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Cynthia Lum and Christopher Koper are both associate professors in the Department of Criminology, Law and Society at George Mason University. Lum served in the Baltimore Police Department for five years and is now the director of the Centre for Evidence-Based Crime Policy (CEBCP) at the university. Koper has worked for the Police Executive Research Forum, the RAND Corporation, and the Police Foundation, and is senior fellow at the CEBCP. He is also the creator of the Koper Curve, a principal that guides the patrolling of crime hot spots. Together, with Cody Telep, who was a research student at George Mason, Lum and Koper developed the evidence-based policing (EBP) matrix and it is the matrix in particular rather than evidence-based policing more generally that is the subject of this monograph.

EBP is the implementation of valid and reliable research into police policy and procedure. The matrix is a means of making research findings readily accessible to law enforcement agencies. Part One of the book introduces EBP and the matrix. The matrix comprises a user-friendly summary of 146 research findings, serving as the basis for guiding future solutions to crime problems courtesy of the general principles the authors derive from the accumulated research.

Part Two of the book comprises detailed discussions of several successful interventions, including the Koper Curve, which is Koper’s finding that police officers can maximise the crime reduction effect of their patrolling by spending 10–15 min in micro hotspots during
their non-committed time. Part Three is the most significant and most substantial section of the work. It presents the methods by which the research represented in the matrix can be implemented. Here, the goal is institutionalisation ‘so that officers view operations informed by research knowledge as “business as usual”’ (p. 150). There are four strategies examined in detail: professional development, playbooks, case of place investigations, and crime analysis. Part Four is a single chapter on translational criminology, a self-reflexive branch of criminological study that explores how and why some, but not all, academic-law enforcement partnerships are successful.

This volume is a landmark contribution to both criminology and police studies, but there are two causes for concern: the role of the standard model of policing (SMP) and the practicality of some of the translation from theory to practice. Lum and Koper define the SMP (also known as the professional, traditional, or reactive model) in terms of the following features: (1) a police department is divided into geographical units on the basis of population density; and (2) within these divisions police officers are allocated beats (3) in which they patrol or respond to calls for service (4) while exercising a high level of discretion and being subject to low levels of supervision. The authors maintain that almost everything is wrong with this model, beginning with its essentially reactive nature. They claim that there is no necessary relationship between proactivity and effectiveness, but they use the descriptive terms proactive and reactive consistently with respectively positive and negative evaluative connotations throughout their work. There is a strong implication, which becomes explicit at times, that the SMP is preventing, rather than enabling, police departments in achieving goals, such as crime reduction. The strongest evidence of this bias is in Chapter 7, where detectives are criticised for being reactive even though a detective’s job is to identify and apprehend individuals responsible for crimes that have already been committed. There are
two problems with this emphasis on proactive tactics. The first is that whatever else police
departments are, they are first and foremost an emergency service funded by the public to
respond to unexpected events. Second, an over-emphasis on proactivity can easily lead to the
idea of stopping crime before it occurs and thence to the social, ethical, and legal difficulties
associated with aggressive zero tolerance policing. The SMP may well be an obstacle to
crime reduction, but the emergency function of the police needs to be incorporated into EBP
not replaced.

Part Three is the core of the monograph and offers four different strategies for translating
theory into practice. Playbooks (Chapter 11) are an example of Lum and Koper at their
finest, providing a quick guide to the evidence in the matrix on the specific crimes patrol
officers are likely to encounter, from graffiti to gun crimes and shootings. Integrating
evidence from the matrix into professional development – police academies, field training,
and leadership training (Chapter 10) – is regarded as the most likely method to lead to the
institutionalisation of EBP. Within this strategy, the various tactics recommended are of
varying quality and include both the eminently suitable ‘one-pagers’ (similar to playbooks)
and the completely unrealistic field training revisions. Lum and Koper have translated the 24
performance measures in the field training manual of the Alexandria Police Department into
EBP terms. Several of these revisions appear to demonstrate a surprising lack of familiarity
with the steep learning curve faced by new officers and three of the worst examples – Motor
Vehicle Operation, Orientation and Geography, and Written Communication – appear on a
single page (p. 166). Where the department has set reasonable and useful guidelines for these
aspects of police work, the EBP revisions are far too involved for a probationary officer who
is simultaneously grappling with the other twenty-odd measures. In fact, many of the EBP
adjustments are more suitable for experienced officers seeking supervisory or command responsibility.

I express these criticisms in the spirit of Lum and Koper’s focus on implementation, as objections likely to be raised by serving police officers and police chiefs, rather than major flaws in the book as a whole. *EBP* not only succeeds in introducing the matrix and its benefits to the international policing community, but also shows how police staff of all ranks and responsibilities can use the evidence it contains to improve their performance in their various duties.
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