

# **The Value of Evidence-based Evaluation**

Tim Prenzler

Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence in  
Policing and Security, Griffith University

APSAC Conference

Brisbane, 29 July 2009

# Contents

Part I: Reasons for performance indicators /  
evidence

Part II: The policy-practice gulf

# Part I: Reasons for PIs/Evidence

## 1. \$\$

Australian anti-corruption agencies 2007/8:

**\$175 million** (annual reports)

## 2. Principles

Independence + power = accountability:

Chain of delegated authority

## Quotable quotes

David Bayley:

“It’s accountability, stupid! ... The rectitude agenda... largely a response to public pressure... The challenge now is to make sure that accountability is rendered in meaningful terms. If it is not, then it is because we, rather than the police, have been stupid” (1994, pp. 124, 136, 140)

Samuel Walker:

“Developing appropriate performance oversight measures and sponsoring independent research are the most important issues facing the citizen oversight movement” (2006, p. 20)

David Brereton:

“The grounds for retaining these bodies are philosophical as well as utilitarian – concepts such as accountability and transparency are important, even if they are not readily susceptible to measurement...

However ...in a world in which governments are placing ever greater emphasis on the need to show “value for money”, appeals to abstract principles may not be enough to win funding arguments – evidence that external oversight has value in a concrete sense is also required” (1999, p. 4)

### **3. Specific stakeholders**

e.g., Complainants, accused, politicians, public sector, journalists, civil libertarian lawyers, academics

### **4. Threats**

e.g, San Jose Police Association and Police Chief block Bar Association push for a Civilian Review Board (See Fehr (1997) in a handbook on police power strategies)

## **5. Integration with learning tools**

e.g., timeliness, communication, mediation,  
independent investigations, covert ops, impacts of  
interventions

# Part 2: The Policy-Practice Gulf

US Study 2007: Police Integrity Agencies

**Mohr (2007) Agency Survey**

46 of 59 responded

% Support    % Use

• Public confidence in police	83	15
• Citizen confidence in system	87	17
• Police satisfaction in system	50	15
• Reduced police use of force	39	13
• Reduced lawsuits	33	4
• Reduced seriousness of complaints	30	8

Others used (reported?):	%
• Complaint types	83
• Complaints findings	80
• Complaint trends	61
• Complainant satisfaction	17
• Subject officer satisfaction	8
• Recommendations implemented	39
• Time taken	59

**Researcher's assessment:**

activity over performance

Australian Studies, 2003, 2006: Police Integrity  
Agencies

**Study 1. Lewis & Prenzler (2005) Part 1:**

1. Agency survey
2. Annual reports, 1999-2000, 2002-3

## 10 Agencies surveyed:

Juris.	Name	Est.
C'wealth	Ombudsman	1976
NSW	Ombudsman	1975
NSW	Police Integrity Commission	1996
NT	Ombudsman	1978
Qld	Crime & Misconduct Commission	1990*
SA	Police Complaints Authority	1985
Tas	Ombudsman	1978
Vic	Ombudsman	1973
WA	Ombudsman	1972
WA	Corruption & Crime Commission	2003*

## Main Findings:

- ‘Live issue’
- Perceived as problematic, e.g. interpreting complaints
- Experimentation
- Common indicators
- Uncommon indicators

## Common indicators:

- # of complaints processed
- Time taken
- Outcomes
- Assessment of police performance
- Recommendations implemented
- Case narratives

Uncommon indicators:

- stakeholder surveys
- independent audits

**Researchers' assessment:**

activity over performance

# Study 1. Lewis & Prenzler (2005) Part 2: Model

- 3 Domains:
1. Goals
  2. Fields
  3. Methods

- 4 Goals:
1. Procedural integrity
  2. Procedural rigour
  3. Timeliness
  4. Contribution to police integrity

## 1. Procedural Integrity

*due process*

case file audits/stakeholder surveys

outcomes of prosecutions

## 2. Procedural Rigour

*thoroughness*

case file audits/stakeholder surveys

outcomes of prosecutions

### 3. Timeliness

*promptness*

est. standards, track complaints

### 4. Contribution to Police Integrity

*deterrence/integrity development*

complaints analysis/intell.

stakeholder surveys/interviews

## Study 2. Prenzler (2007) Update:

Extended measures – 13, annual reports 2005/6,  
9 agencies

### PIs:

1. Time taken
2. Time benchmark
3. Complaints benchmark
4. Stakeholder feedback
5. Public survey
6. Prosecution outcomes
7. Appeals
8. Case file audits
9. Case studies
10. Implementation of recommendations
11. Analysis of complaints/intel.
12. Time series
13. Inspector/monitor reports

## Reportage rates out of 9:

1. Time taken	3	8. Case file audits	0
2. Time benchmark	2	9. Case studies	8
3. Complaints benchmark	0	10. Implementation of recommendations	5
4. Stakeholder feedback	1?	11. Analysis of complaints/ intell.	5?
5. Public survey	1	12. Time series	5?
6. Prosecution outcomes	0	13. Inspector/monitor reports	2
7. Appeals	2?		

# Conclusions

- Accountability requires PIs: relating evidence to principles
- Improvements needed in stakeholder confidence
- PIs problematic
- Mix of measures
- Uptake needs significant improvement
- Common national standard
- Need appropriate responses to findings

# References

- Bayley, D (1994) It's Accountability, Stupid! In K Bryett & C Lewis (Eds) *Un-Peeling Tradition: Contemporary Policing*. Melbourne: Macmillian.
- Brereton, D (1999) Evaluating External Oversight Bodies. *1999 IACOLE World Conference*. Sydney, September 5-9.
- Fehr, M (1997) The 1992 Civilian Review Board Controversy in San Jose. In Burpo, J, DeLord, R & Shannon, M (Eds) *Police Association Power, Politics, and Confrontation: A Guide for the Successful Police Labor Leader*. Springfield Ill.: Charles C Thomas.
- Mohr, BA (2007) *The Use of Performance Measurement in Civilian Oversight in the United States*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico.
- Prenzler, T (2007) Performance Indicators for Police Oversight Agencies. *Police Accountability Roundtable*, Office of Police Integrity. Melbourne, 18 February - 1 March.
- Prenzler, T and Lewis, C (2005) Performance Indicators for Police Oversight Agencies. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*. 64(2): 77-83. This is an abbreviated version of Lewis, C and Prenzler, T (2008) Police Oversight Agencies: Measuring Effectiveness. In Head, B, Brown, A & Connors, C (Eds) *Promoting Integrity: Evaluating and Improving Public Integrity Institutions* London: Ashgate.
- Walker, S (2006) The History of Civilian Oversight. In Perino, J (Ed) *Citizen Oversight of Law Enforcement*. Chicago: American Bar Association Publishing.