



Measurement and Evaluation of Efficiency. Criteria for Police Units

George DIMOFTE*, Gabriela DIMOFTE**, Ionica BOLEA***

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Accepted June 2012
Available online 1 August 2012
JEL Classification
H53, L25, L38, L98, M14

Keywords:
Efficiency; Criteria of evaluation;
Indicators of efficiency; Police
organization

ABSTRACT

It is widely recognized that the exercise of the activity of management, as of all human activities, is not a purpose in itself, but rather a means to increase economic and social efficiency. To achieve a higher efficiency, the management has a major contribution, due to its deep involvement in the development of micro or macrosocial activities, through the decisions adopted and the actions needed for their application. Measuring and evaluating the organizational efficiency /effectiveness may be a task of high degree difficulty when it comes to translating them into practice. During their implementation, in front of the evaluator, appear a number of problems on whose settlement will depends the finality of the process itself. At the level of police organizations it is obvious that efficiency is a priority, getting performances on all levels, expressed with the help of indicators and indices. This study aims to highlight the difficulties of establishing criteria for efficiency in the police units and suggests performance indicators valid for police officers in accordance with the need for performance in public institutions at EU level.

© 2012 EAI. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The need to measure and evaluate the efficiency /effectiveness entails the action itself of measurement and evaluation. However, this action faces an extremely difficult problem, namely the identification of measurement and evaluation criteria. The problem becomes more difficult if we consider that the types of efficiency / effectiveness to be measured and evaluated are extremely numerous. There are types of efficiency / effectiveness, differentiated between them by the type of resources managed and, especially, by their level of structure (personal, interpersonal, group, organizational). Thereto shall be added other types of efficiency classified according to other elements such as the content (economic efficiency, socio-human efficiency etc.), the specific of some organizational activities (decision-making efficiency, managerial efficiency), the one from the actions of the organization (efficiency of training programs, the efficiency of diagnostic efficiency of different forms of intervention in organizations) etc. Despite these difficulties, in the organizational and psychological literature there are attempts to identify criteria for measuring and evaluating the efficiency, and even more, attempts to group and classify them. Simultaneously, there is a process of operationalization of criteria, namely their conversion into observable and measurable behaviors.

In order to address police sector activity from the perspective of the concept of efficiency, it is necessary that efficiency should be understood and considered both under the influence of economic factors and as a consequence of the influence of political, cultural, judicial and human factor, because in fact "human resources are the behind success or failure." [1]

In terms of forms of expression, one can be say that efficiency can be quantified - especially the economic effects - and unquantifiable - social effects. Police managers should take into account both forms, but also the fact that these forms may have, in addition to their present dimension, a future dimension due to the fact that a considerable part of results are achieved over a period of time. Unfortunately, more frequently, future efficiency - propagated efficiency - is ignored. An analysis of the decision system shows a very high percentage of decisions on short term, leading to decisions with immediate effect, most often, at the expense of medium and long term decisions that are totally neglected. Moreover, such an approach determines negative effects on long term, increasing the risk coefficient. In the police sector in Romania the factor of human resources is one of the most neglected, and the consequence of such situation leads to effects that are not hard to deduce. The human factor is a key element of the activity and police sector performance. Moreover, is the essential coordinate of dimension and especially of the quality of work in the police sector. [2]

So we can not mention the effectiveness of police units in general without taking into consideration, in addition to economic efficiency and aspects directly measurable, and a number of imponderables, but which

* Police Inspectorate of Galati County, Romania, Fraud Investigation Department, **Bar Association of Galati County, Romania, ***Anticorruption General Directorate, Territorial Department of Galati County, Romania. Email addresses: avocat_dimofte@yahoo.com (G. Dimofte), avocat_dimofte@yahoo.com (G. Dimofte), boleaoana@yahoo.com (O. Bolea).

have multiple consequences on police sector performance. Among these an important place is occupied, as it is natural, by the efficiency of police officers. On the efficient use of staff depends the actual quality and efficiency of police unit as a whole. It is quite difficult to establish performance indicators for police officers and this study aims to highlight these difficulties of establishing criteria for efficiency in the police units and suggests performance indicators valid for police officers in accordance with the need for performance in public institutions at EU level.

2. Criteria for measuring and evaluating efficiency /effectiveness

An empirical research carried out by a group of Canadian authors[3] found that experienced managers and leaders are concerned to stabilize and develop their organization's structure, to maximize results while lowering costs and providing legitimacy to the organization, to the external environment (clients, customers, investors), and, finally, to satisfy the interests of employees in order to obtain their participation. This allowed the authors to believe that organizational effectiveness could be described by four dimensions:

- 1) economic dimension (economic efficiency)[4];
- 2) psychosocial dimension (human value);
- 3) political dimension (the legitimacy of the organization to external groups);
- 4) systemic dimension (permanence of the organization).

In turn, each dimension is measured by a set of criteria.

Other authors offer suggestions more or less similar regarding the criteria to measure and evaluate effectiveness. Frenchman Claude Menard, for example, divides the criteria to measure and evaluate effectiveness into two categories: static and dynamic. [5]

In the static group he includes:

- 1) models focused on objectives that are based on the following idea: efficiency / effectiveness of an organization is measured by its ability to achieve specific goals set a priori;
- 2) models focused on internal characteristics of the organization, they have the subtext idea that organization is able to provide its own internal coherence and to guarantee its survival in a changing environment;
- 3) models focused on composite criteria that combine pre-defined criteria with those specific to the organization's way of operating, while considering that the organization favors those criteria that will ensure a minimum level of satisfaction of its constituent parts, with different goals and motivations.

However, each of the three categories of models have some disadvantages. The model focused on objectives set a priori overlooks the fact that goals are not always explicitly formulated, they are not always precisely formulated from the beginning, some appearing in the process. The model focused on internal characteristics of the organization emphasizes the internal state measurement means against goals (allocation of internal resources, providing communication between participants etc. leading to delicate problems of estimating the costs). Then, the idea of survival pushes the organization towards passivity; it is focusing too much, if not exclusively, on its own reactions, while, the purpose of an organization is not only to adapt to changing environment, but also to intervene in it. The model focused on composite criteria has difficulties in identifying with precision the strategic constituent parts, activity of which depends the very existence of the organization.

In the dynamic group of criteria, Menard includes:

- 1) criteria for evolution, which refer to the factors of internal evolution, reactivating the theory of organizational life cycle or the ecobiological theory – a sort of organizational selection (as specific criteria occur: organizational flexibility, increasing the organization, reducing the uncertainty);
- 2) criteria for change (changing planned – decided by the organization by changing the objectives, changing by adapting – imposed by the modification of the relationships; changing by crisis - required by rupture, imbalances);
- 3) criteria of inter-relations dynamics (market structure changes and that starts adaptive processes of the organization).

Among the criteria presented above, it is not hard to see that some refer to micro-organizational aspects, while other refer to macro-organizational aspects, some are more quantitative, others qualitative. The quantitative criteria help us to measure the past, but also to establish benchmarks for the future, while qualitative criteria offer us, as one writer put it, "a tempting but illusory security". Each has advantages and limitations. The latter increases while we use limited measurements, based on a single criterion, or even a unique criterion. That is why a combination of criteria and making repeated measurements seem to be much better than previous solutions. From this point of view, extremely valuable suggestion seems to be made by Carnali. He proposes a matrix of efficiency / effectiveness and hence a monitorization of a balanced set of indicators for all four quadrants of the matrix in question. [6]

Table 1. Measurement of efficiency/effectiveness

Qualitative measurements			
Efficiency	Resources: satisfaction involvement	Resources: managerial style management development organizational culture	Effectiveness
	Objectives: position in the hierarchy new technologies	Objectives: excellence adaptability	
	Objectives: inflows output	Objectives: growth quality new services	
	Resources: costs losses fluctuations	Resources: flexibility training and staff development	
Quantitative measurements			

Source: A. Carnali [7]

Here are the requirements that are to be followed in measuring efficiency starting from the above matrix:

- balancing efficiency measurement criteria (arguments: we can not measure the whole process, measuring itself costs money);
- variation of measurement criteria from one organization to another (depending on the specifics of each organization);
- consideration, of course, in a differentiated way, of the factors from all four quadrants (use and development of resources is the main impulse for efficiency)
- setting objectives and strategies is dependent upon the resources and the determination in implementing the proposed actions; many organizations are quite well in the top left quadrant, but few are those who are interested in systematic monitoring of the other three quadrants factors. However, more and more organizations are becoming more concerned with monitoring the other quadrants.

The combination of efficiency measurement criteria, their balanced monitoring is, undoubtedly, an important prerequisite not only for the measurement itself, but also for achieving performance and organizational success. Moreover, this interpretation is in line with the requirements of the systemic approach to organizations. Many years ago, Edgar Schein wrote: "in essence, the efficiency measurement criteria of an organization designed as a system can only be a multiple criteria, including the faculty of adaptation of the organization, its sense of identity, sense of reality and ability to achieve internal integration".

A new question emerges, however, with great poignancy: Can we talk about a fundamental and ultimate criterion for measuring and evaluating the efficiency? Claude Menard not only formulates such a question, but also gives an answer to it. The ultimate criterion of efficiency, he says, is the intervention of the organization upon its environment. "The effective organization changes environment to its advantage and thus contributes to shaping this environment." And the opposite is equally important: the environment creates a part of the conditions favorable or unfavorable to organizational efficiency. Usually, indicates Menard, economists neglect the overall efficiency criteria of the economy and especially their impact on participating organizations. We still know little, he says further, about the consequences of operating arrangements of an economic system over micro-organizations. Even if there has been developed a series of "lists of social indicators", these focus more on profit, turnover, number of employees etc., and less on fundamental aspects of individual wellbeing (health indicators, education indicators occupy insignificant places in measuring organizational efficiency). This is so, as organizational efficiency / effectiveness is a matter of great interest, having major implications not only for each organization, but for the whole social and economic system, national and even international.

3. Problems in measuring the organizational efficiency /effectiveness

Measuring and evaluating the organizational efficiency /effectiveness is a task of high degree difficulty when it comes to translating them into practice. During their implementation, in front of the evaluator appear a number of problems and their settlement will depend on the finality of the process itself.

1) The problem of conceptualization and operationalization of measurement and evaluation criteria [8].

A diagnostic or evaluative criterion, if not well designed and, especially, if not well performed, is of limited value. This is why researchers insist on precise, rigorous conceptualization of each criterion and with priority, over its operationalization, the transposition or translation of the criterion into observable

behaviors, measurable and quantifiable. The criterion appears as an indicator of efficiency, even as a way of defining them, and the operational description as a "measure" of it.

2) The problem of criteria characteristics

The literature indicates that a diagnostic and evaluative criteria should meet at least four conditions:

- objectivity (scores on a criterion must be the same, no matter who measures it);
- validity / confidence (score criterion should be related only to what he intends to measure and not affected by factors other than those taken into account);
- ability to discriminate (criterion should have the ability to correctly discriminate between different levels of efficiency);
- affordability (criterion to be fast, available and accessible).

Meeting by a single criterion of these four requirements is often difficult, which puts into question its veracity. Absenteeism taken as a criterion of efficiency should be objective (on condition that the absence record is well established and not subject to errors). However, absenteeism is unlikely to be a reliable factor of efficiency because it can be affected by external influences, such as illness, training, study time, holidays. This raises questions about the validity – since absenteeism may be affected by external factors, does it only measure the efficiency? If data are accurate and objective, then absenteeism should have the ability to discriminate between different levels of effectiveness, if not, the third requirement (ability to discriminate) is not met. Finally, data on absenteeism can be easily accessible if it is the researcher who collected them. Way of measuring and reporting measurements becomes essential in relation to the assessment of efficiency. [9]

3) The problem of the number of criteria and of their use

We can measure and assess effectiveness / efficiency only by a single criterion? How big should be the number of evaluative criteria to consider correct the evaluative process as correct? We measure and evaluate using only predetermined criteria (whatever their number) or using additional criteria or criteria established after the initial process? - Here is a series of questions that the assessor has to find answers to. The problem of the number of criteria for assessing organizational effectiveness depends on the requirements, demands and interests of the customer, they are derived from customer's priorities. But there are situations when evaluators introduce a number of additional criteria of efficiency that are not derived directly from the client's initial priorities, but can lead to a number of conditions that contribute to customer is objectives. In this way, clients are helped to redefine the specific problems, to broaden the palette of forms of efficiency, to be already prepared to meet future challenges. For example, the consideration, in the evaluative process, of further criteria aimed to measuring satisfaction, motivation, quality of life, may determine the organization to conduct a series of measures to improve the three variables, which might result in obtaining long term benefits, such as fair, innovative, flexible employment. The above suggests the need for taking into consideration in the organizational efficiency diagnosis of both the initially set criteria and the criteria set later by the evaluators. One can notice the requirement of many different indicators which could offer the opportunity of a comprehensive understanding of organizational behavior. Some authors [4] adhere to what is called "balanced scorecard", which is the use of a variety of criteria (objective and subjective) and their combination in order to provide an overview of the organizational efficiency.

4) The problem of conflicts between efficiency criteria

Ideally, all measuring and evaluating efficiency criteria should be compatible with each other. In fact, between them there may be many contradictions and tensions. For example, growth or development of an organization shows that it successfully manages to obtain the necessary resources. Developing an organization however, may be accompanied by a lower participation of members in decision-making process which affects the organization's ability to adapt to the changed conditions. To the above phenomenon adds another one, namely conflicts between criteria of different people or different components of the organization in assessing efficiency. Not every criterion equally serves the interests and priorities of all members of an organization. There is a danger that each individual or each group to promote their own goals and interests or even their own criteria or systems of criteria to assess organizational efficiency.

5) The problem of objective versus subjective measurements / evaluations [10]

Objective measurements (objective criteria, objective methods) are useful for assessing the efficiency / organizational effectiveness. Criteria such as staff turnover, absenteeism, sales volume, profit, market share, return on investment etc. are able to provide an analytical view, but also a synthetic one, on the efficiency of an organization. However, objective criteria can also be contaminated by errors. Hammer and Landau (1981) showed, for example, that absence measurement is complicated by the fact that the absence may be voluntary or involuntary (accidental). For this reason, objective measurements are combined with subjective measurements, based more on subjective criteria. The most common methods are: observation, evaluation scales, selfreporting questionnaires, managers'evaluation, etc. In their case, the intervention of contamination is even greater. For example, the use of evaluation scales leads to a significant number of "scale effects", such

as halo effect (evaluator tends to give the same score for all criteria), central tendency, severity, indulgence (the evaluator uses only a part of the scale due to personal preferences) contrast effect (individual scores influenced by group score) similarity effect (the evaluator compares himself with the measured). In organizational psycho diagnosis, efforts are made to increase objectivity of the evaluation scales: providing comprehensive definitions of the criteria evaluated, designing of scales with behavioral anchors, training of evaluators and even measuring their performance by other evaluators. The use of both types of measurements (objective and subjective) could have complementary or compensatory effects.

6) *The problem of time intervals between measurements*

Intervals at which organizational efficiency / effectiveness measurements are and can be done are highly variable, from hours, ending with years, according to the specific of the organization. Measurements of effectiveness in education (teaching) can be at every hour, while evaluating the effectiveness of organizational activity (especially economic) is done quarterly or annually. Important is to find optimal intervals that have the highest stimulant value. Assessing the effectiveness at short intervals may prove inconclusive and their effects do not have time to stabilize. Assessing the effectiveness at excessive time intervals might prove also useless as it is possible that negative effects have been generalized and difficult to fix.

7) *The problem of comparing standards*

The results obtained from evaluative processes have no value in itself, but only if reported to other results. In the assessment of organizational efficiency / effectiveness there are used the following standards of comparison:

- Comparing current levels to previous levels of efficiency (growth rate, development etc.)
- Comparing the efficiencies of different units / departments within the same organization;
- Comparing the efficiency of an organization with other organizations within the same industry (especially with the competitive or competing organizations);
- Comparing the current state of efficiency of an organization with certain minimum efficiency standards;
- Comparing the current state of efficiency of an organization with maximum or ideal standards of efficiency.

In the light of these problems, the concepts of organizational efficiency/effectiveness becomes more clearly defined, aspect that gives new suggestions for action on problems that will raise during the efficiency measurement and evaluation, whatever their level.

4. Evaluation and criteria in police units

The essential changes in the structure and powers of the Romanian Police, realized with the effort of adjustment to dynamic social reality, gave an impulse to actions of critical examination and, if necessary, of reconsideration of the existing conceptualizations of the phenomenon of management.

Improvement of police management should contribute greatly to improving the activity of maintaining public order, combating crime, strengthening legality, strict compliance with the rights and interests of citizens, permanent increase in the level of legal culture of police as a whole.

The issue of policing is very large and a possible insight into the management of this institution may require an activity too complex to be covered in a single research activity so we propose only to approach a few issues of management of the Police.

Management process should be properly reflected in the efficiency of police work. Precisely for this reason the scientific approach that we propose will try to establish "measures of effectiveness" in the police activity as well as the impact of organizational management of Police efficiency.

When assessing efficiency of the police activity we have to consider the fact that the efforts to meet social needs are measurable, usually quantifiable in terms of value (costs with material, human, information), while social effects are difficult to determine and can not be predicted entirely.

Regarding the necessity of evaluating performance and the difficulty of assessing the results Peter Drucker said: "We know we need to measure results. We also know that, except business, we're no good to measure results in most organizations ". [11]

Efficiency concerns the relations between the objective followed and the result to be achieved in public administration, considering only that efficiency is important. We must not forget the fact that efficiency is influenced by ideological resources running into the mechanisms of social action. Many foreign experts believe that there is no empty efficiency, because "it is more important to realize well what you have proposed to achieve, better than nothing". Is worth mentioning that budgeting together with the efficient use of resources contribute to achieve performance in public organizations.

In this respect, programs should include: the ultimate goal of activity carried out by a ministry or other central or local public entity, objectives, defining the program, specifying priorities and indicating the period of time covered, estimate potential for increased efficiency in the application of the program, financial effort needed for implementation of the program, qualitative and quantitative indicators of results and funding sources. [12]

Actions of transforming the present policing system should be oriented towards determining future objectives in order to confer stability and efficiency to the unit. The tendency to be effective and useful to

society should transform the police into an institution, which structures its concerns both on crime prevention, with more administrative tasks, and on the suppression of anti-social acts by judicial action.

It is known and accepted the fact that police performs tasks predominantly coercive, thus being included, in the universal consciousness, as a social subsystem with powers to compel individuals to enroll to standards established by social norms. Police is called by citizens (those that ensure the existence of this body by taxes which flow into state coffers) to remove all evil from society, such as robberies, murders, thefts, drug addiction, human trafficking, homelessness, prostitution, breach of public order etc. Hence the question: Is the police able to protect citizens and society at large against violent actions, to ensure law and order and peace in the country (a situation which proves the efficiency of police activity)?

At present, the term "efficiency" is used by specialists in various fields of activity, including those working in the police. The last includes in most cases, in the content of that concept an assumption, indefinite and general, about achieving the desired results in law enforcement activities. Such circumstances require us to meditate on the major importance of scientific debate on the issues pertaining to the assessment of efficiency of police activity, on developing a methodology for assessing the efficiency, which in the future could be used in law enforcement activities.

In the specialized literature, it was claimed that the assessment of efficiency can only occur as a result of the determination of criteria that need to be perceived as mandatory requirements to any activity and also parts of its evaluation.

It was found that among the major causes of difficulty of assessing the efficiency of law enforcement institutions are the following:

- the absence of a unique scientific interpretation of the term "efficiency";
- the complexity of interdependencies of social processes, which makes it difficult to reveal the efficient character of the activities developed by a particular legal institution;
- the issue of finding quantitative assessments of social processes;
- the difficulty in identifying indirect consequences of social actions, which, among other things, can essentially amend or minimize the result of these actions;
- the probability of mismatch of social and economic efficiency with certain forms of activity.

It is considered that these difficulties can be overcome by a structural analysis with the assessment of results of the activities by dividing its constituents and developing appropriate indicators for each element. On our part, we believe that a real support in solving the addressed problem would be a proper and adequate definition of certain conceptual terms, as follows:

- efficiency – the capacity to produce the expected effect (positive), reflecting the full or partial achievement of predetermined outcomes or purposes;
- criterion of efficiency – a sign, a point of view, a norm under which an assessment is made;
- index of efficiency – a number, a formula or an expression that reflects aspects of a phenomenon of an action or a situation;
- degree of efficiency – standard or criterion for the assessment of an activity in relation to a reference value, which characterizes also the achievement of the desired goal.

Every step of the process of law enforcement has its corresponding efficiency goals, criteria, indicators and a certain degree of their achievement. Setting individual objectives and performance indicators is the most important step in the evaluation of police officers, regardless of their category. On the quality of the objectives and performance indicators established depends the obtaining of the performance desired / expected results at the level of each police officer, each subdivision, and finally, of the police unit itself. In case there are not followed the requirements and criteria in their establishment, the evaluation stage may encounter several problems, such as:

- lack of consistency / lack of connection between subdivision's objectives and the targets established for every police officer;
- inability to achieve the objectives of the police officer because of objective causes, not attributable to him, but which have not been taken into account in the stage of determining objectives and performance indicators.

It is recommended that the process of setting objectives to be a participatory one. In this respect, the direct leader will discuss and establish objectives with the police officer evaluated. This will ensure a level of greater personal involvement and responsibility of police officers to achieve optimal targets agreed with the assessor.

In order to measure the achievement of the objectives, performance indicators are formulated. Performance indicators analyze synthetically and qualitative the performance of the police officers and the results of the management applied.

Performance indicators are formulated on the basis of objectives, measuring the quantity and quality of products produced or services rendered. There is a limit to fix a definite number of performance indicators. It is important to establish for each objective at least a quantity performance indicator and a qualitative one.

Quantitative performance indicators related to the percentage, frequency, number, percentiles, rates etc. while qualitative performance indicators are related to public perception of services, level of understanding, awareness, satisfaction of employees, beneficiaries etc. Furthermore we present proposals for evaluation criteria and indicators of efficiency within the police units:

Table 2. Criteria and indicators of efficiency

Nr.	Criteria of efficiency	Indicators of efficiency
1	Commitment to departmental goals, programs and objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Works with supervisor and co-workers in planning and building an effective team. - New and additional assignments are accepted and performed. - New methods are suggested and readily accepted to improve effectiveness and gain ways to resolve traffic and crime problems. - Officers objectives, efforts and talents are directed toward the needs of the citizens and the department.
2	Response to radio calls and assignments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Response is made without delay. - Further action is rarely needed in minor cases. - Radio calls are not missed without valid cause. - Assistance provided is appropriate to the need or problem. - Proper radio procedures are followed.
3	Investigation of crimes or traffic accidents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate investigative steps are taken. - Testimony in court accurately reflects accumulated evidence. - Investigations are thorough. - Evidence is properly preserved and thoroughly described. - Other divisions or agencies are properly notified as required.
4	Apprehension, arrest and processing of criminal suspects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All necessary information is included in arrest reports. - Proper warrant procedures are followed. - No substantiated complaints are received concerning the arrest actions taken. - Adheres to department's policy on use of force.
5	Enforcement of traffic regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic is controlled as required by using the proper traffic control gestures. - Actions taken are appropriate to the offense. - Citations are rarely returned for correction. - Warnings are issued where appropriate. - Tickets are issued where appropriate.
6	Performance under stressful, unusual or emergency conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - When under unusual circumstances, no serious deviations from expected performance are demonstrated. - Composure is maintained under stress. - Handles difficult situations in a very confident and professional manner. - Judgment results from sound evaluation of all factors involved.
7	External public relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No verbal abuse of citizens or any other members of the public. - Courtesy is demonstrated at all times to all people. - There is tactful and displays good self control when in contact with irate individuals.
8	Internal communication and cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Completes assignments in harmony with others and is a good team worker. - Problems which occur in work relationships are promptly resolved. - Readily assists and backs up others. - Trains and guides less experienced personnel.
9	Report preparation, submission and presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reports are submitted on time. - Field notes are used and maintained. - Reports are legible, concise, grammatically correct and contain all required information. - Reports and information are rarely returned for correction. - Proper interrogation and interview techniques are used. - Evidence is preserved and thoroughly described.
10	Use, care and maintenance of equipment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vehicles are not abused through poor driving habits. - Equipment is not lost or damaged due to carelessness. - Specified operating and safety procedures are followed in the use and maintenance of equipment. - Cruisers are returned clean and serviced for next shift.
11	Conformance to direction and directives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Instructions are followed and assignments completed on schedule. - Unassigned time is effectively utilized. - Special attention is directed to high accident or crime areas. - Work does not have to be closely supervised.
12	Compliance to policies, procedures and regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Town policies, general orders, procedures, etc., are followed as prescribed or exceptions are approved by supervisor. - Sick leave is not abused. - Leave time is used only as authorized or specified.
13	Physical condition and appearance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uniform and equipment are well kept and pride is taken in appearance. - All physical standards prescribed by the department are met. - Corrective measures recommended by a physician or by another designated health representative are followed in a timely manner.

5. Conclusions

Objectivity of the police efficiency assessment process can be achieved only after the implementation of a system of criteria, which would stimulate the activity of each employee, manager and division in increasing the efficiency in combating crime and maintaining order in the territory. Police acts in support of the citizen

and of the law as long as it is effective. An effective police is inextricably linked to the management approached at the level of the institution by its leaders at all levels.

At the level of police organizations, it is obvious that efficiency is a priority, getting performances on all levels, expressed with the help of indicators and indices, being the natural consequence of general or specific management performance. We note in this context, with priority, quality indicators (efficiency) relating to: labor productivity, average wages, rates of return, respecting the relations between labor productivity and wages (referring to the bonuses granted for the results achieved), managers – subordinates relations, respect of colleagues or subordinates.

The study presents the difficulties that should be taken into consideration when establishing criteria and indicators of efficiency and in the same time presents criteria and indicators for police officers no matter in which division of a police unit they activate. Of course to these criteria and indicators one should add those specific to each division in a police unit. It is important to establish general indicators for police officers because the unit performance as a whole depends on each officer's efficiency in the law enforcement process. One could notice that the indicators that we propose refer do not economic quantifiable effects such as the value of prejudices recovered, the value of fines applied, and the number of arrested persons. We orientated our research to identify unquantifiable, social effects that have their value for the citizens, namely tax payers.

The management and its the exercise are not a purpose in themselves but a decisive factor for enhancing efficiency and effectiveness of police organizations. For the best performances at this level, we need a good management, provided by professional managers. Managerial reengineering results in a performant management, while preparing "ground" for a safe transfer to a higher the stage, that of knowledge management.[13]

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Project SOP HRD TOP ACADEMIC 76822/ 2010.

References

- [1]. Bonnet, Fr., *Management de l'administration*, Paris, De Boeck Université, 1993, pp. 47;
- [2]. Armenia Androniceanu, *Updates on public management*, Bucharest, ASE, 2010;
- [3]. *L'efficacité de l'organisation : théories, représentations et mesures* ", Montréal, Gaetan Morin, Editeur, 1994;
- [4]. H. Schaffer, "Business Management and Organization", Central Institute of Technical Documentation, Bucharest, 1971;
- [5]. Menard Claude *The Economics of Organization*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press (forthcoming);
- [6]. Zlate M. (2004) "Organizational and managerial psychology" Publisher Polirom, Iași;
- [7]. Carnal, A , *Managing Change in Organisations*, 1990, pp. 69-70;
- [8]. Zlate M. (2004) , "Leadership si management / Leadership And Management", Publisher Polirom, Iași;
- [9]. Eccles, R.G., (1991) 'The Performance Measurement Manifesto', *Harvard Business Review*, January-February
- [10]. Mihaela Vlăsceanu, "Organisations and Organizational Behavior", Ed. Polirom, Iași, 2003;
- [11]. P. Drucker, „Management: Tasks, responsibilities, practices”, Harper & Rox Publishers, New York, 1974;
- [12]. George Dimofte, Gabriela Dimofte, Ionica Bolea (2011), "Efficiency and Managerial Performance in Police Units", *Journal of accounting and Management*, Danubius University, Galati;
- [13]. Champy, J. (1995). "Reengineering du management / Management Reengineering", Publisher Dunod, Paris.