

COMPSTAT MANAGEMENT IN THE NYPD: REDUCING CRIME AND IMPROVING QUALITY OF LIFE IN NEW YORK CITY

*By Dr. Vincent E. Henry**



I. INTRODUCTION

One of the most remarkable stories and most discussed topics in contemporary American law enforcement and throughout the criminal justice field is the tremendous decline in crime achieved in New York City since 1993. Indeed, the number and rate of major felony crimes in New York City have declined at unprecedented rates for the past thirteen consecutive years, and New York City continues to be the safest large city in the United States (City of New York, Mayor's Office, of Operations, 2005).

According to New York Police Department (NYPD) figures, the total number of reported crimes for the seven major crime categories declined an unprecedented 65.99% in 2003 from the levels reported in 1993¹. Only 146,397 of these major crimes occurred in 2003, as compared to 430,460 in 1993, and the 2003 figures represent the lowest annual number of total complaints for the seven major crimes in well over three decades. The overall level of crime in New York City - both in terms of the actual number of crimes and rate of crime - is now at its lowest point since 1963.

One of the most remarkable declines occurred in the Murder category, which fell 68.9% between 1993 and 2003 — from 1,927 murders in 1993 to 598 murders in 2003. As depicted in Table 1, the 598 murders recorded in New York City in 2003 represented more than a 73% decline from 1990, the year homicides reached their historic peak in New York City with 2,245 murders. Robberies fell 69.8% between 1993 and 2003, felony assaults declined 54.3 percent, grand larcenies declined 45.3%, burglaries declined 71.0%, and grand larceny autos and forcible rapes respectively declined 45.3% and 41.8% (NYPD, 2005).

While final year-end data for 2004 were not available at the time this article was written, NYPD data demonstrate that crime continued to decrease in 2004. Data for 2004 through December 12 (that is, for the first fifty weeks of 2004) was available, and it shows that the number of murders in New York City for that period, as compared to the same fifty-week period in 1993, declined 70.3 percent; the number of reported Rapes declined 45.7% from the same period in 1993, and Robberies fell 72.1% from the comparable 1993 period. Felony Assaults dropped 56.3%. In terms of property crimes, the data shows that Burglaries fell 73.6%; Grand Larcenies declined 44.6%, and Grand larceny-Auto (i.e., motor vehicle thefts) plummeted an astounding 81.8%. The total number of reported crimes for these seven major crime categories fell 67.82% for the first fifty weeks of 2004 as compared to the first fifty weeks of 1993.

According to the FBI's Uniform Crime Report (UCR) data for 2003 (FBI, 2005), New York City's rate of Index Crimes per 100,000 population ranked 211th of the 230 American cities with a population over 100,000 in 2003. This showed a great improvement over the first 6 months of 1996, when New York City

* Associate Professor, Long Island University, Homeland Security Management Institute.

¹ The seven crimes that collectively comprise the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) Index are Murder and Non-Negligent Manslaughter, Forcible Rape, Robbery, Aggravated Assault, Burglary, Larceny-Theft, and Motor Vehicle Theft. The total number of reported crimes in these categories comprise the UCR Index; the crimes of Manslaughter and Non-Negligent manslaughter, Forcible Rape, Robbery, and Aggravated Assault comprise the UCR Violent Crime Index subset; and the total number of reported crimes in the Burglary, Larceny-Theft, and Motor Vehicle Theft categories comprise the UCR Property Crimes Index subset. UCR data, which are based on offence categories and definitions collected from police agencies in all fifty of the United States, provide a basis for comparing data across jurisdictions and they are slightly different than the New York State Penal Law crime definitions utilized by the NYPD's Compstat system. Although the UCR definitions and the New York State Penal Law definitions vary slightly, the differences are slight and the two measures are roughly comparable.

ranked 144th, and a vast improvement over the comparable 1993 period, when it ranked 87th of 181 large cities. By way of comparison, St. Louis's crime rate in 1999 was 240% higher than New York's; Orlando's was 238% higher; Atlanta's was 229% higher; Flint, Michigan's was 164% higher; Salt Lake City's was 151% higher; Washington, D.C.'s was almost 94% higher; and Denver's was almost 30% higher than New York City's 1999 crime rate (City of New York, Mayor's Office, 2000).

Among the ten largest American cities, New York's rate of 4,291.8 total Index crimes per 100,000 population ranked it tenth - the safest. Such 'big ten' cities as San Diego (4,237.6 Index crimes per 100,000), Los Angeles (4,819.2), Philadelphia (5,450.2), Las Vegas (5,783.3), Houston (7,056.5), San Antonio (7,548.7), Phoenix (7,654.8), Detroit (8,683.4) and Dallas (9,244.2) have total Index crime rates exceeding New York's, and it should be noted that five of those cities have Index crime rates more than double New York's (City of New York, Mayor's Office, of Operations, 2005).

It should also be clearly noted how favourably New York City's rate of major offences per 100,000 population compares to that measure of crime in Japan and in other highly industrialized and urbanized nations. While it is notoriously difficult to make fair and objective comparisons using international crime data, figures obtained from a statistical compendium issued by Japan's Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (Japan in Figures, 2005) show that Japan as a nation experienced a rate of 2,187 major offences per 100,000 population in 2003. The crime rate for major offences in France is reported at 6,880 per 100,000, the crime rate in Germany is reported at 7,736 per 100,000, the crime rate in the United Kingdom is reported at 10,608 per 100,000, and the rate for the United States as a whole is reported at 4,161 per 100,000 (Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications, 2005). New York City's crime rate of 4,291.8 total UCR Index crimes per 100,000 population is thus about double the rate for Japan, but considerably lower than the rate for any of the other highly industrialized and urbanized nations cited.

The FBI's UCR statistics show that crime has been falling in large American cities across the nation over the past few years, but New York City's decline in reported crime has been significantly greater - in all crime categories - than the national or major city averages. New York City's crime decline not only has surpassed the national average reduction but actually pulled the national averages down. Between 1993 and 1999, for example, the UCR data show that the number of murders and non-negligent manslaughters occurring in U.S. cities with a population over 100,000 (excluding New York City) fell 37%, whereas these crimes fell 66% in New York City. The 36% drop in New York City's aggravated assaults was nearly twice the national average decline (19%). Robberies in these cities fell 35% between 1993 and 2000, but fell 58% in New York City. New York City's decline in the forcible rape category (40%) was more than double the decline in other cities (17%), and New York City's 59% decline in burglary was also more than twice the national average decline (26%). New York City's 65% reduction in motor vehicle thefts over this period was more than double the 24% national decline, and its 40% drop in larceny theft was almost quadruple the national big-city decline of 11%. While the overall Total Index Crime in cities with a population over 100,000 (excluding New York City) fell 17% between 1993 and 1999, New York City's Total Index Crime reduction was an astounding 50.1% (City of New York, Mayor's Office, 2000).

Murder is often regarded as the bell-wether crime, insofar as its seriousness and the degree of violence associated with it captures the public imagination. Here again, New York has achieved remarkable reductions. Of the ten largest American cities, New York's murder rate of 7.4 murders per 100,000 population ranks third - slightly behind San Antonio (7.1 per 100,000) and San Diego (5.1 per 100,000). The fourth and fifth-ranked cities in this category, Los Angeles and Houston, respectively had 2003 murder rates (13.4 per 100,000 and 13.6 per 100,000) nearly double that of New York. The disparity in 2003 murder rates increases dramatically when we compare New York to the remaining 'big ten' cities of Phoenix (17.2), Dallas (18.2), Chicago (20.4), Philadelphia (22.8), and Detroit (38.0). Thus the actuarial probability of being murdered in the three cities in this category with the highest murder rates are, respectively, 2.75 times, 3.1 times, and 5.1 times that of the probability of being murdered in New York (City of New York, Mayor's Office, of Operations, 2005).

The quality of life enjoyed by those who visit and live in New York City has also improved tremendously over the past decade, and there is a palpable positive change in the sense of safety and civility throughout the city. The vastly improved quality of life, in conjunction with tremendous decline in serious crime, has dramatically improved the city's public image. Although quality-of-life indicators are much more difficult to quantify than reported crimes, it is clear that New Yorkers see less graffiti, encounter fewer hooligans with

loud “boom-box” radios, and are far less frequently accosted by aggressive panhandlers and “squeegee pests” than they were just a few years ago. Not only do New Yorkers have a much lower actuarial likelihood of becoming a crime victim, but they feel safer as well.

One quantifiable indicator of improved quality of life in New York is the steadily-decreasing number and rate of arrests for narcotics offences, since these data typically represent the impact of sustained police attention in reducing the number of narcotics dealers operating on the city’s streets. In Fiscal Year 2000, the NYPD effected a total of 136,647 arrests (39,414 Felonies, 96,050 Misdemeanours, and 1,183 minor Violations) for narcotics offences. These figures declined to 122,253 total narcotics arrests in FY 2001 (36,289 Felonies, 84,683 Misdemeanours, and 1,281 minor Violations), 99,970 total narcotics arrests in FY 2002 (27,745 Felonies, 71,442 Misdemeanours, and 783 minor Violations), and 103,356 total narcotics arrests in FY 2003 (27,725 Felonies, 74,867 Misdemeanours, and 764 minor Violations). In FY 2004, the NYPD effected 96,965 total narcotics arrests, including 26,161 Felonies, 70,140 Misdemeanours, and 664 minor Violations (City of New York, Mayor’s Office, of Operations, 2005).

Another indicator of enhanced public safety and improved quality of life in New York City is the number of crimes taking place within schools, and here again, significant declines have been realized. There were 1,778 reported Index crimes in schools in FY 2000, 1,575 in FY 2001, 1,341 in FY 2002, 1,214 in FY 2004, and 1,365 reported Index crimes in FY 2004. The number of gang-related criminal incidents reported to the police declined by almost two thirds between FY 2000, when 1,763 such incidents were reported, and FY 2004, when only 611 gang-related criminal incidents were reported (City of New York, Mayor’s Office, of Operations, 2005).

A host of empirical data and anecdotal evidence illustrate the remarkable changes that have taken place in New York City over the past decade, and in large measure these remarkable changes are the result of a revolution in the way the NYPD conducts its business. In this relatively brief period the NYPD has transformed itself from a rather passive and reactive agency that lacked energy and focus to an agency that responds quickly and strategically to crime and quality-of-life trends with an unprecedented vigour. Emerging patterns of crime and quality-of-life problems are identified virtually as they occur, and once they are identified the NYPD reacts immediately and aggressively to address them and does not diminish its efforts until the problem is solved. The NYPD uses timely and accurate intelligence to identify emerging problems, swiftly deploys personnel and other resources to bring a comprehensive array of effective tactics to bear on the problem, and relentlessly follows up and assesses results to ensure that the problem is truly solved. This revolution in the way the NYPD conducts its business is the result of a radically new and thoroughly dynamic police management process known as Compstat.

The Compstat process has attracted a great deal of attention in the local, national, and international media as well as the attention of police practitioners and academics in the criminal justice field. Perhaps because of the many misconceptions and misinterpretations that often surround it, Compstat is one of the most talked-about issues in the field of policing today, and many prominent criminal justice academicians and police leaders are convinced that the innovative and strategic problem-solving processes developed and refined in the NYPD over the past several years are primarily responsible for New York City’s falling crime rates (Kelling, 1995; Kelling & Coles, 1996; Silverman, 1998, 1999). This conviction on the part of a growing number of criminal justice academics and police leaders is evident in the rapid development and growth of Compstat-based management systems in American police agencies - especially in the agencies that have seen the greatest decline in crime. This attention and optimism has not been limited to police and academic criminology circles, however. The NYPD’s revolutionary management control and problem-solving processes have been described in feature articles in *Business Week*, *Forbes*, *the Economist*, *the Wall Street Journal*, *Newsweek*, and a host of other electronic and print media outlets that do not typically cover issues related to police management. Compstat and the new style of results-oriented police management it engenders speaks not only to its effectiveness in reducing crime and improving quality of life, but to the applicability of Compstat management principles in organizations and industries beyond policing. Compstat’s influence is also evidenced by the tremendous number of police executives and academicians who have visited the NYPD to study its innovative management methods and problem-solving activities.

Because it is such an effective and successful management tool, Compstat was named one of five recipients of the prestigious Innovations in American Government Awards in 1996. This prestigious award, conferred jointly by the Ford Foundation and Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government,

selected Compstat from among 1,500 applicant programmes nationwide as one of the five most innovative and successful initiatives at any level of American government. The Innovations in American Government programme's Web site describes how Compstat involves an interplay of technology, communication, and organizational change, noting that Compstat is:

a system that allows police to track crime incidents almost as soon as they occur. Included is information on the crime, the victim, the time of day the crime took place, and other details that enable officials to spot emerging crime patterns. The result is a computer-generated map illustrating where and when crime is occurring citywide. With this high-tech "pin-mapping" approach, the police can quickly identify trouble spots and then target resources to fight crime strategically. (Innovations in American Government, 1996)

Although other police agencies are now using computers to map crime and improve crime-fighting strategies and methods, the NYPD took one other essential step by undertaking a major management overhaul that brought the city's 76 precinct commanders and top departmental management closer together, enhancing and devolving power, authority, accountability and discretion throughout the organization. This process knocked down traditional walls between patrol officers, detectives, and narcotics investigators that inhibited communication, establishing new avenues and new imperatives for sharing crime strategies and criminal intelligence information. In an agency where isolation, 'turf protection,' and the hoarding of information previously reigned, the NYPD now holds weekly management meetings that bring together a broad spectrum of police officials to intensely review the computer-generated crime data and to strategize new ways to cut crime in specific locations. At these meetings, local commanders and middle managers are held highly accountable for their crime-fighting activities by executives who require them to report on steps they have taken to reduce crime as well as their plans to correct specific crime and quality of life conditions. Also essential to the Compstat process are continual follow-up and assessment of results. Finally, building on its Community Policing orientation, a variety of interested parties ranging from school safety officials to prosecutors are invited to attend and participate in order to help fashion a comprehensive and highly focused response in crime-ridden areas.

Despite the many accolades and attention it has received, Compstat has also been greatly misunderstood as a management system. Compstat has been variously portrayed as a high-pressure meeting between executives and middle managers, as a technology system, as a computer programme, and as a system for sharing important management information. The fact that the Compstat management style involves all of these things (and a great deal more) may account for some of the misconceptions that surround it.

It should be clearly understood that Compstat, per se, is a management process through which the NYPD identifies problems and measures the results of its problem-solving activities. Compstat involves meetings between executives and managers and uses computer-based technology and other technology systems, but these elements are simply components in a much larger system or paradigm of management that has taken hold in the NYPD and, more recently, in other law enforcement and criminal justice agencies. Compstat meetings have been a key element in crime reduction, but they are only the tip of the iceberg - a great deal more goes on behind the scenes to achieve these unprecedented crime reductions and improvements in New York's quality of life. Without this fundamental transformation in the NYPD's organizational structure, culture, and mind-set, the crime reductions and quality of life improvements could never have been achieved.

Strong political support and coordination among other Criminal Justice agencies in New York City have also enhanced Compstat's intrinsic effectiveness as a management tool. Compstat meetings and Compstat technology are two facets of a comprehensive and carefully orchestrated array of management strategies and practices that were implemented throughout the NYPD and other criminal justice agencies to achieve these effective and dramatic results.

Agencies of government - especially criminal justice agencies - should never be conceived of as operating independent of other agencies. Within the criminal justice enterprise, police agencies regularly and flexibly interact with prosecutors, courts, corrections, and probation and parole agencies, and to some extent each of these agencies and all of their personnel are interdependent. If a serious breakdown of communications occurs, or if necessary resources and activities in any sphere of the criminal justice enterprise are not forthcoming, the entire system of justice administration could grind to a halt. In this way, criminal justice

must properly be viewed as an enterprise of government involving the coordinated interaction of numerous spheres of interest, function, and responsibility, rather than as a complex of separate and relatively autonomous agencies each independently pursuing its own goals and agendas.

A schematic depiction of all the lines of communication and interaction among these agencies would resemble a web, with multiple interconnecting lines extending from each agency to every other agency. A great deal of the increased efficiency and effectiveness of the criminal justice enterprise in New York City over the past several years can be credited to the coordination and direction provided by the Giuliani and Bloomberg mayoral administrations, which used their influence over agencies to facilitate enhanced interaction and to achieve results. What was once simply a web of interconnecting lines has come to resemble a network of complementary policies, practices, and strategies that combine to make the criminal justice enterprise in New York City reach a new level of effectiveness.

A simple example of the need for cooperation and coordination among agencies might be when a police department plans to conduct a major crackdown on those driving while intoxicated (DWI) over a holiday weekend. If the police agency arrests a large number of violators but the agencies responsible for detaining, prosecuting, arraigning, and arranging for pre-trial release of arrestees do not have sufficient staff on hand, the police department will encounter serious problems that may backlog the entire system for an extended period. Prior coordination, cooperation, and communication ensure that the system operates with greater efficiency and effectiveness.

One of the most important reasons why Compstat has functioned so well to reduce crime and improve the quality of life in New York City - that is, to make the criminal justice enterprise operate as it should - is that it has enjoyed strong political support. Prior to 1994, mayor David Dinkins presided over a city in which record-breaking levels of crime and disorder were seen, despite an intensive effort to introduce a vision of Community Policing as the dominant philosophy within the NYPD. Crime and public disorder were major campaign issues in the 1993 mayoral election campaigns, and at the beginning of 1994 newly elected mayor Rudolph Giuliani's administration accepted as its mandate the public's demand for a reduction in crime and a restoration of order and civility in a city that appeared to be out of control.

II. THE NYPD'S MANDATE FOR CHANGE

Giuliani appointed William Bratton, the highly regarded former chief of the New York City Transit Police² and several police agencies in his native Boston, as police commissioner. Bratton immediately set about rousing the department's executive corps from their bureaucratic malaise, replacing all but one of the NYPD's five top chiefs in the first few weeks of his administration and assembling a top-notch staff of fairly young but well-seasoned executives who were aggressive risk takers (Bratton, 1998b; Krauss, 1994; McQuillan, 1994). Bratton immediately set the tone for the NYPD's new direction and new mission, announcing his intention to achieve significant crime reductions within his first year in office. Conscientious and dedicated officers who had been frustrated with the old management cadre's complacency and passivity toward increasing crime welcomed new leadership that sought to join them in an aggressive struggle to reduce crime and improve the quality of life throughout New York City.

Bratton and the new executive cadre he assembled immediately made it clear that middle managers - particularly precinct commanders - would be given greater authority, discretion, and organizational power at the same time they would be held more highly accountable for these and other resources they were given. Empowering middle managers and an emphasis on quality-of-life enforcement proved to be essential factors in the NYPD's transformation. Just two weeks after the new administration took office in January 1994, a senior police planning officer commented in the *New York Times* that the new administration would give precinct commanders "direct control over resources to carry out enforcement operations, to address chronic crime locations and suppress the low-level irritants to their communities" (Krauss, 1994, p. B3).

When weekly Crime Control and Quality of Life Strategy Meetings - which became known informally as Compstat meetings - were introduced in January 2004, they were used to identify individual managers'

² At that time, the Transit Police was a separate agency under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority rather than the City of New York. Similarly, the Housing Police Department operated under the aegis of the New York City Housing Authority. The Transit and Housing Police Departments were merged with the NYPD in 1995.

strengths and weaknesses, and how effectively they managed their personnel and other resources to reduce crime. These Crime Control and Quality of Life Strategy Meetings evolved quickly into highly refined management accountability sessions as new technology, new forms of statistical analysis, and new crime mapping technology were introduced. The quantity and quality of accountability achieved at these weekly Compstat meetings permitted executives to identify which managers were performing poorly and should be replaced, just as it identified the high performers who should be promoted and given additional responsibility. Within the new administration's first year, more than two thirds of the department's 76 precinct commanders were replaced - either by moving them to positions more suited to their less assertive management style or by promoting them to more challenging positions (Bratton, 1998b; Silverman, 1996). The strategy was to match up particular positions with the commanders who had the requisite skills, experience, expertise, and personality to manage them proficiently.

The shake-up was calculated to reverse the lethargy, passivity, and drift that had previously characterized the NYPD's executives and middle managers, and the new management team immediately began to articulate and demonstrate that the NYPD could achieve unprecedented levels of performance (Buntin, 1999; Chetkovitch, 2000a, 2000b, 2000c).

One of the first substantive steps toward reducing crime was to develop a system for rapidly collecting, analyzing, and disseminating information about the incidence and spatial distribution of crime, and this effort resulted in the development of the Compstat management system. Until the advent of Compstat, the NYPD had no functional system in place to rapidly and accurately capture crime statistics or use them for strategic planning. Crime statistics were often three to six months old by the time they were compiled and analyzed, and the methods used to analyze them were rudimentary at best. Six-month-old crime data are of little use to any police executive because they say nothing about when and where crimes are occurring today, and they cannot be used to develop strategies and tactics that will have immediate impact. Crime patterns and problems had months to take hold before they could be identified and addressed. The fact that NYPD executives in previous administrations never bothered or never saw a compelling need to get accurate and timely crime intelligence is emblematic of the overall lassitude and lack of concern that characterized many of the agency's managers (Henry, 2002).

This is not to say that every member of the NYPD's management cadre was timid, indecisive, or unconcerned with effectively addressing the kind of crime and quality-of-life issues that plagued the city. Indeed, the agency had many fine and highly skilled managers, but it was only when a sufficient number of these less-effective managers were weeded out or marginalized that an important shift could take place within the agency's management culture. Once the indecisive, unimaginative, and ineffective managers were identified and removed or neutralized - largely through the interactions and accountability for performance taking place at the weekly Crime Control and Quality of Life Strategy meetings that began to take place in January 2004 - the number and percentage of the strong managers who were most capable of leading the department reached a critical mass, and the inept managers no longer impeded the agency's progress.

Substantive change required a new management coalition dedicated to reducing crime as well as substantial empowerment of middle managers. Earlier attempts at implementing Community Policing sought to empower beat officers - the individuals at the very bottom of the organizational hierarchy who had the lowest rank and the least legitimate power in the organization - but the failure of that particular Community Policing vision to achieve significant measurable results, to reduce crime, or to enhance the agency's overall effectiveness illuminated the need to expand the power of middle managers. In the new regime, power, discretion, and authority were decentralized and pushed down the organizational pyramid from headquarters executives to precinct and operational commanders in the field. Bratton (1996) explained his rationale for devolving power from top executives to those at the middle of the organization and rank structures:

I gave away many of my powers not — as my predecessors wanted — to the cop on the beat, but rather to the precinct commander. I did not want to give more power to the cops on the beat. They were, on the average, only 22 years of age. Most of them never held a job before becoming New York City police officers, and had only high school or GED qualification. These kids, after six months of training, were not prepared to solve the problems of New York City; sorry, but it just was not going to work that way. However, my precinct commanders typically had an average of 15 years of service, and they were some of the best and the brightest on the police force. All of them were

college educated; all were very sophisticated; and they were at the appropriate level in the organization to which power should be decentralized.

My form of Community Policing, therefore . . . put less emphasis on the cop on the beat and much more emphasis on the precinct commanders, the same precinct commanders who met with community councils and with neighbourhood groups. They were empowered to decide how many plain clothes officers to assign, how many to put in Community Policing, on bicycle patrols, and in robbery squads. They were empowered to assign officers as they saw fit — in uniform or in plain clothes — to focus on the priorities of that neighbourhood. . . . Whatever was generating the fear in their precinct, they were empowered to address it by prioritizing their responses. We decentralized the organization, and I eliminated a few levels in the organization of the force and in the hierarchy as well.

Achieving a critical mass of dedicated, decisive, and innovative managers revitalized the agency's management culture, and was akin to what Malcolm Gladwell (1995, 2000) has called a "tipping point." This concept of "tipping points," a term Gladwell borrowed from epidemiology, also helps explain why the NYPD's strategic and highly focused use of quality-of-life enforcement led so quickly to such dramatic crime declines. The tipping point concept involves the idea that some social phenomena (including, according to Gladwell, some forms of crime and social disorder) behave like infectious agents: the frequency of these phenomena increases in a gradual and linear fashion until they reach a certain critical mass or threshold (a "tipping point"), when they explode in an epidemic. Gladwell noted (Lester, 2000) that James Q. Wilson and George Kelling's (1982) "broken windows" theory is fundamentally a tipping point argument, and he pointed out that the key to controlling crime is to reduce the frequency of quality of life offences to within manageable limits—below the tipping point that made crime explode (Gladwell, 1995, 2000). This is essentially what the NYPD did in its strategic and highly focused enforcement efforts—efforts that were largely based in the Compstat process and in its capacity to develop timely and accurate crime intelligence as well as to direct the rapid deployment of personnel to address emerging crime and quality-of-life issues.

This new mandate to assertively address crime and disorder was the impetus for the revolutionary Compstat process, and within a few weeks the first affirmative steps were taken to develop appropriate technology systems, policies, and practices that would ultimately and permanently transform the way the NYPD looked at and responded to crime and disorder problems (Buntin, 1999; Chetkovitch, 2000a, 2000b, 2000c).

Eli Silverman (1996) succinctly summarized and described the Compstat process, its emphasis on rapidly compiling, analyzing, and using crime statistics to manage crime problems, and its impact on the NYPD's operational mind-set. He notes that

the most significant aspect of the department's organizational changes within the past few years has been the process known as Compstat. . . . Compstat was originally a document, referred to as the Compstat book, which included current year-to-date statistics for criminal complaints, arrests for major felony categories and gun violations, compiled on a citywide, patrol borough and precinct basis. The initial versions of the Compstat book, which improved steadily over time with regard to overall sophistication and degree of detail, developed from a computer file called "Compare Stats," hence Compstat. . . .

Compstat, through the weekly headquarters meetings, provides the dynamics for precinct and borough accountability, and an arena for testing the mettle of field commanders. As a management tool, Compstat melds upgraded quantitative information on crime locations and times with police deployment arrangements and qualitative quality-of-life information. Precinct problem-solving can be weighed against available resources, and the responsibilities, information-sharing and interaction of different department units can be gauged.

According to Silverman, the establishment of Compstat meant that "for the first time in the agency's long history, key members of the organization began gathering each week to examine various sources of crime information at a meeting devoted solely to the issue of reducing crime and improving the quality of life enjoyed by New York City's residents".

III. COMPSTAT: A NEW MANAGEMENT PARADIGM

Compstat meetings and Compstat technology are management tools that an increasing number of American police agencies are employing to great effect within a radically new and potentially revolutionary management paradigm. Compstat is a revolutionary method of police management because it involves a fundamental shift in an agency's management paradigm and because, after its origination in the NYPD and implementation in several other municipal police agencies, it began to spread rapidly across the landscape of American police management (Henry, 2002).

The terms *revolution and paradigm* are used here in the same sense that scientific historian Thomas Kuhn (1970) applied them when he addressed the idea of revolutions in science and scientific thought. Paradigms are a sort of mind-set or a collection of organizing principles and fundamental viewpoints around which we organize our basic understanding of the world. Paradigms can be compared to ideologies, belief systems, philosophical principles, or cognitive models that shape our understanding of something, and because they determine the kind of problems and issues we consider important as well as the way we approach the problems, they influence our behaviour as well. In terms of management, a paradigm is a sort of general point of view about human nature and human behaviour and about how human organizations operate. It also prescribes the management issues we deem most important and the way we approach their resolution. Our paradigm or outlook on management determines the kind of results we seek to achieve as well as the methods and tools we use to achieve them.

Kuhn (1970) pointed out that under ordinary conditions, new technological innovations, new knowledge, and new insights increase gradually within the prevailing paradigm's limiting boundaries. In the case of policing, most police executives and managers were guided by one or both of the paradigms prescribed by what have been referred to as the Professional Model and the Community Policing Model. Like scientists, police executives are generally guided by the paradigms they follow, and because they accept the paradigm's basic assumptions and propositions they seldom venture far from them to intellectually consider or experiment with dramatically new ideas. Scientific revolutions occur, Kuhn explained, when paradigms shift radically or when a new paradigm emerges and more effectively explains some scientific phenomenon. As other scientists begin to operate within the new paradigm, they stretch the boundaries of knowledge and develop new theories and new technology based on the paradigm.

As evidenced by the continual increase in crime across American jurisdictions from the late 1950s and early 1960s until the advent of the Compstat paradigm in New York in the mid-1990s, the Professional Model and Community Policing Model paradigms that approach police managers and executives adopted to fight crime were not highly effective. Generally speaking, in the agencies that subscribe to the traditional Professional Model or the more recently evolved Community Policing paradigms, police executives and managers continue to take approaches that are not very different from what they and others have done in the past. Because they continue to operate within narrow management paradigms that generally do not encourage innovation and generally do not strive to stretch the potential boundaries of performance, many of these police executives must be satisfied with what are at best incremental improvements. It can be argued that neither the Professional Model nor the Community Policing Model, as practiced in the United States today, generally do not truly embrace one of the Compstat paradigm's most important underlying principles and beliefs: that police officers and police agencies can really have a substantial positive impact on the crime and quality-of-life problems facing the communities they serve.

Scientific (and management) revolutions occur when a radical paradigm shift takes place - when there emerges a new set of ideas, ideologies, or controlling principles around which we organize our understanding of a phenomenon. In turn, the new understanding points up new insights and better practices. The new paradigm takes hold and gains acceptance when it proves effective - when its methods achieve more positive and more effective results than the paradigm preceding it.

The Compstat paradigm presents police managers and executives with a radically different way of looking at police organizations and police activities, and it points to new methods and strategies police can use to pursue their goals (Henry, 2002). As illustrated in the examples and statistics cited at the beginning of this article, the Compstat paradigm's effectiveness in achieving results can scarcely be denied.

IV. THE COMPSTAT MEETING: TECHNOLOGY, INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION

To many casual observers, Compstat appears to be simply a meeting at which executives and managers discuss the latest information about emerging crime trends, develop specific tactical plans to address them, and monitor the results of the actions previously undertaken. In one sense, Compstat is a meeting. Each week, the commanders of all precincts and operational units in a given geographic area of New York City gather in the NYPD's Command and Control Centre at Police Headquarters to give an accounting of themselves and their officers' activities for the past month (Bratton, 1998b; Kelling, 1995; Maple & Mitchell, 1999; Silverman, 1996).³ The Command and Control Centre is a high-tech conference facility equipped with numerous computer systems, video monitors, video projection screens, and communications equipment, but this level of technological sophistication is not absolutely essential for a Compstat management process to be effective. Indeed, the early Compstat meetings were conducted in a small room equipped only with easels and flip charts, and they nevertheless produced startling and immediate results.

During the Crime Control and Quality of Life Strategy Meeting, each precinct commander takes his or her turn at the podium to present his or her activities and accomplishments and to be closely questioned by the police commissioner, several deputy commissioners, various chiefs, and other top executives. Precinct commanders are accompanied by detective squad supervisors, narcotics and vice squad commanders, and ranking personnel from just about every operational and investigative unit within their geographic area of responsibility. Because of the intensity of the questioning, the quantity of statistical performance data, and the nature of the technology involved (including computerized pin mapping, comprehensive crime trend analyses, and other graphic presentations of data), Compstat meetings permit the agency's executives to have an unprecedented level of in-depth knowledge about the specific crime and quality-of-life problems occurring at specific locations in each of the NYPD's 76 precincts. Both the executives and the commanders are provided with this crime intelligence data in advance of the actual meeting in order to permit them the opportunity to review and analyze it, to identify emerging crime patterns and trends, and to develop cogent strategies based on the information. With this wealth of highly specific knowledge, executives can ask commanders and managers probing and intensive questions about the particular activities and tactics they are using to address specific crime and quality of life problems at specific locations. Crime and quality-of-life trends and patterns can be more easily discerned through the discussions, and connections between seemingly disparate events and issues are more easily identified. Commanders are expected to have an intimate knowledge of the crime incidents and the quality of life problems occurring within their area of responsibility, just as they are expected to have answers and to demonstrate results. In line with the Compstat paradigm's emphasis on cooperation and coordination throughout the agency, precinct and specialized squad commanders must show how they cooperate and coordinate their activities with other operational entities. The focus is on performance and results at Compstat meetings (Bratton, 1998b; Henry, 2002; Kelling, 1995; Kelling & Coles, 1996; Silverman, 1999; Witkin, 1998).

Compstat meetings provide executives with an in-depth knowledge of the crime and quality of life conditions with which middle managers must contend, and the meetings also provide in-depth knowledge of other management performance data beyond enforcement and productivity information related to crime and quality-of-life. Executives focus on each commander's efforts to ensure that officers in his or her command interact with citizens and with other members of the department in a courteous, professional, and respectful manner. Executives can effectively gauge the morale in each command by examining sick rates, the number and type of disciplinary actions taken, the number of civilian complaints made against officers, and a host of other statistical data. Each commander's performance in managing such important functions as overtime expense, traffic safety, and even the number of automobile accidents involving department vehicles can be evaluated at Compstat meetings. Executives can (and do) focus on virtually any area of management responsibility, comparing each commander's performance to that of his or her peers. Changes over time can be calculated and charted for graphical presentation on practically any crime, quality of life, or other management performance criteria within the commander's scope of responsibility (Bratton, 1998b; Kelling, 1995; Silverman, 1999). In essence, the Compstat meetings amount to intensive monthly performance evaluations for every commander of practically every operational unit in the agency.

³ For administrative purposes, the NYPD divides the five boroughs of the city into eight patrol boroughs. The 76 precincts, 12 transit division districts, and nine Housing Bureau Police Service Areas are about equally apportioned among the eight geographic patrol boroughs.

Commanders who fail to achieve results or who otherwise do not make the grade may find that they are no longer commanders, but those who excel and achieve results find promotion and advancement. Compstat meetings have introduced a unique element of competition among the department's management cadre, and they are a stimulus to achieve results. Because commanders of support units, local prosecutors, and representatives of other criminal justice agencies attend the Compstat meetings, information is widely disseminated among appropriate parties. Although the support unit commanders and other attendees may not be asked to make presentations, their presence allows them to participate in the immediate 'real-time' development of highly integrated plans and strategies. A precinct commander who intends to commence a major enforcement effort, for example, can get on-the-spot commitments for the resources and assistance he or she needs from ancillary and operational units (Kelling, 1995; Witkin, 1998). Details of the plan can be worked out without crossing bureaucratic lines or scheduling a prolonged series of meetings. Compstat meetings, then, are also about supporting and empowering commanders, sharing information and crime intelligence, communicating top management's values and objectives, and ensuring accountability. But again, Compstat meetings are just a part of the story behind the NYPD's transformation and its performance, and the meetings are simply one of the tools used within the larger Compstat paradigm.

V. SUPPORTING COMPSTAT THROUGH SYSTEMIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL CHANGES

The NYPD implemented a host of other organizational, structural, and philosophical changes to support its crime reduction and quality-of-life improvement mission, making the tremendous crime reductions and quality-of-life improvements possible by enhancing discretion and changing the dimensions of power, responsibility, authority, and accountability throughout the agency. Without these fundamental systemic and philosophical changes in the department and without the support and direction provided by the administration to the police and other criminal justice agencies, the transformation would not have been possible and the dramatic results would never have been achieved. One can scarcely overstate the importance of these structural and philosophical transformations to the agency's overall success. By themselves and without adoption of other elements of the overall Compstat paradigm, Compstat meetings are unlikely to achieve more than temporary results. They may also potentially incur long-term damage and possibly undermine the organization's viability as an effective law enforcement agency. The organizational, structural, and philosophical changes are as much a part of the Compstat paradigm and the NYPD's transformation as the Compstat meetings themselves.

Compstat meetings permit executives and managers to monitor virtually every aspect of the agency's activities—from fulfilling the primary mission of reducing crime and making the city's streets safer to closely observing and controlling virtually every systemic change instituted in the agency's systems, practices, structures, and culture. Compstat meetings are, in a sense, a window through which the department's executives and managers can glimpse every aspect of its operations as well as the progress and directions of every change taking place. They are also a mechanism by which the agency's operations and practices can be continually assessed and fine-tuned to ensure their continued success, and through which important messages can be subtly or overtly transmitted and reinforced.

The Compstat meetings present the unique opportunity for executives to temporarily (and, in a sense, artificially) free the agency from the constraints typically imposed by bureaucracy and by rigid hierarchical organizational structures. Instead of operating within a hierarchical framework where lines of communication, authority, and responsibility are precisely defined by straight horizontal and vertical lines on an organizational chart, for the duration of the Compstat meeting the organizational structure changes to one resembling what Bratton called a "seamless web" (see Henry, 2000). This seamless web facilitates brainstorming, innovative problem solving, and the development of effective strategies and plans, since every individual, every unit, and every function can communicate immediately and directly with every other individual, unit, or function. Once the meeting concludes and strategic decisions and plans have been formulated, the structure reverts to one resembling a hierarchical bureaucratic organization - the kind of structure that is particularly well tailored to carrying plans through to fruition.

The Compstat management style permeates every level of the agency. To remain prepared for the weekly Compstat meetings at Headquarters, most commanders convene their own in-house Compstat-style meetings with key personnel. Thus, accountability and responsibility for achieving results is not just placed on managers by executives, but by managers upon supervisors and to some extent by supervisors upon

rank-and-file officers. These formal or informal meetings and interactions have had a profound influence, to the extent that a high degree of communication and a sharp focus on achieving results pervades the organization.

VI. A HYBRID MANAGEMENT STYLE

The Compstat paradigm is a hybrid management style that combines the best and most effective elements of several organizational models as well as the philosophies supporting them. Compstat retains the best practices of traditional Professional Model policing, for example, but also incorporates insights and practices from Community Policing and Problem-Solving Policing styles. It also utilizes the kind of strategic management approaches used by successful corporate entities that thrive in highly competitive industries. Because the Compstat paradigm is so flexible and because it emphasizes the rapid identification and creative solution of problems, it can be applied in virtually any goal-driven human organization.

Although Compstat management draws on the strengths of the traditional Professional Model as well as the Community Policing and Problem-Solving Policing models, it also differs from each in important ways. The NYPD has based its approach to crime reduction and quality-of-life improvement on the "Broken Windows" theory articulated by Wilson and Kelling (1982) - an approach that many Community Policing theorists have also championed. This important theory takes the position that quality-of-life problems such as graffiti, public intoxication, loud radios, urban decay, and a host of other petty annoyances of modern urban life are in themselves criminogenic - when left untended, they subtly convey a message that disorder and incivility prevail, that social controls have broken down, and that no one really cares about the neighbourhood in which they occur. This message often translates to the idea that such conditions are somehow acceptable and that because minor offences are acceptable, more serious ones must be as well. Ultimately, if minor offences are left unchecked they lead to more serious crime (Kelling, 1987, 1991, 1992, 1995; Kelling & Coles, 1996, 1997; Wilson, 1983; Wilson & Kelling, 1982, 1989).

The postulates of the Broken Windows theory are central to many Community Policing ideologies and practices, although many leading Community Policing theorists and practitioners place the burden for identifying and remedying a neighbourhood's crime and quality-of-life problems on the beat officer. To empower the beat officer and support effective Community Policing, many advocates say, the agency must be thoroughly decentralized so that power can be almost completely devolved to those at the bottom of the organizational pyramid. In the NYPD, though, the Compstat paradigm has placed the burden of identifying and solving problems squarely on the shoulders of middle managers. On the basis of its experience during the late 1980s and early 1990s in implementing a version of Community Policing that emphasized the primacy of the beat officer, the NYPD recognized that it is unfair and unreasonable to expect beat cops to disentangle and successfully address entrenched social problems whose solutions have confounded police executives, social scientists, and criminal theorists for years. Despite their best efforts and, in many cases, their skills and expertise, beat-level police officers simply cannot muster the organizational resources needed to attack these problems.

VII. REALIGNING ORGANIZATIONAL POWER, MOBILIZING EXPERTISE

Closely related to the NYPD's decentralization was the redistribution of power in the agency. The five bases of power operating within a police organization - coercive, legitimate, expert, reward, and referent power - need to be realigned if the agency and its members are to achieve their full potential. In traditionally managed agencies, most power is concentrated among the executive cadre, and because others have almost no access to coercive, legitimate, or reward power, they cannot easily obtain or apply the agency's resources to address problems (see, generally, French & Raven, 1959).

The Compstat paradigm's effectiveness also derives from its emphasis on mobilizing expertise and good practice - especially the expertise and good practices of experienced patrol officers - and making them the norm throughout the agency. This, too, is a tenet of Problem-Solving Policing, but as an organizational reality it has often proven to be an illusory goal in American policing. The NYPD's executives gathered together experts from throughout the agency as well as from outside it and drew upon their knowledge and experience to develop a series of crime control and quality-of-life strategies. The strategies, specifically crafted to be flexible and adaptable to the local community's particular needs and conditions, addressed specific types of crime and disorder problems and were promulgated throughout the department. Every precinct commander was mandated to adapt and implement them, and Compstat meetings are one way to

ensure that they have been implemented effectively.

As a practical matter, the crime control and quality-of-life strategies all proceeded from the broken windows theory's basic position that many serious crimes will be prevented and serious problems avoided if we attend to minor offences as they occur or soon afterward. The strategies also primarily use enforcement tactics to suppress these lower-level offences and quality-of-life problems. Some Community Policing adherents eschew enforcement as a means to reduce crime and disorder, or at best they express ambivalence about how effectively enforcement tactics work to reduce crime. Their position, in a nutshell, is that the police should become agents of change who empower and build communities to police themselves. Other Community Policing advocates rarely deal with the idea of *actually* reducing crime, preferring instead to emphasize that the perceived *fear* of crime in a community can be reduced through more positive police-community interactions. These Community Policing theorists have been criticized by more traditional thinkers for placing more emphasis on the *appearance* of public safety than upon substantive crime reduction. Highly focused enforcement activities were always a goal of the professional model that dominated American policing for most of this century, but they were nevertheless a rarely achieved goal. Through the Compstat paradigm and the Compstat meetings, the NYPD has had great success with the use of highly focused enforcement strategies in the Broken Windows context (Henry, 2002).

It is important to recognize that although the results achieved by the NYPD depended greatly on enforcement activities, the Compstat management paradigm can be used equally well to manage an agency in which enforcement has a lower priority. Another agency may or may not achieve the magnitude of crime reduction accomplished in New York City - indeed, some agencies may not face the compelling crime problems the NYPD did - but the agency will improve its performance on any criteria it deems important if it implements the paradigm cogently. If the agency's prevailing philosophy is that the number and quality of police-citizen encounters are of primary importance and that enforcement has little value, Compstat paradigm management can be adapted and used to tremendously improve the quality and number of those positive encounters. Regardless of the agency's specific goals and objectives, implementing the basic principles of the Compstat paradigm will dramatically increase the likelihood that they will be attained (Henry, 2002).

As practiced in New York City, the Compstat paradigm also articulated a bold new philosophy - an unwavering belief in the capacity of police officers to make a difference and to reduce crime. Police officials in the NYPD and elsewhere have, of course, spoken to this philosophy for years, but in fact their words often amounted to mere platitudes and in many cases were betrayed by their actions. This perceived or real insincerity combines with other factors to foment cynicism, to drive a divisive wedge between street cops and management cops, and to undermine the legitimacy of managers as well as their capacity to effectively manage and direct their department's affairs (Henry, 2002).

At the heart of the Compstat paradigm is a realistic appreciation of the wealth of expertise and experience held by effective police officers. Expert officers of every rank worked together to create and implement the crime and quality-of-life strategies that helped reinvigorate the NYPD, and they worked together in the reengineering committees that restructured 12 important functional areas. In far too many agencies, including the NYPD, managers and executives have subtly or overtly devalued operational officers and their contribution to the agency. Good and effective officers exist in every agency, and the Compstat management paradigm insists that managers and executives capitalize on that expertise and use this essential resource effectively. Quite frankly, this often demands that executives and middle managers put aside their own egos to acknowledge that in many instances street cops may have greater expertise and greater knowledge than they (Henry, 2002).

The Compstat paradigm demands that managers and executives take risks - even the kind of risks that might compromise their own careers. Risk-averse executives have often foolishly spent a disproportionate share of their energies on restraining and controlling operational officers, promulgating broad policies and practices that place unnecessary and burdensome restrictions on officers without regard to their capabilities. Compstat management not only demands that these obstacles to performance be removed in order to let good officers flourish and influence others around them to do the same but helps identify and reward the officers who perform best (Henry, 2002).

Another central tenet of this management philosophy is an unwavering belief in the idea that police *can*

make a difference and that police *can* reduce crime. When it comes to crime, a great many criminologists, politicians, and police executives equivocate about whether the police really make a difference. When a police officer performs a creditable act or when the agency performs well, executives laud it as an example of the kind of difference police can make, and certainly few police executives are reluctant to take credit when crime declines. When crime rises, though, many are unwilling to acknowledge their own managerial inadequacies or failures, and they begin looking about for other explanations. They may never directly articulate a *disbelief* in the capacity of police officers to make a difference by reducing crime and improving the quality of life enjoyed in their communities, but their failure to maintain a consistent approach often casts them as self-serving and undermines their legitimacy in the eyes of officers. In the world of policing, the disjunction between words and actions often breeds suspicion and distrust, and such subtleties rarely go unnoticed by officers. The Compstat paradigm rejects this pessimistic and cynical management view and optimistically asserts without question that conscientious police officers in a well-managed police organization can make a remarkable difference.

VIII. POSSIBILITIES AND OBSTACLES: THE FUTURE OF THE COMPSTAT PARADIGM

Paradoxically, the tremendous success of the Compstat paradigm raises some potential problems that may complicate its continued growth and future success as more and more agencies attempt to implement it. One of the primary difficulties might be called “cookie-cutter management.” That is, there is a distinct tendency throughout American policing to find some policy or practice that another agency has put to good use and to appropriate it. Agencies borrow these policies from another agency composed of different people with a different organizational culture and structure and a different set of environmental and political forces working upon them, and then they press the borrowed policy down on their own agency as if it were a cookie cutter or template. Unimaginative managers wind up trying to make the agency fit the policy or practice rather than the other way around. Experience and close observation of police agencies and systems in the United States and overseas show that in the vast majority of cases, a home-grown policy or practice will work much better than an imported policy or practice precisely because it was developed in conformance with the reality of the department. Such policies and practices also work better because they are developed by people who are intimately familiar with the agency, its history and culture, and the capabilities of its personnel. The same is true of the Compstat paradigm’s adoption: Its general principles must be carefully tailored to the specific conditions, situations, and realities faced by other agencies in other contexts (Henry, 2002).

A related management practice that seems to affect American police management is what we might call “cargo cult management”. The notion of “cargo cult management” derives from the millennial cults that developed in Melanesia and the South Pacific islands during and after the Second World War and continue to exist today. In essence, members of these primitive cultures had no exposure to the outside world, and as a function of their insularity the cultures were permeated with a deep strain of magical thinking and a propensity to attribute results to rituals and magic rather than to their actual causes. These cultures had their first real exposure to outsiders during the war, when foreigners (military personnel) arrived and began to carve out long flat strips of jungle. The foreigners engaged in such rituals as marching around in formation with unusual devices made of wood and metal over their shoulders. The foreigners built towers and spoke odd words into strange boxes, and shortly thereafter large birdlike flying machines came out of the sky laden with all sorts of good stuff the foreigners called “cargo”. The foreigners eventually departed but left behind some of the cargo - various ingenious machines and building materials that were far superior to anything the tribes had known before. To this day, cargo cultists continue to carve out strips of jungle, march around with tree limbs over their shoulders, build bamboo towers or climb trees and speak into coconuts as they await the return of the cargo-bearing magical flying machines.

The analogy of “cookie cutter management” and “cargo cult management” to the expanding use of Compstat-like programmes is clear. Gootman (2000), for example, noted that 235 police agency representatives visited NYPD Compstat meetings in the first 10 months of 2000, while 221 visited in 1999 and 219 visited in 1998. There is no doubt that many of these representatives are highly experienced practitioners and fine managers, but on the basis of their too-brief exposure to the Compstat meetings, we can expect that many will return to their agencies with only a rudimentary and very superficial understanding of the Compstat process and even less knowledge of the Compstat paradigm as a whole. There is a distinct possibility that some proportion of these representatives will not fully grasp how and why the process works in terms of motivation, strategy development, the dissemination of knowledge and expertise, or organizational and cultural transformation, nor will they comprehend the important activities

(such as reengineering and training) that were undertaken to support it. They may convene Compstat-type meetings where executives apply a heavy hand where a gentle touch is required, and in many cases they will not go beyond the statistical data to identify important qualitative issues that should be of concern to competent police executives.

Some police executives who see the wonderful things Compstat can bring to the organization (and to their careers) may engage in ritualistic repetition of the overt behaviours they've witnessed while the larger picture eludes them. This certainly may not be the case in all situations, but the overall pervasiveness of "cookie cutter management" and "cargo cult management" in American police management certainly illuminates the potential harm that Compstat can do when unenlightened executives wield such a powerful management tool. Perhaps the greatest danger lies in the possibility that the organizational and cultural damage they do will remain submerged, creating a host of concealed difficulties with which future generations of police officers and executives will have to grapple. Wittingly or unwittingly, far too many police chief executives seem willing to enter into the Faustian bargain of selling their souls to achieve immediate results without regard for the long-term organizational and social consequences or the management burdens that others will have to assume when they've moved on (Henry, 2002).

Compstat principles are eminently adaptable and applicable to any police agency's particular needs and objectives. As a management paradigm, Compstat has proven its applicability throughout the public and private sectors. It has been successfully adapted, for example, to manage New York City's jail system (O'Connell & Straub, 1999), and the city of Baltimore has implemented a "Citistat" programme based on the Compstat paradigm for managing the entire city and all its agencies (Clines, 2001; Swope, 2001).

Compstat continues to evolve and find broader application in other spheres of public sector administration, but its roots are firmly planted in policing. Compstat continues to evolve and to bring about remarkable changes in other spheres, but its most tangible, quantifiable, and dramatic impact continues to be in the area of crime reduction and quality-of-life improvement. American policing faces an array of unprecedented challenges in the coming years, and the Compstat paradigm represents an important opportunity for the kind of flexible and effective management style these challenges require.

APPENDIX

<p align="center">Major Felony Crime in New York City, 1993 to 2003 By Number and Percentage (NYPD Data)</p>					
Crime	1993	1997	% Change v. 1993	2003	% Change v. 1993
Murder	1,927	767	- 60.2	598	- 68.9
Rape	3,225	2,783	- 13.7	1,875	- 41.8
Robbery	85,892	44,335	- 48.3	25,919	- 68.8
Felony Assault	41,121	30,259	- 26.4	18,774	- 54.3
Burglary	100,936	54,866	- 45.6	29,215	- 71.0
Grand Larceny	85,737	55,686	- 35.0	46,877	- 45.3
Motor Vehicle Theft	111,662	51,312	- 54.0	23,139	- 79.2
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>430,460</i>	<i>240,008</i>	<i>- 44.24</i>	<i>146,397</i>	<i>- 65.99</i>

REFERENCES

- Bratton, W. J. (1996, October 15). *Cutting crime and restoring order: What America can learn from New York's finest*. Heritage Foundation Lectures and Educational Programs, Lecture No. 573. Retrieved January 10, 2005 from Heritage Foundation Web site: www.heritage.com/lectures.htm.
- Bratton, W. J. (1998b). *Turnaround: How America's top cop reversed the crime epidemic*. New York: Random House.
- Buntin, J. (1999). *Assertive policing, plummeting crime: The NYPD takes on crime in New York City*. Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government Case Study Program series, #C16-99-1530.0.
- Chetkovich, C. A. (2000a). *The NYPD takes on crime in New York City. (A)*. (Case Study No. CR16-00-1557.3). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Kennedy School of Government.
- Chetkovich, C. A. (2000b). *The NYPD takes on crime in New York City. (B) Compstat* (Case Study No. CR16-00-1558.3). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Kennedy School of Government.
- Chetkovich C. A. (2000c). *The NYPD takes on crime in New York City. (C) Short-term outcomes* (Case Study No. CR16-00-1559.3). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Kennedy School of Government.
- City of New York, Mayor's Office of Operations. (1998, February). *The mayor's management report: Preliminary Fiscal 1998*. New York: City of New York, Mayor's Office of Operations.
- City of New York, Mayor's Office of Operations. (2000, September). *The mayor's management report: Fiscal 2000*. New York: Author.
- City of New York, Mayor's Office of Operations. (2001, February). *The mayor's management report: Preliminary Fiscal 2001*. New York: City of New York, Mayor's Office of Operations.
- Clines, F. X. (2001, June 10). Baltimore uses a databank to wake up city workers. *New York Times*, p. A11.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (2005). Uniform Crime Reports, Crime in the United States, 2003. Retrieved January 3, 2005 from Federal Bureau of Investigation website: <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/05cius.htm>.
- French, J. P. R., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.
- Gladwell, M. (1995, June 3). The tipping point: What if crime really is an epidemic? *New Yorker*. Retrieved from Malcolm Gladwell's Web site: www.gladwell.com/1996/1996_06_03_a_tipping.htm.
- Gladwell, M. (2000). *The tipping point: How little things can make a big difference*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Gootman, E. (2000, October 24). Police department's allure is growing. *New York Times*, p. B1.
- Henry, V. E. (2000). Interview with William J. Bratton. *Police Practice and Research: An International Journal*, 1, 397-434.
- Henry, V. E. (2002). *The Compstat paradigm: Management accountability in policing, business and the public sector*. Flushing, NY: Looseleaf Law Publishers.
- Innovations in American Government. (1996). Compstat: A crime reduction management tool: 1996 winner. Retrieved May 22, 2001 from Innovations in American Government Web site: <http://ksgwww.harvard.edu/innovat/winners/cony96.htm>.
- Kelling, G. L. (1987). Acquiring a taste for order: The community and the police. *Crime and Delinquency*, 33(1), 90-102.
- Kelling, G. L. (1991). Reclaiming the subway. *City Journal*, 1(2), 17-28.

- Kelling, G. (1992). Measuring what matters: A new way of thinking about crime and public order. *NY: The City Journal*, 2(3), 21-33.
- Kelling, G. L. (1995). How to run a police department. *City Journal*, 5(4), 34-45. Retrieved January 3, 2005 from City Journal Web site: www.city-journal.org/html/5_4_how-to_run.html.
- Kelling, G. L., & Coles, C. M. (1996). *Fixing broken windows: Restoring order and reducing crime in our communities*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kelling, G., & Coles, C. (1997, January). The promise of public order (interview by Ryan Nally). *Atlantic Monthly*. 22-30. Retrieved May 10, 2001 from City Journal Web site: www.theatlantic.com/unbound/bookauth/broken/broke.htm.
- Krauss, C. (1994, January 26). Giuliani and Bratton start effort to shake up top police ranks: Reorganization will move more officers to street. *New York Times*, p. A1.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lester, T. (2000). Epidemic Proportions. *Atlantic Monthly*, March 29, 2000. Retrieved January 5, 2005 from Atlantic Monthly Web site: www.theatlantic.com/unbound/interviews/ba2000-03-29.htm.
- Maple, J., & Mitchell, C. (1999). *The crime fighter: Putting the bad guys out of business*. New York: Doubleday.
- McKinley, J. C. (1994, January 26) Dispute Flares Over Number of Officers on Patrol. *New York Times*, B3.
- McQuillan, A. (1994, January 24). Bratton plan targets lazy cops: Says he'll "kick butt." *New York Daily News*, p. 18.
- Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (2005, January). Japan in Figures, 2005. Retrieved January 3, 2005 from the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications website: www.stat.go.jp/english/data/figures/pdf/2005f.pdf.
- New York Police Department (NYPD) (2005, January). *CompStat Report Covering the Week of 12/06/2004 Through 12/12/2004*. Retrieved January 10, 2005 from New York City Police Department Web site: www.nyc.gov/html/nypd/pdf/chfdept/cscity.pdf.
- New York Police Department. (1990, October). *Staffing needs of the New York City Police Department*. New York: Author.
- O'Connell, P. E., & Straub, F. (1999). Why the jails didn't explode. *City Journal*, 9(2), 28-37. Retrieved May 15, 2004 from City Journal Web site: www.city-journal.org/html/9_2_why_the_jails.html.
- Silverman, E. B. (1996, December 15). Mapping change: How the New York City Police department reengineered itself to drive down crime. *Law Enforcement News*. 1, 6. Retrieved May 10, 2001 from Lloyd Sealy Library Web site: www.lib.jjay.cuny.edu/len/96/15dec/12.html.
- Silverman, E. B. (1998). Crime in New York: A success story. *Public Perspective*, 8(4), 3-5.
- Silverman, E. B. (1999). *NYPD fights crime: Innovative strategies in policing*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Swope, C. (2001, April). Restless for results: Baltimore Mayor Martin O'Malley is tracking performance on a scale never seen before in local government. *Governing*, 14, pp. 24-30.
- Wilson, J. Q. (1983). Thinking about crime. *Atlantic Monthly*, 252(3), 72-88.
- Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. (1982, March). Broken windows. *Atlantic Monthly*, pp. 29-38.
- Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. (1989, February). Making neighborhoods safe. *Atlantic Monthly*, pp. 46-52.
- Witkin, G. (1998, April 25). The crime bust. *U.S. News and World Report*. pp. 46-56.