

# From Static Values to Living Doctrine: Aligning Police Mission, Vision, Values, Directives, and Performance Evaluation

Theodore L. Bremer Jr.

## **Abstract / Executive Summary**

Mission, Vision, and Values (MVV) statements remain necessary in police agencies because they define organizational identity, public purpose, and expected character. The problem is not the existence of MVV. The problem is that MVV often becomes static language that is posted on a website, printed in a strategic plan, or repeated in policy manuals without being actively connected to Directives, training, supervision, performance evaluation, and operational decision making. When MVV is not kept current and translated into agency systems, a gap forms between what the organization claims to value and how Personnel are actually directed, trained, supervised, and evaluated.

This paper argues that police agencies should preserve MVV as a living identity framework, but should not treat MVV as a substitute for operational decision guidance. MVV defines who the agency is, what public purpose it serves, and what behavioral commitments it expects. Guiding Doctrine translates MVV into a single structured decision framework. Directives carry out the Doctrine through specific legal, procedural, supervisory, and documentation requirements. Training and supervision reinforce application. Performance evaluation measures whether Personnel demonstrate observable conduct consistent with MVV, Guiding Doctrine, Directives, and assigned responsibilities.

The paper proposes a practical operational model for Chiefs of Police. MVV should be reviewed annually for alignment, formally realigned every three years, fully reassessed every five years, and reviewed after major triggering events such as a new Chief, critical incident, major litigation, accreditation finding, statutory change, consent decree, public trust event, or significant operational shift. The paper concludes that modern police leadership should not discard MVV. It should make MVV functional by translating it into Guiding Doctrine, carrying it out through Directives, reinforcing it through training and supervision, and measuring it through performance evaluation.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Police agencies have long used Mission, Vision, and Values (MVV) statements to describe organizational identity, public purpose, and expected character. Properly used, MVV can help an agency explain why it exists, what it seeks to become, and what behavioral commitments should define its service to the public. The problem is not that police agencies use MVV. The problem is that MVV often becomes static language that is adopted during a strategic planning process, posted on a website, placed in a policy manual, or repeated in public documents without being actively connected to the systems that guide daily organizational behavior. Mission statement research supports this concern because mission statements are widely used to communicate organizational purpose and identity, but their value depends on connection to strategy, implementation, and organizational performance rather than mere adoption or symbolic display (Alegre et al., 2018, Sidhu, 2003, Weiss & Piderit, 1999).

This disconnect is especially significant in policing because police agencies do not operate only as symbolic organizations. They operate as legal, instructional, supervisory, and decision making systems. Officers, Supervisors, Command Staff, and civilian Personnel make decisions under conditions of uncertainty, risk, legal constraint, public scrutiny, and limited time. If an agency's stated MVV is not connected to Directives, training, supervision, evaluation, and corrective action, the organization creates a gap between what it claims to value and what its Personnel are actually directed and evaluated to do. This is not merely a communications problem. It is a systems problem. Organizational theory has long recognized the difference between espoused commitments and actual practice, where organizations may formally state one set of beliefs while daily behavior is governed by different routines, incentives, assumptions, and informal norms (Argyris & Schön, 1974). In policing, that gap is especially dangerous because stated commitments are tested through real decisions involving lawful authority, discretion, risk, public trust, and accountability.

Modern police leadership requires a structure that closes this identity to action gap. MVV should remain part of the police organization, but it should function as a living identity framework rather than a static statement. A living MVV system must be reviewed on a regular cycle, realigned when the operating environment changes, translated into decision principles, carried out through Directives, reinforced through training and supervision, and measured through performance evaluation. Professional policing guidance supports this management approach. PERF's agency level performance measurement framework emphasizes that police executives should connect performance expectations, performance measures, and accountability structures to organizational goals and outcomes (Police Executive Research Forum [PERF], 2006). IACP strategic planning guidance similarly emphasizes the need for strategic goals, objectives, performance measures, baseline metrics, annual targets, and regular leadership review (Marshall, 2010). In this model, MVV does not disappear. It becomes the identity layer of the agency's operating system.

This paper argues that the missing link between MVV and daily police operations is a single Guiding Doctrine. MVV defines who the agency is, what public purpose it serves, and what commitments it claims. Guiding Doctrine translates MVV into structured decision principles that govern Directives, training, supervision, review, and evaluation. This translation layer is necessary because real world police decision making often occurs under uncertainty, time pressure, and cognitive demand. Naturalistic decision making research shows that decision makers in high consequence environments frequently rely on experience, pattern recognition, cues, and rapid judgment rather than slow abstract reasoning (Klein, 1998, 2008). Cognitive load theory also indicates that complex or poorly structured information can impose

unnecessary cognitive burden and interfere with learning and performance (Sweller, 1988, 2011). Guiding Doctrine therefore gives the agency a structured framework that converts identity into decision guidance.

Directives then operationalize the Doctrine through specific legal, procedural, supervisory, and documentation requirements. Training teaches Personnel how to apply the system. Supervisors reinforce and correct conduct. Performance evaluations measure whether Personnel demonstrate observable behavior consistent with MVV, Guiding Doctrine, Directives, and assigned responsibilities. This layered approach is supported by implementation science, which distinguishes formal adoption from actual implementation and emphasizes the importance of leadership, training, coaching, performance assessment, fidelity monitoring, feedback, and organizational capacity (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005, Nilsen, 2015). A police agency does not operationalize MVV by adopting new language alone. It operationalizes MVV by building a system that carries the language into decisions, training, supervision, review, and evaluation.

The practical contribution of this paper is an implementation model for police executives. It does not argue that MVV should be discarded. It argues that MVV must be made current, living, and operationally connected. A Chief of Police should review MVV annually for alignment, formally realign it every three years, fully reassess it every five years, and review it after major triggering events such as a new Chief, critical incident, litigation, accreditation finding, statutory change, consent decree, public trust event, or significant operational shift. The paper then explains how Guiding Doctrine can translate MVV into decision principles, how Directives can carry those principles into operational rules, how training and supervision can reinforce them, and how performance evaluation can measure them. The goal is to give police leadership a practical architecture for ensuring that what the agency says it believes is reflected in how the agency actually directs, trains, supervises, evaluates, and corrects its Personnel.

## **II. WHAT MVV SHOULD DO IN A POLICE AGENCY**

Mission, Vision, and Values should serve a defined organizational purpose in a police agency. Mission explains why the agency exists. Vision explains what the agency is trying to become. Values explain the behavioral commitments the agency expects its Personnel to demonstrate. These statements matter because police agencies exercise public authority, enforce law, use discretion, and act in the name of government. Mission statement research supports the importance of organizational purpose and identity, but also cautions that mission language becomes more meaningful when it is connected to strategy, internal alignment, and performance rather than treated as isolated symbolic language (Alegre et al., 2018, Weiss & Piderit, 1999). A police agency without a clear Mission risks becoming reactive. A police agency without a clear Vision risks drifting from one administration or crisis to the next. A police agency without clear Values risks allowing informal culture, habit, or individual preference to define the organization more than the Chief of Police, the governing body, or the community it serves.

The Mission statement should identify the agency's public purpose in operationally meaningful terms. In policing, that purpose should normally include public safety, lawful service, protection of constitutional rights, preservation of peace, crime prevention, order maintenance, community protection, and responsible use of government authority. A Mission statement should not be written as a slogan. It should be written as the agency's governing statement of purpose. It tells Personnel why the agency exists and tells the public what the agency is organized to provide. Public agency mission statement research recognizes that mission statements can influence organizational focus, but the literature also shows that their usefulness depends on whether the

mission is connected to implementation, management systems, and measurable performance (Alegre et al., 2018, Sidhu, 2003, Weiss & Piderit, 1999). In a police agency, that means the Mission must be visible not only in public messaging, but in Directives, training, supervision, and performance evaluation.

The Vision statement should describe the future condition the agency is trying to build. For a police agency, Vision should not merely say that the Department seeks to be professional, trusted, or excellent. Those terms may be appropriate, but only if the agency defines what they mean in practice. A useful Vision should describe the desired future state of the agency in terms of public trust, lawful and effective service, employee competence, organizational learning, technology use, community partnership, leadership development, wellness, accountability, and operational readiness. Current police strategic planning practice reflects this broader function. Police strategic plans commonly connect Mission and Vision language to strategic goals involving public safety, community partnership, workforce development, innovation, accountability, and organizational improvement (San José Police Department, 2023, Tracy Police Department, 2025). The Vision should therefore help the Chief of Police align planning, budgeting, staffing, training, policy development, supervision, and performance expectations around a coherent direction rather than a collection of disconnected initiatives.

Values should identify the behavioral commitments that define how the agency expects Personnel to exercise authority. Values are important because policing depends heavily on discretion. Officers and Supervisors routinely make decisions that cannot be fully controlled by written rules. However, values become weak when they remain abstract. Terms such as integrity, respect, courage, service, fairness, professionalism, and accountability are common in police agencies, but they do not guide conduct unless they are translated into observable behavior. Integrity must mean accurate reporting, truthful communication, correction of known errors, disclosure of material information, and refusal to conceal misconduct. Respect must mean lawful treatment, clear communication, restraint, impartiality, and recognition of human dignity. Accountability must mean accepting review, documenting decisions, correcting errors, and complying with lawful supervision. PERF's agency level performance measurement guidance supports this translation because goals and expectations must be connected to measures and accountability structures before they can reliably shape organizational behavior (Police Executive Research Forum [PERF], 2006).

MVV should therefore operate as the identity layer of the agency. It should explain who the agency is, what public purpose it serves, what future it is working toward, and what behavioral commitments should define its Personnel. This identity function is legitimate and necessary. Research on Mission statements supports their role in communicating organizational identity and strategic intent, and police specific research shows that police mission statements can reveal how agencies define their role, priorities, and orientation toward policing (Alegre et al., 2018, Phillips, 2022). The mistake in legacy policy systems is not the presence of MVV. The mistake is treating MVV as if it can perform functions it was not designed to perform. MVV does not by itself define legal authority, establish decision thresholds, sequence actions, assign supervisory duties, require documentation, or create review criteria.

This distinction is critical. MVV should guide the agency, but it should not be treated as a substitute for operational doctrine, written Directives, training, supervision, or evaluation. MVV expresses the agency's identity and purpose. Guiding Doctrine translates that identity and purpose into decision principles. Directives convert those principles into operational requirements. Training develops the ability to apply them. Supervision reinforces them. Performance evaluation measures them. Implementation science supports this layered

approach because organizational change requires more than adoption of language or formal statements. It requires implementation structures, training, coaching, monitoring, fidelity, feedback, and organizational capacity (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005, Nilsen, 2015). When these layers are connected, MVV becomes living and functional. When they are disconnected, MVV becomes symbolic and may have little effect on the decisions, conduct, and supervisory practices that define the agency in the real world.

A Chief of Police should therefore treat MVV as an active management responsibility. MVV should not be written once and left untouched for a decade. It should be reviewed, tested, and realigned against the agency's operating environment. That review should ask whether the current Mission still reflects the agency's public purpose, whether the Vision still identifies the future the agency is trying to build, and whether the Values are being translated into observable conduct. The review should also ask whether Directives, training, supervision, performance evaluations, promotion processes, complaint reviews, use of force reviews, and community reporting actually reflect the MVV. Professional policing guidance supports this approach by emphasizing performance expectations, performance measures, community and Personnel involvement, and accountability structures as part of agency level performance management (PERF, 2006). If the agency cannot connect MVV to these systems, it does not have a living MVV framework. It has a statement of aspiration disconnected from the machinery of organizational behavior.

The proper role of MVV, then, is not to replace policy or control every decision directly. Its role is to provide the identity foundation from which the agency's operating system is built. MVV should define purpose and character. Guiding Doctrine should define decision principles. Directives should define requirements. Training and supervision should define application. Performance evaluation should define accountability. This structure allows Chiefs of Police to preserve MVV while correcting the primary legacy failure: the separation of organizational identity from operational conduct.

### **III. WHY MVV BECOMES STATIC AND DISCONNECTED**

Mission, Vision, and Values becomes weak when it is treated as a completed product rather than an active leadership system. Many police agencies develop MVV during a strategic planning process, accreditation preparation, leadership transition, reform effort, or public messaging initiative. Once adopted, the language is often placed on a website, inserted into a policy manual, printed in a strategic plan, or referenced during ceremonies and public presentations. The agency then moves on to daily operations. Over time, the Mission remains unchanged, the Vision no longer reflects current priorities, and the Values are repeated without being tested against actual conduct. This is how MVV becomes static. It is not rejected by the agency. It is neglected. Mission statement research supports this concern because organizational mission language is widely used, but its effect depends on connection to strategy, implementation, and organizational behavior rather than mere existence (Alegre et al., 2018, Sidhu, 2003, Weiss & Piderit, 1999).

The static statement problem is especially serious because police agencies operate in changing environments. Law changes. Accreditation standards change. Technology changes. Community expectations change. Crime patterns change. Staffing levels, recruitment conditions, officer wellness concerns, public scrutiny, litigation risk, data systems, investigative methods, and training demands all change. A Mission statement written ten or fifteen years earlier may still contain good language, but the agency cannot assume that old language still reflects present operating conditions. A Vision statement that once seemed forward looking can become stale if

it is not tested against the agency's current direction. Values can also become hollow when the agency keeps the words but fails to define how those values must appear in conduct, supervision, training, and evaluation. Professional policing guidance on strategic planning and performance measurement supports regular review because agencies need goals, measures, leadership review, and accountability structures that remain connected to current operating conditions (Marshall, 2010, Police Executive Research Forum [PERF], 2006).

MVV also becomes disconnected because it is often structurally separated from the systems that control agency behavior. MVV may exist in the strategic plan, while Directives exist in the policy manual, lesson plans exist in the training function, performance evaluations exist in human resources, and supervisory review occurs in daily field operations. Each system may operate independently. The Chief may publicly emphasize trust, accountability, professionalism, or service, but the Directives may not translate those commitments into decision requirements. Training may not test them. Supervisors may not reinforce them. Evaluations may not measure them. Promotion systems may not reward them. This separation reflects the classic organizational problem of distance between espoused theory and theory in use, where an organization's stated commitments differ from the routines and practices that actually govern behavior (Argyris & Schön, 1974). It also reflects a sensemaking problem because Personnel learn organizational meaning from what the agency repeatedly notices, measures, rewards, ignores, and corrects (Weick, 1995).

This separation creates an identity to action gap. The agency may claim that it values integrity, but if the performance evaluation does not measure truthful reporting, accurate documentation, correction of errors, and disclosure of material facts, integrity remains an abstraction. The agency may claim that it values preservation of life, but if the use of force Directive, pursuit Directive, tactical response Directive, medical aid Directive, training curriculum, and review processes do not operationalize that priority, the value has limited practical force. The agency may claim that it values community partnership, but if patrol deployment, complaint handling, communication practices, problem solving, and performance evaluation do not reflect that commitment, the value becomes public language rather than organizational practice. Performance measurement literature supports this critique because organizational goals must be connected to expectations, measures, and accountability structures before they can reliably shape conduct and outcomes (PERF, 2006).

The measurement problem is central. A Chief of Police cannot manage MVV effectively if the agency does not measure whether Personnel are acting in ways that reflect it. Performance evaluation systems often rely on broad categories such as dependability, initiative, professionalism, judgment, or teamwork. Those categories may be useful, but they are insufficient when they are not connected to observable conduct and agency priorities. A modern evaluation system should ask whether Personnel demonstrate conduct that carries out the Mission, advances the Vision, and reflects the Values. It should also ask whether Personnel apply the Guiding Doctrine, comply with Directives, exercise sound judgment, document decisions, accept supervision, and correct deficiencies. PERF's agency level performance measurement guidance supports the use of meaningful performance expectations, multiple measures, and accountability mechanisms to connect agency priorities to actual organizational behavior (PERF, 2006).

The same problem applies to supervision. Supervisors are the daily carriers of agency culture. They translate policy into practice through briefing, coaching, report review, complaint review, use of force review, pursuit review, field correction, mentoring, and discipline. If Supervisors are not trained and expected to reinforce MVV through Guiding Doctrine and Directives, then MVV

will not reliably reach the point of performance. Personnel will learn what the organization truly values from what Supervisors inspect, tolerate, praise, ignore, and correct. Implementation science supports this point because organizational change requires active implementation drivers, including leadership, coaching, performance assessment, feedback, and fidelity monitoring, rather than adoption of language alone (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005, Nilsen, 2015).

The disconnection of MVV is also a leadership risk. When MVV is outdated or detached from operations, the agency may unintentionally send conflicting messages. The public sees one statement of identity. Personnel experience another set of operational incentives. Plaintiffs, oversight bodies, accreditation assessors, municipal officials, and community members may compare the agency's stated values against its actual practices. If those practices are inconsistent, the agency's own language can become evidence of organizational drift. The problem is not that the agency had values. The problem is that it failed to connect those values to the machinery of policy, training, supervision, evaluation, and correction. This is why implementation research is important to police leadership. Adoption is not implementation, and a formal statement does not produce organizational change unless it is supported by systems that train, reinforce, measure, and correct practice (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005).

This is why MVV must be treated as a living system. A living MVV system is reviewed on a schedule, tested against current conditions, translated into Doctrine, carried into Directives, reinforced through training and supervision, measured through performance evaluation, and corrected through feedback. It does not require constant rewriting. Stability matters. But stability is different from neglect. The Chief of Police should know whether the current MVV remains accurate, whether Personnel understand it, whether Directives carry it out, whether training teaches it, whether Supervisors reinforce it, and whether evaluations measure it. If the agency cannot answer those questions, MVV is not functioning as an organizational system. It is functioning as a statement of aspiration disconnected from the systems that govern behavior.

The core failure, therefore, is not the existence of Mission, Vision, and Values. The failure is the absence of alignment. MVV becomes static when it is not reviewed. It becomes disconnected when it is not translated. It becomes symbolic when it is not measured. It becomes weak when it is not supervised. A police agency that wants MVV to matter must connect it to Guiding Doctrine, Directives, training, supervision, performance evaluation, promotion, discipline, and organizational review. Only then does MVV move from statement to system.

#### **IV. THE CHIEF'S OPERATING MODEL: MVV TO DOCTRINE TO DIRECTIVES TO EVALUATION**

A Chief of Police needs a practical structure that connects organizational identity to daily conduct. The proposed model uses five connected layers: Mission, Vision, and Values, Guiding Doctrine, Directives, training and supervision, and performance evaluation. MVV identifies who the agency is, what it exists to do, what future it is trying to build, and what behavioral commitments it expects from Personnel. Guiding Doctrine translates that identity into decision principles. Directives convert those principles into operational requirements. Training and supervision reinforce application. Performance evaluation measures whether Personnel are actually carrying out the system. This architecture is consistent with performance measurement principles that emphasize the need to connect organizational expectations, measures, and accountability structures to actual agency behavior and outcomes (Police Executive Research Forum [PERF], 2006). It also reflects implementation science, which cautions that adoption of a concept is not the same as implementation with fidelity, because implementation requires

leadership, training, supervision, monitoring, feedback, and correction (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005).

MVV should remain the identity layer. It should answer the most basic leadership questions: Why does the agency exist? What public purpose does it serve? What future condition is the agency trying to build? What conduct must define the Personnel who exercise authority in the agency's name? This identity layer matters because policing is not merely a technical function. It is the public exercise of government authority. Mission statement research supports the role of Mission statements in communicating organizational purpose, identity, and strategic direction, but also shows that such statements have limited value when they are not connected to organizational systems and measurable behavior (Alegre et al., 2018, Weiss & Piderit, 1999). A police agency must therefore preserve MVV as its identity framework while recognizing that identity language alone cannot control operational behavior.

Guiding Doctrine should serve as the translation layer between MVV and operations. Doctrine is necessary because it converts broad organizational commitments into structured decision principles. If the agency says it values preservation of life, the Doctrine must explain how preservation of life governs decision making. If the agency says it values legality, the Doctrine must require decisions to remain within constitutional, statutory, and policy authority. If the agency says it values accountability, the Doctrine must require decisions to be capable of articulation, documentation, review, and correction. This translation function is important because real world police decision making often occurs under uncertainty, time pressure, and stress, where Personnel rely on cues, pattern recognition, experience, and structured judgment rather than abstract reflection (Klein, 1998, Klein, 2008). Guiding Doctrine gives the agency one common decision framework that can be carried through every major Directive, training program, supervisory review, and evaluation process.

Directives should operate as the agency's operational layer. A Directive should not merely repeat MVV language. It should carry out MVV through the Guiding Doctrine by defining what Personnel must do in specific circumstances. Each major Directive should identify its purpose, legal authority, scope, definitions, decision triggers, required actions, prohibited actions, supervisory responsibilities, documentation requirements, training implications, and review standards. Instructional design literature supports this structure because effective instruction requires alignment among goals, expected performance, conditions of performance, training, assessment, and feedback (Dick et al., 2005, Gagné, 1985). Cognitive load theory also supports clearer Directive design because unnecessary complexity, ambiguity, and poorly structured information increase cognitive burden and can interfere with learning and performance (Sweller, 1988, Sweller, 2011). A Directive system should therefore convert Doctrine into usable operational guidance, not leave Personnel to infer meaning from broad identity statements.

Training and supervision form the reinforcement layer. Training should not treat each Directive as an isolated document to memorize. It should teach Personnel how to apply MVV, Guiding Doctrine, and Directives together in realistic situations. Personnel should practice identifying decision triggers, recognizing risk, applying lawful authority, selecting proportionate responses, documenting decisions, and explaining conduct under review. Police decision making research supports this applied approach because officers often make decisions in complex environments where stress, uncertainty, and incomplete information affect perception, judgment, and action (Di Nota & Huhta, 2021, Dube et al., 2025). Supervisors then reinforce the same system in daily practice. They should use the Guiding Doctrine during briefings, report review, use of force review, pursuit review, complaint intake, employee counseling, field correction, mentoring, and discipline. This daily reinforcement is essential because implementation research shows that

sustained practice, monitoring, coaching, and feedback are necessary for organizational change to take hold (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005).

Performance evaluation is the accountability layer. If the agency claims that MVV matters, then evaluations must measure observable conduct connected to MVV, Guiding Doctrine, Directives, and assigned responsibilities. Evaluation should not rely only on broad traits such as professionalism, judgment, integrity, or initiative. Those traits must be translated into conduct that can be observed and documented. Integrity can be measured through truthful reporting, accurate documentation, disclosure of material facts, correction of errors, and refusal to conceal misconduct. Judgment can be measured through lawful decision making, risk recognition, proportionality, communication, documentation, and acceptance of supervisory correction. Service can be measured through responsiveness, problem solving, respectful communication, and appropriate use of discretion. PERF's performance measurement guidance supports this approach because agency performance systems should use meaningful measures, connect those measures to accountability structures, and place performance information in context rather than rely on vague or symbolic expectations (PERF, 2006).

The operating model also gives the Chief a diagnostic tool. When a failure occurs, the agency should not immediately assume the problem is only individual misconduct. The Chief should ask whether the failure occurred at the level of MVV, Guiding Doctrine, Directives, training, supervision, evaluation, or implementation. If Personnel acted inconsistently with agency values, were the values translated into Doctrine? If the Doctrine was sound, did the Directive clearly operationalize it? If the Directive was clear, was it trained? If it was trained, did Supervisors reinforce it? If Supervisors reinforced it, was performance evaluated and corrected? This diagnostic approach is consistent with implementation science, which emphasizes that outcomes are shaped by system capacity, implementation quality, fidelity, adaptation, monitoring, and feedback rather than by formal adoption alone (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005, Nilsen, 2015).

The value of this model is that it allows a Chief of Police to align the entire agency without reducing policing to slogans or checklists. MVV remains important because it defines identity and purpose. Guiding Doctrine becomes essential because it translates identity into decision principles. Directives become stronger because they are connected to a common doctrine rather than written as isolated documents. Training becomes more realistic because it teaches application. Supervision becomes more consistent because Supervisors use the same decision framework. Performance evaluation becomes more meaningful because it measures observable conduct tied to the agency's stated identity. The result is a connected architecture that allows MVV to become living, operational, and measurable.

## **V. REVIEW AND REALIGNMENT OF MVV**

Mission, Vision, and Values must be reviewed on a defined cycle if it is going to remain current and operationally useful. A police agency should not assume that MVV remains valid simply because the language still sounds acceptable. The question is not whether the words are attractive. The question is whether the words still reflect the agency's legal obligations, public safety mission, operating environment, community expectations, internal capacity, and strategic direction. Mission statement research supports this distinction because mission statements may communicate organizational purpose and identity, but their usefulness depends on connection to implementation, behavior, and organizational performance rather than mere adoption (Alegre et al., 2018, Sidhu, 2003, Weiss & Piderit, 1999). A Chief of Police should therefore treat MVV review as a recurring executive function, not as a one time strategic planning exercise.

The first level should be an annual alignment review. This review does not require the agency to rewrite MVV every year. Frequent rewriting can create instability and weaken organizational continuity. Annual review means testing whether the current MVV remains aligned with agency conditions and whether the rest of the organization is carrying it out. The Chief and Command Staff should review whether Directives, training priorities, supervisory practices, performance evaluation standards, complaint trends, use of force reviews, pursuit reviews, community feedback, accreditation findings, litigation concerns, and budget priorities remain consistent with MVV. This aligns with professional policing guidance that agency performance systems should connect expectations, measures, and accountability structures to organizational goals (PERF, 2006).

The annual review should be tied to existing management cycles. Police agencies already operate through annual budget preparation, training plans, policy review, accreditation maintenance, crime analysis, performance evaluation cycles, and public reporting. MVV review should be integrated into those processes rather than treated as a separate symbolic meeting. IACP guidance on strategic planning emphasizes the importance of strategic goals, objectives, performance measures, baseline metrics, annual targets, and regular leadership review (Marshall, 2010). When the agency prepares its training plan, it should ask whether training priorities support MVV. When it reviews Directives, it should ask whether those Directives carry out the Guiding Doctrine and reflect MVV. When it reviews performance evaluations, it should ask whether the evaluation system measures observable conduct connected to MVV.

The second level should be a formal three year realignment. Every three years, the agency should conduct a more structured review involving Command Staff, Supervisors, Officers, civilian Personnel, municipal leadership, and appropriate community stakeholders. The purpose of the three year realignment is to determine whether the existing MVV still accurately describes the agency and whether Personnel understand, accept, and apply it. This is consistent with performance measurement principles that emphasize involvement of agency Personnel and community stakeholders when developing or evaluating organizational goals and measures (PERF, 2006). Internally, the agency should review staffing, supervision, morale, training, discipline, leadership development, wellness, technology, and operational capacity. Externally, the agency should review crime trends, public safety risks, community expectations, legal changes, municipal priorities, and public trust concerns.

The third level should be a five year strategic reset. Every five years, the agency should step back and conduct a full reassessment of its strategic direction. This reset should determine whether the Mission still reflects the agency's public purpose, whether the Vision still describes the future the agency must build, and whether the Values still identify the behavioral commitments required of Personnel. Current police strategic plans commonly use multi year planning cycles to connect Mission, Vision, strategic goals, public safety priorities, workforce development, community partnership, innovation, and accountability (San José Police Department, 2023, Tracy Police Department, 2025). A five year reset should also examine whether the Guiding Doctrine remains sufficient, whether the Directive system is aligned, whether training reflects operational risk, whether Supervisors are reinforcing the system, whether performance evaluations are measuring the right behaviors, and whether the agency has the capacity to carry out what it claims.

The agency should also use trigger based review. Some events are significant enough that the Chief should not wait for the next annual, three year, or five year cycle. Triggering events should include the appointment of a new Chief of Police, a serious critical incident, major litigation, a

consent decree or external monitoring requirement, an accreditation finding, a major statutory or constitutional development, a serious public trust event, a significant technology change, a major staffing or organizational restructure, or a substantial shift in crime patterns or public safety priorities. Implementation research supports the need for ongoing monitoring, feedback, and adaptation because adopting a framework is not the same as implementing it with fidelity (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005, Nilsen, 2015). Trigger based review allows the Chief to determine whether the issue is located in MVV, Guiding Doctrine, Directives, training, supervision, evaluation, or implementation.

MVV review should not be treated as a public relations exercise. It should produce documented findings and decisions. At the end of an annual review, three year realignment, five year reset, or triggered review, the agency should identify whether MVV remains unchanged, requires clarification, requires realignment, or requires full revision. The agency should also identify downstream changes that are necessary. If the agency updates a Value such as accountability, the change should lead to Directive review, training updates, supervisory guidance, evaluation criteria, and performance measures. If the agency strengthens its commitment to preservation of human life, that commitment should be tested against use of force, pursuit, crisis response, medical aid, tactical response, and detention Directives. Review without downstream action does not make MVV living. It merely refreshes the language.

The review process should include both leadership judgment and evidence. Chiefs should consider complaint data, use of force data, pursuit data, employee evaluation trends, discipline patterns, training deficiencies, litigation claims, accreditation findings, community feedback, employee feedback, staffing data, and operational performance measures. PERF's agency level performance measurement guidance supports the use of multiple measures, contextual interpretation, and accountability structures to evaluate whether agency goals are being carried into actual organizational performance (PERF, 2006). This does not mean MVV should be reduced to numbers. It means the agency should not rely solely on impressions. A police agency that claims to value fairness should examine complaint patterns, discretionary enforcement practices, supervisory review, and community feedback. An agency that claims to value professionalism should examine report quality, conduct complaints, training performance, discipline, and supervisory documentation.

The Chief should also protect MVV from two opposite failures. The first failure is neglect, where the agency leaves outdated language untouched for years. The second failure is constant reinvention, where every new administration rewrites MVV so frequently that Personnel stop taking it seriously. The correct approach is disciplined continuity. MVV should remain stable enough to create institutional identity, but flexible enough to remain truthful and aligned with changing conditions. Annual review, three year realignment, five year strategic reset, and trigger based review provide that balance. This approach is consistent with the broader implementation literature, which emphasizes sustained leadership, fidelity, adaptation, feedback, and organizational capacity rather than one time adoption of new language or procedures (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005).

A living MVV system gives the Chief of Police a practical leadership advantage. It allows the Chief to connect public messaging, internal expectations, Directives, training, supervision, evaluation, promotion, discipline, and organizational learning into one coherent system. It also allows the Chief to show municipal leadership, Personnel, accreditation assessors, oversight bodies, and the community that MVV is not decorative language. It is reviewed, translated, implemented, measured, and corrected. That is the difference between a static statement and a functioning leadership architecture.

## VI. BUILDING THE GUIDING DOCTRINE

Guiding Doctrine is the agency's single structured, operational, and auditable decision framework. It translates Mission, Vision, and Values into governing principles that shape Directives, training, supervision, performance evaluation, and organizational review. MVV identifies who the agency is and what it claims to value. Guiding Doctrine explains how those commitments govern decisions. This translation is necessary because police Personnel do not operate in an abstract environment. They make decisions under legal constraint, uncertainty, time pressure, cognitive demand, and public consequence. Naturalistic decision making research shows that decision makers in complex operational environments rely heavily on cues, pattern recognition, experience, and rapid judgment rather than slow reflection on general statements of purpose (Klein, 1998, 2008). Guiding Doctrine therefore gives Personnel a common decision structure that can be recognized, trained, supervised, and evaluated.

The first principle of Guiding Doctrine should be preservation of human life. This principle should operate as the agency's primary governing constraint across the Directive system. It should influence use of force, vehicle pursuits, tactical operations, crisis response, mental health calls, domestic violence response, medical aid, prisoner care, juvenile encounters, barricaded subject events, and emergency operations. Preservation of human life does not mean that force can never be used. It means that the agency's decisions, tactics, supervision, and review processes must prioritize actions that reduce the likelihood of death or serious bodily injury unless a lawful and objectively reasonable use of force is necessary to address an imminent threat. This principle aligns with constitutional use of force standards requiring objective reasonableness and recognizing the seriousness of deadly force (*Graham v. Connor*, 1989, *Tennessee v. Garner*, 1985). It also aligns with police use of force decision research emphasizing the need to structure complex decisions around threat, risk, proportionality, and available options (Di Nota & Huhta, 2021).

The second principle should be legal sufficiency. Every decision and action must remain within constitutional, statutory, regulatory, and Directive authority. Legal sufficiency is essential because police power is not general power. It is delegated government authority limited by law. A police agency may have a Mission to protect the community, but that Mission does not authorize conduct beyond lawful authority. A value such as safety does not justify an unlawful search. A value such as accountability does not authorize a legally unsupported detention. Guiding Doctrine must therefore make legality a controlling condition of all operational conduct. This principle also strengthens the agency's liability posture because courts evaluating police action focus on legal authority, reasonableness, policy, training, and supervision rather than general organizational aspirations (*City of Canton v. Harris*, 1989, *Connick v. Thompson*, 2011, *Monell v. Department of Social Services*, 1978).

The third principle should be decision justifiability. Personnel should make decisions that can be clearly articulated, documented, and objectively evaluated against law, Guiding Doctrine, Directives, training, and known facts. This principle is critical because policing depends on discretion, but discretion must be explainable. An Officer should be able to identify what was known, what risk was present, what legal authority applied, what options were available, what action was selected, and why that action was reasonable under the circumstances. Decision justifiability also supports supervision and organizational learning. If a decision cannot be reconstructed through articulation, documentation, and review, the agency cannot reliably determine whether the conduct was lawful, trained, consistent, or correctable. Performance measurement research supports this kind of accountability structure because expectations must

be connected to observable conduct and reviewable measures (Police Executive Research Forum [PERF], 2006).

The fourth principle should be threat based decision making. Decisions should be based on objectively identifiable conditions, including the presence, severity, immediacy, and direction of a threat. This principle reduces reliance on speculation, emotion, status assumptions, or vague impressions. It requires Personnel to connect action to observable facts. In the use of force context, this means assessing conduct, capability, opportunity, proximity, weapons information, resistance, environmental risk, and the availability of alternative tactics. In investigative or field decision making, it means distinguishing suspicion from evidence, possibility from probability, and generalized concern from articulable fact. This principle is supported by naturalistic decision making research because operational decision makers rely on recognizable cues, but those cues must be trained, structured, and reviewed to reduce error and inconsistency (Klein, 1998, 2008).

The fifth principle should be proportionality and necessity. Personnel should select actions that are proportionate to the threat, lawful objective, and known circumstances, and should use only the degree of intervention reasonably necessary to accomplish that objective. This principle is broader than use of force. It applies to enforcement discretion, vehicle pursuits, tactical deployment, search decisions, detention, arrest, field commands, investigative intrusions, and supervisory direction. Proportionality prevents the agency from treating all lawful options as equally appropriate. Necessity requires Personnel to consider whether a less intrusive, less risky, or more effective option is reasonably available. Police use of force model research supports this approach because complex police decisions require structured consideration of subject behavior, officer response, risk, context, and available alternatives (Di Nota & Huhta, 2021).

The sixth principle should be risk minimization. When multiple lawful options are available, Personnel should select the option that reasonably reduces overall risk to the public, Officers, victims, suspects, bystanders, and persons in custody. Risk minimization is necessary because police decisions often involve competing harms. A pursuit may serve apprehension but create danger to uninvolved motorists. Immediate entry may address one risk but increase another. Delayed action may improve safety in one context and create greater harm in another. Guiding Doctrine should require Personnel and Supervisors to compare risks rather than pursue single objectives in isolation. Cognitive decision research supports this principle because complex policing environments impose significant cognitive demands, and structured decision approaches can help reduce impulsive or biased default responses (Dube et al., 2025).

The seventh principle should be discretion channeling. Police discretion cannot be eliminated, and it should not be treated as a defect. Discretion is necessary because Directives cannot anticipate every factual variation Personnel will encounter. However, discretion should be guided by law, MVV, Guiding Doctrine, Directives, training, supervision, and review. Discretion channeling means that Personnel retain judgment, but that judgment operates within defined decision pathways. This principle is important because unmanaged discretion can produce inconsistency, bias, arbitrariness, and avoidable risk. Evidence based policing and performance measurement literature support the need for structured systems that guide practice, measure outcomes, and connect agency expectations to actual conduct (PERF, 2006, Sherman, 1998).

The eighth principle should be information integrity. Personnel should base decisions on the most accurate, current, relevant, and verified information reasonably available under the circumstances. This principle applies to patrol response, investigations, intelligence, arrests,

reports, supervisory review, command decisions, and public communication. Information integrity requires Personnel to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, preliminary information from confirmed information, and firsthand observations from third party reports. It also requires correction when new information changes the factual basis for a decision. This principle is necessary because decision quality depends on the quality of information entering the decision process. Cognitive bias literature cautions that decision makers may interpret new information through prior assumptions, which makes structured attention to information quality essential (Kahneman, 2011, Dror, 2020).

The ninth principle should be cognitive clarity. Directives, training, supervisory instructions, and review processes should be structured to reduce unnecessary ambiguity, complexity, and cognitive burden. This principle is central to the purpose of Guiding Doctrine. If Directives are legally dense, structurally inconsistent, undefined, or filled with competing instructions, Personnel may struggle to apply them under stress. Cognitive load theory shows that working memory is limited and that unnecessary complexity can interfere with learning and performance (Sweller, 1988, 2011). Police decision making research further supports the need for usable decision structures because Officers often make decisions in fast moving environments with incomplete information and competing demands (Di Nota & Huhta, 2021, Dube et al., 2025). A Guiding Doctrine should therefore require Directives to be written in a way that Personnel can learn, recall, apply, document, and explain.

The tenth principle should be consistency. Similar facts, risks, legal standards, and operational conditions should produce similar decisions across Personnel, shifts, Units, and assignments. Consistency does not require mechanical sameness because policing always involves context. It does require that similarly situated persons and events be treated according to the same legal standards, Doctrine principles, and Directive requirements. This principle supports fairness, supervision, training, public trust, internal discipline, and legal defensibility. Consistency also allows the agency to identify whether deviations are justified by facts or reflect training gaps, supervisory failure, policy ambiguity, or individual misconduct. Performance measurement guidance supports this principle because organizational accountability requires expectations and measures that can be applied across the agency (PERF, 2006).

The eleventh principle should be supervisory accountability. Supervisors must reinforce, evaluate, and correct the application of MVV, Guiding Doctrine, and Directives. A Guiding Doctrine that is not supervised will not become operational. Supervisors are responsible for turning agency principles into daily practice through briefing, coaching, report review, field direction, complaint review, use of force review, pursuit review, employee counseling, mentoring, and discipline. Implementation science supports this principle because organizational change requires active leadership, coaching, performance assessment, fidelity monitoring, and feedback (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005, Nilsen, 2015). Supervisory accountability ensures that the Doctrine does not remain a document. It becomes part of how the agency teaches, reviews, corrects, and learns.

Guiding Doctrine must also include a hierarchy for resolving conflicts between principles. Preservation of human life should serve as the first governing constraint. Legal sufficiency should establish the lawful boundary for all action. Threat based decision making should define the factual basis for intervention. Proportionality, necessity, and risk minimization should guide the selection of options. Decision justifiability, information integrity, cognitive clarity, consistency, and supervisory accountability should govern explanation, documentation, review, and correction. Without hierarchy, principles may compete without resolution. With hierarchy, the Doctrine becomes a usable decision framework.

The most important design rule is that Guiding Doctrine must not become a new values list. Each principle must control or evaluate decisions. If a principle cannot affect what Personnel do, how a Directive is written, how training is conducted, how a Supervisor reviews conduct, or how performance is evaluated, it does not belong in the Doctrine. This requirement prevents the agency from replacing one symbolic system with another. MVV remains the identity framework. Guiding Doctrine becomes the decision framework. Directives become the operational requirements. Training and supervision become the application system. Performance evaluation becomes the accountability system. This is how the Chief of Police converts organizational identity into daily operational behavior.

## **VII. ALIGNING DIRECTIVES WITH MVV AND GUIDING DOCTRINE**

Directives are the operational instruments through which Mission, Vision, and Values and Guiding Doctrine become agency practice. MVV defines organizational identity. Guiding Doctrine translates that identity into decision principles. Directives must then convert those principles into clear requirements that Personnel can understand, train on, apply, document, supervise, and evaluate. If Directives are not aligned with MVV and Guiding Doctrine, the agency remains fragmented. One part of the organization states what it values, another part writes rules, another part trains, another part supervises, and another part evaluates. Instructional design research cautions against this kind of fragmentation because effective instruction requires alignment between objectives, performance expectations, conditions of performance, assessment, and feedback (Dick et al., 2005, Gagné, 1985).

Every Directive should include an alignment statement. The alignment statement should explain which Guiding Doctrine principles the Directive carries out and how those principles support the agency's MVV. This does not mean every Directive must repeat the full Mission statement or list every Value. It means the Directive should show its place in the agency's operating system. A vehicle pursuit Directive, for example, should identify its relationship to preservation of human life, legal sufficiency, risk minimization, proportionality, decision justifiability, supervisory accountability, and community safety. A report writing Directive should identify its relationship to integrity, information integrity, decision justifiability, legal sufficiency, accountability, and organizational learning. This creates a traceable path from MVV to Doctrine to operational conduct.

Directive alignment must be more than introductory language. A Directive should be tested internally to determine whether its purpose, definitions, decision triggers, required actions, prohibited actions, supervisory duties, documentation requirements, and review standards actually carry out the Guiding Doctrine. Cognitive load theory supports this requirement because poorly structured, ambiguous, or unnecessarily complex information increases cognitive burden and can interfere with learning, recall, and performance (Sweller, 1988, 2011). Police Directives should therefore be structured to reduce ambiguity, clarify decision points, and make the required conduct easier to recognize under operational conditions. A Directive that expresses an important value but fails to identify what Personnel must do does not operationalize MVV. It preserves symbolism.

The drafting standard should require every major Directive to include core operational elements. Those elements should include purpose, scope, legal authority, definitions, governing principles, decision triggers, required actions, prohibited actions, supervisory responsibilities, documentation requirements, training implications, and review standards. Purpose explains why the Directive exists. Legal authority defines the lawful basis for action. Definitions reduce

ambiguity. Decision triggers identify when the Directive applies. Required actions state what Personnel must do. Prohibited actions state what Personnel must not do. Supervisory responsibilities identify who must review, approve, respond, or correct. Documentation requirements preserve the decision record. Training implications identify what must be taught. Review standards identify how compliance will be evaluated. This structure reflects instructional design principles because Personnel learn and apply expectations more effectively when objectives, conditions, performance requirements, and evaluation criteria are aligned (Dick et al., 2005, Gagné, 1985).

Directives should also use consistent language of obligation. Terms such as shall, should, may, and may not should be used with precision because each term carries a different decision meaning. Shall should establish a mandatory duty. Should should identify a preferred practice when circumstances permit. May should authorize discretion. May not should prohibit conduct. Inconsistent use of obligation language increases uncertainty and undermines supervisory review. If a Directive says Personnel should do something when the agency actually intends a mandatory requirement, Supervisors may be left with an unclear enforcement standard. If a Directive says Personnel shall do something but provides no conditions or exceptions, Personnel may be forced into mechanical compliance even when circumstances require judgment. Clear obligation language reduces ambiguity and supports consistent application.

Directive alignment should also account for real world police decision making. Officers and Supervisors often act under conditions of incomplete information, time pressure, competing risk, and uncertainty. Naturalistic decision making research shows that decision makers in complex operational settings rely on cues, pattern recognition, experience, and rapid judgment rather than purely analytical reasoning (Klein, 1998, 2008). Police Directives should therefore be written around recognizable conditions and decision points. A Directive should not merely state that Personnel shall act professionally or reasonably. It should identify the facts, risks, thresholds, and choices that make action lawful, necessary, proportional, prohibited, discretionary, or supervisory. This allows Personnel to connect the Directive to operational cues rather than search for meaning in abstract language during a high demand event.

The Chief of Police should require a Directive audit process. Each Directive should be reviewed against a common set of questions. Does the Directive support the agency's MVV? Does it apply one or more principles of the Guiding Doctrine? Does it identify lawful authority? Does it define key terms? Does it identify decision triggers? Does it distinguish required, authorized, preferred, and prohibited conduct? Does it assign supervisory responsibility? Does it require documentation sufficient for review? Does it reduce cognitive burden? Does it support training? Does it create observable performance standards? Does it allow the agency to evaluate compliance consistently? PERF's performance measurement guidance supports this approach because agency goals and expectations must be connected to measures, accountability structures, and review processes before they can shape organizational behavior (Police Executive Research Forum [PERF], 2006).

The audit process should classify Directives into three categories. The first category is aligned Directives. These Directives clearly support MVV, apply Guiding Doctrine, provide operational direction, and create reviewable standards. The second category is partially aligned Directives. These Directives may contain useful content but require revision because they are vague, outdated, incomplete, difficult to train, weakly supervised, or poorly connected to Doctrine. The third category is misaligned Directives. These Directives conflict with MVV, fail to reflect Guiding Doctrine, contain outdated legal authority, create unnecessary complexity, or produce

inconsistent conduct. This classification gives the Chief and Command Staff a practical method for prioritizing revision instead of attempting to rewrite the entire policy manual at once.

Directive revision should be treated as implementation work, not clerical editing. Implementation science distinguishes formal adoption from actual implementation, and emphasizes that durable change requires training, coaching, performance assessment, feedback, leadership support, and organizational capacity (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005, Nilsen, 2015). A revised Directive is not operational merely because it has been published. It becomes operational when Personnel are trained, Supervisors are prepared to reinforce it, performance evaluation reflects it, documentation systems support it, and review processes test it. This is especially important in policing because Directive failure often appears at the point of action, long after the document was approved.

The Directive system should also function as a feedback system. When complaints, use of force reviews, pursuit reviews, litigation claims, accreditation findings, training failures, or supervisory reviews reveal recurring problems, the agency should examine whether the relevant Directive is clear, current, lawful, trainable, supervised, and aligned with Guiding Doctrine. If Personnel repeatedly misunderstand a requirement, the problem may not be individual noncompliance alone. It may be unclear drafting, inadequate training, weak supervision, conflicting Directives, poor documentation systems, or an implementation gap. A Chief who uses Guiding Doctrine as the audit standard can identify whether the problem is located in the Directive, the training system, supervision, evaluation, or organizational practice.

The goal of Directive alignment is to make the policy system coherent. MVV should not sit apart from policy. Guiding Doctrine should not sit apart from training. Directives should not sit apart from supervision. Evaluation should not sit apart from daily conduct. Each Directive should be part of one connected architecture that allows Personnel to understand what the agency values, how those values are translated into decision principles, what conduct is required, how Supervisors will review it, and how performance will be evaluated. When this alignment exists, the Directive system becomes more than a compliance archive. It becomes the operational expression of the agency's identity, Doctrine, and leadership expectations.

## **VIII. TRAINING AND SUPERVISION**

Training is the point where Mission, Vision, and Values, Guiding Doctrine, and Directives begin to become operational capability. A police agency should not train Personnel to memorize isolated policies as separate documents. It should train Personnel to apply MVV, Guiding Doctrine, and Directives together in realistic decision environments. This is important because policing often requires Personnel to act under uncertainty, time pressure, legal constraint, incomplete information, and competing risks. Naturalistic decision making research supports this approach because decision makers in complex operational environments rely on cues, pattern recognition, experience, and rapid judgment rather than slow abstract reasoning (Klein, 1998, 2008). Training should therefore build recognition, judgment, articulation, and lawful application rather than assume that Personnel will convert broad values or dense Directives into correct action on their own.

Scenario based training should be the primary method for teaching the application of Guiding Doctrine. Personnel should be placed in realistic situations that require them to recognize decision triggers, assess threat, identify risk, apply lawful authority, select proportionate options, communicate effectively, document decisions, and explain their reasoning. This does not mean every training exercise must be physically complex or tactically dramatic. Scenario based

training can include tabletop exercises, report writing drills, supervisor review exercises, body worn camera review, pursuit decision simulations, use of force decision scenarios, domestic violence response exercises, crisis intervention scenarios, and investigative decision reviews. Police decision making research supports the use of structured decision practice because complex police encounters involve cognitive demand, uncertainty, and rapidly changing information (Di Nota & Huhta, 2021, Dube et al., 2025). Training should therefore help Personnel practice the exact decision processes the agency expects them to use.

Training should also reduce cognitive load. A Directive system that is too complex, inconsistent, or abstract creates unnecessary burden on Personnel, especially under stress. Cognitive load theory explains that working memory is limited and that unnecessary complexity interferes with learning and performance (Sweller, 1988, 2011). For that reason, training should organize Directives around the Guiding Doctrine rather than teaching each policy as an unrelated set of rules. Personnel should learn the recurring decision structure: preserve human life, remain legally sufficient, identify threat and risk, act proportionately and necessarily, maintain information integrity, document the decision, and accept supervisory review. This repeated structure allows Personnel to build usable mental models rather than rely on fragmented memory of separate policies.

Training should distinguish between knowledge, comprehension, application, and performance. Personnel may be able to acknowledge receipt of a Directive or answer a basic policy question without being able to apply the Directive in a realistic setting. This distinction matters because policy acknowledgment is not the same as operational readiness. Instructional design literature supports the need to align learning objectives, practice conditions, performance expectations, and assessment methods (Dick et al., 2005, Gagné, 1985). If the agency expects Personnel to make lawful and proportionate decisions under pressure, then training must evaluate whether Personnel can actually apply the relevant Doctrine and Directives under conditions that resemble the work.

Supervision is the daily reinforcement system. Supervisors are responsible for turning formal expectations into routine practice. They do this through roll call discussion, field coaching, report review, use of force review, pursuit review, complaint intake, early intervention review, employee counseling, mentoring, corrective action, and discipline. If Supervisors do not use the Guiding Doctrine, the Doctrine will remain an administrative document rather than a living decision framework. Personnel learn what the organization truly values from what Supervisors inspect, correct, tolerate, praise, and document. Organizational theory supports this point because actual practice is often shaped less by formal statements than by routines, incentives, interpretation, and day to day meaning making within the organization (Argyris & Schön, 1974, Weick, 1995).

Supervisors should be trained separately on how to apply the Guiding Doctrine in review and correction. A Sergeant reviewing a report should ask whether the Officer identified the relevant facts, applied lawful authority, documented the decision, and acted consistently with the Directive and Doctrine. A Lieutenant reviewing a use of force incident should ask whether the event was evaluated through preservation of human life, legal sufficiency, threat based decision making, proportionality, necessity, risk minimization, and decision justifiability. Command Staff reviewing trends should ask whether repeated errors reflect individual misconduct, weak supervision, unclear Directives, inadequate training, or implementation failure. This approach makes supervision diagnostic rather than merely disciplinary.

Training and supervision should also create a corrective feedback loop. When Personnel make mistakes, the agency should determine whether the failure was individual, supervisory, training based, Directive based, Doctrine based, leadership based, or implementation based. Implementation science supports this broader analysis because outcomes are shaped by implementation quality, organizational capacity, leadership support, training, coaching, fidelity monitoring, and feedback systems rather than formal adoption alone (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005, Nilsen, 2015). A police agency that only blames individuals may miss the deeper system failure. A police agency that only blames the system may fail to correct individual misconduct. The Chief needs both levels of analysis.

Training records should reflect more than attendance. The agency should document what Doctrine principles and Directives were trained, what scenarios were used, what performance was assessed, what deficiencies were identified, what remediation occurred, and whether Supervisors were notified of recurring issues. This documentation supports accountability, organizational learning, and legal defensibility. In failure to train litigation, courts examine whether the municipality's training choices reflect deliberate indifference to known or obvious risks, and whether policy, training, and supervision are connected to the alleged constitutional violation (*City of Canton v. Harris*, 1989, *Connick v. Thompson*, 2011). While legal defensibility should not be the only reason for training rigor, it reinforces the need for documented, structured, and operationally relevant training.

The Chief of Police should also require training to be evaluated for transfer. The question is not simply whether Personnel attended training or passed a written test. The question is whether training changed behavior in the field. Agencies should examine complaint trends, report quality, use of force reviews, pursuit reviews, supervisory corrections, body worn camera reviews, evaluation results, and field performance after training. PERF's performance measurement guidance supports the use of multiple measures and accountability structures to determine whether agency goals are being translated into actual performance (Police Executive Research Forum [PERF], 2006). Training should therefore be treated as part of the agency's performance system, not as a separate compliance activity.

This section is where the role of the Supervisor becomes essential. A Chief can adopt MVV, issue a Guiding Doctrine Directive, and revise the policy manual, but the system will not hold unless Supervisors reinforce it daily. Supervisors must be evaluated on whether they coach, review, document, correct, and model the Doctrine. A Sergeant who ignores weak reports, tolerates poor articulation, fails to correct unsafe tactics, or treats policy violations as paperwork problems is allowing the system to decay. A Lieutenant who reviews incidents only for technical compliance but not for Doctrine alignment is missing the purpose of the model. Supervision is the bridge between written architecture and lived agency practice.

Training and supervision therefore complete the operational movement from MVV to conduct. MVV identifies what the agency claims to be. Guiding Doctrine converts that identity into decision principles. Directives define the requirements. Training teaches application. Supervision reinforces and corrects application. Without training and supervision, the model remains theoretical. With training and supervision, MVV becomes visible in how Personnel make decisions, how Supervisors review them, and how the agency learns from its own performance.

## **IX. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY**

Performance evaluation is the accountability mechanism that determines whether Mission, Vision, and Values, Guiding Doctrine, and Directives are actually reflected in Personnel conduct. If MVV is important enough to define the agency's identity, then it must be important enough to measure. A police agency cannot claim that integrity, professionalism, service, accountability, preservation of life, fairness, or constitutional policing are core commitments while evaluating Personnel only through generic categories disconnected from observable behavior. Performance measurement literature supports this point because organizational goals must be translated into expectations, measures, and accountability structures before they can reliably influence conduct and outcomes (Police Executive Research Forum [PERF], 2006).

Performance evaluations should not measure values as abstract traits. They should measure observable conduct that demonstrates whether Personnel are carrying out the agency's MVV through the Guiding Doctrine and applicable Directives. A rating category such as "integrity" is weak if it merely asks a Supervisor to make a general impression. It becomes stronger when the agency defines integrity through conduct such as accurate reporting, truthful communication, correction of known errors, disclosure of material facts, refusal to conceal misconduct, compliance with legal duties, and cooperation with supervisory review. This approach is consistent with instructional design principles because expected performance must be defined in terms that can be observed, assessed, corrected, and reinforced (Dick et al., 2005, Gagné, 1985).

The same conversion should occur for every major value. Professionalism should be measured through lawful conduct, preparedness, appropriate communication, policy compliance, emotional control, report quality, respectful treatment, and acceptance of correction. Accountability should be measured through documentation, self-reporting, compliance with supervision, timely correction of deficiencies, and willingness to explain decisions. Service should be measured through responsiveness, problem solving, victim assistance, follow through, communication, and appropriate use of discretion. Fairness should be measured through consistency, impartiality, respectful interaction, lawful decision making, and avoidance of arbitrary treatment. In this structure, values are not abandoned. They are made observable.

Performance evaluation should also measure application of Guiding Doctrine. Personnel should be evaluated on whether they preserve human life when reasonably possible, remain within lawful authority, identify threats based on objective facts, select proportionate and necessary actions, minimize risk, exercise discretion within defined pathways, maintain information integrity, communicate clearly, document decisions, and accept supervisory review. These categories are not separate from MVV. They are the operational translation of MVV. This connection is important because real world police decision making often occurs under uncertainty and cognitive demand, where Personnel need structured decision principles rather than abstract values alone (Klein, 1998, 2008, Sweller, 1988, 2011).

Evaluations should be role specific. Officers, Detectives, Sergeants, Lieutenants, Command Staff, civilian Personnel, and specialized assignment Personnel do not carry out MVV in identical ways. Patrol Officers may be evaluated on field decision making, communication, lawful enforcement, report quality, call handling, and discretion. Detectives may be evaluated on investigative integrity, evidence handling, case documentation, victim communication, source evaluation, and legal sufficiency. Sergeants should be evaluated on field supervision, report review, coaching, early correction, use of force review, pursuit review, complaint intake, and reinforcement of Guiding Doctrine. Command Staff should be evaluated on policy alignment, training priorities, organizational learning, resource allocation, risk management, accountability systems, and strategic implementation. PERF's performance measurement guidance supports

the use of multiple measures and contextualized evaluation rather than a single generic performance standard (PERF, 2006).

Supervisory evaluation is especially important because Supervisors are the daily enforcement mechanism for the agency's operating system. A Sergeant who fails to correct weak articulation, poor report writing, unsafe tactics, discourteous conduct, avoidable risk, or inconsistent Directive application allows MVV and Doctrine to fail at the point of performance. A Lieutenant who reviews incidents only for paperwork completion but not for decision quality, risk, legal sufficiency, and Doctrine alignment leaves the agency with shallow accountability. Supervisors should therefore be evaluated on whether they reinforce MVV, apply Guiding Doctrine, review Directives correctly, coach Personnel, identify patterns, document correction, and elevate system problems. Implementation science supports this emphasis because coaching, performance assessment, fidelity monitoring, feedback, and leadership support are central to translating formal adoption into actual practice (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005, Nilsen, 2015).

Performance evaluation should also be connected to promotion, specialty assignment, leadership development, and discipline. If the agency promotes Personnel who do not demonstrate MVV, Guiding Doctrine, Directive compliance, sound judgment, accountability, and supervisory responsibility, then the agency undermines its own stated identity. Promotion systems teach the organization what is truly valued. Specialty assignments do the same. Leadership development should therefore include demonstrated ability to apply Doctrine, explain decisions, supervise fairly, correct deficiencies, and connect performance to agency goals. This structure prevents MVV from becoming ceremonial language that appears in speeches but disappears in selection decisions.

Evaluation data should be used for organizational learning, not merely individual rating. If multiple Officers struggle with the same Directive, the agency should ask whether the Directive is unclear, whether training was inadequate, whether Supervisors failed to reinforce it, or whether the Guiding Doctrine needs clarification. If multiple Supervisors fail to correct the same performance issue, the agency should examine supervisory training, review standards, leadership expectations, and accountability structures. If performance evaluations repeatedly rate Personnel highly despite complaints, poor reports, weak documentation, or recurring tactical concerns, the agency should examine whether the evaluation instrument is too vague or whether Supervisors are avoiding meaningful review. This is consistent with implementation research, which emphasizes feedback, adaptation, organizational capacity, and system correction (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005).

The evaluation system should produce measurable information for the Chief of Police. Aggregate evaluation data should help identify training needs, supervisory weaknesses, policy gaps, performance trends, leadership development needs, and organizational risk. This does not mean the agency should reduce policing to numbers. It means the Chief should not rely only on anecdote, tradition, or informal impressions. PERF recommends that agencies use multiple measures, place measures in context, and connect performance information to accountability and management decisions (PERF, 2006). A useful evaluation system should help the Chief determine whether MVV is being lived, whether Doctrine is being applied, whether Directives are being followed, and whether Supervisors are correcting performance.

Performance evaluation also strengthens legal and administrative defensibility. Courts examining municipal liability look to policy, training, supervision, and deliberate indifference to known or obvious risks, not to generalized value statements (City of Canton v. Harris, 1989,

Connick v. Thompson, 2011, Monell v. Department of Social Services, 1978). A police agency that can show it has translated MVV into Guiding Doctrine, operationalized that Doctrine through Directives, trained Personnel, supervised application, evaluated performance, and corrected deficiencies is better positioned to demonstrate that its system is structured, active, and accountable. This does not eliminate liability risk, but it creates evidence of governance rather than passive aspiration.

The purpose of performance evaluation is not to punish Personnel for failing to embody abstract values. The purpose is to make the agency's expectations clear, observable, trainable, supervisable, and correctable. Personnel should know what the agency expects, how those expectations are connected to MVV and Guiding Doctrine, how performance will be observed, how deficiencies will be corrected, and how excellence will be recognized. Supervisors should know what they are responsible for reinforcing. Command Staff should know what the evaluation data reveals about the organization. The Chief should know whether the system is working.

Performance evaluation completes the alignment model. MVV defines identity. Guiding Doctrine translates identity into decision principles. Directives define operational requirements. Training teaches application. Supervision reinforces behavior. Performance evaluation measures whether the system is actually being lived. Without evaluation, MVV can remain symbolic. With evaluation, MVV becomes part of the agency's accountability structure.

## **X. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR A CHIEF OF POLICE**

A Chief of Police should implement Mission, Vision, and Values, Guiding Doctrine, Directives, training, supervision, and performance evaluation as one connected system. The implementation should not begin with a new slogan, a revised policy cover page, or a stand alone training bulletin. It should begin with a structured diagnosis of the current agency system. Implementation science cautions that adopting a new framework is not the same as implementing it with fidelity. Durable implementation requires leadership, organizational capacity, training, coaching, feedback, monitoring, and correction (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005, Nilsen, 2015). A Chief who wants MVV to become operational must therefore treat the process as organizational implementation, not document revision.

The first step is diagnosis. The Chief should inventory the current MVV, strategic plan, policy manual, training plan, supervisory review practices, performance evaluation forms, promotional criteria, complaint data, use of force reviews, pursuit reviews, litigation claims, accreditation findings, employee feedback, community feedback, and available performance data. The purpose of this diagnosis is to determine whether the agency's stated identity is actually connected to its operating systems. PERF's agency level performance measurement guidance supports this kind of system review because police executives need performance expectations, measures, accountability structures, and contextualized information to understand whether agency goals are being translated into behavior and outcomes (Police Executive Research Forum [PERF], 2006). The Chief should not assume alignment. Alignment must be tested.

The second step is MVV realignment. The Chief should determine whether the current Mission still describes the agency's public purpose, whether the Vision still describes the future condition the agency is trying to build, and whether the Values still identify the behavioral commitments expected of Personnel. If the MVV remains accurate, the Chief should preserve it and focus on operational alignment. If the MVV is outdated, vague, incomplete, or disconnected from current conditions, the Chief should conduct a structured realignment process involving Command

Staff, Supervisors, Officers, civilian Personnel, municipal leadership, and appropriate community stakeholders. Mission statement research supports this careful approach because MVV type language can serve identity and strategic communication functions, but its usefulness depends on whether it is connected to organizational systems and performance rather than treated as isolated rhetoric (Alegre et al., 2018, Sidhu, 2003, Weiss & Piderit, 1999).

The third step is adoption of a Guiding Doctrine Directive. The Chief should formally establish Guiding Doctrine as the agency's operational translation layer between MVV and the rest of the agency system. This Directive should define the Doctrine, identify its governing principles, explain how those principles relate to MVV, and require all Directives, training, supervisory review, performance evaluation, and organizational review to align with it. This step is necessary because MVV alone cannot provide operational decision thresholds, risk priorities, legal boundaries, supervisory standards, or review criteria. Naturalistic decision making research supports the need for structured decision frameworks because decision makers in complex operational environments often rely on cues, recognition, experience, and rapid judgment rather than abstract reasoning (Klein, 1998, 2008). The Guiding Doctrine Directive gives Personnel and Supervisors a common decision structure.

The fourth step is Directive audit and revision. The agency should review every major Directive against the Guiding Doctrine. The review should ask whether each Directive supports MVV, applies relevant Doctrine principles, identifies legal authority, defines key terms, establishes decision triggers, states required and prohibited conduct, assigns supervisory responsibilities, requires documentation, supports training, and creates reviewable standards. Directives that are aligned should be retained. Directives that are partially aligned should be revised. Directives that are outdated, legally weak, ambiguous, internally inconsistent, difficult to train, or disconnected from Doctrine should be prioritized for substantial revision. Instructional design research supports this alignment process because effective instruction requires coherence among objectives, performance expectations, conditions, assessment, and feedback (Dick et al., 2005, Gagné, 1985).

The fifth step is training alignment. Once Guiding Doctrine and priority Directives are adopted or revised, the agency must train Personnel to apply them. Training should not be limited to policy acknowledgment. Personnel should practice applying MVV, Guiding Doctrine, and Directives in realistic scenarios that require decision recognition, lawful authority, threat assessment, risk minimization, proportionality, documentation, and articulation. Cognitive load theory supports this approach because training should reduce unnecessary complexity and help Personnel build usable mental models for performance under demanding conditions (Sweller, 1988, 2011). Police decision making research also supports structured decision practice because police encounters often involve incomplete information, uncertainty, stress, and competing risks (Di Nota & Huhta, 2021, Dube et al., 2025).

The sixth step is supervisory alignment. Supervisors must be trained to reinforce the Guiding Doctrine during daily operations. Sergeants, Lieutenants, and Command Staff should understand how to use the Doctrine during briefings, field coaching, report review, use of force review, pursuit review, complaint review, employee counseling, discipline, and performance evaluation. Supervisory alignment is essential because implementation fails when new expectations are issued but not reinforced at the point of performance. Implementation science identifies coaching, performance assessment, fidelity monitoring, feedback, and leadership support as necessary drivers of implementation (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005). If Supervisors do not apply the Doctrine, Personnel will quickly learn that the Doctrine is formal language rather than operational expectation.

The seventh step is performance evaluation redesign. The Chief should revise evaluation instruments so Personnel are evaluated on observable conduct connected to MVV, Guiding Doctrine, Directives, and assigned duties. Evaluations should not merely rate broad traits such as professionalism, integrity, judgment, or dependability. They should define the behaviors that demonstrate those traits. For example, integrity should be evaluated through truthful reporting, accurate documentation, correction of known errors, disclosure of material facts, and compliance with law and Directives. Judgment should be evaluated through lawful decision making, risk recognition, proportionality, documentation, communication, and acceptance of supervisory correction. PERF's performance measurement framework supports the use of meaningful expectations and measures connected to accountability structures (PERF, 2006).

The eighth step is creation of an annual feedback loop. The Chief should use evaluation data, training performance, complaint patterns, use of force reviews, pursuit reviews, report review findings, litigation claims, accreditation findings, community feedback, employee feedback, and supervisory observations to assess whether the system is working. The annual feedback loop should answer several questions. Is MVV still current? Is Guiding Doctrine being applied? Are Directives clear and trainable? Are Supervisors reinforcing expectations? Are evaluations measuring the right behaviors? Are recurring errors individual, supervisory, instructional, policy based, or system based? Implementation research supports this continuous improvement approach because organizational change requires feedback, adaptation, fidelity monitoring, and correction over time (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Nilsen, 2015).

The ninth step is governance. The Chief should assign responsibility for maintaining the system. One executive level function should oversee MVV review, Guiding Doctrine maintenance, Directive alignment, training coordination, supervisory review standards, performance evaluation alignment, and annual reporting. This does not mean one person writes everything or controls every function. It means one office or command level structure is responsible for ensuring that the components remain connected. Without governance, the system will drift. Policies will be updated without Doctrine review. Training will move in one direction while evaluation remains unchanged. Supervisors will use inconsistent standards. MVV will again become static.

The tenth step is communication. Personnel should understand that the model is not a branding project or a compliance exercise. The Chief should explain that MVV defines identity, Guiding Doctrine defines decision principles, Directives define requirements, training teaches application, supervision reinforces conduct, and evaluation measures performance. Municipal leadership and the public should also understand the model because it gives the agency a way to explain how stated values become operational practice. This is important for legitimacy and accountability, but it is also important for internal clarity. A police agency cannot expect Personnel to live a system they do not understand.

The implementation plan should be phased. A Chief should not attempt to rewrite the entire agency at once. Phase one should diagnose the system and review MVV. Phase two should adopt the Guiding Doctrine Directive. Phase three should audit high liability Directives, including use of force, vehicle pursuits, search and seizure, arrests, domestic violence, crisis intervention, prisoner care, internal affairs, report writing, and supervision. Phase four should align training and supervision. Phase five should revise performance evaluations. Phase six should establish annual review and reporting. A phased approach is consistent with implementation science because complex organizational change requires capacity building, sequencing, feedback, and sustained leadership rather than one time adoption (Fixsen et al., 2005, Nilsen, 2015).

The Chief should also identify early evidence of implementation. Early indicators may include revised Directives, updated training plans, Supervisor training completion, improved report review quality, evaluation form revision, documented coaching, clearer use of force review language, better articulation in reports, and identification of recurring system issues. Later indicators may include reduced policy ambiguity, improved consistency in supervisory review, clearer corrective action, stronger training transfer, fewer repeated errors, improved complaint analysis, and better alignment between agency goals and performance evaluation. These indicators should be interpreted carefully and in context. PERF cautions that police performance should be evaluated through multiple measures rather than simplistic single indicators (PERF, 2006).

The implementation plan gives the Chief a practical path from statement to system. MVV becomes current through review and realignment. Guiding Doctrine translates MVV into decision principles. Directives carry those principles into operational requirements. Training builds application. Supervision reinforces performance. Evaluation measures conduct. Feedback corrects the system. Governance prevents drift. This is how a Chief of Police operationalizes MVV without discarding it and without allowing it to remain symbolic.

## **XI. CHIEF'S OPERATIONAL CHECKLIST**

The Chief of Police should use a practical checklist to determine whether Mission, Vision, and Values is functioning as a living management system or merely existing as symbolic language. The checklist should not be treated as a one time compliance form. It should be used during annual review, three year realignment, five year strategic reset, accreditation preparation, policy review, training planning, performance evaluation review, and after major triggering events. PERF's agency level performance measurement guidance supports this approach because police executives need expectations, measures, accountability structures, and multiple sources of information to determine whether agency goals are being translated into actual performance (Police Executive Research Forum [PERF], 2006).

The first question is whether the agency's MVV is current. The Chief should ask when the Mission, Vision, and Values were last reviewed, whether they still reflect the agency's public purpose, whether they remain consistent with current law and community expectations, and whether Personnel understand them. A Mission statement that has not been reviewed in ten years may still contain useful language, but the Chief should not assume alignment without testing it. Mission statement research shows that mission language is most useful when connected to strategy, implementation, and organizational behavior, rather than preserved as isolated organizational rhetoric (Alegre et al., 2018, Sidhu, 2003, Weiss & Piderit, 1999).

The second question is whether the agency has a Guiding Doctrine Directive. MVV identifies the agency's identity and purpose, but Guiding Doctrine translates that identity into operational decision principles. Without Doctrine, the agency may have values but no structured mechanism for applying those values to decisions, Directives, training, supervision, or review. The Chief should ask whether the Doctrine is formally adopted, whether it is known by Personnel, whether it begins with preservation of human life, whether it includes legal sufficiency and decision justifiability, and whether it guides the construction and interpretation of Directives. Naturalistic decision making research supports the need for structured decision guidance because operational decision makers often rely on cues, recognition, experience, and rapid judgment under complex conditions (Klein, 1998, 2008).

The third question is whether Directives carry out the Doctrine. The Chief should ask whether each major Directive identifies its relationship to MVV and Guiding Doctrine, whether it defines legal authority, whether it uses consistent obligation language, whether it provides decision triggers, whether it distinguishes mandatory, discretionary, preferred, and prohibited conduct, whether it assigns supervisory responsibilities, and whether it creates documentation and review standards. Instructional design research supports this alignment because performance expectations, conditions, instruction, assessment, and feedback should be connected in a coherent system (Dick et al., 2005, Gagné, 1985). If a Directive cannot explain what Personnel must do differently, it is not operationally sufficient.

The fourth question is whether training applies the system. The Chief should ask whether training teaches Personnel to apply MVV, Guiding Doctrine, and Directives together in realistic scenarios. Training should test whether Personnel can recognize decision triggers, assess risk, apply lawful authority, choose proportionate options, document decisions, and explain conduct under review. Acknowledging receipt of a Directive should not be treated as proof of operational readiness. Cognitive load theory supports this distinction because Personnel need structured learning, reduced ambiguity, and usable mental models to perform under demanding conditions (Sweller, 1988, 2011).

The fifth question is whether Supervisors reinforce the system. The Chief should ask whether Sergeants, Lieutenants, and Command Staff use the Guiding Doctrine during briefings, report review, use of force review, pursuit review, complaint review, employee counseling, corrective action, mentoring, and discipline. Supervisors are the daily carriers of the agency's operating system. If they do not reinforce the Doctrine, Personnel will learn that MVV and Doctrine are administrative language rather than real expectations. Implementation science supports this point because organizational change requires coaching, performance assessment, fidelity monitoring, feedback, and leadership support (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005, Nilsen, 2015).

The sixth question is whether performance evaluations measure observable conduct tied to MVV, Guiding Doctrine, Directives, and assigned duties. The Chief should ask whether evaluations define values in behavioral terms. Integrity should be measured through truthful reporting, accurate documentation, disclosure of material facts, correction of known errors, and compliance with lawful authority. Accountability should be measured through acceptance of review, documentation, correction, and compliance with supervision. Judgment should be measured through lawful decision making, proportionality, risk recognition, communication, and decision justifiability. PERF's performance measurement framework supports this approach because organizational expectations must be connected to meaningful measures and accountability structures (PERF, 2006).

The seventh question is whether promotion, specialty assignment, and leadership selection are aligned with the system. If the agency promotes Personnel who do not demonstrate MVV, Guiding Doctrine, sound judgment, Directive compliance, supervisory accountability, and decision justifiability, the agency undermines its own stated commitments. Promotion and assignment decisions communicate what the organization truly rewards. The Chief should therefore ensure that selection processes evaluate more than tenure, productivity, popularity, or technical skill. They should evaluate demonstrated alignment with the agency's operating system.

The eighth question is whether the agency uses feedback to correct the system. The Chief should ask whether complaint trends, use of force reviews, pursuit reviews, training deficiencies,

performance evaluations, litigation claims, accreditation findings, employee feedback, community feedback, and supervisory observations are reviewed together. These information sources should help determine whether failures are individual, supervisory, training based, Directive based, Doctrine based, or implementation based. Implementation literature supports continuous feedback and adaptation because formal adoption does not ensure fidelity or performance improvement (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005).

The Chief's checklist can be summarized as follows: Is the MVV current? Is it reviewed annually? Has it been formally realigned within the last three years? Has it received a full strategic reset within the last five years? Is there a Guiding Doctrine Directive? Do Directives carry out the Doctrine? Does training apply the Doctrine? Do Supervisors reinforce the Doctrine? Do evaluations measure observable conduct tied to MVV and Doctrine? Are promotion and assignment decisions aligned with the system? Are results reviewed annually? Is the system corrected when failures appear?

The purpose of the checklist is not paperwork. Its purpose is executive control. It gives the Chief of Police a practical method to test whether the agency's stated identity is connected to the systems that govern conduct. If the checklist reveals gaps, the Chief can identify where the system is failing. The problem may be outdated MVV, missing Doctrine, vague Directives, weak training, inconsistent supervision, generic evaluations, misaligned promotions, or poor feedback. The checklist allows the Chief to move from aspiration to diagnosis, and from diagnosis to correction.

## **XII. CONCLUSION**

Mission, Vision, and Values should not be abandoned in police agencies. MVV remains necessary because it defines organizational identity, public purpose, strategic direction, and expected character. The failure in many legacy systems is not that agencies have MVV. The failure is that MVV is often left static, disconnected, and unmeasured. When MVV is treated as website language, policy manual language, or strategic planning language without connection to Directives, training, supervision, performance evaluation, and review, it loses operational force. Mission statement research supports this distinction because mission language may communicate purpose and identity, but its value depends on connection to strategy, implementation, behavior, and organizational performance rather than mere adoption (Alegre et al., 2018, Sidhu, 2003, Weiss & Piderit, 1999).

The central argument of this paper is that MVV must become a living management system. That requires a connected architecture. MVV defines who the agency is, what it exists to do, what future it seeks to build, and what conduct it expects. Guiding Doctrine translates MVV into operational decision principles. Directives convert those principles into legal, procedural, supervisory, documentation, and review requirements. Training develops the ability to apply the system. Supervisors reinforce and correct performance. Evaluation measures whether Personnel are demonstrating observable conduct consistent with MVV, Guiding Doctrine, Directives, and assigned responsibilities. PERF's performance measurement guidance supports this approach because police agencies need expectations, measures, and accountability structures that connect agency goals to actual behavior and outcomes (Police Executive Research Forum [PERF], 2006).

Guiding Doctrine is the missing translation layer in many police policy systems. MVV can state that the agency values life, lawfulness, accountability, fairness, professionalism, and service. But without Doctrine, those commitments may remain too abstract to guide decisions under

pressure. Police Personnel make decisions in environments marked by uncertainty, legal constraint, cognitive demand, time pressure, and risk. Naturalistic decision making research shows that decision makers in complex environments rely on cues, recognition, experience, and rapid judgment rather than slow reflection on abstract statements (Klein, 1998, 2008). Cognitive load theory also shows that unnecessary complexity and ambiguity can interfere with learning, recall, and performance (Sweller, 1988, 2011). Guiding Doctrine responds to that reality by giving the agency a common decision framework that can be trained, supervised, reviewed, and evaluated.

The first principle of that Doctrine should be preservation of human life. From that starting point, the Doctrine should establish legal sufficiency, decision justifiability, threat based decision making, proportionality and necessity, risk minimization, discretion channeling, information integrity, cognitive clarity, consistency, and supervisory accountability. These principles should not become a new values list. Each principle must control or evaluate decisions. If a principle does not affect how a Directive is written, how training is conducted, how a Supervisor reviews conduct, how a decision is documented, or how performance is evaluated, it does not belong in the Doctrine. The purpose of Doctrine is operational translation, not symbolic restatement.

The Chief of Police is the system architect. A Chief cannot rely on MVV language alone and expect it to shape daily conduct. The Chief must review MVV annually, realign it formally every three years, reassess it strategically every five years, and review it after major triggering events such as a new Chief, critical incident, litigation, accreditation finding, statutory change, consent decree, public trust event, or major operational shift. The Chief must also ensure that the Guiding Doctrine Directive is adopted, that Directives are audited and revised, that training teaches application, that Supervisors reinforce the system, that performance evaluations measure observable conduct, and that feedback is used to correct failure. Implementation science supports this approach because organizational change requires leadership, capacity, training, coaching, monitoring, feedback, and fidelity rather than formal adoption alone (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, Fixsen et al., 2005, Nilsen, 2015).

The practical value of this model is that it gives police executives a way to diagnose and correct system drift. If Personnel act inconsistently with MVV, the Chief can ask whether the problem is outdated MVV, missing Doctrine, vague Directives, inadequate training, weak supervision, generic evaluation, misaligned promotion, or poor feedback. This prevents the agency from treating every failure as either only individual misconduct or only abstract system failure. It allows the Chief to identify where the operating system broke down and correct the proper layer. That approach is more useful than relying on broad values language after the fact.

The model also strengthens accountability. Courts, oversight bodies, accreditation assessors, municipal leaders, and the public do not evaluate a police agency only by what it claims to believe. They evaluate what the agency directs, trains, supervises, measures, corrects, and tolerates. The legal framework for municipal liability focuses on policy, training, supervision, deliberate indifference, and the relationship between agency action or inaction and constitutional harm rather than generalized statements of values (City of Canton v. Harris, 1989, Connick v. Thompson, 2011, Monell v. Department of Social Services, 1978). An agency that can demonstrate MVV review, Doctrine translation, Directive alignment, training application, supervisory reinforcement, performance evaluation, and feedback correction is better positioned to show active governance.

The final conclusion is straightforward. MVV should live at the identity level. Guiding Doctrine should live at the decision level. Directives should live at the operational level. Training and

supervision should live at the application level. Performance evaluation should live at the accountability level. Annual review and feedback should keep the entire system alive. This structure allows a Chief of Police to preserve MVV while preventing it from becoming static language. It converts organizational identity into decision architecture, decision architecture into operational requirements, operational requirements into trained performance, and trained performance into measurable accountability.

Modern police leadership should not discard MVV. It should demand more from it. MVV should not be decorative language. It should be the living identity framework of the agency. But it can only become living when it is translated into Guiding Doctrine, carried out through Directives, reinforced through training and supervision, measured through performance evaluation, and corrected through ongoing review. That is how a police agency moves from stated values to operational reality.

## REFERENCES

Alegre, I., Berbegal-Mirabent, J., Guerrero, A., & Mas-Machuca, M. (2018). The real mission of the mission statement: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 24(4), 456–473. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2017.82>

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1974). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. Jossey-Bass.

*City of Canton v. Harris*, 489 U.S. 378 (1989).

*Connick v. Thompson*, 563 U.S. 51 (2011).

Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2005). *The systematic design of instruction* (6th ed.). Pearson.

Di Nota, P. M., & Huhta, J. M. (2021). Complex motor learning and police use of force: A critical review of visual models for police use of force decision-making. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article 652588. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.652588>

Dror, I. E. (2020). Cognitive and human factors in expert decision making: Six fallacies and the eight sources of bias. *Analytical Chemistry*, 92(12), 7998–8004. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.analchem.0c00704>

Dube, O., MacArthur, S. J., & Shah, A. K. (2025). A cognitive view of policing. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 140(1), 745–791. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjae039>

Durlak, J. A., & DuPre, E. P. (2008). Implementation matters: A review of research on the influence of implementation on program outcomes and the factors affecting implementation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(3–4), 327–350. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-008-9165-0>

Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M., & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature*. University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, The National Implementation Research Network.

- Gagné, R. M. (1985). *The conditions of learning and theory of instruction* (4th ed.). Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Graham v. Connor, 490 U.S. 386 (1989).
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Klein, G. (1998). *Sources of power: How people make decisions*. MIT Press.
- Klein, G. (2008). Naturalistic decision making. *Human Factors*, 50(3), 456–460. <https://doi.org/10.1518/001872008X288385>
- Marshall, M. A. (2010). IACP strategic plan: A clear blueprint for the future. *Police Chief*, 77(12), 6. <https://www.policechiefmagazine.org/iacp-strategic-plan-a-clear-blueprint-for-the-future/>
- Monell v. Department of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658 (1978).
- Nilsen, P. (2015). Making sense of implementation theories, models and frameworks. *Implementation Science*, 10, Article 53. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-015-0242-0>
- Phillips, S. W. (2022). Reappreciating the varieties of police behavior: A national examination of contemporary police mission statements. *Policing: An International Journal*, 45(6), 893–907. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-02-2022-0026>
- Police Executive Research Forum. (2006). *Implementing an agency-level performance measurement system: A guide for law enforcement executives*. [https://www.policeforum.org/assets/docs/Free\\_Online\\_Documents/Police\\_Evaluation/implementing%20an%20agency-level%20performance%20measurement%20system%202006.pdf](https://www.policeforum.org/assets/docs/Free_Online_Documents/Police_Evaluation/implementing%20an%20agency-level%20performance%20measurement%20system%202006.pdf)
- San José Police Department. (2023). *Strategic plan*. <https://www.sjpd.org/about-us/office-of-the-chief-of-police/strategic-plan>
- Sherman, L. W. (1998). *Evidence-based policing*. Police Foundation.
- Sidhu, J. (2003). Mission statements: Is it time to shelve them? *European Management Journal*, 21(4), 439–446. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-2373\(03\)00072-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-2373(03)00072-0)
- Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4)
- Sweller, J. (2011). Cognitive load theory. *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, 55, 37–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-387691-1.00002-8>
- Tennessee v. Garner, 471 U.S. 1 (1985).
- Tracy Police Department. (2025). *2025–2028 strategic plan*. <https://tracypd.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/2025-2028-Tracy-PD-Strategic-Plan.pdf>
- Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Sage.

Weiss, J. A., & Piderit, S. K. (1999). The value of mission statements in public agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 9(2), 193–223.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024407>