

**Policing in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Reconnecting police and the people  
CONSULTATION**

| <b>CHAPTER 2:</b>   |              |            |
|---|--------------|------------|
| <p>1. Will the proposed checks and balances set out in this chapter provide effective but un-bureaucratic safeguards for the work of Commissioners, and are there further safeguards that should be considered?</p> <p>2. What could be done to ensure that candidates for Commissioner come from a wide range of backgrounds, including from party political and independent standpoints?</p> <p>3. How should Commissioners best work with the wider criminal justice and community safety partners who deliver the broad range of services that keep communities safe?</p> <p>4. How might Commissioners best engage with their communities - individuals, businesses and voluntary organisations - at the neighbourhood level</p> <p>5. How can the Commissioner and the greater transparency of local information drive improvements in the most deprived and least safe neighbourhoods in their areas?</p> <p>6. What information would help the public make judgements about their force and Commissioner, including the level of detail and comparability with other areas?</p> |              |            |
|   | <b>AGREE</b> |            |
| <b>JM Response:</b>   | <b>YES:</b>  | <b>NO:</b> |
| <p>1. There appears to be little difference between the role of the Police and Crime Panel and the current Police Authority arrangement at force level. There is no mention made of the current Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny committee arrangements and whether there is an expectation that this will continue. If policing is to become more citizen-focused and accountable to local communities, and the authority of Chief Constables is to be effectively scrutinised, checked and where appropriate, challenged, then the Police and Crime panel must have a proper mandate for this and the best way of achieving this is to see the membership directly elected by the communities they will serve.</p>  |              |            |
| <p>2. A single Commissioner for the force may not achieve the desired reconnection with local communities as they will be elected from a very large geographical area comprised of 7 districts and a unitary authority. Para. 2.19 hints (albeit vaguely) that CSPs may become accountable to the Commissioner. Given that the majority of CSPs are managed and co-ordinated by Local Authority employed staff, this may cause conflict where the Commissioner is from a different political party to the Local Authority executive or cabinet member for community safety. It is important that the Role Requirement for the Commissioner explicitly states that this is</p>   |              |            |

## Annex Two

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| a non-political appointment.   |  |  |
| 3. It is important that Commissioners receive adequate training to support the role that they will fulfil. This includes a detailed understanding of the Criminal Justice landscape, the roles and responsibilities of statutory responsible authorities and CSPs.   |  |  |
| 4. The proposal to encourage neighbourhood engagement is very welcome. With the implementation of neighbourhood policing, the days of public engagement through barely attended public meetings have gone. The use of street surgeries, social networking and website communication has increased significantly and needs to be built on to ensure meaningful engagement with all sectors of the community is achieved.  |  |  |
| 5. The sharing and availability of data has improved greatly. It is important that communities have access to accurate crime and disorder data for their area. However, this has to be communicated and managed in a way that does not increase fear of crime or stigmatise particular geographical locations.   |  |  |
| 6. Clearly communicated information on action taken to address public concerns is required. Comparison with other areas is largely meaningless if the emphasis is on pure localism. There is little commonality between the 8 local authority areas within North Yorkshire Police force area. Previous government attempts to develop “most similar” lists have been flawed by conflicting groupings for different agencies and again a lack of true likeness between local authority areas. |  |  |
| <b>Further Comments:</b>   |  |  |

| <b>CHAPTER 3:</b>  |              |            |
|--|--------------|------------|
| <p>7. Locally, what are examples of unnecessary bureaucracy within police forces and how can the service get rid of this?</p> <p>8. How should forces ensure that information that local people feel is important is made available without creating a burdensome data recording process?</p> <p>9. What information should HMIC use to support a more proportionate approach to their ‘public facing performance role’, while reducing burdens and avoiding de-facto targets?</p> <p>10. How can ACPO change the culture of the police service to move away from compliance with detailed guidance to the use of professional judgement within a clear framework based around outcomes?</p> <p>11. How can we share knowledge about policing techniques that cut crime without creating endless guidance?</p> |              |            |
|  | <b>AGREE</b> |            |
| <b>JM Response:</b>  | <b>YES:</b>  | <b>NO:</b> |
| 7. The removal of Government imposed targets and KPIs is welcome. Internally, within NYP there has been a great deal of duplication in the completion of performance templates required by HQ to capture delivery of the Policing Pledge. The removal of this will allow officers to get on with policing rather than spending time filling in forms. However the focus on outcomes achieved through collaborative working should not be lost in the rush to dispense with performance management frameworks.  |              |            |
| 8. Crime recording has been reviewed every two years on average. This makes it difficult to compare like with like and makes it difficult to adopt intelligence led approaches based on accurate crime pattern analysis that uses data over two years old. In order to reduce bureaucracy on the police, ensure consistent ad single messages, communication of information to the public should be undertaken through the CSPs using their established communication media eg. Website, Your Ward newsletters, local press etc.   |              |            |
| 9. Measuring ASB has not been done terribly well despite it being a top community priority. It is therefore essential that some focus be places on how to accurately measure ASB if the aim is to see how well we are achieving outcomes.  |              |            |
| 10. The key to delivering a more outcome focused performance regime is through the use of partnership problem solving. However this involves the police in focusing on their role and contribution through application of their policing skills. There is opportunity for the government to create a set of policing standards akin to the national standards introduced for CSPs. This would ensure compliance but give flexibility for individual force approaches to problem solving.   |              |            |
| 11. Nowadays, the internet provides the first port of call for those seeking ideas or good practice. Originally  |              |            |

## Annex Two

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>the Crime Reduction website provided this information, but due to various cuts in funding/staffing, this is no longer kept up to date. The National Community Safety Network provides the opportunity to share good practice through its website, newsletter and events. Easily accessible and affordable options like this, would reduce the need for detailed lengthy guidance documents.</p> |  |  |
| <p><b>Further Comments:</b></p>  |  |  |

| <b>CHAPTER 4:</b>  |             |              |
|--|-------------|--------------|
| <p>12. What policing functions should be delivered by forces acting collaboratively?</p> <p>13. What are the principal obstacles to collaboration between forces or with other partners and how can they be addressed.</p> <p>14. Are there functions which need greater national co-ordination or which would make sense to organise and run nationally (while still being delivered locally)?</p> <p>15. How can the police service take advantage of private sector expertise to improve value for money, for example in operational support, or back office functions shared between several forces, or with other public sector providers</p> <p>16. Alongside its focus on organised crime and border security, what functions might a new National Crime Agency deliver on behalf of police forces and how should it be held to account?</p> <p>17. What arrangements should be in place in future to ensure that there is a sufficient pool of chief officers available, in particular for the most challenging leadership roles in the police service? Is there a role for other providers to provide training?</p> <p>18. How can we rapidly increase the capability within the police service to become more business-like, with police leaders taking on a more prominent role to help drive necessary cultural change in delivering sustainable business process improvement?</p> |             |              |
|  |             | <b>AGREE</b> |
| <b>JM Response:</b>  | <b>YES:</b> | <b>NO:</b>   |
| 12. A single ICT system that can support information sharing across forces and open opportunities for consistent multi-agency information would be welcome. Similarly economies of scale could be achieved through the collaborative delivery of training and procurement. Protective services which are costly to provide, can also be achieved through a collaborative approach between forces.  |             |              |
| 13. There is still a high degree of parochialism between forces and partners. This would require some cultural shift if true collaboration is to be achieved.  |             |              |
| 14. There needs to be a single accredited training programme developed at a national level but delivered locally.  |             |              |
| 15. There are definite economies of scale to be achieved through the outsourcing of certain back office functions either to other neighbouring forces or local public sector partners. For example, there are opportunities to deliver single IT support, HR and payroll functions that are currently replicated in all local public sector organisations.   |             |              |
| 16. The new National Crime Agency needs to absorb the functions of all existing 'national' policing units to rationalise the landscape and act as a single point of contact for all national police functions. This should   |             |              |

## Annex Two

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| include absorbing some of the functions currently delivered through NPIA which is to be phased out.  |  |  |
| <b>18.</b> There is still a weakness within police service culture in relation to working in partnership. This partly results from the reactive/responsive nature of law enforcement as opposed to strategic problem solving and partly due to a lack of 'partnership' training within national police training programmes. This is compounded by the problem of constant turnover as senior officers move on in order to be promoted. To introduce some sustainability, consideration needs to be given to the civilianisation of some key partnership focused roles that will drive through cultural changes and provide some stability of leadership for a longer term. |  |  |
| <b>Further Comments:</b>   |  |  |

| CHAPTER 5:  |      |              |
|---|------|--------------|
| <p>19. What more can the Government do to support the public to take a more active role in keeping neighbourhoods safe?</p> <p>20. How can the Government encourage more people to volunteer (including as special constables) and provide necessary incentives to encourage them to stay?</p> <p>21. What more can central Government do to make the criminal justice system more efficient?</p> <p>22. What prescriptions from Government get in the way of effective local partnership working?</p> <p>23. What else needs to be done to simplify and improve community safety and criminal justice work locally.</p>  |      |              |
|   |      | <b>AGREE</b> |
| JM Response:  | YES: | NO:          |
| <p>19. The previous government introduced the concept of Community Crime Fighters. Take up nationally was poor. With the exception of a minority of community activists and active volunteers, the majority of communities still regard agencies such as the police and local authorities as responsible for keeping neighbourhoods safe. Some excellent initiatives involving communities in specific projects aimed at tackling local crime and anti-social behaviour have been developed through community safety partnerships. However, many of these have been funded through Government regeneration and neighbourhood renewal programmes.</p>                  |      |              |
| <p>20. Special Constables provide the same powers as regular officers without the associated salary and oncosts associated with full time members of staff. A high proportion of Specials see this as a route to becoming a regular officer. However, this report talks about reviewing the pay and conditions of regular officers, which is likely to make them less appealing to new recruits. Without the incentive of attractive future long term career prospects, it will be difficult to incentivise young people to become Special Constables. Special Constables and volunteers should not be viewed as means to deliver policing “on the cheap.”</p>        |      |              |
| <p>21. Closer working between Criminal Justice Agencies has improved significantly with the implementation of the Prolific and Other Priority Offender Scheme, Local Criminal Justice Boards bringing partners together and more recently the addition of the Probation Service as a Statutory partner. However, the barriers to efficient working seem to occur through the inconsistency of messages coming from the Home Office on the one hand and the Ministry of Justice on the other. Better joined up working at the top level, will assist in strengthening what is already starting to prove successful in partnership working at local/delivery level.</p> |      |              |
| <p>22. Paragraph 5.20 talks of stripping away “unnecessary prescription and bureaucracy” and “repealing some of the regulations” for CSPs while retaining the “helpful core statutory duty” - presumably this is Section 5 (requirement to work in partnership) of the Crime and Disorder Act. However, some obligations on statutory</p>   |      |              |

## Annex Two

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>partners eg Section 17 (mainstreaming) and Section 115 (data sharing) need to remain and in some ways would benefit from being strengthened. In difficult economic times, it could become too easy for agencies to axe those services which are not protected by statute. However, the contradiction of different performance measurement regimes eg LAA, BSC comparator etc do hamper local delivery and therefore a less bureaucratic means of monitoring the activities and value of CSPs would be welcome.</p>  |  |  |
| <p><b>23.</b> Community Safety Partnerships have come a long way since their establishment under the Crime and Disorder Act. There are now excellent examples of intelligence led multi-agency problem solving that have contributed to sustained National crime reduction performance. It would be disappointing if the expertise and good practice that has been developed is lost either due to public funding cuts or the perceived need for the new government to establish a completely new structure. Although the statutory requirement is for local authorities to work in partnership, the statute does not require them to have dedicated community safety staff. Based on the track record of many CSPs in delivering sustainable solutions to community safety problems, short term saving derived from abolishment of this structure would soon result in medium and long term overspend as the cost of rising crime and anti-social behaviour will impact again on other services' budgets. In order to improve on the CSP structure, there needs to be greater dialogue between government departments eg Health, Education , CLG and Home Office to ensure that a consistent message is given in relation to the contributions of those charged with delivery at the local level to the CSP agenda.</p> |  |  |
| <p><b>Further Comments:</b></p>  |  |  |