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October 2012
Letter from the Director

Dear Colleague,

The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services continues its mission to foster effective policing by cultivating community policing environments that enhance trust and mutual respect between law enforcement agencies and their communities. The fundamental goal of the Police Ethics and Integrity Initiative is to continue to meet emerging and changing law enforcement needs by assisting agencies in developing or strengthening local programs. Typical programs involve strategies that entail developing best practices, model problem-solving partnerships, and training on important issues related to police ethics and integrity.

This publication is a technical assistance guide prepared by the Virginia Beach Police Department (VBPD) in compliance with a requirement of the Enhancing Cultures of Integrity competitive grant program. The Enhancing Cultures of Integrity program encouraged the development of policies, practices, programs, and changes in organizational culture that would build mutual trust and respect between law enforcement and citizens. Recipient agencies, such as VBPD, were required to document in a report suitable for sharing with other agencies the challenges, accomplishments, or successes achieved with this funding.

The COPS Office understands the value of learning from the experience of others. It is in this spirit that we are pleased to share this report. We hope you will find this publication helpful in your local efforts, and we encourage you to share this publication, as well as your successes in replicating any and all aspects of this project with other law enforcement practitioners.

Sincerely,

Bernard Melekian, Director
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
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About the COPS Office

The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office) is the component of the U.S. Department of Justice responsible for advancing the practice of community policing by the nation’s state, local, territory, and tribal law enforcement agencies through information and grant resources.

Community policing is a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies that support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques, to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime.

Rather than simply responding to crimes once they have been committed, community policing concentrates on preventing crime and eliminating the atmosphere of fear it creates. Earning the trust of the community and making those individuals stakeholders in their own safety enables law enforcement to better understand and address both the needs of the community and the factors that contribute to crime.

The COPS Office awards grants to state, local, territory, and tribal law enforcement agencies to hire and train community policing professionals, acquire and deploy cutting-edge crime fighting technologies, and develop and test innovative policing strategies. COPS Office funding also provides training and technical assistance to community members and local government leaders and all levels of law enforcement. The COPS Office has produced and compiled a broad range of information resources that can help law enforcement better address specific crime and operational issues, and help community leaders better understand how to work cooperatively with their law enforcement agency to reduce crime.

◆ Since 1994, the COPS Office has invested nearly $14 billion to add community policing officers to the nation’s streets, enhance crime fighting technology, support crime prevention initiatives, and provide training and technical assistance to help advance community policing.

◆ By the end of FY2011, the COPS Office has funded approximately 123,000 additional officers to more than 13,000 of the nation’s 18,000 law enforcement agencies across the country in small and large jurisdictions alike.

◆ Nearly 600,000 law enforcement personnel, community members, and government leaders have been trained through COPS Office-funded training organizations.

◆ As of 2011, the COPS Office has distributed more than 6.6 million topic-specific publications, training curricula, white papers, and resource CDs.

COPS Office resources, covering a wide breadth of community policing topics—from school and campus safety to gang violence—are available, at no cost, through its online Resource Information Center at www.cops.usdoj.gov. This easy-to-navigate website is also the grant application portal, providing access to online application forms.
Background of the Jurisdiction and Agency

Jurisdiction: City of Virginia Beach

Location: Southeastern Virginia

Population: 437,994

Race/Ethnicity: White: 67.7%, Black or African American: 19.6%, American Indian and Alaska Native: 0.4%, Asian: 6.1%, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander: 0.2%, Hispanic or Latino (of any race): 6.6%

Area/Density: 249 square miles / 1,759 persons per square mile

Agency personnel: 775 sworn; 163 civilian

Reported crime: 820 violent offenses; 13,232 property offenses

Crime rates: 1.87 violent offenses and 30.2 property offenses per 1,000 population

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
Budgeted Cost Summary for Grant Funded Items

All purchases and contracts would be handled in accordance with established purchasing procedures of the City of Virginia Beach. Equipment costs are associated with the technology needed to complete this project. Contract speaker fees and related costs cover expenses to be incurred during the development and implementation of the command staff integrity training series: advanced leadership training, leadership coaching program, management skills course, and command staff team building. Other funds requested are self explanatory (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Cost Summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Summary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Evaluator partner (5% of budget)</td>
<td>$21,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>$21,093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Intervention System:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer consultant</td>
<td>$265,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQL server (equipment)</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InFocus machine</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data entry (Overtime)</td>
<td>$5,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to D.C – DOJ</td>
<td>$945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Phoenix – site visit</td>
<td>$1,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>$305,905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IA Database:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Software custom enhancements</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Developing Software &amp; related training</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Audio Logger</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training – IA Seminar</td>
<td>$2,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Philadelphia – site visit</td>
<td>$580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>$20,945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improving citizen complaint process:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrity seminars:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract speaker fees and expenses</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training supplies</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total** $442,943

*Source: Provided by Virginia Beach Police Support Administration*
Project Introduction and Overview

The Virginia Beach Police Department (VBPD) has long enjoyed an excellent reputation within the community and among other law enforcement agencies for our integrity and commitment. Our Core Values embody the principles of Professionalism, Respect, Integrity, Dedication, and Excellence [PRIDE]. At the same time, the VBPD recognizes that without constant vigilance, integrity concerns are a possibility in any department. Scandals have affected departments around the country with reputations as good as ours.

Our department has a history of providing ethics training for all members of the organization, sworn and civilian. Starting in 1999, the department developed a cadre of ethics trainers, and the following year put every member through an eight-hour block of ethics training. In addition to this training, the Department has committed itself to an open dialog with the community—maintaining a permanent liaison to the city’s Human Rights Commission and command representatives to each of the major minority communities in the city. We have also maintained a progressive Professional Standards Office with a strong commitment to accepting, investigating, and documenting all complaints.

The Professional Standards Office has encountered obstacles from time to time in fulfilling our mission of becoming a “premier law enforcement agency.” The technology available for this effort had not kept pace with the times, and our ability to track complaints and respond as promptly as we’d like was less than optimal.

In 2003, the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office) awarded four law enforcement agencies $1.7 million in grants to fund police integrity initiatives. The grants, entitled Enhancing a Culture of Integrity, were awarded to the Boston, San Diego, and Virginia Beach Police Departments, as well as the Sacramento County Sheriff’s Department. The grants were to be dedicated to funding initiatives related to developing innovative programs that address policies and practices that could impact organizational culture within law enforcement agencies.

Our Department approached the Enhancing a Culture of Integrity grant as an opportunity to circumvent any potential problems and emphasize to our members and to the community that integrity is more than a high priority; it is an essential part of the structure of our organization. Recognizing that the development of leaders was the key to virtually all aspects of the culture of a police agency, we took the opportunity to partner with DOJ to work on leadership programs with an eye toward enhancing integrity.

We also looked at several other means of enhancing integrity, as well as increasing the confidence of the community in our integrity. Leadership development, coaching and mentoring, a management skills program, an improved complaint system, and a mediation program were all part of the main program to enhance our culture of integrity.
The funding was directed toward three main project components:

- **The production and presentation of advanced leadership training.** The advanced training component brought high level training programs related to integrity to our first-line supervisors, police training officers, and command staff and supervisory personnel from other area jurisdictions. The leadership aspects of our efforts were and continue to be successful. A number of our supervisors have completed the Management Skills Course, others have been trained as coaches and mentors, and almost all have completed the West Point Leadership Course.

- **Strengthening and improving Internal Affairs operations by process improvement and technical modernization of the Professional Standards Office.** This included improvements to our complaint process and increasing citizen’s access to the office by creating a web portal for complaints to be filed via the Internet. We initiated follow up letters to citizens, letting them know their complaints were received and the process that would be followed. We produced and distributed a number of informational brochures in both English and Spanish to assist the citizenry with understanding the department’s functions and protocols. We initiated an internal monthly report distributed to all department members to provide insight and increase transparency into the disposition of finalized administrative investigations (citizen complaints, internal investigations, firearms discharges). These reports have been extraordinarily well received by the staff and have served as a resource to supervisors to ensure equity in actions taken command to command. The reports are sanitized to protect the identity of the involved employee(s), while still providing enough information to make the report a useful resource for department members. The grant money was used to purchase a modern, commercially available software program called IAPro. This software is in wide use by police departments around the country, and it has done everything we hoped it would do in terms of modernizing our Internal Affairs information capturing, reporting, and statistical analysis capabilities. It has enabled us to digitize nearly all of our IA documents and provide useful and comprehensive reports to city leaders and decision makers in the Department. We have accomplished this and achieved better results than we anticipated or predicted. Additionally, we recently initiated a new web based reporting system known as BlueTeam. This software works in tandem with IAPro to support field personnel by enabling uses-of-force, pursuits, firearms discharges, and administrative investigations to be entered and managed in the field. The application streamlines the intake and assessment of information from the field and eliminates significant redundant data entry workload within Professional Standards by providing a link between the two.
Development of a highly advanced and effective Early Intervention System (EIS). Our intention was to acquire a sophisticated Early Intervention System that would interface with existing databases, follow an officer through different assignments, consolidate and track a variety of reports, compare indicators with units of productivity rather than time, and enabling members to utilize all aspects of this system. While we have been successful in this effort, this phase of the project took far longer than envisioned and proved to be an incredible challenge. It took far more time and funds to develop than we anticipated, and involved overcoming one technical obstacle after another. The program we have in place, however, custom configured for our Department by Management Science Associates (MSA), a Pennsylvania based company, is a dramatic improvement over a simple EIS and truly satisfied our goal of deploying a management performance system.

In order to establish a baseline as to where we were at the onset of this project, the department contracted for and conducted the Campbell Organizational Climate Survey. We recognized early on that without good data and feedback about the current climate within the organization, we could not select and present relevant information that would help us move toward our goal of being the premier law enforcement agency based on a culture of integrity and values. During the survey, approximately 50 percent of the organization provided responses. As a result of information gained, we established four Department Action Teams to address the specific issues identified. These teams: Employee Support and Development, Planning, Quality, and Leadership were tasked to work on initiatives to improve the organization and its overall climate. It is envisioned that the results of this study could be used as a before and after benchmark to gauge the success of our efforts.

The grant mandated that the results of these programs would be published by COPS to serve as technical assistance resources to law enforcement agencies nationwide. This report memorializes the VBPD’s accomplishments and lessons learned attributed with this funding.
Leadership Development Initiatives

The VBPD has undertaken an extensive effort in developing leadership initiatives. The purpose of these leadership initiatives is to improve the followership and leadership knowledge, skills, and abilities of all personnel in the Department. In her book, *Bad Leadership: What It Is, How It Happens, Why It Matters*, Barbara Kellerman, the Research Director of the Center for Public Leadership and Lecturer in Public Policy at the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, found that bad leadership was almost always coupled with bad followership. The leadership faculty at the VBPD recognized everyone in the Department was both a follower and a leader and needed to be good in both roles. The core principle of this effort is that every member, if trained and socialized appropriately, can enhance their ability to manage today's tasks as well as those challenges faced in the future. This training and socialization was undertaken through the implementation of a variety of programs and initiatives all designed to dovetail together and provide the opportunity for career-long learning.

In-Service Training

The Department introduced followership and leadership principles in its basic recruit training and during officer, sergeant, and executive in-service training for 2003 and 2004. This served to introduce and develop a shared understanding of followership and leadership in the organization.

Advanced Leadership Training

We proposed in the grant to develop a Leadership Speaker Series involving subject matter experts. Our plan involved seeking out subject matter experts to conduct training courses in Virginia Beach during the grant period. This provided an opportunity for Virginia Beach field training officers, first-line supervisors, and command officers, as well as those from other local, state, and federal agencies in the region to attend these classes.

Additionally, we were able to expand the learning opportunity during each class to not only supervisors from throughout our region, but also line officers and community members. This is in keeping with our philosophy that everyone has a leadership responsibility when it comes to crime prevention and community policing. Our seminar topics included:

- Building a Belief System Built on Values (Dr. Bill Westfall, 12/15/03)
- Bullet-Proof Mind (Lt. Col. Dave Grossman, 12/03)
- Leadership Development Foundations (Keilty Goldsmith and Company, 12/1/03)
- Challenging the Organizational Culture (Dr. Jack Enter, 2/16/04)
- Emotional Survival for Law Enforcement (Dr. Kevin Gilmartin, 3/15/04)
- Developing Productive Relationships (Dr. Steve Sampson, 6/9/04)

Based on the Leadership Speakers Series, we were able to provide leaders at all levels of the organization with over 80 hours of current, relevant, and practical training that will enable each to grow and expand their knowledge and skills that will be immediately applicable to their current and future assignments. The total number of officers trained throughout the series exceeded eight hundred. In conjunction with the speaker series, the Department conducted a number of internal processes to augment the information learned.

**West Point Leadership Course**

The Department recognized the need to train both new leaders and seasoned members in a shared basic leadership philosophy. The first step in executing these initiatives was to develop a faculty group that could develop, implement, and facilitate the training program. The Virginia Beach Police Supervisors’ Association (VBPSA) took the initial step in this direction by sending two members, one active and one retired Sergeant from the VBPD, to the West Point Command and Leadership Program. This program was facilitated by the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police in the fall of 2000. The entire cost of tuition, travel, and lodging was borne by the VBPSA. The members attended the training on their own time. The curriculum for this program was developed based on the model created by the Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership, United States Military Academy (USMA), West Point, New York.

These two VBPSA members conducted a West Point Leadership Course for a private institute in the fall of 2001. This training was attended by a Lieutenant with the VBPD to assess its value for potential implementation within the VBPD. The Lieutenant’s evaluation was positive and he recommended that the VBPD implement the program.

The VBPD sent a second Lieutenant to the West Point Command and Leadership Program with the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police in the spring of 2002. This Lieutenant attended the course on duty and the Department provided funding.

Two VBPD supervisory members who attended the Faculty Development workshop at USMA in the summer of 2002 collaborated to develop and implement the leadership training programs for the VBPD. The Department’s relationship with the Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership at the USMA was not a formal partnership. This was due to the fact that the mission of the USMA is not to train law enforcement officers. However, recognizing the benefits that their program could offer to the law enforcement community, the faculty of the USMA shared materials and lesson plans and provided opportunities for training to the Department’s leadership faculty members. Former USMA faculty members who have been stationed in the Virginia Beach area have volunteered time to offer advice and review presentations to help further improve the Department’s efforts.
From these efforts, the VBPD has implemented its academically rigorous version of the West Point Leadership Course (WPLC) in order to train Department leaders in this shared basic leadership philosophy. The course meets once a week for 15 weeks each fall and spring session. As of June 2010, the Department has conducted twelve sessions of the course. To date, 162 members of the VBPD have completed the course. Most attendees from our Department are currently working in supervisory roles. During the past few sessions the course was also opened up to senior police officers aspiring for promotion to leadership positions within the Department. With current levels of attrition due to retirement, it is projected that the incorporation of the WPLC will be an ongoing endeavor for the VBPD.

In addition to the members of the VBPD that have completed the course, the following organizations have also benefited by sending their own members: the Virginia Beach Sheriff’s Office (34 attendees), the Virginia Beach Fire Department (7 attendees), other Virginia Beach non-police Department supervisors (11 attendees), and other police agency’s supervisors (26 attendees).

The principal challenge in conducting extensive leadership training in an organization the size of the VBPD has been developing faculty to facilitate learning in the training. As Department members complete the West Point Leadership Course, those with the highest academic achievement and with the best leadership reputations in the Department are invited to consider becoming members of the leadership faculty. Those that accept then attend a faculty development workshop within the VBPD and are provided the opportunity to attend the Faculty Development Workshop at the USMA.

**Leadership Feedback**

The Department is working under the theory that all leader development is self-development. In order to stimulate reflective learning the Department utilizes the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), which is a “360 degree” feedback instrument. Three hundred and sixty degree feedbacks—also known as multi-rater feedback, multisource feedback, or multisource assessments—provide the benefit of supplying feedback from all around an employee. The LPI is conducted just before each student begins the West Point Leadership Course and the feedback is provided on the first day of class. The LPI is completed on an annual basis thereafter.

The Department’s command staff has also undergone multi-rater feedback sessions as a separate group apart from the West Point Leadership Course. Although some members of the command staff have completed the West Point Leadership Course, they received this feedback separately in order to obtain a wider spectrum of feedback than is provided to the West Point Leadership Course students.

**Management Skills Course**

The VBPD has committed to an ambitious plan to further improve the culture of integrity in the Department. The Department’s leadership recognizes that it must be proactive to sustain this culture and support the Department’s vision of “setting the standard for excellence.” Attaining this goal requires developing leaders at all levels of the organization, and training is a key element. To cultivate effective leaders and to facilitate achievement of desired outcomes, the Department formed a leadership committee to develop a management skills course.
The Management Skills Course was envisioned as being the foundation for consistent organizational practices and would be complimentary to the West Point Leadership Course and the Virginia Beach City Supervisors Course. The desire was to fill the void between the basic leadership concepts and theories discussed in the West Point Leadership Course and the actual tasks the supervisor is expected to undertake as part of their routine duties. For this reason, the target audience for the course would not necessarily be the recently promoted supervisor. Instead it would be the member who has been working in a supervisory capacity for at least some time. The optimal student will have been a supervisor long enough to have mastered the basic skills necessary for police supervision and is now ready to learn more advanced concepts. Current and future leaders of the Department will achieve competencies in integral areas of command and leadership. The course will provide a sound base of understanding of administrative and operational tasks required of police leaders at various levels of command and how the tasks affect other divisions, agencies, and organizations in the City.

In order to develop the curriculum for this new course, a steering committee of Department supervisors from diverse disciplines and perspectives was gathered. During subsequent, regularly occurring meetings, they developed the overall goals for the course. This group worked under the direct supervision of a Deputy Chief, which enabled them to overcome many obstacles relating to time commitments, acquiring necessary assets, etc. The group established a timetable for course development and initiation that was aggressive, but also sufficient to develop the quality course envisioned. The group surveyed current Department leaders (Captains and Lieutenants) to assess the needs and identify the knowledge, skills, and abilities important for all leaders of this Department. These responses were compiled and a curriculum was developed. The course was broken down into four main areas: Customer Perspective, Financial Perspective, Internal Processes, and Learning and Growth.

Members of the committee were designated to develop learning objectives for each of the areas. The committee members further defined each of the four areas into specific and relevant topics for instruction. As an example, the area of Financial Perspective was broken down into two topic sections; Purpose of Risk Management (with sub-topics of Understanding Risks, Costs, and Self-insurance) and Overview of Budget/Purchasing/Grant Process (with sub-topics of Department Resource Management, City Economics, and Compensation Issues). Once sub-topics were identified and approved by the main committee as within the scope of the course, an umbrella of goals and objectives for each topic was developed and instructors who are leaders and professionals in the disciplines were recruited. The committee invited each of the selected instructors to attend an informational session in order to provide an overview, establish a sense of buy-in, and gain commitments from them to both develop lesson plans for their assigned topic and take part in instructing the topic during the first session of the course. The program for the first course to be held was ultimately honed to 60 hours of actual classroom instruction that would be supplemented by additional self-paced study away from the classroom.
During the development of the lesson plans, sub-group leaders maintained contact with each topic instructor to ensure the various lesson plans were meshing together as was envisioned. All completed lesson plans were then vetted through the main committee. Special attention was placed on ensuring lesson plan drafts were congruent with the goals and objectives established for the course. Subject matter experts were also tasked to review individual lesson plans for any conflicts with current Department policies and standards.

It was recognized that positive student feedback would be important for course success. As such, a marketing plan was developed to “sell” the course’s attributes, and efforts were focused on a target group of department members who were identified as current low- to mid-level leaders with promising potential for future growth within the organization.

The first session of the Management Skills Course was held beginning in October 2005. As Virginia Beach is a tourist destination and demands on the department increase during the summer season, in order to minimize the affect of course attendance on police operations and still maximize course availability the plan was to offer the course twice a year—once in the spring and again in the fall. The course would run several weeks with the class meeting as a group on an average of once a week. There was also expected to be self-study assignments that the student would be required to complete away from the classroom. This structure was patterned after the West Point Leadership course schedule. Infused into each block of instruction were evaluation mechanisms designed to gauge whether the instruction and curriculum effectively met the mission goal. Examples of some evaluation mechanisms are class participation, written assignments, and standard testing. A plan was developed to ensure a thorough review of evaluations and make adjustments to the curriculum as appropriate.

The inaugural course of instruction received positive feedback from attendees. Polling of attendees found that some topics were thought to be more relevant to the needs of the target audience, and as such the curriculum was adjusted with the plan of expanding preferred areas and minimizing or removing undesirable sections. Unfortunately, the course was not offered after this first group completed it. No specific issue could be identified that led to the course’s demise. The most likely cause is simply that with the significant amount of minimum standards training already required, along with the other instruction mandated by the department to ensure our members were above minimum standards, the Management Skills Course simply faded from existence. Also a likely contributor was the fact that the Deputy Chief who had spearheaded the implementation of the course left the department shortly after this first session. Recently, conversations have occurred with our current training staff to research the potential for reviving the course and making it available to our current supervisory cadre. As of the production of this report, these discussions are ongoing.
Sergeant’s Indoctrination Training

The Department’s senior leadership has long been concerned about the quality of the training and performance of new sergeants in the organization. This is literally the first step into leadership for many police leaders. Without adequate training beforehand, and appropriate developmental training after promotion, there is a significant possibility of a new leader stumbling during these first steps into police leadership.

The Department has developed and implemented a Sergeant’s Indoctrination Course for all sergeant promotional candidates. This weeklong course introduces the candidates to the principles of leadership and management that they will be expected to exercise. The course also emphasizes the administrative and tactical responsibilities of the police sergeant in the VBPD.

Sergeant’s Field Training Program

The Department has also developed a system of field training for new sergeants. Each newly promoted Sergeant undergoes three weeks of field training. The first week of field training consists of shadowing the Field Training Sergeant. The last two weeks of field training consist of completing a series of tasks using similar methods applied by Field Training Officers.

Leadership Coaching

Based on its research and experience in administering multi-rater feedback instruments (360-degree evaluations), the leadership faculty recognized the need to provide coaching newly promoted supervisors in order to improve the self-development potential gained from using multi-rater feedback instruments. It was further recognized that the best long-term option would be to develop a cadre of leadership coaches within the Department instead of contracting for that service. The Department partnered with George Mason University (GMU) to train these coaches.

The purpose of developing and using leadership coaches within the Department was to improve the leadership knowledge, skills, and abilities of formal leaders. This was accomplished through coaching leaders within the framework of the Leadership Practices Inventory multi-rater feedback that is provided to each student in the West Point Leadership Course and annually thereafter. A secondary purpose of leadership coaching was to facilitate faster and easier learning for newly promoted leaders.

The first step in developing leadership coaching abilities was to audit leadership coaching development programs throughout the nation. Programs can be administered through private providers as well as universities. The costs of many of these programs are prohibitive. Unfortunately, there were no leadership coaching development programs in Southeastern Virginia, however there were several provided by private providers and universities in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan region.
Based on an audit of programs in the Washington, D.C. area, the Professional Development and Training Leadership Development Coordinator contacted representatives of GMU. The School of Public Policy at GMU offers a graduate certificate in Leadership Coaching. A private leadership coaching development consulting company was also contacted. Both of these providers expressed an interest in partnering with the VBPD in developing leadership coaches.

The Leadership Development Coordinator spent a considerable amount of time with representatives from GMU and the private consulting firm in order to ensure that each provider understood the framework of leadership development within the VBPD and the Department’s desires in terms of developing and utilizing leadership coaches. The Leadership Development Coordinator worked with each provider to develop a leadership development proposal that met the needs of the VBPD. Both GMU and the private consulting firm responded to the formal proposal requests VBPD submitted. The proposal from GMU was selected primarily based on being the least costly.

The Department had decided that an initial cadre of fifteen leaders would be trained as leadership coaches. Leaders from throughout the Department were solicited to participate in the program. An informational briefing was conducted for those interested so that each had a good understanding of the time commitments associated with the developmental program and afterwards as leadership coaches. Participants were selected and began the program in February of 2005.

The leadership coaching development program consisted of a blended curriculum. This comprised four workshops of two days each, conducted in February, March, April, and May of 2005. Between each workshop, required readings and short papers were to be completed by each student and posted on GMU’s online learning environment. The class was divided into three groups of five, and each group was required to meet and complete group projects between workshops as well.

Coaching practice was also incorporated into the curriculum. Initially, each student practiced discrete aspects of coaching during student to student classroom group exercises. A leadership coach trainer also coached each student privately. This coaching was done within the context of each student’s recent feedback report using the Leadership Practices Inventory. After being coached, each student also coached a student in the current West Point Leadership Course while being observed by his or her leadership coach trainer.

Each student group completed a culminating exercise in group coaching by selecting a tough problem that a work group within the VBPD was attempting to resolve. The coaching groups coached the work groups in order to more fully align the work groups’ efforts and guide them to a successful resolution to the problem.
Challenges to Developing Leadership Coaches in Law Enforcement Agencies

There are four serious challenges to developing leadership coaches within a law enforcement agency. The first challenge is ensuring that a leadership development framework exists within the agency. There are many leadership development frameworks that can be applied within a law enforcement agency. The purpose of this guide isn’t to establish which may or may not be appropriate for any law enforcement agency, as conditions and funding will vary greatly. It is important that the agency’s leaders decide which framework works best for that agency and stick with it.

The second challenge is that, quite likely, no law enforcement agency has the internal capacity to independently develop leadership coaches. Consequently, outside providers must be utilized. The principle challenge in utilizing an outside provider is ensuring that the provider can and will supply training that meets the agency’s needs. It is important that the agency work closely with the provider to ensure the provider understands the leadership development framework within the agency and proposes a program shaped to meet the agency’s needs.

The third challenge is establishing how leadership coaching will occur within the law enforcement agency. It is quite likely that any specific or detailed concept of how coaching will be implemented before the coaches are trained will not be optimal for applying these newly learned skills. The best solution to this challenge is to make those decisions after the coaches are trained. The new coaches will be able to provide invaluable insight into how they can apply their new skills.

The fourth challenge is cost. Leadership coaching development requires a considerable amount of time devoted to individual and observed coaching sessions between the student and the coach trainer. This drives the costs up. The only consistently reliable solution to this challenge is to accept that leadership coaching development isn’t cheap, but the benefits the agency receives as a result will linger far into the future.

In developing and administering leadership programs, it is important to ensure that these programs and faculty don’t become stagnant. Extensive after-action reviews with both the students and faculty are conducted following each West Point Leadership Course. The leadership courses are continually evolving due to this rigorous after action review process, keeping things up to date and fresh.
Strengthening & Improving Internal Affairs Operations

Background

The primary goal of the grant component was to strengthen and improve the functions and operations of Internal Affairs. We wanted to ensure that our Professional Standards Office was able to provide the most up to date, detailed, and useful information to the command staff, to supervisors and officers, and to citizens and members of the community. Our desire was to make it easier and more transparent for both citizens and Department members to access information relevant to office operations, to complete our transition to digital technology, and to create an environment where citizens can easily file complaints or commendations, make suggestions, and receive updates.

The following is provided to assist the reader in gaining some perspective of the department's Professional Standards Office with respect to size, makeup, and mission. The staffing at the time of this report was one captain, two lieutenants, five sergeants, one master police officer, two administrative support personnel, and one part-time employee. As their primary responsibility, the Professional Standards Office is responsible for maintaining, and where possible, increasing the integrity of the Virginia Beach Police Department.

The office is subdivided into two branches to accomplish this goal:

The Internal Affairs Office

This section monitors and conducts full, fair, and objective investigations of all complaints against the Department, or allegations of misconduct on the part of employees of the department. The section is responsible for conducting all administrative investigations into allegations of employee misconduct relating to:

- Corruption
- Brutality
- Misuse of force
- Breach of civil rights
- Criminal misconduct
- All internal investigations involving the discharge of firearms
- All internal investigations involving persons who, while in police custody, or as a result of police action, receive a serious injury, attempt suicide, or die
- Assist the department's administration, the City's Risk Management Division, and the City Attorney's Office in preparation of cases to address civil litigations involving police personnel
- Other investigations as designated by the chief of police
It is the responsibility of the Internal Affairs section to develop sufficient information to support an appropriate disposition of each matter being investigated. Investigators diligently pursue every legitimate course of action in their efforts to obtain the facts. They are a fact-finding/investigative body only. It is not the office’s responsibility to adjudicate those matters it has investigated. Once the investigation has been completed, the case file will be provided to the commanding officer of the involved employee for adjudication. The final disposition is subject to the approval of the chief of police.

The Internal Affairs section acts as the clearinghouse and custodian for all administrative investigations. This includes maintaining written communications to provide status updates with the citizen complainant.

The office is tasked with maintenance and administration of the department’s computerized employee performance management and early warning system known as psAdvance.

During the past year the office took on the additional responsibility of conducting the administrative investigation into any line of duty employee disability and/or death cases. At the culmination of the investigation the office coordinates with the Virginia Retirement System to finalize the employee’s claim.

One sergeant is tasked full time as the Department’s Custodian of Records. In 2009 the office responded to 799 formal requests under the Freedom of Information Act, Subpoena Duces Tecum, and court orders for documents. This represents a 21.9 percent increase in requests when compared to the previous year. This is a trend that has been noted during the past several years.

A court liaison position is staffed by a part-time employee who is responsible for coordinating the relationship between our department and the Virginia Beach Courts.

**The Accreditation Office**

This section is responsible for the management and recordkeeping of all files, policies, and forms associated with the department’s standing as a fully accredited agency by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc. (CALEA®). This position requires daily oversight in the operation of the department and compliance with all the standards set forth by CALEA. This includes coordinating annual staff inspections of all the commands within the department to ensure operational readiness and administrative compliance with departmental policies for each command within the agency.
In 2009, Professional Standards documented a total of 393 administrative investigations broken down by the following incident types:7

- Citizen Complaints – 113
- Internal Investigations – 90
- Inquiries – 54
- Information – 108
- Disability – 3
- Firearms Discharges (including animal euthanasia) – 25

Pre-Grant Established Goals

With the aim of strengthening and improving Internal Affairs operations in mind, certain goals were identified in the early stages of this process by administrators and stakeholders as being important and within the scope of the grant’s primary objective of enhancing a culture of integrity within the VBPD. Most changes involve the use of technology enhancements or process improvements to increase communications in and out of the Professional Standards Office with both internal and external customers. We feel we have been very successful in accomplishing this broad goal. There were many unknowns at the onset of this project, and as such, the goals were in some cases modified to fit the reality as the project evolved. Following is a listing of the pre-grant established goals for the program. This listing is then followed by a description of what was actually realized and implemented.

- Purchase and deploy a modern computer software system that will enhance our Internal Affairs information capturing, reporting, and statistical analysis capabilities.
- Identify and purchase digital technology that will assist investigators and office personnel in recording, transcribing, and storing interviews and investigative material.
- Provide custom modifications and enhancements to the in-house IA database.
- Update our in-house IA database to include a web-based use of force system where relevant data are available to line personnel while security and confidentiality are maintained.
- Develop policy and staff training for the use of the web-based use of force application.
- Distribute a monthly publication to all police personnel of the closed administrative cases, listing a summary, allegation, and disposition of each case while protecting the identity of the involved employees.

---

- Add a commendation and complaint link on the police department’s web page that allows citizens to submit complaints, requests, and commendations directly to the Professional Standards Office for appropriate action.
- Provide alternative resolution strategies for complaints by providing a tool for the officer and citizen to communicate and voice their concerns.
- Follow up on citizen complaints with a letter sent to the complainant informing them that their complaint has been received and will be investigated as well as what is involved with the complaint process.
- Develop, publish, and distribute police informational brochures for the public in both English and Spanish.

**Implemented Process Changes & Improvements**

The goals established for these projects were well thought out and researched prior to our grant application. As such, how we put the new goals into operation remained fairly in line with our established goals. That being said, some modifications were made as the project progressed due to technology advancements and resource availability. Below are the actual outcomes of our efforts.

**Goals and Outcomes**

*Purchase and deployment of the IAPro Internal Affairs software.*

At the time we applied for this grant, the Professional Standards Office was utilizing an in-house developed software program to enter and track administrative investigations. This was supplemented by a paper-based tracking and documentation system. While this system was functional and satisfied our needs on a very basic level, research had shown us that technology enhancements were occurring at a rapid pace and that better systems were available in the marketplace. Our desire at that time was to purchase a modern computer software system designed to enhance Internal Affairs information capturing, reporting, and statistical analysis capabilities.

*Source: Reproduced by permission of Mr. Michael Blumberg, President. IAPro Internal Affairs Software. CI Technologies, Inc. Saint Augustine, FL.*
After researching the few programs on the market specifically designed to meet our needs, we purchased a modern, commercially available software program developed by CI Technologies, Inc. called IAPro. IAPro is full-featured software that's been designed from the ground-up to meet the needs of Internal Affairs and Professional Standards units. IAPro was first released in 1998 and is currently the leading Internal Affairs/Professional Standards software used by law enforcement agencies across the United States, Canada, and Australia. The program is designed to ensure the most efficient handling of citizen complaints, administrative investigations, use of force reporting, and other types of incidents, while providing the means to analyze and identify areas of concern. At the time of this report’s production there are over 250 public safety agencies utilizing IAPro.8

CI Technologies’ goal is to provide a software solution that addresses the following core needs:

- **Case management** – The handling of citizen complaints and other internal investigations in a timely and effective manner is crucial to the effectiveness of IAPro customers. IAPro has many features that support this concept, often with unique, graphical interfaces that are easy to learn and utilize.

- **Statistical reports and charts** – A wide range of these are available from IAPro, many of which are highly configurable in a user-friendly manner.

- **Security and access control** – Data in IAPro is secured so that access can be controlled based on need-to-know concepts. In addition, access to many key IAPro features can be set individually for each IAPro user. The IAPro system administrator is in charge of maintaining each IAPro user’s access rights and privileges.

- **Automated correspondence** – IAPro offers several approaches to supporting the time-consuming endeavor of generating letters and other documents.

- **Early intervention** – Also known as early warning, early intervention encompasses the proactive identification of possible performance problems within the organization. Performance problems can be identified at the employee, unit, or allegation level, among others. IAPro supports the early intervention concept via its alert functions, and also various reports and data display interfaces.

This software is in wide use by police departments around the country, and it has done everything we hoped it would do in terms of modernizing our Internal Affairs information capturing, reporting, and statistical analysis capabilities. It has enabled us to digitize nearly all of our IA documents and provide useful and comprehensive reports to city leaders and decision makers in the Department. We have accomplished this and achieved better results than we anticipated or predicted in all areas with the exception of the program’s early intervention component. While functional, we found it did not address our need for a more intuitive and self-administered program. A standalone early intervention system was sought out and acquired. This system will be discussed in greater detail later in this report.

---

The section of our grant allocated toward support functions proved to be unnecessary. The vendor for our software program was able to successfully integrate the data from two different programs into the new IAPro software without having to do manual data entry or transfer. The analysis described in the proposal was based on having to compile the data related to the new database, but the software we acquired included the database analysis features that we expected to have to provide ourselves. The baseline data is established in the program itself.

Overall, our success with the IAPro system and dealings with CI Technologies have been nearly 100 percent successful. We would recommend the product and vendor to other law enforcement agencies seeking to deploy a dedicated IA case tracking and storage system.

*Identify and purchase digital technology that will assist investigators and office personnel in recording, transcribing, and storing interviews and investigative material.*

Modernizing the technology of the Professional Standards Office was a major priority for this funding. The goal was to develop systems where various technological elements would work cooperatively. The solution to this was moving away from outdated systems and incorporating an all-digital structure that would enhance the integration of the unit’s operations. This required converting files and equipment to a digital format, purchase of a state of the art laptop, new digital recording equipment, software for transcribing digital recordings, and—overlapping into the Enhancing a Culture of Integrity grant—new digital telephone recording equipment. This portion of the grant project has been a great success. All of the Professional Standards investigators are now equipped with digital recording equipment and the support staff is equipped to transcribe interviews, telephone calls, etc. This has enabled us to store all files in a central, accessible, electronic format, send files electronically in a secure format, record and maintain all calls, even those that may not be valid complaints, and do all of this more quickly and more efficiently. These electronic files are then transferred to a network storage drive where they are accessible, archived, and also become part of the electronic case file entered into the IAPro system. This benefits the organization, the employees, and the citizens of our community by helping to ensure that their complaints are handled effectively and expeditiously.

This concept was part of our overall goal in modernizing the equipment we were utilizing to increase the quality and interoperability of our current processes. It was envisioned that this would ultimately cut costs by reducing the number of consumables (paper, recording tapes, etc.) we were utilizing. At the time this initiative was first undertaken, electronic digital data storage of high volume items such as audio and video recordings was just emerging into the marketplace as a viable alternative to more traditional analog cassette tapes. This system has worked very well for us and has actually been used as a model for other investigative units in the department.
Provide custom modifications and enhancements to the IA database to include a web-based use of force system where relevant data are available to line personnel while security and confidentiality are maintained.

Our solution ultimately was to eliminate the IA database we were using and begin using the IAPro system.

Develop policy and staff training for the use of the web-based use of force application.

One of the attractive features of IAPro is an available sub-system that works in tandem with IAPro to open up field reporting capabilities outside of the Professional Standards Office. BlueTeam is software that allows officers and supervisors to enter and manage incidents from “the field.”

A simple, step-by-step internet-style interface is used, minimizing training requirements. Incidents including use-of-force, field-level discipline, complaints, vehicle pursuits, and firearms discharges are entered via a secure web-accessible interface and can then be routed through the chain-of-command with review and approval at each step. The approved entry can then be electronically transferred directly from the field to the Professional Standards Office.

The application streamlines the intake and assessment of information from the field and eliminates significant redundant data entry workload within Professional Standards by providing a link between the two. It also eliminates the handling and filling out of cumbersome paper forms. Rather than having paper forms filled out and sent to the Professional Standards Unit for data entry, the information is entered one time via a web form, where BlueTeam enforces the entry of required information. The web form utilizes pick-list values, enforcing consistency of the data entered. This results in more consistent and pertinent statistical reports. Since BlueTeam is a browser-based web application, it resides on a web server and no installation of software is required on the users’ computers. There are also no digital storage issues beyond what is already utilized by the IAPro system.

Our department initially purchased the BlueTeam supplement shortly after beginning use of the IAPro database. There was some concern among department leaders that some officers would not possess the technical capabilities to manipulate this type of system, and as a result, deployment of BlueTeam throughout the department was delayed for several years while adequate training resources were identified. What we learned is that most officers do in fact possess the knowledge, skills, and abilities to work within such a system. Training and full deployment of the system was only recently accomplished, but so far the system has met with extremely favorable feedback from users and there have been few noted difficulties. In order to diminish apprehension in some people that may not be overly computer savvy, during the training the instructors would typically utilize a phrase similar to, “If you can buy something online from Amazon or eBay, you can use the BlueTeam system.” This statement has turned out to be fairly accurate and we have gotten great results.
Distribute a monthly publication to all police personnel of the closed administrative cases, listing a summary, allegation, and disposition of each case while protecting the identity of the involved employees.

The focus of this goal was to provide a level of transparency to all department members of the details relating to administrative investigations. Like most departments, ours contained a culture where most things held as secret did not remain secret long. This was undoubtedly true with respect to some details of the administrative investigations being conducted. What we found to be consistent was that even though some factual details relating to these investigations tended to circulate, the vast majority of what floated about in the “rumor mill” was in fact fictitious. Unfortunately, human nature seems to predispose us to believe what we hear as fact. This set the stage for conflict when the actual outcomes of some administrative investigations became known. Depending on the content of the rumored details, the rank and file would draw conclusions that the accused member “beat the system” if the rumor was worse than the actual facts, or they “got screwed” if the rumors minimized the facts.

Much debate occurred on this issue at all levels of the department prior to beginning to disseminate these reports in January 2005. Good arguments were made on both sides of the issue, with the primary concerns raised relating to a perceived reduction of information security and a violation of the privacy expectations of the accused member. It was ultimately resolved that it was more important to ensure the distribution of factual information and to provide the opportunity for observational learning than it was to place absolute protections on the information. Concerns with the employee’s privacy rights were alleviated by ensuring that the information put out is sufficiently sanitized to protect the identity of the involved employee(s), while still providing enough information to make the report a useful resource for department members.

Other benefits have also been realized with respect to providing a resource to ensure consistency between different commands as to the appropriate outcomes and actions taken on certain infractions. Prior to this report being distributed it was not unheard of for employees in one command to receive considerable discipline for an indiscretion while employees at another command fared much better when faced with similar circumstances. In most cases this was not a result of one commander being more uncompromising than the other; it was merely a result of commanders not being aware of how their peers were handling these matters. The department had instituted a number of procedures in the past to provide some level of oversight to this process and attempt to reduce the examples of over and under reactions by commanders, however most of these efforts met with limited success. By providing this monthly report, and maintaining an archive of them, supervisors now have a resource to turn to in order to gauge how other commands are handling matter similar to their own.
The enhanced level of transparency within this process also acts as a quality control measure for the commands adjudicating cases. Prior to instituting the process, it was observable that some commands tended to have lower rates of sustained cases than others. It was also occasionally noted that some command’s adjudicatory findings did not seem to mesh with the actual details of the investigation. This publication provides a sanitized summary of the original allegation as well as any pertinent details revealed during the investigation, resulting in a good overall view of the facts. This “light of day” test provides barriers to adjudicating cases in a manner inconsistent with the facts. While many employees might have suspected that department leaders were overly harsh and been under the perception that leaders were sustaining allegations against them that should have been cleared otherwise, the facts support the opposite conclusion.

Add a commendation and complaint link on the police department’s web page that allows citizens to submit complaints, requests, and commendations directly to the Professional Standards Office for appropriate action.

The City of Virginia Beach and the VBPD have long maintained an interactive and interoperable public access web page that provides citizens with current information and the ability to make inquiries. These types of advances have resulted in the city winning a number of technology awards. This background provided us with a good footing to enhance the department’s web page with a simple hyperlink that would give the citizen access to a fill-in-the-blank submission page where they can voice a concern or provide a compliment with respect to an interaction they had with a member of the department.

The web form asks them to provide their name and contact information (both optional), a narrative as to what occurred, and the name of the law enforcement employee they encountered. We have experienced great success by offering this 24/7 service. While we do encounter a few anonymous rants that contain little value, the vast majority of submissions are from citizens expressing real concerns. We also receive a surprising number of compliments on our officers. These sentiments are ones we may not have been made aware of if the citizen was required to call in during business hours. Additionally, we’ve received “tips” of a substantial nature, providing detailed information on employee misconduct. The nature of some of these tips leads us to believe the informant is most likely an employee taking advantage of the anonymous nature of the web portal to pass along information they are concerned about.
For a no-cost, low maintenance approach to increasing the accountability of the department and the approachability of its internal affairs function, this option is hard to beat.

*Provide alternative resolution strategies for complaints by providing a tool for the officer and citizen to communicate and voice their concerns.*

This goal culminated in a new program, the Citizen Complaint Mediation Program, developed by the police department in cooperation with the City’s Mediation Coordinator. The program’s concept is a good one, but it has met with mixed results. The program will be discussed in detail later in this report.

*Follow up on citizen complaints with a letter sent to the complainant informing them that their complaint has been received and will be investigated as well as what is involved with the complaint process.*

This process was developed and instituted in policy a short time after being established as a goal. Professional Standards acts as the clearinghouse for the documentation and assignment of all administrative investigations. Upon initial notification of a citizen complaint, they correspond in writing with the complainant in order to acknowledge receipt of the complaint. Upon return of an administrative investigation case file from the chief, they notify the complainant of the disposition in writing and record the findings accordingly. If the investigation goes beyond time lines established in policy they would make written notification to the complainant advising them of such.9

*Develop, publish, and distribute police informational brochures for the public in both English and Spanish.*

These informational brochures were developed and distributed a short time after being established as a goal. The department currently has three bilingual pamphlets currently available; *Giving Compliments or Making Complaints, Internal Affairs Factsheet,* and *What to Do When Stopped by the Police.* Both versions of each document are available on the department’s web page, as well as in every command and bureau within the department.

---

Citizen Complaint Mediation Program

Overview

In order to enhance community relations between Department members and the citizens of Virginia Beach, the VBPD developed a voluntary program that allows citizens and Department members the opportunity to discuss their concerns, share their views, explore possible solutions, and work through a neutral mediator to resolve their differences.

The process was designed to allow direct communications between Department members and citizens who had contacted the Professional Standards Office to express their dissatisfaction with the services they received from the Department member. It was envisioned that the program would provide Department members with the opportunity to explain their actions to the citizen and perhaps educate the citizen about Department practices and protocols as a result. It was also predicted that officers would walk away from the experience with a better understanding of how their interactions with a citizen were perceived and perhaps provide them the ability to adjust how they interact with citizens in the future. From the citizen’s perspective it was considered desirable to provide more satisfaction with the complaint process, a better understanding of the agency’s protocols and practices, and the opportunity to personally make their concerns known and understood. In short, it provided the opportunity for the parties to learn from one another.

Development of the Program

Members of the VBPD’s Professional Standards Office consulted with the San Diego Police Department about a similar program they had in place. Virginia Beach then tailored a program to fit the criterion established by department leaders. Basic program elements were outlined and the department’s command staff was consulted for their input. Consultations were also held with the City Attorney to determine the legal feasibility of enacting the program, and the City Mediation Coordinator was contacted to ensure our program was in compliance with the Supreme Court’s provisions on mediation. Once consultations were complete, a draft General Order was prepared and ultimately endorsed by the department’s command staff. An informational bulletin and the guiding general orders were then distributed department wide, advising that the process was available and what its parameters were. Members of the Professional Standards Office then attended precinct staff meetings to familiarize the supervisors about their responsibilities in the process and a block of instruction was taught in the department’s Management Skills Course.
Program Guidelines

As is described in the department’s Administrative Investigation Field Guide, the Mediation Program was established as a voluntary process in accordance with Code of Virginia Section 2.2-4116; that allows citizens and department members the opportunity to discuss their concerns, share their views, explore possible solutions, and work through a neutral mediator to resolve their differences. Mediation is “a process in which a neutral (mediator) facilitates communication between parties and without deciding the issues or imposing a solution on the parties enables them to understand and resolve their dispute.” Mediators utilized in this process are trained mediators from the City's Human Resources Department. The police department designates a Mediation Coordinator who serves as the liaison between Professional Standards and the City Mediation Coordinator. The VBPD Coordinator will also answer any general questions about department policies or practices that the mediator may need addressed.

All citizen complaints can be considered for mediation. Generally speaking allegations of Conformance to Laws and Excessive or Unnecessary Force will not be referred for mediation because of the significant nature of those offenses. Each case is judged on its merits and severity as to whether it is eligible. Those complaints that we have seen mediated most are Courtesy, Unsatisfactory Performance, and Treatment of Persons. These are the types of incidents that have the greatest potential for both a resolution and a common understanding being adopted by both parties.

Complaints from persons who have been charged with a crime will not be eligible for mediation until the criminal charges pending against the complainant have been heard and court proceedings are concluded. All members of the VBPD are eligible for mediation provided the employee does not have a high number of founded complaints or previous involvement in the mediation process.

The mediation process is typically initiated during the first interview conducted between the complainant and the documenting supervisor. Supervisors and members of Professional Standards shall accept and document the complaint as provided by policy. During the initial interview with the complainant, the complainant is made aware of the mediation program as an alternative to resolving his/her dispute with the employee. If the citizen is interested in mediation, the supervisor then contacts a Professional Standards Lieutenant who will review the merits of the case and make the final determination as to whether the case can proceed to mediation. If the case is determined to be eligible for mediation, a member of Professional Standards will contact the employee, advise the employee of the case eligibility factors, and inquire about the employee’s willingness to participate in the program. If the employee is agreeable to mediation, then the complainant will be made aware of that decision and the department Mediation Coordinator will coordinate the process of locating a City Mediator that is acceptable to both parties and a mutually agreeable date, time, and location for the mediation session. If the officer declines to participate in mediation, the matter will proceed as a formal complaint in accordance with standard procedures.

Regardless of how the matter proceeds, the complainant will be made aware of the process being undertaken.

For tracking and filing purposes, mediation cases are given a Professional Standards Office (PSO) case number in a fashion similar to all other formal administrative investigations. Prior to the beginning of the mediation session the employee and the complainant must sign an Agreement to Mediate form, which describes the process guidelines. At anytime during the mediation process either party can withdraw their request for mediation. The complaint will then revert back to the PSO for investigative assignment. Under the provisions of Virginia state code, mediation is confidential; therefore no proceeding will be recorded. There shall be no appeal from a successful mediation resolution. Any agreement arising out of the mediation proceeding shall not be binding upon the department unless the department affirms the agreement. At the conclusion of the mediation, the mediator(s) will deliver a statement of outcome to the VBPD Mediation Coordinator categorizing the resolution as agreement, non-agreement, or partial agreement. A non-agreement will be referred back to Professional Standards for investigative assignment.

If the citizen complaint is successfully mediated, the complainant will agree to authorize Professional Standards to “officially” withdraw the complaint. The case will then be logged and tracked by the assigned mediation case number. Both parties will receive a letter outlining their successful mediation and declaring the issue(s) fully resolved. In accordance with Virginia state law mediation files are confidential. As such, the mediation file shall not be reproduced, duplicated, or made public in any way. The files will be maintained for a period of 2 years, commencing from the date of the mediation, before being removed and destroyed. If the mediation is unsuccessful, or if during the course of the mediation, either or both parties request a formal investigation, the case will be returned to Professional Standards for investigation. During the Professional Standards investigation, no party will be permitted to refer to any statements made during the mediation process unless all parties to the mediation agree in writing to waive the confidentiality.

For tracking and statistical purposes the confidentiality of these records shall not preclude Professional Standards from capturing general statistical information necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of the mediation process.
Program Outcomes

The program has met with mixed outcomes. While the concept is good, and there truly are benefits to be had by both parties, we have had low participation and the program has for the most part fallen out of use. The following is an overview of general program participation facts since its inception in 2006:

◆ 2006 – Five mediation cases were initiated and all were rated as being successful by the participants. A successful rating is indicative that an agreement was reached. In debriefing the assigned mediators without discussing the particulars of any individual case, we learned that the parties in some of these matters may have never come to the complete agreement that whatever disagreement had occurred—prompting the original complaint—was resolved. However, in all cases the parties agreed that each of them had justifiable reasons for their perceptions and they both came away with a better understanding of each other. We certainly consider that a successful resolution.

◆ 2007 – Eleven mediation cases were initiated. Five of the mediations were listed as successful, but six were not. Of the six that were not, in almost every case it was a result of the complainants failing to follow up with the Mediation Coordinator in coordinating an appointment with the mediator. The complainants in these cases simply stopped being involved in the process (failing to return phone calls, disregarding letters, etc.) or advised us they no longer desired to proceed.

◆ 2008 – Five mediation cases were initiated. Two of the mediations were listed as successful and one was not.

◆ 2009 – No mediation cases were initiated.

◆ 2010 – One mediation case was initiated and it was successful. It should be noted that this case did not follow the normal path that one of these incidents typically follows. Mediation was used more as an adjudicatory step by the involved employee’s command to assist the employee to gain a better perspective on how they were perceived by the public. The command reported positive outcomes with this tactic. With the consent of the Professional Standards commander, the case was then reclassified from a Citizen Complaint, which had already been fully investigated, to a Mediation. While policy does not strictly permit this to occur, the outcomes were positive overall.
As was stated previously, it is our position that the concept of mediation is a good one. It offers the citizen the opportunity to voice their concerns directly to the officer in a controlled environment, and provides the officer an opportunity to better understand how their actions were perceived by the citizen. If successful, the interaction may cause a better understanding and an opportunity for growth for both parties. From the officer’s perspective, it also offers them the opportunity to keep the complaint from being documented as a formal matter and being placed in the employee’s permanent Professional Standards’ history. As long as the officer does his/her part to engage in the Mediation process, details on those cases are kept confidential and not reported out as part of his/her history. It is noteworthy that in almost all cases in which mediation was not successful, the citizen failed to participate and follow through. We rarely saw officers balk at the opportunity to mediate the case.

The low participation in the program most likely results from a sense of frustration on the part of the Professional Standards investigators. During the first years of the program it was mandated that the possibility of mediation be introduced in all citizen complaints that were of the type appropriate for mediation received by Professional Standards. Of the hundreds of complaints received during each of those years, only a small handful agreed to participate in mediation. Of those that agreed to participate, only a small percentage ultimately followed through and participated in the program. This was regardless of the extra efforts made by the investigator to secure their participation. Ultimately the program fell out of use as a result of the Professional Standards investigators becoming sufficiently frustrated with it and thereby not introducing it to complainants as an option. While there is no harm in allowing the program to exist as an option in policy, perhaps a restructuring of the program is in order to make it more appealing for use.
Early Intervention System

Overview

Effective community policing is based on the mutual trust that is established between police officers and the citizens they serve. It is imperative that the community has confidence in the integrity of their officers. Improper or unethical actions of a few officers can erode the trust between the community and the police department. The expectation is to develop positive relations with the community by reducing or eliminating problem behaviors of officers. It sends the message to citizens that the department does not tolerate unacceptable behavior.

Another crucial element for reinforcing the community policing philosophy is to ensure officers have confidence in the integrity of the system. By identifying and intervening with those employees demonstrating problem behaviors, positive steps are made to ensure the employee’s success. Successful employees are those the community trusts and appreciates.

Prior to the application for this grant, the VBPD had an internal affairs software program that was developed in-house, along with a basic use of force software program, also developed in house. Neither provided any sort of automatic notification of excessive complaints or use of force. We had no mechanism in place for looking at use of force reports or citizen complaints—the system relied solely on Professional Standards Office investigators manually looking up an officer’s history and letting their command know how many previous complaints were on file.

Virginia Beach Police Chief A. M. Jacocks, Jr., and members of his command staff were familiar with some of the work being done in the area of Early Intervention Systems (EIS), and knowing that our internal affairs software was badly out of date, looked to this COPS grant as an opportunity to modernize our system and develop a state of the art EIS at the same time. Our grant application therefore, described the sort of EIS that we hoped we could acquire with this funding, and we included all the features we considered desirable.

One of the first things we did with this funding was to send two members to an EIS conference in Phoenix, Arizona. Phoenix is a city that, like Pittsburgh, Los Angeles, and a few others, has invested quite a bit in the past few years to develop their Early Intervention programs. The members we sent, representing our Information Technology staff and our Professional Standards staff, provided us with a balanced view of what we wanted to accomplish and what the technological challenges would be. They learned very quickly that the amount available in the application would not begin to fund a software package that would approach the level of sophistication we described. The programs that were in place in Phoenix and in Pittsburgh, which included the elements we described, were budgeted in the millions of dollars, not the thousands we envisioned.

The good news, however, was that software vendors were beginning to include the features found in those state of the art programs in their off-the-shelf internal affairs programs. While not as sophisticated, some of the new products on the market would provide many of the features we needed, and lay the groundwork for future expansion. After looking at a wide variety of applications, and doing much research, we settled on the product made by CI Technologies called IAPro, with a fairly comprehensive early intervention component.
This brought our use of force database and our internal affairs database into one application, and provided an automated alert system for complaints, internal investigations, and uses of force. We still wanted to further advance our EI system capabilities, but the initial success of IAPro was a good indicator that the Enhancing a Culture of Integrity Grant would enable us to reach our goal.

This portion of the project was largely internal to the city, and our partners were the city’s Communications and Information Technology Department (ComIT) and the purchasing department. While no particular barriers were encountered, there were communications breakdowns. The speed with which the project was implemented became an issue, partly because of our lack of knowledge of our own internal systems. This difficulty was preventable, but it may be a common problem with law enforcement agencies dealing with highly technical purchases.

The VBPD established a goal of implementing an automated and functional EIS that would decrease citizen complaints, improve employee performance, implement an effective early intervention database, and reduce the opportunity for litigation on the basis of deliberate indifference. The department has always tracked employee performance through a manual process. Positive performance was recorded on a yearly performance appraisal report that includes mandated supervisory consultation with the employee. Negative performance tracking was accomplished by Internal Affairs by reviewing the employee’s complaint history and notifying the respective command if there was a concerning pattern of behavior or a high number of complaints in a given period of time. This approach was very one dimensional in nature and lacked any mechanism for the reviewing supervisor to study the complaints to determine if correlating factors existed. No automated tracking mechanisms were in place to ensure adequate scrutiny by the employee’s command.

The goal of our agency was to develop a more complex EIS that captures various behavior indicators, both positive and negative, and provides these data to supervisors in an interpretable format. This system would assist department leaders to assess, manage, and minimize risk through intervention before it became a matter for disciplinary action or some other crisis occurred that could ruin a career and erode community confidence. Such a system would allow the department to identify police employees who may be considered at risk, as well as employees demonstrating exemplary behavior. At their core, EISs are designed to perform three primary functions:

- Identify those employees that are exhibiting symptoms of job stress, training deficiencies, or personal problems that affect their job performance.
- Assist supervisors in identifying, addressing, and potentially preventing harmful behavior on the part of their employees.
- It “warns” the officer (puts them on notice) so if there is a behavioral problem they have the opportunity to address it.
EI Systems have been used in some police agencies for more than 25 years, but early systems were designed to merely “warn” supervisors about “problem officers.” The warnings were generated in most cases because the officer breached a pre-defined numeric threshold. Because of the rudimentary nature of these systems, no consideration was given to officer productivity or assignment. Typical EISs in place at the time of initiation of this project operated by an administrator manually establishing certain predetermined parameters on quantifiable activities, and then the system automatically monitoring employee performance for those events to occur. When thresholds are reached the system provided notification to the administrator who would then bring the situation to the attention of the employee’s chain of command, allowing for supervisory intervention. Depending on what activity the alert was related to, the department might be in a position to intervene before the behavior leads to the need for discipline.

Approximately 3 years following the incorporation of the IAPro system for use in the department, the PSO began to utilize the newly introduced early intervention component in IAPro. IAPro’s early intervention functionality is based on alerts, analysis functions, and statistical reports that enable the customer to identify officers or organizational components that may be experiencing performance problems. In IAPro, most alerts are triggered by the linking of an officer to an incident. When this occurs, thresholds that have been set by the IAPro system administrator are checked in the background, and alerts are triggered for any that are met or exceeded. Thresholds are the number of occurrences within a given time period. An example would be when three or more citizen complaints are received against a particular employee during any 12-month period, a “Citizen Complaint” alert will be triggered. There are several different types of alert thresholds that can be set in IAPro, but they all function on this same premise. No consideration is given for overall employee activity or assignment—the system merely counts certain entries. In Virginia Beach, system managers in Professional Standards had established threshold limits with respect to individual employee involvement in certain administrative investigations (citizen complaints, internal investigations, inquiries) and/or the completion of a certain number of Use of Force reports. The system also has the capability of generating notifications if members working for a certain supervisor or organizational component reach certain overall alert activity thresholds. This may be useful in determining if a certain supervisor or organizational component is, as a group, exhibiting potentially concerning behaviors. IAPro is a functional system, but fairly simplistic in nature. It purely counts entries without any further analysis. It is up to administrators to determine what the trigger points for an alert should be. It is also a high maintenance system since all administration occurs in Professional Standards. This includes a system review to ensure the alert is valid, generation of documentation (activity causing the alert, employee’s PSO history, etc.) to support the alert, which is forwarded to the employee’s command for review, and tracking of responses from the parent command to determine how the matter was addressed. Since Virginia Beach has opted to not provide department supervisors with access to the IAPro database, and the command needs detailed information beyond the standard PSO employee resume, the supporting documentation for some employees can be expansive.

The importance of setting appropriate thresholds was recognized by the Professional Standards Office. Too high a threshold and the system would fail to alert administrators when potentially unacceptable behavior was occurring. Too low would cause the system to fire unnecessarily and become a nuisance to users. Prior to introduction of the program department wide, research was conducted in an effort to determine reasonable threshold levels. Several national studies had been released on EIS use that indicated in any given law enforcement agency a small percentage of employees were responsible for a disproportionate share of negative job related feedback, such as citizen complaints and the use of excessive force. It was also established as a generally accepted belief by police leaders that 10 percent of their officers were the cause of 90 percent of problems. Incredibly, one national sample of complaints found that 2 percent of officers are responsible for 50 percent of all citizen complaints. While Virginia Beach did not perfectly align with these national studies, we were close enough to make the research applicable and the facts were considered when establishing threshold limits. Virginia Beach set threshold limits to capture the activity generated by the top 10 percent of the department’s officers during a 12-month observation period. As an example, a review of the use of force activity for the department’s 800 sworn officers revealed that the top 10 percent of officers had completed six use of force reports during a 12-month period. Based on that logic, the following thresholds were established. An alert would be generated if during a 12-month rolling calendar period an individual employee was listed as the involved officer in:

- Three or more citizen complaints
- Three or more internal investigations
- Three or more inquiries
- Six or more use of force reports regardless of nature
- Twelve or more of any combination of incidents

While this equation was based on solid research, it failed to take into account certain factors. Depending on assignment, employees may be far more prone to engage in activities that would cause the generation of alerts. This is especially true of a seasonal tourist destination such as Virginia Beach. Not only might some activities occur at a far more rapid interval than others depending on the employee’s assignment, but differences also tend to occur based on time of year. IAPro is unable to adapt to these changing dynamics without the active management of an administrator. The task of constantly determining at what threshold levels each individual unit and squad should be operating at depending on the season of the year would be a full-time administrative task and unlikely to be successful. However, the result of not performing these constant adjustments is that some employees in non-confrontation prone assignments

Figure 2. Breakdown of alerts generated by EIS between 2004 and 2006.

(Economic Crimes Detective, Crime Analyst, DARE officer, etc.) are directly compared to employees involved in more confrontation prone assignments (walking beat officer in tourist/bar district, K9 handler, SWAT officer, etc.). This reality ultimately wreaked havoc within the system, causing the walking beat officer to collect a steady stream of alerts and the ECU detective to never receive one.

In addition, with the settings used the system constantly looks at the past 364-day time period for activity and generates alerts based on that activity. So the officer who completes his sixth use of force report in the third month of the period under observation will generate an alert for that use of force and every other one that occurs after that until the employee can get back under the six in 12 months threshold. For some employees in high confrontation prone assignments, such as the walking beat officer during the height of tourist season, they never got down below that threshold and as a result generated an alert every time a use of force report was completed.

To illustrate graphically how this affected our department, the early intervention component of IAPro was first introduced for department use late in 2004 and remained active under the 10 percent/364 day rule until mid-year 2007. In 2004 a total of only four alerts were generated, albeit the system was introduced late in the year. As the system continued to build on activity under review we began to see dramatic increases in the number of alerts being generated. In 2005 44 alerts were initiated followed by 188 in 2006 (see Figure 2). That is representative of approximately a 427 percent increase from 2005 to 2006.16

The types of alerts received were significantly weighted toward use of force reports being initiated (see Figure 3). The alerts in reference to administrative investigations, while still disproportionately seen in some assignments, would most likely have been manageable to review for the system administrator and the parent command. The alerts, except for use of force, were simply untenable. In 2006 we documented so many alerts on some employees that we administratively began defeating our own system and only issued every third or fourth alert to the parent command for their review. It did not take long for the EIS to lose credibility as a reliable source of information.

To make matters worse, the vast majority of these alerts were occurring within just a few commands (see Figure 4 on page 37). Not surprisingly, the alert activity centered on those commands which had officers working in assignments that were more prone toward the utilization of force, the receipt of citizen complaints, and initiation of internal investigations. This includes the Second Precinct, which oversees operations in the main Oceanfront (tourist) area of the city, and Special Operations, which houses the K9 Unit, SWAT Team, and DUI Task Force.17

---

**Figure 3.** Breakdown of alerts generated by EIS in 2006.
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Source: Provided by Virginia Beach Police Department Office of Professional Standards.
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17. CI Technologies. 2007. Virginia Beach Police Department IAPro Production Database, December.
Development and Implementation of a Stand Alone Early Intervention System

The introduction of IAPro’s early warning component to the VBPD was always felt to be a stopgap measure until a more intuitive performance management system could be designed and fielded. We began the process of developing requirements for an effective and state of the art EI system, focusing on a broader approach than what most EI systems look at. While most EI systems at the time were looking at complaints and use of force, we wanted to look at overall performance and provide constant monitoring. A traditional EI system has triggers that alert management to potential problems, but we wanted a system that would enable supervisors to look at performance issues on a day-to-day basis. Although we knew that other agencies, such as the Los Angeles and Pittsburgh Police Departments, had developed EI systems that cost millions of dollars, we believed we could benefit from speed in the growth of the technologies involved and hopefully count on the general trend of computer related products to go down in cost.

It was recognized that a project of this scope would need experts from different disciplines involved from inception to the final deployment. The development team was made up of subject matter experts with a strong background in law enforcement and employee performance, as well as those with strong technical abilities in the areas of computer networking and software design. The law enforcement aspect was provided by mid-level managers and first-line supervisors from the Professional Standards Office and the technical expertise came from systems analysts employed by the police department and network/database analysts employed by the city’s Information Technology office.
Two members of the police department, a police lieutenant and a civilian systems analyst, attended an early intervention conference in Phoenix, Arizona. At that time the Phoenix Police Department had what was considered to be a cutting edge EIS in place, which they developed by use of their own in-house technology department.

Upon our members’ return, presentations were made to our command staff outlining the purpose of an EIS and identifying the desire to develop a system customized specifically to meet the needs of our department. Department commanders endorsed the concept, thereby providing the support needed to further the project. At the time of this briefing the plan for how the system would work and what it would include were very loosely defined. Commanders directed that a broad spectrum of department members be included in the early planning stages in order to establish design parameters.

Based on our desire to field a system that would be used to monitor more than just negative employee attributes (complaints, use of force allegations, etc.), and the recognition that the system would need to rely heavily on electronic databases for functionality, the city’s Information Technology department (ComIT) was consulted and it was decided they would supply a Project Manager who would facilitate and track the progress of the project. The decision to turn over the management component of the project to an entity outside of the police department was not taken lightly. The City of Virginia Beach’s Information Technology department is tasked with the oversight, placement, and maintenance of all city owned computer system hardware. They also control all software deployment and internal networked applications used by the city government. Project coordinators needed access to these various ComIT controlled assets in order to extract, load, and display data in the EIS from other database systems. In order for the access to be granted, ComIT’s management insisted on overall control of the project. It is noteworthy that once ComIT’s project manager was assigned, that person created an informal arrangement with the police department’s project leaders that management of the project would be shared by the two organizations. Regardless of how the senior management in ComIT viewed the supervision of the project, those actually performing the work recognized the need for collaboration.

A focus group, comprised of members from various ranks, divisions, and units of the police department was formed to define current business processes and discuss how automated technology could improve them. They also undertook a study of EISs and defined the parameters and thresholds that would meet the department’s needs. This included research on EI systems currently in place in other law enforcement agencies to determine if they met our goals and objectives. Other stakeholders included representatives from the Supervisors’ Benevolence Association (local police union), the Fraternal Order of Police, civilian members of the department, and members of the ComIT. Meetings were held on a monthly basis and approximately 15 months was expended on this portion of the project.
The global goal of the project was to focus on overall performance activities that impacted an employee’s appraisal. At the time this criteria was developed, first-line supervisors and line officers had little or no direct access to the information envisioned for this EI system. As such, merely providing these needed data was considered to be a substantial milestone. Additionally, in evaluating the usefulness of the EIS information, success would be measured by whether it improves the performance of the officers or the service to the community.

The design committee identified the broad goals of the program as the following:

- To enable commanders, supervisors, and even individual officers to easily identify anomalies and potential performance problems
- To effectively intervene before they lead to disciplinary action, lawsuits, or other serious personnel actions
- To provide benchmarks for line officers for self-improvement

These goals would be satisfied by fielding a system that provides a single source for employees and supervisors to review all performance data about themselves and employees and organizations beneath them in the chain of command. The system would interface with several existing systems and present summary information on activities from those source systems resulting in the simultaneous tracking of numerous activities. The system would allow supervisors and employees to conduct statistical analysis on their activities so that they could get a perspective on how their activities compare to their peers. The early intervention component would also provide automated alerts when employees exceed defined thresholds based on peer group comparisons and not solely on arbitrary administrator settings. The system would provide options to the supervisor to conduct detailed research to further explore the validity of alerts and would enforce the handling of those alerts.

With the assistance of our partners in ComIT, an acceptable system interface design was developed to allow us to focus on what information was available for use by the EI system. Initial planning focused on a design that would facilitate the extraction of data already available, in order to provide department supervisors with a broad view of employee performance. At the time of this project’s conception the information supervisors needed to properly evaluate an officer’s performance was either difficult to compile or not available to that supervisor. We recognized that by way of a wide array of computerized records systems, the police department captures a significant amount of quantifiable data regarding each officer’s performance that is not included within the traditional paper-based personnel file. These data include the arrests they make, the compliments they receive, traffic stop activity, uses of force occurrences, training courses taken, citizen complaints received, attendance rates, etc. Because these data are not easy to access, or in some cases not available to most department supervisors, it is markedly difficult and time consuming to assemble all of it. As a result, this valuable information is not being used by most supervisors to properly evaluate their employees. This lack of centralized data promotes inconsistent officer evaluations, as supervisors are not using the same information to make evaluation decisions.
Figure 5. Early Intervention System Interface Diagram as was determined during the RFP process.

Figure 5 represents the initial extract, transform, and load (ETL) process that was developed by Virginia Beach database analysts in order to feed the EI system. It was recognized early on that the greatest challenge throughout the build portion of this process was going to be the development of current software that had the ability to extract data from a variety of different systems, some of which were relatively modern and some that were not, and make that information useful. Most delays associated with this project were a result of this challenge.

The City of Virginia Beach recognized that it did not have sufficient technical assets in place to efficiently develop and deploy the system independently of outside assistance. As a result, vendors were identified that could potentially provide us with an existing system that could be adapted to Virginia Beach’s needs. The vendors were invited to provide demonstrations of their EIS products to the focus group. A subcommittee of four staff members, two from the police department and two from ComIT, was formed to develop a Request for Proposal (RFP) for an EIS that contained the general system requirements needed to meet the goals and objectives outlined by the EIS focus group. This committee detailed the functional and technological requirements for this system and provided an illustration of the conceptual design showing real-time interfaces to current data sources. A challenge for the RFP subcommittee was finding a boilerplate RFP that contained a format for an EIS. Several law enforcement agencies were contacted that willingly shared their documentation and in some cases included examples of RFPs. Delays in creating an acceptable work product included a desire to define detailed requirements and objectives to ensure the best
possible software selection and a desire to define the application expectations in a way that would enable vendors to adequately respond to the RFP. The final version of the RFP was delivered to both the Department of Information Technology’s Project Management Team (PMT) and the City’s Purchasing Department for review and approval. This evolution took approximately 13 months to complete. A copy of the final RFP is incorporated as an appendix to this report. The following are some highlights that we considered important for project success.

The Virginia Beach Police desired an early intervention system that would:

- Provide the ability to evaluate individual officer, supervisor, and unit activity through performance analysis.
- Provide the ability to initiate intervention and training based on appropriate activity and pattern assessment.
- Provide the ability to track supervisor’s observations, concerns, and records of interventions. This would include a methodology for entering, retrieving, combining, monitoring, and exporting for analysis relevant data on an identified at-risk employee.
- Provide the ability to record detailed non-disciplinary intervention and referrals. Referral options may include: Interview/counsel, training, transfer/change of assignment, Employee Assistance Program, surveillance, administrative investigations. The potential options for referrals were established by the initial planning group as a method of ensuring fluid communications up, down, and across the chain of command. The group felt this communication should be candid, and if desired by the author, anonymous. Fellow employees, family and friends, or the employee themselves may submit referrals. A self-referral may come from an employee who has recognized the need for some type of intervention to assist with situations or actions that may be beyond the employee’s ability to control. Anonymous reporting may involve a peer, a fellow employee, or family member who has experienced or witnessed unusual or inappropriate behavior or actions by an employee, but does not wish to be identified as the reporting person. While the intent of the group was good, and the vendor ultimately designed our system to comply with this intent, concerns have evolved over time as to whether it was prudent to incorporate this functionality. Some benefits exist, but the potential conflicts resulting from the freedom and anonymity functionality of this component make it potentially problematic. The planning group established the following as desired functionality:
  - Supervisor can refer employee after a fact-finding interview with supervisor
  - General referral (family member or outside friend can telephone in a referral)
  - Employee referral (employee can refer a supervisor or fellow employee)
  - Self-referral (an employee requests help)
  - EIS Administrator referral based on review of EIS outcomes

- Have the ability to show the effectiveness of an intervention plan by recording employee progress.
◆ Have the ability to summarize or group all officer activities within a specified date/time range.

◆ For automated early intervention functionality, the system shall provide the ability to track any number of weighted indicators. These are indicators that had been determined to be relevant factors in overall employee performance by a number of national early intervention/warning studies:
  — All complaints/investigations
  — Failure to appears (Court, Missed Appointments, AWOL)
  — Equipment loss/damage
  — Property loss
  — Assaults on officer
  — Arrests and summonses
  — Sick leave
  — Counseling
  — Commendations and awards
  — Use of force
  — Police-involved shootings
  — Lawsuits
  — Vehicle pursuits
  — Use of leave and leave balance
  — Employee rank and assignment history
  — Employee training and certification records
  — Firearms qualification data
  — Calls for service and out of service codes by employee

◆ Be capable of capturing existing information, which is then converted to preset early intervention threshold levels. The system would automatically monitor thresholds in order to identify employees who require early intervention.

◆ Have the ability to allow the user (system administrator) to define and modify the thresholds and customize performance indicators.

◆ Have the ability to identify officers exceeding a specified threshold within a role or work group (perform “apples to apples” analysis).

◆ Have the ability to capture the entry of supervisor notes, needs, concerns, positive performance, or observations used at the discretion of the supervisor to document actions of an employee.

◆ Support a decentralized decision-making approach to management by placing the relevant, accurate, and timely information in the hands of first-line supervisors.

◆ Have the ability to track and analyze information in order to facilitate the assessment of job performance.
✦ Eliminate ineffective and redundant manual and paper-intensive operations.

✦ Enable the performance of appropriate decision support processes including the analysis of information needed to determine the effectiveness of training, the consequences of changes in policy, or the implications of changing demographics (such as assignments, schedules, or change of supervisor).

✦ Because the system deals with personnel data, security and workflow must remain internal to the system in compliance to state and local laws on privacy.

✦ Have the ability to electronically notify supervisors when thresholds have been reached or exceed the defined limit.

✦ On documented interventions, the system shall have the ability to electronically route the intervention plan for approval through each level of the chain of command.

✦ Allow user-defined due dates for supervisory review and response, the basis for which the system sends out overdue notices.

✦ Provide a basic suite of predefined reports with a user-friendly interface, including security and auditing reports. The below were felt to be important, but some were not provided by the vendor. A more detailed reporting process is needed for completion of auditing reports, command monitoring of employee, and supervisor actions, etc.
  — The media for the reports should be available with a variety of user-selectable electronic output formats, such as View, Print, Graph, or Save As: Adobe PDF, Excel, MS Word, dbf, SDF (standard data format), text (ASCII delimited), html, etc.
  — The system shall have the ability to provide reports via the web or in a downloadable format.
  — The reports should enable the user to quickly generate activity information for individual employees, groups of employees, and/or the organization within specified date ranges. This should include detailed reports as well as reports that count and cross-tabulate specified activities by type and status.
  — Ability to query or produce reports on any field or combination of fields.
  — Methodology for generating ad-hoc reports and/or queries, not previously specified, in which data comparison from any requested tracked data elements might be combined.

✦ Have the ability to produce audit and security reports. The audit reports should contain detailed information by user ID and console ID of records added, data modified, and data viewed. The security reports should show by user ID and/or console ID the number of logins, lockouts, and password violations.

✦ Have the ability to perform statistical analysis on specified employee activities. This includes standard deviations, means, averages, counts, ratios, and variances.

✦ Have the ability to compare statistics for employees within a peer group (same district, unit, and shift) for specified employee activities.
◆ Have the ability to generate reports and conduct analysis by roles, work units, sections, bureaus, or other work groups.

◆ Must have access to system from any police terminal, including web-enabled access.

◆ Provide user maintainable online EIS help, incorporating current referral information and contacts (i.e., EAP—Employee Assistance Program)

◆ Should present understandable error messages and warnings; let user know the reason for the error and what to do to resolve the error.

◆ In order to ensure optimum security the system must have the ability to use Active Directory for user authentication. Login names and Passwords will not be kept in the new system. User Member ID will be obtained from Active Directory.

◆ Have the ability to allow the user to define roles or work group.

◆ Supervisors will only have access to the employees under their span of control. Supervisors must be able to evaluate individual officers, recognize appropriate activity, and assess patterns of conduct. When analyzing activities it is important to compare officers in like situations and in context. When a supervisor recognizes a potentially “at risk” employee he must be able to initiate intervention. Executive staff will have expanded access based on their position in the organization.

◆ System administrators will have total system access for both quality control and system manipulation reasons.

◆ Have the ability to provide levels of access and security.
  — Includes the ability to perform User Authorization within the application, where each user may be assigned one or more roles.
  — Includes the ability for some positions within the department to have different levels of access due to job requirements.
  — Provide a secured system where only designated users can update or view information.
  — Employees can look at their own personal data as well as threshold data so they can see their standing.
  — Has the ability to assign levels of security for access and capabilities based on user roles. For example, temporary permissions given to a substitute sergeant for employees assigned to the absent supervisor.
  — Include a full audit trail accessible to the administrator of the identification of the accessing individual and the reason for his/her access. Keeps a log of user login activity, page access activity, and a list of error messages generated by the system to facilitate troubleshooting when problems occur.
  — Automatically log the user off after a designated amount of time of inactivity.
  — For accountability the system will log all internal notifications, actions, and interventions.
The psAdvance Employee Performance Management System

Overview

Following a competitive bidding process, Management Science Associates, Inc. (MSA) was selected to build our early intervention system. Concessions had to be made by Virginia Beach, which resulted in it taking on an increased share of the work to build the system. Also, reductions were made with respect to built-in support hours and the depth of the post-contract maintenance agreement. While these factors may have been unavoidable, they ultimately factored into how efficiently the system was built and how well it can be maintained and enhanced following that build.

The psAdvance Employee Performance Management System is the result of a collaborative effort between the VBPD, the Virginia Beach Department of Communications and Information Technology, and Management Science Associates, Inc. of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. MSA had previously worked with the New Jersey State Police on a performance tracking system known as MAPPS. The NJSP program was developed as a result of a consent decree with the U.S. Department of Justice to develop more transparent systems that would enhance department leaders’ accountability over their subordinates. The result was a management awareness program that correlated data from motor vehicle stops, arrests, searches, misconduct history, civil suits, and trooper performance into one application, thereby collapsing disparate data systems into a single repository for supervisors to access and obtain a complete picture of their subordinate’s history. MAPPS was a precursor to psAdvance.

psAdvance was designed to be a highly advanced and automated computerized personnel management and early intervention system. psAdvance is a web based program that employees are able to access from the city’s intranet. This system’s security and functions all revolve around a chain of command hierarchy providing a single source for employees and supervisors to review all performance data about themselves and the employees and organizations beneath them in the chain of command. The system interfaces with several existing systems and presents summary information on activities from those source systems. The goal was to focus on overall performance activities that would impact an employee’s appraisal. The system’s functionality provides employees and supervisors the ability to monitor performance related activities, make peer comparisons to employees in similar assignments, identify intervention opportunities and avenues, and document those actions. While we have been successful in building and deploying a system to fit those parameters, this phase of the project took far longer and utilized more funding than envisioned and proved to be an incredible challenge. It involved overcoming one technical obstacle after another. While the program is a dramatic improvement over a simple early warning mechanism, and came much closer to satisfying our goal of deploying a management performance system, the process of achieving that status was wearisome.
While the mandates of the grant funded contract have been satisfied, and we believe the system we fielded is revolutionary, we do not consider it to be a finished product. We have identified a number of shortcomings that are beyond the scope of the original contract and we are currently contemplating how to best address the situation. Other agencies considering purchase of this software or other early intervention related programs should be mindful of these issues while developing RFPs and in preparing scope of work contracts. Two principal shortcomings have been identified:

◆ The system’s inability to provide detailed statistical analysis of overall system activity. This type of reporting would be desirable for activities such as internal monitoring, compliance with mandated reporting to The Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc., (CALEA®), and reporting to other oversight agencies.

◆ The system’s inability to provide a functional method to monitor and provide oversight of the actions of first-line supervisors within the program.

With respect to psAdvance’s lacking the ability to report out on activities occurring within the system, we have determined that there is a need to provide better overall report out capabilities. While a tremendous amount of data is imported into psAdvance and then manipulated by the system to produce performance management and early intervention related outputs, the system’s focused output is on the user. There are no built-in capabilities for a department analyst or administrator to pull activity reports from the system. The data is there, and can be accessed by a database analyst utilizing appropriate research tools, but is not available at the department user or administrator level. As such, even answering a simple question such as “How many alerts fired for excessive complaint activity in a given time period?” cannot be easily answered. This type of information does not need to be made available to the average user, but is essential to system administrators. It is those administrators that typically play a role in providing periodic reports on department activities to oversight agencies such as CALEA. Without access to that data it is difficult to comply with mandates of these reports.

In regard to psAdvance’s lacking the ability to provide a functional method to monitor and provide oversight of the actions of first-line supervisors within the program, we have found this lacking accountability and quality control piece to be very troubling. In short, we are incapable of effectively supervising the supervisors. The management strategy of the VBPD has always been to vest a significant degree of responsibility for the supervision of officers in their first-line supervisors. We believe the primary responsibility for maintaining and reinforcing employee conformance with the department’s standards of conduct rests with the employee themselves and the employee’s first-line supervisor. As such, it is imperative that supervisors familiarize themselves with the employees in their unit and closely observe their general conduct, appearance, and performance on a daily basis and remain alert for indications of behavioral problems or changes that may affect an employee’s normal job performance. It was with this mantra in mind that psAdvance’s designers constructed the system in such a way that it makes an employee’s immediate supervisor, and to some extent others up the chain of command, the identified recipient of a wide range of performance related and early intervention alerts.
The psAdvance system’s performance management capability provides the supervisor a window into the employee’s daily work product and how that compares to the employee’s peers. The automated early intervention component of the system provides the immediate supervisor assistance in identifying potentially problematic behaviors and allows them to be addressed before becoming significant issues. The employee’s immediate supervisor is the person programmatically tasked with the direct maintenance and oversight of their employees in the system. What we found to be lacking is the ability for those middle and upper level managers above that first-line supervisor to be able to monitor what the first-line supervisor is doing in the psAdvance system. This includes the inability to determine how they are handling the myriad of issues the system brings to their attention.

The following example is portrayed in order to highlight this concern. psAdvance imports data from several source systems on a daily basis and then uses these data to provide feedback to the first-line supervisor on employee performance. Some of this feedback includes the periodic creation of activity scatter plots designed to highlight how an employee’s activities compare to his/her peers and built-in automated alerts designed to notify the employee’s immediate supervisor of potential problems. For this example let’s pretend the officer has received three citizen complaints during the past four months. During the system’s refresh each day it pulls in new data from the source systems and immediately analyzes it for certain criteria. A trigger has been established to alert supervisors when excessive similar activities have occurred, so when the employee receives his/her third complaint an alert notifies the employee’s immediate supervisor of the event. The supervisor is provided a task to look into the issue and report back what, if any, intervention was required. While there is a built-in system to allow notification to higher level supervisors that the alert was fired, it is not possible for those supervisors to review the actions of the immediate supervisor, unless they generate a formal entry into the system such as a Journal entry. In our experiences most of these alerts are concluded by the immediate supervisor without the need for formal documentation. The supervisor merely looks into the alert, determines if any issues exist, and concludes the alert’s associated task after making a few comments in the task’s notes field. Other department leaders, regardless of whether they are in the employee’s chain of command, do not have access to the content of that task. Short of speaking with the supervisor that concluded the matter, there is no way to systematically access those details. A system administrator can mine that data from the program, but even that effort is difficult. The system needs to be enhanced to allow this scrutiny from above.

That being said, while the journey was a difficult one, and the product is not yet complete because of the noted deficiencies, we believe the end result justifies the efforts expended. By encompassing the performance management component, we believe our program is a model for other agencies interested in a system that is far more useful than a typical early warning system.
How exactly does psAdvance differ from a standard Early Warning System? psAdvance provides a vast amount of information and assists the user in making it useful. It accomplishes this by providing access to a wide array of employee activities and incorporates functionality that allows for the comparison of that data to the employee’s peers to determine norms. In addition, via its Notifications, Alerts, and Tasks (NAT) it provides prompts directly to supervisors and commanders of employee activities and/or behaviors that may be a concern.

All modern law enforcement agencies create an incredible stockpile of electronic records as a result of the activities we perform. These records include who was arrested and what for, details on summonses written, the compliments received, traffic stops performed, uses of force, training courses taken, absentee records, citizen complaints received, etc. These records are stored in a wide array of computerized records systems. The type of information collected can be used to paint a fairly descriptive picture of an employee’s performance if the supervisor has the ability to properly collect, organize, and interpret the data. The problem lies in the fact it is not easy to get to this data and supervisors don’t have the time or ability to assemble it. This lack of centralized and accessible data promotes inconsistent officer evaluations as different supervisors are not using the same information to make evaluation decisions.

The following information is currently accessible to department members in the psAdvance system:

- Leave taken
- Overtime earned
- Assignment history
- Rank history
- Commendations and awards
- Offense reports taken
- Cases investigated
- Arrests made
- Summonses issued
- Use of force reports completed
- Complaints of employee misconduct
- Vehicle pursuit data
- Firearm discharge data
- Calls for service responded to
- Accident reports completed
- Missed training
- Missed court

psAdvance is accessed via Virginia Beach’s internally networked Intranet system. As such, all city networked computers have direct access to it.

The system is also accessible “off campus” over any Internet connection via a third party remote access interface known as Citrix.
Once at the login screen (see Figure 6) the user enters his/her unique city network active directory user name and password to gain access to the system.

Upon logging in the user accesses the Main Menu (see Figure 7 on page 50). This single screen will provide the user with access to all subsections of the system via a series of links. The user also has the ability to access an on-demand set of help files as well as the ability to log off the system from this same screen.

The many functions within psAdvance are accessed by selecting the provided blue hyperlinks. All of the options presented to the user throughout psAdvance are specific to that user’s "status." The functions a user performs for the agency will determine what access privileges he/she is automatically granted by the system. As an example, non-supervisory members (those employees that have no direct reports) will be provided with sufficient access to conduct research on themselves. This access would not include the supervisory reports section (because they are not a supervisor) or the organizational statistics section (since they have no organization below them). Regarding users who are supervisors, they will only be able to see content that is within their span of control, so depending on what level they are within the organization’s chain of command they will be able to see more or less of the organizational statistics.
The following is a breakdown of the different major sections of the psAdvance system and what benefit they provide.

**Personnel Files**

Personnel Files is where you will go to see all of your activity, and for supervisors, any subordinate employees that are under you in the chain of command. The Personnel File screen is the central point for all employee centered functions. The following sections are included and worthy of further description.

**The Employee’s Name, Role, and Organization**

The employee will be identified at the top of the Personnel File page being viewed (see Figure 8 on page 51). Also shown will be the employee’s current role and organization. The concept of assigning an appropriate role and organization is extremely important to the psAdvance system. It is the combination of these factors that is used to place the employee in an appropriate peer group. These peer groups are utilized by the analytical and early intervention portions of the system to determine activity baselines and alert standards.
The employee’s role relates to the job he/she does on a day-to-day basis. It does not necessarily take into account his/her rank or assignment, but what the primary work tasks are. As an example, two employees might be the same rank and assigned to the same command, but one works as a patrol officer and one works as a crime analyst. It would be unreasonable to compare these two employees’ work products to determine if they are performing at appropriate levels. In order to get an “apples to apples” comparison you would need to only compare the patrol officer with other patrol officers working under similar circumstances (same shift, geographic area, etc.) and the crime analyst with other employees working in similar jobs as the analyst.

The employee’s assignment is a bit more straightforward, but same as in relation to the role, we needed to ensure we were only comparing an employee with those members working under similar circumstances. For this reason we incorporated the employee’s command, shift, and squad in the assignment equation. As such he/she is only being compared to those employees that are working in the same job.
Figure 9. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Indicator Points Administration.

![Indicator Points Administration](image)


The Employee’s Current Indicator Points Toward an Alert

Indicator points are accrued by each employee based upon the activities that he/she is involved in during a rolling calendar period and weighted values assigned to some of these activities (see Figure 9). Points are only assigned to certain activities—typically those that could be indicative of a negative performance trend. The following activities are considered: Complaints, Court Absences (Excused Leave from Court), Court Absences (Failure to Appear), Firearm Discharge, Intervention, PN Counseling, Use of Force, and Vehicle Pursuit. An activity’s points are calculated by multiplying the number of records entered into psAdvance for the activity during the rolling calendar period by the weighted value of the activity. The points for each of the activities listed above are then added together to determine the total Current Indicator Points for the employee. When the total points exceed a predefined threshold established by the System Administrator during the rolling calendar period an “Overall Alert” is generated.

The Employee Tree

The Personnel Files screen displays the Employee Tree on the left column. The user’s name will be listed at the top and if the user has employees below him/her in the chain of command they will be listed below the user’s name. Users have viewing privileges of themselves and all employees beneath them in the chain of command. Only those employees viewable by the user will appear on the employee tree. To view an employee’s performance data the user clicks on his/her name on the tree structure.
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Figure 10. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Activity Details with Arrest Activity Highlighted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults &amp; Resisting Arrests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN Commendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Employee Activity Details

The Activity Details section displays counts of records entered for all activities captured in psAdvance during the time period displayed in the time period selector (see Figure 10).

Each activity can be researched in further detail by clicking on the blue numeric link on each total value, bringing you to a “drill down” screen.

The drill down screen lists the individual activities that made up the total on the previous page (see Figure 11).

Figure 11. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Arrest Activity Drilldown Screen.

The dates of each event are also blue links allowing the user to conduct further research by drilling down to a summary page for the event itself. This final drill down brings you to the specific event’s summary screen, which provides basic information about the event (see Figure 12). If more detail is needed, the source system should be accessed.

The Time Frame under Review

The date box determines the time period of the activity counts that are displayed. The time period selector is defaulted to the current year. The date can be changed to a particular month, quarter, tourist season, or year by selecting the time period type in the selector followed by the specific time period (see Figure 13). There is also Ad Hoc Date functionality.

Figure 12. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Arrest Activity Detail Screen.


Figure 13. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance calendar function.

Comparison Statistics and Scatter Plots

psAdvance provides a number of analysis and reporting functions designed to present an overall picture of an employee’s activity. Probably the most noteworthy, and most popular with users, is the Employee Comparison Activity Count Statistics.

Count scatter plots compare an employee’s count of a given activity (Arrests, Complaints, Journal entries, etc.) to his/her peers. The employee’s peers are those employees assigned to the same organization group and role group during a calendar period. If an employee’s assignments placed him/her in multiple peer groups for the time period, the employee will have scatter plots for each peer group and activity. Each of these peer groups are listed in a drop down box on the scatter diagram.

This functionality allows for detailed peer comparisons and statistical analysis to be made on every activity listed on the Personnel File screen.

The employee will be listed on every activity scatter for each of his/her peer groups, even if the count of the activity was zero. Conversely, if an employee has activity attributed to a given peer group but was never assigned to the peer group, then that activity will not appear on any scatter diagram.

Count scatters are only available for quarters, tourist season, and years that have expired.
Each dot on the scatter represents an employee and his/her count of the selected activity, while assigned to the selected peer group, during the selected time period (see Figure 15). Placing the cursor on a dot reveals that employee’s identity if that employee is a subordinate in the user’s chain of command. If not, a message will be displayed stating the user is not authorized to view the record. Clicking on a dot will take you to the Personnel File screen for that employee (again, only if the user is authorized to view the record). Employees represented by green dots were assigned to the same peer group for the entire time period selected. Employees represented by yellow dots were assigned to more than one peer group for the time period selected. The triangle represents the employee being reviewed. If red, the employee was a full-time peer. If yellow, he/she was a part-time peer.

In addition to plotting an employee’s position on the scatter, the system will provide a mathematical statistical analysis of the employee’s position with respect to the rest of the peer group (see Figure 16 on page 57). By analyzing the group’s dispersion, the system will determine how far from the mean (average) an employee is. Too great of a deviation from the mean can act as a trigger for early intervention alerts being issued.

Source: Provided by the Virginia Beach Police Department’s Office of Professional Standards. Reproduced by permission of Mr. Chuck Warden, Project Manager. psAdvance Employee Performance Management System software. Management Science Associates, Inc. (MSA), Pittsburgh, PA.
Standard deviation is a measure of how spread out the data is. From this we can gauge what data are similar to other data in the group, or within “normal” limits and what data are outside of that normal range and how far outside it is. In Virginia Beach we typically utilize a standard deviation of two to determine the placement of the red alert line. For an alert to be generated, the activity level must be twice the level of the group’s average. In order to illustrate, the bell curve in Figure 17 on page 58 represents a theoretical data group. A normal distribution of data means that most of the population is close to the “average,” while relatively few examples fall to one extreme or the other. In the example, 95.6 percent of the “population” is below two standard deviations. The 4.4 percent that is left is considered to be statistically extreme and as such would warrant an early intervention alert being generated.
Figure 17. Standard deviation analysis example.

The Lines on the Scatter Plot

The mathematical equations detailed in Figure 17 are graphically represented on the scatter plots in the form of colored lines in Figure 18. The green line represents the median (average) for the group’s full-time members. The yellow lines represent cautionary boundaries. The red lines are considered boundaries for the outliers for the peer group. Depending on the activity affected, a notification will be sent to the recipients set up by the administrator.

Employee Comparison Statistics (Demographics)

Demographic scatters compare officers to their peers based on the race and gender of the VB residents and visitors they have interacted with (see Figure 19 on page 59). An employee’s peers are employees having records for the same activity, demographic (race or gender), and organization and zone(s) during the same time period. The organization is the organization an officer is assigned to at the time of the activity. The zone is a code for where the activity occurred (i.e., the geography of the activity).

Figure 18. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance lines on the scatter plot.

Figure 19. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Employee Comparison Statistics (Demographics).

A scatter plot will be available for an employee for every demographic/activity/peer group (organization and zone) combination for which he/she has records. The employee and his/her percentage of activity for the combination selected will be displayed. If an employee’s activity placed him/her in multiple demographic/activity/peer group combinations for the time period, the employee will have scatter plots for each distinct combination. If the employee’s count for the activity and peer group selected is less than the low volume threshold (set-up by the Application Administrator) the employee will not be displayed on the scatter and will be listed in the low volume section. Demographic scatter plots are created for the Operations Division (four police patrol precincts and Special Operations) only, as none of the other divisions will have enough activity volume to permit meaningful comparisons.
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Figures 20–21. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Employee Promotion and Assignment History.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/16/2005</td>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>PROMOT3/3FF CAPAD COMP</td>
<td>PROMOTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16/1998</td>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>SGT</td>
<td>TRANSFER FROM DETP</td>
<td>PROMOTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/1994</td>
<td>DETP</td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>REMAINS IN DETECTIVE BUREAU</td>
<td>CAREER/PROGRESSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/1998</td>
<td>2ND</td>
<td>POL ORF</td>
<td>ASSIGNED 2ND PCT 09/28/98</td>
<td>PROMOTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1998</td>
<td>F&amp;T</td>
<td>RECRUIT</td>
<td>ASSIGNED PAT POLICE ACADEMY</td>
<td>ORIGINAL EMPLOYMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Provided by the Virginia Beach Police Department's Office of Professional Standards. Reproduced by permission of Mr. Chuck Warden, Project Manager. psAdvance Employee Performance Management System software. Management Science Associates, Inc. (MSA), Pittsburgh, PA.

Figure 22. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Employee Performance Report Main Page.

Figure 23. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Intervention and Assignment History.

Source: Provided by the Virginia Beach Police Department's Office of Professional Standards. Reproduced by permission of Mr. Chuck Warden, Project Manager. psAdvance Employee Performance Management System software. Management Science Associates, Inc. (MSA), Pittsburgh, PA.

Employee Assignment & Promotion History

psAdvance provides a number of analysis and reporting functions designed to present an overall picture of an employee’s activity, such as listings of an employee’s assignment and promotion history (see Figures 20 and 21).

Employee Performance Report

psAdvance offers a printable PDF report containing a summary of an employee’s performance (see Figure 22). Specifically, this report contains activity trends and comparisons for four quarters, or four years, depending on the calendar period type selected. Also included on the report are complete allegation history, complete history of system generated notifications sent out about the employee (see Figure 23), complete intervention history (see Figure 24 on page 61), complete promotion history (see Figure 25 on page 61), and complete assignment history.
Figures 24–25

Figure 24. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Early Intervention History.

Figure 25. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Promotion History.


Organization Statistics / Information

Just as psAdvance breaks down individual employee performance, allowing it to be closely studied, it does the same for individual organizations. Only supervisors with organizations below them in the chain of command will have access to this function. Organization Statistics functions very similarly to the Personnel Files functions, allowing for easy training and transition between the two sub-systems.
The Organization Statistics section is accessed via the link on the Main Menu. Upon entering Organization Statistics, an Organization Tree is presented in the left column with the user’s organization at the top and those organizations listed below the user in the department hierarchy (see Figure 26).

Organizational Activities and Links are provided to give the user access to all of the same activities they previously saw in the Personnel File area. The difference here is that you will be looking at activities for an individual unit or command, not for an individual employee (see Figure 27 on page 63).

At the lowest (squad) level the screen layout, activities, and calendar period selector function and look nearly identical to the Personnel File screen discussed previously. The Activity Details section displays counts of records entered about employees assigned to the organization selected for all activities captured in psAdvance during the time period displayed in the time period selector. As before, the data can be drilled down further by clicking on the total number, to bring you to a more detailed screen that lists the arrests and provides general overview information (see Figure 28 on page 63).
Figure 27. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Organizational Activity Drill-Down page.


Figure 28. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Organizational Activity Detail page.

Figure 29. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Organizational Graphical Breakdown by Division.


For users high enough in the chain of command to see multiple levels below them, psAdvance enables them to conduct detailed statistical analysis and comparisons of the organizations below through a series of selectable links. By selecting the “Organization Event Statistics” link the Organization Activity Statistics screen will open. The Activity dropdown gives the user the option to conduct analysis on any activity captured by psAdvance. A pie chart for the selected activity is displayed while breaking down the activity count by the sub-organizations below the selected organization (see Figure 29).

Each pie chart section represents each sub-organization under the selected organization. To drill down further, click on a section of the pie chart to view another pie chart showing the activity by the organizations that directly report to the organization that was chosen from the previous pie chart (see Figures 30 and 31 on page 65).
Figures 30–31

**Figure 30.** Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Organizational Breakdown by Operations Division Command.

**Figure 31.** Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Organizational Breakdown by Precinct Squad.

*Source:* Provided by the Virginia Beach Police Department’s Office of Professional Standards. Reproduced by permission of Mr. Chuck Warden, Project Manager. *psAdvance Employee Performance Management System* software. Management Science Associates, Inc. (MSA), Pittsburgh, PA.
Data Entry Functions

The planning group for this project recognized that our department was lacking a standardized method to document performance-related employee notes. psAdvance incorporates several methods to document and track employee activities in preformatted data entry functions. Some of these functions have found more use than others, but overall they have satisfied our need to provide secure and open non-disciplinary documentation. Each of these provides the user the ability to enter data about the employee, and then save or submit that entry to the employee’s Personnel File screen. Figure 32 shows the functions provided.

In order to demonstrate the functionality of these data entry options, a Journal entry will be stepped through in the same manner a user would enter and review the entry. All other data entry functions work in substantially the same manner as the Journal. Any differences will be highlighted.

Journals

Journal entries are meant to provide a place for supervisors to keep notes about subordinates that can be reviewed when evaluating the employee. They are less formal than other data entry options. They may or may not be tied to a specific incident. Only supervisors have access to this entry function, and they can only create entries on employees beneath them in the chain of command.

The actual use of this type of entry was modified by department leadership after the contract and other scope of work documents had been completed. Currently the system will maintain these entries indefinitely, but we are in the process of seeking modifications that would cause the entries to only be retained by the system for 18 months. This is in an effort to comply with Virginia Beach’s Human Resource protocols that indicate non-disciplinary documentation such as this should only be available for consideration until the employee’s next annual evaluation cycle. These modifications are pending funding at this time.

Selecting Journal on the data entry link causes the data entry screen to be displayed. If selected from a specific Personnel File, the Journal will by default display the record of that employee (see Figure 33 on page 67).

Multiple employees can be included in one entry by selecting additional members from the drop down (see Figure 34 on page 67).
Figure 33. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Journal Entry Step One – Selecting Recipients.

Source: Provided by the Virginia Beach Police Department’s Office of Professional Standards. Reproduced by permission of Mr. Chuck Warden, Project Manager. psAdvance Employee Performance Management System software. Management Science Associates, Inc. (MSA), Pittsburgh, PA.

Figure 34. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Journal Entry Function Step One – Recipients Selected.

Source: Provided by the Virginia Beach Police Department’s Office of Professional Standards. Reproduced by permission of Mr. Chuck Warden, Project Manager. psAdvance Employee Performance Management System software. Management Science Associates, Inc. (MSA), Pittsburgh, PA.
Step One – Selecting Reason.

A Computer Aided Dispatch number, Incident Based Reporting number, Internal Affairs case number, etc., can be entered as a reference if the Journal is for a specific incident.

A reason is selected by clicking on the drop down arrow (see Figure 35). This list can be updated by an administrator.

Throughout the data entry screens there are required fields that are identified by red asterisks that must be completed for the record to be submitted. In addition to the pre-formatted data entry fields, the entry has a free text narrative to more completely capture the essence of what occurred (see Figure 36 on page 69). The narrative has a number of font options and tools, such as spell check, available. The ability also exists to paste from any other text based document (e-mails, Word, Excel, etc.), making the entry of data entry records fast and easy.

Clicking the Save Current Work button saves the entry as a partially completed record that can be retrieved and completed later.

When the Save button is clicked, a message appears stating that the journal entry is now on your pending list.

You can return to a saved data entry (see Figure 37 on page 69) item and continue your work by going to the Pending Entries screen from the Personnel File screen or in the case of the Journals, the Journal link on the Main Menu.
Figure 36. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Journal Entry Function Step Two – Narrative Entry.


Figure 37. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Journal Entry Function Step One.

Figures 38–39

Figure 38. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Pending Journal Entry Function.

Figure 39. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Selecting record to edit.

The Journal Menu opens (see Figure 38). Click on the pending link and any pending Journals will be displayed (see Figure 39).

Click on the Subject link next to the entry you wish to update and the data entry screen will be displayed containing the information previously entered.

When the Journal is complete, click the Submit button. A message will be displayed asking if you’re sure you want to submit the journal entry (see Figure 40 on page 71). Click OK to officially submit the entry. The read only version of the entry will then be displayed (see Figure 41 on page 71). As with all data entry functions in psAdvance, once an item is submitted it cannot be retracted. When the entry is submitted it will be added as an activity on the employee’s Personnel File screen. It will be listed based on the date the entry was submitted.
**Figure 40.** Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Journal Entry Function – Submitting Entry.

![Journal Entry Form](image)

*Source:* Provided by the Virginia Beach Police Department’s Office of Professional Standards. Reproduced by permission of Mr. Chuck Warden, Project Manager. *psAdvance Employee Performance Management System software* Management Science Associates, Inc. (MSA), Pittsburgh, PA.

**Figure 41.** Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Journal Entry – Completed Form.

![Journal Entry](image)

*Source:* Provided by the Virginia Beach Police Department’s Office of Professional Standards. Reproduced by permission of Mr. Chuck Warden, Project Manager. *psAdvance Employee Performance Management System software* Management Science Associates, Inc. (MSA), Pittsburgh, PA.

**Performance Notes**

Commendation and Counseling Performance Notes (PN) are a formal addition to an employee’s record regarding his/her performance during a specific incident. Performance Notes can be complimentary (Commendation) or instructive (Counseling) (see Figure 42). Performance Notes differ from Journal entries in the following ways:
Figure 42. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Commendation & Counseling Performance Notes (PN).


- They are filed by Date of Incident
- They are not purged from the system after a certain amount of time has elapsed
- By design they are structured to capture more incident-related detail

Because of their more formal nature, the PN entries have the ability to be formatted and printed to include signature blocks at the bottom of the form.
Figure 43. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Mobile Video Recording (MVR) data entry screen.


Referrals

Referrals are designed to facilitate performance-related information sharing between department members.

- Referrals can be reported by anyone, including one’s self and the public (if enabled), and may regard any employee regardless of rank or position in the department.
- They can report positive or concerning information about an employee.
- Referrals can be submitted anonymously.
- Once a referral is submitted it will only be viewable by the subject employee and those employees with viewing privileges of the subject employee.

MVR (Mobile Video Recorder Review)

Department policy mandates that supervisors periodically review recorded data from an officer’s vehicle mounted video recording system (see Figure 43).

- psAdvance provides a specifically formatted data entry function to document these reviews.
- Click on the Complete Review tab to answer the review questions.
- The list of review questions will be displayed. Answer each review question by clicking on the radio buttons in the Yes, NO, and N/A columns.
- Any question answered No requires that a Narrative be entered to describe the reason. Click on the Narrative tab to navigate to the narrative.
Interventions

EI systems are, by their nature, a non-disciplinary approach to officer performance concerns. Interventions are at the heart of this approach. This is where computer data transforms into supervisory performance management. Officer performance issues vary greatly, and intervention strategies should be customized to fit a given situation. Modern performance management systems allow supervisors to step away from traditional responses to employee problems and draw on the various resources available to them for assisting their officers.

Specific examples of interventions might include:

- Supervisory coaching
- Meeting with a peer counselor
- Referral to the employee assistance program (EAP)
- Assignment to specific training opportunities
- Development of a work improvement plan
- Relief of duties

psAdvance provides a framework to assist the supervisor in developing a plan for an intervention, allows for approval of the plan, and facilitates documenting those efforts. psAdvance’s Intervention data entry function is available to enter formal training plans for employees geared toward improving performance or promoting further development (see Figure 44). Workflow (tasking and approvals) is included with the idea that an intervention training plan is significant enough to require formal approval to precede with the plan. You will be able to submit intervention plans for any employee beneath you in the chain of command.
Figure 45. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Performance Appraisal data entry screen.

Source: Provided by the Virginia Beach Police Department’s Office of Professional Standards. Reproduced by permission of Mr. Chuck Warden, Project Manager. psAdvance Employee Performance Management System software. Management Science Associates, Inc. (MSA), Pittsburgh, PA.

Performance Appraisals

psAdvance provides the ability to complete both the supervisor’s performance appraisal and the employee’s self evaluation (see Figure 45). Employees can be evaluated for their performance in a calendar month, quarter, year, or any ad hoc time period. Once submitted, the completed appraisal will appear on the subject employee’s Personnel File screen based on the beginning date for the review period. The entire appraisal process is to be completed within psAdvance.

When the appraisal is submitted, the read only version of the appraisals will be displayed. This is similar to what has been discussed previously and can be printed and/or previewed in the psAdvance standard format as previously described.

In addition, a link titled “Official Document” will be available on the read-only version of the appraisal. Selecting that link will cause the document’s format to be modified and will present it as an HR approved city form P-35 (see Figure 46 on page 76).

Notifications, Alerts, and Tasks (NAT)

The psAdvance system provides highly automated functionality for both routine work processes and early intervention related matters. This is the workflow center of the early intervention system. This module provides inboxes of event notifications and alerts that the user should be aware of and tasks that the user is expected to act upon.
Notifications and alerts are system generated when employees, typically subordinates, exceed predefined activity thresholds. Tasks can be either system generated, similar to notifications and alerts, or sent directly from one user to another. Notifications, alerts, and tasks each have their own inboxes on psAdvance.

Upon entering the Notifications module, the user is presented with a single inbox that shows all notifications, alerts, and tasks that currently reside in each inbox (see Figure 47 on page 77). This is the Messages (All Inboxes) selection on the left side of the screen. To view a specific inbox (notifications, alerts, or tasks) select the Inbox link under the appropriate heading on the left side of the screen.

Notifications and Alerts are always system generated and are sent when officers exceed event specific thresholds as defined by the system administrator.

When the Notifications screen is initially displayed all notifications, alerts, and tasks will be listed on the same screen in chronological order based on sent date. This is to provide the user immediate access to newer NATs.

Each type of notification has its own set of inboxes on the left side of the screen along with an Actions section for sending tasks and setting unavailability.
**Figures and Notes**

**Figure 47.** Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Notifications, Alerts & Tasks (NATs) Inbox.

*Source: Provided by the Virginia Beach Police Department’s Office of Professional Standards. Reproduced by permission of Mr. Chuck Warden, Project Manager. psAdvance Employee Performance Management System software. Management Science Associates, Inc. (MSA). Pittsburgh, PA.*

---

**Notifications and Alerts**

The Notifications and Alerts Inboxes are where users see system generated notifications. These may be a result of employees exceeding preset early intervention thresholds, missing training, having an appraisal due, etc. The message itself will explicitly define why the notification was issued. If any unread items are in the inbox there will be a bracketed red number next to it. The only difference between Notifications and Alerts is what level of importance the organization places on them. They function identically. As a matter of routine, notifications will be sent when an event occurs that might be beneficial for the recipient to be aware of. Alerts will be reserved for more significant events and will often be accompanied by a task.

There are several columns describing the notification. Most important for notifications and alerts are the Regarding and Subject columns (see Figure 48 on page 78). These two fields identify the subject employee of the notification (the employee causing the notification to be sent) and the reason for the notification (the trigger and the statistics of the event that caused the trigger). Selecting the subject line will provide additional details of the trigger.

The user has a number of options on the handling of notifications and alerts. In the Perform an Action section a drop down box allows the user to move the notification into the Archived, Deleted, or Inbox. The Inbox action will allow a message to be moved back to the regular Inbox if the notification is in the Archived or Deleted section.
The recipient can also enter comments if needed, to have a record of his/her review of the notification. Selecting the Submit Action button moves the notification to the designated location and captures the comments.

**Tasks**

Tasks can be automatically generated like Notifications and Alerts, and the inboxes of tasks look and work much like that of Notifications and Alerts, in that you can select a task to perform actions, view additional details, and see message history. What makes tasks different is that tasks can be sent manually, like an e-mail, and tasks need to be completed. Tasks can also be passed to another person to complete or returned to the sender. In addition, two extra columns will be used for viewing tasks: Due Date and the completion check box (see Figure 49 on page 79).

Four methods/options exist for clearing a task:

- Complete – The user has completed the task. Completed tasks are moved to the “Completed” task folder.
- Pass – The user has passed the task on to someone else for completion. Passed tasks are moved to the “Passed” task folder.
- Return – The task has been returned to the sender.
- The fourth method relates to tasks sent as a result of Appraisal and Intervention data entry steps (i.e., workflow tasks). These cannot be completed manually, but will complete automatically when each step of the workflow process is completed.
Figure 49. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Tasks detail screen.

Source: Provided by the Virginia Beach Police Department’s Office of Professional Standards. Reproduced by permission of Mr. Chuck Warden, Project Manager. psAdvance Employee Performance Management System software: Management Science Associates, Inc. (MSA), Pittsburgh, PA.

psAdvance Early Intervention and Administrative NATs

While psAdvance was adapted to be an overall performance management tool, at its core it is an early intervention and warning system. As such, there are several automated early intervention alerts built into the system to ensure supervisors are aware of potential issues involving their employees. The most frequently observed alerts will be reviewed here. In the case of the more critical early intervention triggers, Virginia Beach has established that an alert would be sent to the subject employee’s immediate supervisor and a notification will be sent to the department leaders two levels up from the subject employee on the chain of command.

Scatter Plot – Activity Counts

At the end of each pre-designated calendar period (quarter, tourist season, and year) the psAdvance system automatically generates scatter plots for each of the activities tracked for every member of the department. A series of triggers then evaluate the information contained within the scatters and generate alerts for any employees exceeding the alert thresholds (upper and lower).
Figure 50. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Early Intervention Functionality – Scatter Plot Activity Counts.

Source: Provided by the Virginia Beach Police Department’s Office of Professional Standards. Reproduced by permission of Mr. Chuck Warden, Project Manager. psAdvance Employee Performance Management System software. Management Science Associates, Inc. (MSA), Pittsburgh, PA.

This trigger is available to automatically alert supervisors when an employee is above the upper alert threshold or below the lower alert threshold on the count scatter plot diagram for an activity (see Figure 50). The upper and lower alert thresholds (the top and bottom red lines) for an activity are determined by the system administrator setting the standard deviation for the activity. The red lines are considered boundaries for the outliers for the peer group. This does not automatically mean there is a problem with this employee’s performance, it only indicates that he/she was a statistical extreme when compared to the average of the peer group.

**Scatter Plot – Demographic Counts**

This trigger is available to automatically alert supervisors when an employee is above the upper alert threshold for an activity on the demographic scatter plot diagram.
Figure 51. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Early Intervention Functionality – Indicator Points Administration screen.


Indicator Points

This looks at overall activities (see Figure 51) and based on a weighted analysis of some of those activities provides alerts when overall parameters are breached. Activities analyzed are:

- Complaint entered (citizen complaint, internal investigation, inquiry)
- Excused Leave from Court
- Failure to Appear in Court
- Firearms Discharge
- Interventions entered by a supervisor
- PN Counseling entered by a supervisor
- Use of Force reports entered
- Vehicle Pursuit involved in

Similar Incidents

This trigger is available to automatically alert supervisors when their subordinates incur a specific number of records for an incident (Incident = Indicator in the Indicator Points Administration screen) of the same type during a rolling time period.
Figure 52. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Employee Support “link” capability.


**New Activity Entered**
Automatically notifies specified users when certain data entry functions are completed.

**Training Reminder**
Automatically notifies specified users when training has been scheduled.

**Appraisal Due**
Automatically notifies supervisors when a subordinate evaluation is coming due.

**Lack of Use**
Automatically notifies commanders when supervisors fail to log into psAdvance at predefined frequencies.

**Overdue Tasks**
Automatically notifies supervisors when system tasks become overdue.

**Employee Support**
The Employee Support section provides a listing of organizations, policies, resources, and references users might find beneficial while considering personal options, during the performance of their duties, or while contemplating an intervention with an employee. Access to the Employee Support section is gained from the link on the Main Menu (see Figure 52).
Figure 53. Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Employee Support “Rolodex.”


A listing of references is provided in an electronic “Rolodex” format (see Figure 53). This list is maintained by an administrator and is updateable. The listing will provide support options—including a brief description of them—and links to gather additional information if applicable.

The rolodex provides basic information on the program and a link to related exterior websites.

**Reports**

psAdvance is primarily geared toward the user viewing data contained within the system, and not toward the printing or exporting of that data. However, a few printable reports are available. To access reports you must be a supervisor. Selecting the Report link on the Main Menu causes a list of reports to be displayed. The following reports are available and can be printed:

**Activity Ratio Report**

This report compares an officer’s frequency of certain incidents with his/her peers, taking into consideration the activity level of the officer. There are some incidents that officers are more likely to get involved in if they are more active in the field. For these types of incidents it may not be fair to compare officers to each other without considering these differences in activity levels. Using ratios negates officer activity differences and enables more accurate comparisons. The report is available by the race or gender of citizens the officer interacted with.
Demographic Comparisons
This report compares demographic statistics for an officer to his/her peers during the time period selected on the report, and presented in an easily readable, printable format. This information can also be viewed in the Employee Comparison Statistics (Demographics) screen. However, only one peer group can be selected at a time. This report will display all peer groups the officer has activity in during the time period selected on the report.

Demographic Scatter Plot
This report displays a table representing a specific scatter plot diagram. Instead of showing the diagram, the table provides a summary of the figures used to create the scatter plot. Demographic scatter plot information will be easily readable in printable format.

Employee Performance Report
This report contains a summary of an employee’s performance. Specifically, this report contains activity trends and comparisons for 4 quarters, or 4 years, depending on the calendar period type selected. Also included on the report are complete allegation history, complete history of system generated notifications sent out about the employee, complete intervention history, complete promotion history, and complete assignment history.

MVR Questions Answered “No”
This report displays a bar chart showing the percentage of reviewed incidents where MVR questions were answered “No.” VBPD will be capturing this data on the EIS, but it will be difficult to see any patterns or trends without the summary the report will provide. The data is actionable in that, if a given question is answered “no” frequently for an employee or organization, management can intervene to assist/remind officers to follow procedures.

Tasks Overdue
This report shows those psAdvance users within a selected organization who have tasks outstanding that are beyond the due date. At the top of the table are those users with the most overdue tasks. The secondary sort is # Days Overdue (in descending order). This report provides supervisors with identification of the users who are currently having difficulty in completing their assigned tasks. Supervisors can then intervene and assist the recipient in task completion.

Training Absences
The Training Absences data entry screen is used to record absences from training classes and provide a method for supervisors to document the findings of their investigations into those absences. This functionality was specifically built into psAdvance at the request of Virginia Beach in order to explore the possibility of expanding the system to facilitate other work processes.
Previously, training absences were tracked manually and involved substantial effort on a number of people’s parts. Our goal was to use psAdvance’s automation and work process capabilities to automate the entry, tracking, and documentation of training absences.

Creating training absence records is a multi-step process completely coordinated by psAdvance.

- An automated trigger sends a notification to the training coordinator, advising them that a training class has ended and needs to be reviewed for absences.
- The coordinator reviews the class roster and selects which employees were absent (see Figure 54). Other fields can be entered as required. The coordinator then submits the class.
- An automated trigger identifies the immediate supervisor of employees marked as absent and sends a system task to that supervisor notifying him or her of the absence and prompting them to investigate and appropriately conclude the entry.
- The supervisor reviews the class roster and then investigates the circumstances of the absence. The supervisor can modify various fields in the record to reflect the findings of his/her investigation. The supervisor is also tasked to determine if the absence was excused or not excused (see Figure 55 on page 86).
**Figure 55.** Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Training Absence Functionality – Supervisor data entry screen.

![Image of Supervisor data entry screen]

*Source: Provided by the Virginia Beach Police Department’s Office of Professional Standards. Reproduced by permission of Mr. Chuck Warden, Project Manager. psAdvance Employee Performance Management System software. Management Science Associates, Inc. (MSA), Pittsburgh, PA.*

**Figure 56.** Virginia Beach Police/psAdvance Training Absence Functionality – Final report.

![Image of Final report]

*Source: Provided by the Virginia Beach Police Department’s Office of Professional Standards. Reproduced by permission of Mr. Chuck Warden, Project Manager. psAdvance Employee Performance Management System software. Management Science Associates, Inc. (MSA), Pittsburgh, PA.*

Once submitted, the training absence will be reflected on the employee’s Personnel File screen (see Figure 56).

**Moving Forward**

Like most investments, our EIS was a compromise between a system with all of the bells and whistles, and one that we could afford. While we recognize our EIS has room for growth and improvement, we have in fact achieved all goals that were established from a technological perspective for the funding provided by this grant. We have attempted to provide a good overall view of the psAdvance system in this document, but if your agency is seriously considering a purchase in this area we would recommend that you take the time to thoroughly review the system manuals for the particular system being considered as well.
We found three significant flaws in our current system that will need to be addressed if we are to continue to utilize psAdvance as our primary early intervention system, and all relate to administrative oversight of the system.

The first deficiency relates to psAdvance’s inability to provide senior leaders with a transparent view of how the system is being utilized by less senior supervisors. psAdvance does what we consider to be a very good job of assisting the first-line supervisor in monitoring and intervening with their direct reports. What the system lacks, is the reporting tools for more senior department leaders to monitor how the first-line supervisors are addressing issues raised in the psAdvance system. The system can be set to make these leaders aware that an alert of some type was generated, but there is no way for the leader to easily determine what the first-line supervisor did in response.

The second issue is similar to the first, but relates to the system administrator’s inability to conduct an analysis of what is occurring in the system. The VBPD is fully accredited by CALEA, which has certain annual reporting requirements for a department’s EIS. While we have been able to comply with these requirements by showing what our system’s potential is and how it is being utilized, we cannot report out on specific details—such as how many of certain types of alerts occurred, what supervisors did to address those issues, etc. We are currently working with the vendor to develop reporting functionality to address these issues.

A third significant flaw was identified in the development and deployment of our EIS that in fact, had very little to do with the system itself, but more to do with how we handled that deployment. Prior to the use of the IAPro EIS, written notification was made to department supervisors by e-mail and the command staff was briefed verbally on the system’s general parameters and what administrative procedures would be put into place to process alerts. Beyond that, little guidance was provided. As a result of this lack of awareness of how the system functioned, department supervisors were left with little understanding of what was expected of them when reviewing and responding to an alert. For that matter, most supervisors lacked insight into what situations caused the alert in the first place. As for the department’s non-supervisors, even less information was provided on early intervention systems. In the absence of any actual understanding, many officers became suspicious and wary of the system. This, combined with the problems noted earlier in this report with respect to the significant level of alerts received by some commands, caused the system to quickly gain a poor reputation with both supervisors and non-supervisors. It was ultimately dismissed by most as a nuisance.

In order to combat this shortcoming, the introduction of psAdvance was more deliberately planned and executed. One year prior to expected delivery of the system all sworn department members were provided a block of instruction during Inservice training on early intervention system theory. The course was designed to demystify how these systems work and what was expected by personnel when an alert was issued. The course described the IAPro system in place at the time, and also provided a “teaser” introduction to the psAdvance system.
During the following year’s in-service instruction a subsequent course was taught to all department members on the use of the psAdvance system. This training was timed to begin when the psAdvance system was being deployed department wide for use. As members attended the training they were entered into the system as an active user and allowed to begin using the system. With the complexity of the system it was thought to be a better approach to restrict use until attending the introductory training. This meant that it took approximately one year from the date of final delivery until all members had access to the system, but the benefits of having educated users ultimately paid dividends and resulted in the system being valued and understood. For any department contemplating a substantial software roll out to occur to the majority of its members it is highly recommended that adequate training be incorporated in that deployment schedule.
Conclusions and Lessons Learned

The Enhancing a Culture of Integrity Grant provided significant benefits to the VBPD, and by extension, the citizens we serve. We fully recommend that other agencies seek grant funded improvements to their agency. While the time investment can be considerable on a large grant such as this one, the benefits to the organization are long term and worthwhile. This funding helped to establish in the minds of our own citizens, our own personnel, and those in other law enforcement agencies, that we have a strong and abiding commitment to integrity.

The Advanced Training component worked well for us. The paid speakers brought in from outside the organization were certainly the uncomplicated approach for an organization to take. Very little work typically needed to be done to support these activities, but there are significant financial costs often associated with hosting this type of training. We hosted some of the top rated professional speakers working in the field at the time. Along with their lengthy listing of credentials often came substantial charges for their time. We managed to limit our costs somewhat by coordinating attendance from other agencies and charging them nominal fees, but this still was an expensive endeavor. The obvious benefit was that we were able to train large complements of our supervisory staff on cutting-edge law enforcement and leadership topics in a short amount of time.

The development of the in-house training courses saved substantial funding costs, but was a significant commitment for the agency and took time, energy, and talent to succeed. Those involved in developing these processes undoubtedly benefited from that experience, but there are costs associated with these people being committed on a part-time basis away from their regular duties. Those who attended the courses were able to glean knowledge from the in-house instructors, which has an economy of scale associated with it, making the initial investment somewhat less a concern. It is noteworthy that what determination we possessed in the beginning to orchestrate these programs may have waned following their initial presentations. Of the programs developed, only a few are still taught on an ongoing basis.

The modernization of the Professional Standards Office was also a success, and we strongly recommend to other agencies that they follow this model. The cost is minimal, the results significant, and the message is important. We are telling our citizens that we are willing to make their concerns and issues high priorities by putting the same emphasis on state-of-the-art technology for the Professional Standards Office functions as we do for SWAT and Crime Analysis. The fact that we do so for a modest sum is neither noticed nor important. What is important is that the technology works, and provides us much better results and feedback to the community.
With respect to the early intervention portion of the project, the VBPD strongly urges all law enforcement agencies with more than a few members to seriously consider investment in some form of EIS. While the breadth and depth of an agency’s need for one of these systems varies depending on their culture, size, and jurisdiction, we would submit that a functional EIS could go a long way toward improving accountability, integrity, and the overall health in any organization. Perhaps most important, early intervention may provide alternatives to simply waiting for the situation to become so egregious that disciplining the employee is the only option. As was indicated by Carl R. Peed (Director, COPS) and Chuck Wexler (Executive Director, PERF), in the preface to *Supervision and Intervention within Early Intervention Systems: A Guide for Law Enforcement Chief Executives*,¹⁸

> “the vast majority of this country’s law enforcement officers are principled men and women who provide professional service to the communities they serve. Their responsibilities are great, and the expectations from their communities are high. Unfortunately, there are times when officers’ performance falls short of agency expectations for any number of reasons. In these circumstances, agencies have traditionally responded to such officers through disciplinary means—hoping that any inappropriate behavior will end. We now know, however, that there are a variety of ways to solve these issues, and in some cases we have the ability to do so before a problem even manifests itself in inappropriate behaviors on the job. Agencies are adopting early intervention systems that are successfully achieving this goal.”

Recommendations are provided throughout this document to help agencies improve supervision and expand intervention options within an EIS. While we believe our EIS has room for growth and improvement, we in fact achieved all we had hoped to from a technological perspective from the funding available. There were numerous opportunities for us to learn during this project, and from our experiences we offer the following suggestions.

First, agencies should carefully establish where they desire to go with early intervention and plan accordingly. Based on Virginia Beach’s experiences, we highly recommend stepping beyond the typical early warning system and develop a performance management styled approach. This approach allows for the system to be proactively and productively used on a daily basis by all layers of the department hierarchy and works to clearly identify good, mediocre, and poor performers. This approach provides great advantages when compared to a system that merely warns supervisors when critically bad performance is present.

A second recommendation would be for the members of the law enforcement agency tasked with developing this system, and those technical experts they plan to partner with to design and build it, to spend significant time together during the initial planning and design phase so that both entities have a better understanding of the needs of the agency and the capabilities of the software or program. This time together will also help both groups to gain an understanding of what realistic time frames are needed to build a system of this scale. This is especially critical if the law enforcement agency is intent on securing funding via a grant or some similar means where deadlines are an issue. To highlight why this issue is important, the psAdvance project took nearly twice as long to complete as the law enforcement agency’s administrators initially budgeted for. This in turn caused external deadlines to be missed with respect to the grant completion, and internal staffing difficulties with respect to personnel tasked to complete the project. Having more realistic expectations from the beginning may have alleviated this issue to some degree.

The third and perhaps most important recommendation is to ensure adequate time is spent creating understanding and “buy in” of the system by the rank and file. While this is a critically important need throughout the organization, special attention should be paid to the first-line supervisors who need to be made to realize the value of the system, as they will be interacting with the system on the most frequent basis. These systems are expensive and difficult to integrate into a department’s current software infrastructure, but we believe from an administrative standpoint it is a worthwhile cost. That being said, it is entirely up to the department’s workforce whether the system succeeds or falls out of use.

A word of caution with respect to developing a multi-faceted EIS—in addition to the cost of purchasing software and licenses to use the program, there was a substantial manpower cost for our department. As was highlighted previously, at the time Virginia Beach began researching commercially available EIS software, we found little was available and what was, had a price tag we could not afford. Because we did not buy an “off the shelf” system, much of the design, implementation, and testing manpower costs were borne by agency members. This was a multi-year, multi-department investment with respect to our internal resource commitment. It is our sincere hope that the time Virginia Beach spent implementing this program will aid the next agency undertaking a similar quest, so that they benefit from our difficult, and at times, painful efforts.

The members of the VBPD are grateful to the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services and the U.S. Department of Justice for providing us the funding and opportunities to pursue the goals set forth in this document. In exchange, we offer our ongoing commitment to assist other agencies in reaching some of those same goals. We welcome requests for assistance.
The Virginia Beach Police Department Enhancing Cultures of Integrity Technical Assistance Guide is the third in a series of reports detailing projects resulting from the COPS Office Creating a Culture of Integrity grant program. These grants funded initiatives related to developing innovative ethics and integrity programs to address policies and practices that can impact organizational culture within law enforcement agencies. In this guide, the Virginia Beach Police Department details their steps to enhance police integrity by focusing on leadership development, coaching and mentoring, and an improved citizen complaint system and complaint mediation program.