

**THE NEED FOR SUPERVISORY STAFFING CRITERIA
FOR PATROL POSITIONS IN THE PHILADELPHIA
POLICE DEPARTMENT 25TH DISTRICT**

**Stephen L. Clark
Philadelphia Police Department**

**A Staff Study Submitted to the
Northwestern University Center for Public Safety
School of Police Staff & Command
Class #277
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
May 29, 2009**

The Need for Supervisory Staffing Criteria for Patrol Positions in the Philadelphia Police Department 25th District

Problem

The Philadelphia Police Department currently has no policy for the deployment and staffing of supervisory positions in patrol assignments. The 25th District, for example, has 214 police officers with 12 sergeants and 3 lieutenants assigned. Conversely, the 7th District has 99 police officers with 12 sergeants and 4 lieutenants. The span of control for a sergeant [first line supervisor] in the 25th District is 17.8 police officers to 1 sergeant. In the 7th District, this same span of control is 8.3 to 1. Recommended span of control in law enforcement, depending on the source, is 5 to 12 police officers to 1 first-line supervisor. Currently there are 9 [of 22 total] districts which have become the main focus of the department's strategy to reduce crime. Some of those 9 districts, with the highest overall crime rates in the city, have high police officer to supervisor ratios. Often, large supervisory spans of control exist in districts with substantially higher levels of violent crime than districts with rather tight supervisory spans of control.

Assumptions

- Increases in violent crime will continue to place additional demands on district police officers and supervisors.
- Large spans of supervisory control will continue to reduce training and administrative efficiency among first-line supervisors.
- Police vehicle accidents and citizen complaints against police will continue to be problematic in districts with higher levels of crime and incidents handled by police.
- Close supervision of police officers will enable deficiencies in driving, use of force, tactics, and report preparation to be discovered earlier, leading to increased efficiency in those areas and possibly fewer complaints against police and civil suits against the City of Philadelphia.
- The number of young and/or inexperienced officers in districts with higher levels of crime continues to increase, exacerbating the need for tighter spans of control.

Facts

- In the Philadelphia Police Department, the sergeant rank is the first-line supervisor in patrol assignments.

- The 25th District, a patrol assignment in an economically-depressed area, encompassing 4 square miles, with among the highest crime rates of any district within the City of Philadelphia, has 214 police officers assigned to 12 sergeants (Annex A, C).
- In 2008, there were 4884 Part One Offenses [1525 Part One Violent Offenses and 3359 Part One Property Offenses] committed within the 25th District (Annex A).
- In 2008, there were 37 police vehicle accidents and 27 felony assaults of police officers within the 25th District (Annex B).
- The 25th District recorded 204 use of force incidents in 2008 (Annex E).
- The 7th District, a patrol assignment in a middle-class area, encompassing 12 square miles, with among the lowest crime rates of any district within the City of Philadelphia, has 98 police officers assigned to 12 sergeants (Annex A, C).
- In 2008, there were 1789 Part One Offenses [255 Part One Violent Offenses and 1534 Part One Property Offenses] committed within the 7th District (Annex A).
- In 2008, there were 13 police vehicle accidents and 2 felony assaults of police officers committed within the 7th District (Annex B).
- The 7th District recorded 27 use of force incidents in 2008.
- Other local jurisdictions have policies regarding maximum spans of control for supervisory positions.
- The recommended span of control in law enforcement, depending on the source, is 5 to 12 officers per supervisor.

Discussion

In 2008, the 25th District staffing levels for police officers fluctuated between 192 and 233 police officers while the number of sergeants fluctuated between 10 and 13. Presently, in the 25th District there are 214 police officers assigned to 12 sergeants. The 25th District has a population of approximately 73,932 people (Annex C). In 2008, the 25th District handled 144,281 incidents which were 4% more than the 139,216 incidents handled in 2007 (Annex A). The 7th District currently has 98 police officers with 12 sergeants assigned. The 7th District has a population of approximately 84,453 people (Annex C). In 2008, 7th District officers handled 51,015 incidents (Annex A).

Work Distribution

In 2008, 25th District officers responded to and investigated 4884 Part One Offenses. These Part One Offenses consisted of 1525 Part One Violent Offenses and 3359 Part One Property Offenses (Annex A). Furthermore, 25th District officers conducted 25,145 vehicle investigations, 20,403 pedestrian investigations, and made 7,473 arrests in 2008 (Annex A). Additionally, the 25th District recorded 37 police vehicle accidents, 34 formal citizen complaints, and 204 use of force incidents (Annex A, E).

7th District officers handled 1789 Part One Offenses, consisting of 255 Part One Violent Offenses and 1534 Part One Property Offenses in 2008 (Annex A). They conducted 15,015 vehicle investigations, 3,770 pedestrian investigations, and made 546 arrests (Annex A). The 7th District also recorded 7 police vehicle accidents, 8 formal citizen complaints, and 27 use of force incidents (Annex A, E). These work distribution totals for the 25th and 7th Districts are demonstrated in the table below.

District	Part One Totals	Part One Violent	Part One Property	Vehicle Invest	Pedestrian Invest	Arrests	Police Vehicle Accidents	Use of Force	Formal Citizen Complaints
25th	4884	1525	3359	25,145	20,403	7,473	37	204	34
7th	1789	255	1534	15,015	3,770	546	7	27	8

Work Distribution Ratios

Using the current staffing levels applied to 2008 totals, the workload for 25th District officers is 22.82 Part One Offenses per officer, consisting of 7.13 Part One Violent Crimes and 15.70 Part One Property Crimes per officer (Annex D). There were 117.50 vehicle investigations, 95.34 pedestrian investigations, and 34.92 arrests per officer (Annex E). Also, there were 674.21 incidents handled, .17 police vehicle accidents, .95 use of force incidents, and .16 citizen complaints per officer (Annex E, F).

The workload for 7th District officers is 18.26 Part One Offenses per officer, consisting of 2.60 Part One Violent Crimes and 15.65 Part One Property Offenses per officer (Annex D). There were 153.21 vehicle investigations, 38.47 pedestrian investigations, and 5.57 arrests per officer (Annex E). Also, there were 520.56 incidents handled, .07 police vehicle accidents, .28 use of force incidents,

and .08 citizen complaints per officer (Annex E, F). The work distribution ratios are also illustrated in the tables below.

District	Part One per officer	Part One Violent per officer	Part One Property per officer	Vehicle Invest per officer	Pedestrian Invest per officer	Arrests per officer	Police Vehicle Accidents per officer	Use of Force per officer	Formal Citizen Complaints per officer
25th	22.82	7.13	15.70	117.50	95.34	34.92	.17	.95	.16
7th	18.26	2.60	15.65	153.21	38.47	5.57	.07	.28	.08

District	Total Incidents Handled per officer
25 th	674.21
7th	520.56

Spans of Control

Officers in the 25th District generate a significantly higher level of activity and citizen contacts than their colleagues in the 7th District. This type of police activity highlights the need for tight spans of control by first-line supervisors. The span of control for a first-line supervisor in patrol assignments according to many police departments and law enforcement source books and publications is between 5 to 12 officers per first-line supervisor. A required sourcebook, for the sergeant and lieutenant promotional examinations in the Philadelphia Police Department, explains that, “the optimal span of control most often recommended at the level of operations varies, but rarely exceeds twelve to one. However, a narrow span of control of about six to one is always more preferable to a broader span of control of about twelve to one” (Schroeder & Lombardo, 2006, p. 28). As an example, the Abington Township Police Department, a CALEA-accredited department responsible for policing a jurisdiction bordering the City of Philadelphia, has a policy mandating that “supervisors will have a reasonable number of employees under their immediate command and control. Except under unusual or emergency conditions, this number will not exceed twelve employees” (Annex G). The Pennsylvania State Police Administrative Regulations mandate that “absent unusual or exigent circumstances, no more than nine personnel shall be under the immediate control of a supervisor under normal day-to-day operations” (Pennsylvania State Police, 2009).

In the City of Los Angeles, California, the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) does not have a written policy setting a span of control, but the organization “tries to maintain a span of control as close to the NIMS/ICS model as possible” (Peters, interview). “The LAPD attempts to maintain a span of control of 7 to 8 officers per supervisor, with a maximum of ten officers to one supervisor” (Annex H). In the LAPD North Hollywood Station, the authorized strength is 181 police officers and 23 sergeants, with 160 police officers and 26 sergeants actually deployed (Annex I). The authorized span of control is 8 police officers to 1 sergeant, while the actual span of control is 6 police officers to 1 sergeant.

In the 25th District, using the number of 12 total sergeants, the span of control for a first-line supervisor is 17.83 to 1. Excluding the one sergeant on restricted duty, the span of control is 19.45 to 1. In the 7th District, the span of control for first-line supervisors is 8.17 to 1 (Annex D). Frequently in the 25th District, there are as many as 24 officers on patrol with only one sergeant available to supervise them. While the officers patrol an area of only 4 square miles, the higher demand for police service scatters the officers in the 25th District more frequently than those in the 7th District. The significantly higher level of violent crime and police/citizen contacts via vehicular and pedestrian investigations and arrests indicates a need for a tighter span of control than the average 17.83 police officers to 1 sergeant ratio in the 25th District.

Policy Considerations

Presently, sergeants with broad spans of control spend inordinate amounts of time darting from one immediate concern to another. This means that a sergeant is not able to evenly spend quality training and monitoring time with his or her subordinates (Lane, 2006). If the 4% increase in incidents handled by 25th District officers from 2007 to 2008 and the significantly higher level of violent crime and police activity in the 25th District is taken into consideration, the need for a policy for supervisory staffing criteria similar to the Abington Township Police Department policy (Annex G), based on best practices in other departments, is clear. The following alternatives can be considered in formulation of staffing criteria:

- Shifting or re-deployment of sergeants from one district or unit to another to tighten the gaps in span of control would alleviate staffing issues. Re-deployment, commonly referred to as the “detailing” of an employee, is only done for periods up to 90 days, due to labor agreements. Re-deployment of supervisors is currently done in the Chicago Police Departments to deal with low supervisory staffing levels (Vann, interview).

- Designating senior officers as “acting” supervisors on a rotating basis as the need arises also helps to narrow span of control issues. This is a common practice in smaller departments in the suburbs adjacent to the City of Philadelphia. In the Borough of Eatontown, New Jersey the labor agreement provides that, “a police officer shall receive sergeant’s pay for time served in that capacity when placed in charge of a shift as a Road Supervisor for a minimum of two hours” (Borough of Eatontown, NJ, 2008). The logistics of selecting and training viable candidates while maintaining compliance with the collective bargaining agreement and civil service regulations could be problematic.
- Promotion of officers to the rank of sergeant using the existing promotional process provided in civil service regulations and agreed upon by the Fraternal Order of Police is the traditional method for addressing the needs for increased supervisory staffing, yet the current economic environment and fiscal situation of the City of Philadelphia provide obstacles.

Conclusion

The Philadelphia Police Department currently has no policy or criteria for manageable span of control and the deployment and staffing of supervisory positions in patrol assignments. This is best illustrated in drawing comparisons between the 7th and 25th Districts. The 25th District has 214 police officers with 12 sergeants and 3 lieutenants assigned. Conversely, the 7th District has 99 police officers with 12 sergeants and 4 lieutenants. The span of control for a sergeant [first line supervisor] in the 25th District is 17.8 police officers to 1 sergeant. In the 7th District, the span of control is 8.3 to 1.

The sergeant staffing levels in the 25th District create demanding span of control issues for those first-line supervisors. The situation is further exacerbated by the more intense workload faced by officers and sergeants in the 25th District. In 2008, 25th District officers handled 22.82 Part One offenses, 7.13 violent Part One offenses, 95.34 pedestrian investigations, 34.92 arrests, and .95 use of force incidents per officer. Conversely, 7th District officers handled 18.26 Part One offenses, 2.60 violent Part One offenses, 38.47 pedestrian investigations, 5.57 arrests, and .28 use of force incidents per officer.

Promotion of personnel to the rank of sergeant in the Philadelphia Police Department is the traditional means used to improve span of control in patrol assignments, yet the current City of

Philadelphia budget crisis has prohibited this solution. Attempts to tighten spans of control by having senior officers cover as acting supervisors at a sergeant pay rate are used by departments in the Philadelphia area. Currently, the Philadelphia Police Department has no program for the development of such roles, so the logistics of selecting and training viable candidates for such a program would need to be developed. The ability to quickly develop such a program in the Philadelphia Police Department is also hindered by the budget crisis. Current civil service regulations and the City of Philadelphia labor agreement with the Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge 5 also prohibit an “acting supervisor” program from being implemented as a short-term solution.

Developing a policy for span of control and the staffing of supervisory positions in patrol assignments would provide the framework for working toward the goal of maintaining a manageable span of control for patrol sergeants. The most responsive and fiscally responsible option is to re-deploy supervisors from districts or units with tighter spans of control and lower levels of responsibility or violent crime and police activity levels to districts with large spans of control and high levels of violent crime and police activity. This is utilized successfully in other large departments and has been used successfully in the Philadelphia Police Department for up to 90 days due to the labor agreement.

Recommendation

In order to tighten the spans of control for sergeants in patrol positions, the Philadelphia Police Department should develop a policy for span of control and the staffing of sergeant positions in patrol assignments. A suggested policy can be found in the attached Annex L. Furthermore, in order to address span of control issues in patrol districts the Philadelphia Police Department should identify districts with large spans of control and re-deploy supervisors from districts and units with smaller spans of control lower levels of crime and police activity.

Police Commissioner – City of Philadelphia

Concur Do Not Concur

WORKS CITED

- Abington Township Police Department (Pennsylvania) – “*General Order 11.2.1.*” May 1, 2004.
Abington Township Police Department Policy and Procedure Manual.
- Borough of Eatontown, NJ - Labor Agreement between the Borough of Eatontown and New Jersey State Policemen’s Benevolent Association, Inc., Local No. 305. Article 21, Section 3. January 1, 2008.
- Lane, T., (2006). Span of Control for Law Enforcement Agencies. *The Police Chief*, 73 (10), 74-83.
- Los Angeles Police Department (Agency Data) – *Department Sworn Strength*, May 24, 2009.
- Pennsylvania State Police (Agency Data) – “*Administrative Regulation 10.*” Pennsylvania State Police Administrative Regulations. 2009.
- Peters, Jon. Captain, City of Los Angeles Police Department, North Hollywood Station. Telephonic Interview May 27, 2009.
- Philadelphia Police Department (Agency Data) – *INCT Computerized Reporting System*, Year-End Statistics for 2008.
- Philadelphia Police Department (Agency Data) – *Unit Strength Report*, February 13, 2009.
- Schroeder, D. J., & Lombardo, F. (2006). *Management and Supervision of Law Enforcement Personnel* (4th ed.). Charlottesville, VA: LexisNexis Gould Publications.
- Vann Jr., Eugene. Lieutenant, Chicago Police Department, Research and Development Division, Policy and Procedures Section. Electronic Interview. April 21, 2009

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Need for Supervisory Staffing Criteria for Patrol Positions in the Philadelphia Police Department 25th District

Problem

The Philadelphia Police Department currently has no policy or criteria for manageable span of control in the deployment and staffing of supervisory positions in patrol assignments. This is best illustrated in drawing comparisons between the 7th and 25th Districts. The 25th District has 214 police officers with 12 sergeants and 3 lieutenants assigned. Conversely, the 7th District has 99 police officers with 12 sergeants and 4 lieutenants. The span of control for a sergeant [first line supervisor] in the 25th District is 17.8 police officers to 1 sergeant. In the 7th District, this same span of control is 8.3 to 1.

The current practice creates demanding span of control issues for sergeants. The situation is further exacerbated by the more intense workload faced by officers and sergeants in patrol assignments such as the 25th District.

Possible Solutions

1. Promotion of officers to the rank of sergeant using the existing promotional process. However, this is prohibited by the current budget crisis for the City of Philadelphia.
2. Designating senior officers as “acting” supervisors on a rotating basis as the need arises also helps to narrow span of control issues. The logistics of selecting and training viable candidates could be problematic.
3. Shifting or re-deployment of sergeants from one district or unit to another to tighten the gaps in span of control would alleviate staffing issues.

Recommendation

The Philadelphia Police Department should develop a policy for span of control and the staffing of sergeant positions in patrol assignments. Furthermore, in order to address span of control issues in patrol districts the Philadelphia Police Department should identify districts with large spans of control and re-deploy supervisors from districts and units with smaller spans of control lower levels of crime and police activity.

PHILADELPHIA POLICE DEPARTMENT Annex A

MAJOR CRIMES AS REPORTED TO P.P.D. - 25TH DISTRICT - Y.T.D. (2007 TO 2008)

25

COMMANDER PROFILE			WEEKLY COMPARISON			28 DAY COMPARISON			01/01/08 TO 12/28/08		
Captain Christopher Werner #126			VIOLENT CRIME					% Change	2007	2008	% Change
Appt. Date	3/20/89		Homicide					0%	39	32	-18%
Promotion Date	3/18/02		Rape					0%	66	88	33%
Assignment Date	5/5/08		Robbery/Gun					0%	335	356	6%
			Robbery/Other					0%	371	331	-11%
			Aggravated Assault/Gun					0%	264	258	-2%
			Aggravated Assault/Other					0%	458	460	0%
			TOTAL VIOLENT CRIME	0	0	0	0	0%	1533	1525	-1%
DISTRICT PERSONNEL			PROPERTY CRIME					% Change	2007	2008	% Change
	2007	2008	Burglary/Residential					0%	433	501	16%
Captain	1	1	Burglary/Non Residential					0%	174	210	21%
Exe. Officer	0	0	Theft Of Motor Vehicle Tag					0%	291	218	-25%
Lieutenant	4	3	Theft From Person					0%	65	71	9%
Sergeant	12	12	Theft From Auto					0%	556	636	14%
Corporal	3	3	Theft					0%	869	826	-5%
Police Officer	192	211	Retail Theft					0%	192	140	-27%
Civilian	5	3	Auto Thefts					0%	982	757	-23%
			TOTAL PROPERTY OFFENSES	0	0	0	0	0%	3562	3359	-6%
			TOTAL PART ONE CRIMES	0	0	0	0	0%	5095	4884	-4%
			# Of Shooting Incidents					0%	192	219	14%
			# Of Shooting Victims					0%	156	165	6%
			Firearms Seized					0%	375	408	9%
ARREST SECTION											
			VIOLENT CRIME					% Change	2007	2008	% Change
			Homicide					0%	13	30	131%
			Rape					0%	29	49	69%
			Robbery/Gun					0%	107	138	29%
			Robbery/Other					0%	132	153	16%
			Aggravated Assault/Gun					0%	146	157	8%
			Aggravated Assault/Other					0%	272	375	38%
			TOTAL VIOLENT CRIME ARRESTS	0	0	0	0	0%	699	902	29%
			PROPERTY CRIME					% Change	2007	2008	% Change
			Burglary/Residential					0%	54	121	124%
			Burglary/Non-Residential					0%	39	78	100%
			Theft Of Motor Vehicle Tag					0%	0	2	100%
			Theft From Person					0%	3	3	0%
			Theft From Auto					300%	34	43	26%
			Theft					0%	53	49	-8%
			Auto Theft					0%	269	184	-32%
			TOTAL PROPERTY CRIME ARRESTS	0	0	0	0	0%	452	480	6%
			TOTAL PART ONE ARRESTS	0	0	0	0	0%	1151	1382	20%
			Quality Of Life Arrests					0%	678	744	10%
			V.U.F.A. Arrests					0%	127	155	22%
			Other Part II Arrests					0%	1357	2141	58%
			District Narcotic Arrests/Buyer					0%	655	960	47%
			District Narcotic Arrests/Seller					0%	397	471	19%
			Retail Thefts					0%	102	89	-13%
			Other Unit Narcotic Arrests/Buyer					0%	1278	553	-57%
			Other Unit Narcotic Arrests/Seller					0%	1279	978	-24%
			TOTAL ARRESTS	0	0	0	0	0%	7024	7473	6%
ACTIVITY SECTION											
			Tow Truck Investigations					0%	264	582	120%
			Recovered Stolen Autos					0%	1017	834	-18%
			Curfew Violations					0%	2795	1923	-31%
			Truancy Violations					0%	3118	2769	-11%
			Moving Violations					0%	12740	10400	-18%
			Parking Violations					0%	12710	8906	-30%
			Vehicle Investigations					0%	25482	25145	-1%
			Pedestrian Investigations					0%	13862	20403	47%
			COMPLAINTS AGAINST POLICE					0%	34	34	0%
			TOTAL POLICE ACCIDENTS					0%	45	37	-18%
YTD DC NUMBERS			District Unfounded Radio Calls					0%			0%
	2007	2008	Total District Radio Calls					0%			0%
	139216	144281	District Pct. Radio Calls Unfounded					0%			0%
	4%		Citywide Pct. Radio Calls Unfounded					0%			0%



YEARLY COMPARISON Annex B

7TH POLICE DISTRICT	2007	2008	% Change
POLICE AUTO ACCIDENTS	15	13	-13%
RESISTING ARREST	2	1	-50%
ASSAULT ON POLICE	2	2	0%
TOTAL	19	16	-16%
25TH POLICE DISTRICT	2007	2008	% Change
POLICE AUTO ACCIDENTS	45	37	-18%
RESISTING ARREST	8	4	-50%
ASSAULT ON POLICE	26	27	4%
TOTAL	79	68	-14%

COMPARSION 2007	7TH	25TH	% Change
POLICE AUTO ACCIDENTS	15	45	200%
RESISTING ARREST	2	8	300%
ASSAULT ON POLICE	2	26	1200%
TOTAL	19	79	316%

COMPARSION 2008	7TH	25TH	% Change
POLICE AUTO ACCIDENTS	13	37	185%
RESISTING ARREST	1	4	300%
ASSAULT ON POLICE	2	27	1250%
TOTAL	16	68	325%

Numbers compiled from Philadelphia Police Department INCT Reporting System

Summary:		7	
Population			
Total Population			% base
Population/square mile	6,763.40		
Land area (square miles)	12		
Urban	84,453	100%	
Rural	0	0%	
Farm	0	0%	
Nonfarm	0	0%	
Population by Household Type		84,453	% base
In family households	68,582	81%	
In nonfamily households	13,860	16%	
In group quarters	2,012	2%	
Population by Race		84,453	% base
One Race	83,071	98%	
White	73,551	87%	

Black or African American	2,640	3%
American Indian & Alaska Native	60	0%
Asian	5,612	7%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	54	0%
Other race	1,153	1%
Two or more races	1,383	2%

Hispanic or Latino Origin by Race	2,692	% base
One Race	2,535	94%
White	1,452	54%
Black or African American	65	2%
American Indian & Alaska Native	22	1%
Asian	24	1%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	4	0%
Other race	968	36%
Two or more races	158	6%

Summary:		25	
Population			
Total Population	73,932	%	base
Population/square mile	17,394.10		
Land area (square miles)	4		
Urban	73,932	100%	
Rural	0	0%	
Farm	0	0%	
Nonfarm	0	0%	
Population by Household Type	73,932	%	base
In family households	66,563	90%	
In nonfamily households	6,433	9%	
In group quarters	936	1%	

Population by Race		
	73,932	% base
One Race	70,147	95%
White	16,769	23%
Black or African American	25,423	34%
American Indian & Alaska Native	273	0%
Asian	2,493	3%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	92	0%
Other race	25,097	34%
Two or more races	3,785	5%

Hispanic or Latino Origin by Race		
	40,546	% base
One Race	38,090	94%
White	10,718	26%
Black or African American	1,945	5%
American Indian & Alaska Native	136	0%
Asian	276	1%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	0	0%

Other race	25,016	62%
Two or more races	2,455	6%
Unemployment rate	21.20%	
Male unemployment rate	20.90%	
Female unemployment rate	21.50%	

Statistics obtained from Philadelphia Police Department Research and Planning Unit – Statistical Section

Annex D Crimes per officer

	OFFICER	LT	SGT	PART ONE CRIME	PART ONE VIOLENT	PART ONE PROPERTY	PART ONE PER OFFICER	VIOLENT CRIME PER OFFICER	PROPERTY CRIME PER OFFICER	Officer PER Supervisor	Officer PER Sgt	
7TH DISTRICT	98	4	12	1789	255	1534	18.26	2.60	15.65	6.13	8.17	
25TH DISTRICT	214	3	12	4884	1525	3359	22.82	7.13	15.70	14.27	17.83	
			11	(1 Sgt Restricted Duty)							15.29	19.45

Numbers compiled from Philadelphia Police Department INCT Reporting System

Annex E

	OFFICER	LT	SGT	Vehicle Invest	Veh Invest per officer	Ped Invest	Ped Invest per officer	Arrests	Arrests per officer
7TH DISTRICT	98	4	12	15,015	153.21	3,770	38.47	546	5.57
25TH DISTRICT	214	3	12	25,145	117.5	20,403	95.34	7,473	34.92
			11	(1 Sgt Restricted Duty)					

Numbers compiled from Philadelphia Police Department INCT Reporting System and Internal Affairs Division data

Annex F accidents/complaints per officer

	OFFICER	LT	SGT	Total Incidents	Police Accidents	Citizen Complaints	Incidents PER OFFICER	Pol Accid PER OFFICER	Complaints PER OFFICER	SUPERVISOR PER OFFICER	SGT PER OFFICER
7TH DISTRICT	98	4	12	51015	7	8	520.56	0.07	0.08	6.13	8.17
25TH DISTRICT	214	3	12	144281	37	34	674.21	0.17	0.16	14.27	17.83
				11 (1 Sgt Restricted Duty)						15.29	19.45

Numbers compiled from Philadelphia Police Department INCT Reporting System

Annex G



Abington Township Police Department Policy and Procedure Manual

Chapter:	Organization	General Order:	11.2.1
Section:	Unity of Command	Original Date:	050104
Title:	Member Accountability	Re-Issue Date:	090107
Issued By:	William J. Kelly, Chief of Police	Reevaluation Date:	090110
Signature:		Expiration Date:	Indefinite
Replaces:	All Previous General Orders Relative to Subject		
Distribution:	All Members	Total Pages:	2
CALEA Standard References:	11.2.1, 11.2.2		
Pennsylvania Accreditation References:			

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this general order is to provide members with guidelines on the member accountability.

II. POLICY

See General Order: 11.1.1 - Policy Statement

III. **PROCEDURE**

A. Accountability to Supervision (11.2.1)

1. All employees will be accountable to only one supervisor at any given time.
2. Occasions may arise requiring a supervisor to issue an order to an employee outside the supervisor's immediate responsibility. Nothing in this section shall prevent this. If the order conflicts with a previous order, the procedure set in General Order: 12.1.3 - Obedience to Orders shall be followed.

B. Direct Command, Component (11.2.2)

1. Each Division and Unit of the Police Department is under the direct command of only one supervisor.
2. Members shall not bypass their immediate chain of command unless urgent or immediate circumstances dictate a departure from this general order.
3. Supervisors will have a reasonable number of employees under their immediate command and control. Except under unusual or emergency conditions, this number will not exceed twelve employees.

Annex H

Phone Interview with Captain Jon Peters, City of Los Angeles Police Department, Wednesday 5-27-09

Q. What is the span of control in the LAPD?

A. Generally, the department attempts to maintain a ratio of 8 officers to 1 sergeant with 7 to 1 being optimal.

Q. Does the LAPD have a policy setting these criteria?

A. No, there is no official policy, but the department tries to maintain a reasonable span of control of 7 or 8 officers to 1 sergeant with 10 officers to one sergeant maximum. The LAPD tries to keep the span of control as close to the NIMS/ICS model as possible. The tighter span of control is based on the findings of the Rampart CRASH unit corruption investigation. As one of the supervisors in that unit, 21 officers were under my direct supervision. One of the positives that came out of the scandal was that it illustrated the need for tight spans of control.

Q. How does the department address the need for additional supervisors in an assignment?

A. The department utilizes promotions and re-deployment of supervisors. Currently, my area, the North Hollywood station has 23 sergeants for 181 total police officers, with a span of control of 8 officers per sergeant.

Every deployment period (28 days) a department wide transfer is published by our Office of Operations in which all vacancies are filled. So if I lose a sergeant, they send me another one to fill my vacancy. If that means they have to promote someone off the current eligibility list then they do it. Office of Operations has a Field Deployment Unit that works closely with our Personnel Division to monitor all vacancies City wide. This is how we are able to meet that one to seven or eight ratio on a consistent basis.

Also, as a reminder, Valley Bureau is made up of seven geographic divisions or stations: Topanga, Devonshire, Mission, North Hollywood, Foothill, Van Nuys, and West Valley.

ANNEX I DEPARTMENT SWORN STRENGTH - AUTHORIZED TO (AU), ADJUSTED TO (ADJ) AND DEPLOYED (DEP)

	SGT 1			PO 3+1			PO 3			PO 2/ PO 1		
	AU	ADJ	DEP	AU	ADJ	DEP	AU	ADJ	DEP	AU	ADJ	DEP
VNY	27	27	27	7	7	7	57	55	45		123	120
WVAL	23	23	25	6	6	6	52	52	43		109	101
NHWD	23	23	26	8	9	8	60	58	44		114	107
FTHL	23	23	24	6	6	6	51	51	41		113	104
DEV	23	23	24	6	6	5	50	50	39		118	112
MISN	32	32	35	8	8	7	61	56	48		164	172
TOP	23	23	23	7	7	6	64	64	51		112	110
VTD	9	9	9	8	8	6	14	14	9		100	88
BONUS	9	9	9								75	74

Annex J

Electronic Interview with Lt. Eugene Vann, Jr., Policy & Procedures Section, Research & Development Division, Chicago Police Department, Chicago, IL April 21, 2009

Not a problem. Say "Hi" to Chuck Ramsey for me when you see him.

Lt. Eugene Vann, Jr.

Policy & Procedures Section

Research & Development Division

312-745-6071 ext. 84249

Fax 312-745-6932

From: Steve Clark [mailto:stephen.clark371@verizon.net]

Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2009 7:54 AM

To: Vann Jr, Eugene G.

Subject: Re: RE: RE: Request for Information on Span of Control

Thank you very much! This information is very helpful. Similar to the way we work; we just need more sergeants in patrol. Is it ok with you if I use this in my staff study, with the info credited to you and the Chicago PD? As I said it is part of the Northwestern University class School of Police Staff and Command class#277.

Steve Clark

Apr 21, 2009 12:26:01 PM, Eugene.VannJr@chicagopolice.org wrote:

We do not. How many officers a sergeant supervises is more dependent on how many sergeants are working and how generous the watch commander is in giving time off. Our tactical teams generally have one sergeant to eight officers but watch sergeants span of control varies. Our supervisors log has room for nine beat (cars) or 18 names. It is not uncommon to use two or more log sheets.

“Normal” staffing would be eight to ten. Again, nothing written, just the discretion of the watch commander (captain). If we are short sergeants, we sometimes “borrow” from a neighboring district. As you are aware, NIMS would have a span of control much lower.

Lt. Eugene Vann, Jr.

Policy & Procedures Section

Research & Development Division

312-745-6071 ext. 84249

Fax 312-745-6932

From: Steve Clark [mailto:stephen.clark371@verizon.net]

Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2009 12:06 PM

To: Vann Jr, Eugene G.

Subject: Re: RE: Request for Information on Span of Control

Lt. Vann,

Thanks for your speedy reply. I am enrolled in the Northwestern University School of Police Staff and Command. I am preparing a staff study on supervisory staffing and span of control. Currently, in the district in which I work, there are 18 police officers per sergeant. I was inquiring to determine if Chicago PD had any staffing or span of control criteria for patrol districts, i.e. does Chicago have any orders or policies specifying the maximum number of employees per supervisor.

Thanks,
Steve Clark
Lieutenant
Phila. PD

Apr 21, 2009 11:41:01 AM, Eugene.VannJr@chicagopolice.org wrote:

The Chicago Police Department does not have any policies specifically regarding span of control. Perhaps, if I knew a little bit more about the issue you are looking at, I could be of further help.

Lt. Eugene Vann, Jr.
Policy & Procedures Section

Research & Development Division
312-745-6071 ext. 84249
Fax 312-745-6932

-----Original Message-----

From: webcrew
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2009 11:26 AM
To: Vann Jr, Eugene G.
Subject: FW: Request for Information on Span of Control

From: Steve Clark [stephen.clark371@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2009 8:24 AM
To: police@cityofchicago.org
Subject: Request for Information on Span of Control

To Whom It May Concern,

Greetings. I am a lieutenant in the Philadelphia Police Department, 25th Police District, and am currently conducting a staff study on supervisory staffing and span of control issues. I am respectfully requesting any copies of policies the Chicago Police Department may have on span of control. If so, could you please e-mail any information to the enclosed e-mail address. I can also be reached on my mobile 215-605-7056. Thank you in advance for any information or help you can provide.

Respectfully,

Stephen L. Clark
Lieutenant #371
Philadelphia Police Department
25th Police District
3901 Whitaker Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19124
ph# 215-686-3250/51

Annex K

AGREEMENT

Between

THE BOROUGH OF EATONTOWN

And

NEW JERSEY STATE POLICEMEN'S BENEVOLENT
ASSOCIATION, INC., LOCAL NO. 305

EFFECTIVE: January 1, 2008 through December 31, 2011

ARTICLE 21

SALARIES

Section 3. A police officer shall receive Sergeant's pay for time served in that capacity when placed in charge of a shift as a Road Supervisor for a minimum of two hours.

ANNEX L

Philadelphia Police Department

(Proposed) Directive 138

Supervisory Span of Control

Purpose

The purpose of this directive is to establish the number of supervisors to be assigned to districts and units of the department.

Policy

The department requires adequate supervision, direction, and guidance of personnel in patrol and front-line assignments. In order to maintain direction and control of normal daily operations, supervisors must have a manageable span of control. Except under unusual or exigent circumstances, no more than twelve [12] employees in patrol or front-line assignments shall be under the immediate control of a supervisor in normal daily operations. The Police Commissioner shall have the ability to modify any component of this directive.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Need for Supervisory Staffing Criteria for Patrol Positions in the Philadelphia Police Department 25th District

Problem

The Philadelphia Police Department currently has no policy or criteria for manageable span of control in the deployment and staffing of supervisory positions in patrol assignments. This is best illustrated in drawing comparisons between the 7th and 25th Districts. The 25th District has 214 police officers with 12 sergeants and 3 lieutenants assigned. Conversely, the 7th District has 99 police officers with 12 sergeants and 4 lieutenants. The span of control for a sergeant [first line supervisor] in the 25th District is 17.8 police officers to 1 sergeant. In the 7th District, this same span of control is 8.3 to 1.

The current practice creates demanding span of control issues for sergeants. The situation is further exacerbated by the more intense workload faced by officers and sergeants in patrol assignments such as the 25th District.

Possible Solutions

1. Promotion of officers to the rank of sergeant using the existing promotional process. However, this is prohibited by the current budget crisis for the City of Philadelphia.
2. Designating senior officers as “acting” supervisors on a rotating basis as the need arises also helps to narrow span of control issues. The logistics of selecting and training viable candidates could be problematic.
3. Shifting or re-deployment of sergeants from one district or unit to another to tighten the gaps in span of control would alleviate staffing issues.

Recommendation

The Philadelphia Police Department should develop a policy for span of control and the staffing of sergeant positions in patrol assignments. Furthermore, in order to address span of control issues in patrol districts the Philadelphia Police Department should identify districts with large spans of control and re-deploy supervisors from districts and units with smaller spans of control lower levels of crime and police activity.