



Law Enforcement Challenge

Adjudication Manual

Updated March 31, 2010

Executive Summery

The Law Enforcement Challenge judging system is a means to encourage and reward creativity, commitment and excellence in traffic safety education and enforcement while providing a vehicle that will educate agencies that have just begun their traffic safety efforts in such a way that they will grow and understand and evolve to the greatest level of their potential.

A Challenge judge functions on three levels. It is our intent that this system will encourage, reward and acknowledge the traffic safety efforts each agency has conducted, not only within their agency, but also within their community. Judges should:

- **Encourage** - the small and beginning agencies
- **Appreciate** - the achievements and efforts of the experienced and developed agencies
- **Learn** – from the well developed and fully operational traffic safety programs/agencies

The system acknowledges the joint efforts of the entire agency in a single goal, to save lives through policy, training, rewards, recognition, and public information and enforcement.

This system utilizes a method of subjective evaluation that rewards the achievements of positive qualities and offers continued encouragement to strive for greater achievement. This is a positive system rewarding successful efforts at every level, and is designed to encourage agencies to develop, maintain and project an aggressive and positive traffic safety program within the department and the community. Therefore, we emphasize creativity, originality and excellence.

Philosophy of the Scoring System

This system is a means to encourage and reward new standards of creativity, commitment and excellence in traffic safety education and enforcement while providing a vehicle that will educate agencies that have just begun their traffic safety efforts in such a way that they will grow and understand and evolve to the greatest level of their potential.

It is our intent that this system will encourage, reward and acknowledge the traffic safety efforts each agency has conducted, not only within their agency, but also within their community. The system acknowledges the joint efforts of the entire agency in a single goal, to save lives through policy, training, rewards, recognition, and public information and enforcement.

This system utilizes a method of subjective evaluation that rewards the achievements of positive qualities and offers continued encouragement to strive for greater achievement. This is a positive system rewarding successful efforts at every level, and is designed to encourage agencies to develop, maintain and project an aggressive and positive traffic safety program within the department and the community. Therefore, we emphasize creativity, originality and excellence.

Growth and innovation are to be rewarded and must be achieved with quality and positive results to receive a maximum score.

Numbers assigned by a judge should reflect the successful achievement of a certain criteria. The system is educational and WILL reward agencies based on accomplishments.

Philosophy of Judging

We, as judges, are extremely close to some of the agencies we adjudicate, especially on a local and state level. State coordinators and Law Enforcement Liaisons work with these agencies to ensure they have the tools they need to get the job done. We share in their growth and we take on the responsibility of giving them input for improvement. Sometimes we talk directly to the head of the agency and sometimes we talk to the traffic officers to help them understand what is being asked of them and what they need to make a comprehensive traffic safety program. Many of us are not isolated from the competitors we grade. Because of this we need to look at the judging process.

The Challenge program is a competition, and our job as judges is to RATE & RANK each competitor. Because it is a competition, it is sometimes confused with an evaluation or assessment program. The Challenge was designed as a reward and recognition program to recognize agencies for traffic safety activities. The agencies that do the best job are the ones that take home the awards, but **EVERY AGENCY** is to be recognized for its life saving activities. It is not our position to question or belittle the information provided. Our job is first to RATE and second to RANK in order those agencies that stand out as exceptional examples.

Many judges have been on the receiving end of the Challenge judging in the past and know what it's like to feel the stinging indifference of a judge who didn't seem to care if we grew or not. Some have seen the comments on the sheets that have helped us grow because the judge went just a little beyond to explain and help us grow our traffic safety programs. Most of us are basically motivated to give something back and assist each agency grow, develop and save lives in their community.

A Judge functions on three levels. Agencies with limited traffic safety knowledge and activities require us to be teachers. Our comments will be "How to" clinics in the basics of traffic safety. This must be done with patience -- setting a logical progression of development for them to follow.

We must offer encouragement when they are unsure what comprehensive traffic education and enforcement entails and enthusiasm when they show some level of success. Some of these agencies are new at the traffic game and remember that these agencies are where many of us were some 10 or more years ago.

Deal with them in basic terms. Without encouragement and enthusiasm for their successes, growth could be impaired. The nurturing process at this level is of vital importance to ensure growth.

At the second level we deal with agencies that have been around for a few years, very involved in traffic safety and the Challenge program. They may have achieved some success and believe that they are ready to move to the next level. Here we find ourselves dealing with a majority of agencies in the Challenge program. They are convinced of their expertise and often reluctant to accept the fact that they have anything to learn. At this point, judges find themselves in the role of "counselor". This role requires the most patience, the strongest concern and the greatest amount of effort.

Finally, there are the agencies that have grown and truly have a fully functional comprehensive traffic safety program. They show moments of brilliance in the traffic safety plan they have designed and the execution of that plan is outstanding. They have it all together, surpassing the teacher, outgrown the counselor and look to us to be the objective judge. At this point we must challenge them; encourage them to set even higher goals and standards. We must be professional, concerned and supportive.

Law Enforcement has always demanded total commitment to whatever we do. With the many different priorities on our radar screen any given day, traffic safety tends to fall off or is pushed back to the back of the very long list of things to do. Despite these competing priorities the Challenge agencies that enter always try to give 100% into their traffic safety efforts. Superior judges also give more than 100%. We expect these agencies to be professional – so must we be professional. We expect them to respect us – so must we respect them. Demand no less of yourself than is demanded of each agency.

Judge with your head, with your heart and in a positive, nurturing, and challenging manner as you contribute to the growth and development of these traffic safety programs and agencies.

- **Encourage** - the small and beginning agencies
- **Appreciate** - the achievements and efforts of the experienced and developed agencies
- **Learn** – from the well developed and fully operational traffic safety programs/agencies

Judging General

Instructions & Procedures

Each agency's submission will be evaluated by two judges with the average of the two scores placed on the sheet. This is a change from previous years because of the numbers of entries and reduced number of judges. Judges will award a first, second and third place for each category with the exception of the special award categories. If a tie occurs in the top three places, the review panel will leave the tie to be determined by the Highway Safety Committee. The committee may or may not break the tie. There will be NO ties for special awards categories. (If the first of two judges score is less than 60 total points then the second judge will not judge that application)

One judging team will be chosen at the end of the week to determine the Clayton Hall Memorial Award. Because of the evolution of the Law Enforcement Challenge over the years, it has become apparent that choosing an "overall – Best of the Best" has become difficult to determine when judging the different types of agencies in competition for the award. Judges will look at ALL of the Hall agencies and pick ONE agency that designs and executes the best comprehensive traffic safety programs despite size and type. An agency is eligible for this award only once in a five-year period and ties are not allowed.

Special awards, Speed, DUI, Occupant Protection, CPS etc..., will only be considered if the agency has a special tab in the back of the application outlining the special award nomination. If an agency has requested to be considered for a special award and there IS a special section highlighting that award, then the judges should place that nomination in the appropriate judging area after they are done the overall judging.

Prior to the Judging

- Review the Challenge application and judging criteria.
- Review the Judging Manual and scoring criteria.
- Review the score sheet.
- Always have Judging Manual available for quick reference.

Duties

- Judges are to rank the agencies.
- Judges are to rate the units by the comparative scores earned during the course of the contest.
- Judges are to aid the agencies to improve through comments via the score sheet.

Conduct

- All judges are expected to maintain an impartial attitude at all times. They should refrain from discussing the judging outcome until the Highway Safety Committee releases the final results.
- Judges WILL NOT judge any category in which their agency is competing.
- Judges are encouraged to talk to each other and ensure that each is looking at the agencies entry using similar tolerances. (Different scores are expected but each team should ensure they are finding the same information or materials)
- Judges can make changes on the sheet if needed, but the judges should initial the changes made.

During the Judging

- Use a ranking tote sheet of the agencies to assure sub-caption ranking.
- Keep brief, clear notes on each agency's presentation.
- All discrepancies should be discussed with the program coordinator.

Challenge Score Management Guide

Policy & Guidelines (20 possible points)

5 Points for each policy (They have or do not have policies we do not judge the policy content)

NOTE: If an agency did not include them then they failed to follow the directions of the application and should be docked in the quality of submission section of the score sheet.

NEW NATIONAL REQUIERMENTS: Applicants **MUST provide an actual copy** of there polices and guidelines for safety belt use within the agency as well as enforcement policies and guidelines for safety belt, child passenger safety restraints, impaired driving, and speed.

Judges need to see the policy along with critical information such as the date it was written, title, etc. DO NOT just type in the wording of your policy – a copy of the actual policy is required!

Include only the page(s) with the necessary information, not the entire policy. If your belt use policy is one page of a 14-page policy, you only need to include one page.

Points

0 – 4	5	10	15	20
<i>Agency Indicated they have policies on application but no evidence of any polices</i>	<i>Agency has one of the requested policies, and they are present in presentation</i>	<i>Agency has two of the requested policies, and they are present in presentation</i>	<i>Agency has three of the requested policies, and they are present in presentation</i>	<i>Agency has all four of the requested policies, and they are present in presentation</i>

If the policies are checked and none are present then the judge may elect to score each in box one. Example:

If agency X indicates they have all of the policies but fails to include them then the judge could score as follows.

Belt Use policy **1 to 4 Point(s)** **or** **0 points**

Belt Enforcement policy **1 to 4 Point(s)** **or** **0 points**

Speed Enforcement policy **1 to 4 Point(s)** **or** **0 points**

DUI Enforcement policy **1 to 4 Point(s)** **or** **0 points**

This is a judge's discretion but, be consistent. If you give agencies points from box one for having a policy but not including it then do it for all. If you give no points for no policies then do that throughout the judging process.

Training (20 possible points)

You can use the following scale to assist you in placing a score for this section. Use your experience and expertise in the traffic safety field to rate the agencies training activities.

Points

0 – 4	5- 8	9 – 13	14 - 17	18 - 20
Seldom (Poor)	Rarely (Fair)	Sometimes (Good)	Frequently (Excellent)	Constantly (Superior)
<i>Training is lacking in previous years activities- and overall training in traffic safety issues not conducted or documented</i>	<i>The training in past year was sporadic and incomplete, not covering all target training objectives (OP, Speed, DUI) Issues were rarely addressed or documented</i>	<i>Training in the past year shows a good commitment to the cause incorporates all the target objectives but is still a work in progress with only some officers receiving the well rounded training needed</i>	<i>Training in the past year shows a broad and varied delivery method and commitment & they address all the target objectives. There is an increased level of awareness agency wide because of the training</i>	<i>Training in the past year shows a constant commitment to traffic safety. Incorporates all target objectives through a variety of training at ALL levels. There is a constant connection to the agency & the target issues due to the training conducted</i>

Public Information & Education (40 possible points)

Agencies provide a written narrative of ALL of the PI&E efforts conducted in the previous year. This includes all traffic safety activities targeting the three major target areas.

Points

0 - 8	9 - 16	17 - 24	25 - 32	33 - 40
Seldom (Poor)	Rarely (Fair)	Sometimes (Good)	Frequently (Excellent)	Constantly (Superior)
<p><i>PI & E is lacking in previous years activities- and overall PI & E in traffic safety issues is seldom conducted or documented. No indication or evidence of national or state mobilizations conducted</i></p>	<p><i>The PI & E in past year was sporadic and incomplete, not covering all target training objectives (OP, Speed, DUI) Issues were rarely addressed or documented. No evidence of national or state mobilizations conducted</i></p>	<p><i>PI & E in the past year shows a good commitment to the cause incorporates all the target objectives but is still a work in progress with only limited community involvement and support. Some evidence of participation in mobilizations.</i></p>	<p><i>PI & E in the past year shows a broad and varied delivery method and commitment. They address all the target objectives. There is an increased level of awareness in the community because of the frequent activities and presentations. The agency is a committed partner in the mobilizations and documents their activities.</i></p>	<p><i>PI & E in the past year shows a constant commitment to traffic safety. Incorporates all target objectives through a variety of PI & E at ALL levels. There is a constant connection to the community & the target issues due to the PI & E conducted. They highlight their involvement in the mobilizations and use them to constantly motivate and educate the public</i></p>

Enforcement Activity

40 possible points: Occupant Protection = 10, Speed = 10 & DUI = 10, Enforcement Efforts = 10

Calculating Enforcement Activity Consistently

This is provided to you as a guide to assist you in determining how to calculate enforcement activities. This guide will ensure consistency between judges. Your scores may or may not be exactly the same but they should be based on a consistent application of calculations from one judge to the next. This calculation also takes into account the community seat belt usage rate. (The higher the usage rate the more difficult it is to write tickets)

Enforcement Activity – Scoring Methodology

The methodology used to establish scoring criteria was based upon a random sample of local law enforcement agencies from all size and classification categories. This random sample was used to make inferences about the general law enforcement population characteristics.

From an assortment of Law Enforcement Challenge applications, data was obtained in following categories:

- Total Number of Sworn Personnel
- Total number of uniformed officers working on the street
- Number of seat belt citations and Number of Child seat Citations (*Seat Belts*)
- Number of Speeding Citations (*Speed*)
- Number of Impaired Driving Arrests (*DUI*)

The data for all agencies was tallied and distributed within each of the aforementioned categories. The **Mean (\bar{x})**, **Simple Standard Deviation (σ)**, and **Standard Deviation of the Mean (μ), or *SDOM*** were calculated using the following formulas:

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{n} \quad \sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (x - \bar{x})^2}{n-1}} \quad \mu = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}$$

Within each data sample, outliers (extreme high and extreme low values) were identified. The outliers were removed, typically the highest and lowest values, yielding a more accurate data distribution curve.

Each agency's score was calculated in 3 of the scoring categories:

- 1. Seat Belts**
- 2. Speed**
- 3. DUI**

The 4th category, *Enforcement Efforts*, will be determined on a scale of 1-10 based upon the judge's interpretation of the agency's enforcement efforts. Factors include, but are not limited to checkpoints, legality of checkpoints in the agency's jurisdiction, enforcement initiatives, and special enforcement efforts targeting traffic related issues.

The raw score for *Seat Belts* was computed by
$$\frac{(SeatBeltCitations) + (ChildSeatCitations)}{PatrolOficers} * (SeatBeltCompliance\% * 0.1)$$

The raw score for *Speed* was computed by
$$\frac{(SpeedCitations)}{PatrolOficers}$$

The raw score for *DUI* was computed by
$$\frac{(DUICitations)}{PatrolOficers}$$

After the raw score for each of the 3 scoring categories was computed, they were then categorized into a range. The range distribution was determined by

- Superior: Raw score is $> \bar{x} + 3 u$
- Excellent: Raw score is $> \bar{x} + 2 u$
- Good: Raw score is $> \bar{x} \pm u$
- Fair: Raw score is $> \bar{x} - 2 u$
- Poor: Raw score is $> \bar{x} - 3 u$

Each judge may use the raw score range to assign a number value based on the 1-10 point scale.

- Superior: "9-10"
- Excellent: "7-8"
- Good: "5-6"
- Fair: "3-4"
- Poor: "1-2"

Each judge will assign a number (1 to 10) in the following categories: *Seat Belts*, *Speed*, *DUI*, and *Enforcement Efforts*, for a total (40 points possible).

Tickets written per PATROL officer LAST Year's Tickets

0 to 10.7	10.7 to 14.4	14.4 to 18.1	18.1 to 21.8	21.8+
1 -2 Points	3 -4 Points	5 -6 Points	7 - 8 Points	9 -10 Points
Seldom (Poor)	Rarely (Fair)	Sometimes (Good)	Frequently (Excellent)	Constantly (Superior)
<i>Tickets were seldom written or addressed per officer for 3 month period.</i>	<i>Officers rarely addressed seat belts at traffic contacts during reporting period</i>	<i>Officers do a relatively good job of addressing OP issues and sometimes write tickets but have not incorporated it into regular activities</i>	<i>Officers frequently address OP issues at traffic stops and write tickets regularly for these violations. Conducting several enforcement activities throughout the reporting period</i>	<i>Officers constantly address OP issues at traffic stops and write tickets for these violations. Conducting many different enforcement activities throughout the reporting period</i>

Judges Note: Now that you have the range you must determine where the score should be, an agency with high enforcement numbers and a secondary law could possibly score higher than an agency with the same enforcement numbers with a primary law. Taking all of the enforcement issues into account the judge should select what they believe is the appropriate score for this caption.

You now have a score for the Occupant Protection Enforcement Efforts from 1-10 points.

Speed Enforcement

Use the following chart to determine the number of points to give an agency for Speed Enforcement numbers.

Tickets

0 to 22.1	22.1 to 30.0	30.0 to 37.9	37.9 to 45.8	45.8+
1 -2 Points	3 -4 Points	5 -6 Points	7 - 8 Points	9 -10 Points
Seldom (Poor)	Rarely (Fair)	Sometimes (Good)	Frequently (Excellent)	Constantly (Superior)
<i>Tickets were seldom written or addressed per officer for 3 month period.</i>	<i>Officers rarely addressed speed at traffic contacts during reporting period</i>	<i>Officers do a relatively good job of addressing speed issues and sometimes write tickets but have not incorporated it into regular activities</i>	<i>Officers frequently address speed issues at traffic stops and write tickets regularly for these violations. Conducting several enforcement activities throughout the reporting period</i>	<i>Officers constantly address speed issues at traffic stops and write tickets for these violations. Conducting many different enforcement activities throughout the reporting time</i>

DUI Enforcement Calculation

Use the following chart to determine the number of points to give an agency for DUI Arrest numbers.

DUI Arrests

0 to 5.9	5.9 to 7.2	7.2 to 8.5	8.5 to 9.8	9.8+
1 -2 Points	3 -4 Points	5 -6 Points	7 - 8 Points	9 -10 Points
Seldom (Poor)	Rarely (Fair)	Sometimes (Good)	Frequently (Excellent)	Constantly (Superior)
<i>Arrests were rare for DUI for 3 month period. No Special enforcement efforts were conducted targeting this violation</i>	<i>Officers rarely addressed DUI during reporting period with enforcement efforts rarely conducted targeting these violations</i>	<i>Officers do a relatively good job of detecting and arresting DUIs and sometimes conduct enforcement efforts targeting this issue but have not incorporated it into regular activities</i>	<i>Officers frequently address DUI enforcement issues at traffic stops and arrest regularly for these violations. Conducting several targeted enforcement activities throughout the reporting period</i>	<i>Officers constantly address DUI issues at traffic stops and arrest violators constantly. Conducting many different and diverse DUI and Alcohol enforcement activities throughout the reporting period</i>

The remaining 10 points should be given for the types of enforcement efforts they have conducted. Look at the number of checkpoints and enforcement initiatives they have conducted and what results. Did they conduct different types of enforcement efforts throughout the year and during the mobilizations? How many? Did they document these events in the enforcement area? The descriptions of each of the above 5 boxes should reflect what the agency accomplished in this area.

Remember, checkpoints may be prohibited by state law and / or agency policy in some areas. This should not be a factor, if they do other special targeted enforcement activities to offset this restriction.

Enforcement Activities

1 -2 Points	3 -4 Points	5 -6 Points	7 - 8 Points	9 -10 Points
Seldom (Poor)	Rarely (Fair)	Sometimes (Good)	Frequently (Excellent)	Constantly (Superior)
<i>Enforcement efforts were seldom done or documentation of these events was not presented</i>	<i>Agency rarely addressed the target enforcement efforts with special efforts, checkpoints or patrols or did not completely document these events</i>	<i>Agency did a relatively good job of addressing the enforcement issues and sometimes write tickets but have not incorporated any regular selective patrols, checkpoints or special efforts</i>	<i>Agency frequently conducted special enforcement activities throughout the reporting period with a good blend of patrols and or checkpoints and efforts</i>	<i>Agency constantly addresses issues Conducting many different enforcement activities throughout the reporting period. They aggressively contact special enforcement efforts and patrols targeting traffic related issues</i>

Calculating Total Enforcement Activity

Taking the Occupant Restraint Score (1-10 Points) Add
 Speed Enforcement Score (1-10 Points) Add
 DUI Enforcement Score (1-10 Points) Add
 Enforcement Activities (1-10 Points) =

Total Enforcement Score (1 to 40 Points)

Example:

Occupant Protection	10
Speed	6
DUI	8
Enforcement Activities	10

Total Enforcement Score 34

How Effective Were You? (40 possible points)

The secret to this section is very simple: do the research and find the numbers. This is not only important to complete your challenge application but also data that will help you evaluate and build your entire traffic safety programs. This section can be used as barometer on how well your agency is doing.

Points

0 - 8	9 - 16	17 - 24	25 - 32	33 - 40
Seldom (Poor)	Rarely (Fair)	Sometimes (Good)	Frequently (Excellent)	Constantly (Superior)
<p><i>Effectiveness of program is unclear and no or little information was provided to evaluate effectiveness of their programs</i></p>	<p><i>Effectiveness of past years programs were sporadic and incomplete, not covering all target objectives (OP, Speed, DUI) These issues were rarely addressed or documented.</i></p>	<p><i>Effectiveness of past years programs shows a good commitment to the cause incorporates all the target objectives but is still a work in progress with only limited information provided.</i></p>	<p><i>Effectiveness of past year shows a broad and varied delivery method and commitment. They address all the target objectives. There is an increased level of awareness in the community because of the frequent activities. The agency documents their activities well tracking results and outcomes</i></p>	<p><i>Effectiveness of past year shows a constant commitment to traffic safety. Incorporates all target objectives through a variety of PI & E and enforcement at ALL levels and has the effectiveness data to show it. They show a significant impact through their programs and have community and political support to show for it.</i></p>

Quality of Submission (15 possible points)

The following questions will be considered and a score for presentation will be awarded by the judges.

How well did they organize the application? (Submission should follow the order of the application) How much effort did they expended in preparing the application, was it easy to find! Is all the information clearly provided and is it creatively presented?

Points

0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 9	10 - 12	13 - 15
Seldom (Poor)	Rarely (Fair)	Sometimes (Good)	Frequently (Excellent)	Constantly (Superior)
Agency made little effort to organize and present the materials. They left many of the reporting criteria blank or provided little or no support documentation	They rarely followed the application order and made some attempt to present the information however provided some miss information or unclear information to judge. Numerous mistakes and left out information was distracting to presentation	The agency made a good attempt to provide the information in a clear concise way with most of the information provided in an orderly and creative way. They address All objectives but is still a work in progress with only some small gaps in the information provided.	They completed their presentation with all the required elements and presented it in a creative and organized way. They address all the target objectives. They documented their activities well tracking results and outcomes with little question they are committed to traffic safety	There presentation shows a constant commitment to traffic safety. Incorporates all target objectives in an organized and clear way adding to the effectiveness of their programs. All materials were covered with more then enough information to help the judge understand what activities this agency conducts.

