>	4.71	0.14
Efforts to solve non-violent crime	4.75	0.14
Efforts to reduce auto accidents that will result in injury or death	4.61	0.14
<b>Total</b>	<b>33.02</b>	<b>1.00</b>

As this table shows, while the weights for each performance category are roughly equivalent, relatively more weight should be placed on responding to emergency requests for assistance from citizens and reducing crime and relatively less weight should be assigned to responding to non-emergency requests for assistance from citizens.

These weights should be used to calculate an overall effectiveness indicator for the performance categories for which tradeoffs must be made. The following table summarizes this effectiveness index based on the department's current performance.

Performance Category	Unweighted Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Response to emergency calls-for-service	.55	0.15	.08
Response to non-emergency calls-for-service	.51	0.12	.06
Violent crimes reported	.33	0.15	.05
Non-violent crimes reported	.41	0.15	.06
Solution of violent crimes	.77	0.14	.11
Solution of non-violent crimes	1.06	0.14	.15
Vehicular injury accidents	.54	0.14	.08
<b>Total</b>			<b>.59</b>

<sup>23</sup> The citizen survey did not ask citizens to distinguish between the importance of solving violent crime and the importance of solving non-violent crime. For the purpose of this analysis, the overall score relating to the importance of solving crime once it occurs was adjusted to reflect the relative importance to citizens of reducing violent and non-violent crime.

**Summary.** The following table summarizes the overall assessment of the department's current performance using the methodology suggested in this chapter.

Performance Category	Unweighted Performance	Weighted Performance	Efficiency Measure
Response to emergency calls-for-service	.55(a)	.08	197.6(b)
Response to non-emergency calls-for-service	.51(a)	.06	197.6(b)
Violent crimes reported	.33(a)	.05	(c)
Non-violent crimes reported	.41(a)	.06	(c)
Solution of violent crimes	.77(a)	.11	185.1(d)
Solution of non-violent crimes	1.06(a)	.15	185.1(d)
Vehicular injury accidents	.54(a)	.08	(c)
Weighted Total		.59(a)	
Felony arrests			(e)
Citizen perceptions of safety and security	4.09(c)		(e)
Level of trust and confidence	4.50(c)		(e)
Citizen satisfaction	3.91(c)		(e)
Risk Management	1.52%(f)		(e)

- (a) Target rating for this performance category is 1.0.
- (b) The efficiency measure reflects response to both emergency and non-emergency calls-for-service.
- (c) Efficiency measure should reflect cost per unit of improvement in performance.
- (d) The efficiency measure reflects the solution of both Part I and Part II crimes. Separate efficiency measures were not calculated for violent and non-violent crimes.
- (e) Target rating for this performance category is 5.0.
- (f) Efficiency measures for this performance category are not relevant.
- (g) Target score for this performance category is 0.0.

### **Department Leaders Should Work With City Decision Makers To Establish Short-Term And Long-Term Goals**

The performance expectations incorporated into the methodology for setting goals and priorities presented in this chapter are extremely ambitious. Some targets – especially those relating to response time to calls-for-service, crime reduction, crime solution rates, and reductions in injury accidents – are achievable over time if management improves and adequate resources are provided. Other targets – such as achieving a perfect 5.0 on citizen surveys or reducing lost time due to work related injuries and accidents to zero – will certainly never be achieved. It is extremely important when considering these performance objectives therefore that all stakeholders clearly understand that even for performance categories where the ultimate objective may be achieved over time these represent long-term goals for the police department's performance.

The primary factors that will affect the department's ability to approach these goals are management and resources. The recommendations presented in this report, if implemented, should provide the management capacity needed to implement these recommendations. In addition, the resource recommendations presented should provide

the capacity needed to make significant headway in achieving these goals.<sup>24</sup> However, implementing the recommendations contained in this report will take time and the resources needed to support achieving these ultimate objectives may not be available. It is important therefore that realistic expectations for improving performance be established that reflect a realistic assessment of what can be accomplished over both the short-term and the long-term.

To this end, police department leaders should meet with representatives of the city manager's office and the city council to establish improvement goals for the next year and over a five-year period. For example, these decision-makers might decide that over the next year improvement in the department's overall weighted performance (related to response time, crime reduction, crime solution, and reduction in injury accidents) should increase from 59 percent of the target score of 1 to 65 percent of the target score while scores relating to citizens perceptions of safety and security, trust and confidence, overall satisfaction and risk management remain constant. Over a five year period the goal might be to increase the department's weighted performance to 80 percent of the target score, increasing performance relating to safety and security, trust and confidence and overall satisfaction to 90 percent of the target score of 5.0, and reducing the percentage of injuries by 20 percent. Whatever short-term and long-term goals are established all parties should agree that the level of performance is obtainable (given the level of resources provided). The department should then be held accountable for achieving these goals. If, however, due to financial exigencies agreed upon resources are not provided, performance goals should be modified accordingly.

## **B – PLANNING**

### **CURRENT SITUATION**

#### **The Dallas Police Department Does Not Have A Strategic Plan**

The Dallas Police Department does not have a strategic plan that provides an overall direction for the department, articulates priorities, and describes overall strategies for achieving desired goals. The department's most recent strategic plan covered the years 1998-2000. In addition, a draft strategic plan for the years 2000-2002 was developed but was not approved.

The draft strategic plan for 2000-2002, while not implemented, had a number of worthwhile features. It clearly articulated six core values that define the desired culture of the organization.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> As will be discussed in greater detail in the next section of this chapter, resources needed to respond effectively to incidents requiring police intervention are much easier to assess than the resources needed to proactively reduce crime.

<sup>25</sup> While these values are without question laudable, it is clear from the results of the employee survey as well as from discussions with employees that the department has not yet instilled these values into its culture.

- Integrity
- Leadership
- Innovation
- Commitment
- Sensitivity
- Teamwork

The plan also identified specific departmental objectives that were linked to five public safety strategic objectives that were drawn from the city’s strategic plan.

Public Safety Strategic Objective	Department Objective
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ We will prevent an increase in the incidence of crimes and traffic related injuries and fatalities through prevention, safety operations, enforcement and crime solving efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Ensure continued improvement in crime analysis through the use of technology and improved collaboration with other agencies and jurisdictions</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Ensure continued improvement in crime investigations through the use of technology and improved collaboration with other agencies and jurisdictions</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Implement new community policing initiatives and expand existing ones</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Optimize the deployment of operational resources through quarterly evaluations of crime trends and resource targeting strategies</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Implement a comprehensive training program for employees and citizen volunteers</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Coordinate efforts of public safety and traffic operations to promote safe traffic movement</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ We will reduce injuries and fatalities resulting from substance abuse through education and intervention strategies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Implement strategies to address identified needs for a comprehensive substance abuse prevention system emphasizing reduced demand by youth</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ We will provide coordinated emergency response to protect life and property in the event of a large-scale emergency or disaster</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Review and update emergency management plans to ensure that the city operations are in place to respond to all potential emergencies and disasters</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Coordinate planning, training and communications activities within the city operations and with other agencies and jurisdictions to provide an effective and coordinated response to large-scale emergencies</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ We will maintain and enforce city codes needed to protect our community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Ensure consistent enforcement of city codes through employee training and citizen awareness strategies</li> </ul>

Public Safety Strategic Objective	Department Objective
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ We will utilize the strategic indicators within the Dallas 2000 plan to focus operational efforts to achieve strategic objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Reduce or maintain the level of violent crime</li> <li>■ Reduce or maintain the level of non-violent crime</li> <li>■ Reduce or maintain the level of traffic related injuries and fatalities</li> <li>■ Reduce response times to emergency calls</li> </ul>

Units responsible for achieving each departmental objective were also identified in the plan and timelines for completing the activities were specified.

Reviewing the draft strategic plan in the context of this report is revealing. While the consultants might question specific elements of the plan, the key features of the draft plan are quite sound and are, in fact, superior to many of the strategic plans the consultants have reviewed for other organizations. In addition, many of the initiatives incorporated in this plan are quite similar to the initiatives recommended by this report. Clearly, the department's failure to implement this plan represents a lost opportunity.

The dimensions of the lost opportunity are reflected in the results of the employee survey. Not only do survey findings clearly indicate that the values articulated in the strategic plan have not been inculcated into the department's culture but, not surprisingly given the plan was never formally adopted, very few employees are familiar with the plan. 82.0 percent of the respondents to the employee survey disagree or strongly disagree that they are familiar with the goals and objectives articulated in the strategic plan and fewer than one percent of the survey respondents strongly agree that they are familiar with these goals and objectives.

### **The Department Focuses Insufficient Attention On Operational Planning**

Not only does the department not have a strategic plan to provide overall direction but it focuses insufficient attention on operational planning. The Planning and Crime Analysis Unit focuses primarily on reporting data and handling special projects. Relatively little effort, however, is devoted to using the information that is gathered to develop operational plans to improve department performance. (This results in part, of course, because there are no departmental goals around which to develop plans.) Indeed, most staff assigned to the planning unit consider themselves to be "report preparers" whose primary function is to write reports when directed by management. Even the crime analysts assigned to the unit – who are supposed to provide crime analysis services to patrol divisions and selected central office units – devote the preponderance of their time reporting information to internal and external managers rather than analyzing information and using that information to formulate operational plans.

It should be noted, however, that some divisions have taken the initiative to develop their own operational plans. For example, the Southeast Operations Division has developed its own crime reduction plan.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### The Department Should Develop A Strategic Plan

The strategic plans developed by many public sector organizations are of limited usefulness. These plans often consist of little more than a laundry list of action items that are generally worthwhile activities but that fail to address strategic concerns. The fact that these strategic plans are rarely fully implemented is of little consequence to public sector organizations that already function effectively. While the failure to address strategic concerns for these organizations represents a lost opportunity, the overall consequences for the organization are not significant.

Developing an effective strategic plan for the Dallas Police Department, on the other hand, will be an important step in leadership's efforts to transform police department operations. Because the department lacks a clear direction, the process of developing and implementing a strategic plan will be extremely important both in supporting management's efforts to provide a clear direction for the department and in communicating that new direction to employees and external stakeholders. The strategic plan should include a number of key characteristics.

- **Objectives and priorities should be clearly articulated.** Long term expectations (over the next five years) for the department's performance should be clearly articulated in the strategic plan and measures to assess performance against these objectives should be clearly established. (A methodology for working with the interim city manager and the city council to establish these goals and priorities was detailed in the previous section of this chapter.)
- **Strategies for achieving performance objectives should be detailed.** The strategic plan should detail the key strategic initiatives that the department will undertake to achieve its performance goals. These strategies, which should build on the recommendations made in this report, should clearly articulate the overall direction the department will take to achieve its objectives. These strategic initiatives should be stated in terms simple enough to be easily understood and embraced by both internal and external stakeholders.
- **Resources required to implement selected strategies should be assessed.** Even leaders and managers with the best of intentions will be unable to implement strategic initiatives if insufficient resources are available to support them. Care should be taken, therefore, to ensure that the resource implications of pursuing desired strategies have been detailed and that the decision-makers responsible for funding these initiatives understand these implications. To the extent possible, decision-makers should commit to fund the strategic initiatives over the term of the strategic plan recognizing, of course, that unforeseen financial shortfalls may require funding to be reduced.
- **Communications strategies should be incorporated into the strategic plan.** If the strategic plan is to be an effective vehicle for setting the direction of the police department then the key elements of this plan must be effectively communicated. Indeed, the communications strategy and plan discussed in Chapter IV should be

incorporated into the overall strategic plan since improving communication (to both internal and external stakeholders) is of such vital importance to the success of the department's overall improvement efforts.

- **Progress in achieving objectives should be monitored and reported on a regular basis.** There should be two components to this monitoring and reporting effort. First, the department's overall success in achieving its overall goals and objectives should be assessed. For example, reports of progress against goals might be shared with department employees on a quarterly basis and reviewed with the city council – and reported to the public at large – every six months. In addition to assessing the success of overall efforts to achieve goals and objectives, success in implementing the strategies designed to support efforts to achieve these goals should also be monitored. To this end, quantifiable benchmarks should be developed for each strategy included in the plan and timelines for achieving each benchmark established. Progress in achieving these benchmarks should be reviewed at least once each quarter and, as necessary, modifications in implementation approaches should be made based on the results of these reviews.
- **A process for modifying the strategic plan should be established.** While both department and city leaders should commit themselves to implementing the strategic plan, over a five year period emerging circumstances may make some features of the strategic plan unnecessary or obsolete. If, for example, the city experienced a financial boon modifying the plan to incorporate strategies that were not previously considered feasible would be warranted. On the other hand, if the city experienced an unforeseen downturn in its financial situation the plan would need to be adjusted to reflect the new financial conditions.<sup>26</sup> It should be stressed, however, that modifying the strategic plan is not a process that should be undertaken lightly. Before the plan is approved all key decision makers should express a commitment to implementation. Nonetheless, given the exigencies of an uncertain future, a process for modifying the strategic plan is needed.

### **Each Bureau And Division Should Develop Annual Operational Plans Consistent With The Department's Strategic Plan**

While effective strategies are needed to establish an overall direction for the police department, progress in achieving desired goals will not be achieved unless tactical and operational plans – consistent with the department's overall strategic direction – are developed. As part of this operational planning process each bureau and division should assess the resources available to it, its current strengths and shortcomings, its current performance (using, as appropriate, the measures that are used to evaluate the department's overall performance), information on best practices employed by other law enforcement agencies and in other divisions of the Dallas Police Department, and information on trends and needs in the external community (e.g., information on crime trends). An operational plan should then be developed that details how the resources available to the unit will be used to support efforts to accomplish the department's overall goals and objectives. Quarterly benchmarks should be incorporated into these plans

---

<sup>26</sup> It should be noted that in addition to modifying the strategies incorporated in the plan, performance goals would need to be adjusted as well.

that can be used to assess progress in implementing operational initiatives. To the extent benchmarks are not being achieved, modifications to the annual operational plan should be developed.

### **Tactical Plans Should Be Developed At The Unit And Subunit Level**

Just as the department's strategic plan will provide a context for the operational plans developed by each bureau and division, these operational plans should provide a context for the tactical plans developed at the unit and subunit level. These tactical plans should articulate the specific problem being addressed (e.g., a rash of burglaries in a specific area) and present an analysis of the information used to understand the problem, the specific tactics that will be employed to address the problem, the resources that are needed to implement the tactics, the results that are expected to be achieved, and the time frame over which the results will be achieved. Care should be taken to prevent the development of these tactical plans from being administratively burdensome. They need not be lengthy nor finely worded. Rather, the primary purpose of developing these plans should be to enforce a discipline that requires managers to use information to assess need, to be specific about the resources and tactics that will be employed to address that need, and to provide specific measures that can be used to assess the success of these efforts. The fact that some tactical plans may not achieve their objectives should be of less concern to managers than continuing to employ these tactics when they are not yielding desired results. In addition, as will be discussed in more detail in Chapter VII, in the recommended organizational structure the deputy chiefs who oversee patrol divisions will have significant discretionary resources at their disposal to address crime problems. These tactical plans will provide these managers with the information they need to determine how best to allocate resources among competing needs.

## **C – RESOURCE ALLOCATION**

### **The Department's Current Approach To Allocating Resources Does Not Adequately Link Resource Allocations With Results**

The department has made good progress over the past year in modifying its budget process to better link resource allocations with department priorities. In particular, the department has introduced a "zero based" approach to budgeting that divides department services into 58 separate service areas and then ranks those services using criteria established by the Office of Financial Services and the city manager's office.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> These services areas, listed in order of priority, are: field patrol; crimes against persons; youth/family crimes; communications, property crimes; narcotics; vice enforcement; auto pound; property recovery; traffic; recruit/in-servicing training; recruiting and background; neighborhood nuisance response/abatement; crime scene response; school crossing guard and support; criminal intelligence; tactical; helicopter; bomb unit; canine unit; love field security; departmental and executive support; property evidence; records, Lake Ray Hubbard; vice permit licensing; employee services/safety monitoring; open records; first offender program; psychological services; prisoner processing; public integrity; gang unit; planning and crime analysis; legal services case filing; alarm processing; school liaison/youth officers; financial and contract management; grant cash match and payment; central business district; internal affairs, interactive community policing coordination, Walker designated storefronts; fleet/ENP/asset management; forensic lab; inspections; interactive community policing; police technology and technical support; mounted unit; quartermaster; fugitive/parolee unit; legal services subpoena assistance, media

The budget then identifies the resources that are needed to maintain current service levels.

This approach to budgeting has a number of worthwhile features in that it identifies priority services and in a general way links service levels with budget allocations.<sup>28</sup> Despite these good efforts, however, the current budgeting approach does not yet ensure that the resource allocation process is structured to facilitate discussions about what level of resources are needed to achieve a given level of results. The fact that the services currently identified tend to be related to existing organizational units contributes to this problem. While this is not a problem for some services – such as those provided by the auto pound where one unit is primarily responsible for all activities related to a function – for other services this approach is more problematic. Success in solving crime, for example, depends on patrol officers doing thorough preliminary investigations at crimes scenes, crime scene response unit officers doing a good job of collecting evidence, and investigators doing an effective job of conducting follow-up investigations. The current unit based approach to defining services does not adequately take these interactions into account.

More problematic, however, is the fact that service expectations are not explicitly detailed as part of the budget development process. Without this information it is difficult for decision-makers to determine how resource allocations might be modified to enhance the overall level of service the department provides. Ranking services in terms of their priorities, by itself, will not facilitate these decisions. If, for example, the department provides an extremely high level of service in a high priority area and an unacceptably low level of performance in a lower priority area, it may be rational to divert resources to improving performance in the lower priority area even if doing so would result in a slight decrease in the level of service provided in the high priority area.

### **The Department Should Adopt A Resource Allocation Methodology That Clearly Links Resources And Results**

In its recent budget development cycle the police department took a good first step in its efforts to ensure that its resource allocation decisions reflect department priorities and to link service expectations and resources. The department should build on these efforts to establish a process that further strengthens the linkage between resources and results. This process should have a number of key features.

**Performance expectations for all organizational units should be clearly articulated.** The approach to establishing overall performance expectations presented in the first section of this chapter should provide the starting point for this effort. For some units and functions the linkage between the department's overall objective and the unit's objectives will be obvious. The performance goals for the unit responsible for investigating homicides, for example, will be closely linked to the department's overall performance goal for solving violent crimes. For other units, while the linkage between

---

relations; community affairs; protective services; Walker support and management; facilities management; and non-CBD bicycle patrol.

<sup>28</sup> The department details the resources needed to maintain the “current level of service” but does not specify what the level of service is.

the department's goal and the unit goals will be clear, more than one departmental goal will be addressed by the unit. For example, expectations for patrol officers might include response time expectations, expectations for time spent on crime reduction activities, expectations with regard to ensuring thorough preliminary investigations are performed at crime scenes, and expectations relating to community outreach efforts. For still other units, a clear relationship between the unit's goal and the department's overall goal may be difficult to establish. The auto pound, for example, performs an important function but it is difficult to link performance expectations for that unit to any of the individual performance measures suggested for the department. Rather than try to create a linkage that does not exist, performance expectations for such units should be linked to the specific goals the unit is working to address.

**Expectations for performance relating to specific budget allocations should be specified.** The level of service the department is able to provide to the citizens of Dallas is ultimately limited by the resources that are available to support those services. This reality should be explicitly addressed in resource allocation alternatives prepared for each organizational unit. For example, with regard to patrol staffing the department should specify the response time expectations it will commit to achieving if it is provided funding at various levels. Likewise, units responsible for conducting follow-up investigations should indicate how solution rates will improve or decline if resource levels are increased or decreased.<sup>29</sup>

In developing these budget and service level expectations decision makers should clearly understand that the link between resources and results are more clearly defined for some types of services than others. For example, the link between the response time patrol officers can achieve and the number of patrol officers who are deployed is reasonably concrete.<sup>30</sup> For crime solution, on the other hand, the precise link between resources and results is somewhat more tenuous. Nonetheless, it is not unreasonable to assume that increasing the resources devoted to solving crimes will result in an increase in the number of crimes solved – albeit with diminishing “returns” for each increment in resources. For proactive activities such as crime reduction initiatives and efforts to enhance citizen perceptions of safety, on the other hand, the link between resources and results is more speculative. Nonetheless, it is important that the anticipated success of implementing various proactive service improvement strategies (as reflected in the department's overall strategic plan and the individual operational plans developed by individual bureaus and divisions) be specified, the probability of success assessed, and the costs associated with implementing alternative strategies specified. “Expected value” calculations can then be performed<sup>31</sup> and compared to the anticipated costs associated with implementing alternative service improvement strategies.

---

<sup>29</sup> This discussion assumes that the department is already making effective use of existing resources and that opportunities to improve services without increasing costs have already been addressed.

<sup>30</sup> This relationship will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter XIV.

<sup>31</sup> The expected value of a specific initiative would be calculated by multiplying the expected quantitative impact of the initiative by the probability of its success.

**Resources should be allocated to optimize department performance against agreed upon goals.** One of the benefits of clearly identifying the impact on service of alternative approaches to allocating department resources is that decision makers will have a clear understanding of the impact various budget scenarios will have on the services citizen receive. Moreover, by clarifying the service implications of various budget alternatives the department can determine (and present to the interim city manager and city council) the optimal way to allocate resources to achieve agreed upon performance goals. As discussed in the first section of this chapter, the recommended methodology for developing performance goals weights various services based on their relative importance to citizens. By specifying, to the extent possible, the level of service that will be provided with alternative levels of funding, the department can allocate the resources available to it in ways designed to optimize anticipated performance against those goals.