



**CCI**

CUTTING CRIME  
IMPACT

# Cutting — Crime Impact

DRAFT

[www.cuttingcrimeimpact.eu](http://www.cuttingcrimeimpact.eu)

DELIVERABLE 2.4

## Review of State of the Art: Community Policing





**CCI**  
CUTTING CRIME  
IMPACT



DELIVERABLE 2.4

# Review of State of the Art: Community Policing

**Deliverable Type**  
Report

**Work Package**  
WP 2

**Dissemination**  
Public

**Month and Date of Delivery**  
Month 09, 24 June 2019  
(Revised: July 2020)

**Leader**  
USAL

**Authors**  
Prof. Caroline L. Davey, USAL  
Andrew B. Wootton, USAL  
Dr Roberta Signori, GMP  
Francesc Guillén, INT  
Mónica Diniz, CML  
Paul van Soomeren, DSP

**Programme**  
H2020

**Contract Number**  
787100

**Duration**  
36 Months

**Start**  
1 October 2018

## CONTRIBUTORS

| NAME             | ORGANISATION |
|------------------|--------------|
| BRAM VAN DIJK    | DSP          |
| PAUL SAVILL      | GMP          |
| ROBERTA SIGNORIA | GMP          |

## PEER REVIEWS

| NAME              | ORGANISATION |
|-------------------|--------------|
| DR. OSKAR GSTREIN | RUG          |
| PILAR DE LA TORRE | EFUS         |

## REVISION HISTORY

| VERSION | DATE       | REVIEWER                | MODIFICATIONS                       |
|---------|------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1       | 29/05/2019 | PROF. CAROLINE L. DAVEY | Initial version                     |
| 2       | 19/06/2019 | PROF. CAROLINE L. DAVEY | Edits & additional conclusions      |
| 3       | 30/06/2019 | ANDREW B WOOTTON        | Formatting & minor edits            |
| 4       | 26/11/2019 | USAL                    | Minor edits                         |
| 5       | 16/07/2020 | GMP & USAL              | Lessons learnt section & formatting |

## Table of Contents

|    |   |    |
|----|---|----|
| 1  | Introduction.....   | 6  |
| 2  | Methodology .....   | 8  |
| 3  | Background – UK approach to community policing .....                            | 9  |
|    | 3.1 <i>Origins community policing</i> .....                                     | 9  |
|    | 3.2 <i>Modernisation and crisis</i> .....                                       | 11 |
|    | 3.3 <i>Reassurance policing and neighbourhood policing</i> .....                | 12 |
|    | 3.4 <i>Austerity and increasing demand impacts neighbourhood policing</i> ..... | 14 |
|    | 3.4.1 <i>Different models of neighbourhood policing</i> .....                   | 16 |
|    | 3.5 <i>Managing neighbourhood policing – current priorities</i> .....           | 16 |
|    | 3.6 <i>Evaluations of effectiveness</i> .....                                   | 18 |
| 4  | Community policing in Greater Manchester.....                                   | 19 |
| 5  | Community policing in Portugal.....   | 23 |
|    | 5.1 <i>The safe school programme</i> .....                                      | 23 |
|    | 5.2 <i>Integrated Program of Proximity policing</i> .....                       | 24 |
|    | 5.3 <i>Public Security Police</i> .....   | 25 |
|    | 5.4 <i>National Republican Guard (GNR)</i> .....                                | 26 |
| 6  | Community policing in Lisbon.....   | 29 |
|    | 6.1 <i>Lisbon Municipal Police (LMP)</i> .....                                  | 29 |
| 7  | Community policing: Spain and Catalonia .....                                   | 36 |
|    | 7.1 <i>The transition to democracy and the implications for policing</i> .....  | 36 |
|    | 7.2 <i>The new era of global terrorism</i> .....                                | 38 |
|    | 7.3 <i>Current approach to community policing</i> .....                         | 39 |
|    | 7.4 <i>Assessing the success of community policing</i> .....                    | 42 |
|    | 7.5 <i>Toolkits for supporting proximity-oriented policing</i> .....            | 43 |
|    | 7.6 <i>Issues related to the delivery of community policing</i> .....           | 44 |
|    | 7.7 <i>Ethical, legal and social issues related to community policing</i> ..... | 45 |
| 8  | Community policing: Germany .....   | 46 |
| 9  | Community policing in federal state of Lower Saxony .....                       | 50 |
| 10 | Lessons Learnt.....   | 51 |

|    |   |           |
|----|---|-----------|
|    | <i>10.1 Community policing and police culture .....</i>                 | <i>51</i> |
| 11 | Conclusions and discussion.....   | 53        |
|    | <i>11.1 The community policing model.....</i>                           | <i>53</i> |
|    | <i>11.2 The concept of trust.....</i>                                   | <i>55</i> |
|    | <i>11.3 Terrorism and community policing.....</i>                       | <i>55</i> |
|    | <i>11.4 Policing in a time of austerity.....</i>                        | <i>56</i> |
| 12 | References.....   | 57        |
| 13 | Appendices .....  | 64        |
|    | <i>13.1 Typology of approaches to community policing in the UK.....</i> | <i>64</i> |
|    | <i>13.2 UK College of Policing Guidelines .....</i>                     | <i>65</i> |
|    | <i>13.3 Emergency planning .....</i>                                    | <i>67</i> |

DRAFT

# 1 Introduction

Community policing is about fostering trust, confidence and legitimacy in policing—goals that are long term, important and strategic. Community policing traditionally involves three main aspects: providing a visible police presence; actively engaging with local citizens; and prioritising the concerns of local communities. Such concerns may cover a range of issues from crime and fear of victimisation to problems of anti-social behaviour and incivility. There is often an overlap between community policing and problem-oriented policing, with the community likely to be involved in specific problem-solving efforts (Weisburd & Majumdar, 2018, p. 151). Community policing is also recognised as supporting the prevention of radicalisation. Local police officers may be the first contact point with radicalised youth and their parents (Cherney, 2016) or be contributors to wider networks of organisations that help prevent extremism (e.g., services for young people, religious groups, residents' groups) (Beatrice de Graaf, 2011).

Law enforcement agencies (LEAs) are expected to move away from an emergency-response, reactive style of policing to an intelligence-led, problem-oriented and proactive approach. Local communities and their concerns are expected to have a real voice in policing priorities and practices. Community policing is delivered through a decentralised management structure with officers on the ground being able to respond to public demands and make things happen locally. Law enforcement agencies (LEAs) work in partnership with other agencies because a range of actions must often be taken to address often complex problems—some of which are outside the remit of police officers (Mackenzie, & Henry, 2009)

The defining features of community policing can be traced back to the “Peelian” principles developed by Sir Robert Peel (1829), the British Prime Minister and Conservative party leader who aimed to develop an ethical police force and who promoted “policing by consent”. However, when and how the approach came into operation varies across different contexts. In the UK, where law enforcement is founded on the community policing model, the approach is termed “Neighbourhood Policing”. In the United States, community policing emerged in the 1970s. The term ‘community-oriented policing’ (COPS) is currently being used to describe a philosophy that combines traditional aspects of law enforcement with prevention measures, problem-solving, community engagement and partnership working (Diamond and Weiss, 2009; Skogan and Steiner, 2004). In Portugal, community policing termed ‘Proximity Policing’ emerged around 2009. This report outlines community policing policy and practice across four European contexts:

- UK, including in Greater Manchester
- Portugal, including in Lisbon
- Spain, including in Catalonia
- Germany, including in Lower Saxony

The report discusses contextual factors impacting delivery of community policing—from national government policy through public funding for law enforcement and technological development to the community context.

DRAFT

## 2 Methodology

The review of current law enforcement agency (LEA) practice and 'what works' in community policing in four European countries was conducted for the Cutting Crime Impact (CCI) project. Three research activities were undertaken, as follows:

- A review of academic and LEA operational literature on community policing. Jaap de Waard, from the CCI Advisory Board, undertook a review of the academic literature on community policing and problem-oriented policing. CCI consortium members provided background information on community policing in their country and provided examples of existing toolkits, and (where available) impact (see CCI deliverables D2.2 and D2.3).
- A workshop was held in Amsterdam with LEA consortium partners (part of Consortium Meeting 2, in February 2019) to: (i) discuss results and issues raised by the research; and (ii) seek to understand and explore different approaches to tool development and delivery relating to community policing.
- Interviews were held with 'leaders in the field'—including co-ordinators of EU-funded research projects on community policing (see deliverable D2.1).



## 3 Background – UK approach to community policing

An understanding of the background to policing in the UK is crucial to understanding why community policing is central to LEA policy and practice and the challenges facing policing in the UK today. The British model has also informed policing in other European countries. The development of community policing is described below.

### 3.1 Origins community policing

Watchmen and constables have been in operation in Britain since the Thirteenth Century and the system of policing by unpaid parish constables continued in England until the 19th century (Guth 1994). The defining features of modern community policing can be traced back to the “Peelian” principles developed by Sir Robert Peel (1829), one of the founders of the modern Conservative party. Sir Robert Peel served twice as Prime Minister in Great Britain (1834–35 and 1841–46) and twice as Home Secretary (1822–27 and 1828–30). He is regarded as the father of modern British policing for founding the Metropolitan Police Service in London. Peel aimed to develop an ethical police force and promoted “policing by consent”, an approach that acknowledged that police powers depend on public approval or acceptance. Local police officers were supposed to prevent crime and disorder, as well as deal with offenders, whilst maintaining public approval and were designed to negate the need for military intervention (Emsley, 2009).

*“With the Metropolitan Police Act of 1829 Sir Robert Peel formalised the mixed economy of parish constables and watchmen who patrolled the streets of London into a ‘New Police’. Given instructions to prevent crime by patrolling on foot, checking the security of buildings and apprehending ‘suspicious persons’, the new constabulary fell naturally into a ‘beat’ structure with each constable taking responsibility for a small geographic patch...this ‘jigsaw’ structure provided the basic organisational framework for British Policing for the next 130 years. The mode of policing the beat model encouraged — locally focused, (theoretically) preventative and delivered by consistent, familiar, uniformed civilians — has been celebrated as uniquely British and uniquely consensual, from at least the 1930s to the present day.”*

Higgins, 2018. p. 8.

The approach to community policing in the UK—currently termed neighbourhood policing—has changed over the years (see timeline below). However, the connection to its original foundations.

remained throughout, namely, the use of police officers to patrol the streets, engaging with communities and dealing with incidents—all within a particular locality or neighbourhood.

The Police Foundation, an independent think tank, suggests that allocating the same officers to the same streets, as well as charging officers with preventing crime might help create an informed, accountable and consensual approach (Higgins, 2018).

*Table 1: Timeline for community policing in Great Britain*

| DATE / TIME PERIOD | DETAILS  |
|--------------------|--|
| • 1829             | Police Act establishes locally focused, preventative civil policing model (Sir Robert Peel)  |
| 1960s              | Technology used to modernise policing, but reduced contact with the public.  |
| • 1967             | Home Office Circular 142 'Unit Beat Policing'  |
| 1970s – early 80s  | Police crises due to: police corruption; miscarriages of justice; clashes with miners; race riots  |
| • 1979             | Chief Constable Alderson's Community Police Order emphasised consensual style and need for proactive, preventative approach                        |
| 1980s              | After Brixton riots, Scarman report highlighted need to re-engage with the public  |
| • 1997             | The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (published as "The Macpherson report") identifies 'institutionalised racism'.   |
| Early 2000         | National Reassurance Policing Programme to address the "reassurance gap" between crime (which was falling) and the public's perception of unsafety |

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| 2000 – 2010    | Neighbourhood policing to address local crime and disorder issues, engage with the public and reconnect with communities |
| 2010 – present | Austerity programme results in cuts to community policing service.   |

### 3.2 Modernisation and crisis

In the 1960s, there were attempts to modernise policing, which inadvertently undermined some intrinsic benefits of the traditional Peelian model. A Home Office Circular 142 issued in 1967 encouraged UK police forces to move to a system of ‘Unit Beat Policing’. This aimed to capitalise on technologies (such as personal radios and police patrol cars) to increase police productivity and respond more quickly to calls for service. As a result, police officers were taken off the beat and put into patrol cars, reducing opportunities for regular face-to-face interaction with the public. The organisational changes have been linked to subsequent problems that arose in the 1970s:

*“It is debatable whether these organisational changes precipitated or were merely unhelpful in responding to the series of crises that beset British policing over the following decades.”*

Higgins, 2018, p. 8.

The 1970s and early 1980s saw police corruption and miscarriages of justice hit the headlines with increasing regularity. The police were also pitched into direct conflict with contrasting communities during race riots in urban areas (Emsley, 2009) and against striking miners in the provinces (Milne, 2004). The disconnect between the police and the public they served became increasingly stark and problematic.

In addition, questions were raised about the effectiveness of police practices—and criminal justice in general—in terms of controlling rising crime rates and rehabilitating offenders. The limitations of the response-oriented ‘standard’ policing model were highlighted. Greater emphasis came to be placed on preventing crime, addressing the “causes of crime” and aligning policing with the needs of diverse communities.

*“...Many of the ideas that have come to be associated with ‘community’ and then ‘neighbourhood’ policing emerged as correctives to increasingly disconnected and reactive policing, and as a realignment to the needs of a more diverse, liberal and plural society.”*

Higgins, 2018, p. 8.

The changes in approach required UK police to adopt new ways of working and managing. Early formulation of community policing is most closely associated with chief constable John Alderson,

responsible for Devon and Cornwall in the South of England. According to Higgins (2018), Alderson's Community Police Order to his officers in 1979 advocated shifting: from an authoritarian to a consensual style; from reactive enforcement to proactive prevention; and from unilateral to partnership working—all guided by crime analysis and community consultation. This approach was conceptualised by Alderson in terms of tiers—or levels: Community policing as a 'first-tier' strategy, backed up by second tier response and third tier investigation (Higgins, 2018).

Policing issues continued to emerge through the late 1980s to 1990s. In the wake of the Brixton riots, Lord Scarman identified the need for the police to re-engage with the public. Community policing remained culturally marginal and fragmented in terms of implementation and practitioners began to look abroad for good practice (Higgins, 2018). Following its mishandling of the murder in 1993 of black teenager, Stephen Lawrence (Lawrence, 2011), the Metropolitan Police attempted to tackle the problem of "institutional racism" identified in the Macpherson report.

### 3.3 Reassurance policing and neighbourhood policing

In England and Wales, the National Reassurance Policing Programme (NRPP) ran in pilot sites between 2003 and 2005. Influenced by good practice in the US, and regional UK practice, the NRPP set out to address the 'reassurance gap'. This is the mismatch between falling crime rates and the public's contrary perception that crime was going up. The approach drew on the 'signal crimes' perspective, which argued that specific (but varying) types of crime and disorder — including some incidents not traditionally considered to be 'serious' — can disproportionately impact on individuals and communities in terms of their feelings of security. The implication for the police was that by identifying and targeting the crimes with the strongest local signal values, and in particular antisocial behaviour, they might reduce fear, improve confidence and reassure the public (Higgins, 2018). The NRPP evaluation published the Home Office highlighted the success of the programme:

*"...Overall [the programme] had a positive impact on crime, perceptions of crime and anti-social behaviour, feelings of safety and public confidence in the police... The findings of this study show that the public not only notice increased police foot patrol, they also notice the efforts that the police put into engagement and the effects of properly targeted problem solving designed to reduce anti-social behaviour."*

Tuffin, Morris Alexis Poole, 2006, ix.

From 2000 to 2010, 'neighbourhood policing' was developed to address local crime and disorder issues, reassure the public, and reconnect the police with communities throughout England and Wales. Neighbourhood policing embraces Peelian principles:

*"Neighbourhood policing in South Yorkshire provides communities with teams of dedicated, local police officers, together with police community support officers, who listen to, and work with, the public, community groups, partner agencies and businesses"*

*to reduce crime, protect the vulnerable and enhance community safety through problem-solving approaches."*

South Yorkshire Police in England

While neighbourhood policing is delivered by a patchwork of small teams of police and community support officers, it was nevertheless centrally designed and funded. The evidence from the pilot projects suggested that the approach offered benefits, including reductions in victimisation—although these were not fully realised when the approach was rolled out (Higgins, 2018). Prior to the completion and evaluation of the National Reassurance Policing Programme (NRPP), the Labour Government issued in 2004 the White Paper 'Building Communities, Beating Crime'. The approach was resource intensive but chimed with New Labour's ideal of 'new localism'. Neighbourhood policing was supported by a £50m fund and the provision of 25,000 Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs).

*"Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) work with police officers and share some, but not all of their powers". In contrast, "special constables are volunteers who have the same powers as police."*

UK Government website (accessed 18.01.19)

Between 2005 and 2008, the Neighbourhood Policing Programme (NPP) was scaled-up and rolled-out on a national basis, together with key elements the National Reassurance Policing Programme (NRPP approach). The process of implementation started with Pathfinder sites in each police force area. Visible foot-patrol, community engagement and problem solving remained central to the approach, but the Neighbourhood Policing Programme recognised the need for flexibility in terms of implementation. It also contained a subtle shift in expectations from law-enforcement to crime reduction outcomes, alongside improvements in public perceptions of safety and confidence in the police (Higgins, 2018).

Although lacking concrete evidence, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) reported in 2008 that all forces had achieved basic standards by making neighbourhood policing teams a 'core part' of operational policing — resulting in a national patchwork of 3,600 local teams, staffed by nearly 30,000 police officers and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs). It is noteworthy that evaluations conducted subsequently suggested visible foot-patrol only worked when combined with other aspects of neighbourhood policing (Higgins, 2018).

The Labour government issued its Policing Pledge in 2009, which included commitments that neighbourhood teams would continue to spend 80 per cent of their time 'visibly working' in their designated areas, responding promptly to enquiries and that staff turnover would be minimised to ensure community relationships were sustained. The strong emphasis on communities driving policing was reflected in the development of 'service standards' and local agreements (Home Office, 2008, 2010). Furthermore, all central police targets were replaced with a single public confidence measure (Higgins, 2018).

While the UK government claimed in its 2008 Green Paper, *From the Neighbourhood to the National*, to be "...absolutely committed to neighbourhood policing as the bedrock for local policing in the 21st Century", experience revealed that implementation of problem-solving is far from straightforward (Bullock and Tilley, 2009) and would become even more difficult in times of high demand, staff shortages and organisational change.

### 3.4 Austerity and increasing demand impacts neighbourhood policing

In 2010, the new Conservative government Home Secretary Theresa May was appointed to oversee a programme of sweeping police reforms. In 2012, elected Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs), along with chief constables, took the lead in deciding policy at a local level—and the Home Office stepped back. Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) and chief constables were considered best placed to make decisions on how local policing should be organised and delivered; a policy that has continued under the current Conservative government to this day. In line with this philosophy, previously ring-fenced funding streams, including those for neighbourhood policing and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) have generally been rolled into the Police Main Grant, allowing local decision makers greater flexibility in how they deliver services (Higgins, 2018).

#### What are Police and Crime Commissioners?

*"Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) are elected representatives who oversee how crime is tackled in a police force area. Their aim is to cut crime and to ensure the police force is effective. There are separate arrangements for London and Greater Manchester... In Manchester, the Mayor of Greater Manchester is responsible for Police and Crime Commissioner functions".*

*Source: Police UK website, Home Office (accessed 30.05.19)  
<https://www.police.uk/information-and-advice/police-and-crime-commissioners/>*

Over the last decade, cuts in public funding have impacted police staffing levels significantly. Between 2010/11 and 2015/16 central government police funding reduced by 25 per cent in real terms, with forces absorbing overall budget reductions of between 12 and 23 per cent (average 18 per cent). Indeed, cost reduction measures have been a defining characteristic of policing in England and Wales over the last decade—impacting significantly on the number of police officers, with police staff (including PCSOs) in decline (Higgins, 2018).

There is evidence that neighbourhood policing has not fared well under these conditions. According to a report conducted by the Police Foundation in 2018 (Higgins, 2018), resource problems exist across all police forces.

*“In all of the forces visited during the focus groups programme, front line practitioners provided ‘then and now’ comparisons... to illustrate how neighbourhood policing staffing levels had reduced over recent years. In the view of the vast majority, this had resulted in significant deterioration in capability and service. These narratives are consistent and appear at odds with the relatively robust neighbourhood officer headcount indicated by the official data”.*

Quotes from research participants suggest that previously large teams of 20 to 28 Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) are now significantly reduced to between 3 to 6 PCSOs (Higgins, 2018).

The nature of the challenge facing the police has also changed. The emphasis shifted from volume crime (which has been in decline since the mid-1990s) to harmfulness, and from public-place and property crimes to those affecting vulnerable individuals and groups, including child sexual exploitation, historic abuse and mental health crises. Police demand increased as they become involved in more resource intensive activities, including responding to those in mental health crisis and previously under-reported crimes such as violence against women. Police also had to deal with emerging problems such as cybercrime and threat of Islamic State-inspired terrorist attacks. Police officers participating in the Police Foundation research reported that demand on local policing had intensified and changed, creating a ‘perfect storm’ of increasing workload and shrinking resource. This situation was variously attributed to increased organisational focus on safeguarding and vulnerability, growing populations, societal changes and increasingly complex communities. In summary, one or more of three factors detailed below are identified (Higgins, 2018).

- Attrition to other services, leading to demand displaced onto policing as the ‘service of last resort’.
- An increase in demand (linked to the above) relating to individuals in the community suffering from poor mental health.
- And finally, a vicious circle arising from a lack of police(-led) problem-solving and timely attention:

*“If something’s really risky then it will get dealt with, but if someone’s more low level then it will just get put to the side. But the thing is, these low-level things can just continue, continue, continue, until they become risky, and then all of a sudden they’re problematic.”*

(FG8)

Developments in social media technology would appear to be a mixed blessing. On the one hand, social media is enabling police officers to engage with communities more widely, as well as gain citizen support in addressing specific incidents, such as missing persons. On the other hand, inappropriate use of social media by police staff can generate problems for police forces and individual officers potentially new to the medium. In addition, social media and the internet in general is generating

additional demand for the police, who have to address a range of problems exacerbated by the internet and mobile technologies: hate crime; harassment; drugs; child exploitation; suicide and mental health.

### 3.4.1 Different models of neighbourhood policing

Research conducted by the Police Foundation suggests that the way in which neighbourhood policing is being delivered varies significantly across the police forces. The Police Foundation has developed a high-level 'typology' to act as a starting point for exploring recent changes and capturing the wide range of models for delivering neighbourhood policing across England and Wales. The author of the report (Higgins, 2018) concludes that there is a "...looser, less specified formulation of what 'neighbourhood policing' means and a breakdown in consensus about its functions and component activities" (p.20). In addition, there is a growing diversification in the way neighbourhood policing is delivered, with "...differing and sometimes opposing strategies being adopted across forces (consolidation versus redesign, generalisation versus specialism, civilianisation versus de-civilianisation)" (p. 20). Furthermore, there is "...inconsistent and changing use of PCSOs" (p.20), as well as an apparent "...dissolution of the boundaries between reactive and proactive local policing" — at least in some forces. This is because to maintain officer numbers, neighbourhood policing officers may be co-opted into a force's broader strategic aims.

### 3.5 Managing neighbourhood policing – current priorities

The concept of 'the community' and problem-solving are central to the current definition of neighbourhood policing. According to the UK Policing College (2018, p. 3), the defining features of neighbourhood policing are:

- Police officers, staff and volunteers that are accessible to, responsible for and accountable to communities
- Community engagement that builds trust and develops a sophisticated understanding of community needs
- Collaborative problem-solving with communities supported by integrated working with private, public and voluntary sectors. The *"combination of these features distinguishes neighbourhood policing from other broader policing functions"* (DCC Gavin Stephens College guideline committee chair and NPCC lead for neighbourhood policing, p. 3).

#### UK College of Policing

Established in 2012, the College of Policing is described as:



*"...The professional body for everyone who works for the police service in England and Wales". The purpose of the College is to provide those working in policing with the skills and knowledge necessary to "prevent crime, protect the public, and secure public trust."*

*Source: UK College of Policing website (accessed 07.06.19)*

Neighbourhood policing encourages the use of locally tailored, evidence-based practice to achieve a sustained impact on reducing harm and repeat demand, as well as increasing community resilience. It requires effective data sharing between different agencies for problems to be identified and properly understood, and for effective action to be taken.

Neighbourhood policing is firmly accepted in the UK and it is difficult for politicians to abandon the approach without encountering widespread public dissatisfaction. Hence, the Policing Vision 2025 describes how the link between the police and the public will continue to form the bedrock of British policing. However, the College of Policing admits that maintaining neighbourhood policing in the face of public funding cuts has been difficult (UK College of Police, 2018c, p. 5).

Unwilling to increase public spending, government attempts are being made to address performance problems and maintain services through better 'management' of LEAs. To this end, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Service (2016) recommend LEAs implement College of Policing guidelines to tackle:

*"...the continued erosion of local policing and the need for many forces to take urgent action to maintain a proactive and preventative approach to policing."*

(UK College of Policing, 2018c, p. 5).

The College of Policing is firmly committed to an 'evidence-based' approach to policing, where police forces make greater use of scientific methodologies and evidence from social science research informs police policy and practice (Society of Evidence-based Policing, accessed 7 June 2019). In 2010, the first professional Society of Evidence-Based Policing was founded at the University of Cambridge, and now has some 2,000 members from mostly UK police forces. Reviews of current practice and 'what works' were conducted to help develop detailed guidance for senior officers, entitled "Neighbourhood policing guidelines: Supporting material for senior leaders" (UK College of Policing, 2018). The guidelines outline the essential elements of neighbourhood policing but leave the question of how to achieve neighbourhood policing in a time of austerity to the discretion of the chief police officers. An example of the evidenced-based methodology and the content of the guidelines are included in Appendix B.

### 3.6 Evaluations of effectiveness

In light of the focus on evidence-based approaches, there have been attempts to demonstrate the 'value' of neighbourhood policing. Systematic reviews of the evidence (Gill et al 2014, cited in UK College of Policing, 2018c) show that neighbourhood policing has been effective at:

- Reducing public perceptions of disorder
- Increasing trust and confidence in the police
- Increasing the perceived legitimacy of the police

Targeted foot patrol and community engagement when implemented with problem solving in UK ward-level pilots reduced criminal victimisation and disorder, improved feelings of safety, increased trust and improved public perceptions of policing over 12 months (Tuffin *et al*, 2006). However, foot patrol is unlikely to lead to improvements in public trust in the police without community engagement, problem solving and perceived police fairness.

DRAFT

## 4 Community policing in Greater Manchester

This next section discusses neighbourhood policing in Greater Manchester—an area in the north west of England that includes the cities of Manchester and Salford, as well as a number of large surrounding towns. The diverse population of 2.8m residents includes over 16 percent ethnic minorities. The region has a growing economy, but also districts that are some of the most deprived in the UK. There are also some 100,000 students and 5 million people living within one hour’s travel — travelling to the city for leisure, work, retail, and so on. The area is home to a thriving night-time economy and hosts over 1,200 public events each year that draw on policing resources (HMICFRS, accessed 23.05.19).

### Structure of policing in the UK

Policing in the UK is subdivided by geographical region, and comprises 43 police forces in England and Wales; the British Transport Police; and police forces of Scotland and Northern Ireland

*Source: website, <http://www.police.uk>*

The area is service by Greater Manchester Police (GMP)—one of the CCI project’s LEA partners. GMP deals with more priority incidents relative to population than any other UK force and has recorded almost 335,000 crimes in 2018. There is significant demand for policing services and GMP’s police officers deal with more crimes per officer than the average of comparable metropolitan forces in London. There is growing complexity in investigations and safeguarding, with more incidents of online crime and harassment, as well as 18,500 mental health incidents and almost 46,000 domestic abuse incidents. GMP is also monitoring some 3,500 sex offenders. The importance of maintaining strong specialist policing resources together with local policing, investigation and victim support was underscored by the terrorist attack in May 2017 in which 22 people were murdered (HMICFRS, accessed 23.05.19).

In Greater Manchester, the Mayor is responsible for Police and Crime Commissioner functions. In 2017, Andy Burnham was elected Mayor of Greater Manchester and in March 2018 he published a new plan for policing and crime, “Standing Together: Greater Manchester’s plan for safer, stronger communities”. Standing Together was developed in consultation with local people, community and voluntary organisations, local authority community safety partnerships, victims’ groups, and support services (HMICFRS, accessed 23.05.19).

GMP has lost over 25 percent of its workforce in the last eight years due to cuts to the policing budget. Between 2011/12 and 2017/18, GMP made savings of £215 million and must find further anticipated budgetary savings of £63.6 million by March 2023 (HMICFRS, accessed 23.05.19). Since 2010, GMP has lost around 2,000 police officers and 1,000 staff and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) (Greater Manchester, 2018). Significantly, social care services have also lost a high proportion of their funding (Eichler, 2017), impacting on the provision of health and social care services. As a result, there is considerable pressure on public services to cope with demands that include complex mental health issues. Indeed, around 20% of GMP's police radio time is spent dealing with mental health issues and missing persons. According to the Standing Together report:

*"Greater Manchester is one of the most challenging areas to police in Europe. Demands on policing and other services have soared, and although serious and complex crimes are on the increase, Government grants have been cut and Greater Manchester Police (GMP) has been forced to lose 2,000 police officers."*

(Baroness Beverley Hughes, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and Andy Burnham, Mayor of Greater Manchester, page 3).

As a result of workforce reductions, GMP has experienced a period of around six years during which it did not recruit new officers. It is currently facing a situation where more experienced officers have left the force or retired, and nearly 50 percent of its police officers have less than two years' experience.

Leadership of neighbourhood policing teams and numbers of neighbourhood police officers have declined significantly, which means that there are now only between 3 and 5 police officers plus Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) covering 15,000 residents in an area. Police constables must often respond to calls for immediate assistance, which is eroding the relationships GMP has established with local communities.

According to the UK Police Federation, GMP is committed to neighbourhood policing and has attempted to support police officers in patrolling local areas and proactively responding to problems—but there are some issues that must be tackled. Some 'Neighbourhood Police Officers' are unable to patrol or engage with local communities because they are required to respond to incidents needing immediate attention:

*"Providing visibility is a principal concern in central Manchester where Neighbourhood Beat Officers reported spending meaningful amounts of time on patrol — a service they felt was highly valued by local businesses. Across the force, an attempt to supplement neighbourhood policing by allocating response officers to smaller geographic areas and freeing up some of their time for local proactive work was reported to have faltered but had (rather confusingly) left these responders with the job title of 'Neighbourhood Police Officers.'"*

Higgins, 2018, p.26.

GMP is attempting to improve its performance through restructuring and improved management. To improve force management, GMP has restructured again, reinvesting in middle managers who link with police officers, as well as helping to build partnerships with other agencies.

Greater Manchester is leading the way on the devolution of powers and budgets from the national UK government. The aim of devolution is to enable more local decision making, which will lead to greater benefits for people and communities. The fourth and latest devolution agreement was published in March 2016 and included new responsibilities for Greater Manchester including criminal justice. Consequently, the Mayor of Greater Manchester, Andy Burnham, has freedom to reshape GMP services. The aspiration is for neighbourhood policing to work more closely with health and social care teams. The aim is to better understand the needs of individuals and families and to identify the agencies that should respond to problems such as domestic violence and mental health issues. Such agencies may need to tackle a range of complex issues, including childhood trauma and adverse childhood experience, as well as engage in early intervention programme where beneficial. This planned close working relationship between police and other agencies is a significant development, and worth observing in terms of concrete implementation (HMICFRS, accessed 23.05.19).

GMP is currently prioritising meaningful engagement with key stakeholders in crime hotspots and in tackling specific problems, such as commercial burglary, child exploitation and County Lines crime.

### County Lines Crime

*"County lines crime' is a term used in the UK to describe new ways of selling illegal drugs. Criminals from major cities such as Liverpool, Manchester, London and Birmingham expand their drug networks to other areas of the country. The crime is called county lines because a single telephone number is used to order drugs, operated from outside the area. These criminal gangs often set up a base in a rural area for a short time, taking over the home of a vulnerable person (also known as 'cuckooing'). They then use adults and children to act as drug runners. County line networks are bringing illegal drugs, violence and exploitation to rural counties. Vulnerable children and adults are being recruited to transport cash and drugs all over the country. The organised criminals are able to remain detached from the crime location, and LEAs must attempt to operate across police borders."*

*Source: Crime Stoppers (accessed 23.05.19) Drug gangs and county lines campaign, available at: <https://crimestoppers-uk.org/campaigns-media/campaigns/drug-gangs-and-county-lines>*

In 2018 GMP launched "Operation Valiant" to reduce personal robberies by deterring offenders and educating the public about the risks and different measures they can employ to keep themselves safe. Tactics have included specific deployments of officers in key locations to disrupt offending, as well as

working with Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) to have signage on trams that provides safety advice to the public and deterrent messages to offenders, alerting them to police presence. The operation involves working closely with partners, Manchester City Council, to ensure that the legislation available is used to apply for Criminal Behaviour Orders to ensure offenders are banned from the city centre (GMP, accessed 28.05.19).

GMP notes that trust in the police is rising and the focus is on providing a good 'service'. Indeed, this involves GMP officers and other key service providers being available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, as well as being able to engage with a range of social issues from loneliness and social isolation to young people in transition and Muslim communities.

However, satisfaction with the police is falling, which is not helped by police being unable to investigate certain types of crime due to limited resources. In 2013, Sir Peter Fahy, Chief Constable of Greater Manchester Police, reported that due to lack of resource officers were concentrating on about 40 percent of all reported crime, and that other police forces were adopting a similar strategy (BBC News, 2013).

On 22 May 2017, a suicide bomber — a radical Islamist — detonated a shrapnel-laden homemade bomb as people were leaving the Manchester Arena following a concert by the American singer Ariana Grande (GWS, accessed 28.05.19). Twenty-three people died, including the attacker, and 139 were wounded, more than half of them children. Several hundred more suffered psychological trauma. The incident was the deadliest terrorist attack and the first suicide bombing in the UK since the 7 July 2005 London bombings (EPS, 2018) — further information in Appendix 12C.

The bomber was Salman Ramadan Abedi, a 22-year-old local man of Libyan ancestry. Abedi was a "closed subject of interest" for the British security service MI5 — an individual who had been a cause of concern but, based on an assessment of the available intelligence, was assumed unlikely to turn to violence. There were some signs that this assessment should have been revised, in that he visited a jailed recruiter in prison and had recently returned from Libya. Police believed Abedi had largely acted alone, but that others had been aware of his plans (Casciani, 2018). There may have been opportunities to learn of radicalisation, and gain intelligence on Abedi in particular, through neighbourhood policing and community engagement by other agencies. The potential for community policing to uncover problems of radicalisation and potentially provide 'early warning' of possible terrorist activity is another reason for greater investment in community policing in the UK.

## 5 Community policing in Portugal

In Portugal, the national police are divided in two main security forces, both are under the direction of the Ministry of Internal Administration:

- The Public Security Police (PSP) that patrol the urban areas
- National Republican Guard (GNR) that patrol the rural areas

In some municipalities in Portugal there are also Municipal Police forces, which are administrative police with the mission to cooperate with the security forces in the maintenance of public tranquillity and in the protection of local communities.

The municipal police in the municipalities of Lisbon and Porto, created in 1891 and 1938, respectively, are afforded special status and are different from the other municipal police. Their police officers come from the Public Security Police (PSP) and therefore they have a special regime—or form of organisation and governance. The 1999 Law 140/99 regulates the creation of the municipal police forces, which is seen as a fundamental vehicle for the territorialisation of security and an indispensable element in proximity policing, providing greater security for citizens and ensuring tranquillity in local communities. The main mission for municipal police in Lisbon and Porto is to contribute to citizens' quality of life by monitoring compliance with laws and regulations in their areas of competence, cooperating with the Security Forces and Services in maintaining public order and the tranquillity of communities.

### 5.1 The safe school programme

In Portugal the model of Proximity Policing was adopted following successful experience developed by the Safe School Unit (Núcleo Escola Segura — NES). The model was later extended to other areas, such as the Seniors in Security, Safe Trade and others. In 1992, a number of schools began to benefit from the police presence in order to ensure the safety of the exterior spaces of schools considered to be priorities. The prioritised schools were those located in economically and socially disadvantaged territories, marked by poverty and social exclusion, in which violence, lack of discipline, truancy and poor school performance were more evident. The Safe School Program (PES) was created through a protocol signed between the Ministry of Internal Administration and the Ministry of Education in 1992. However, the main objectives, strategic principles and the structure for coordination were only defined in 2005 (Joint Order No. 105 - A / 2005 of February 2), having been re-evaluated and republished in a Joint Order 25649/2006 November 29.

The Safe School Program (PES) defines as priority objectives: i) the promotion of a culture of security in the schools; (ii) promotion of citizenship and the affirmation of the school community as a privileged space for integration and socialisation; (iii) the diagnosis, prevention and intervention in school security problems; (iv) the identification, prevention and eradication of the occurrence of risk and/or illicit behaviour in schools and surrounding areas; (v) the implementation of awareness raising and training on prevention and security in the school context; and (vi) collection of information and statistical data and carrying out of studies to enable competent authorities to obtain objective knowledge about violence, feelings of insecurity and victimisation in the educational community.

The work of the Safe School Unit (NES) and the Safe School Program (PES) were understood as a first level of police action from the perspective of pedagogical awareness, in relation to crime prevention. The program was operationalised by police agents that deliver the service almost exclusively—i.e. they are dedicated to school safety. The strategic principles on which the Safe School Program (PES) was based were: i) the territorialisation of the program at the local level, focusing it on schools, with the active participation of the whole community; ii) the promotion and development of partnerships at both national and local level; iii) training for all of the education elements of the security forces involved in the program and the monitoring of phenomena of violence, risk behaviour and incivilities in schools.

## 5.2 Integrated Program of Proximity policing

The developments described above concerning safe schools was the context in Portugal for the emergence of Proximity Policy in the 1990s. The concept of Proximity Policing first started to be used in the Program of the XIII Institutional Government of Portugal (1995). The Program mentions the need for the adaptation of the organisation and territorial arrangements of the security forces in order to reconcile objectives of operational effectiveness with concrete protection of citizens and proximity to the police. The need to update the Portuguese police model is highlighted. The updated model enshrines increased influence and participation for municipalities, through the creation of municipal police and the establishment of local councils for security, involving local authority representation and civil society institutions. The 1999 Law 140/99 that regulates the creation of municipal police forces is seen as a fundamental vehicle for the territorialisation of security and an indispensable element in proximity policing, delivering greater security to citizens and increased tranquillity for local communities.

In 2005, the term "Policing of integration and proximity" appears in the Program of the XVII Constitutional Government of Portugal (2005-2009). The Program is put into action in 2006 by the Strategic Directive No. 10/2006 of the National Directorate of the Public Security Police (PSP), with the creation of the Integrated Program of Proximity Policing (PIPP).



### 5.3 Public Security Police

The PIPP is a new approach that impacts the Public Security Police (PSP), the national police that patrol urban areas. The PIPP Program aims to bring together several projects that were implemented in a fragmented way (School, Commerce and so on). The PIPP aggregates the projects in a global strategy, through the establishment of strategic and operational objectives, and through the implementation of coordination, evaluation and training mechanisms. This gives greater focus to the proximity component and prevention of crime aspect, improving its articulation within components of public order, criminal investigation and police information. This Integrated Program was initially implemented through a pilot project in 26 Subunits of the Public Security Police (PSP) at the national level. Police officers who are incorporated into the Subunits covered by the pilot project, including the Victim Support and Victim Support Teams (EPAV) and the Safe School Program Teams (EPES), have received special training to carry out the missions assigned to them.

The changes initiated by the Program are evident in current approaches and methods used by the Public Security Police (PSP). Proximity and Victim Support Teams (EPAVs) are responsible for security and proximity policing in each sector of the area of responsibility of the subunits. Depending on the results of the security diagnosis carried out at each Command, EPAVs are responsible for the level of prevention and surveillance of commercial areas, surveillance in residential areas mostly inhabited by elderly citizens, prevention of domestic violence, support for crime victims and post-victimisation monitoring, identification of problems that may interfere with the security situation of citizens and the detection of unreported crimes. In view of their role in prevention and their engagement with citizens, the role of Proximity and Victim Support Teams are important for the CCI project to understand.

The Safe School Program Teams (EPES) are responsible for security and surveillance in school settings, prevention of juvenile delinquency, detection of problems that may interfere with the security situation of citizens and the detection of unreported crimes within school communities.

The police elements that integrate these teams are called Proximity Agents. Operationally, these agents have a mission that ranges from visibility policing, resolution and management of occurrences / conflicts, strengthening the police–citizen relationship and detecting situations that may constitute social problems or which may result in criminal practices. The Proximity Agents are subject to a number of rules of accountability and delegation of powers, being required to develop contacts with the general population, services for local parish councils and city councils, courts, local social welfare projects, boards of directors of educational institutions, traders, as well as with the general population.

The accountability of Proximity Agents is considered as one of the fundamental features of the Program. Proximity Agents are made accountable through the definition of protocols of procedures, forms and rules of action that link them to identify problems and to act in situations that can directly or indirectly influence public security and road safety (e.g. Abandoned vehicles, street lighting, graffiti,

damaged or destroyed traffic signals, vacant homes, identification of minors at risk or in a situation of parental abandonment).

The Public Security Police (PSP), through public funding (Operational Program for Public Administration – POAP), carried out an evaluation with the population and police elements, in order to analyse perceptions of the work of the PSP, the feelings of safety or insecurity and the impact that this new program had on such feelings. The assessment was first made in October 2006 and again in December 2007. By the end of 2008, the Public Security Police (PSP) had implemented PIPP in 112 police stations.

## 5.4 National Republican Guard (GNR)

Proximity policing was implemented in relation to the National Republican Guard (GNR) that patrol the rural areas, under guidelines issued by the Government via the Ministry of Internal Administration, through the implementation of the special programs and within a framework of development of new working methods. The model of Proximity Policing in the National Republican Guard (GNR) develops and implements new forms of police organisation, as well as new techniques of proximity and visibility to the citizen, through the operationalisation of special programs focused on addressing concrete problems and aimed particularly at the most vulnerable social groups.

These new proximity techniques are operated by the National Republican Guard (GNR) through the Special Proximity Policing Programs (PEPP), comprising the following programs: "Safe School"; "Seniors in Security" and "Safe Trade". The aim of the programme is to strengthen patrolling and make use of information technologies in order to facilitate and strengthen cooperation and collaboration not only with citizens but also with local entities.

In 2011, a standard of permanent implementation (NEP/GNR-3.58/2011) that regulates the operationalisation of the Special Proximity Policing Programs (PEPP) developed by GNR came into being. The Programs essentially focus on proactivity, through the presence of police elements on the ground. The patrols may be carried out in police vehicles, on horseback or on foot. Foot patrols are the most valued method, since they ensure a close relationship between the police and the population in the areas assigned to the proximity policing teams. They help to associate police with a friendly image, and support efforts to address problems of public order and security with imaginative and effective strategies.

Proximity Policing, in strategic terms, aims to act proactively, through the presence of police elements on the ground. The Special Programs aim to bring the police and citizens closer together, "improving the relationship between them and guiding police action towards solving community problems, in order to make GNR and the citizens themselves active elements in crime prevention and community safety, in the joint effort to improve safety and quality of life" (GNR, 2019, translated from Portuguese).

With the restructuring of the National Republican Guard (GNR) in 2009, the Special Programs Division within the Operations Department was established. Its main goals were:

- To study and present proposals for the organisation of the GNR Special Programs
- To elaborate, disseminate and ensure the coordination of compliance with the directives and guidelines on criminal prevention, proximity policing and community security and special programs—particularly in the area of domestic violence, support and protection of minors, the elderly and other particularly vulnerable groups of risk
- To coordinate, supervise and prepare the statistical data related to the activity developed under the Special Programs
- To plan, coordinate and supervise the execution of missions related to criminal prevention, proximity policing and community security and special programs
- To ensure that GNR is linked to partner institutions and agencies in the various Special Programs.

In 2018, the Special Programs Division was reviewed, and the Criminal Prevention and Community Policing Office incorporated within the GNR structure. This demonstrates that the GNR intends to develop Community Policing, where new partnerships are formed between people and the police, based on the idea that the police and the community have to work together to identify and define priorities and find solutions to the problems of the current society (GNR, 2019). The Community Policing approach, with Anglo-Saxon roots is defined as "...a philosophy and an organisational strategy that seeks a new partnership between people and the police. It is based on the idea that the police and the community have to work together to identify and define priorities and find solutions to the problems of today's society" (GNR, 2019). One of the most important instruments in community policing is partnerships. It is in this sense that the GNR intends to develop a model of community policing, where new partnerships are formed between people and the police, based on the idea that the police and the community have to work together to identify and define the priorities and find solutions to the problems of the current society. In strategic terms, it aims to develop and implement new forms of police organisation, proximity techniques and visibility, as well as to establish specific programs focused on concrete problems and on more vulnerable groups, where the community becomes involved in the security dynamics, constituting a true principle of active citizenship.

In the framework of the "2020 Guard Strategy", the GNR intends to be a "...human, near and reliable Security Force that stands out for excellence and recognised as a national reference in the field of security". Prevention should be the main pillar, which is being established as priority lines of action in the scope of Special Programs and covers: prevention and containment of crime, strengthening partnerships and citizen accountability and participation.

The Community Policing model in GNR intends to implement proactive policing, namely a more visible and efficient social proximity policing, seeking to improve citizen's living standard and thus improve

the so-called “acceptance” of the security forces in each local community, fulfilled through their visible and close presence. The main objectives of this policing model are to create a sense of public safety, to build and maintain relationships of trust, to maintain order through a detailed analysis of the characteristics and origin of certain problems and to reduce criminality, using anticipation as an effective tool in maintaining social peace close to the communities. Through the community policing model, the GNR began to develop several special programmes that led to the participation and accountability of the community (citizens, public and private entities), constituting several partnerships without however this state attribution having been delegated. This networking has significantly contributed to enhancing citizens’ sense of security.

At present, the GNR exclusively affects 338 military personnel to the Special Programs, constituted in 81 Sections of Special Programs.

DRAFT

## 6 Community policing in Lisbon

The community policing strategy implemented by the Municipal Police of the Lisbon Municipality was built on the necessity for police to adopt a more preventative approach that would be open to citizen participation. Through a preventive approach and an effective and trustful relationship between police and citizens, the new model for policing aims to ensure a more efficient and sustainable response when addressing security problems at a local level. Following this strategy, the Lisbon Municipal Police (LMP) conducted a pilot-project on community policing in 2009, in close cooperation with local partners in Alta de Lisboa—a northern residential area of Lisbon, placing emphasis on citizen participation as co-producers of community safety. The chosen territory for this pilot fell to Alta de Lisboa, a mixed housing area in the north of Lisbon, with security problems, but also with an active local partnership—the Community Group of Alta de Lisboa (GCAL).

The model of community policing adopted by the Lisbon Municipal Police was influenced by Anglo-Saxon models of community policing, namely the English model of “Neighbourhood Policing” put into action by the Metropolitan Police and community representatives in the London Boroughs. The community policing model developed in Lisbon is a model of policing focused on the analysis of causes of community problems identified by citizens, trying to understand why they occur (sometimes continuously), and mobilising the community resources to mitigate and prevent them. In this sense, the police work together with community representatives to gain a better knowledge of their security concerns. As a consequence, the approach engages community partnerships in the process of jointly solving existing problems, contributing to the reduction of fear of crime and helping residents to see their community as a safer and better place to live. Through this model of policing, focused on strategic partnerships and on problem solving, police, citizens and partners work together to not only identify the community problems, but to systematically reflect and understand why they occur and to mobilise community resources for problem mitigation and prevention.

### 6.1 Lisbon Municipal Police (LMP)

The Lisbon Municipal Police (LMP) is a specialised body of armed and uniformed police officers and civilian staff, integrated in the structure of the Lisbon Municipality. The main mission for the LMP is to ensure, in the city of Lisbon, compliance with all laws and regulations relating to local authorities’ competences (e.g. Urban Mobility, Public Space, Lodging, Trade and Supply, Protection of Nature and the Environment, Public Health, Urban Construction). The LMP has also the mission to cooperate with other security forces in maintaining public order and in protecting local communities.

In 2009, the Lisbon Municipal Police (LMP) joined the Community Group of Alta de Lisboa (GCAL). The involvement of local partners was crucial to facilitate a concerted intervention in the territory and local partners were expected to take a proactive role in planning the introduction of community

policing in the territory. The Community Policing initiative, “Safer Alta de Lisboa”, was carried out through the partnership between the Lisbon Municipal Police, public and civil society organisations operating in the territory and representatives of local residents (from social and private housing). The partnership was built upon six key principles of the community policing model:

- Security is not only the responsibility of the police, but also of all the community
- A cooperative and trusting relationship between police and citizens is required
- Consultation and engagement of local community in the process of planning, implementation and evaluation of the community policing should be supported
- Promotion of a preventive approach
- Promotion of a problem-solving approach
- Openness of the police organisation to incorporate community contributions, adopting methods to meet local security needs prioritised by the citizens, networking and enhancing community resources are all required.

The approach taken by the Lisbon Municipal Police (LMP) was first to introduce itself to the local partners and residents and to learn about their public safety concerns and at the same time learn about the local partners’ intervention strategies — that is, target groups, location and schedule). In this way, the Lisbon Municipal Police integrated the Community Group of Alta de Lisboa (GCAL) into its activities in 2009. The LMP started promoting, with local partners, raise-awareness activities targeting vulnerable groups in the community (such as elderly residents and children). On prevention and safety measures, study visits for youngsters to the premises of the Municipal Police, as well as police visits to the schools were undertaken.

In 2010, the first “Security Group” was created, with the mission to plan together with the LMP a Community Policing Project in Alta de Lisboa. At the beginning of 2010, the Lisbon Municipal Police (LMP) launched a challenge to Community Group of Alta de Lisboa (GCAL) partners, to build jointly a community policing project in the territory. Created in March 2010, the “Security Group” was a partnership comprising local partners that step forward in articulating, with the Lisbon Municipal Police, to plan Community Policing in Alta de Lisboa. The partners involved in the Community Policing were at first: the local health centre; schools, parents associations; residents’ associations (from both private and social housing); elderly day care centres; child and youth care centres; sports associations; charities; and municipal services in the area of public spaces maintenance, social development, human rights, culture and housing.

In the first year, between March 2010 and July 2011, the Security Group (Prevention Team of LMP and local partners), through monthly meetings, assessed the main problems and concerns of the population related to insecurity in Alta de Lisboa. The Group worked on the following actions:

- Identification of main security problems to be addressed by community policing;

- Identification of priority areas to begin the on-foot patrolling; and
- Definition of the community policing team officers' profile and training needs, to be selected to go to Alta de Lisboa

Through focus group discussions with residents and local partners, the concept of community policing was introduced in Alta de Lisboa. The intention to introduce a community policing approach in Alta de Lisboa was explained to residents. Residents were asked about their main concerns, what they felt were the most problematic areas and the profile of the agents that should be chosen to patrol Alta de Lisboa. Based on the results of the security group meetings and focus group with the residents, police officers for the community policing role were selected. This was the first time that the process of selection of police officers for Lisbon Municipal Police (LMP) incorporated input from citizens.

In November 2011 was the beginning of the first on foot patrol by the Community Policing Team (2 police officers). The team two police officers also started participating in the monthly meetings of the Security Group. Since then, through this close cooperation between the police and local partners, the partnership promotes crime prevention activities aimed at more vulnerable groups. For instance, crime prevention has been targeted at:

- Elderly residents – e.g. workshops on safe behaviour
- Young people – e.g. study visits to the premises of the Municipal Police to diminish the barriers between young people and the police officers
- Children – e.g. the visit of police officers to schools to debate the importance of the preservation of public spaces, bullying prevention, among other topics.

Presently the proximity policing team of the Public Security Police (PSP) also joined the Security Group, collaborating closely with the local community policing team and partners.

The implementation of the community policing pilot-project in Alta de Lisboa helped in terms of guiding the Lisbon Municipal Police (LMP) training strategy. The strategy focused on short to medium-term goals relating to how to develop in police officers the skills to sustain and enhance the police-citizen relationship and how to involve all social groups—especially in the context of culturally diverse communities.

The pilot experience established the concept of Community Policing between the Lisbon Municipal Police (LMP) and the partnership, defining in 2011 “Community Policing” (or proximity policing as it is referred to in Portugal) as:

*“... A preventive model of policing that is planned, implemented and evaluated with the participation of citizens and local partners, through the joint identification and resolution of local insecurity problems, that recognises the shared responsibility and cooperation*

*between the Police and the community in improving the security and feelings of security of the population and their quality of life in the city."*

Lisbon Municipal Police, 2011.

The approach in Lisbon is based on the concept that, like in the US, community policing "is a philosophy that promotes organisational strategies that support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder and fear of crime" (COPS, US Department of Justice, 2014).

With the aim of diminishing neighbourhood incivilities and increasing the sense of safety of the citizens of Alta de Lisboa, community policing addresses security concerns felt by the community with a main focus on: i) crime prevention; ii) public space intervention; iii) consideration of non-crime anti-social behaviour; and iv) improvement of the police-citizen relationship. To this end, the Community Policing Team, in close articulation with local partners and residents, identifies and contributes to solving various problems of insecurity in the territory.

The community policing team has been involved in public space interventions that meet the residents' concerns. For example, land clearing of shrubbery in areas where there was traffic and drug use nearby schools or improving and replacing lighting in public spaces. Complementing this approach, in 2013, the LMP in collaboration with the Lisbon Municipality Training Department, promoted a training course on the CPTED approach. The CPTED course was targeted not only at the community policing teams, but also other municipality services (e.g. urban environment, housing, social housing, social development, urbanism, public space planning, rehabilitation and maintenance services). The purpose of the course was to build up technical expertise in CPTED and to build bridges between urban planners and police officers in the process of exchanging information on safety and to use safety criteria while planning urban projects that are the responsibility of the municipality.

In summary, three main methods can be identified as important to community policing in Lisbon:

- Building up a partnership between police and local partners through the establishment of the "Security Group"

The "Security Group" is a police-community security partnership, where police, local partners and residents identify and build together preventive responses to tackle insecurity problems felt by the population in the community. It brings together various groups, including police; residents associations (social and private housing); health centres; charities; social agencies (e.g. children, youngsters & elderly day centres); parents associations; schools; sports clubs; not-for-profit organisations; municipality services (e.g. public space, housing); NGOs; and shopkeeper associations.

- Enabling participative diagnosis of local safety issues and citizen involvement in the identification of the community police officer profile



The Security Group currently has the mission to plan the implementation of the Community Policing in a given neighbourhood. This involves diagnosis and prioritisation of problems and identifying the profile for the community policing team to be selected to patrol the neighbourhood. Various methodologies have been used in support of this phase of the mission, including walking studies, focus groups in the community and participative methods to enable the prioritisation of security concerns in the community.

- Developing a program to support the selection and training of the Community Policing Team

This model has been developed by a multidisciplinary team in the LMP (social sciences and police sciences), with skills and competences in the field of strategic planning, profiling and training community policing teams. The design and implementation of the training program for the community policing officers has been evolving over the years, in these main areas:

- Theoretical models of community policing and problem-oriented policing;
- Interpersonal relationship skills;
- CPTED approach;
- Intercultural competences; and
- Knowledge of the territory and conflict resolution techniques in the community.

Furthermore, the LMP has been developing community policing projects with a training-action strategy focused on the police-citizen exchange of visions and perspectives to enable community policing teams to work closer and more effectively with social actors and residents in the context of local safety partnerships. Under community policing the training strategy contributes to developing police officers' social skills to sustain and enhance the police-citizen relationship. At the same time, this requires the training of social partners in technical and relational skills for the identification and building up of local security responses together with the police.

In 2017, under the implementation of a new project of community policing project in Padre Cruz Neighbourhood the police training was targeting, for the first time, not only at police officers but community representatives, namely social workers and residents. Also, for the first time, the venue of the training course took place outside the LMP headquarters, to be implemented in a venue in Padre Cruz Neighbourhood—a residential area of municipal social housing in Carnide Parish located in the northern area of Lisbon.

The main goal of the training is to improve the police-citizen relationship and to enhance the cooperation between community policing officers, social workers and residents to put in place a community policing project. The training programme is built under a training action model to be implemented in a community context, where participants, through group exercises and study visits (walking tours), are asked to put into practice, preventive and problem-solving approaches to tackle security problems identified by the community.

The training strategy also aims to develop participants' networking capacity building for community safety by improving participants' technical, relational, intercultural and mediation competences. Also, the findings so far recommend that, for the community policing teams to be able to discuss with the citizens and to establish a trusting relationship in diverse cultural contexts, it is important that the LMP training strategy focuses on both intercultural learning skills of the police officers, as well as the development of their mediation skills. This training approach assumes that the police officers will be more apt and able to manage and mediate conflict, knowing that the benefits of the acquisition and/or training of these skills, are not limited only to the promotion of professional skills but also to their empowerment and personal growth.

Foot patrols by the community policing team. After the planning phase and the selection and training of the police officers, foot patrols can begin in the territory by the designated community policing teams. The police team integrates with the Security Group that convenes in monthly working meetings, to discuss the main problems identified in the territory related to insecurity, reflecting and building together the answers to their resolution. The community policing team comprises two municipal police officers that on a daily basis patrol on foot in the territory, establishing a close relationship with the population, participating in follow up meetings with local partners and promoting a networking response to solve the security problems previously identified in the meetings or face-to-face in their beats. In the context of community policing, where the police officers are more integrated in the social fabric, and therefore acting as social cohesion agents, there is an increasing need for the police to use a preventive and problem-solving approach.

The transfer of the community policing to new neighbourhoods. Following the pilot-project on developing community policing in Lisbon since 2009, in close articulation with citizens and local partners, the model has been transferred to other Lisbon territories. This is embedding these approaches that have been crucial to set in place, including collective responses to tackle local security concerns, and engaging citizens and local partners to work with the police as co-producers of community safety.

In 2017, the Lisbon Municipal Council starts to incorporate in the city goals community policing in measure 11, mentioning the aim to:

*"...Extend the Community Policing projects of the Lisbon Municipal Police to more neighbourhoods in the city based on a participatory approach of local partners and citizens, aiming to increase the security in the neighbourhoods."*

(*"2018–2021 Multi-year Plan of Lisbon City"*, 2017; *"2019–2022 Multi-year Plan of Lisbon City"*, 2018).

Currently, the community policing model is being implemented in six areas of the city of Lisbon: Baixa-Chiado, Alvalade, Alta de Lisboa, Mouraria, Ameixoeira-Galinheiras and Bairro Padre Cruz, and being planned in three new neighbourhoods: Bairro Alfredo Bensaúde, Bairro das Olaias - Portugal Novo and Bairro de Santos.

The empowerment of the municipalities on proximity policing model. In 2018 a new Law (50/2018) was created on the transfer of powers to local authorities and inter-municipal entities, establishing in article 23 that refers to proximity policing, "...the responsibility of municipal bodies to participate, in conjunction with the security forces, in definition of the proximity policing model to be implemented".

DRAFT

## 7 Community policing: Spain and Catalonia

Spain is a highly centralised unitary state that has devolved power to 17 (and 2 cities) autonomous communities that have some right to govern themselves (from the Spanish: *comunidad autónoma*). The communities exercise their right to self-government within the limits of the Spanish constitution of 1978 and their autonomous statutes.

The Department of Interior is responsible for the security within the territory of Catalonia. Responsibilities include the management of the Generalitat Police-Mossos d'Esquadra (about 17,000 police officers), as well as the coordination of local police services; there are currently in Catalonia 215 municipal police services and 10,850 municipal police officers. They are also responsible for the management of public order (video surveillance, demonstrations); civil protection, emergencies and fire brigade (with the exception of the municipality of Barcelona); traffic; and supervision of private security.

### 7.1 The transition to democracy and the implications for policing

In the transition to democracy in the late 1970s and 1980s, there was a need to transform the Spanish police from a (political) State Police force into a Police Service that would as a minimum be respectful of citizens' human rights. The police had had an active role in preserving Franco's Regime, and the new situation required new values and principles, and indeed a new Police mission. It was not simply a matter of the former senior police officers, but more importantly to establish new parameters that should inspire all police activities. The need to transform the police, resulted in a frenetic search for models that could serve as a reference and that had democratic prestige. The UK's "Peelian Principles" (although probably effectively drafted by Rowan and Mayne) were a relevant point of reference and considered the basis of community policing—although it was also termed differently, including: "proximity policing", "neighbourhood policing" or "public service policing" (Guillén, 2016). In all territorial police levels, it was a label of democratic policing to identify the police as a community (proximity, neighbourhood) policing service. Therefore, all police services in Spain have aspired to the Peelian model.

At the local (municipal) level, the Peelian community policing model has had a lot of influence. Although we cannot affirm that all municipal police services follow effectively that model (there are

too many and they are quite diverse<sup>1</sup>), we can objectively say that it is at this level where we find the better approaches to the original model.

The new Autonomic Police Services (mainly the Basque and the Catalan) have also identified themselves as a sort of community police service in order to distance themselves from the former state police services, which suffered from the stigmatisation of having been principal actors of repression during the dictatorship. Furthermore, the state police forces aspire to practice community policing in order to move on from their recent past as actors of a non-democratic political power. At the National Police level, they have set up different projects with the name “proximity policing”, “community policing” and other equivalent wordings (Guillén, 2016). However, the results have been inconsistent and public perceptions divided following events in October 2017.

After the restoration of democracy, there have been several projects to foster the community policing model across all levels of policing. There was an intense wave during the late 1990s and at the beginning of the 21st Century (Ferret and Maffre, 2000; Guillén and Rabot, 2003). Indeed, the security debate at the turn of the Century was about incivilities and community policing (with some authoritarian versions of it that related it with the Broken Windows policing, Guillén 2016).

The national police drafted a Manual on *Policía de Barrio* (Neighbourhood Policing) in 1987. At a state level, community policing has been promoted in speeches, but there is less evidence of it having been accompanied by effective reforms. In the Basque Country, the persistence of the terrorist group, ETA, made it very difficult to talk about community policing (as was the case in Northern Ireland, Hamilton et al, 1995) and it was the fight against terrorism that dominated the debate in that part of Spain. Indeed, terrorism conditioned any relevant police reform at the state level, since the main security worry was the fight against ETA. The situation meant that intelligence and the investigation of terrorism occupied significant police resources and dominated political speeches at the state level. Community policing in the Basque country was difficult since police officers had to look under their cars in order to detect whether a bomb had been placed there.

The police model of the *Generalitat* Police-Mossos d’Esquadra, the autonomous police force of Catalonia, is inspired by the proximity or community police model. This is the model adopted since 1994, when this police force started to replace the National Police and the Civil Guard. “This replacement was considered not only as a change of police forces but as a change from a more traditional police model to a community one” (Guillén, 2015). But, in practice, there is no validated or assumed corporative manual in which is explained what is meant by the “community policing model” and how to apply this model (Requena, 2013). These two circumstances are, still now, the main factors that explain how community policing being applied.

---

<sup>1</sup> In Catalonia alone there are 215 municipal Police services

## 7.2 The new era of global terrorism

The Twenty-first Century brought two fundamental changes: one from within Spain and the other from developments internationally. In Spain, ETA declared first a truce and afterwards the end of their activities, which implied a serious change in the situation—not only at the Basque level, but also at a state level. Police services could reorganise internally without the pressure of terrorism. Community policing started to have more presence in the Basque country. However, an international trend, the jihadist threat, pushed in the opposite direction. The 11th September 2001 attack in the United States and the 11th March 2004 terrorist attacks in Madrid attracted all the security focus to terrorism again. The political priority to cope with terrorism and the paranoia around the terrorism threat invaded the whole area of security. As a result, the state did not dismantle its anti-terrorist structures, but focused them on the jihadist threat. With some unlucky interventions at the beginning, since they used tactics used against ETA, without realising that the modus operandi was different. The key difference being that: ETA terrorists wanted to preserve their lives and were deterred by the risk of police intervention, whereas the jihadists were ready to kill themselves if they could cause more casualties to the enemy. After the 11th of March attacks, Spanish police officers had not taken that into account in an intervention in an apartment where there were terrorists. When they were trying to get into the flat, the terrorists detonated their bombs causing the death of a police officer and injuries to some of them.

The aftermath of the terrorist attacks brought back speeches on toughness in policing and all efforts were focused on extending police and judiciary powers and on reducing “presumed” terrorist rights. The terrorist hysteria facilitated a tough intervention in communities with Islamic background that resulted in cases of arrested people, who were afterwards freed without charges. This trend implies a lot of concern for police officers’ security (better arms, protective equipment) much more than pressure on proximity. Although the state level was the most influenced by the terrorist threat, the autonomic and the local level, were also affected.

The recent terrorist attacks in Barcelona (August 2017) showed that autonomic and municipal police were also directly involved in addressing terrorism (actually the central government were not satisfied with the fact the police response was exclusively in the hands of the Generalitat Police with some support at the local level). These events extended the worry about terrorism to all levels of policing, much more, if possible, than before. Consequently, community policing is still present in the speeches on security (at least at autonomic and municipal level) but terrorism is quite predominant in the political speeches, which means that police resources are predominantly devoted to the fight against terror.

### 7.3 Current approach to community policing

The concepts of “community policing”, “proximity policing”, “neighbourhood policing” or “public service policing” are used as synonymous and not in their strict sense. They constitute a label of reform, a label to show that police are changing their focus from the political powers to the public. That means that under the umbrella of those concepts, we find very different realities.

A common reality is a police service that keeps in general the traditional approach and structure, with a new unit that has as its main function to get in touch with the community (neighbours, associations, minorities, clubs, etc.). These units can vary from very few police officers (a sort of “cosmetic” unit) to quite consistent units with a considerable level of contact with the public. There has been some debate about whether these cases really represent a community policing approach or just a slight change in the focus of police activities. Theoretically, community policing is a model that should affect the whole police service. The setting up of these small “proximity units” is not fully consistent with this philosophy, since the rest of the police service continues to operate within traditional parameters.

Police work suffers from considerable pressure to react. Any serious senior police officer or police authority will always mention prevention as the main target of police work but compromises due to reactive police actions are becoming higher. For instance, in Catalonia, it has become usual that a wide number of police services publish a sort of “Chart of Services” where they commit themselves to respond to incidents with a concrete level of quality (in terms of time of response, information to the citizen, etc.). Those commitments are politically very sensitive because they raise public expectations concerning police response. In case police are not able to fulfil those expectations, their prestige is damaged and consequently public confidence goes down. So, it means that there should be sufficient numbers of police patrols to cope with the answers to daily incidents that affect the security of the members of the public (Wilson and Weiss, 2012).

The existence of a sort of “Community” or “Proximity” unit does not necessarily imply that the idea of community policing does not inspire the whole police activities. It is possible that the information gathered from the community units feed back into the work of the whole organisation. This would be interesting to explore.

According to the community policing model, the organisation should be designed to meet the needs of the public—regardless of organisational framework (although it is true that a very “vertical” organisation may be less suited to achieving this goal). The majority of cases where we can witness how the police organisation is structured around the public needs are at the local level. There are different reasons for this. An important one is the fact that municipal police services in Catalonia (or in Spain) do not have relevant criminal investigation or Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) structures. The majority of their members are involved in police patrol, which keeps them closer to the public.

In relation to the Catalan police, the Generalitat Police-Mossos d’Esquadra, we can talk about two orientations of the community policing model: (i) at a global level (central services) and (ii) at a local

level. Central services have a specialised unit in Community Policing (ORC). This area lists the topics of interest to deal with from its point of view. For example, there is a list of vulnerable groups, such as: elderly people, minors, female victims of gender violence, victims of domestic violence, victims of hate crimes or discrimination, tourist victims, etc. There are also specific areas of citizen security such as: home burglaries, crime associated with companies or commercial establishments, security in nightlife, thefts and robberies in the rural areas, etc. These are therefore concrete objectives in the field of the prevention and public safety, for which specific monitoring is carried out and where priority is given to proximity actions. Central services make generic operating guidelines that, once in the local areas, adapt according to their particular circumstances and the specialised units of proximity and their relationship with the community of each police station. This more theoretical approach at global level, contrasts with the absolutely practical approach at a local level. These, practice community policing from two points of view:

- According to the community policing guidelines of the central services (preventive actions on vulnerable groups or areas of special interest).
- Manage any kind of local security issues, from coexistence problems in a neighbourhood, reiteration of uncivil acts at some point, conflicting areas with concentration of crime, etc.

Community policing tasks related to the guidelines of the central services are usually monitored through a series of structured indicators: dedicated hours of service, number of contacts or meetings with different groups, number of incidents or crimes in the areas of interest, etc. Regarding the rest of the proximity tasks the management is exclusively local. The chiefs of the police stations are those who register (locally) the problems that they consider to be of interest, those who monitor them directly and those who determine when the problem is solved. To monitor these tasks there is no guideline or protocol and no software for registration and monitoring of the different problems of community policing managed in each territory.

The organisation states publicly that Community policing should not be an exclusive task of agents located in concrete destinations: The Community Policing Office (ORC). It should be a global vision of the entire organisation, each one with its own task but from each one of these approaches to citizenship should be applied: from public security patrolling, through the report's office and public order service to the investigation unit. Therefore, community policing should not be exclusive for a few, but plural to the whole organisation. This point could be improved, and we could consider it a weak point in terms of our performance in community policy. Since this vision has still not been achieved, it is necessary to do pedagogy-oriented interventions with members of the organisation that do not currently adopt a community policing approach. It is relevant to show them this valuable and operative proximity duty and that police officers delivering community policing should not be seen as the chief's friends, but as agents who have such respectable and valid qualities like the rest of the police officers.



To deliver community policing, it would be necessary to improve resources in specific groups; easy resources such as having corporate mobile phones that allow a connection—almost online—with your contacts and at the same time squeeze all the potential that technology offers to open direct channels of communication between society and the police.

In Spain, steps have been taken to deliver policing in a way that is consistent with the community policing approach. Within the Public Order Policing Brigade, a Mediation Unit has been established. This approach to police work, which belongs without any doubt to the field of community policing, has been effectively implemented by the police of the Generalitat-Mossos d'Esquadra (and at the local level), with special attention to conflicts in the area of public order policing (in the case of Mossos d'Esquadra). Barcelona is one of the cities in Europe with more demonstrations than any other all through the year. Most of them are peaceful, but in order to prevent incidents in the streets, seven years ago the Police set up the Mediation Unit to manage a demonstration—since the police only have knowledge of the demonstrate once it is planned.

The mediation of Mossos d'Esquadra follow the recommendations made by the Godiac Project, carried out in the framework of CEPOL<sup>2</sup>, where the resolution of public order problems through positive management helps in reducing social conflict.

The police maintain continuous contact with very diverse groups, and especially with the most radical and aggressive, with the aim of identifying valid partners and establishing reliable communication channels. The goal is not only to avoid and solve problems, but also to reduce escalation in clashes between demonstrators and police, as well as to identify and influence the causes of conflict in order to reduce them. How is conflict avoided, for example, in the case of a public protest? The police identify stakeholders and create spaces for dialog. The police also advise on and negotiates in relation to:

- Legislation and administrative procedures to follow
- Ways to manage the demonstration as it develops
- The administrative consequences of breaches of procedures
- Situations of risk that can occur regarding the security of the participants and of third parties
- Measures to avoid incidents

At the beginning, members of the public order unit (the mobile brigade) considered it useless to try to mediate and negotiate with such anti-system groups. However, they now accept now that the Mediation Unit has achieved a meaningful reduction of violent incidents in the area of public order. At the municipal level, mediation is also taken into account to varying degrees, although there are

---

<sup>2</sup> Vid. <https://bulletin.cepol.europa.eu/index.php/bulletin/article/view/48>

significant differences in terms of context. While some police services comprise 25 officers, other's thousands. It is not practical for all these different police services to perform the same functions. There several municipal police services in Catalonia that have adopted mediation as a way to solve conflicts in all fields of police work (Cobler and López, 2017). Frequently the area of immigration and cultural conflicts has been the preferred one for this kind of approach. In the whole of Catalonia, there are 183 police officers working for Community Police Offices and the 10 police officers at the Mediation Unit.

## 7.4 Assessing the success of community policing

It is very difficult to assess the success of community policing policies in Spain. One of the central problems is police indicators. Police organisations, even those ones that adopt proximity strategies, tend to keep the indicators that they used in the past. That is to say: crime reported to the police; people's complaints; arrests, traffic fines, etc. Since the work carried out by community police officers may not influence these indicators, the officers who get more professional recognition will be those dealing with police arrests, crime investigation, traffic. That is negative for two different reasons: Firstly, it sends a mixed message to police officers: we say that contact with the community is paramount, but the only work that will be useful to achieving promotion is the traditional, reactive one—simply because there are no valid indications to evidence community policing work. There is a clear need to integrate into usual police indicators some new measures that show the level of success in the area of community policing (Rodríguez Herrera, 2014). Secondly, the current indicators do not inform on the success of police work. We do not get any information about the impact of policing from them. This is the key problem with the indicators used by Mossos d'Esquadra. The indicators focus on police activity. The indicators do facilitate the recognition of police officers work but are not good enough to check whether the aims have been achieved or not. The number of contacts with different associations or citizens shows how hard police officers have worked for instance but tell us nothing about the success—i.e. the impact of their work.

There is a general problem in Europe in the area of assessment and indicators (INHESJ, 2003). Admittedly, here are paths to follow to achieve new goals. Of course, there are tools that can identify much better police work with the community.

For example, there are different kinds of surveys that can provide information on the public level of subjective security and the satisfaction with the police work (Stanko, 2010). However, for medium and small municipalities, it could be too expensive to implement a survey that is of a high quality. Nowadays, the fact that surveys can be done online could

be a way of making them cheaper to administer. Anyway, it is important to retain the importance of subjective security (Guillén, 2012) and, consequently, surveys as tools to check police impact for community policing might be away forward. The use of surveys for measuring feelings of insecurity is covered in CCI Deliverable 2.6.

Community policing places the citizen at the centre of police intervention. Their satisfaction or dissatisfaction becomes the most important target for the police. Consequently, how safe citizens feel is paramount for the model. Criminality is, of course, still important, but it is not the core of police interventions. A very low level of criminality with a low citizens' subjective security (which normally is related to police-public relationship) would be considered as a failure in this model. The war on crime that was the fundamental mission with the professional model is over. Crime is relevant to the extent that it contributes to people's perception of security—that is to say, to people's wellbeing. That means, for instance, that petty crime or incivilities, which were not considered as relevant work for police by the professional model, get given greater importance here since they influence the daily quality of life of citizens, causing them harm or inconvenience (Guillén, 2016).

The paramount instrument to measure police success or failure in this context cannot be police crime statistics, but Crime Victimization Surveys (and any similar kind of survey) because they include information about the level of security experienced by the people and their opinion about the police—crucial elements for the good functioning of the model. That's the reason why in Catalonia (both at general and municipal levels), surveys have experienced a high level of development over the last years.

## 7.5 Toolkits for supporting proximity-oriented policing

As outlined above, Generalitat Police/Mossos d'Esquadra and the municipal police services that have tried to increase proximity have normally created special units devoted to keeping in touch with the people, in order to understand their priorities and to involve them in policing. Without partnership with citizens and civilian organisations there is no proximity, no community policing (Carque, 2014). To some extent, there should be certain coproduction of security. These units facilitate police-public communication and should inform the whole organisation about public needs in order to set up the proper measures to satisfy them. In this context, we can find different municipalities where a sort of Urban Security Council exists. The Council of the city of Barcelona is probably the most well-known (Antillano, 2002). Citizens and civilian organisations are normally represented in them and they can discuss with all police services that work in the municipality (normally autonomic and municipal) about the main security issues. In Catalonia, it is required by law that in all municipalities where municipal police exist, a Junta Local de Seguretat (Local Security Council) must be established (at the state level, it is not compulsory). The council is chaired by the Major and all police services acting in the territory should take part in them. Citizens and associations are not permanent members, but they can be invited to take part in the meetings (which happens quite often, although not always). Both kinds of councils are good tools in order to put in place community policing dynamics and strategies.

Especially vulnerable groups are also taken into account, because proximity means to consider the different sensibilities and needs of different groups. The ways to establish and keep the relationship with them can adopt very different forms. For instance, Generalitat Police-Mossos d'Esquadra use theatre plays in order to advise seniors about their security. Some municipality police services have

developed APPs with which citizens can permanently report their worries on security (spaces where they feel unsafe, or that are very deteriorated, etc.) and in general the use of Twitter and Facebook is quite usual. Actually, it is quite well-known that the Generalitat Police-Mossos d'Esquadra's twitter account was crucial to keep the public aware about the evolution of the situation after the terrorist attack on the 17th of August 2017.

Another consequence of this policing approach is that normally police services that adopt it draft and publish what is known as "Services Charts". They contain police commitments in most usual public demands to the police (traffic accidents, a fire, reported crime, domestic violence, etc.). They mean transparency because everybody knows with which levels of quality police are expected to react to any incident that is known to them. The adoption of this kind of commitment implies a lot of reactive work that could make problematic the preventative approach that should be central for the model. For instance, if there is a public commitment to send a couple of police officers in two-three minutes in urban areas to the place where a traffic accident has happened and the police fail to fulfil it, that will endanger police reputation and public confidence which is dreadful for the model. In order to fulfil those commitments a lot of police officers should be devoted to them and won't be able to be used in other functions or approaches.

## 7.6 Issues related to the delivery of community policing

The community policing model requires, undoubtedly, a sufficient (generous) number of police officers. At the same time that demands on police officers that deal with communication with the public (which is slow and requires some touch), reaction should be kept in an acceptable level of quality in order to keep the people's respect and confidence. Furthermore, the transversal approach to security that this model promotes, implies to devote a lot of police officers' time to work jointly with other public services that should be involved in order to offer a proper answer to people's demands. Since the model proposes to take care of people's wellbeing, the number of fields in which police services can be demanded can be extremely wide.

The economic crisis that has taken place lately has had a negative influence on community policing because, not only has it been impossible to increase the number of police officers needed to perform required tasks to implement community policing, but the police service has seen the number of officers reduced. The Generalitat Police-Mossos d'Esquadra have not had any new cadets for seven years, which has reduced the number of effectives, since there have been no new promotions of officers for seven years and some have retired, gone on sick leave or had other incidences that deprive them from policing. That has been a serious shortcoming for the sensible implementation of community policing strategies.

At the municipal level some police services have resorted to the use of other kinds of actors that may assist them in keeping safety, such as civic agents, negotiators, mediators, etc. At the same time, some

police services that don't require a high level of police expertise, such as buildings' surveillance, have been guaranteed by hiring private security guards.

Another possible obstacle to a positive implementation is mentioned by Medina (2011) that clarifies that the participation of the public in this model can be quite problematic. First of all, the model assumes that everybody wants to participate and that's not true—there are people that are not willing to participate or to collaborate with the police. Secondly, not everybody has the necessary time to participate, since labour and family duties can make the participation quite hard in some cases. Thirdly, not everybody knows how to participate, which implies: knowing what to say and when; understand the stakeholders; and understand the moments to get a proposal accepted, etc. It is likely that the ones who want to participate, that can do it and know how to do it in an efficient way are those who are already in a quite comfortable position in terms of security and are not considering the general interest, but the private one. So, participation should be properly organised and police officers involved in it should get the necessary training to provide them with the adequate knowledge and skills to cope with the challenges of public involvement in policing.

Despite the issues, research has evidenced (Curbet, 2009; Fernández and Yñiguez, 2014) that community policing is quite positive in providing the citizen with a hope of security. The public perceive that:

- Police care for them and their problems.
- Police inform them about relevant issues.
- They can ask Police for accountability.

That perception raises the level of police legitimacy, public-police relationships which increase the level of subjective security. It is also true nevertheless that there is no evidence that community policing does reduce crime.

## 7.7 Ethical, legal and social issues related to community policing

These types of problems have not been raised in the practice of community policing in Catalonia. However, a certain debate could arise around the participation of police in the social networks at local level to find out possible security problems, either with authentic profiles or under covered or anonymous. There may also be a debate about the extent to which, the proximity officers must establish a personal trustworthy bond with the people they deal with because of their work. Where does neighbourhood police begin, and does it end? How about the police who acts a "guardian agent"? To what extent should this work be done at home, or 24 hours per day? Here we may consider the possibility of having the privacy of the people in touch with the police put at risk. The police can accumulate a huge amount of information about the people without any link to crime, and its use may become problematic.

## 8 Community policing: Germany

The term most commonly used in Germany is “Bürgernahe Polizeiarbeit”, literally “citizen-oriented policing” (Feltes, 2012, p. 219). The term was first discussed at a conference at the University of Heidelberg in the 1980s, where US proponents of community policing presented their ideas (Feltes, 2012). According to Feltes, 2012, it was not a new policing method rather a “philosophy of how policing should be carried out” (p. 219). In other words, a guiding vision that should be embraced by the entire police service and not the responsibility of a single department. The police were seen as responsible for “upholding public security and public order, preventing crime, and catching criminals. At the same time, they also need to deal with the fears and concerns of citizens” (p.219). Under the heading of “community policing”, preventive approaches to improve citizens’ feelings of security have been under discussion in Germany since the late 1980s. The key events and timeframes are summarised in Figure 2, below.

*Table 2. Timeline for community policing in Germany*

| DATE / TIME PERIOD | DETAILS  |
|--------------------|--|
| 1980s              | Discussions at the University of Heidelberg, where approach presented by representatives from the US   |
| 1990s              | “Crime prevention councils” established (kriminalpräventive Räte) and numerous local partnerships emerge.  |
| 1993–2003          | The Community Crime Prevention Research Group of the German state of Baden-Württemberg (Forschungsgruppe Kommunale Kriminalprävention in Baden-Württemberg) supports planning authorities in considering crime issues. |

Feltes (2012) argued that community policing required a fundamental shift in the way that police work was administered and managed—a process of organisational change. To deliver community policing institutions must embrace greater openness, democracy, a broadening role for the police and a more participatory style of management. He suggests that it might be appropriate to refer to “a paradigm shift” (p.219).

The bulk of community policing work consists of defining local problems and finding creative ways to solve them, suggests Feltes (2012). Community policing in Germany ideally starts with the compilation of a ‘situation report’, detailing: (i) problems in a given community, according to different stakeholders; and (ii) identification of who might address or ideally prevent them. Notably, prevention is prioritised over law enforcement in community policing approaches. The situation report demonstrates that citizens’ subjective sense of security and their difficulties are being taken seriously. As the police service is available 24/7, it was assumed that the police should be responsible for citizens’ feelings of security (Feltes, 2012).

Increasingly, however, community problems and crime prevention are commonly seen as requiring a whole of society response—especially as police resources are necessarily limited. Community policing draws together a variety of stakeholders, including other state agencies, private organisations, NGOs, business owners, householders, and citizens into the process of ensuring security. The role of the police is to provide advice to stakeholders, in addition to traditional policing activities (Feltes, 2012). While approaches may vary, community policing does two things:

- Creates better links between the police, communities, and citizens, enabling law enforcement to be augmented or, where possible, be replaced by measures implemented by other agencies;
- Improves the police’s ability to systematically identify and analyse problems in the community, as well as decide who is able or required to deal with them and how.

Interviews with German police and citizens conducted during the EU-funded UNITY research project largely support standard definitions of community policy. Community policing aims to facilitate cooperation with local communities and partners to fight crime, improve safety and protect citizens. Its value in creating mutual understanding, as well as fostering trust and confidence in the police is also highlighted. With dialogue and communication central to delivery, community policing appears to be a human-centred approach that seeks to engage a wide range of groups, including, older people, young people and migrants.

Community policing is often delivered through creation of a ‘working group’. The work group typically analyses the community’s social structure and the crime situation, via surveys and consultation. The findings are analysed, and specific problems selected by work group members to address. Interventions may extend to wider society solutions such as job creation jobs, improving schools, or maintenance of neighbourhoods. Due to the need to engage with local agencies, community policing is usually delivered in a decentralised way (Feltes, 2012).

In Germany, many forms of co-operation between the police and local communities have emerged in recent years to support community policing and crime prevention—approaches that are considered difficult to separate.

Crime prevention councils and partnerships – Starting in 1990, “crime prevention councils” (kriminalpräventive Räte). Some federal states also established additional partnership and networks—

“partnerships for public order” (Ordnungspartnerschaften), which bring together police and other local government departments with responsibility for public order (Ordnungsbehörden). Typically, such partnerships deal with support for children and young people, immigrants, etc. and public order issues related to particular locations / services. By 2012, more than 2,000 crime prevention networks existed in Germany at local and regional level (Feltes, 2012).

Local authority planning – In many communities, the focus on the needs of citizens led to the issues of “security” or “crime” being included in local authority planning. However, planning authorities have little access to suitable resources to support them. In 1993 the Community Crime Prevention Research Group of the German state of Baden-Württemberg (Forschungsgruppe Kommunale Kriminalprävention in Baden-Württemberg) started to be employed to conduct crime victimisation and fear of crime surveys, as well as research problem areas. Citizen surveys came to be seen as “an indispensable basis for the provision of community policing and citizen-oriented public security services” (Feltes, 2012, p. 224), providing a window into perceptions, priorities and differences between neighbourhoods.

Policing in the neighbourhood – The starting point for community policing and crime prevention is the neighbourhood, all aspects—including its infrastructure, architecture, public utilities, social integration, gentrification processes, and crime statistics makes it possible to identify and localize the causes of crime. Neighbourhood-based community development interventions seeks to empower inhabitants to bring about positive change. However, evaluations of publicly financed measures are often lacking (Feltes, 2012). In many localities, the idea of “neighbourhood management” continues to be pursued and expanded.

Measures of performance – Sample citizens’ perceptions emerged as the most frequently named indicator to assess good community policing performance. Such perceptions described a “high subjective feeling of safety” and that citizens experienced “no places of fear”; to a lesser extent a more general “satisfaction of the police work in the communities” (UNITY Project). Indicators of community policing performance covered both concrete measures of police work (such as numbers of solved cases) and subjective measures regarding citizens’ perceptions of safety, as well as improved relationships, closer cooperation and an increase in citizen participation (UNITY project).

Experience suggests that community policing strategy can improve relations between police and citizens, raise levels of citizen satisfaction with the police and help address feelings of insecurity. However, such outcomes are harder to achieve in deprived areas, where citizen engagement may be more difficult. Furthermore, it is often the case that community problems are not directly related to crime (Feltes, 2012).

Community policing and crime prevention impact on all aspects of the neighbourhood: infrastructure, social structure and situational conditions. The problem of “stigmatisation” of certain districts is an ethical concern (Feltes, 2012).



The problem of engaging hard to reach groups and residents in deprived areas are often raised. In recent years, police have been accused of failing to properly police incidents involving certain groups, such as refugees and immigrants accused of assaulting women and girls during New Year celebrations. Such incidents harm the trust in the police and contribute to the wider debate about refugees and immigrants coming to and integrating in Germany. Ethical factors are considered within the indicator for community policing, in the sense of equal treatment by the police of groups, a lack of bias, and in more concrete terms a low number of complaints against police (UNITY project).

DRAFT

## 9 Community policing in federal state of Lower Saxony

Germany and the German police is decentralised due to federalism with each state responsible for their police forces. Lower Saxony is divided into the State Office for Criminal Investigation (LKA), the Central Police Directorate (ZPD), the Police Academy (PA) and six Police Directorates (PD). Within the police directorates, department 11 is responsible for crime prevention and the fight against crime. 33 police departments (PI) are assigned to six police directorates. The police departments always have a Commissioner for Crime Prevention, a Commissioner for Youth and a Commissioner for Traffic. Each head of department is primarily responsible for crime prevention.

There are also 155 police commissariats (PK), as well as several police stations assigned to the 33 police departments. At least one, and up to three, contact officers (KOB) in these police commissariats and police stations establish direct contact with the citizens. The LKA is developing predictive policing approaches and tools. The contact officers (KOB) are estimated to be about 100 officers in charge of community policing, neighbourhood policing.

The crime prevention councils are a special feature of Lower Saxony. The so-called Crime Prevention Councils exist in around 200 municipalities and towns. The topic of crime prevention is dealt with by these councils as a task for society as a whole. The councils are always made up of municipal representatives and others, as well as the police.

The EU-funded project COMPOSITE reveals that while use of social media to engage with communities is still in its infancy in Germany, the police in Lower Saxony (together with North Rhine- Westphalia) are much more active in the use of social media than others (Rogus and Rüdiger, 2014).

# 10 Lessons Learned

## 10.1 Community policing and police culture

Community policing remains a prominent issue on the political agenda (Oliver, 2000). Its principles — the fostering of trust, confidence and legitimacy — are in line with the fundamental values of contemporary democracies (Gstrein *et al*, 2019) and go largely uncontested by the general public, the media and academics (Oliver, 2000).

From a theoretical standpoint, community policing is flawless and neat. Its implementation and delivery in practice, however, is seldom straightforward. Ultimately, community policing is implemented by front-line officers who are part of complex organisations and who are charged with delivering such principles within even more complex social contexts. While the concept of community policing is widely accepted, police officers' acceptance of its principles is far from being unproblematic.

It has been consistently identified that the resilience of traditional police culture can negatively impact police officers' perception of community policing, therefore acting as an obstacle to effective implementation (Irving *et al*, 1989; Bennett and Lupton, 1992; Sadd and Grinc, 1994; Skogan *et al*, 1999; Novak *et al*, 2003; Long *et al*, 2012; Myhill, 2012; Cosgrove and Ramshaw, 2015; Cosgrove, 2016; Mastrofski *et al*, 2016; O'Neil, 2019). This issue seems not only to affect different countries, but also appears to persist over time.

While police culture is far from homogenous and universal (Paoline, 2003; Moon, 2006), there is broad consensus that some of its most defining features include a focus on crime fighting, isolation from the general public and a strong loyalty towards colleagues (Paoline, 2003). These features are not easily compatible with the community policing approach (Moon, 2006), since the latter emphasises cooperation between police and citizens and prioritises preventative actions over reactive responses to crime.

To many police officers — irrespective of their rank, background and experience — community policing is “second class” police work, whilst crime fighting, punitive policing remains the most legitimate police remit.

Several UK-based studies have explored the cultural resistance towards community policing within police forces and stressed the lack of professional status of community policing roles, which are often considered inferior (Irving *et al*, 1989; Bennett and Lupton, 1992; Myhill, 2012; Cosgrove and Ramshaw, 2015; Cosgrove, 2016; O'Neil, 2019).

This issue does not appear to be confined to the UK. There is evidence that cultural resistance from police officers is also one of the main challenges to the implementation of community policing in the

US (Sadd and Grinc, 1994; Long *et al*, 2012; Mastrofski *et al*, 2016; Skogan *et al*, 1999), and beyond (Weisburd and Amir, 2002; Topping, 2008). As in the UK, police officers' role perception in the US is dictated by the persistence of the traditional occupational police culture which emphasises police autonomy, law enforcement, and criminal investigation. Community policing challenges this role perception and is therefore resisted by police officers (Mastrofski *et al*, 2016).

While it is safe to say that the relationship between police culture and community policing is troublesome, it is important to stress that several factors must be considered when discussing officers' resistance to community policing (and resulting poor implementation practices). These include the role of leadership's attitudes and priorities, the wider political and cultural context, as well as the multifaceted nature of police culture and the complexity of the socialization process.

DRAFT

# 11 Conclusions & discussion

## 11.1 The community policing model

This review of the state-of-the-art in community policing reveals widespread consensus on the approach. Police officers are expected to be in close and regular contact with citizens, organisations and businesses in their local community in order to inform, advise and involve them—and to be informed and advised by them. In this sense, meaningful engagement supporting a two-way dialogue between police and community is envisaged. Ideally, community policing delivery is geographically organised to be close to the community, for example by police structures reflecting and mapping onto neighbourhoods.

Police officers are also expected to adopt a proactive, problem-oriented approach. This involves officers identifying, defining and assessing problems in partnership with key local stakeholders. Through problem-solving, community policing has the opportunity to be proactive and potentially prevent crimes from occurring in the first place. However, problem-solving requires a shift from a reactive to a proactive, strategic approach that can be difficult for LEAs required to be responsive to emerging problems. Experience tells us that the implementation of problem solving is far from straightforward. Bullock and Tilley (2009) draw attention to the many obstacles identified over 25 years of experimentation with the principles of problem solving. They examine what is known about implementation of problem solving in the police service, the factors that influence its delivery and the implications for the delivery of community policing (Bullock and Tilley, 2009).

The community policing approach is not only about police visibility, proximity and trust, however—or even citizen-police dialogue. It is also about what priorities will govern policing delivery, who will do what and what their aims and targets will be. The community-oriented approach is increasingly embedded in organisational mission statements, strategies and performance management systems. Integration into LEA policies and procedures is designed to support the delivery of community policing, but can have unintended consequences. For example, police officers may focus on quantitative targets at the expense of achieving qualitative outcomes.

The Home Office report by Tuffin *et al* (2006) showed that targeted foot patrol—in combination with community engagement, problem-solving and perceived police fairness—reduced criminal victimisation and disorder, improved feelings of security, increased trust and improved public perceptions of policing. The relationship between the different concepts (community policing, neighbourhood approaches, crime victimisation, feelings of insecurity and trust in and legitimacy of the police) is still far from clear. Nevertheless, we might reasonably conclude that the community policing approach works—in that it offers benefits desired by citizens and policymakers.

Looking internationally, the terms used for community policing vary between countries and change over time. Terms include:

- Neighbourhood policing (UK);
- Citizen-oriented police work (DE);
- Territorial police work (DE);
- Proximity policing (ES); and
- Community-oriented policing (US).

In 1829, Sir Robert Peel reformed policing in the UK, establishing the London Metropolitan Police Force. The basic principle of local officers engaging with citizens in local areas remains the same, but the emphasis has changed over the years. Programmes of reform have aimed to tackle issues such as corruption and racism, as well as to shift focus onto addressing the perceptions and concerns of local communities.

A similar process of policing transformation has occurred in the Netherlands. The Dutch police had to contend with a few cases of corruption in Amsterdam in the mid-1970s and there were efforts by police inspectors to promote a less hierarchical, more "listening to people" style. From 1979 onwards, there was also a shift towards crime prevention. In some other European countries, the approach to policing and the context in which it has been delivered has been quite different.

In countries such as Portugal and Spain, the introduction of community policing is a more recent phenomenon, implemented through projects, initiatives and the establishment of police teams tasked with community policing. The approach involves a shift from: (i) formal law enforcement (involving written laws and the justice system) to informal small groups and neighbourhood rules (involving norms and values of the street); and (ii) a technical and instrumental approach to a more client-focused or even human-centred approach. Indeed, it could be argued that community policing can only really be effectively delivered within a democracy. This partly explains why Catalonia in Spain and Lisbon in Portugal—former dictatorships—only started to introduce community policing in the 1990s. In contrast, community policing based on Peelian (or similar) principles was the starting model for policing in countries of North Western Europe.

Community policing focuses on 'The Citizen' or 'The Community'. In practice, there are differences between citizens due to a wide range of factors, including age, gender, ethnicity and socio-economic factors. Likewise, there are differences between communities — sometimes simply due to the context in which people live. Research conducted for the EU-funded project, *Planning Urban Security (PLuS)* (2008–2012), revealed significant differences between communities in Manchester city centre (UK), compared to those in other European cities, such as Hannover in Germany (Schroeder *et al*, 2008–2012). In Manchester, city living has become extremely attractive to young professionals, who rent (or possibly buy) small apartments in the city centre. Tenure is often relatively short and typically around

two years. Busy professionals often have little or no contact with neighbours and couples typically move out of the city once they have children. This is because Manchester's city centre offers few facilities for young families with children—there are a few play areas, little green space, no schools and limited housing suited to families in the city centre.

There is of course large demographic change occurring in European societies, as a result of immigration, refugees and the aging population. Such societal changes in the makeup of 'communities' are important for every organisation and therefore also LEAs.

## 11.2 The concept of trust

Community policing appears to start with the notion of 'visibility'. However, community policing goes beyond the potentially narrow definition of this term (i.e. the ability to be seen), as citizens must be able—and be willing—to engage in face-to-face contact with community police officers (and vice versa). Thus, while the term 'visibility' may often be used, what is actually required is "the potential for engagement"—explaining why foot patrol is better than vehicle patrol. Medina (2011) suggests that participation of the public in this community-oriented policing model can be quite problematic. Citizens must want to participate, be able to participate and understand how to participate. But even before that contact can take place there must be trust. The officers should trust the citizens' (and the information they give) but probably even more important is that citizens should trust the police. If citizens do not trust the police, they will be less willing to contact officers, and may be unwilling to talk to them openly, in public. Trust implies a kind of social contract, a two-way dialogue. Citizens must believe the police to be fair, just and honest, more or less following community rules, norms and expectations—not only formal written laws. Police officers wedded to a punitive, law enforcement role are less likely to be trusted by citizens. While in many police models, 'trust' is seen as a beneficial result of community policing, trust may equally be seen as an important prerequisite for effective community policing.

## 11.3 Terrorism and community policing

The impact of terrorist threats on community policing are varied and complex. We can see that terrorist attacks by ETA made community policing difficult to implement in Spain. It also resulted in a political focus on counter-terrorism in Spain—possibly at the expense of community policing. In addition, the threat of terrorism can have the effect of changing the police model and working methods, resulting in a return to 'hard-policing' and even the increased militarisation of policing. For a while, the adoption of a hard approach (a "war on terror") may be reassuring to the general public, but in the long run it may undermine the perceived 'approachability' of the police. Reduced approachability implies the police losing their connection to the public, considering the community perspective less, and also becoming distrusted—particularly by some sections of the community.

Following a terrorist attack, LEAs can actively promote community engagement. In Greater Manchester, the aftermath of the 2017 Manchester Arena terrorist attack was used to build community cohesion. The “We Stand Together” charity was established to celebrate difference, fight hatred and intolerance and help build a safer and stronger community. Greater Manchester Police was at the forefront of this initiative, which involved Chief Inspector Umer Khan—later awarded an Order of the British Empire (OBE) for his work. There have been a host of community events under the campaign and the hashtag continues to be used at national events (see <https://www.westandtogether.org.uk>).

## 11.4 Policing in a time of austerity

The problems facing policing in the UK today arise from austerity, combined with increasing demand for police services. The budget cuts that have been made to community policing are surprising, given that a systematic review has shown that neighbourhood policing has been effective at reducing public perceptions of disorder, increasing trust and confidence in the police and increasing the perceived legitimacy of the police (Gill *et al*, 2014). The College of Policing guidance outlines key principles for neighbourhood policing but touches only briefly on the challenges facing police forces due to cuts in funding or increased demand. Indeed, the guidelines are explicit in their attempt to remain neutral regarding UK public spending cuts, reductions in staffing and police restructuring initiatives. How community policing in the UK may develop in the future as policing cuts continue to bite is not known. The aspiration to stick with the Peelian principles that form its foundation will prove increasingly difficult to maintain if recent rises in demand for police services continue.



## 12 References

- Antillano, A. (2002). "Las nuevas políticas de seguridad: el caso de Barcelona". En Revista Catalana de Seguretat Pública, No. 10, pp.77–101.
- Bayerl, P.S, van der Giessen, M. and Jacob, G. (2015) DELIVERABLE 3.1 Unity – Report on Existing Approaches and Best/Effective Practices to Community Policing. Available from: <https://www.unity-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/D3.1-Report-on-Existing-Approaches-and-Best-Practices-to-CP.pdf>
- BBC News (2013) "Greater Manchester Police does not investigate 60% of crimes", BBC News website, 5 September 2013, available at: <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-manchester-23967098>
- Bennett, T. and Lupton R. (1992). "A survey of the allocation and use of community constables in England and Wales." *The British Journal of Criminology* 32(2), 167-182.
- Bullock, Karen & Nick Tilley (2009). "Born to Fail? Policing, Reform and Neighbourhood Problem Solving". *The Police Journal: Theory, Practice and Principles*, vol. 82, no. 2, pp. 117–133. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1350/pojo.2009.82.2.459>
- Carque, J.L. (2014). "Nuevos retos de la policía comunitaria: En busca del diálogo permanente entre vecinos y policía". En VIDALES, C, y CARQUE, J.L. (coords.). *Policía Comunitaria. Una policía para la sociedad del siglo XXI*. Valencia. Tirant lo Blanch. Págs. 133 a 245.
- Casciani, B. (2018) "MI5 'too slow' over Manchester Arena bomber", BBC News, article by Home affairs correspondent, 22 November 2018, available at: <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-46303812>
- Cazorla, N. (2009). *La police de proximité. Entre réalités et mythes*. París. L'Harmattan.
- Chiodi,S., Diniz,M., Grönlund, B., Neves, A., Nicolini, U., Saraiva, M., Soomeren, P., (2016). "Lisbon CP-UDP Workshop Security and Urban Planning – Working Group Report Final Report". Action TU1203 - Crime Prevention through Urban Design and Planning – CP-UDP. Available at: [http://www.costtu1203.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/LisbonCOSTWorkshop\\_FinalReport.pdf](http://www.costtu1203.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/LisbonCOSTWorkshop_FinalReport.pdf)
- Cobler, E., and López, E. (2017). *Mediación y prácticas restaurativas policiales. Construyendo la cultura de la paz*. Uno editorial.
- Cosgrove, F.M. and Ramshaw P. (2015). It is what you do as well as the way that you do it: the value and deployment of PCSOs in achieving public engagement. *Policing and society*, 25(1), 77-96.
- Cosgrove, F. M. (2016). 'I wannabe a copper': The engagement of Police Community Support Officers with the dominant police occupational culture. *Criminology & criminal justice*, 16(1), 119-138.

Counsel and Care (2010–2011) *Community Care: Understanding the system in England*. Published by the charity to support older people. Available at:

<http://www.firststopcareadvice.org.uk/downloads/kbase/1522.pdf>

Curbet, J. (2009). *El rey desnudo*. Barcelona. UOC.

De Graaf, B. *Why Communication and Performance are Key in Countering Terrorism*, ICCT Research Paper. International Centre for Counter-Terrorism: The Hague, 2011

Diamond, Drew & Deirdre Mead Weiss (2009) *Advancing community policing through community governance: A framework document*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Department of Community-Oriented Policing Services.

<https://www.masc.sc/SiteCollectionDocuments/Public%20Safety/advancing%20community%20policin g.pdf>

Diniz, M. & Santa Cruz, C. (2014) "Lisbon community policing: The challenge of the intercultural and mediation approach" in *Intercultural mediation in Europe: narratives of professional transformation*. On Diversity -Common Ground Publishing. Available at:

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269988046\\_Intercultural\\_Mediation\\_in\\_Europe\\_Narrative\\_s\\_of\\_Professional\\_Transformation](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269988046_Intercultural_Mediation_in_Europe_Narrative_s_of_Professional_Transformation)

Diniz, M. (2011). *Práticas policiais e cidadania a nível local: a participação dos cidadãos no contexto do policiamento comunitário "Alvalade mais seguro"*. Tese de Mestrado, ISCTE. Available at:

[https://repositorio.iscte-iul.pt/bitstream/10071/4775/1/Dissertacao\\_Monica\\_Diniz\\_2011.pdf](https://repositorio.iscte-iul.pt/bitstream/10071/4775/1/Dissertacao_Monica_Diniz_2011.pdf)

Dirección General de la policía (1987), *Manual de la Policía de Barrio*. Madrid. Ministerio del Interior.

Eichler, W. (2017) Manchester City Council announces £30m of cuts, LocalGov, the UK's largest local government news website, 04 January 2017, available from: <https://www.localgov.co.uk/Manchester-City-Council-announces-30m-of-cuts-/42292>

Emsley, C. (1983) *Policing and its context 1750–1870*, London, Macmillan. DOI : 10.1007/978-1-349-17043-2

Emsley, C. (1999a) *A typology of nineteenth-century police*, *Crime Histoire & Sociétés / Crime, History & Societies*, 3.1, pp. 29–44.

Emsley, C. (1999b) *Gendarmes and the state in nineteenth century Europe*, Oxford, Oxford University Press. DOI : 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198207986.001.0001

Emsley, C. (2009) *The Great British Bobby. A History of British Policing from the 18th Century to the Present*. Quercus: London, UK.

Emsley, C. (2007) *Crime, Police, & Penal Policy : European Experiences 1750–1940*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

EPS (2018) *Manchester Arena attack: Casualty Bureau communications breakdown*, Emergency Planning Society (EPS) Administrator, 29 June 2018, available at: <https://www.the-eps.org/manchester-arena-attack-casualty-bureau-communications-breakdown/>

Fernández, C. and Yñiguez, A. (2014) *Gestió estratègica de la policia. Organització de l'eficiència en el treball policial*. Sevilla. Punto Rojo Libros.

Ferret, J, and Maffre, P. (2000), "l'usage de la notion de police de proximité en Espagne : indice d'une mutation inachevée". En *Les Cahiers de la Sécurité intérieure* n°39. Págs. 77–101.

Full Fact (accessed 24.05.19) *The Police*. Full Fact is the UK's independent fact check charity: available at: [https://fullfact.org/finder/crime\\_law/police/#1](https://fullfact.org/finder/crime_law/police/#1)

GMP website (accessed 28.05.19) *Operation Valiant*. Greater Manchester Police website, available at: <https://www.gmp.police.uk/police-forces/greater-manchester-police/areas/greater-manchester-force-content/c/campaigns/2019/operation-valiant/>

Greater Manchester (2018) *Standing Together. Greater Manchester's plan for safer, stronger communities – Summary*, February 2018. Available at: <https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/media/1270/standing-together-summary-document.pdf>. The full Police and Crime Plan is available to download from <https://goo.gl/9fsQmc>

Gonçalo, R.G . (2014), "Police reform and the transnational circulation of police models: The Portuguese case in the 1860s" in *Crime, Histoire & Sociétés / Crime, History & Societies*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 5–29.

Goncalves, G. R. (2018) "Police Reform and the Transnational Circulation of Police Models: The Portuguese Case in the 1860s". *Crime, Histories and Societies*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 5–29. Available from: <https://journals.openedition.org/chs/>

Gondra, B.J. (2009) "Els indicadors en l'àmbit de la seguretat interior: sobre la mesura dels resultats". En *Apunts de Seguretat*, núm. 3, pp. 5–32.

Guillén, F. (2016) *Modelos de policía. Hacia un modelo de seguridad plural*. Barcelona. Bosch editor.

Guillén, F. (2015) *Modelos de policía y seguridad*. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona : <http://hdl.handle.net/10803/291813>

Guillén, F. (2009) "Dalle "finestre rotte" alla lotta contro la delinquenza: alcuni passaggi perduti". En CARRER, F. (coord.). *Le politiche della sicurezza. Dalla "polizia comunitaria" alla "tolleranza zero"*. Milano. FrancoAngeli.

Guillén, F, and Rabot, A. (2003) "Projet de recherche Oisin II. Recherche d'une méthodologie commune d'évaluation de l'impact des reformes de police de proximité en Europe". Rapport final de l'équipe espagnole.

Hamilton, A., Moore, L. and Trimble, T. (1995) *Policing a Divided Society: Issues and Perceptions in Northern Ireland*. The University of Ulster, Coleraine. Available at:  
<https://cain.ulster.ac.uk/csc/reports/police.htm>

Guth, DeLloyd J. (1994). "The Traditional Common Law Constable, 1235–1829: From Bracton to the Fieldings to Canada". In Macleod, R.C. and Schneiderman, D. (eds.). *Police Powers in Canada: The Evolution and Practice of Authority*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. p. 6. ISBN 0-8020-2863-2.

GWS (accessed 28.05.19) "Terror attack at pop concert in Manchester", *Global Warnings System* (GWS). Sweden, Lund, available at: <https://globalwarningsystem.com/terror-attack-at-pop-concert-in-manchester/>

Higgins, A. (2018) *The Future of Neighbourhood Policing*. UK Police Think Tank. Published by The Police Foundation: London, UK. Available at: [http://www.police-foundation.org.uk/2017/wp-content/uploads/2010/10/TPFJ6112-Neighbourhood-Policing-Report-WEB\\_2.pdf](http://www.police-foundation.org.uk/2017/wp-content/uploads/2010/10/TPFJ6112-Neighbourhood-Policing-Report-WEB_2.pdf)

HMICFRS (accessed 22.05.19) *Greater Manchester Police*. Home Office, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services, available at:  
<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/police-forces/greater-manchester/>

HMICFRS (accessed 23.05.19) *More about this area*. Home Office, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services, available at:  
<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/peel-assessments/peel-2018/greater-manchester/more-about-this-area/>

Home Office (2008) *From the neighbourhood to the national: Policing our communities together*. Norwich: The Stationery Office. Available from:  
[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/229019/7448.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/229019/7448.pdf)

Home Office (2010). *Safe and confident neighbourhoods strategy: Next Steps in Neighbourhood Policing*. <http://library.college.police.uk/docs/homeoffice/safe-confident-neighbourhoods-strategy-2010.pdf>

INHESJ (2003) "Évaluer la police ?" In *Cahiers de la Sécurité Intérieure et la Justice*, No. 53, 3rd trimester

Irving B., Bird C., Hibberd M. and Willmore, J. (1989). *Neighbourhood Policing: The natural history of a policing experiment* (Vol. 12). London: Police Foundation.

Lahosa, J.M. (1999). "Seguridad urbana: ¿realidad o percepción?". En *Revista Catalana de Seguretat Pública*, No. 4, pp. 123–136.

Lawrence, D. (2011) *And Still I Rise*. Faber & Faber: London, UK

Long J., Wells W. and De Leon-Granados W. (2002). Implementation issues in a community and police partnership in law enforcement space: Lessons from a case study of a community policing approach to domestic violence. *Police Practice and Research*, 3(3), 231-246.

Mastrofski S. D., Willis J. J. and Kochel T. R. (2007). The challenges of implementing community policing in the United States. *Policing: a journal of policy and practice*, 1(2), 223

Medina. J. (2011). *Políticas y estrategias de Prevención del delito y Seguridad ciudadana*. Madrid-Montevideo-Buenos Aires. Edisofer. Editorial B de F.

Milne, S. (1994) *The Enemy within: Thatcher's Secret War Against the Miners*. Verso Books.

Moon, B. (2006). The influence of organizational socialization on police officers' acceptance of community policing. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*.

Myhill, A. (2006). *Community engagement in policing: Lessons from literature*. London: Home Office.

Normandeau, A. (1994). "Balance y perspectivas de la policía comunitaria". In *Prevenió*, No. 10, Ajuntament de Barcelona.

Novak K. J., Alarid L. F. and Lucas W. L. (2003). Exploring officers' acceptance of community policing: Implications for policy implementation. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31(1), 57-71.

O'Neill M. (2019). *Police community support officers: cultures and identities within pluralised policing*. Oxford University Press.

Paoline III, E. A. (2003). Taking stock: Toward a richer understanding of police culture. *Journal of criminal justice*, 31(3), 199-214.

Pinto, R. (2017) *O Programa Escola Segura na prevenção da Violência escolar*, Tese de Mestrado, Academia Militar. Available at:  
[https://comum.rcaap.pt/bitstream/10400.26/19286/1/569\\_Pinto\\_%20O%20Programa%20Escola%20Segura%20na%20preven%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20da%20viol%C3%Aancia%20escolar.pdf](https://comum.rcaap.pt/bitstream/10400.26/19286/1/569_Pinto_%20O%20Programa%20Escola%20Segura%20na%20preven%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20da%20viol%C3%Aancia%20escolar.pdf)

Rabot, A. (2004) "Implantación y evaluación del modelo de policía de proximidad en España". In *Revista Catalana de Seguretat Pública*, No. 14, pp. 199–217.

Requena, J. (2013) "La proximitat a la policia de la Generalitat-Mossos d'Esquadra, entre el discurs i la realitat". In *Revista Catalana de Seguretat Pública*. Març 2013.

Rogus, M and Rüdiger, T-G. (2014) *Country Report for Germany on the Use of Social Media by Police*, Available from the COMPOSITE website, at:  
[https://www.fhpolbb.de/sites/default/files/field/dokumente/somep\\_country\\_report\\_germany.pdf](https://www.fhpolbb.de/sites/default/files/field/dokumente/somep_country_report_germany.pdf)

Rodríguez Herrera, M. (2014). “La policía comunitaria: una aproximación a su concepto y principios”. En Vidales, C. and Carque, J.L. (edit.) *Policia Comunitaria. Una policia para la sociedad del siglo XXI*. Valencia. Tirant lo Blanch. 15-64.

Sadd S. and Grinc R. (1994) Innovative neighbourhood-oriented policing: An evaluation of community policing programmes in eight cities, in Rosenbaum, D. (ed) *The challenge of community policing*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Salas, L. (2014). “La policía comunitaria y su evaluación”. In Vidales, C, and Carque, J.L. (coords.). *Policia Comunitaria. Una policia para la sociedad del siglo XXI*. Valencia. Tirant lo Blanch. pp 65–86.

Simões, C. (2016) Modelo de Policiamento na GNR, Tese de Mestrado, Academia Militar. Available at: [https://comum.rcaap.pt/bitstream/10400.26/15227/1/RCFTIA\\_174Sim%C3%B5es.pdf](https://comum.rcaap.pt/bitstream/10400.26/15227/1/RCFTIA_174Sim%C3%B5es.pdf)

Saraiva, M., Matijosaitiene, I., Diniz, M., Velicka, V. (2016). *Model (my) neighbourhood – a bottom-up collective approach for crime-prevention in Portugal and Lithuania*. Available at: <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/JPM09-2015-0033>

Skogan, Wesley G. & Lynn Steiner (2004). *Community policing in Chicago, year ten, An evaluation of Chicago’s Alternative Policing Strategy*. Chicago: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. [http://www.skogan.org/files/Community\\_Policing\\_in\\_Chicago\\_Year\\_Ten.pdf](http://www.skogan.org/files/Community_Policing_in_Chicago_Year_Ten.pdf)

Skogan W. G., Hartnett S. M., Comey J. T., Dubois J., and Kaiser M. (2019). *On the beat: Police and community problem solving*. Routledge.

South Yorkshire Police Force (accessed April 2019). *Neighbourhood Policing Team*. Available at: <https://www.southyorks.police.uk/find-out/your-neighbourhood-policing-team/>

Sutherland, J. (2017) *Blue. Keeping the Peace and Falling to Pieces*. Weidenfeld & Nicolson: London, UK.

Topping J. R. (2008). *Community policing in Northern Ireland: a resistance narrative*. *Policing & Society*, 18(4), 377–396.

Tuffin, Rachel, Julia Morris & Alexis Poole (2006) *An evaluation of the impact of the National Reassurance Policing Programme*. London: Home Office, Research, Development and Statistics Directorate. <http://library.college.police.uk/docs/hors/hors296.pdf>

UK College of Policing (accessed 7 June 2019) *About Us*. Website of the professional body for the police service in England and Wales, available at: <https://www.college.police.uk/About/Pages/default.aspx>

UK College of Policing (2018a) *Neighbourhood policing guidelines*. UK College of Policing, Coventry, UK. Available at: [https://www.college.police.uk/What-we-do/Support/Guidelines/Neighbourhood-Policing/Documents/neighbourhood\\_policing\\_guidelines.pdf](https://www.college.police.uk/What-we-do/Support/Guidelines/Neighbourhood-Policing/Documents/neighbourhood_policing_guidelines.pdf)

UK College of Policing (2018b) *Neighbourhood policing guidelines: Supporting material for senior leaders*. UK College of Policing, Coventry, UK. Available at: [https://www.college.police.uk/What-we-do/Support/Guidelines/Neighbourhood-Policing/Documents/neighbourhood\\_policing\\_guidelines.pdf](https://www.college.police.uk/What-we-do/Support/Guidelines/Neighbourhood-Policing/Documents/neighbourhood_policing_guidelines.pdf)

UK College of Policing (2018c) *Neighbourhood Policing. Impact and implementation*, UK College of Policing, Coventry, UK. Available at: [https://www.college.police.uk/What-we-do/Support/Guidelines/Neighbourhood-Policing/Documents/Neighbourhood\\_policing\\_impact\\_and\\_implementation.pdf](https://www.college.police.uk/What-we-do/Support/Guidelines/Neighbourhood-Policing/Documents/Neighbourhood_policing_impact_and_implementation.pdf)

UK Government website (accessed 18.01.19) *Police and Community Support Officers*. Available at: <https://www.google.com/search?client=safari&rls=en&q=Police+and+Community+Support+Officers&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8>

Vidales, C. (2014). "Seguridad ciudadana, políticas de Seguridad y estrategias policiales". En Vidales, C, and Carque, J.L. (coords.). *Policía Comunitaria. Una policía para la sociedad del siglo XXI*. Valencia. Tirant lo Blanch, pp. 101–126.

Weisburd D., Shalev O. and Amir M. (2002). Community policing in Israel. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*.

Wheller, L. (2013) *What is a Rapid Evidence Assessment? What's involved?* Evidence Base Camp 2013. Presentation from Levin Wheller, Practice Development Team, Research Analysis and Information Unit, College of Policing. Available at: [https://whatworks.college.police.uk/Partnerships/Documents/Base\\_Camp\\_1\\_What\\_is\\_REA.pdf](https://whatworks.college.police.uk/Partnerships/Documents/Base_Camp_1_What_is_REA.pdf)

Wilson, J.M., and Weiss, A. (2012) *A performance-based approach to police staffing and allocation*. COPS. Department of Justice. Available at: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=262179>

# 13 Appendices

## 13.1 Typology of approaches to community policing in the UK

### The Police Foundation

The Police Foundation is the UK's policing think tank. It is the only independent body in the UK that researches, understands and works to improve policing for the benefit of the public. The Foundation states:

*"Policing has never changed as fast and as much as it is today. All this makes the existence of an independent body that uses high quality evidence to deliver an impartial perspective on contemporary policing issues more important than ever".*

Source: The Police Foundation Website (accessed 7 June 2019)  
Available at: <http://www.police-foundation.org.uk>

The Police Foundation published a high-level 'typology' to provide a starting point for exploring recent changes in neighbourhood policing that seeks to capture the wide range of models for delivering neighbourhood policing in England and Wales (Higgins, 2018).

### A. Consistent traditional

16 forces had maintained a workforce model broadly similar to that typically employed by forces in 2008, with around 10 to 15 percent of the total workforce allocated to neighbourhood policing roles, made up of roughly equal numbers of police officers and PCSOs. It should be noted that where the number of police officers allocated to neighbourhood roles was increased significantly, police officers were often fulfilling a dual-role or a broader interpretation of the role had been adopted.

### B. Civilianised rurals

Nine forces—largely in rural areas—had maintained roughly 10 to 15 percent of workforce in neighbourhood roles but had done so by increasingly relying on PCSOs.

### C. Officer preservers

Four forces have maintained roughly average proportions of workforce in neighbourhood roles (10 to 15 per cent) but have progressively de-civilianised their neighbourhood function, replacing PCSOs with warranted police officers. For example, the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) is the most notable example of this approach.



#### D. Robust purists

Three forces (Cleveland, Greater Manchester and West Midlands for much of the analysis period) had maintained comparatively large neighbourhood functions alongside substantial incident management contingents, theoretically suggesting the potential for a well-resourced, functionally discrete neighbourhood policing offering.

#### E. Outright outliers

In 2016 Bedfordshire (along with the City of London and West Yorkshire) reported a particularly atypical workforce model. In the case of the former, this was the result of previous decisions to adopt a 'back to basics' policing model in response to austerity, which it has subsequently acknowledged to be a "big mistake".

## 13.2 UK College of Policing Guidelines

The College of policing is firmly committed to an 'evidence-based' approach to policing, where police forces make greater use of scientific methodologies and the evidence from social science research informs police policy and practice. The approach values scientific evaluations of policing measures, empirical studies and reviews of best practice (Society of Evidence-based Policing, accessed 7 June 2019). Indeed, over the last decade UK LEAs have been very much encouraged to adopt an evidence-based approach. In 2010, the first professional Society of Evidence-Based Policing was founded at the University of Cambridge, and now has some 2,000 members from mostly UK police agencies.

The importance of the evidence approach is reflected in the work of the UK College of Policing, tasked with improving LEA performance in neighbourhood policing. The College Guideline Committee considered findings of from "rapid evidence assessments" (REAs). REAs involves, identifying search terms and criteria, obtaining relevant papers and grading the papers in terms of the reliability and validity of the results, synthesizing the results and writing up the findings (Wheller, 2013). Two REAs were conducted to answer the following questions:

**REA1** – What constitutes effective neighbourhood policing?

**REA2** – What acts as a facilitator or barrier to successful implementation of neighbourhood policing?

The findings of rapid evidence assessments were presented by College researchers to the Guideline Committee—in the form of evidence tables. These evidence tables were then reviewed by committee members to: (a) identify areas where there was sufficient evidence to recommend policing practice; and (b) determine how strongly worded each guideline should be. For example, whether LEAs 'should do' something or 'are advised to do' something. The results inform detailed guidance for senior officers "Neighbourhood policing guidelines: Supporting material for senior leaders" (UK College of Policing, 2018).

Seven guidelines on implementing effective neighbourhood policing are identified. Summarised in model of page 4 of the document, these are as follows:

#### Guidelines on delivering neighbourhood policing

1. Engaging communities
2. Solving problems
3. Targeting activity

#### Guidelines on supporting neighbourhood policing

4. Promoting the right culture
5. Building analytical capability
6. Developing officers, staff and volunteers

#### Evidence gaps

7. Developing and sharing learning

Aimed at Chief Police Officers, an example of the recommendations is provided in the box below:

#### Example of content from Guidelines on Neighbourhood Policing

##### 1. Engaging communities

Chief officers should work with police and crime commissioners to deliver and support neighbourhood policing and must ensure it is built on effective engagement and consultation with communities.

Essential elements include:

- Officers, staff and volunteers being responsible for and having a targeted visible presence in neighbourhoods
- A clearly defined and transparent purpose for engagement activities
- Regular formal and informal contact with communities
- Working with partners (e.g. by identifying communities and sharing arrangements for engagement)
- Making available information about local crime and policing issues to communities
- Engagement that is tailored to the needs and preferences of different communities
- Using engagement to identify local priorities and inform problem-solving
- Officers, staff and volunteers providing feedback and being accountable to communities
- Officers, staff and volunteers supporting communities, where appropriate, to be more active in the policing of their local areas.

Community engagement in neighbourhoods should:

- Provide an ongoing two-way dialogue between the police and the public
- Enable the police to develop a better understanding of communities and their needs, risks and threats.

*Source: UK College of Policing Guidance (2018)*

### 13.3 Emergency planning

On 22 May 2017, a suicide bomber—a radical Islamist—detonated a shrapnel-laden homemade bomb as people were leaving the Manchester Arena following a concert by the American singer Ariana Grande (GWS, accessed 28.05.19). The Kerslake Inquiry into the Manchester Arena attack found that overall the response of the emergency services had been very positive. However, there were some problems in some areas of the response, including the communication with Fire services and with a systems failure at Vodafone in relation to the that resulted in families and friends being unable to find obtain news about loved ones (EPS, 2018). At its height, 641 people were reported missing. Under nationally agreed arrangements since 2009 through the Home Office, Vodafone is contracted to activate the necessary telephone support, to provide the host police service with a dedicated telephone number, through which all calls can be routed. It also enables other police forces to stand up their Casualty Bureau and thereby assist the host police force with additional call-taking capacity throughout periods of high volume. The facility is referred to as the National Mutual Aid Telephony system (N-MAT). However, the system was not fully operational and failed to work in the crisis (EPS, 2018).



# CCI

CUTTING CRIME  
IMPACT

DRRAAF

