

**ASSESSING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA METRO-  
POLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT'S YEAR 2000  
PERFORMANCE**

---

---

**HEARING**

BEFORE THE

OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT,  
RESTRUCTURING, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
SUBCOMMITTEE

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON  
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS  
UNITED STATES SENATE  
ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

—————  
MARCH 22, 2001  
—————

Printed for the use of the Committee on Governmental Affairs



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

72-499 DTP

WASHINGTON : 2001

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office  
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

FRED THOMPSON, Tennessee, *Chairman*  
JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Connecticut, *Ranking Democrat*

TED STEVENS, Alaska	CARL LEVIN, Michigan
SUSAN M. COLLINS, Maine	DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
GEORGE V. VOINOVICH, Ohio	RICHARD J. DURBIN, Illinois
PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico	ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, New Jersey
THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi	MAX CLELAND, Georgia
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire	THOMAS R. CARPER, Delaware
ROBERT F. BENNETT, Utah	JEAN CARNAHAN, Missouri

HANNAH S. SISTARE, *Staff Director and Counsel*  
JOYCE A. RECHTSCHAFFEN, *Democratic Staff Director and Counsel*  
DARLA D. CASSELL, *Chief Clerk*

---

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT,  
RESTRUCTURING, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

GEORGE V. VOINOVICH, Ohio, *Chairman*  
RICHARD J. DURBIN, Illinois, *Ranking Democrat*

TED STEVENS, Alaska	DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
SUSAN M. COLLINS, Maine	ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, New Jersey
PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico	THOMAS R. CARPER, Delaware
THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi	JEAN CARNAHAN, Missouri

Andrew Richardson, *Staff Director*  
Marianne Clifford Upton, *Minority Staff Director and Chief Counsel*  
Julie L. Vincent, *Chief Clerk*

# CONTENTS

Opening statement:	Page
Senator Voinovich .....	1

## WITNESSES

THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 2001

John A. Koskinen, City Administrator, District of Columbia .....	3
Margret Nedelkoff Kellems, Deputy Mayor for Public Safety and Justice, District of Columbia .....	6
Charles H. Ramsey, Chief of Police, District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department .....	10

## ALPHABETICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

Kellems, Margret Nedelkoff:	
Testimony .....	6
Prepared statement .....	33
Koskinen, John A.:	
Testimony .....	3
Prepared statement .....	27
Ramsey, Charles H.:	
Testimony .....	10
Prepared statement with attachments .....	43



**ASSESSING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT'S  
YEAR 2000 PERFORMANCE**

---

**THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 2001**

U.S. SENATE,  
OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, RESTRUCTURING,  
AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUBCOMMITTEE,  
OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS,  
*Washington, DC.*

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:20 a.m., in room SD-342, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. George V. Voinovich, Chairman of the Subcommittee, presiding.

Present: Senator Voinovich.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR VOINOVICH**

Senator VOINOVICH. The hearing will please come to order. First of all, I want to apologize to the witnesses for being late. We had a vote and a computer glitch. I want to thank you for coming, and I am hoping that some of my other colleagues may appear, although some of their staff people will be reading your testimony and going over it.

This is the fourth time in 2 years that we have come together to discuss the progress of performance management in the District of Columbia. Our efforts so far have focused on encouraging the District to consolidate its various performance documents, and while much work remains to be done in this regard, I am pleased to report that the District's efforts, with the Subcommittee's encouragement, may be paying off. The Mayor's office has acknowledged and begun to address the need to consolidate the various performance documents into a comprehensive plan to inform the public and enable the District Government to measure its performance.

Today, the Subcommittee meets to highlight the Metropolitan Police Department's performance achievements from last year, using the MPD as an example of how performance measurement is working in the District. I am pleased today to welcome City Administrator John Koskinen, Deputy Mayor for Public Safety and Justice Margret Kellems, and Police Chief Charles Ramsey.

Crime and public safety have been hot issues in the District for decades. Like many cities in Ohio where I am from, gaining the upper hand in law enforcement continues to be a daily struggle. My hat goes off to Police Chief Ramsey and Deputy Mayor Kellems for

taking on this responsibility and working daily to make our Nation's Capital a safer place to live, work, and visit.

Despite these efforts, public safety reports on the District remain mixed. On a positive note, Chief Ramsey has been praised for responding to the residents' demand to put more officers on patrol. As a result, violent crime in the District decreased 2.5 percent in 2000, though, Chief, I am sure people can debate that one way or another. As Mayor for 10 years of Cleveland, I thought putting more people out there made the difference, but sometimes other things came into play.

However, negative coverage continues to plague the Department, as highlighted by recent stories on the mishandling of child abuse reports and homicide case files.

To combat some of these problems, the Metropolitan Police Department established performance measures in the District's Year 2000 Performance Accountability Plan that was submitted to Congress in 1999. These performance goals were then revised halfway through the performance cycle, accompanied by a letter from Mayor Williams explaining that the District intends to be held more accountable for the revised goals rather than the goals laid out at the beginning of the cycle. So, essentially, the District decided to move the goal posts halfway through the year.

This was confusing to me, and certainly confusing, I suspect, to the residents of the city, who want to know how their government is performing. In other words, the District had 1999 goals, and then I think in March 2000 they revised those goals.

The Department's year 2000 goals range from reducing homicide and improving 911 response time, to increasing youth membership in the Metropolitan Police Department Boys and Girls Clubs and upgrading the Department's technology. These goals are the focus of today's hearing.

It concerns me to report that of the 20 performance goals established for 2000, only 4 were realized. That is a 20-percent success rate. On top of last year's questionable performance, I was exceedingly discouraged to learn that the Department intends to drop 17 of its 20 performance measures for Fiscal Year 2002.

For example, such tangible outcome measures as reduction in homicides and aggravated assaults are being replaced by a measure of Part I violent crimes. Last year's measures to improve 911 response time are being replaced by a measure of the number of calls the MPD receives on public disorders. I am confused as to exactly how the number of distress calls the Department receives relates to the agency's ability to respond to such emergencies. I mean, really what we are interested in is response time, not the number of calls. It seems to me that everywhere in the country you measure your response times.

Essentially, it appears that the Department is replacing tangible, transparent performance goals with some ambiguous, unaccountable measures. I would be interested to hear how the witnesses justify these changes in performance measures.

The Subcommittee also looks forward to learning whether the Metropolitan Police Department's successes and failures were typical among District agencies, and whether other agencies in the

District intend to replace last year's performance measures with a new set of measures.

What I am getting at is that we had 1999 measures, then we changed them in 2000, and now I understand we are going to be changing them again. The issue is what measures are we going to use next year when we measure the performance of the District. What are they?

On a related issue, I am disappointed with the submission of the District's Fiscal Year 2000 Performance Accountability Report which was due March 1 and still has not been submitted. I must tell you that I scheduled this hearing with the expectation that the report would be here on time. As a result, this morning's hearing will not be as meaningful, I think, as it could be. I am putting the District Government on notice today that I would like to have that report on time next year.

It also presents a problem for the General Accounting Office, because they are supposed to review it and get back to us by April 15 of this year. Again, that is going to present them with a problem in trying to meet their deadline that they are supposed to make to Congress.

On a more cordial note, I would like to congratulate the Williams administration for its progress so far. I am well aware that the Mayor has only been in office for a little over 2 years, and that these types of changes do take time. Although much work remains to be done, I believe the District is on the right track.

I am particularly impressed with the quality of individuals that the Mayor has been able to attract to the administration. I think all of us know that an administrator—a mayor, governor, commissioner—is only as good as the quality of the individuals that they are able to attract to their team. I do want to have responses, though, to the questions that I have raised in this statement.

Since Senator Durbin is not here, I think we will move immediately to your presentations. If you could limit them to no more than 5 minutes, I would be most appreciative. We will start out with Mr. Koskinen.

**TESTIMONY OF JOHN A. KOSKINEN,<sup>1</sup> CITY ADMINISTRATOR,  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Mr. KOSKINEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to provide you and the Subcommittee with an update of the status of the development of the District of Columbia's performance management system. With your approval, I will submit for the record my full statement and summarize it here.

I am joined here today by Margret Nedelkoff Kellems, Deputy Mayor for Public Safety and Justice, and Charles Ramsey, Chief of the Metropolitan Police Department.

I will present an overview of the District's performance management system, our ultimate goals, the status of several issues that we still need to address, and our prognosis about how long it will take to resolve these issues.

Ms. Kellems will discuss the criteria she used to evaluate Chief Ramsey's performance during 2000, including the Chief's FY 2000

<sup>1</sup>The prepared statement of Mr. Koskinen appears in the Appendix on page 27.

performance contract with the Mayor and the Chief's calendar 2000 scorecard of performance measures. Chief Ramsey will then discuss his own evaluation of his performance and that of the Metropolitan Police Department.

I am pleased to submit to you this morning the District of Columbia Fiscal Year 2000 Performance Accountability Report, which as you note was due on March 1. As we had advised your staff, we have been trying to consolidate this process, we have been a few days behind. But to assist GAO in their work, as you noted, we have been providing them the chapters of this report as it was prepared. So several of those, about half of them, were in their hands on March 1. We are committed, as we streamline this process, to submit next year's report well in advance of the March 1 deadline.

As you know and stated, Mayor Williams strongly supports the development of strategic goals and the use of performance goals and measures as a way of improving the delivery of municipal services to our citizens. He understands that this should not be a paperwork exercise, but needs to lead to a system of tracking progress and managing against performance on an ongoing basis.

When fully realized, the District of Columbia's performance management system will allow the government to set priorities that reflect the input of all relevant stakeholders, including citizens, local businesses, non-profit organizations, the faith community, the City Council, and the Congress; establish goals and measures that we track over an extended period of time of at least 3 to 5 years, to be able to deal with the concerns you and everyone have about shifting the goals which we are measuring year to year; establish goals and measures that tie the priorities into performance contracts between the Mayor and his cabinet agency directors that will manage against those priorities, goals, and measures; and measure and report performance to the public, the Council, and the Congress on a regular basis.

Implementing a complete performance management and reporting system is an evolutionary process, and we expect that additional improvements will need to be made over the next 2 years. Nonetheless, especially judged against my experience overseeing the Government Performance and Results Act for 3 years at OMB, I think the District Government has achieved significant success thus far in its efforts to establish a performance management system.

Let me give you a brief review of what we have achieved to date. During 1999 to 2000, the District emphasized engaging citizens in the development of its first citywide strategic plan. As we prepare to update the citywide strategic plan this coming fall, we plan to continue to engage District residents this spring and summer through identifying neighborhood-specific priorities and needs by developing 39 strategic neighborhood action plans. In addition, we plan to seek input from the Council and the Congress in updating the citywide strategic plan prior to the October 2001 Citizen Summit.

As you noted, over the course of the first 2 years of the Williams administration, we have generated some inconsistencies by changing goals and measures during the reporting period and estab-

lishing different reporting periods—fiscal years for the budget and calendar years for the District's year 2000 scorecard.

Some of this inconsistency is not surprising in the early stages of establishing a performance management system. Nonetheless, we have directed agencies to review past years' sets of goals and measures and to consolidate them into a single set of goals and measures consistent with the citywide strategic plan, agency strategic plans, the directors' performance contracts, the budget goals and performance measures, and the performance plans for the middle managers, the management supervisory service, and excepted service personnel. Ultimately we will have one set of goals that are consistent in all of our plans, budget submissions, contract reports, and performance reports. They will allow us to track trend data over a series of years.

In the past, agencies have tended to emphasize process measures or inputs and outputs. While these goals are important, we are asking agencies to shift their emphasis to measures of efficiency, quality, and outcomes, such as improvement in health care vital statistics or decreases in the number of fires throughout the District. As you noted in your opening statement, in effect, we are asking agencies to say what does the public expect of your Department and how would we measure progress toward those expectations.

However, agencies will continue to monitor selected inputs and outputs to support our efforts to develop program-based budgeting, as illustrated in a significant chapter in the FY 2000 budget that will be arriving here in the Congress in June.

Prior to the October 2000 oversight hearing before this Subcommittee, my staff worked with the General Accounting Office to spot-check selected performance measures for quality. In general, GAO found that District agencies did not adequately describe the systems or procedures for ensuring the credibility of its performance data.

Verifying our results has been a concern of the Mayor's from the start of his administration. As a result, we asked, in June, the Inspector General to audit agencies' calendar year scorecards and fiscal year measures to identify common areas in need of improvement, and best practices in agencies that can be shared with colleagues throughout the city.

One of the Inspector General's initial findings was, across several agencies, a lack of clear policies and procedures for recording, calculating, and analyzing performance data, echoing the GAO's findings. By summer 2001, my office will develop a set of general guidelines for agencies to document how they collect, manage, and report performance data for the goals and measures in the agency FY 2001 performance accountability reports and the 2003 performance accountability plans.

As much progress as we may have made in designing and implementing our performance management system, I believe we are at least another year away from a fully integrated and seamless operation. We have the major components in place—a citywide strategic plan crafted by our citizens to reflect their priorities; scorecards to present clear goals and deadlines to the public; agency-specific strategic plans that outline fundamental changes in the way each of our agencies conducts business; and individual performance con-

tracts that translate our larger citywide plans into tangible personal commitments, measures by which the Mayor and the public can judge the success of each of his cabinet members.

In future years, District budgets will be increasingly based on past performance, and requests for new funds will be accompanied by justifications tied to projected performance with and without the new funds. We have included a special chapter, as I noted, on performance-based budgeting in this year's budget for FY 2002 which the Council is now considering, and it will have one or more performance-based budgeting presentations for at least one program from each of seven major District agencies.

We anticipate presenting a full performance-based budget for at least those agencies in our FY 2003 budget a year from now. Establishing these connections between expenditures and results is critical to both make work more meaningful for District employees and to restore confidence in the District Government.

As I said at the outset, establishing the District's performance management system is an evolutionary process. We have accomplished a great deal in the first 2 years of the Williams administration, but we have more work to do. We appreciate the support we have received from this Subcommittee, from the GAO, and we look forward to working with both of you, as well as with the public, as we continue to refine and improve and update the Mayor's performance management system.

I would be happy to answer any questions you might have now or after Ms. Kellems and Chief Ramsey make their presentations.

Senator VOINOVICH. If it is all right with you in terms of your time, I would like to hear from Ms. Kellems and the Chief. Would that work out for you?

Mr. KOSKINEN. That is fine.

Senator VOINOVICH. Ms. Kellems.

**TESTIMONY OF MARGRET NEDELKOFF KELLEMS,<sup>1</sup> DEPUTY  
MAYOR FOR PUBLIC SAFETY AND JUSTICE, DISTRICT OF CO-  
LUMBIA**

Ms. KELLEMS. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the District of Columbia's performance management system. As you requested, I will outline my evaluation of the performance of Chief Charles Ramsey and the Metropolitan Police Department during 2000.

As Mr. Koskinen noted, I evaluated Chief Ramsey's performance against his FY 2000 performance contract.

Senator VOINOVICH. Can I interrupt you just a minute? If you could speak a little bit closer? Even with my hearing aids, I am having a tough time. And you can take your time.

Ms. KELLEMS. My husband tells me I talk too fast. Sorry about that.

As Mr. Koskinen noted, I evaluated Chief Ramsey's performance against his FY 2000 performance contract, his calendar year 2000 scorecard, and other relevant activities and accomplishments.

I have submitted written testimony for inclusion in the record, with your permission. That testimony outlines in much greater de-

<sup>1</sup>The prepared statement of Ms. Kellums appears in the Appendix on page 33.

tail each of the performance goals and measures that I will briefly highlight today.

Chief Ramsey's evaluation was for his performance in 2000. But by way of background, it is important to note that at the end of 1997, Part I crimes in the District totaled nearly 55,000. Chief Ramsey assumed leadership of the MPD—

Senator VOINOVICH. I am sorry. What was that?

Ms. KELLEMS. Nearly 55,000 at the end of calendar year 1997 for Part I crimes.

Chief Ramsey assumed leadership of the MPD in early 1998. Less than 2 years later, Part I crimes totaled less than 40,000, a drop of 27 percent. Homicides are the lowest in many years, as is youth violence. Much of this decline in crime can be attributed to Chief Ramsey's wholesale reform of the Department. Incrementally over the last 3 years, Chief Ramsey has implemented a community-oriented policing strategy, called Policing for Prevention, that the Chief will detail more fully in his testimony.

Certainly, there are many areas in which MPD must improve, but Chief Ramsey has exceeded expectations in controlling crime, managing major events, rebuilding the credibility of the Department, and restoring a relationship with the community.

As I will describe today, his accomplishments in 2000 met or exceeded the expectations set by the citizens. But equally important, Chief Ramsey has instilled a new pride and a new level of accountability in the Metropolitan Police Department, and the citizens of the District of Columbia are much better served by their police than ever before. He produced these outcomes while transforming all aspects of a troubled agency.

I turn to a brief outline of the component parts of the Chief's performance contract that were evaluated. Each agency director's performance contract is divided into two sections, general requirements expected of all agency directors and agency-specific requirements that are drawn from the agency's strategic plan.

Chief Ramsey's performance was evaluated against a total of nine contract requirements—three general requirements and six agency-specific requirements. Chief Ramsey exceeded expectations on four of the nine contract requirements, and met expectations on the remaining five. The rating of "exceeded expectations" means that an agency director has met 90 to 100 percent of the expectations.

The first general requirement area in each agency director's performance contract was alignment to the Mayor's Strategic Plan. In this area, Chief Ramsey exceeded expectations. His strategic plan outlined a series of performance objectives and measures, each aligned to one or more of the five key areas in the Mayor's Strategic Plan. The Chief's plan primarily supports two of these five areas—building and sustaining healthy neighborhoods, and making government work.

His plan also projects these objectives out over several years, with more rigorous performance standards each year. This long-range planning avoids the common problem of new programs and initiatives that are started up and then disappear in the same year, never achieving meaningful, lasting, and sustainable change over time.

The second general requirement in each agency director's performance contract is the establishment of performance agreements for their senior managers. Chief Ramsey met expectations in this requirement area.

He also met expectations in the third and final general requirement area in every agency head's performance contract. The third area is the development of a risk management plan for the agency.

In addition to the general requirements of all cabinet-level agency directors, each agency director's performance contract includes agency-specific performance requirements. Chief Ramsey's contract includes six such requirements drawn from his strategic plan. Chief Ramsey received ratings of "met expectations" or "exceeded expectations" on all six of these requirements. I will outline the first two of these in some detail, but further details are provided on all six in my written submission.

The first agency-specific requirement was to improve police-community coordination. This is one of the areas of most notable improvement in the Department. Under Chief Ramsey's mandate, the sworn members of the Department have received extensive training in community-police relationship-building and Problem-Solving. MPD supports the officers with literature, training, management, and accountability.

Partnerships for Problem-Solving was established in 43 Police Servicing Areas (PSA) in the year 2000 and is now in place in 55 of the District's PSA's. They will be in place in all 83 PSA's by the end of the fiscal year.

Additionally, MPD command staff participate in eight Neighborhood Service core teams in each of the city's wards. These core teams are multi-disciplinary groups that work with community members to identify, prioritize, and resolve chronic neighborhood problems such as nuisance properties that require the resources of many agencies.

One significant weakness in this requirement area that was discussed during the evaluation process was the public perception that MPD was unresponsive or uncooperative with the community in its homicide investigations. The sentiment of many homicide survivors was that their cases had been left unattended or uninvestigated. Moreover, some felt that if MPD were more cooperative, more homicide cases would be brought to successful closure. In FY 2001, Chief Ramsey is implementing sweeping reforms in homicide investigations, and has committed to meeting his 65-percent closure rate and to changing the public's perception.

The second agency-specific requirement that was evaluated was the Chief's goal of increasing the presence and visibility of sworn officers in the community. Some of the activities outlined in my written testimony address the issue of officer visibility, but the other essential element is raw numbers of officers deployed on the streets.

In June 2000, MPD achieved its budgeted staffing complement of 3,600 sworn officers. Only 12 months before, the Department had been at 3,450. In fact, at one point, in September 2000, MPD's recruiting was so successful the Department was able to make use of Federal grant funds to exceed 3,600 by 58 officers.

In addition to these 200 newly hired officers, Chief Ramsey nearly doubled that number again with his innovative redeployment program. In fact, between new hires and redeployment, Chief Ramsey put the equivalent of 344 additional officers on the street, far exceeding his performance goal.

The third MPD-specific requirement that I evaluated was the Chief's obligation to improve MPD responses to emergency and non-emergency service calls. The Chief met expectations in this area, and again I would ask you to refer to the written testimony that outlines more details about the progress we have made.

He also met expectations in the fourth agency-specific requirement, which was addressing the challenges of youth and domestic violence and child abuse. Similarly, he met expectations in building a high-quality workforce, his fifth agency-specific requirement. In giving a rating of "met expectations" in this area, I focused mainly on the Chief's recruiting and training.

The final agency-specific requirement was facilities improvement. Chief Ramsey exceeded expectations in this area. The most significant evidence of this is found in the MPD headquarters that now has a state-of-the-art command center that allows the Department to effectively manage daily operations, as well as major events such as the Presidential Inauguration.

I will provide a very brief overview of the Chief's performance against his scorecard goals. The Chief will talk about these in his testimony in much greater detail.

The performance goals, as Mr. Koskinen mentioned, are the public scorecard for agency performance. They contain the performance measures that are important to measures of success for the community.

Chief Ramsey's performance against his calendar year 2000 scorecard goals were also included. The goals were, first, put 200 more officers on the street. As I mentioned earlier, Chief Ramsey exceeded this goal through recruiting new hires, lateral transfers, and redeployment efforts that put 344 additional officers on the street.

Second, achieve a 5-percent reduction in Part I violent crime. As you noted in your opening remarks, the District realized a decrease of approximately 2.6 percent, according to our preliminary data, falling short of this target.

The third goal was to achieve a 5-percent reduction in Part I property crimes. The Chief achieved a decrease of approximately 5.2 percent, according to preliminary data, meeting this target.

The fourth public scorecard goal was to achieve a 65-percent homicide clearance rate. The actual clearance rate was approximately 57 percent. The national average for cities of comparable size is approximately 60 percent. The Chief's target remains 65 percent in 2001.

Based on my assessment of Chief Ramsey's performance in 2000 against the contract and the scorecard goals, I felt an overall rating of "exceeded expectations" was warranted. Mayor Williams and City Administrator Koskinen concurred after our February evaluation meeting with Chief Ramsey.

As Mr. Koskinen discussed in his comments, we are encouraging the agencies to set ambitious, stretch goals that they may not

achieve immediately, or even over the course of one single year. Chief Ramsey's goals were ambitious, and although he did not hit every measure under every contract requirement, he did meet and exceed expectations overall in each category.

Moreover, the citizens of the District of Columbia have benefited greatly from his leadership. The quality of life in our neighborhoods and the quality of service delivery by our police officers are evidence of his outstanding performance as our Chief of Police.

I also would be pleased to answer your questions. Thank you.

Senator VOINOVICH. Thank you very much.

Chief Ramsey.

**TESTIMONY OF CHARLES H. RAMSEY,<sup>1</sup> CHIEF OF POLICE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT**

Chief RAMSEY. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning.

The year 2000 was certainly a year of high-profile events for the Metropolitan Police Department. It was also a year of everyday challenges and quiet yet significant victories for our Department and for the communities that we serve.

With the support of this Subcommittee and the Congress, as well as Mayor Williams and the D.C. Council, the Metropolitan Police Department continues to make significant progress toward making the District of Columbia a safer, more attractive, and livable city for our residents, workers, and visitors alike.

Year in and year out, no other municipal police department in the country has to deal with the quantity or complexity of major events that we do. I am very proud of how our members respond to these challenges, in particular their handling of last April's IMF-World Bank meetings and the Presidential Inauguration. I truly believe our Department has set a new standard for planning and execution in these types of operations for ensuring that major events can take place as scheduled, that protestors can lawfully exercise their First Amendment rights, and that public safety can be maintained.

These events, however, are not without cost. Our Department has incurred significant and sometimes unbudgeted expenses for major events over the past year, both in terms of overtime and equipment. Recognizing that these events take place in the District of Columbia because this is our Nation's Capital, Congress has been very supportive in providing some financial reimbursement for our costs.

Our Department's performance over the last year involved much more than handling major events, however. The past year also saw continued reductions in crime, growing public confidence in the Metropolitan Police Department and, as we build for the future, tremendous growth and development of our community policing strategy. I am extremely proud of our members for their accomplishments in these areas as well.

Our FY 2000 performance accountability plan included four goals: (1) Put 200 more officers on the street fighting crime and

<sup>1</sup>The prepared statement with attachments of Chief Ramsey appears in the Appendix on page 43.

partnering with the community, (2) achieve a 5-percent reduction in violent crime, (3) a 5 percent reduction in property crime, and (4) achieve a 65-percent homicide closure rate. Detailed information on our performance in each of these areas is included as an attachment to my statement.

I considered these to be stretch goals, deliberately set high to give our members and the community something to strive for. For example, we set out to achieve a 5-percent reduction in crime, knowing full well that this would have come on top of significant, often double-digit crime reductions in recent years. We also set a 65-percent homicide closure rate, despite the fact that homicide clearances are falling nationally. While our Department did not meet every goal, I am still pleased with our performance in these and other critical areas over the past year.

Putting more officers on the street was a priority not just of the Police Department, but of the Mayor and the community. We not only met our goal of 200 additional officers, but exceeded it through a combination of increased hiring and more effective deployment. Our Department surpassed our hiring goals during FY 2000, thanks to more effective recruiting, strong interest in our lateral hiring program, and lower than anticipated attrition rates.

We ended FY 2000 with just over 3,650 officers, which was our highest sworn strength in many years. Our strength has dropped about 100 officers during the current fiscal year, as spending pressures have prevented the District's Chief Financial Officer from granting us the authority to hire new officers. That freeze, however, has now been lifted and we will begin hiring next month. Our long-range goal, which is being supported by a \$15 million grant from the Federal COPS office, is to rebuild the force to our authorized level of 3,800 officers.

In addition to hiring more sworn officers, we have been creative in how we deploy our personnel to ensure that we have uniformed personnel on the street when and where they are needed the most. Last year, we implemented a new shift schedule system that increased the number of officers working evenings and weekends, when crime and calls for service are at their highest.

We created the Mobile Force, which is a team of officers working voluntary overtime during the evening shift to target hot spots of crime and disorder. More recently, we established a Narcotics Strike Force which focuses on open-air drug markets. Using a special \$1 million congressional appropriation, we were able to get the Strike Force off the ground and provide it with state-of-the-art equipment and technology.

Finally, we implemented a redeployment initiative, in which most officers in specialized units or support assignments now spend 1 week each month in uniform patrolling a police service area, or PSA. Redeployment is adding dozens of officers to community patrols across the city 5 nights a week.

More officers on the street is translating into continued reductions in crime. Reported crime in the District declined for a fifth consecutive year last year, a 4-percent reduction overall according to preliminary data. This follows a 9.4-percent reduction in 1999. Homicides fell by nearly 2 percent last year, to their lowest level since 1987. Homicides involving juvenile victims, a particular con-

cern in recent years, fell by nearly one-third last year, from 28 to 19.

Other violent crimes did increase slightly in 2000, which means we fell short of our 5-percent goal. However, property crimes such as burglary and auto theft declined by more than 5 percent, falling to their lowest levels in decades last year.

Crime is down not only because more officers are on the street, but also because of stronger partnerships between police and community. Over the past year, we continued to enhance our community policing model, focusing on the critical areas of training, problem-solving, leadership, and accountability.

For example, we expanded our innovative Partnerships for Problem-Solving training program which provides residents and their officers with information and techniques on how to work together to strengthen leadership and accountability. We assigned a lieutenant to head up each PSA and provided those lieutenants with specialized tools and training on their role in community policing.

We created a new, more efficient system for police officers to access other city services that impact public safety, and we forged new partnerships with social service agencies and other providers to get at some of the underlying causes and conditions that contribute to crime in our city. For example, our Office of Youth Violence Prevention is working with the clergy and other community stakeholders to put in place effective intervention and prevention programs for at-risk youth.

As I noted earlier, the homicide rate in our city continues to drop, which is encouraging. After declining 2 percent last year, homicides are down almost 40 percent so far in 2001. My goal, and this is certainly another stretch goal, is to end the year with fewer than 200 homicides for the first time since the mid-1980's. We plan to accomplish this through a combination of focused law enforcement strategies targeting the most violent offenders, as well as intervention and prevention strategies targeting at-risk individuals and behaviors, including drug trafficking and abuse. I see this short-term goal of fewer than 200 homicides as the next step toward reducing the homicide rate even more dramatically over the next several years.

An equally important goal is to increase our homicide clearance rate. Not just the Metropolitan Police Department but major city police departments across the country are facing unprecedented challenges when it comes to solving homicides.

Whereas 35 years ago police closed almost 9 out of every 10 murders, that number has dropped to between 60 to 70 percent in recent years. This trend is driven in part by the changing nature of homicide itself. Years ago, most homicides involved family members or other people who knew one another. Today, homicides are more likely to involve strangers arguing over drugs, gang territory, and the like. This factor, combined with the reluctance of witnesses to come forward and the greater sophistication of some offenders, has led to a decline in homicide clearance rates across the country.

The District of Columbia has been no exception. Our homicide closure rate for the year 2000 was 57 percent, down from 61 percent in 1999, and below our goal of 65 percent. Increasing the

clearance rate remains a key goal for our Department and we are taking a number of steps to meet that goal.

These include a new standard operating procedure for homicide investigations; an upgrade of our computerized criminal intelligence system; a new, more rigorous selection process for detectives; enhanced victim and survivor outreach; and expanded training. In the area of training, we are creating a new criminal investigators academy, with the advice and input of London's New Scotland Yard, the world's premier investigative agency.

In short, we will do everything we can to improve our ability to investigate and close homicides and other violent crimes. To the victims and survivors of these crimes, we owe nothing less than our very best effort.

I just want to touch very briefly on other accomplishments over the past year. These were not specifically identified as goals in the year 2000, but they certainly contributed to our success last year.

One of the accomplishments is the dramatic reduction in the use of force by members of the Metropolitan Police Department. Just 2 years ago, following a series of articles in the *Washington Post* and a number of high-profile use-of-force incidents, I asked the U.S. Department of Justice to come in and help MPD analyze and reengineer the entire range of policies, procedures, equipment, and training related to the use of force.

Since then, we have worked very hard internally and with the Justice Department to make dramatic improvements in all of these areas. We are now close to finalizing a memorandum of understanding with DOJ that will endorse the changes we have made and avoid a formal consent decree that other departments have entered into.

Our reforms in this area have been substantially. We totally rewrote our use of force policy, introducing a use of force continuum that includes verbal command and less than lethal weaponry. We equipped and trained our officers with OC spray and new expandable batons, known as ASPs. We increased officers' firearm training from 8 to 16 hours a year, and expanded the course to focus on tactics and judgment, not just marksmanship. To improve investigations and recordkeeping, we created a first-ever Force Investigation Team that responds immediately to the scene of all instances in which officers use deadly force.

The results of these and other reforms have been dramatic. Over the last 2 years, police-involved shootings have declined 78 percent. In 1998, 32 suspects were shot by MPD officers, 12 of them fatally. Last year, seven suspects were shot by the police, only one fatally. In short, we have gone from being a national embarrassment in the area of use of force to a national model for innovation and effectiveness.

Over the past year, we have also expanded our level of cooperation with other law enforcement agencies that have jurisdiction in the District. This enhanced level of cooperation was critical during the IMF-World Bank protests and the Presidential Inauguration. But cooperation is also taking place on a daily basis throughout our city.

For example, a law that was spearheaded by Congresswoman Norton and passed by Congress allows our Department to enter

into cooperative agreements with other agencies, permitting them to extend their jurisdictions and to assist MPD. To date, we have cooperative agreements in place with Amtrak and the Zoological Police, and several more in the developmental stage. These, of course, are in addition to MOUs that already exist with the U.S. Capitol Police and the U.S. Park Police.

We are working closely with Federal agencies on critical problems of illegal drugs, guns, and arson. The DEA task force, for example, has provided us with valuable analysis of drug trends and markets in the District, and the task force continues to assist our enforcement efforts.

The ATF has provided the Metropolitan Police Department with new computer technology that allows our Department to access their Washington Regional Gun Crimes Center in order to trace firearms more quickly and efficiently. We have also exchanged personnel with ATF and acquired a new arson truck, as we work together on reducing arson crimes in the District. These types of cooperative efforts will be critically important in the future as we continue to focus on enhancing police presence and reducing crime.

For FY 2001 and 2002, we have made some changes in our system of defining performance goals, and I know you have some concerns around that. Rather than focus on a few relatively narrow goals, we have broadened our goals and established specific objectives and performance measures within each goal. Detailed information on these specific goals and objectives is also attached to my testimony.

While our approach to performance accountability has changed slightly, our basic commitments remain the same, to reduce and prevent crime, to hold offenders accountable, to enhance the public sense of safety, to use force judiciously and fairly, to ensure customer satisfaction, and to continue developing our organization.

I know this hearing is focusing on year 2000 performance. In closing, I would ask the Subcommittee to step back and take a slightly longer view of the progress made in the Metropolitan Police Department.

I became Chief of MPD almost 3 years ago. At that time, many of our facilities were literally falling apart. Our equipment was sub-standard, our computer technology was outdated, our policies and training were spotty, especially on critical issues such as use of force. Our recruiting was insufficient and ineffective. We were actually losing more officers than we were attracting. Our community policing strategy covered only the basics. Morale within the Department was low and community confidence in the police was shaken.

Over the past 3 years, my management team and I have worked very hard, and quite successfully I believe, to rebuild this police department. We have rebuilt not only the physical infrastructure; we have also rebuilt the pride of our members and the confidence of the people that we serve.

The fact that we are concentrating our energy and resources on something as complex as improving our homicide clearance rate and not on something as basic as equipping our districts with toilet paper or making sure officers attend firearms training is a sign of just how far we have come.

The comprehensive rebuilding effort we have undertaken could not have been possible without the support of this Subcommittee and the entire Congress. Not just your financial support, but your leadership and assistance on public safety issues in general, have made a tremendous difference to our Department and the residents that we serve.

We still have a long way to go to make our city, our Nation's Capital, as safe and livable as it should be. But I am confident that with the continued support of our Mayor, the District Government, the President, the Congress, and especially our partners in the community, we can and will continue to reduce crime and work toward making the Metropolitan Police Department a model for community policing in our Nation.

Thank you.

Senator VOINOVICH. Thank you, Chief. That was a very impressive presentation. I identified with many of the things that you were talking about because, as you know, I was Mayor of Cleveland for 10 years.

Chief RAMSEY. Yes, sir.

Senator VOINOVICH. And one of the challenges was to transform our police department into a department that was responsive to the community's needs and one that people had confidence in. I think the concept of your community officers working with the community is excellent because that is a way of breaking down the barriers between the police department and the people they are serving in the community.

I would like to get more information from you on how you are dealing with the use of force. The fact that you were able to avoid a consent decree is very impressive. My former safety director, who went to work for me when I became governor and ended up being head of the Department of Public Safety for the State, is now the safety director in the city of Columbus and trying to come to grips with that.

All over the country, we have got problems with use of force, and I am not going to ask you to go into the details with it, but I would love to see, maybe, several pages on what you did in order to put that in place. You have had some good results with it, which is very comforting to know. Sometimes, you put these things in place and you don't see the results.

Have you increased the diversity training on the part of the current officers and new officers? How do you handle that?

Chief RAMSEY. Yes, sir, we have. Actually, prior to my arrival the Department entered into an MOU with the Justice Department as the result of an action that was filed by the Hispanic Police Association some years ago that required us to enhance our diversity training. I took advantage of that and we expanded on that significantly.

We provide some 32 hours of training for recruits in the academy. We have in-service training now, which prior to my arrival was not mandated. We have 40 hours a year now for all veteran officers as part of our in-service training. Diversity is covered in that.

At the district level, what we have begun doing is as new officers come into a district, they have an orientation. The community par-

ticipates in that and they learn more about the community that they will be serving so we can more specifically target that population that is in that particular district, as opposed to just a more generic type of diversity training for officers.

Senator VOINOVICH. Do you have a violence or use-of-force crack team that comes in, or how does that work?

Chief RAMSEY. Mr. Chairman, we created a Force Investigation Team. It is in our Office of Professional Responsibility; Internal Affairs, many agencies call it. Whenever an officer discharges a firearm at a person, at a human being, this team responds immediately to the scene and takes over the investigation. Previously, those investigations were done at the district.

This team does a thorough investigation to find out whether or not the shooting was within the policy of the Department, what training implications may be—

Senator VOINOVICH. Excuse me. Is it just limited to shooting or all the use of force?

Chief RAMSEY. Well, it is expanding to all uses of force. We started it off with just shootings. Now, they are moving into all areas of use of force, whether a firearm is involved or not. So we have just given them some added responsibility. We will have to staff that unit up more so that they can handle more cases. But our feeling is that we need to attack all uses of force the same way so that we can make sure that officers are always using only that level of force that is necessary.

Senator VOINOVICH. You have a crack team of people on call 24 hours so that is the group that comes in and investigates rather than the officers who are on the scene?

Chief RAMSEY. Yes, sir, they are on call 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, whenever an incident takes place.

Senator VOINOVICH. Do you have any opportunity for citizens in the community who are unhappy with the performance of the Department to file a complaint, like a police review board or civilian review board?

Chief RAMSEY. Yes, sir. Just recently, a Citizen Complaint Review Board was established. Citizens can make a formal complaint either through our Department or through the CCRB which is now functioning. They handle excessive force, verbal abuse, harassment, those kinds of complaints. Our Internal Affairs now continues to handle other issues regarding misconduct. My goal is to eventually have our Internal Affairs handle all other forms of conduct, and take all those investigations away from the districts.

Senator VOINOVICH. I would like to know more about that, also.

As you know, my staff has been working with the Department in terms of expanding the memorandums of understanding between the Department and the various other police outfits in the District. After the shooting at the National Zoo, I think that emphasized the importance of coordination between those various police departments.

It appears that you have signed agreements now with Amtrak and the National Zoo Police, and that you are trying to work out agreements with the FBI and the GSA. Is that correct?

Chief RAMSEY. Yes, sir, it is.

Senator VOINOVICH. Are there any other agencies that you are looking at entering into agreements with?

Chief RAMSEY. Well, we have made the offer obviously to all the different agencies. The ones that we work on a regular basis and already have MOUs with are the Secret Service, the Park Police, and the Capitol Police, who cover the majority of the area in the District. We work with them on a regular basis now and they do have jurisdiction.

We have extended the offer to other agencies, the Mint Police, for an example, the Federal Protective Service, and others. Many of those are in the works in terms of what exactly it is that their area would cover, what they can do. Many of the universities in the area have expressed an interest in extending their jurisdiction beyond their campus, which would be useful in many instances, so we are working actively with them.

Senator VOINOVICH. I can tell you that the more of those agreements you have and the better understanding you can get and coordinate your effort, the more effective you are going to be. Three thousand and eight hundred is a very ambitious goal, but you can maximize your efficiency by working with other agencies and their working with you, and by coordinating all the resources you have, really make a difference.

Mr. Koskinen, I have looked at these performance issues, and the first question I would like to ask is what are we going to measure the FY 2001—what goals are you going to use?

Now, I mentioned in my opening statement that there were goals, and I talked about 20 and you performed on four. One of the questions I was going to ask is how did Ms. Kellems evaluate you. And I thought she did a pretty good job, so I don't need to ask that question.

Mr. KOSKINEN. As you know, part of the problem with performance management is that at any one point in time you are reporting on the prior year's results, acting on the current year's goals and planning the next year's goals. For instance, we just submitted the FY 2000 performance accountability report, are half-way through FY 2001 and just submitted our FY 2002 budget to the Council.

As the Mayor, the Deputy Mayors and I met with each agency to review performance in 2000, we had to review some goals for the fiscal year ending on September 30, 2000 and some goals for the calendar year ending December 31, 2000. For FY 2001, all goals will be reported on a fiscal year basis.

In addition, at the outset of the FY 2002 budget process, we asked agencies to review all existing goals—FY 1999, 2000 and 2001—and to consolidate them into a single set of goals so that we get as much continuity over time as we can, so we can look at trend data over time and tell you and others how we did in 1999, 2000, and 2001. Those consolidated goals are presented in the FY 2002 budget that Congress will receive in June.

Senator VOINOVICH. So the goals that we are going to be looking at next year will be what goals?

Mr. KOSKINEN. We have a set of goals right now for 2001 and there have been some, although much less, changes from what was in the budget presentation, which is where you have been looking

for goals, for 2001 because that budget was done last year. We have modulated those in the performance agreements with the agencies, and those will be public. They will be on Web sites. We will be delighted to provide you and your staff with exactly what those are. Those goals then build on and are consistent with the goals that are in 2002.

One of the things we did with the agencies was wherever possible, we wanted in 2001 to continue with an expansion of whatever they had in 2000. Some agency directors said, well, those are my 2000 goals, now I need to have a new set of goals. And our view was no; if those were good enough goals in 2000, we need to build on those. We may add goals, but we should, in fact, over time have a view, as I say, of looking at what does the public expect of your agency and how are you doing it.

Senator VOINOVICH. So I will specifically be able to know what the goals are for 2001 so that we can look at those and go through them item by item?

Mr. KOSKINEN. You will know, yes. In fact, the newest initiative, trying to move this along, is we, in 2000, had scorecard goals which were the performance goals extracted out of the process, and those were very visible. If you went into an office, you saw what the scorecard goals were of that department. We had a public rollout and reported on the results in January.

What we are now moving to is we would like to, in every office where you go, not only know what their goals for the year are, but have regular, updated status reports on how they are doing in the middle of that year. So if you go into the Department of Motor Vehicles, you not only know what their wait time goal is for car inspections, but you will see actually how they have been doing month by month.

We need to have that on Web sites and we want to have that out publicly so that when you walk into any District Government office, you will see what their goals are for the year and how they are doing and being measured against those goals as we move through the year rather than just once at the end of the year.

Senator VOINOVICH. There were 20, and according to the information we have they are dropping 17 of them. Are there going to be replaced with some other goals?

Ms. KELLEMS. Yes, they will be. Some of those are being replaced. Some of those are just being aggregated because of how we are going to collect the data. For MPD, the proposed measures in 2001 and 2002—there are five major goals. Under each of those, there are two or three specific measures, and I will give you an example. The Chief alluded to some of these.

The first goal is reduce and prevent crime and criminal victimization citywide. This goal will show up in 2001, 2002, 2003, and beyond. Underneath that, there are three specific measures. One is the percent change in Part I violent crime, one is the percent change in Part I property crime.

Senator VOINOVICH. Yes, but when you are talking about Part I crimes, you will break them down by categories? We are not going to get just one general number? We will be able to monitor the various levels of Part I crimes?

Ms. KELLEMS. I think the issue comes down to what that means, where we are presenting that information. All that information, publicly available statistics, are all available on the MPD Web site. One of the things we are trying to consolidate is the amount of reporting that we are doing in the various avenues that we have to report to. All of the crime statistics are broken down by type of crime and that is public information.

Mr. KOSKINEN. One of the issues with GAO—and we had the same problem with Federal agencies—one of the criticisms GAO had was we had too many goals; they were all over the place. And I think that was right. What we need, and our goal ultimately for the Department is we need three or four very visible goals that the public is concerned about in that department that we can measure, and that we can measure over time and you can see how we are doing.

There will be sub-sets. Some of them will be output goals, some will be process goals that will be internal in the agency for management purposes. But ultimately what we want to do is be able to have people understand quickly and easily what is the goal of MPD, what is the goal of the Department of Motor Vehicles, what are the major goals of the Department of Public Works, and then be able to measure against them.

There will be sub-goals and statistics available behind that, but we are trying to make it easier for people to understand. For instance, in fire, the ultimate issue and interest the public has is we would like fewer fires and we would like faster response time.

Senator VOINOVICH. So we are going to have information on response time to fires, police calls, and EMS?

Ms. KELLEMS. Absolutely.

Mr. KOSKINEN. In fact, one of the reasons the goals have changed is, again, it was a prior administration, but when you started in 1999 you had an approach and some of it was just pro forma. And as we are moving through, one of the things we are going to do and why the goals change is we are trying to refine and get better at identifying exactly how to articulate the goal in a way that resonates with people. We need to manage against the data in terms of how are we doing, but also we need to communicate that data to the public in a way that they can comfortably understand.

Senator VOINOVICH. Are you confident that you have the wherewithal to do the measuring? There was some question about whether or not, because of the recordkeeping.

Mr. KOSKINEN. Yes. In fact, the IG report has come out this week. Last summer, we asked the Inspector General, and we have been working with the GAO to take a look at what the data collection and procedures are. On the basis of their review of three or four departments, we are now developing a set of policies and procedures for all of the government agencies, because it is one thing to have the goal and one thing to have the data.

What you really want to make sure is that the data is accurate and it is in the right time frame. In other words, if you are measuring on a fiscal year basis, you want to get as much data as you can and make sure that the data being collected fits the time of the goal. So I think we will have those standards and procedures, but

we have asked the IG to continue to work with us, and audit and manage against that.

We, fortunately, and it didn't surprise me, didn't find anybody actually manufacturing data. What we have found is that the data is not being collected in all places in the same way and in an orderly way that can be replicated over time.

Senator VOINOVICH. Chief, in organizing your management team, who decides—how many districts do you have?

Chief RAMSEY. Seven, sir.

Senator VOINOVICH. Seven districts?

Chief RAMSEY. Seven districts.

Senator VOINOVICH. And then you have specialty people in charge of—what do you call them, bureaus?

Chief RAMSEY. Well, actually, we have organized now. It is all part of Operations if it is an operational unit.

Senator VOINOVICH. But there are key people in the operational unit?

Chief RAMSEY. Right.

Senator VOINOVICH. Who decides who those individuals are going to be?

Chief RAMSEY. In terms of our command staff, I do. I began a process for selection of people in the command ranks where they actually apply, and submit a resume. I ask a series of questions that they have to respond to in writing, and then set up interviews for these people with a board that is established, where my executive assistant chief chairs along with a commander and another assistant chief. And then the top 8, 9, or 10 people, I will have one-on-one interviews with.

Senator VOINOVICH. The people in order to qualify—do you have a pecking order where you go off and you get your sergeant and move them up the line? We call them inspectors, the top—do they have to achieve one of those levels before they could be considered as a district commander?

Chief RAMSEY. Yes, sir. Only captains right now, by our personnel regulations in the District, are eligible to move beyond that rank. I cannot select from any rank other than captain.

Senator VOINOVICH. What are the ranks above captain?

Chief RAMSEY. Inspector, commander, assistant chief.

Senator VOINOVICH. And the ones below are lieutenants?

Chief RAMSEY. Yes, sir. It would be police officer, detective, sergeant, lieutenant.

Senator VOINOVICH. Do you feel that you have enough flexibility with the way it is working out? My experience in Cleveland was that many times the way the civil service thing worked was that we got people that got to be inspectors, which was one of the highest ranks, and they didn't have the interpersonal skills and the management skills to get the job done. We had to reach into the lower ranks to get people, and we gave the chief the opportunity to select his own management team in terms of the district commanders and also the people who ran the bureaus.

Do you feel that you have enough flexibility there in terms of the pool?

Chief RAMSEY. It is limited when you only have captains to select from. The more flexibility, the better. But I think that you raise a

larger issue, and that is how we prepare people throughout the organization to move up the ladder, if you will.

The problem in policing is that the only way to advance financially, quite frankly, is through a promotional process. Many people take a promotional test not because they necessarily want to be supervisors, but because it pays more money and they have families to support. We need to carve out career paths for individuals that don't necessarily involve promotions into supervisory ranks, where people can be compensated based on the skills they have and what they bring to the table.

Everyone doesn't want to be a supervisor, and we wonder why a person was a heck of a detective but a terrible sergeant or a terrible lieutenant. They ought to be able to have a career path where they can stay in investigations and be rewarded.

We also do not measure people appropriately, I don't think, in terms of judging their ability to move to the next level. Most performance evaluations deal with what you do in your current role, and you could be very effective, but you need a second piece of that, and that is a judgment on your readiness to move to the next level. That is something that we are trying to put in place with our performance evaluation system that we are trying to develop within our Department.

Senator VOINOVICH. When you have these PSA's, do you have an officer assigned to each one of them?

Chief RAMSEY. Yes, sir. We have 83 police service areas in the city. We average close to 14 people per PSA. Some PSA's have many more, some have slightly less. It depends on the work volume, but they are permanently assigned for at least a year. That gives us a cadre of people who get to know the crime conditions, and the community in that particular PSA.

Senator VOINOVICH. How often does your district commanders meet with the people in those PSA's?

Chief RAMSEY. Well, we have just begun a new process now where our district commanders are required to have regular meetings with the PSA lieutenants and talk about crime and disorder problems in the PSA. They have to do that at a minimum, monthly. In some of the PSA's that are more high-crime, they do it more frequently.

So they have sessions—we call them TOPS, Targeted Organizational Performance Sessions—where they actually go in detail around all the crime and disorder problems, other performance issues, people on the medical roll, people on limited duty, various other personnel matters, too. Those lieutenants are the ones who run that PSA, and their job is to see to it that the lieutenants are running them properly and dealing with the issues.

Senator VOINOVICH. One of the things we found when we got our group together that was amazing—where we had especially burglaries, the people in the community sometimes were more effective in apprehending these individuals than we were because there was a grapevine that was working out there. They were able to not only help us with that, but also tip us off to some things that were happening in the community.

We called them police-community relations groups. The district commander was required to meet with them once a month, and

then they would have the zone officers in also to break down the barriers between the people and the department. It was just amazing, over an 8-year period, how the attitude of the folks in the neighborhood toward the department and the department toward folks in the neighborhood changed from one of an adversarial—beat-up, screaming, yelling—to finally in the last couple of years where the local groups would honor police officers and their families. Council members would get up and give tributes. It was just amazing, and it was only because people started to meet together and put each others' shoes on that really made the difference there.

Mr. KOSKINEN. We are actually building on that same concept into what we call Neighborhood Action, which is to go into the 39 clusters of communities in the District and reach out to the communities, all of the faith-based civic organizations, council staff, etc., and on a regular basis develop the plans and priorities, as I said in my testimony, and then also deal with chronic critical issues in those neighborhoods, according to the neighbors' priorities.

We pulled together all of the relevant city agencies for a safe and clean community. So we have the Department of Public Works, and Consumer and Regulatory Affairs. But most importantly, one of the major, leading agencies for us has been MPD because they have been there already in their community. So they and Fire and EMS are critical parts of what we call the core teams in each of these wards, who on a regular basis now are working not only for longer-term planning and priority-setting, but then organizing all of the agencies to work together in a community to solve problems, whether they are drug dens or abandoned housing or other kinds of chronic problems in the neighborhood that historically we have dealt with episodically, or one agency after another has tried for each problem to get the relevant agencies together and solve that individual one.

So, in effect, what we are doing is creating an ongoing set of teams, cross-government teams. But it basically goes back to your instinct, which is our experience as well, which is the people who know best about what the problems in each individual community are and what the right priorities are, are the people who live there. And if you can engage them in a dialogue, first, you will be more efficient and effective in your work. But, second, you will then correspondingly develop a much greater confidence and acceptance by the community of the work that their government across the board is doing.

Senator VOINOVICH. Well, it is amazing. I have gone back to Cleveland several times, out in the neighborhoods, and our local development corporations and our neighborhood housing organizations have just been unbelievable in terms of dealing with rehab, new housing, code enforcement, and the rest of it. In fact, people volunteer to do code enforcement for us, neighborhood people.

Mr. KOSKINEN. We have volunteers who go with us on our clean city assessments. In one area, we are doing them every 2 weeks and the assessors are volunteers from the neighborhoods, who have said, gee, we will come out and help you. And then we publish which streets are clean, which are hazardous. Again, we have had

this tremendous outreach from the community, who are very knowledgeable and delighted to play a role with us.

Senator VOINOVICH. The last question, and we didn't get a chance to talk about it when you were in the office, but is there any thought being given to instituting quality management in the city? What I mean by quality management is the training of people who work in the city in quality principles and problem-solving, creating quality management team facilitators, and in effect empowering the people who are charged with the responsibility to get the job done, to come back and talk about how they think they can best achieve what it is.

Mr. KOSKINEN. We are coming at that in two ways. One is we started with performance agreements with the cabinet heads. We now have performance agreements that are being developed, or were supposed to be developed by now, with all the middle managers. We have a management supervisory service, who are managers who have agreed to be at will, rather than civil service-protected, in exchange for bonuses for performance, and then any other manager. And then we are going to go down to performance agreements with front-line workers, which again will allow everyone to be working in the same direction.

But at the same time, we have a citywide effort for what are called labor-management partnerships, and we are developing partnership councils in each agency which are focused on just that issue. With front-line workers and managers, how do we do the work today? How could we improve the work we are doing so that, in fact, we provide better-quality services and meet these performance expectations that we are generating?

We have some wonderful examples, as everyone does. It is the Japanese quality circle concept that, again, workers on the front lines are the best people at reengineering the process.

Senator VOINOVICH. Is it organized or is it more extemporaneous department by department?

Mr. KOSKINEN. We have set up an Office of Labor-Management Partnerships in my office. We have a citywide council chaired by the Mayor and labor leaders, and one of their performance goals is, in fact, to have active labor-management partnership councils in every agency this year. We have training we provide. We have trained facilitators.

In fact, one of the performance measures in the performance agreement by the agency heads with the Mayor is to make progress on labor-management partnerships and to meet the requirements to make sure that their managers have performance agreements. So we will measure each cabinet head on how they are doing in those two areas, as well as how they are doing in overall performance.

Senator VOINOVICH. I would like some more information on that from you, OK?

Mr. KOSKINEN. Yes, we would be delighted to provide that.

Senator VOINOVICH. How much time did you spend with the Chief evaluating his performance?

Ms. KELLEMS. I spent a lot of time by myself evaluating it and talking to other people and getting input from the community, from staff in the organization, reviewing statistics and their reports. To

get an estimate on my time, I would probably say it was maybe 40 or 50 hours.

The Chief and I met and discussed these goals, and contents, and what things he was being reviewed, on so that he had an opportunity to give me additional information if I hadn't captured it. And then the document that I drafted was presented to the Mayor and to the City Administrator.

Senator VOINOVICH. How much time did you actually spend sitting with him and doing the evaluation?

Ms. KELLEMS. During the actual document presentation?

Senator VOINOVICH. Yes, actually sat down with him and got all the details and you did the backup stuff. How much time did you actually spend sitting at the table?

Ms. KELLEMS. Maybe 2 hours.

Senator VOINOVICH. Pardon?

Ms. KELLEMS. Maybe 2 hours just in this part of it, but I think it is important to note the Chief and I spend a good amount of time everyday on the phone or communicating or in meetings. This is very much an ongoing, daily management issue, not a drop in, parachute in once a year and try to capture things.

And I told the Chief if I am not learning anything new in this evaluation process, then I haven't done my job and neither has he. It was really a way of collecting and presenting the information to make sure that it met all of the requirements to satisfy the Mayor.

Senator VOINOVICH. Chief, how much time do you spend evaluating your district commanders, how much physical time in a room going through the procedure?

Chief RAMSEY. Well, I have a couple of things that I do. With district commanders and district chiefs, I have the targeted organizational performance sessions that I personally get involved in. I had a staff meeting I attended yesterday, for an example, with all the district commanders and assistant chiefs that went on for probably about 3 hours and we looked at a variety of issues.

I have a weekly executive staff meeting, usually on Fridays, where again for about a 3-hour period we get together and we go through all the different issues—crime, and various other issues that affect the Department.

Senator VOINOVICH. What I am saying is how many people in your management team do you personally sit down with the paperwork and go through it and write the stuff down and then dialogue with them and let them know where they are?

Chief RAMSEY. I do a quarterly one-on-one with command staff, is what I do, and I allow an hour, an hour-and-a-half to go through that. But, again, it is no surprise because we communicate on a daily basis. There is absolutely nothing that we talk about that they wouldn't already be aware of.

Actually, after a couple of months have past, if there is an issue, it is usually too late to really try to successfully resolve it. So on a daily basis, I take a look at our crime summary. I take a look at a variety of other issues. I get on the phone. I will make surprise visits.

Senator VOINOVICH. Getting back to that time that you sit down and you gather the information and you have to go through that exercise of thinking about how did they do in terms of their goals

and then sit down and look them in the eye and say, you have this yearly performance and it has been satisfactory, it has been better than satisfactory, and let's talk about next year, about how much time do you personally do that?

Chief RAMSEY. I would say probably—and I guess I am not answering your question properly, but probably a quarter of my over-all time is spent dealing with individual command staff.

Mr. KOSKINEN. I think what the Senator is after is when you do the actual formal evaluation, what is that process? In other words, sitting down and actually either quarterly or annually—

Chief RAMSEY. Because of the fact that these statistics are being compiled on a regular basis and I review it on a daily basis, I would say that for the formal evaluation it probably takes about 3 to 4 hours to prepare for it, so I go over all the information, and then it takes another 1½ to 2 hours to sit down with an individual, depending on their command, depending on the issues, to spend time one-on-one with them talking specifically about them.

Senator VOINOVICH. The reason I am asking is because we talk about performance evaluation with individuals, and I know that it is one of the most difficult things that I have had to do over my career as a governor to sit down and go off someplace and get the information and go through the form and fill it in and then sit down with someone and talk to them about their performance and have that kind of experience.

I think it is one of the things that we talk a lot about, but doesn't really get done as much as we would like it to. Too often, the quality of it isn't as good as it should be. It is kind of neglected and I think it is really important that it be emphasized.

Mr. KOSKINEN. And as I noted, and I didn't give the details, the culmination of all of this is the Mayor and I, often with the deputy mayors, spend at least an hour with every cabinet secretary reviewing at the end of the year how they did for 2000. We will have a cluster review with the Mayor for an hour-and-a-half at mid-year, as well.

But you are exactly right. Having spent 35 years both in the private sector and the public sector as a senior manager, no one ever actually looks forward to sitting down and going through that process. So what you need to do so everyone understands its value is design a system that, in fact, makes that just part of the way the operation works.

So at the citywide level, we do a mid-year review with the clusters, and then the Mayor and I—and it got delayed and part of the reason it got delayed was his schedule. But we probably spent an hour each in 30 different meetings, so we spent 30 hours, the two of us, going department by department doing just what you said. How did you do last year? What is your evaluation and what is the evaluation of the deputy mayor? What are your goals for next year? How do those goals relate? What are your resource needs?

Ultimately, everybody at the end of the process thinks it is worthwhile. But you are right; when you look at the next time of 30 more of those meetings, you begin to think isn't there some way I could shorten this?

Senator VOINOVICH. Well, thank you very much for being here today, and I look forward to working with you.

Ms. KELLEMS. Thank you.

Chief RAMSEY. Thank you, sir.

[Whereupon, at 11:35 a.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

# APPENDIX

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
EXECUTIVE OFFICE

OFFICE OF THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR  
DEPUTY MAYOR



PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:  
AN OVERVIEW AND STATUS REPORT

TESTIMONY OF JOHN A. KOSKINEN

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT, RESTRUCTURING  
AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS  
UNITED STATES SENATE

MARCH 22, 2001

Chairman Voinovich, Senator Durbin, members of the Subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to provide you with an update on the status of the development of the District of Columbia's performance management system.

I am joined here today by Margret Nedelkoff Kellems, Deputy Mayor of Public Safety and Justice and Charles H. Ramsey, Chief of the Metropolitan Police Department. I will present an overview of the District's performance management system: our ultimate goal, the current status of several issues we still need to address and our prognosis of how long it will take to resolve these issues. Ms. Kellems will discuss the criteria she used to evaluate Chief Ramsey's performance during 2000 including the Chief's FY 2000 performance contract with Mayor Williams and the Chief's calendar year 2000 scorecard. Chief Ramsey will discuss his own evaluation of his performance and that of the Metropolitan Police.

As you know, Mayor Williams strongly supports the development of strategic goals and the use of performance goals and measures as a way of improving the delivery of municipal services to our citizens. He understands that this should not be a paperwork exercise but needs to lead to a system of tracking progress and managing against performance data on an ongoing basis.

**The Ultimate Goal**

When fully realized, the District of Columbia's performance management system will allow the District government to:

- Set priorities that reflect the input of all relevant stakeholders including citizens, local businesses, non-profit organizations, the faith community, Council and Congress;
- Establish goals and measures that we track over an extended period of time of at least three-five years;

- Tie the priorities, goals and measures into performance contracts between the Mayor and his cabinet agency directors;
- Manage against the priorities goals and measures; and
- Measure and report performance to the general public, Council and Congress on a regular basis.

#### Current Status

Implementing a complete performance management and reporting system is an evolutionary process and we expect that additional improvements will need to be made over the next two years. Nonetheless, especially judged against my experience at OMB for three years overseeing the implementation of the Government Performance and Results Act, I think the District Government has achieved significant success thus far in its efforts to establish a performance management system.

Let me now give you a sense of what we have achieved to date.

*Stakeholder input:* During 1999-2000, the District emphasized engaging citizens in the development of its first citywide strategic plan. As we prepare to update the Citywide Strategic Plan this coming fall, we plan to continue engaging District residents this spring and summer through *Neighborhood Action* and, as the name implies, we will emphasize neighborhood specific priorities and needs by developing 39 strategic neighborhood action plans (SNAPs). In addition, we plan to seek input from the Council and Congress in updating the Citywide Strategic Plan prior to the October 2001 Citizen Summit.

*Consistency:* Over the course of the first two years of the Williams' Administration, we have generated some inconsistencies by changing goals and measures during the reporting year and establishing different reporting periods—fiscal year for the budget and calendar year for the District's 2000 Scorecard. Some of this inconsistency is not surprising in the early stages of establishing a performance management system. However, we have directed agencies to review past years' sets of goals and measures and to consolidate them into a single set consistent with:

- City wide strategic plan
- Agency strategic plan
- Directors' performance contracts
- Budget and goals and performance measures
- Performance plans for MSS and excepted service personnel

We have presented these consolidated goals and measures in the FY 2002 Operating Budget and Financial Plan that was transmitted to Council last week. The pattern of changing goals and measures will lessen with each performance plan and report but will continue through the FY 2002 performance accountability report that the District will issue in March 2003. We anticipate that the performance goals and measures presented in the FY 2003 budget will remain significantly more constant through the planning, implementation and reporting phases that will culminate in the FY 2003 performance accountability report in March 2004.

Achieving this consistency among the goals presented in the performance accountability plan and the subsequent performance accountability report two years later is critical so that we may begin to see emerging trends in improving or deteriorating performance.

*Nature of Goals:* In the past agencies have tended to emphasize process measures or inputs and outputs. While these goals are important, we are asking agencies to shift their emphasis to measures of efficiency, quality and outcomes such as improvement in healthcare vital statistics or decreases in the number of fires throughout the District. However, agencies will continue to monitor selected inputs and outputs to support our efforts to develop program-based budgeting that we illustrated in the special chapter in our FY 2002 budget.

*FY 2002 Performance Accountability Plan:* As agreed with this committee last fall and codified into law by the Performance Accountability Plan Amendments Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-449), the District's budget will serve as its performance accountability plan. Each agency's budget chapter includes performance goals and measures drawn from its strategic plan, if it has one in place, or aligned to its mission statement if no strategic plan is in place. The Mayor's Budget, transmitted to Council on March 12, 2001 serves as the District's initial performance accountability plan. The FY 2002 Operating Budget and Financial Plan, due to be transmitted to Congress in June 2001 following the District's consensus process will serve as the final plan.

*Data Quality:* Prior to the October 2000 oversight hearing, my staff worked with the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) to spot-check selected performance measures. In general, GAO found that District agencies did not adequately describe the systems or procedures for ensuring the credibility of its performance data. Verifying our results has been a concern of the Mayor's from the start of his administration. While we could not afford to wait for perfect data to set and measure our strategic goals, we need to improve the availability and reliability of our data to allow us to manage effectively against actual results.

The District had already taken steps to address this before the October hearing. In June 2000 Mayor Williams asked the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) to audit the agencies' calendar year scorecard and fiscal year performance contract measures to identify common areas in need of improvement and best practices in agencies that can be shared with their colleagues throughout the city. We had hoped to include the Inspector General's findings in our FY 2000 performance accountability report, but OIG just issued their final report this week.

One of the OIG's initial findings recurring in several agencies is a lack of clear policies and procedures for recording, calculating and analyzing performance data, echoing the GAO's findings. Too many agencies' performance data operations are dependent on the individual(s) assigned to the responsibility today—should any of these personnel leave, there is little documentation on reporting practices. In some instances, OIG has also found that data collection methodologies do not stand-up to basic stress tests of possible albeit unlikely changes in conditions.

By summer 2001, my office will develop a set of general guidelines for agencies to document how they collect, manage and report performance data for the goals and measures in agency *FY 2001 Performance Accountability Reports* and *FY 2003 Performance Accountability Plans*. OCA will continue to seek input from the Office of the Inspector General and welcomes recommendations from the District of Columbia Auditor and the U.S. General Accounting Office for establishing the proposed guidelines.

*Directors' Performance Reviews:* The Mayor, Deputy Mayors and I have just completed our review of more than 30 agency directors based on our evaluation and ratings on performance against FY 2000 performance contracts, calendar year scorecard goals and selected activities and accomplishments outside the scope of either the contract or scorecard. Deputy Mayor Kellems will discuss how she conducted this evaluation of the Metropolitan Police Department in her comments.

*Publicizing Our Results:* As important as it is for the District to report regularly to Council and Congress on progress against our goals and commitments, it is perhaps more important to publicize our results to the residents and other stakeholders in the District. In January we published our calendar year 2000 Scorecard. Those results are incorporated into our FY 2000 performance accountability report, including a March 2001 update on results that were not available at the press deadline for the December report.

However, annual reports are not sufficient to keep the public apprised of our progress in meeting our commitments. I have asked agency directors to begin posting FY 2001 scorecard results in their agency lobbies on at least a quarterly basis by this spring.

#### **Prognosis**

As much progress as we have made in designing and implementing our performance management system, I believe we are at least another year away from a fully integrated and seamless operation. We have the major components in place: 1) A Citywide Strategic Plan, crafted by our citizens to reflect their priorities; 2) Scorecards that present clear goals and deadlines to the public; 3) Agency-Specific Strategic Plans that outline fundamental changes in the way each of our agencies would conduct business; and 4) Individual performance contracts that translate our larger, citywide plans into tangible, personal commitments—measures by which the Mayor can judge the success of each of his cabinet members.

However, we did not accomplish everything we intended during 2000 according to our own timetables or statutory deadlines set by Council and Congress. Below is a discussion of our accomplishments and some of the challenges we encountered.

*Directors' Performance Assessments:* This year we delayed the directors' performance evaluations to incorporate their performance against calendar year scorecard goals as well as their fiscal year performance contracts. We have set the reporting period for all goals and measures to the fiscal year for FY 2001 and beyond to avoid such delays in the future.

*Single Set of Goals:* In addition, we are moving toward a single set of goals. In addition to the discrepancy among reporting periods, not all goals in agency scorecards were reflected in their

strategic plans or performance contracts. As discussed above, we have made progress in consolidating agencies' disparate goals during the FY 2002 budget development cycle, but we anticipate some continuing changes

*Manage Toward the Goals:* While the Mayor and Deputy Mayors evaluated agency directors against the goals in their performance contracts, we need to do more to ensure that directors are assessing their senior managers and management supervisory service employees against the same set of goals. Agency directors will complete their draft FY 2002 performance contracts no later than September 2001 so that deputy directors, senior managers and all other agency staff have access to their director's goals in developing their FY 2002 individual performance plans. As we evaluated agency directors on their performance against their strategic goals, agency directors will be able to evaluate their own senior managers and management supervisory service personnel on how their day-to-day efforts support the agency's pursuit of those goals. In turn, agency directors will increasingly be evaluated against the performance of their senior managers in meeting their internal agency goals.

*The Importance of Missing Some Goals:* On its face this statement is counterintuitive but it is a critical element of the culture change we need to make in encouraging agency directors and all District employees to set ambitious stretch goals. If performance bonuses, salary increases and promotions are contingent on achieving every single goal and target, the goals agencies and individuals establish will not be very ambitious and will serve the District residents less well. I would rather award a bonus to someone who just missed one or two of his or her targets on a set of ambitious goals rather than to someone who met or exceeded every target on a set of timid goals. Constructing our performance evaluation system to recognize and reward ambitious goals will be challenging but not as challenging as changing the attitudes and behaviors of employees used to working in a government that penalized any failure and thereby encouraged setting conservative, easily achievable goals to the extent that goals were set at all.

*Base Budget and Management Decisions on Goals:* In future years, District budgets will be increasingly based on past performance and requests for new funds will be accompanied by justifications tied to projected performance with and without the new funds. We have included a special chapter on program-based budgeting in our FY 2002 budget and anticipate presenting full program-based budgets for at least the seven agencies highlighted in that chapter in our FY 2003 budget. Establishing these connections between expenditures and results is critical to both make work more meaningful for District employees and restoring confidence in the District government.

*FY 2001 Performance Reporting:* For FY 2001 we plan to consolidate the directors' self-evaluations with the performance accountability reports due to both Council and Congress. Combined with unifying the reporting period for all goals and measures to a fiscal year basis, this will streamline reporting and ensure that agencies meet the Council's January deadline and the District meets Congress's March deadline.

#### **Conclusion**

As I said at the outset, establishing the District's performance management system is an evolutionary process. We have accomplished a great deal in the first two years of the Williams

administration. At the same time, in light of where we are today and where we hope to be in a year or two with the Council and Congress, we recognize where our earliest performance plans, goals and measures fell short of statutory requirements. We addressed many of those shortcomings in developing the FY 2001 budget and have addressed more still in the ongoing FY 2002 budget development cycle. With each budget cycle the components of our performance management system are more closely aligned to each other and better meet the reporting needs of Council, Congress and the residents of the District of Columbia.

Thank you. I welcome any questions you may have now or after Deputy Mayor Kellems and Chief Ramsey's comments.

**Hearing on Performance Management in the District of Columbia:  
Evaluating the Performance of  
The Metropolitan Police Department**

**United States Senate  
Committee on Governmental Affairs  
Subcommittee on Oversight of Government, Restructuring  
and the District of Columbia**

**The Honorable George V. Voinovich  
Chairman**



**Testimony of Margret Nedelkoff Kellems  
Deputy Mayor for Public Safety and Justice**

**March 22, 2001  
10:00 a.m.  
342 Dirksen Senate Office Building**

Chairman Voinovich, Senator Durbin, members of the Subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to discuss the District of Columbia's performance management system. As you requested, I will outline my evaluation of the performance of Chief Charles Ramsey and the Metropolitan Police Department during 2000. As Mr. Koskinen noted, I evaluated Chief Ramsey's performance against his FY 2000 performance contract, his calendar year 2000 scorecard, and other relevant activities and accomplishments outside the scope of each.

## OVERVIEW

At the end of 1997, Part I crimes totaled approximately 54,770. Chief Ramsey assumed leadership of the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) in early 1998, and Part I crimes totaled less than 40,000 by the end of calendar year 2000 – a drop of approximately 27%. Homicides are the lowest in decades, as is youth violence.

Much of this decline in crime can be attributed to Chief Ramsey's whole-scale reform of the Department. Incrementally over the last three years, Chief Ramsey has implemented a community-oriented policing strategy called Policing for Prevention. The Chief will detail this strategy more fully in his testimony. In short, officers are now trained in problem solving, community involvement, and victimization response. Community members are actively engaged in problem-solving with their neighborhood patrol officers, so that we can resolve the problems that enable and foster crime in the community.

Policing for Prevention is the driving force of the Chief's strategic plan for his Department. That plan, aligned with the city's strategic plan, focuses on preventing crime and engaging the community in building and sustaining their own healthy neighborhoods. Under that strategic plan in FY2000, the Chief assigned the equivalent of 344 additional officers to the seven police districts. He deployed a Mobile Force that targets open-air drug markets and crime hotspots in the neighborhoods. He created an Office of Youth Violence Prevention and is now establishing the first-ever Chief's Youth Advisory Council.

The Policing for Prevention operating model, and all of its component programs, do not operate in isolation, however. They are fully integrated into a larger city-wide agenda that addresses youth violence reduction, neighborhood service delivery, and victims' services, among others.

Certainly, there are many areas in which the MPD must improve, but Chief Ramsey has far exceeded expectations in controlling crime, managing major events, rebuilding the credibility of the Department, and restoring a relationship with the community. Perhaps most importantly, Chief Ramsey has instilled a new pride and a new level of accountability in the Metropolitan Police Department, and the citizens of the District of Columbia are much better served by their police than ever before. He produced these outcomes while transforming all aspects of a troubled agency.

**THE CHIEF’S PERFORMANCE CONTRACT**

I turn now to a brief outline of the component parts of the Chief’s contract that were evaluated.

Each agency director’s performance contract is divided into two sections: 1) general requirements expected of all agency directors and 2) agency specific requirements drawn from the agency’s strategic plan. Chief Ramsey’s performance was evaluated against a total of 9 contract requirements – three general requirements and six agency specific requirements from the MPD FY 2000-2001 Strategic Plan. *(Note: Two general requirements – identifying competitive costing pilots and meeting the District’s standards for responsiveness to customers – that were included in agency performance contracts were excluded from all director evaluations for reasons described below.)*

**Performance Contract Rating**

Chief Ramsey exceeded expectations on four contract requirements and met expectations on five contract requirements. The ratings criteria to award an overall rating of Exceeded Expectations established at the start of FY 2000 read as follows:

Exceeded Expectations: Met 90-100% of the expectations or more (i.e., met expectations, achieved additional cost savings, added productivity, and/or engaged in innovative actions that benefited the District government).

**General Requirements**

During FY 2000, each agency director was expected to address each of the five general requirements that appear in the table below. Based on my evaluation of Chief Ramsey’s performance, I rated his performance on each of the five requirements as shown below:

GENERAL REQUIREMENT	RATING
1. Alignment to the Mayor’s Strategic Plan	EXCEEDED
2. Performance Agreements for Senior Managers	MET
3. Competitive Costing Pilots	EXCLUDED
4. Responsiveness to Customers	EXCLUDED
5. Risk Management	MET

1. Alignment to the Mayor’s Strategic Plan: The mission of the Metropolitan Police Department is to “Prevent crime and the fear of crime by working with others to build safe and healthy neighborhoods.” Chief Ramsey has highlighted over 50 successful initiatives and accomplishments and has linked each item to at least one of the categories outlined in the City Wide Strategic Plan.

For example, one of MPD's strategic goals is to reduce and prevent crime and criminal victimization. In support of that goal, MPD outlines three categories of objectives and detailed accomplishments within each:

- Improve Police Response to Crime
  - Implemented new Computer Aided Dispatch System (CAD) and other operational reforms in communications center
  - Implemented non-emergency 311
- Improve Police, Community, and City Agency Coordination in Addressing Crime and Disorder
  - Published and trained on new roles, Policing for Prevention, and Patrol Service Area (PSA) Action Plans.
  - Redefined roles of management to align to mission and Policing for Prevention strategies.
  - Implemented Neighborhood Services Initiative programs.
  - Trained 43 of 83 PSA teams in Partnerships for Problem Solving.
  - PSA meetings and crime stats are published on the web.
- Provide Crime Prevention Services to Most Vulnerable
  - Established Youth Violence Prevention Office and staffed Youth Intervention Team with four officers.
  - Expanded faith-based initiative to Central ROC.
  - Implemented gun buy-back program.
  - Began providing offense reports, crime prevention brochures, and crime victimization information to victims of certain crimes.
  - Developed and began mandatory in-service training on victimization.

2. Performance Agreements for Senior Managers: Chief Ramsey established Performance Agreements for Executive Assistant Chief Terrance Gainer, Senior Executive Director Nola Joyce, and Senior Executive Director Erik Coard, the senior management team of MPD. These contracts are on file with the Mayor's Office. Performance evaluations have been conducted and Chief Ramsey is of the opinion that his senior managers have performed at the requisite 75-90 percent success rate. The Department is currently developing a performance management program for all management ranks in the Department.
3. Competitive Costing Pilots: The general requirement for Competitive Costing Pilots was not included in the evaluation of Chief Ramsey or any agency director because the Office of the City Administrator did not fully implement its plans to develop activity-based costing model projects in agencies.
4. Responsiveness to Customers: Agencies are expected to acknowledge receipt of constituent information or service requests within 48 hours (2 business days) 80 percent of the time. This general requirement was also excluded from the agency directors' performance evaluations because we had not yet fully implemented the customer tracking system in all agencies. Customer service will be included, however, in Chief Ramsey's and all agency directors' FY2001 performance evaluations.

5. Risk Management: MPD has drafted and submitted a risk management plan for current and future initiatives. The Risk Management program is managed by the Executive Director of Quality Assurance in MPD. Recently, an expert in Law Enforcement Risk Management has been brought on staff and is now training line personnel and administrative staff on risk reduction alternatives.

One of the most significant risk drivers in MPD is the use of force. This issue has received special attention in the Department. Chief Ramsey, with the support and participation of the Administration, took proactive measures to reduce the MPD's risk in this area and invited the United States Department of Justice (US DOJ) to work collaboratively to resolve this issue.

In the last year and half, MPD has made great progress in reducing the use of excessive or mitigable force by officers and canines. Draft operating policies have been developed. New training curricula are in place at the academy. A nationally-recognized program called the Force Investigation Team (FIT) is now responding to all instances of use of force within the Department. The FIT Team is now considered a "best practice" in law enforcement. These efforts have culminated in the praise of the US DOJ and the offer to enter voluntarily into a use of force Memorandum of Understanding (as opposed to being forced into action by a law suit or consent decree as has happened in many other jurisdictions).

**Agency Specific Requirements**

In addition to the general requirements asked of all cabinet agency directors, Chief Ramsey's performance contract includes six requirements drawn from the MPD FY 2000-2001 Strategic Plan. Chief Ramsey received ratings of "met expectations" or "exceeded expectations" on all six of these requirements.

AGENCY SPECIFIC REQUIREMENT	RATING
6. Improve Community Police Coordination	EXCEEDED
7. Increase the Presence and Visibility of Sworn Officers in Communities	EXCEEDED
8. Improve MPD Response to Emergency and non-Emergency Service Calls	MET
9. Address the Challenges of Youth/Domestic Violence and Child Abuse	MET
10. Build a High Quality Workforce	MET
11. Improve Facilities	EXCEEDED

6. Improve Community Police Coordination: This is one of the areas of most notable improvement. Under Chief Ramsey's mandate, the sworn members of the Department have received extensive training in community-police relationship

building and problem solving. MPD supports the officers with literature, training, management, and accountability. Partnerships for Problem Solving were established in 43 PSAs in 2000 and are now in place in 55 of the District's PSAs and will be in place in all 83 PSAs by the end of the fiscal year.

All 7 police districts have deployed the City Service Request System that allows officers to enter constituent requests for service into a centralized tracking and reporting system. The requesting officer can then track the status of the service request against the city's service schedule and follow up with the responsible agency or the constituent. Additionally, MPD command staff participate in each of the eight Neighborhood Services Core Teams in each of the city's wards. These Core Teams are multi-disciplinary groups that work with community members to identify, prioritize, and resolve chronic neighborhood problems such as nuisance properties that require the resources of many agencies.

One significant weakness in this area in FY2000 was the public perception that MPD was largely unresponsive and uncooperative with the community in homicide investigations. The sentiment of many homicide survivors is that their cases were left unattended and uninvestigated. Moreover, many feel that if MPD were more cooperative, more homicide cases would be brought to successful closure. In FY01, Chief Ramsey is implementing sweeping reforms in homicide investigations and has committed to changing the public's perception and driving up the closure rate.

7. Increase the Presence and Visibility of Sworn Officers in Communities: I have described much of the issue of officer visibility above, but there is one more essential element – raw numbers of officers deployed on the streets.

In June 2000, MPD achieved its full, funded staffing complement of 3,600 sworn officers. Only 12 months before, MPD was at approximately 3,450 sworns. This impressive accomplishment is the result of several factors including recruitment of new officers and lateral transfers from outside agencies. At one point in September 2000, MPD reached 3,658 sworns – the unbudgeted officers were funded in large part through the COPS Universal Hiring Program grant.

In addition to these newly hired officers, Chief Ramsey nearly doubled the number of new officers on the streets with his innovative redeployment program. In fact, between new hires and redeployment, Chief Ramsey put the equivalent of 344 officers on the streets, far exceeding his performance goal of 200. Sworn officer schedules were also realigned to match the ebbs and flows of crime throughout the days of the week and the hours of the day, including a new "power shift" from 4 p.m. to 12 midnight.

Finally, 110 positions were identified for civilianization efforts, addressing the common criticism that too many sworns are assigned to desk jobs. FY01 budget pressures prevent the Department from continuing this effort. Nonetheless, the

redeployment, the increased staffing levels, and the new operations units like Mobile Force and the Gang Unit have had a tremendous impact on officer visibility.

The one area which has the potential to yield even greater police presence on the streets is the reform of mandatory court-related overtime. This issue, however, implicates many agencies outside of MPD, and outside of city control. MPD continues to be an active participant and catalyst for court-related overtime reform.

8. Improve MPD Response to Emergency and non-Emergency Service Calls: In early FY2000, MPD was criticized for its poor response to calls for service. During the fiscal year, MPD made a number of operational and infrastructure improvements in this area. Specifically, MPD implemented a new Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system in the communications center. Additionally, Chief Ramsey developed new protocols for managing call response and dispatch, such as on-site monitoring and technical support. A recent one-year anniversary story by a local television station found *no* evidence that the problem of “dropped calls” still existed. Standards are now in place that mandate five second pick up for 911 calls.

Further, Chief Ramsey implemented a 311 non-emergency call system to relieve some of the burden on the 911 emergency system. MPD continues to work closely with the Citywide Call Center to coordinate the response to 311 calls for services. Standards are now in place for 10 second pickup for 311 calls.

The final piece of the response program is the consolidation of the MPD 911 system with the Fire and EMS emergency dispatch system. In FY01, MPD is on schedule to purchase a new Automated Call Distributor (ACD) system and co-locate with FEMS at the McMillan Reservoir facility. The anticipated completion date for this integration is June 2001.

9. Address the Challenges of Youth/Domestic Violence and Child Abuse: Chief Ramsey has implemented a number of new programs to respond to this broad goal. First, MPD now has a Youth Violence Prevention program office managed by an Assistant Chief. This office houses the Youth Violence Intervention Team – a multidisciplinary team comprising representatives from MPD, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (for youthful offenders over 18), and the Court Social Services Division (for youthful offenders under 18), among others. This team is charged with identifying at-risk youth and intervening to prevent their bad conduct from escalating to crime.

MPD works closely with faith-based and community-based organizations to offer opportunities to these youth to help them stay on the right path. MPD has developed a particularly effective relationship with the 7 Point Coalition and Inner Thoughts in ROC East. A second partnership is being developed in ROC Central with financial support from a grant from my office. The new Police Fund is also providing financial assistance to MPD by sponsoring programs that will assist in youth crime prevention.

Finally, Chief Ramsey has a renewed commitment to the MPD Boys and Girls Clubs and has expanded enrollment for troubled youth in Camp Brown.

In the area of Domestic Violence (DV) and other sexual victimization, Chief Ramsey has put MPD at the forefront. The Department developed and introduced a new DV curriculum that sensitizes officer to the unique requirements of DV cases and the needs of DV victims. MPD has also spearheaded a technology initiative for identifying and tracking DV offenders and victims. The Department was and continues to be a strong supporter of the Rape Crisis Center's new Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) program at Howard University.

In FY01, MPD is trying to expand the scope of the city's DV initiatives to include other elements of family violence prevention.

10. Build a High Quality Workforce: Recruiting and training were the primary focuses in this goal area. MPD's ability to hire laterally has made a significant difference in the quality of the workforce. Lateral hires bring experience and expertise that takes many years to acquire. The Department benefit from this tool by hiring strategically to improve several of its operations like case investigations.

Training is the second key component. Until Chief Ramsey took over the Department, there were no in-service training requirements for officers. Now, all officers receive mandatory continuing education in regular training cycles. They are also recertified in firearms twice annually. MPD's Institute of Police Science has implemented a program called "Every Day is Training Day." This program produces daily roll call training sessions which focus on the high risk activities in which officers must engage.

Notwithstanding these improvements, Chief Ramsey is still struggling to overcome decades of apathy, poor management, and an ingrained culture of troubled performance. Changing an organizational culture is a slow process. Chief Ramsey has made significant strides in the last year in building performance excellence in his agency.

11. Improve Facilities: Chief Ramsey exceeded his performance goal in this area by upgrading HVAC systems in multiple sites and installing emergency power systems. He also undertook major interior and exterior facility improvement projects at the municipal center. There is now a state of the art command center there that allows the Department to effectively manage daily operations as well as major events such as the Inauguration. Finally, all three of the Regional Operations Command center were relocated to neighborhood-based facilities in keeping with the Mayor's government centers initiative that moves government offices into the community.

## THE MPD SCORECARD

In addition to each agency director's performance contract, each director established a scorecard for agency performance. The scorecards contain three to five significant performance goals that are important measures of success for the community. These goals emerged during the citywide strategic planning process that began at the Citizen Summit in November 1999. The scorecard goals were set for a calendar year in 2000, but are being realigned to the fiscal year in 2001 and beyond.

In some instances, agencies established new goals, such as placing more officers on our neighborhood's streets. In other instances, agencies highlighted pre-existing goals such as the reductions in incidents of violent and property crimes and the homicide clearance rate.

Chief Ramsey's calendar year 2000 scorecard goals and results were as follows:

1. **Put 200 more officers on the street** – (September) As noted above, Chief Ramsey exceeded this goal through recruiting new hires, lateral transfers, and redeployment efforts. Approximately 344 additional officers are patrolling neighborhood streets as a result of those efforts.
2. **Achieve 5% reduction in Part I Violent Crimes** – (December) The District realized a decrease of approximately 2.6% according to preliminary data, falling short of the target.
3. **Achieve 5% reduction in Part I Property Crimes** – (December) The District realized a decrease of approximately 5.2% according to preliminary data, meeting this goal's target.
4. **Achieve a 65% homicide clearance rate** – (December). Actual result is approximately 57%. National average for cities of comparable size is 60%.

The Homicide Clearance Rate measure was a topic of discussion in the recent Office of the Inspector General report, *Audit of Contract Performance Measures and the Mayor's Scorecard Measures* (OIG-00-2-12MA). The homicide clearance rate was calculated according to FBI Uniform Crime Report (UCR) standards that measures current year clearances, regardless of the year in which the homicide took place, as a percentage of current year homicides. It is important to note that that measure is used by virtually every police department in the country. It is equally important to note that the MPD baseline performance was set using UCR standards and that the performance goal for FY2000 was established with that same standard.

The OIG audit team initially recommended either using a current year clearance rate that only includes clearances of crimes committed during the same year or a clearance rate that compares current and past year clearances to all open homicides.

While we understood OIG's concerns over the use of the UCR statistic as a performance measure, both MPD and the Office of the Mayor felt that continuing to use the UCR statistic while disclosing the way in which it is calculated is preferable. The current-year only does not reflect performance on prior years' open cases that are cleared during the year. All open homicides include cases that are not actively worked on during the year being measured. Finally

as noted above, the UCR standard is widely used by other cities, providing the District with an appropriate comparison to other jurisdictions' performance.

#### **OVERALL EVALUATION RATING**

Based on my assessment of Chief Ramsey's performance against his performance contract and scorecard goals, I believe my rating of Exceeded Expectations is more than warranted. Mayor Williams and City Administrator Koskinen agreed in our February evaluation meeting with Chief Ramsey. As Mr. Koskinen discussed in his comments, we are encouraging agencies to set ambitious, stretch goals that they may not achieve immediately or even over the course of a single year. Chief Ramsey's goals were ambitious and, although he did not hit every measure under each contract requirement and scorecard goal, he did meet or exceed expectations overall in each category. Moreover, the citizens of the District of Columbia have benefited greatly from his leadership. The quality of life in our neighborhoods, and the quality of service delivery by our police officers are evidence of his outstanding performance as our Chief of Police. Thank you.

**Hearing on Metropolitan Police Department  
Year 2000 Performance**

**United States Senate  
Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management,  
Restructuring and the District of Columbia**

**The Honorable George V. Voinovich  
Chairman**



**Charles H. Ramsey  
Chief of Police  
Metropolitan Police Department**

**March 22, 2001**

Mister Chairman, members of the Subcommittee, staff, and distinguished guests – thank you for the opportunity to present testimony this morning, and answer any questions you may have, concerning the Metropolitan Police Department’s performance during the year 2000. As a note to those in the chamber, the text of my prepared remarks is available on our Department’s Web site – [www.mpdc.org](http://www.mpdc.org).

The year 2000 was certainly a year of high-profile events for the Metropolitan Police Department. It was also a year of everyday challenges and quiet, yet significant victories for our Department and for the communities we serve. With the support of this subcommittee and the Congress, as well as Mayor Williams and the DC Council, the Metropolitan Police Department continues to make significant progress toward making the District of Columbia a safer, more attractive and livable city for our residents, workers and visitors alike.

People who look at the MPD’s performance over the past year likely will focus on the major events we handled: preparations for Y2K and the Millennium celebrations; the IMF/World Bank meetings and protests; the Million Mom and Million Family Marches, and planning for the 2001 Presidential Inaugural. These events, along with the dozens of smaller, less publicized demonstrations, present unique challenges to the MPD. Year in and year out, no other municipal police department in the country has to deal with the quantity or complexity of major events that we do. I am very proud of how our members respond to these challenges – in particular, their handling of last April’s IMF/World Bank meetings and the Presidential Inaugural. I truly believe our Department has set a new standard for planning and execution in these types of operations – for ensuring that major events can take place as scheduled, that protesters can lawfully exercise their First Amendment rights, and that public safety can be maintained.

These events, however, are not without costs. Our Department has incurred significant, and sometimes unbudgeted, expenses for major events over the past year, in terms of both overtime and equipment. Recognizing that these events take place in the District of Columbia because this is our Nation’s Capital, Congress has been very supportive in providing some financial reimbursement for our costs. Still, as we look ahead, we can expect more of these events, and the potential for more, and more sophisticated, protesters in our city. During this calendar year alone, the IMF and World Bank will meet twice in the District, in April and again in October. The Metropolitan Police Department will continue to do everything we must do to ensure the public’s safety during these types of events. But the cost remains significant, and we will likely need continued support this year and into the future.

Our Department’s performance over the past year involved much more than handling major events, however. The past year also saw continued reductions in crime, growing public confidence in the

MPD, and, as we build for the future, tremendous growth and development of our community policing strategy. I am extremely proud of our members for their accomplishments in these areas as well.

Our FY2000 Performance Accountability Plan included four goals:

- Put 200 more officers on the street – fighting crime and partnering with the community.
- Achieve a 5 percent reduction in violent crime.
- Achieve a 5 percent reduction in property crime.
- Achieve a 65 percent homicide closure rate.

Detailed information on our performance in each of these areas is included as an attachment to my statement. I considered these to be “stretch goals,” deliberately set high to give our members and the community something to strive for. For example, we set out to achieve a 5 percent reduction in crime, knowing full well that this would have to come on top of significant, often double-digit crime reductions in recent years. We also set a 65 percent homicide closure rate, despite the fact that homicide clearances are falling nationally. While our Department did not meet every goal, I am still pleased with our performance in these and other critical areas over the past year.

Putting more officers on the street was a priority not just of the Police Department, but of the Mayor and the community. We not only met our goal of 200 additional officers, but exceeded it through a combination of increased hiring and more effective deployment. Our Department surpassed our hiring goals during fiscal 2000 – thanks to more effective recruiting, strong interest in our lateral-hiring program, and lower-than-anticipated attrition rates. We ended fiscal year 2000 with just over 3,650 officers, our highest sworn strength in many years. Our strength has dropped by about 100 officers during the current fiscal year, as spending pressures have prevented the District’s Chief Financial Officer from granting us the authority to hire new officers. That freeze has now been lifted, and we will begin hiring next month. Our long-range goal, which is being supported by a \$15 million grant from the federal COPS office, is to rebuild the force to our authorized level of 3,800 officers.

In addition to hiring more sworn officers, we have been creative in how we deploy our personnel – to ensure that we have uniformed personnel on the street when and where they are needed the most. Last year, we implemented a new shift schedule system that increased the number of officers working evenings and weekends, when crime and calls for service are at their highest. We created the Mobile Force, a team of officers working voluntary overtime during the evening shift to target hot spots of crime and disorder. More recently, we established the Narcotics Strike Force, which focuses on open-air drug markets. Using a special \$1 million Congressional appropriation, we were able to get the Strike Force off the ground and provide it with state-of-the-art equipment and

technology. Finally we implemented a “redeployment” initiative in which most officers in specialized units or support assignments now spend one week each month, in uniform, patrolling a Police Service Area (PSA). Redeployment is adding dozens of officers to community patrols across the city five nights a week.

More officers on the street is translating into continued reductions in crime. Reported crime in the District declined for the fifth consecutive year last year – a 4 percent reduction overall, according to preliminary data. This follows a 9.4 percent reduction in 1999. Homicides fell by nearly 2 percent last year, to their lowest level since 1987. Homicides involving juvenile victims – a particular concern in recent years – fell by nearly one-third last year, from 28 to 19. Other violent crimes did increase slightly in 2000, which means we fell short of our 5 percent goal. However, property crimes such as burglary and auto theft declined by more than 5 percent, falling to their lowest levels in decades last year.

Crime is down not only because of more officers on the street, but also because of stronger partnerships between police and community. Over the past year, we continued to enhance our community policing model, focusing on the critical areas of training, problem solving, leadership and accountability.

For example, we expanded our innovative “Partnerships for Problem Solving” training program, which provides residents and their officers with information and techniques on how to work together. To strengthen leadership and accountability, we assigned a lieutenant to head up each PSA, and provided those lieutenants with specialized tools and training on their roles in community policing. We created a new, more efficient system for police officers to access other city services that impact public safety. And we forged new partnerships with social service agencies and other providers to get at some of the underlying causes and conditions that contribute to crime in our city. For example, our Office of Youth Violence Prevention is working with the clergy and other community stakeholders to put in place effective intervention and prevention programs for at-risk youth.

As I noted earlier, the homicide rate in our city continues to drop, which is encouraging. After declining 2 percent last year, homicides are down almost 40 percent so far in 2001. My goal – and this is certainly another “stretch goal” – is to end the year with fewer than 200 homicides for the first time since the mid-1980s. We plan to accomplish this through a combination of focused law enforcement strategies targeting the most violent offenders, as well as intervention and prevention strategies targeting at-risk individuals and behaviors, including drug trafficking and abuse. I see this short-term goal of fewer than 200 homicides as the next step toward reducing the homicide rate even more dramatically over the next several years.

An equally important goal is to increase our homicide clearance rate. Not just the Metropolitan Police Department, but major city police departments across the country are facing unprecedented challenges when it comes to solving homicides. Whereas 35 years ago, police closed almost 9 out of every 10 murders, that number has dropped to between 60 and 70 percent in recent years. This trend is driven, in part, by the changing nature of homicide itself. Years ago, most homicides involved family members or other people who knew one another. Today, homicides are more likely to involve strangers arguing over drugs, gang territory and the like. This factor, combined with the reluctance of witnesses to come forward and the greater sophistication of some offenders, has led to a decline in homicide clearance rates across the country.

The District of Columbia has been no exception. Our homicide closure rate for the year 2000 was 57 percent, down from 61 percent in 1999 and below our goal of 65 percent. Increasing the clearance rate remains a key goal for our Department, and we are taking a number of steps to meet that goal. These include a new standard operating procedure for homicide investigations; an upgrade of our computerized criminal intelligence system; a new, more rigorous selection process for detectives; enhanced victim and survivor outreach, and expanded training. In the area of training, we are creating a new Criminal Investigators Academy, with the advice and input of London's New Scotland Yard, the world's premier investigative agency. In short, we will do everything we can to improve our ability to investigate and close homicides and other violent crimes. To the victims and survivors of these crimes, we owe nothing less than our very best effort.

I want to briefly touch on other accomplishments over the past year. These were not specifically identified as goals in the year 2000, but they certainly contributed to our success last year.

One of these accomplishments is the dramatic reduction in use of force by members of the MPD. Just over two years ago, following a series of articles in *The Washington Post* and a number of high-profile use-of-force incidents, I asked the U.S. Justice Department to come in and help the MPD analyze – and re-engineer – the entire range of policies, procedures, equipment and training related to use of force. Since then, we have worked very hard internally and with the Justice Department to make dramatic improvements in all of these areas. We are now close to finalizing a memorandum of understanding with DOJ that will endorse the changes we have made and avoid a formal consent decree that other departments have entered into.

Our reforms in this area have been substantial. We totally rewrote our use-of-force policy, introducing a use-of-force continuum that includes verbal commands and less-than-less weaponry. We equipped and trained our officers with OC spray and new expandable batons known as ASPs. We increased officers' firearms training from 8 to 16 hours a year, and expanded the course to focus

on tactics and judgment, not just marksmanship. And to improve investigations and record-keeping, we created a first-ever Force Investigation Team that responds immediately to the scene of all instances in which officers use deadly force.

The results of these and other reforms have been dramatic. Over the last two years, police-involved shootings have declined 78 percent. In 1998, 32 suspects were shot by MPD officers, 12 of them fatally. Last year, 7 suspects were shot by the police, only one fatally. In short, we have gone from being a national embarrassment in the area of use of force to a national model for innovation and effectiveness.

Over the past year, we have also expanded our level of cooperation with the other law enforcement agencies that have jurisdiction in the District. This enhanced level of cooperation was critical during the IMF/World Bank protests and the Inauguration. But cooperation is also taking place on a daily basis, throughout our city.

For example, a law spearheaded by Congresswoman Norton and passed by Congress allows the MPD to enter into cooperative agreements with other agencies, permitting them to extend their jurisdiction and assist the MPD. To date, cooperative agreements have been signed with the Amtrak Police Department and the Zoological Police, with several more in the development stage. These agreements are in addition to MOUs that already exist with the U.S. Capitol Police, the U.S. Park Police and others.

We are also working closely with federal agencies on the critical problems of illegal drugs, guns and arson. The DEA Task Force, for example, has provided us with valuable analysis of drug trends and markets in the District, and the Task Force continues to assist our enforcement efforts. The ATF has provided the MPD with new computer technology that allows our Department to access ATF's Washington Regional Gun Crimes Center in order to trace firearms more quickly and efficiently. We have also exchanged personnel with the ATF and acquired a new arson truck, as we work together on reducing arson crimes in the District. These types of cooperative efforts will be critically important in the future, as we continue to focus on enhancing police presence and reducing crime.

For FY2001 and FY2002, we have made some changes to our system of defining performance goals. Rather than focus on a few, relatively narrow goals, we have broadened our goals and established specific objectives and performance measures within each goal. Detailed information on these specific goals and objectives is also attached. But while our approach to performance accountability has changed slightly, our basic commitments remain the same: to reduce and prevent crime; to hold offenders accountable; to enhance the public's sense of safety; to use force judiciously and fairly; to ensure customer satisfaction, and to continue developing our organization.

I know this hearing is focusing on year 2000 performance. In closing, I would ask the subcommittee to step back and take a slightly longer view of the progress the Metropolitan Police Department has made. I became chief of the MPD almost three years ago. At that time, many of our facilities were literally falling apart; our equipment was substandard; our computer technology was outdated; our policies and training were spotty (especially on such critical issues as use of force); our recruiting was insufficient and ineffective (we were losing more officers than we were attracting); our community policing strategy covered only the basics. Morale within the Department was low, and community confidence in the police was shaken.

Over the past three years, my management team and I have worked very hard – and quite successfully, I believe – to rebuild this police department. We have rebuilt not only the physical infrastructure; we have also rebuilt the pride of our members and the confidence of the people we serve. The fact that we are concentrating our energy and resources on something as complex as improving our homicide clearance rate – and not on something as basic as equipping our districts with toilet paper or making sure officers attend firearms training – is a sign of how far we have come. The comprehensive rebuilding effort we have undertaken could not have been possible without the support of this subcommittee and the entire Congress. Not just your financial support, but your leadership and assistance on public safety issues in general, have made a tremendous difference to our Department and the residents we serve.

We still have a long way to go to make our city – our Nation's Capital – as safe and livable as it should be. But I am confident that with the continued support of our mayor and District government, the President and Congress, and especially our partners in the community, we can continue to reduce crime and work toward making the MPD a model for community policing in our nation.

Thank you again for the opportunity to present this overview and to answer any questions you may have.

**METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT  
FY 2000 Performance Accountability Report**

**Calendar Year 2000 Director's Scorecard Goals**

**GOAL:** Put 200 more officers on the street by September 2000.

**MANAGER:** Charles H. Ramsey, Chief, Metropolitan Police Department  
**SUPERVISOR:** Margret Nedelkoff Kellems, Deputy Mayor for Public Safety and Justice

**Goal Exceeded:** MPD deployed 344 officers on the street from January-September 2000. During that period, MPD graduated 107 new recruits and 84 lateral hires that were all assigned to street duties. Beginning in August 2000, MPD instituted a program whereby sworn members assigned to administrative and investigative duties are redeployed one out of every four weeks to work in the streets in uniform in the seven police districts. On average, 153 members have been redeployed each week.

**GOAL:** Achieve 5% reduction in Part I Violent Crimes over the prior year by December 2000.

**MANAGER:** Charles H. Ramsey, Chief, Metropolitan Police Department  
**SUPERVISOR:** Margret Nedelkoff Kellems, Deputy Mayor for Public Safety and Justice

**Goal Not Achieved:** Preliminary crime data indicates the District experienced a 2.5 percent reduction in Part I Violent Crimes in CY 2000 over CY 1999. The decrease in violent crime is less than our target of 5 percent reduction due to the large increase of 14.1 percent in sexual assaults. Robberies also experienced a 4.4 percent increase in CY 2000. The large increase in sexual assaults is due mainly to new reporting policy instituted by the Chief to ensure more accurate documentation of such reports. The good news, however, is that there was nearly 2 percent decrease in homicides during 2000.

**GOAL:** Achieve 5% reduction in Part I Property Crimes over the prior year by December 2000.

**MANAGER:** Charles H. Ramsey, Chief, Metropolitan Police Department  
**SUPERVISOR:** Margret Nedelkoff Kellems, Deputy Mayor for Public Safety and Justice

**Goal Achieved:** Preliminary crime data indicate the District experienced a 5.2 percent reduction in Part I Property Crimes in CY 2000 over CY 1999. The largest reduction in Part I Property Crimes was 7.6 percent in burglaries.

**GOAL:** Achieve 65% homicide clearance rate by December 2000.

**MANAGER:** Charles H. Ramsey, Chief, Metropolitan Police Department  
**SUPERVISOR:** Margret Nedelkoff Kellems, Deputy Mayor for Public Safety and Justice

**Goal Not Achieved:** For Calendar Year 2000, MPD achieved a 57 percent homicide clearance rate. To achieve this goal next year, a new "Standard Operating Procedures" (SOPs) for homicide investigation was just completed. In addition, a new selection process for investigators and detectives is planned for implementation in FY 2001. Finally, a Detective Academy is being developed to improve investigative skills that will lead to an improved homicide clearance rate, as well as better clearance rates in other crime categories.

**GOAL**

**Prevent Crime and the Fear of Crime:** The mission of the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) is to prevent crime and the fear of crime, as we work with others to help build healthy and safe communities throughout the District of Columbia.

**MANAGER:** Charles H. Ramsey, Chief, Metropolitan Police Department  
**SUPERVISOR:** Margret Nedelkoff Kellems, Deputy Mayor for Public Safety and Justice

**Goal Achieved:** The preliminary data shows that the overall goal of crime prevention was achieved through reduction in homicides and property crimes during Calendar Year 2000. Additionally, more than 200 police officers were redeployed as a means of reducing fear of crime through increased police visibility throughout the City.

<b>PERFORMANCE MEASURES</b>	<b>CY 2000 Target</b>	<b>CY 2000 Actual</b>	<b>CY 2001 Target</b>
Percent Reduction over prior year incidents in selected crimes			
Part I Violent Crimes	5%	+2.5%	-2%
Homicides	8%	-1.7%	Dropped
Aggravated Assaults	8%	-0.1%	Dropped
Part I Property Crimes	5%	-5.2%	-5%
Auto Thefts	8%	-5.9%	Dropped
Burglaries	8%	-7.6	Dropped
Service to Victims: Percentage residents reporting police are doing a good or very good job helping crime victims.	60%	N/A*	60%
Crime Prevention: Percentage residents reporting police are doing a good or very good job preventing crime in their neighborhood.	64%	N/A	Dropped
Fear of Crime: Percentage of residents reporting they feel very safe being alone outside in their neighborhood during the day.	62%	N/A	Dropped

\* N/A = The goal was not measured during Calendar Year 2000 due to resource limitations to conduct citywide survey of residents. MPD is planning to conduct telephone interviews with victims of crime in the city. The data collected from the survey will be used as baseline for measurement of the Department's services to victims.

<p><b>GOAL</b>  <b>Improve Community-Police Coordination</b> by building community problem solving partnerships, connecting police to city services tracking systems, and instituting regular community meetings in each Police Service Area (PSA).</p> <p><b>MANAGER:</b> Terrance W. Gainer, Executive Assistant Chief                  Nola M. Joyce, Senior Executive Director, Office of Organizational Development</p> <p><b>SUPERVISOR:</b> Charles H. Ramsey, Chief, Metropolitan Police Department</p> <p><b>Goal Achieved:</b> This goal was largely achieved through the partnerships for problem solving training sessions that were conducted throughout the city. During CY 2000, partnership for problem solving training was provided for more than 2,500 people in 49 PSAs. Plans are underway to complete training for the remaining PSAs by September 30, 2001. A system for tracking city services, including using PD 904 Forms to enter requests for police services, has also been implemented in all 7 Districts. The police department is working with the Neighborhood Services Initiative.</p>			
<b>PERFORMANCE MEASURES</b>			
	<b>CY 2000 Target</b>	<b>CY 2000 Actual</b>	<b>CY 2001 Target</b>
Partnership: Percent of residents reporting police are doing a good or very good job working together with residents in their neighborhood to solve local problems.	65%	N/A	Dropped
Problem Solving: Percent of Residents reporting police are doing a good or very good job dealing with the problems that really concern people in their neighborhood.	67%	N/A	Dropped

<p><b>GOAL</b>  <b>Increase the Presence and Visibility of Sworn Officers in Communities</b> by increasing sworn staff levels, reducing and/or civilianizing selected administrative functions, aligning deployment to service calls and increasing foot and bike patrols in neighborhoods.</p> <p><b>MANAGER:</b> Terrance W. Gainer, Executive Assistant Chief                  Eric Coard, Senior Executive Director, Corporate Support</p> <p><b>SUPERVISOR:</b> Charles H. Ramsey, Chief, Metropolitan Police Department</p> <p><b>Goal Achieved:</b> This goal was achieved during Calendar Year 2000. Between January and September 2000 the Department deployed more than 300 additional officers on the streets. The goal to civilianize administrative functions, however, was not fully achieved due to budgetary constraints.</p>			
<b>PERFORMANCE MEASURES</b>			
	<b>CY 2000 Target</b>	<b>CY 2000 Actual</b>	<b>CY 2001 Target</b>
Percent of sworn positions budgeted for civilianization with civilians in them	80%	61%*	Dropped

\* No additional progress expected due to budgetary constraints.

<b>GOAL</b> <b>Improve MPDC Response to Emergency and non-Emergency Service calls.</b>			
<b>MANAGER:</b> Terrance W. Gainer, Executive Assistant Chief <b>SUPERVISOR:</b> Charles H. Ramsey, Chief, Metropolitan Police Department			
<b>Goal Achieved:</b> The goal of responding to 911 emergency calls for service within 5 seconds was achieved by MPD. The Department also achieved an 8 seconds response to time to non-emergency calls for service.			
<b>PERFORMANCE MEASURES</b>	<b>CY 2000 Target</b>	<b>CY 2000 Actual</b>	<b>CY 2001 Target</b>
Average telephone response time to 911 emergency calls for service (seconds)	5	5	Dropped
Average telephone response time to 311 non-emergency calls for service (seconds)	New	10	Dropped
Average response time of officers to emergency service calls (call to scene)	New	N/A	Dropped

<b>GOAL</b> <b>Address the Challenges of Youth Violence, Domestic Violence and Child Abuse</b> By expanding educational and school-based programs, enhancing detective training and developing interagency partnerships and information sharing.			
<b>MANAGER:</b> Terrance W. Gainer, Executive Assistant Chief, Operational Services Nola Joyce, Senior Executive Director, Office of Organizational Development <b>SUPERVISOR:</b> Charles H. Ramsey, Chief, Metropolitan Police Department			
<b>Goal Achieved:</b> The Chief initiated a program to involve all senior management, both sworn and civilians, to participate in the summer program at Camp Brown and more than 2,300 at-risk youth attended summer programs during CY 2000, thus achieving the goal. More than 20,000 youth were involved in Boys and Girls Clubs activities during the year.			
<b>PERFORMANCE MEASURES</b>	<b>CY 2000 Target</b>	<b>CY 2000 Actual</b>	<b>CY 2001 Target</b>
Number of at-risk youth involved in summer program at Camp Brown	New	2,300	Dropped
Number of youth involved in MPD Boys and Girls Clubs (includes duplicates)	New	20,000	Dropped

<b>GOAL</b>			
<b>Build a High Quality MPDC Workforce</b> by expanding recruiting, enhancing training opportunities, renovating outdated facilities and upgrading information technology resources.			
<b>MANAGER:</b> Eric Coard, Senior Executive Director, Corporate Support Nola Joyce, Senior Executive Director, Office of Organizational Development			
<b>SUPERVISOR:</b> Charles H. Ramsey, Chief, Metropolitan Police Department			
<b>Goal Achieved:</b> This goal was achieved through extensive investment in the infrastructure of the Department. Phase I renovations has been completed for all Districts, including new heating systems and offices for detectives. Completed upgrading computer systems at the Headquarters and all the 7 Districts, including new email systems and networks.			
<b>PERFORMANCE MEASURES</b>	<b>CY 2000 Target</b>	<b>CY 2000 Actual</b>	<b>CY 2001 Target</b>
Percent of funded sworn positions filled: • out of 3,600 funded FTEs in FY 2000 • out of 3,800 requested FTEs in FY 2001	98.6%	100%	Dropped
Facilities lifecycle measure (e.g., percent of MPD facilities within recommended timeframe for design and construction, assuming no approval delays and labor disputes)	80%	100 % of Phase I	Dropped
Information technology measure (e.g., percent of major systems upgraded within recommended timeframe)	95%	95%	Dropped

<b>METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT</b> <b>Initial FY 2000 Agency Goals</b>
--

From FY 2000 Operating Budget and Financial Plan, page F-29

1. **Differentiate Roles and Responsibilities.** This includes the separation of police operations from the corporate support functions including fleet, building maintenance and equipment procurement. The distinction between policing operations and support functions will ensure that the ultimate goal of the MPD—preventing crime and improving public safety—will be accomplished.  
 Addressed under final FY 2000 Goal (provide Goal name).  
 Achieved, but not designated a final FY 2000 Goal.  
 Not addressed in final agency plan.
2. **Reengineer Training.** The MPD strives to create new training opportunities for both the civilian and sworn members of the department. The reorganized training program will provide ongoing opportunities for learning and skills development.  
 Addressed under final FY 2000 Goal (provide Goal name).  
 Achieved, but not designated a final FY 2000 Goal.  
 Not addressed in final agency plan.
3. **Create Leadership.** The structure creates clear mechanisms for demonstrating strong leadership and ensuring accountability. In particular, the creation of the Regional Operations Centers (ROCs)—each headed by an Assistant Chief—aims to geographically base accountability.  
 Addressed under final FY 2000 Goal (provide Goal name).  
 Achieved, but not designated a final FY 2000 Goal.  
 Not addressed in final agency plan.
4. **Improve Infrastructure.** Critical to the successful implementation of a new community-policing model for the District are the working conditions for MPD. Existing problems that have compounded due to years of neglect are being aggressively addressed with the assistance of a recently completed comprehensive facilities review. The FY 2000 Capital Budget attempts to combat many of these obstacles.  
 Addressed under final FY 2000 Goal (Build a High Quality Workforce).  
 Achieved, but not designated a final FY 2000 Goal.  
 Not addressed in final agency plan.

Table 2: Aligning Metropolitan Police Department's FY 2000, FY 2001, and FY 2002 Goals with the Citywide Strategic Plan

MPD's Goals	City Strategic Priority	FY 2000 Objectives	FY 2001 Objectives	FY 2002 Objectives	Performance Measures (end outcomes)
<p>Reduce and Prevent Crime and Criminal Victimization.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthening Children, Youth, Families, and Individuals.</li> <li>Building and Sustaining Healthy Neighborhoods.</li> <li>Promoting Economic Development.</li> </ul>	<p>Improve Police Response to Crime</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve Response to Emergencies.</li> <li>Implement 311 Non-Emergency System</li> <li>Construct a new Operations Command Center</li> </ul> <p>Improve Police, Community and City Agencies Coordination in Addressing Crime and Disorder.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhance Community Policing</li> <li>Improve Police Access to Other City Services</li> <li>Institute Problem Solving Partnerships in Neighborhoods</li> <li>Ensure Monthly PSA Meetings</li> <li>Expand Crime Information Available to Community</li> <li>Provide Crime Prevention Services to Most Vulnerable.</li> <li>Expand Youth Violence Prevention Programs.</li> <li>Improve Victim Services</li> </ul>	<p>Improve Police Response to Crime</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modify dispatch policy</li> <li>Begin capturing arrival time in the CAD system.</li> <li>Move the Communications Division to Macmillan Drive</li> <li>Establish a 24 hour Synchronized Operation Command Center</li> </ul> <p>Improve Police, Community and City Agencies Coordination in Addressing Crime and Disorder.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work to ensure that Policing for Prevention becomes institutionalized in the police department</li> <li>Participate in NSI and monitor address crime and disorder.</li> <li>Work with PSA lieutenants to make PSA meetings productive.</li> <li>Implement IRMA and develop citizen's IRMA.</li> </ul> <p>Provide Crime Prevention Services to Most Vulnerable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a restorative justice initiative.</li> <li>Implement a youth advisory council to the Chief.</li> </ul>	<p>Improve Police Response to Crime</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish a world-class emergency response and operation command center.</li> </ul> <p>Improve Police, Community and City Agencies Coordination in Addressing Crime and Disorder.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement a police district-based service office (budget)</li> <li>Expand Policing for Prevention to specialized units.</li> <li>Implement citizens' IRMA</li> <li>Begin to develop means of incorporating citizen services into Policing for Prevention</li> </ul> <p>Provide Crime Prevention Services to Most Vulnerable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Priorit a restorative justice initiative (budget).</li> <li>Establish referral networks for youth services.</li> <li>Implement a school-based Partnership for Problem Solving program.</li> <li>Work with youth and communities to implement violence prevention</li> </ul>	<p>Reduction in Part I Violent Crimes</p> <p>Reduction in Part I Property Crimes</p> <p>Reduction in Youth Victimization Rates</p>

MPD's Goals	City Strategic Priority	FY 2000 Objectives	FY 2001 Objectives	FY 2002 Objectives	Performance Measures (end outcomes)
Produce Justice by Calling Offenders to Account for Their Crimes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthening Children, Youth, Families, and Individuals</li> <li>Building and Sustaining Healthy Neighborhoods</li> <li>Promoting Economic Development</li> <li>Making Government Work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve Police Response and Investigation Protocols to                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Domestic Violence</li> <li>Child Abuse and Neglect</li> <li>Sexual Assault</li> <li>Homicide</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work with the Police Foundation to implement youth violence prevention programs</li> <li>Develop a school-based partnership for Problem Solving program</li> <li>Work with parents to develop a victim services program</li> <li>Implement the police-based advocacy project</li> <li>Improve Police Response and Investigation                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create a protocol on Stalking</li> <li>Participate in domestic violence fatality reviews</li> <li>Implement the protocol on homicide investigations</li> <li>Work to build or convert a building to house Forensic Lab</li> <li>Implement a new procedure for selecting investigators and detectives</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement school-based Partnership for Problem Solving program in two high schools</li> <li>Improve Police Response and Investigation Protocols on                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement a case management focus in domestic violence investigations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Increase in Homicide Clearance Rates
Enhance the Sense of Safety and Security in Public Spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthening Children, Youth, Families, and Individuals</li> <li>Building and Sustaining Healthy Neighborhoods</li> <li>Promoting Economic Development</li> <li>Making Government Work</li> <li>Enhancing Unity of Purpose</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase the Presence and Visibility of Sworn Officers in Communities                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase Civilian/Sworn Staffing Levels</li> <li>Increase Visibility of Uniformed Officers</li> <li>Locate ROC Centers in the Community</li> </ul> </li> <li>Use focus law enforcement on hot spots for open-air drug</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase the Presence and Visibility of Sworn Officers in Communities                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase sworn staffing to 3,800 (budget)</li> <li>Monitor the redeployment initiative</li> <li>Implement a patrolling reform pilot</li> <li>Use focus law enforcement on hot spots for open-air drug dealing</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase the Presence and Visibility of Sworn Officers in Communities                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain a sworn headcount of 3,800 (budget)</li> <li>Implement patrolling reform citywide</li> <li>Use focus law enforcement on hot spots for open-air drug dealing, prostitution, and crimes of public disorder</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Reduction in calls for service for public disorder

Table 2: Aligning Metropolitan Police Department's FY 2000, FY 2001, and FY 2002 Goals with the Citywide Strategic Plan

MPD's Goals	City Strategic Priority	FY 2000 Objectives	FY 2001 Objectives	FY 2002 Objectives	Performance Measures (end outcomes)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use Force and Authority Judiciously and Fairly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Making Government Work</li> <li>Enhancing Unity of Purpose</li> </ul>	dealing, prostitution, and crimes of public disorder. Ensure orderly public demonstrations while protecting civil rights. Improve traffic flow.	prostitution, and crimes of public disorder. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use MPD's helicopter to disrupt open-air drug markets.</li> <li>Continue the Mobile Force (budget)</li> <li>Close at least six open-air drug markets.</li> <li>Monitor street prostitution to ensure it is eliminated.</li> <li>Ensure orderly public demonstrations while protecting civil rights.</li> <li>Prepare and support the inauguration.</li> <li>Prepare and be present for the IMF/World Bank's two meetings.</li> <li>Improve traffic flow.</li> <li>Continue the traffic aides (budget)</li> <li>Continue the red light camera campaign (budget).</li> <li>Implement the automated speed cameras (budget)</li> </ul>	disorder. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use MPD's helicopter to disrupt open-air drug markets (budget).</li> <li>Continue the Mobile Force (budget)</li> <li>Close at least six open-air drug markets.</li> <li>Monitor street prostitution to ensure it is eliminated.</li> <li>Ensure orderly public demonstrations while protecting civil rights.</li> <li>Improve traffic flow.</li> <li>Continue the traffic aides (budget)</li> <li>Continue the red light camera campaign (budget).</li> <li>Continue the automated speed cameras (budget).</li> </ul>	Percentage reduction in the number of excessive force allegations. Percentage reduction in the

Table 2. Aligning Metropolitan Police Department's FY 2000, FY 2001, and FY 2002 Goals with the Citywide Strategic Plan 3/20/01

MPD's Goals	City Strategic Priority	FY 2000 Objectives	FY 2001 Objectives	FY 2002 Objectives	Performance Measures (end outcomes)
Assure Customer Satisfaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Making Government Work Enhancing Unity of Purpose</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work to establish the Citizen Complaint Review Board</li> <li>Improve Services to Victims and Establish Means of Obtaining Feedback from Them.</li> <li>Develop and deliver training programs.</li> <li>Collect, disseminate and use customer satisfaction surveys.</li> <li>Work with other agencies to improve services to victims, offenders, and residents.</li> </ul>	<p>Citizen Complaint Review Board to start up its function.</p> <p>Improve Services to Victims and Establish Means of Obtaining Feedback from Them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement and use victim surveys to improve services.</li> <li>Publish the results of employee surveys.</li> <li>Continue to work with other agencies to improve services to victims, offenders, and residents.</li> </ul>	<p>Board.</p> <p>Improve Services to Victims and Establish Means of Obtaining Feedback from Them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use victim surveys to improve services.</li> <li>Conduct a citizen survey on police services.</li> <li>Begin to integrate human services into police services.</li> </ul>	<p>Majority of allegations of police misconduct.</p> <p>Majority of residents reporting that police do a very good or good job assisting victims of crimes.</p>
Develop the Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building and Sustaining Healthy Neighborhoods.</li> <li>Promoting Economic Development</li> <li>Making Government Work Enhancing Unity of Purpose</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create a High Quality Workforce.</li> <li>Expand Recruiting Efforts.</li> <li>Expand and Enhance Training</li> <li>Improve the Working Environment</li> <li>Enhance Information Systems.</li> </ul>	<p>Create a High Quality Workforce.</p> <p>Expand Recruiting Efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue the enhanced recruiting efforts (budget)</li> <li>Expand and Enhance Training</li> <li>Implement the Police Cadet program (budget)</li> <li>Develop a detective academy, continue in-service and roll call training.</li> <li>Implement a revised Field Training Officer program.</li> <li>Conduct a training needs survey.</li> <li>Begin to revise the recruit curriculum.</li> <li>Establish a Police Testing and Standard Board (POST).</li> </ul> <p>Improve the Working Environment.</p>	<p>Create a High Quality Workforce.</p> <p>Expand and Enhance Training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Police Cadet program fully operational (budget).</li> <li>Detective academy is operational and in-service and roll call training continues.</li> <li>Develop civilian new hire training and in-service program for civilians.</li> <li>Implement a revised recruit curriculum.</li> <li>POST reviewed recruit curriculum.</li> <li>Improve the Working Environment.</li> <li>Enhance Information Systems.</li> <li>Maintain new information</li> </ul>	<p>The majority of employees stating that "MPD is good place to work."</p>

Table 2: Aligning Metropolitan Police Department's FY 2000, FY 2001, and FY 2002 Goals with the Citywide Strategic Plan 3/20/01

MPD's Goals	City Strategic Priority	FY 2000 Objectives	FY 2001 Objectives	FY 2002 Objectives	Performance Measures (end outcomes)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement Phase II of the facility upgrades.</li> <li>• Improve Evidence Property facilities.</li> <li>• Enhance Information Systems.</li> <li>• <b>Outsource or staff daily computer operations (budget).</b></li> <li>• <b>Maintain upgrades in software and hardware completed in FY2000 (budget).</b></li> <li>• Implement upgraded WACISS.</li> <li>• Develop PRIDE</li> <li>• Implement IRMA</li> <li>• Implement a correspondence system.</li> <li>• Work toward CALEA accreditation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement PRIDE</li> <li>• Achieve CALEA Accreditation.</li> </ul>	

Table 2: Aligning Metropolitan Police Department's FY 2000, FY 2001, and FY 2002 Goals with the Citywide Strategic Plan 3/20/01