

The Compstat Concept in Addressing Crime

Charles H. Fordham, II

Abstract

Compstat is a computerized systematic way of using the Geographic Information System (GIS) to track criminal activity and crime trends. Compstat was initiated in 1994 by then New York City Commissioner William Bratton to address the high crime rate in New York City. Compstat goals center on reducing crime, enhancing arrest and community involvement. There have been both positives (open communications, accountability) and negatives (fudge factor, pressure from leadership) listed in reference to the concept of Compstat. This paper will attempt to determine the effectiveness of the Compstat process within the Daytona Beach Police Department, whereas positive and negative aspects of the process will also be identified.

Introduction

Compstat (computer statistics) is a systematic computerized way of using the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to map crime trends and identify problems. Compstat was designed and implemented to address and reduce criminal activity (Wikipedia, 2008).

Compstat is a management philosophy or organizational management tool for police departments, whereas it is considered a multilayered dynamic approach to crime reduction, quality of life improvement, and personnel and resource management (Wikipedia, 2008)

Compstat success is measured by statistical data over a period of time, whether its six months, twelve months, two years or five years this period of time allows ideas, changes and techniques that have been implemented to deter or reduce crime. The data will show a decrease, same, or increase in criminal activity and arrest during the defined time period. Compstat helps enhance community involvement and community activities to educate citizens on fighting, preventing and reporting crime. However, there have been allegations of leaders instructing their personnel to downgrade reports from felony to misdemeanor, or intimidating victims not to report crimes, all in an effort to show crime statistic reduction in their areas of command.

Compstat was implemented in July 2006 at the Daytona Beach Police Department. For this research project I compared statistical data from two years before Compstat (2004) to two years after Compstat (2008). I also conducted an internal survey of all leaders and senior officers on their thoughts and beliefs since Compstat was implemented. The purpose of this research is to determine how the supervisors and senior officers feel about Compstat and what, if any changes should be recommended to the Chief of Police.

I will discuss the tenets or attributes of Compstat, which are the following: 1. it's main goal or objectives- reducing crime, increasing arrest, and enhancing community involvement. 2. The four distinct principles- accurate and timely intelligence, effective tactics, rapid deployment, and relentless follow-up and assessment. 3. Leadership Perspective- enhancing leadership, the pathway to leadership development, the pre-Compstat meeting as a performance appraisal, and participative management and the Compstat meeting protocol.

Literature Review

Research has been conducted on whether law enforcement agencies throughout the country have instituted Compstat or a similar model to address crime in their respected cities. The research was not solely based on criminal statistics, but department size (number of sworn officers) and geographical location. Apparently more of the larger agencies (200+) have instituted Compstat or Compstat like programs, and have expressed their success in reducing crime (Weisburd, et al, 2004)

During the survey of police departments, a few agencies responded they already had programs in effect up to six years earlier that were just as effective as the Compstat model. In the conclusion of this report it discusses departments that have implemented Compstat over departments that have not and their desire to reduce serious crime and increase management control over field operations. It also noted that departments that adopted Compstat were less likely to focus on improving skills and morale of street-level officers (Weisburd, et al, 2004)

New York Police Department (NYPD)

During the implementation of Compstat in the NYPD, Commissioner Bratton brought in outsiders to diagnose the strengths and weaknesses of the department from the top to the bottom and the bottom to the top. The NYPD held meetings twice weekly in which precinct commanders appear before several of the department's top leaders to report on crime problems in their precincts and what they are doing about them. The Compstat meetings, the reports include weekly and monthly reports, of statistics consisting of arrests, type of crimes, suspects, victims and witnesses, whereas the report states "Compstat reports serve as the database for commanders to demonstrate their understanding of the crime problems in their areas and discuss future strategies with the top brass and other commanders present". NYPD not only initiated Compstat, but has become the model that other agencies are following. Most Compstat meetings are held with the following personnel: the command staff, other top brass, the presenters (precinct or district commanders & their staff), and any other persons allowed, e.g...Other department personnel, general public, and media (Weisburd, et al, 2004).

June 30, 2003, NYPD Confidential, An inside look at the New York Police Department reported that the NYPD 'Crime statistics doubts adding up', based on a complaint filed through the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association. The report displays comments from past squad and precinct commanders in reference to allegations of downgrading the crime statistics, from throwing reports/complaints out, to doctoring

crime statistics. The question(s) have been asked about why there have been allegations of downgrading statistics, and the answer has been Compstat, the computerized statistical program that has changed the department's culture.

The article states "COMPSTAT's success has made crime reduction a political issue as never before. This makes department commanders vulnerable to doctoring statistics". Compstat has been compared to the Knapp Commission (which ended the department's systemic corruption), something that is supposed to be positive with a negative side-effect (Levitt, 2003).

Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD)

Compstat Policing in Los Angeles promised to significantly reduce violent crime in the Los Angeles communities, via the new factor instituted by the newly appointed Police Chief, William Bratton (former NYPD Police Commissioner). Compstat had become a proven factor in other agencies, such as NYPD, Boston, Miami, New Orleans, and Newark in reference to those agencies experiencing a reduction in violent crimes. The LAPD reports "a vital component of the Compstat philosophy is its emphasis on holding police managers directly accountable for combating the crime in their assigned area and providing them the authority to deploy their resources to achieve the desired results" (LAPD website 2008).

The elements of COMPSTAT consist of four distinct principles:

1. *Accurate & Timely Intelligence*- this principle suggest that the intelligence/information be used as a radar screen to direct police resources to the exact problem area (in a timely manner).
2. *Effective Tactics*- COMPSTAT tactics encourage "thinking outside the box" and mandates that every resource, both internal and external, are considered in responding to a problem.
3. *Rapid Deployment*- with COMPSTAT, the police department is now armed with vital intelligence regarding emerging crime trends or patterns that allows for a strategic police response.
4. *Relentless Follow-up & Assessment*- the bottom line with COMPSTAT is results. Everything the police department does no matter whether administrative, operational, or investigative in nature is evaluated by the results achieved.

The LAPD reports that the Compstat Unit provides the statistical data and management information needed for the weekly Compstat meeting. The data is presented to the command officers, who are responsible for the future decision making when creating new crime reduction strategies, allocating resources and deploying personnel in their assigned areas. The continuous Compstat cycle of reviewing, strategizing, taking action and being held accountable for results has streamlined the Department's crime fighting abilities and increased its effectiveness in responding

quickly to crime problems as evidenced by the current reduction in the overall occurrence of crime throughout the City of Los Angeles (LAPD website, 2008).

Fudge Factor

The Village Voice published an article titled “These Stats Are a Crime” and wrote “while Bloomberg boasts of crime drop, the hospitals’ work on assault victims is booming”. The article stated that the number of people who went to New York City hospitals because they were assaulted jumped sharply in four of the last five years, a direct contrast to the plunging number of assaults the NYPD reported. The contrast between these two sets of official statistics demonstrates again the need for a thorough independent probe of the police department’s crime reports. A city’s Commission to Combat Police Corruption was appointed, however the NYPD refused to cooperate with the investigation. In this article, the Daily News reported complaints from the presidents of the Patrolman’s Benevolent Association and the Sergeant Benevolent Association in reference to officers being forced to falsify stats which will show a reduction in crime and assaults being downgraded to harassment cases. From 1997 to 2002, the number of assault victims rose 19%, a direct contrast to the number of assaults the NYPD reported to the FBI for its Uniform Crime Reports (Moses, 2005).

The Trouble with Compstat is an article written that discusses the “fudge factor”, that allows commanders to make it look like crime have dropped when it has actually increased. The article states “It was a great idea that has been corrupted by human nature”. The Compstat program made NYPD commanders accountable, whereas the police leadership pressed subordinates to keep the numbers low. When Compstat began initially, it made a real and honest impact on crime in New York City, but the commanders and middle managers who were dragged on the carpet for the weekly Compstat meetings knew that rising stats won’t help anybody’s career. “So how do you fake a crime decrease?” was a question that was asked and answered in many different forms, such as: don’t file reports, misclassify felonies to misdemeanors, under value property crimes, report a series of crimes as one event, and persecute the victims so they will stop reporting crimes. The PBA is asking their members to share information, if and when they see crimes being downgraded (Zink, 2004).

Leadership

An article published September 2006, is titled “The Compstat Process: Managing Performance on the Pathway to Leadership”, and states that Compstat is a “strategic control system”. The article also states that Compstat is “a new paradigm revolutionizing law enforcement management and practice”. It also writes that Compstat could be summarized in one simple statement Collect, analyze, and map crime data and other essential police performance measures on a regular basis and hold police managers accountable for their performance as measured by this data. This article discusses Compstat from a leadership perspective, from leaders enhancing and developing their skills, to them being held accountable for the crime statistics in the areas they command (DeLorenzi, et al, 2006). The following sub-topics were discussed:

**Enhancing Leadership-* Command and supervisory staff are two groups that successful executives must be sensitive to. They serve as a critical link to the rank and file for a chief executive's vision, goals, and objectives and their beliefs should never be taken for granted.

**The Pathway to Leadership Development-* Feedback is an essential mechanism for developing the capacity of field personnel to improve, generate innovative solutions to problems, accept responsibility, and develop into high-quality leaders. This section also discusses Public Compstat, and the negativity it can cause to commanders, supervisors, and the agency itself, by affecting morale, causing embarrassment, supervisor resent, and creating more problems than it solves.

**The Pre-Compstat Meeting as a Performance Appraisal-* the pre-Compstat meeting should be held weekly before the regular Compstat meeting to discuss the previous week's expectations and conduct follow-up.

**Participative Management and the Compstat Meeting Protocol:* Executives must embrace power sharing and decentralized decision making as a motivational tool that leaves those vested with it feeling committed even obligated to provide the best service possible. The beginning of a Compstat meeting is the time to deliver public praise and accolades. Commanders should bring their personnel to Compstat for recognition of outstanding performance (DeLorenzi, et al, 2006)

In 1994, NYPD Police Commissioner William Bratton modified conventional community policing by recognizing it in order for the department to be effective in reducing crime and in responding to the needs of the communities, those operational decisions should be made by the precinct commanders instead of Headquarter executives and the officers on the street. In reference to Compstat, the weekly crime reports are a statistical summary of the week's criminal activity, arrest, significant cases, crime patterns and police activities. The weekly Compstat meetings increase the flow of communication between the department's executives and commanders. These meetings are considered an integral facet of a comprehensive interactive management strategy which enhances accountability while providing local commanders with considerable discretion and the resources necessary to properly manage their commands. The Compstat Unit develops and prepares the Commander Profile Reports (as well as the Compstat Reports). These reports are updated weekly and permit executives to scrutinize commander's performance on a variety of important management variables. The Crime Strategy Meetings are convened twice weekly with visual presentations, since it permits precinct commanders and the Executive Staff to instantly identify and explore trends and patterns as well as solutions for crime and quality of life problems. The technology of Compstat relying on software tools, which often incorporate crime mapping systems and a database collection system. This article from Wikipedia discussed the Origins and Operations (weekly crime reports, accountability, commander profile reports, crime strategy meetings, and technology) of Compstat (Wikipedia, 2008).

Philadelphia Police Department (PPD)

In 2003, five members of the Philadelphia Police Department (including then Lt. Mike Chitwood, who is currently the Chief of Police of the Daytona Beach Police Department, and who also initiated Compstat to the agency) completed and presented a paper titled "What is COMSTAT and who created it and why". Their paper centered on the Philadelphia PD instituting Compstat and the reduction of crime, then cancelling Compstat for a new initiative and the rise of crime. In 1996, then Commissioner John Timoney presented a program to the Philadelphia Police Department called Compstat. They discussed that instituting Compstat opened the lines of communication internally within the PPD, externally with other agencies, and how through the open communication the crime rate was reduced within the city. Throughout the paper, they discussed the beginning of Compstat in New York City, and the employing of the four critical techniques: 1. Accurate and timely intelligence, 2. Effective tactics, 3. Rapid deployment of personnel and resources, and 4. Relentless follow-up and assessment. In 2002, Commissioner Timoney was replaced by Commissioner Sylvester Johnson. After this change the city Mayor and Commissioner Johnson decided to implement a new approach to the problems they observed, and called it Operation Safe Streets, therefore eliminating the Compstat process. The reports states that the crime statistics in Philadelphia showed an increase in crime from 2002 to 2003, when they eliminated Compstat and implemented Safe Streets. Also noted was the cost of police overtime and the city deficit, as questions arose about the worth of the new program. They concluded that due to the crime reduction success of NYC, the crime increase in Philadelphia, the overtime and cost to the city, and the long term effectiveness of Operation Safe Streets, their suggestion was to re-institute the Compstat model of policing (Konowal et al, 2000).

Lincoln (Nebraska) Police Department

Chief Tom Casady of the Lincoln (Nebraska) Police Department wrote an article stating, the combination of geographic information systems and modern police records management systems is one demonstration of the dramatic improvement in the analytic capabilities available to law enforcement agencies. Chief Casady explained a hypothetical situation, where the same modus operandi (m.o.) was used citywide in reference to women's handbags being stolen from lockers in fitness centers. It appears that no one was aware that these crimes were all part of a pattern, but considering this crime pattern at the department's Compstat meeting, the discussion among the attendees turns to an appropriate response. Chief Casady highlighted in his article "Many law enforcement agencies might not be using crime analysis technology to its full potential. Analysts can help formulate and evaluate the strategies used to intervene in crime patterns, and they can be advocates for responses that move beyond merely responding to crime after and instead work to prevent crime". Chief Casady discussed two incidents where crime analysis assisted: one was open-garage burglaries, where the crime dropped 37% percent from 2006 to 2007 and storage garage burglaries that had 129 cases in 1999 to 45 cases in 2007 (with a growth of more than 30,000 residents during the same time period). These incidents were problem-oriented policing

projects, that they (police) were enabling by basic crime analysis that both revealed the trend and helped to evaluate the results. These are simple examples of how good crime analysis can be used to prevent crime (Casady, 2008).

Methods

The methodology in this research was conducted in two phases within the Daytona Beach Police Department. One is an inter-departmental survey (appendix A), and two is a statistical data comparison two years before Compstat 2004 and two years after Compstat 2008 (Appendix B).

Phase One, On September 24, 2008; I forwarded forty-five (45) surveys to the department supervisors and forty-five (45) surveys to the senior officers within the department, with a deadline of responding by October 31, 2008. The purpose of this survey was to get the leaders and senior officers input or ideas on Compstat over the past two years since it was initiated within the department. The survey looks at the number of years the leader has been a supervisor and the number of years they have been on the Daytona Beach Police Department, as well as the number years that the senior officer has been on the department. The survey consisted of six questions using a Likert scale, five questions that required a yes or no answer with a brief explanation for their thoughts or input, and two questions, that ask to list the positive and negative attributes of Compstat. The survey asks the department leaders and senior officers of their professional opinion about Compstat in reference to what would they do differently, changes they would make, and to list positive and negative comments. Their overall responses will show whether or not they approve or disapprove of Compstat. The department leaders are comprised of one Chief of Police, two Deputy Chiefs, three Captains, ten Lieutenants, and twenty-one Sergeants.

One weakness that can be related to this interdepartmental survey is the fact that those who respond might still believe that they can or will be identified, even though I advised them that they may remain anonymous. Therefore it might affect their responses in reference to their true feelings or opinion of Compstat.

Phase Two, I compared the 2004 statistics (two years before Compstat) to the 2008 statistics (two years after Compstat) in reference to Part 1 crimes. The data shows what Part I crimes increased and what Part I crimes decreased.

Results

The results of the survey (Appendix A) show what the department leaders and senior officers think of Compstat and determine whether their ideas are similar or contrast to the goals of Compstat and the goals of the department.

I received 22 of 45 responses (48%) from the supervisors, and 9 of 45 responses (20%) from the senior officers.

The supervisors listed accountability and communications as the more positive ratings or comments, and listed preparation (time) and too much information being

provided to the public as negatives. The senior officers listed the sharing of information as positive, and the preparation of Compstat for the leaders as a negative, because the leadership is putting other things as secondary during that week.

The results of the survey does show that the supervisors and senior officers overall approve of the Compstat method, with minor changes. In reference to those who responded (90%) stated that if they were a department head, they would institute Compstat at their agency.

The 2004 statistics compared to the 2008 statistics showed a 19% decrease in Part I crimes throughout the City. The data showed an increase in the following Part I crimes; Aggravated Assaults (+3%), and Homicides (+110%). The data showed a decrease in the following Part I crimes; Auto Thefts (-54%), Burglary (-27%), Robbery (-13%), Larceny (-7%), Rape (-46%) (See Appendix B).

The decrease in crime can be contributed to the open communications within the department/divisions, increasing of arrests, more community involvement and awareness, tracking of criminal activity, updated fingerprinting system, BOLO's of suspects, Leads on Line program (tracking pawn shops activity), Crime Analysis Unit, and working jointly with Probation and Parole.

Discussion

The concept of Compstat in reference to deterring or minimizing crime, enhancing arrest, and increasing community involvement has been proven through numerous agencies that it works in reducing criminal activity.

Compstat was initiated in 1994 by New York City Commissioner William Bratton to address high criminal activity and crime trends. Through Commissioner Bratton's experience and belief in strategic planning, Bratton and his lieutenants set out to disprove skeptics who claimed that the police can do little about crime and disorder. Commissioner Bratton's idea(s) to address crime included meetings between staff to exchange information and ideas, better training and education of officers, and various programs of community involvement. It appears that this process had to implement the basic principles of planning, this is to gather information or ideas, implement those ideas, and be able to measure the success or failures of those ideas (in short, mid or long terms).

During this research, I discovered that Compstat was implemented in other law enforcement agencies nationally two ways:

1. NYPD officials that went and headed other agencies instituted the Compstat model at those agencies, whereas that type of trend continues.
2. Department heads would send their representatives to NYPD (or other agencies) to view their Compstat meetings, and research their statistical data to see if implementing Compstat or a similar model would benefit their department.

In July 2006, Daytona Beach Police Chief Michael Chitwood instituted Compstat at the Daytona Beach Police Department. Chief Chitwood was a Philadelphia police officer

for 17 years, when he left to become police chief in Shawnee, Oklahoma, where he instituted Compstat there also. Chief Chitwood was a Sergeant at the Philadelphia Police Department, when Police Commissioner John Timoney took over that agency and instituted Compstat, based on the model that he help originate as the Deputy Police Commissioner in NYC in 1994 (under Commissioner Bratton). Chief Chitwood conducts Compstat on a bi-weekly basis, and the presentations are conducted by the District 1 and District 2 Captains (accountability at command level). In Compstat a department is 'broken down' by its geographical areas and the supervisors responsible for those areas. The Daytona Beach Police Department showed a 19% reduction in Part I crimes from 2004 thru 2008, the years before and after Compstat.

During this research, I've concluded that Compstat was developed as a new approach to addressing criminal activity from a managerial standpoint, which forced the mid-level leadership to be innovative and involved. It also opened lines of communication and the sharing of information throughout the department (through the rank & file, and various divisions), which is a key element in the overall success of Compstat. Compstat success is measured by statistical data after a period of six months to twenty-four months or at the discretion of the department head. The crime maps and statistics will show whether there has been an increase or decrease in crimes, arrest, and police activity. The crime maps also show where the crimes are occurring and what types of crimes are being committed. This information through the Compstat process is what the mid-level leaders will be using to address criminal activity, such as where to deploy more officers/resources, overt and covert operations, surveillances, and incorporating neighborhoods into working with law enforcement in deterring or eliminating crime. Compstat is doing two things simultaneously while it is addressing criminal activity, one, identifying and handling specific problems, (such as crime trends, inter-departmental sharing of information), and two, increasing community involvement.

Recommendations

I personally and professionally believe in and appreciate the concept of Compstat, sharing of information and opening the lines of communication in an effort to reduce criminal activity, enhancing arrest and improving the quality of life for the residents and visitors of Daytona Beach, Florida. Below are my recommendations:

1. All police or sheriff agencies should implement Compstat or a similar program to the Compstat model at their respected agency.
2. Maintain open communications between their divisions, and have a working partnership with their respected communities.
3. Develop a Crime Analysis Unit (responsible for tracking crime, BOLO's, statistics)
4. Crime Scene Unit (collection of evidence, fingerprinting, DNA).

Lieutenant Charles Fordham has been with the Daytona Beach Police Department 1989. His previous assignment was a Shift Lieutenant in the Patrol Division where he was responsible for the direction, supervision and administration for assigned patrol activities. Charles is currently serving as the Deputy Commander of the Criminal Investigations Division. He is also a retired Captain from the Florida Army National Guard after serving a total of 22 years of military service. Charles has a Bachelor's degree in Criminal Justice from Bethune-Cookman College.

References

- Casady, T. (2008, September). Beyond arrest: Using crime analysis to prevent crime. *The Police Chief*, 75(9), 40, 42.
- COMPSTAT. (2008, August). *Official Website of the Los Angeles Police Department*. Retrieved August 16, 2008, from http://www.lapdonline.org/crime_maps_and_compstat/content_basic_view/6363
- DeLorenzi, D., Shane, J.M., Amendola, K.L. (2006, September), The Compstat process: Managing performance on the pathway to leadership. *The Police Chief*, 73(9), Retrieved August 31, 2008 from http://policechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display&article_id=998&issue_id=92006
- Konowal, L., Maddred, S., Jackson, R., Osbourne, P., Pullar, S., Terry, R., Chitwood, M. (2000), *the Philadelphia Police Department Research Paper on Compstat*.
- Levitt, L. (2003, June). Crime statistics doubts adding up, *NYPD Confidential* Retrieved August 17, 2008, from <http://www.nypdconfidential.com/columns/2003/030630.html>
- Moses, P. (2005, October 25). These stats are a crime. *The Village Voice*. Retrieved August 17, 2008 from <http://www.villagevoice.com/2005-10-25/news/these-stats-are-a-crime/>
- Wikipedia. (2008, March 29). *CompStat*. Retrieved June 17, 2008 from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Compstat>
- Weisburd, D., Mastroki, S. D., Greenspan, R., & Willis, J. J. (2004, April). The growth of COMPSTAT in American policing. *Police Foundation Reports* Retrieved June 17, 2008, from http://www.lapdonline.org/inside_the_lapd/pdf_view/6247
- Zink, R. (2004, Summer). The Trouble with COMPSTAT. *The PBA Magazine* Retrieved June 17, 2006, from <http://www.nycpba.org/publications/mag-04-summer/compstat.html>

APPENDIX A

COMPSTAT Research Questionnaire

**22 of 45 supervisors responded (48%)

** 9 of 45 senior officers responded (20%)

1. How long have you been a supervisor?

Not a supervisor __ 0-5 years__ 6-10 years__ 11-15 years__ 16-20 years__ 21 + years__

**Average number years of the supervisors' ---6-10 years*

**0-5 years-----9*

**6-10 years----10*

**11-15 years----2*

**16-20 years----1*

**21-25 years----0*

2. How long have you been with the department?

0-5 years__ 6-10 years__ 11-15 years__ 16-20 years__ 20 + years__

**Supervisors Average---11-15 years*

**Senior Officer Averages---16-20 years*

** 0-5 years----2*

**0-5 years-----0*

**6-10 years----2*

**6-10 years----0*

**11-15 years---7*

**11-15 years---5*

**16-20 years---7*

**16-20 years---3*

**21-25 years---4*

**21-25 Years---1*

Please circle the number that most appropriately reflects your opinion:

Strongly Agree = 5 → 4 → 3 → 2 → 1 = Strongly Disagree.

3. COMPSTAT is helping the agency to reduce crime. 5 4 3 2 1
**Supervisors---4.7 *Senior Officers---4.1*
4. COMPSTAT has brought the police and community closer together. 5 4 3 2 1
**Supervisors---4.0 *Senior Officers---4.1*
5. The implementation of COMPSTAT has increased community involvement. 5 4 3 2 1
**Supervisors---3.8 *Senior Officers---4.1*
6. Since the implementation of COMPSTAT communications have increased between divisions. 5 4 3 2 1
**Supervisors---4.4 *Senior Officers---4.1*
7. Non supervisors are an integral part of the COMPSTAT process. 5 4 3 2 1
**Supervisors---3.7 *Senior Officers---4.0*
8. During COMPSTAT meetings, leaders are receptive to new ideas. 5 4 3 2 1
**Supervisors---3.8 *Senior Officers---3.8*

Please Circle the answer that most appropriately reflects your opinion and provide brief explanations as needed.

9. Had you heard of COMPSTAT prior to its implementation at this agency? Yes No
**Supervisors---Yes-16, No-6 Senior Officers--- Yes-2, No-7*
10. In your opinion is there too much pressure placed on the preparation for COMPSTAT? **Please provide a brief explanation:** Yes No
**Supervisors---Yes-1, No-19, skipped question-2 Senior Officers---Yes-7, No-2*
11. In your opinion have other assignments become secondary to the COMPSTAT process? **Please provide a brief explanation:** Yes No
**Supervisors---Yes-4, No-16, skipped question-2 Senior Officers---Yes-4, No-4, skipped question-1*

12. Since the implementation of COMPSTAT, have your responsibilities changed? Yes No
Please provide a brief explanation:

**Supervisors----Yes-11, No-10, skipped question-1 Senior Officers----Yes-4, No-5*

13. If you were the leader of an organization, would you implement COMPSTAT Yes No
or a like process? **Please provide a brief explanation:**

**Supervisors----Yes-22, No-0 Senior Officers----Yes-7, No-0, skipped question--2*

14. If you had the ability to make changes to the current COMPSTAT process at this agency, what would those changes be?

**The consensus of the supervisors and senior officers were the following answers:*

-None (no change)

-Change of the time to later in the day, so night shift personnel can attend.

15. Please list all “**Positive**” attributes of COMPSTAT:

**The consensus of the supervisors and senior officers were the following answers:*

-Accountability

-Information sharing/open communication between divisions

-Dissemination of criminal activity (crime trends, data)

-Community receives knowledge of criminal activity

-Solving more cases

-Better follow-up

17. Please list all “**Negative**” attributes of COMPSTAT:

**The consensus of the supervisors and senior officers were the following answers:*

-Too much information to the public

-The time need to be change to afternoons, to accommodate night shift to attend

-Too much time to prep

-NOTE-From the total number of responses (31) from supervisors and senior officers, eleven (11) stated 'None' in reference to listing negative comments about Compstat.

Appendix B

DAYTONA BEACH POLICE DEPARTMENT

Citywide Part 1 Crimes 2004 to 2008 (5 Year Comparison)

DAYTONA BEACH POLICE DEPARTMENT													
Part 1 Crimes	2004	2005	Percent	2005	2006	Percent	2006	2007	Percent	2007	2008	Percent	5YR AVG
Homicide	5	8	60%	8	4	-50%	4	8	100%	8	8	0%	110%
Rape	79	71	-10%	71	57	-20%	57	53	-7%	53	33	-38%	-46%
Robbery	387	342	-12%	342	302	-12%	302	323	7%	323	362	12%	-13%
Aggravated Assault	683	658	-4%	658	514	-22%	514	679	32%	679	590	-13%	3%
Burglary	1597	1399	-12%	1399	1619	16%	1619	1172	-28%	1172	1051	-10%	-27%
Larceny	3200	2698	-16%	2698	2897	7%	2897	2873	-1%	2873	3132	9%	-7%
Auto Theft	982	730	-26%	730	646	-12%	646	567	-12%	567	462	-19%	-54%
Total Part 1 Crimes	6933	5906	-15%	5906	6039	2%	6039	5675	-6%	5675	5638	-1%	-19%

Please note the 2008 data has not been validated and is subject to review