QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST

Northern Ireland
PolicingBoard

Research on

Experiences of the New PSNI Local Policing Model

**Dr Danielle Blaylock
and Prof Joanne Hughes**
Queen's University Belfast

February 2018

FINAL REPORT

Experiences of the New PSNI Local Policing Model

Queen's University Belfast

University Road Belfast, BT7 1NN

Delivery Entity

Centre for Shared Education

School of Social Sciences, Education and Social Work

69-71 University Street Belfast, BT7 1HL

Contact Point

Dr Danielle Blaylock

Lecturer Applied Social Psychology

Room 0G.438

18-30 Malone Road

School of Psychology

Queen's University Belfast

Email: D.Blaylock@qub.ac.uk

Tel: +44 (0)28 9097 4333

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1
Introduction

In February of 2017 the Centre for Shared Education was invited by the Northern Ireland Policing Board to undertake research on experiences of the new PSNI local policing model. In doing so they seek,

"to gain an understanding of the impact that the changes to local policing have had within a sample of communities across Northern Ireland since its implementation, and how this compares to the arrangements in place prior to August 2015."

This following report begins with a review of the literature exploring community policing and the interventions designed to create a more collaborative relationship between the police and the public, first in the United Kingdom more generally and then in Northern Ireland more specifically. This will be followed with detailed discussion of the methodological approach taken by the Centre to examine the PSNI's new local policing model. The report will end with a discussion of findings and recommendations.

Community Policing in the United Kingdom

At its most basic level, community policing can be understood as a philosophy of policing that emphasises the creation of collaborative relationships between the police and the community, in contrast to the focus on traditional policing on law enforcement and order maintenance. The approach seeks to increase contact between the police and the public in a defined local geographic area to make the work of the police more responsive to the needs of local people (Quinton & Morris, 2008). As the partnership grows, community concerns can be identified and resources can be maximised to prevent crime, reduce the fear of crime, increase public confidence, and apprehend those involved in criminal activity to improve a community's quality of life (Morash & Ford, 2002). Within this approach, the police are no longer viewed as the sole guardians of law and order; instead all members of the community become active allies in the effort to enhance the safety and quality of the community (Weisburd & McElroy, 1988).

The shift from a traditional style of policing to a more community, pro-active approach is rooted in a body of international police research; in the changing nature of communities, and in the changing characteristics of crime and violence that affect communities. Within the United Kingdom, the roots of neighbourhood policing can be traced back to the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy, a US initiative based on the premise that to reduce local concerns about crime the police needed to work together with partner agencies to address issues of concern identified by community members (Karn, 2013). It was anticipated that this would lead to a reduction in the gap between police understandings of problems and the understandings of local citizens. The associated shift in the approach to policing to become more community oriented led to a body of international research on the effectiveness of community policing (Quinton & Morris, 2008). Evaluations were positive, with reported reductions in crime, improvement in neighbourhood conditions, and most striking a drop in fear of crime, particularly amongst the highest fear groups.

Closer to home, the publication of the Scarman Report following the Brixton disorders in 1981 (Lord Scarman, 1981) revealed shortcomings in police-community relations, identifying that the police service had become unresponsive and uncommunicative with the community. It was argued that policing had become police-oriented rather than community-oriented and called for a more service centred ethos (Savage, 2007). In addition, under the Labour government a desire to put the community at the heart of political decision making, giving communities a say in the provision of local services, called 'new localism' (Bullock & Leeney, 2013), provided a political catalyst to the emergence of neighbourhood policing. In 2004, the government published the White Paper "Building Communities, Beating Crime" which aimed to improve the accountability of the police and increase their level of engagement with local communities (Home Office, 2004). Neighbourhood policing was seen to serve three political imperatives: to tackle low level disorder, to improve the quality of life within communities, and to increase confidence in the police. It further served to give the public a greater say in the kinds of services they wanted, and more opportunities to engage with service providers (Bullock & Leeney, 2013).

Initiatives
Along with a growing awareness of the importance of engaging with local communities, surveys revealed a significant gap between falling crime rates and the public's perception of crime as still rising. Known as the reassurance gap, statistics from the 2005/06 British Crime Survey showed that despite falling crime levels, the majority of respondents thought that nationally, crime had increased from the previous two years (Jansson, 2006). Paired with a concern in the low levels of public confidence in the police, reassurance policing was

developed. This model of policing drew on the signal crimes perspective (Innes, 2007) which theorises that certain types of crimes and disorders have a disproportionate impact upon fear of crime and feelings of security and therefore need to be prioritised by the police (Innes & Fielding, 2002; Morris, 2006). To test the model, the Home Office funded the National Reassurance Policing Programme in 16 ward level sites in 8 forces across England and Wales between 2003 and 2005. The two-year pilot study aimed to reduce crime and disorder, including perceptions of crime and disorder, while also increasing public confidence and satisfaction; effectively narrowing the reassurance gap.

In practice, the programme included many of the hallmarks of contemporary community policing, a more visible and accessible police presence, greater engagement with communities to identify local concerns and priorities, and the targeting of police resources at tackling these concerns. Rigorous evaluations of the pilot were undertaken and the results were overwhelmingly positive. In comparison with a matched site, those wards involved in the programme reported increased feelings of safety and public confidence in the police, and reduced perceptions of anti-social behaviour in the community. Further, there were statistically significant positive effects on crime and antisocial behaviour (Tuffin, Morris, & Poole., 2006). These findings provided the basis in 2005 for the Neighbourhood Policing Programme, essentially a scaled up version of the National Reassurance Programme which was rolled out across all forces in England and Wales with the intention that every neighbourhood policing team by 2008.

The programme implemented Neighbourhood Policing Teams, comprised of a dedicated sergeant together with a number of police constables and Police Community Support Officers, in every ward. The aim was to increase public confidence in the police, reduce crime, and reassure the public through three delivery mechanisms: public engagement, increased visibility, and problem-solving approaches. By 2008 an HMIC review found that all forces had made neighbourhood policing a core part of police work and that joint problem solving had been developed. That being said, a number of inconsistencies were cited including how forces engaged with communities, especially with the vulnerable, and how joint problem solving was developed and integrated into the neighbourhood policing agenda. HMIC recommended that moving forward greater clarity of roles and engagement procedures would need to be undertaking. An evaluation of the programme found little evidence of its effectiveness after year 1. Evaluators pointed to methodological issues, as well as the relative infancy of the programme, as reasons why conclusions should not yet be drawn. However, by the end of year two only moderate signs of efficacy were apparent with

reported challenges implanting the programme consistently across neighbourhoods (Mason, 2009).

Research and evaluation

These findings are consistent with the wider literature around community and neighbourhood policing. While early reviews of the empirical research highlight the potential for community policing to have a positive impact, they warn of problems with the implementation of key delivery mechanisms like community engagement and problem-solving (Sherman & Eck, 2002; Weisburd & Eck, 2004). In 2014, a systematic review of evidence on the effectiveness of community policing was conducted reviewing the findings from 25 reports containing 65 independent tests (Gill, Weisburd, Bennett, & Telep, 2014). Results provided robust evidence that community policing increases satisfaction with police, elements of police legitimacy, and citizen perceptions of disorder. However, there was limited support for community policing's impact on fear of crime or official recorded crime. The authors suggest that it is unlikely that public engagement in itself is sufficient to prevent crime; rather specific strategies like problem-oriented policing may mediate the relationship between community engagement and crime control. Positive engagement with the community may 'set the scene' for effective problem solving resulting in crime reduction.

What the evaluations and reviews suggest is that the 'how' of community policing is crucial. In 2013, the National Policing Improvement Agency surveyed forces to establish best practices and key challenges in the field of neighbourhood policing. Findings were based upon the 32 of the 43 forces that had reviewed, or were in the process of reviewing, neighbourhood policing. Examination of these reviews revealed that greater clarity was needed of the role and function of neighbourhood policing, including the demand profile for the neighbourhood policing teams, so that services could be designed effectively given a reduction in resources. It was suggested that officers could use stronger training in the force's vision for neighbourhood policing, as well as their role within this vision, how to effectively engage with the community, implementing problem-solving strategies, and how their work impacts perceptions of police legitimacy.

The review suggested that partnership working between police and local organisations was paramount to effective neighbourhood policing. Research examining police engagement and collaboration with community finds that effective partnerships are those with strong leadership and engaged staff with keen insight into the local area and a vested interest in the well-being of local residents, shared aims and objectives between all partners, and

effective communication between partners (Turley, Ranns, Callanan, Blackwell, & Newburn, 2012).

Effective community engagement can be difficult (Morris, 2006; Myhill & Rudate, 2006); however, attitudes towards community engagement are critical, as a lack of commitment or interest is often recognised by the public and can serve to reduce satisfaction and confidence (Lloyd & Foster, 2009). Research suggests that informal as opposed to formal contacts are quite effective and that positive engagement is bolstered when there is clear communication about the types of engagement that will be undertaken and the commitments to the community, often implicit, that go along with these engagements. Consistently positive and sustained encounters serve to strengthen the relationship between the police and the community. This can be a necessity as negative encounters with the police have been found to have a much greater impact shaping public attitudes towards the police (Skogan, 1998, 2006).

In general, police officers often underestimate the community's desire for engagement and find it particularly challenging to engage with culturally diverse communities. Appealing to common values is often complex in multi-cultural communities as the dominant norms may differ between cultural groups. In these cases, it is argued that efforts should be made to find common ground. Problems experienced by diverse communities mirror those of other communities and neighbourhood policing that utilises a flexible approach to identify residents' concerns, understands their expectations, and involves them in developing effective responses are key; though this can be particularly challenging when there are historical tensions between specific groups and the police. In these situations, sustained work may be needed before residents will become active allies (Longstaff, Willer, Chapman, Czarnomski, & Graham, 2015).

Community policing in Northern Ireland

This resonates in Northern Ireland where policing has proven to be an extremely emotive and contentious issue (Mulcahy, 2006). While many of the problems confronting police services are similar to those in other democratic societies, Northern Ireland faces a number of problems that are unique to a divided society, with its own particular history and culture. While the peace process in Northern Ireland saw an end to a 25 year armed conflict and heralded a political settlement that saw power devolved to a local Assembly, it also initiated

a fierce debate regarding the structure, methods, and practices of the Northern Ireland policing system. Following the paramilitary ceasefires in 1996 there was an imperative to reform not only the policing structures and practices, but also the relationship between the policing service and the community.

Over the course of the conflict, policing became highly politicised and militarised, and the Royal Ulster Constabulary (which pre-dated the Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI)) was seen as disproportionately representative of the Protestant community. As such it was hoped that provisions within the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement might provide the opportunity for a "new beginning to policing in NI with a police service capable of attracting and sustaining support from the community as a whole."

Following the Agreement a systematic review of policing was undertaken by the Independent Commission on Policing, also known as the *Patten Report* (1999). This review outlined a series of recommendations to create a policing system based on human rights principles, public accountability, and transparency. These recommendations may be conceived as two streams. The first, in the reformulation of the system of policing, such as badges, recruitment, training and human rights and the second, concerns itself with policing more broadly (Kempa & Shearing, 2005). In essence, many of the Patton recommendations conceptualised policing as a collective responsibility in which the police service worked *with* the community. This received legal support through the *Policing (Northern Ireland) Act 2000* section 32(5) which states that,

"Police Officers shall, so far as practicable, carry out their functions in co-operation with and with the aim of securing the support of, the local community."

The policing with the community philosophy rests upon five pillars: accountability, empowerment, problem-solving, partnership, and service delivery (Topping, 2008). Attempts to embed this ethos within the core functions of the PSNI were further endorsed through a series of policy statements including the *Police (Northern Ireland) Act of 2003* and *Policing a Shared Future (2005)*, and most notably in 2011's *Policing with the Community Strategy (2020)*. Engagement and partnership with the community are seen as critical and no longer viewed as the purview of specific teams, but rather as an ethos extending across all elements of policing. Current objectives emphasise,

- Preventing harm through working with partners to increase trust and citizen involvement, reducing offending, reduce vulnerability and prevent crime;

- Protecting our citizens and communities, particularly the most vulnerable, through delivering professional policing operations and services in accordance with Human Rights standards; and

- Detecting offences and investigating suspects, working with justice partners to carry out professional investigations and deliver prompt visible and fair outcomes which build the confidence of victims, witnesses and communities.

In July 2007, the Neighbourhood Policing Programme was initiated with a stated intention to embed neighbourhood policing within the service and to provide every neighbourhood in Northern Ireland with access to local policing. The programme also aimed to provide positive interventions to tackle identified community priorities; priorities which would be identified in collaboration with community partners. To provide greater visibility neighbourhood officers would patrol on foot with their name clearly displayed on their uniform. It was envisioned that members of the policing team would serve at least three years in the same neighbourhood. It was anticipated that these actions would help to provide some level of familiarity with local officers. Further, officers were instructed in problem-solving techniques so that there was a wider information-led, problem solving approach to policing.

In practice, community-oriented policing faces a number of definitional and implementation challenges. For example, few studies of community-oriented policing programmes explicitly define "the community". While it may refer to a specific physical setting, such as a neighbourhood or district, where interventions are targeted, it may also refer to a more abstract concept of place or belonging, shared culture, or the actual people within a place who can be mobilised in crime prevention efforts (Gill, Weisburd, Telep, Vitter, & Bennett, 2014). In identifying the neighbourhoods for the Neighbourhood Policing Programme, the Policing with the Community Branch of the PSNI undertook internal as well as external consultation. One guiding principal was the Department for Social Development's work identifying Neighbourhood Renewal areas. These guidelines were based upon internal and external feedback that were flexible enough to incorporate local community needs. However, there was a wide range of strategies used by each district in establishing neighbourhoods. In some cases, historical boundaries and existing estates were used, in others electoral wards, and still others used some combination of the two along with community discussions.

Partnerships

One of the key strategies to develop a more productive relationship with the community was to expand the public's engagement with and influence over policing institutions; one such mechanism was the development of statutory civilian oversight bodies previously knows the

District Policing Partnerships and Community Safety Partnerships, and later reconstituted as the Policing and Community Safety Partnerships (PCSPs) with the passing of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011. PCSPs are intended to be broadly representative of the community in respect of variables such as gender, age and cultural background of the areas in which they are implemented.

Each partnership is made up of 15, 17, or 19 members, comprising political and independent members, as well as representatives of designated organisations. Political members are appointed from the district council, while independent members are nominated by the District Council to reflect "business and trade union interests and to provide expertise in matters pertaining to community safety" (Policing Act 2000, 6.26) and are appointed by the Policing Board. The ratio of political to independent members is balanced such that the number of independents is one less than the number of political members. The designated organisations must represent at least four different organisations and are determined by the Department of Justice through consultation with each PCSP

The overall diversity within the PCSP allows for the representation and influence of various sectors. While the unique division and balance between political and independent members is intended to create a body that can, in theory, both effectively engage with the community to gain perspectives on policing issues and utilise the information gained to shape policy and procedures in ways that reflect the desires of the community.

As a civilian oversight body, the PCSPs functions are to provide public views to the District Commander and Policing Board; monitor police performance; obtain the cooperation of the public with the police in public safety maters; consult and engage with local communities; identify and prioritise particular issues of concern; monitor performance against Partnership Plan. To accomplish this, the PCSPs, in partnership with other organisations, deliver programmes, services, and initiatives designed to meet the needs of their local community. PCSPs are principally responsible for creating the Partnership Plan, which serves as the official compilation of identified and prioritised policing and community safety issues for their locality. While they are not responsible for the Local or Annual Policing Plan, they are both informed by the PCSPs through their consultation with District Commanders in the case of the Local Policing Plan and with the Policing Board in the case of the Annual Policing Plan.

Current Model

While the local policing model features a number of specific objectives, activities and accountability mechanisms to improve community confidence, satisfaction, and safety, it was designed as a "living" strategy with an implementation plan and delivery framework that has evolved over time. As part of the Review of Public Administration in the spring of 2015, local District Councils were restructured from 26 council districts to 11 (see Figure 1 below).

Figure 1. Restructuring of council districts from 26 to 11 (image courtesy of BBC.co.uk)

In an effort to respond to the restructuring, as well as from budgetary pressure, the PSNI moved from eight to 11 Policing Districts in line with the merging of council districts. Each District is supported by central teams of officers and staff, including Local Policing Teams and Neighbourhood Policing Teams. Officers in each District are supported by an Area coordinating tier which handle operational planning, tasking, and coordination of resources. The three Areas cover Belfast, North Area, and South Area located in Belfast, Banbridge, and Ballymoney respectively.

The new model of frontline policing replaces response and neighbourhood policing with 26 dedicated Local Policing Teams. These teams respond to local calls, conduct investigations,

and deal with community problems and it is anticipated that they will have in-depth local knowledge of the area and that they engage with the community through civic leaders, representatives, local clergy, principals of schools and other key figures to understand the specific needs of that community. In areas with higher levels of crime and deprivation, as well as in places of rural isolation, Local Policing Teams are supported by 34 Neighbourhood Policing Teams. In addition to providing additional policing presence, Neighbourhood Policing Teams develop long-term relationships and commitments to the area, helping the community to address conflicts, local crime and complex anti-social behaviour problems.

Similar to the PSNI, the Policing and Community Safety Partnerships have undergone significant reorganisation. Because the partnerships are organised at the District Council level, the transition from 26 council districts to 11 has drastically reduced the number of partnerships.

CHAPTER 2
Methodology

To ascertain the impact that changes to local policing have had since its implementation and how this may compare to arrangements in place prior to August 2015, a mixed methods approach was delivered in 4 stages focusing on multiple levels of analysis, as follows:

Stage 1 - Interviews with senior management officials within the PSNI to develop a more holistic understanding of the rationale and aims of the new model;

Stage 2 - Interviews and focus groups with key stakeholders to explore the impact of the new model at the societal level;

Stage 3 - Interviews and focus groups within 8 Case Study areas designed to provide insight into community level experiences;

Stage 4 - Questionnaires were sent out to all Neighbourhood Watch Volunteers in Northern Ireland to ascertain the impact the model has had on individuals within the community who interact with the police on a relatively consistent basis.

Methodological approach

Interviews

Where the subjective views of individuals are concerned, interviews provide an opportune space for interviewees to discuss their interpretations of a particular subject, and to express how they regard the situation from their own point of view. The conversational nature of the interview allows for spontaneity and for responses to be explored in greater detail providing a more complete understanding of complex ideas. While at the same time, the structured nature of the exchange provides clarity and focus to the conversation in which specific topics and themes can be addressed.

Focus groups

Focus groups provide an ideal methodology from which to gather data in a group environment as they facilitate dynamic interactions among and between members of the group. As each member is stimulated by and reacts to the discussions of another, this can

often lead to a synergistic group effect (Stewart & Shamdasani, 2014; Sussman et al., 1991) where a plethora of topics and ideas can be generated. The flow of ideas and information is thus enhanced by listening to each other's experiences and interactions that occur within the focus group. Additionally, the informal nature of focus group discussion is ideal for fostering an atmosphere to encourage participants to speak freely and comprehensively about behaviours, attitudes, and opinions they possess.

Face to face interviews and focus groups allow for the collection of in-depth information within a more intimate setting, therein facilitating the exploration of subjective experiences; further, by interacting directly with the participant, the interviewer is able to ask for clarification around various points and issues raised and probe for more comprehensive responses. In particular, the semi-structured nature allows for the research questions to determine the focus while also allowing for the emergence of new and unanticipated themes during the course of the discussion.

Based on previous experience exploring confidence in policing amongst young people, including in-depth discussions with various key stakeholders for a number of previous projects for the Northern Ireland Policing Board, and knowledge of relevant theoretical and empirical literature, a similar semi-structured schedule was developed for both interviews and focus groups addressing a number of different themes. These included the participant's understanding of the Local Policing Team model and their role within it, overall impressions of the model, any changes they have perceived since its implementation, and insights into the manner in which the Local Policing Teams engage with their local areas. In line with the semi-structured format, the schedule was used flexibly to allow specific issues of interest to arise spontaneously whilst at the same time allowing for systematic collection of data across interviews and focus groups. Please see Appendix I for a copy of the interview and focus group schedule.

Questionnaires

Whereas interviews and focus groups are undertaken in a more intimate setting the data collected allows for a greater depth of understanding, data collected through questionnaires provide the opportunity for greater breadth. Questionnaires consist of a formalised set of questions provided in a definitive order; as such, the structured format of a questionnaire ensures a level of consistency that is applied systematically to all participants. They may be delivered to participants en masse thus providing an efficient mechanism for obtaining large amounts of information from a large sample of people in a relatively short span of time.

Additionally, particularly within mailed questionnaires, the questions can be answered at a time and place that is most convenient to the participant.

Within a questionnaire format the researcher can select from highly structured to unstructured open-ended responses. For the current project a number of highly structured questions were included which detailed the demographic information of the participant and their Local Policing area, the length of time they had volunteered within the Neighbourhood Watch scheme, and their awareness of the new Local Policing Model. These questions were balanced with more open-ended, unstructured questions exploring the participant's experiences with, and attitudes towards, the model. Please see Appendix II for a copy of the Neighbourhood Watch Volunteer questionnaire.

Data collection

Stage 1 – PSNI Senior Management

To gain a more in-depth understanding of the New Local Policing Model, senior management within the Policing Services Northern Ireland were contacted to participate in either an interview or focus group to discuss the rationale for and creation of the model, how the model was rolled out and implemented, as well as challenges and success to date. Four semi-structured interviews with members of the senior management team were conducted, as well as one focus group with PSNI Engagement Chief Inspectors.

Stage 2 - Key Stakeholders

Exploring the impact the new model has had at the societal level, semi-structured interviews and focus groups were conducted with a range of key stakeholders. In collaboration with the Northern Ireland Policing Board, organisations were approached and asked to select individual(s) from their staff with comprehensive insight into the impact of the new policing model on the various community groups they work with. Eight interviews were completed with representatives from statutory bodies and community groups and two focus groups were conducted with Policing and Community Safety Partnership managers. Further, the researchers attended the Policing and Community Safety Partnership Conference 'Delivering a Difference' in the Titanic Belfast. This provided a chance to understand how the Policing and Community Safety Partnership Joint Committee envisions the role of PCSPs and DPCSPs while at the same time speaking informally with individual members about their interpretation of their, the new model, and their role within the new model.

In total, data were collected with representatives from the following organisations:

- Ards and North Down Policing and Community Safety Partnership
- Armagh, Banbridge and Craigavon Policing and Community Safety Partnership
- Belfast Health and Social Care Trust
- Belfast Policing and Community Safety Partnership
- Department of Justice
- Fermanagh and Omagh District Council
- Fermanagh and Omagh Policing and Community Safety Partnership
- Kesh Development
- Lower Shankill Community Association
- Northern Ireland Policing Board
- North Belfast Policing and Community Safety Partnership
- Probation Board Northern Ireland
- Policing and Community Safety Partnership managers
- Policing Service Northern Ireland
- Police Treatment Centres Northern Ireland
- Rural Community Network
- Seagoe Youth Group
- Workers Party of Ireland
- Youth Justice Agency

Stage 3 - Case Studies

To gain a more in-depth understanding of experiences with the new PSNI Local Policing Model at the community and individual level, eight Local Policing Team areas were selected for Case Study. Taking guidance from the Northern Ireland Policing Board on specific sites, along with insights drawn from interviews and focus groups with key stakeholders in Stage 2, these Case Study areas were selected on the basis of: population density, covering both urban and rural areas; community diversity, so as to include areas with single identity communities and areas with a greater diversity of community backgrounds; and areas where a Local Policing Team is supported by a Neighbourhood Policing Team and those areas where it is not. Primary data collection within each Case Study area comprised a number of semi-structured, focus groups with a range of participants.

Through the case studies, a minimum of 4 and a maximum of 8 focus groups were conducted in each area.

Stage 4 - Questionnaires

To provide insight into the attitudes towards and experiences with the new Local Policing Model from individuals within the community who are more likely to interact with members of the police service, questionnaires were distributed to all Neighbourhood Watch volunteers across Northern Ireland.

In total, 1,020 surveys were mailed to Neighbourhood Watch Coordinators with 142 completed questionnaires returned for a return rate of 23.9% with varying return rates from each of the 11 Local Police Team areas (please see table 1 for a breakdown of participation). Of those who provided demographic information, participants were between the ages of 49 and 85 years of age (M = 62.76 years of age), and were more likely to be white (88%) males (61.2%), and from the Protestant community (47.2%, as opposed to the Catholic community 30.4% and those who indicated they were from some other community 12.8% or preferred not to say 9.6%).

Table 1

Participation by Local Police Team areas

Local Police Team areas	Frequency
Antrim & Newtownabbey	2
Ards & North Down	10
Armagh City, Banbridge & Craigavon	21
Belfast City	23
Causeway Coast & Glens	8
Derry City & Strabane	7
Fermanagh & Omagh	11
Lisburn & Castlereagh	10
Mid & East Antrim	5
Mid Ulster	9
Newry Mourne & Down	15

 *21 participants did not indicate their Local Police Team area

Analytic strategy

Through interviews, focus groups, and questionnaires data were collected from 234 participants. Interviews and focus groups were transcribed verbatim while questionnaire

responses were entered into SPSS. Using this material, a larger dataset was created based upon the transcriptions and open-ended responses in the questionnaires. All demographic information was treated separately.

To appropriately analyse the data a thematic analysis was employed. In the absence of a large body of previous research, the development of a priori strategies regarding the direction of the analysis would be counterproductive (Pidgeon & Henwood, 1997). A thematic analysis is thus ideally suited because of its flexibility and bottom-up nature, allowing analytic themes to emerge inductively from the data themselves. Additionally, a thematic analysis has the advantage of providing an insider's perspective, particularly useful to understand the factors contributing to an awareness of shared identity.

The sections relevant to our research concerns were identified within the context of their occurrence in the interviews and subjected to a thematic analysis following the guidelines set out by Braun and Clark (2006) while using the method of constant comparison to derive patterns of response types across the full data set (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). These procedures allow for active engagement with the data in a close and rigorous examination.

The first stage of analysis involved identifying all sections broadly related to the impact of and experiences with the new Local Policing Model. The data corpus was read and reread and sections related to the research were used to create our dataset. Key segments within each of these sections were then identified and descriptive categories were developed based upon common features. This process was facilitated with the use of memo-writing and consensus building between members of the research team in a method of open-coding (Charmaz, 1995).

Through further discussion and negotiation, initial descriptive categories were further examined and both sub-categories and higher order categories were identified. Next, sub-categories were related to higher order categories in a process of axial-coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). This process was facilitated by a comparison of both positive and negative examples found within the data, and this led to the development of a taxonomy of response types across the data. Establishing relationships between categories represented a movement from the descriptive to the conceptual, leading to the development of theories that were influenced by the data and also by existing literature. At this stage of the data analysis, theoretical saturation occurred when no new data emerged for the categories and the categories were dense enough to cover all variations and relationships (Willig, 2001).

19

The following chapters will present the findings from this extensive dataset in three chapters. First we will provide an overview of the rationale and expectations for the current local policing model as described by members of Senior Management within the PSNI. Next, community understandings of the new policing model and its impact are presented. Finally, we present findings regarding how the model has impacted partnership work between key stakeholders and the PSNI. Throughout each chapter quotes are used to highlight key themes and points raised by participants. All quotes have been anonymised and care has been taken to remove any identifying information about the participant, their organisation, and community; as well, details regarding specific individuals mentioned in the course of discussion have been removed.

CHAPTER 3
Contextualising the Model

To contextualize responses to the new policing model offered by key stakeholder organisations and community representatives, it is important to understand the rationale for its introduction, and the expectations of what it can achieve. Based on extended interviews with four members of Senior Management within the Policing Service Northern Ireland, as well as one focus group with Chief Inspectors, we outline below the arguments for the model and from a policing perspective, the challenges and opportunities of operationalizing and delivering it.

Rationale for the Model

Changes in context

The model of policing in place up to 2015 had become unsustainable, and the reasons for this were threefold. First, the significant **reduction in resources** allocated to policing in the three years prior to the introduction of the new model meant that it was no longer possible to offer the level of neighbourhood policing that had been in place hitherto. Key to the previous model was the assignment of 96 neighbourhood teams across the region, covering every geographical area,

> *Things were just getting stretched. The service delivery model was going to breakdown eventually because we've had in the three years since I've been Chief Constable, we've had close to £200 million taken out of the budget. So there were just the realities of financial cuts that meant that police officer headcount was just going to fall and we were going to have to find a different way of doing things. I think that what we would have seen had we not made the change is poor service delivery because of reducing numbers and reducing resources and increasing and changing demand, so all of this was going to mean that the visible front end of policing was going to get smaller. And if it was going to smaller we were going to have to configure it differently. Which is what we did. (PSNI Interview 1)*

Even without the financial pressure for change, the efficiency and effectiveness of the previous model were being questioned, and in particular the need for neighbourhood teams in areas where levels of 'regular' crime were extremely low.

Now I don't really know that continuing to run, pretending to have 96 neighbourhood policing teams, including the leafy suburbs of Cultra, Holywood, the likes of Donaghadee - Absolutely no need for them. Because if there's a road traffic collision, if there's a burglary, then there will be a response from the police at that point of need, people should get a good experience. But they probably are sufficient enough and there's enough community capability for them to not feel the need for their own police officer on their street. (PSNI Interview 1)

Second, substantial **changes in the nature of crime** and criminal activity demanded a redeployment of police resources away from public spaces and neighbourhood policing and into less visible forms of crime. It was noted that 'traditional' criminal activity such burglary and theft now exist alongside new forms of internet-enabled crime such as child sexual exploitation; the latter preying on the most vulnerable and with a potential for greater harm.

Child sexual exploitation and cybercrime you know is not dealt with on the high street in a high visibility jacket. It's dealt with by putting detectives into more specialised places to understand how to tackle some of these higher end cyber level crimes. So you've got this shift in policing demand which pulls people away from the front end. (PSNI Interview 1)

Third, a model of policing had developed that was seen as a **two tier system** - with neighbourhood teams perceived as representing soft policing, set alongside response policing, generally perceived as more law enforcement focused. Within this model the latter was seen as less able to accommodate the needs of individuals and as less able to respond to victims of crime at a more personal level because of the volume of work undertaken by response units and stretched resources. At the same time neighbourhood policing in some cases had become so far removed from the law enforcement side of policing, that it was considered questionable whether the role fulfilled by some neighbourhood officers was consistent with the organization's ethos, its commitment to public safety and a crime reduction outcomes focus.

They weren't necessarily always seeing themselves as doing law enforcement, which is not the only part, but it is a part of being a cop. I expect neighbourhood policing teams to be doing searches and arrests and interviews and doing the harder edge piece. Some of them were not viewing themselves in that way and they saw themselves there as rather than to deliver the core functions of a police officer, more

to be sole responsive to the people they were dealing with in communities that they didn't do any of the difficult stuff that policing was expected to do, i.e. enforcement. Now some were, some weren't. It was inconsistent. But of course if the neighbourhood officers constantly trying to please than the community is going to like that and want more of that and that's good and we want them to do that, but we also need them to stop search for drugs, need them to be searching houses when it's appropriate, need them to be arresting people for drink driving and all the rest of it. And it would be fair to say that you could easily find neighbourhood policing officers that did not do any of that stuff. So that from a policing perspective, from a legislative requirement, they weren't doing all the things that we need them to do. (PSNI Interview 1)

Addressing community concerns

The message relayed to the police from local communities was that neighbourhood policing was acceptable, whilst response policing was not,

We were hearing people tell us basically: neighbourhood policing teams good; response policing bad. And it was as stark as that, and that's because response teams were like fire brigade policing. It was constantly going from call to call, a large stack of calls in the background, not having time to deal with you as a proper victim as an individual - identify your needs. See if there were any other things we could do for you beyond recording your crime. And so, the old model - people were telling us was not giving people a good experience. Neighbourhood policing is not a specialism. Neighbourhood policing should be the primary service of delivery. Dealing with everything from antisocial behaviour, from you know a confused person with dementia in the street, a child that needs safe guarded, whether there's a criminal offense or not, and actually response policing should be doing the same thing. (PSNI Interview 1)

Creation of a new model

Hence the intention of the new model was to recalibrate police service delivery, taking the best of neighbourhood and integrating it into extended response policing to generate a more standardized model of policing that better reflects organizational priorities.

Professionally we saw neighbourhood policing good but inconsistent. And we saw response policing, doing the best with what they had but hugely under-resourced. And if the public wanted response officers to take more time, to cater for their needs, identify their problems, help problem solve, engage partners, do all the sign posting then we were going to have to find more resources. And actually we needed neighbourhood policing thinking and ethos to be more mainstreamed into response policing. That's what we're trying to do. We're trying to take the good parts out of neighbourhood policing and overlay it onto response policing. And we were trying to increase the numbers in response policing to make them into something new which we called local policing teams that had this neighbourhood policing ethos. That they would have the capacity, the time and the resource to have ownership of local areas, and to do the full gambit of policing functions including enforcement and the harder edge piece. (PSNI Interview 1)

This was not the only model of policing proposed in the period prior to the introduction of the reforms. An alternative approach was offered which rather than seeking to integrate the best of neighbourhood and response policing, would aim to generate a wider gulf between them. At an operational level the majority of policing (around 90%) would be undertaken by neighbourhood teams adopting a softer policing approach, with the remainder delivered by 'emergency response crews'.

I mean one of the models that we talked about, that we were not courageous to go for was almost instead of trying to push neighbourhood policing and response policing closer together to have the same ethos, you actually pull them even further apart. And you say, alright we are going to have the vast majority of frontline resources in neighbourhood policing teams and they will pick up everything except for, I don't know maybe 5 or 10% - you would almost have like emergency response crews that would go to life at risk, crime in action, actually happening, the real blues and twos sort of stuff. So you'd have these extreme response approaches but the 90 something percent of service delivery, where it's not absolutely time dependent that you want to respond to people in a timely fashion as far as evidence is going to be lost or a life's going to be lost or anything like that so. We did consider that but we just thought there's sort of a massive shift in how we were doing things that the model that was more likely to succeed was rather than pulling the two extremes further apart was to push them closer together, and that's what we've gone for. (PSNI Interview 1)

The rationale for rejecting this alternative 'dual policing' model was that it is seen as too far removed from existing approaches and therefore seen as unlikely to succeed.

Operationalising the new model

The key features of the new model included, a reduction in neighbourhood teams from 96 to 34, with the remaining 34 teams attached to neighbourhoods that are defined as 'high output areas' with high levels of economic and social deprivation and vulnerable to the influence of paramilitary or organized crime groups. The identification of neighbourhoods for the new teams was based on a community prioritization index, alongside a level of professional judgment. As well as, the creation of capacity for more officers to undertake response work in local policing teams, such that current load for response officers would be reduced, allowing all officers in local police teams to engage in more personal and interactive policing

> *Ok, so were trying to almost get a neighbourhood policing ethos into response policing. So it wasn't just to be a name change, it was actually to put more people into local policing teams, response teams, call them local policing teams, give each member of those local policing teams some ownership of part of the geography. Not expecting them to just spend all of a period of duty in just that area but it would be their sort of default position. Take a specific interest in that area. Try to get to know who's who in that local area. So, that's where, that's what the model is trying to do. It was trying to have dedicated, committed, critical neighbourhood policing teams in the areas that really needed them, release capacity so that response policing teams could become more like local policing teams with a, not a full neighbourhood team, but enough people so that they weren't rushing from call to call and would have enough time frankly and scope to engage with people to do a little bit of problem solving and partnership working and address community needs. And of course because we were reducing the number of neighbourhood policing teams, so therefore the number of people in them, those people went to local policing teams so we were transferring people in an attempt to bring that ethos to local policing teams as well. (PSNI Interview 1)*

Challenges of implementing the new model

Implementing the new model was not without its challenges. In particular, one ongoing challenge relates to the balancing of resources and ensuring that the model is as flexible as

it needs to be to combat the shifting patterns of crime, both demographic and substantive, but this is stymied by ongoing cuts at organizational level.

Developing appropriate skill sets

At the level of individual officer, it was acknowledged that some might have skills better suited to a neighbourhood style of policing than others, and this being the case there is a challenge involved in equipping all police officers with the envisaged core skill set required to deliver the new model

> *If you take that large group of operational service delivery agents that we call neighbourhood policing and local policing teams and pushed them all together, I think you would get probably close to a normal distribution curve of where at one end will be a person that you have described that is connecting and is well regarded and so on, and at the opposite extreme you would have people who are probably getting closer to misconduct because of their abruptness, and in the middle you'll have people who will deliver the service and do what's required of them. But these are a common set of core skills and attitudes that all police officers should have. (PSNI Interview 1)*

Communication

Whilst the new model is predicated on a desire to work collaboratively with other agencies to support a more holistic approach to crime prevention and resolution, there was concern that information sharing and the good communication networks that are needed to facilitate planning and the delivery of appropriate interventions remains at best ad hoc. It was also noted that the new model has been more difficult to implement in harder to reach communities and relatedly there is an acknowledgement that such communities are likely to have a more negative response to the model.

> *Perhaps in the more challenging communities where people need more attention, police need to be more visible. I'm not sure. I'm hoping that you'll tell us. But in those harder to reach communities from a policing perspective I'm not sure we've made that much progress really with the new model. I think what we have done is mitigated some of the deficit that would have been created by sticking with the old model. (PSNI Interview 1)*

There was recognition that in some areas the new model might mean a loss of police visibility, but concern was expressed that the impact of this would be misrepresented or overestimated by communities in response to the research.

> *The feedback that we have had since then has been very much around, well you slashed neighbourhood teams we never see cops anymore. And some of that is fair in terms of design. Some of it is a little unfair because the public don't really understand the context. There is a shift in policing from visible policing to invisible policing. There is a shift from crime in the streets to crime in cyber space. There is a shift from crime in the streets to crime behind closed doors. And the growth in policing to cyber and behind closed doors, child sexploitation and child sexual offences and all that increasing business area for us isn't about cops in uniform in marked cars riding around the streets, because that officer doesn't deal with it. (PSNI Interview 2)*

Allocation of resources

A reduced funding context taken together with the emergence of new forms of internet-enabled crime that can cause substantial harm to the most vulnerable can necessitate trade-offs in the allocation of resources, such that more pro-active, community based approaches were likely to be compromised.

> *When you put people into that team and they are doing response and something else, if you don't rigorously control the response piece, it just eats up the rest of their day and then everything else they were supposed to do just falls off. (PSNI Interview 2)*

Managing expectations

As the tension between less funding and new policing priorities cannot be reconciled to facilitate the previous levels of community engagement, the deficit that has been created needs to be managed through good communication and education for the public about the changing nature of policing. However, this can be particularly difficult due to historical mistrust and elevated expectations.

> *I think honest communication, candid conversation, presentation of evidence and facts as opposed to anecdote and through developing effective relationships that people trust you and trust your assessment. Don't forget that we come from a divided community. There is a lot of people in this community who fundamentally have*

difficulties in trusting the police and we haven't even in terms of demand even touched on the legacy of the past and the amount of resource that we're putting into that. So it's a real challenge. (PSNI Interview 3)

And then there's a lack of tolerance for policing that there is for some other organisations. If I, you know, if I twist my ankle and go into casualty the nurse will triage me and say, well look that's a twisted ankle. We'll have to get that x-rayed. You'll be waiting the best of 5 hours. And I make a decision whether I wait in casualty for 5 hours. And there's almost an acceptance, maybe a bit of a moan, oh five hours, but there's an acceptance. If someone walked into one of our inquiry offices and said, I want to report my mobile phone, I think I've lost it. And they say, oh that's a lost mobile phone I'm going to deal with all these other people because they're more important than you. It's going to be 5 hours. There would be no tolerance. Much less tolerance for policing issues of that nature than there would be of many of the other professional services. (PSNI Interview 3)

Maintaining community trust

Some areas lend more easily to meeting the challenges of community policing than others. In Policing Districts where there are high levels of calls for service, officers are often too busy to engage in the type of proactive community based work required to build community relations. Additionally, in some districts stretched resources means there are practical constraints to providing dedicated engagement days for community based work. As a consequence, community level trust building is compromised, and this is often reflected in community feedback, where lack of continuity in police/community relations is highlighted as an ongoing concern.

The practicalities of managing engagement in the LPT is really quite problematic as well, in so much as all officers are expected to engage when the opportunity arises, but they are given dedicated engagement days when they rotate off nightshift. Nightshift occurs every 5 weeks; about 4 officers rotate off every night shift, there are about 22-25 officers per section, so in reality an officer getting a dedicated set of engagement days is probably coming up between 3 and 5 months... Because perhaps they are at court... Actually managing getting them the dedicated days has been quite problematic for us, and getting buy in from them has been problematic. Feedback from the community is the lack of consistency in which officers attend, for example, a community meeting. In our area where we don't have a dedicated neighbourhood (PT) there would probably be a different officer, if they meet bi-

monthly, they are likely to get a different officer at every meeting and then its communication … what arose from the last meeting; how's that followed up, so all of that is a bit clunky, and at the minute we are trying to streamline it.... We are being directed to use NICHE but that is problematic. (Chief Inspectors focus group)

The bigger picture

A cautionary note was sounded regarding the collation of research data that are likely to show high levels of community dissatisfaction with the current policing model. Accepting that this dissatisfaction stems from reduced police visibility, focusing on public response at the point of delivery was seen to misrepresent the nature of the problem, which lies more with the broader demands of policing at the present time.

What you are doing [the research team] is looking at this model that is important, but it's like two elements of a sort of 25 element story. You know the influence of paramilitarism and, you know, how that's tackled. In part it's tackled through neighbourhood policing teams but also it's tackled through things called surveillance teams and covert tactile attacks and all sorts of specialisms to unashamedly disrupt paramilitarism as best we can. That enforcement side, that harder edge side is as necessary as the neighbourhood policing team. You have to spread the resource between all of them. Do you see? The bigger picture stuff - And my worry is that, you know, and I don't mean this as disrespect in any way because I'm grateful for the evidence base that you are going to create, but I could have almost wrote, written the findings for this research before it started. I mean we would have been doing it on the basis of professional judgment and some anecdotes, hopefully you are going to give us a much broader, stronger evidence base for it and that will be helpful but because of the narrow element, narrow nature of it, I have a concern that looked at in isolation, you know, it won't address the wicked problem that I have around how we balance resources between the covert and overt, between the preventative and intervention and the enforcement, between the sort of problem solving and the proactivity against the reactive and all those bigger strategic issues that actually impact on the numbers of people that you have in uniform in high visibility jackets in communities to do this local policing team and neighbourhood policing team piece. (PSNI Interview 1)

Opportunities of the new model

Partnership working

The model was presented as aligning well with some of the changes that have taken place under the review of public administration and the community planning initiative. In particular, the reduction of District Councils from 26 to 11 and the coterminous alignment of Policing Districts (raised from 8 to 11) is seen to have positive implications for policing by creating opportunities for partnership working between different service delivery agents to tackle issues that have been identified at district level. A little inconsistently, community planning is seen as both an opportunity and a threat. The current political impasse and the suspension of the local assembly has stalled the community planning process which means that the opportunity it represents has yet to be fully realized, to the extent that work in related areas by different statutory bodies continues to be undertaken 'in silos', with limited sharing between them.

> *I think community planning is still an opportunity that isn't fully realised. I think the whole approach that was in the programme for government which has now sort of dissipated with the breakdown in political consensus but the outcomes based approach, the sort of prevention agenda, collaboration allowing you to share information to intervene in a more intelligent way and in an earlier way therefore more efficiently and [offer] better service for the public. But for that to work properly it needs to be all of the statutory agencies working together. It needs to be because policing should be sort of last resort when everything else has failed. So interventions from education, from housing, from social care, from whoever, youth justice agency - we should be trying to share information around what vulnerability there is for people and work out what are the best interventions as early as possible for the benefit of that individual, their family, that community, that neighbourhood and then applying what they need at that early point. And community planning provides a legislative framework to do that, but, what I'm describing we're a hundred miles away from. Everybody is still working in silos where, you know, sharing information or concerned about sharing information… rather a cautious approach to the data protection act and all the rest of it so that's the area that we need to go further in. I say we, all the agencies, statutories. (PSNI Interview 1)*

Although there was some concern about the limited nature of partnership working to date, there was commitment to collaboration as the best way forward, and initiatives like the community Hub were seen as exemplars of the type of structures that will be required.

Now the work we are piloting around the community project, the concern hubs, I actually think provides a mechanism that has been hitherto absent. Where on a district basis you have a partnership structure where we identify the frequent flyers, the consistent callers, and we start to get into, well what's a health issue, what's an education issue, what's collective [issue]. (PSNI Interview 2)

I don't think we have an option. The way the money's going there's going to need to be a, eventually with austerity people will do one of two things, and I think it's a sort of journey or a cycle that people are on. Less money means that chief executives and chief constables and things will say, right we're returning to basics. We're only going to do what's required of us. We don't have any extra money to do anything extra. So, they'll withdraw into their own trenches, their own business plans, their own departmental priorities and all of that. That's one extreme. The other is that they say, oh actually we have to do things differently. We need to be able to intervene earlier. Not just because it's better for the citizen but because if we are intervening earlier it's reducing, it's taking future demand out of the system and it's a more efficient way of operating as well because it's more effective. But people almost need to get through the pain of realizing that the silos and the trenches don't work to force them to get to that. And I don't think we're there yet. I think we need a good stimulus in the Programme for Government, which we've still seen in the sort of theoretical sphere rather than practical. But at least we are starting to have the conversations, and there are workshops between departments and seminars occurring that we're starting to nudge people in that thinking. But that's lost momentum too because of the political bumps. (PSNI Interview 1)

Some statutory agencies are better than others at responding to the collaborative dimension of the model. Where statutory partners have embraced their PCSP commitments and worked closely with the police, the outcome has been very positive. The Housing Executive and the Education Authority were particularly commended, and examples were given of how through collaboration with police there had been effective responses to local community issues. However, some key agencies such as the Health Trusts and Transport have been less co-operative, and this is seen to undermine the potential of the PCSPs to deliver a holistic approach to local level problem solving. From a police perspective, the limited commitment to the model on the part of some partners has increased their 'mop-up' workload, and detracts from the time they can give to proactive and preventative work:

It is supposed to be a partnership and on the partnership sit a lot of statutories and from that perspective the partnership aspect of it is certainly the weaker bit …It is really difficult sometimes to get the partners to stand up and it is very much a police led…If you take an issue that taxes all of us…our looked after children and young people who consistently go missing…As far as policing goes we are the mop up for those young people because when they are off their heads on drugs, when they get assaulted …all of those issues arise when they go into care,… and we are the mop up…but actually we shouldn't be the lead as far as partnership and other people taking the lead is concerned. (Chief Inspector focus group)

The amount of time that police time is taken up with … because another partner is not upholding their agreement is phenomenal. (Chief Inspector focus group)

We are law enforcement, yet we are the mop up because the other agencies aren't… the protocols are there but it's not always working…. the other agencies don't follow their own protocols. (Chief Inspector focus group)

Advocacy

There was acknowledgment that good communication is essential for acceptance of the model but it was posited that the PSNI may not be best placed to undertake the associated PR work. Rather, it was suggested that the Policing Board, which holds the police to account and which is regularly apprised of policing outcomes might be better placed to communicate the positive impacts of good policing:

You know Reagan said, if you are explaining you're losing sort of thing. So the best way for that to happen is to be people advocating for policing and holding policing to account. So for a Policing Board for example both on one hand hold us to account for performance, when I say performance I don't mean just about you know dots on graphs and what's up and down, I'm talking about how you are responding to vulnerability, what are you doing with the resources you've got. How can you show that you are agile in your approach, that you are flexible? That you are actually putting the resource to the people at the greatest risk. Because a lot of these quality of life things people want to know that they go to constable (blogs) for weren't necessarily high risk. They were important to them but actually nobody was going to die, no child was going to be sexually exploited. Do you know what I mean? So on one hand an accountability that holds you to account, but also advocates for policing. Saying, hang on, rather than just young people have no confidence in police in

working class loyalist areas, working class nationalists areas, all this long list of, we need more of, we need more of. I think there is a role for us to be challenged in using the resources we have available, but those same people have a responsibility to go and be part of the education process. I don't mean advocacy for police as just a positivity without, you know, questioning or anything but I'm talking about more educating about policing. Maybe advocacy is too warm a word for an accountability body but there's something about a two-way flow of holding us to account for what we're doing with the resource we got and also explaining on our behalf or educating and informing communities. (PSNI Interview 1)

CHAPTER 4

Policing with the Community

In this section we present an analysis of interviews with key stakeholders, representing the organisations detailed previously, focus groups undertaken in 5 Case Study areas across Northern Ireland, and questionnaires completed by Neighbourhood Watch Volunteers. The data are organized according to the two key questions asked of each interviewee/focus group:

- What is your understanding of the new policing model?
- How has it impacted you; your organization; your community?

What is your understanding of the new policing model?

Limited knowledge

Knowledge and understanding of the new policing model varied widely with 39% of Neighbourhood Watch volunteers who completed the questionnaire indicating that they did not know or were unsure if the local policing model changed in 2015. Some interviewees were able to articulate in detail how the model is operationalized and the changes incorporated in it. More often though, whilst respondents could offer a broad description of key changes, they were vague about the detail, and many reported frustration that the model had not been adequately explained to them. Some of those (N=2) who expressed most frustration are involved in working in partnership with the police:

Well, to be honest, I'm as the chief executive of an organisation I feel as if I should have some sense of the new model, what it was, particularly since it's been run since 2015 - but I don't have the detail. I don't understand particularly the new model. So whenever we're talking about neighbourhood policing. That's what we're talking about? I actually don't have a picture in my head. Nobody came specifically to… and I can't recall anything, I'm sure someone did come out but I actually can't recall anything… So I'm far removed from it and I suppose where the touch points are for the organization where the probation meet with police colleagues in various collaborative working setups… I don't, to be honest with you, have a sense of the new working model. Only that neighbourhood police are in a sense not really there anymore (Interview 1)

Reflecting a concern of the PSNI Interview 1 that the model had not been well promoted, in one focus group concern was voiced that PR around the model had been poor and this may have affected the largely negative response to it.

What has been the impact of the model?

Results from the Neighbourhood Watch questionnaires presented a pessimistic view of the new model. When asked the top three positive and negative aspects of the new model, only a small number of respondents (N = 44) provided positive responses. Cited as the most positive aspect of the model was communication; primarily indirect forms including social media, text, and email. This group also commented on the positive engagement and contact they had with local officers. A minority within the group recognised the structural elements of the new model as being more centralised, economical, offering a more efficient use of resources. Interestingly, these respondents were more likely to be from the Local Policing Teams of Armagh, Banbridge and Craigavon, as well as from Derry City and Strabane.

However, it is important to note that the most often cited response was that there were no positive aspects to the model. The majority of respondents (N = 81) noted a wide array of negative aspects which revolved around a sense of loss and isolation from local officers. Respondents noted that there was limited communication, a lack of visibility, direct contact, and engagement with the community. Many respondents noted that they were no longer aware of who their designated local officers were and that they had lost hard won relationships. They also spoke of the limited man power and changing personnel. Specific references to local officers noted that they were overworked with limited local knowledge and covering far too wide an area to manage.

This was also the case with the qualitative data were there was broad consensus around a number of issues with an overall generally negative interpretation of the impact the new model. A number of themes emerged relating to: police visibility, police/community engagement, the style of policing – from softer proactive to harsher law enforcement, the loss of neighbourhood policing in many areas, overstretched response policing, partnership working with the PSNI, 'continuous' policing, and diminution of trust, particularly in harder to reach communities. In the following section, we deal with each of these themes.

Police visibility

Lower visibility of the police in local communities since 2015 was mentioned as a negative outcome of the model in almost every response. Primary concerns were that the absence of locally available officers, taken together with the closure of local police stations and confusion/lack of knowledge of the 101 number is seen to have negatively impacted the reporting of offences and has increased a perception, particularly amongst more vulnerable groups, such as the elderly, that local communities are less safe.

> *Police visibility was always really, it was key. Always. And it mightn't necessarily be, you know, they aren't actually doing anything but the police visibility has dramatically reduced in the past number of years, and because of diminished resources but I think that also, you know, there's a lot of people saying, well I rung the police and nobody came out. You know that erodes away the trust and confidence in policing. Again, it's about police engagement, engaging with communities, you know, knowing who they are, and knowing where to get them but it is very difficult now. (PCSP focus group 1)*

In the absence of a visible police presence and known local officers, including those who have particular specialisms, such as for example domestic violence, there is some confusion within local communities as to how to contact the police. Feedback on the 101 number suggested some resistance to using the facility, primarily because it is seen as impersonal and cannot therefore offer the same sense of security for users as reporting to an officer who is known to them:

> *GR1: Some people don't even know the 101 number. And I mean, I understand that the police have their budget and they're constrained, but, I'm kind of torn between (understanding the police) but we're also representing the community, we are receiving continuous feedback from members of the community saying that their previous contact with the community police officers has diminished. At this stage most of them don't even have a contact number.*
> *GR2: Yeah.*
> *GR1: Or if they do they have one contact number which is held by the duty sergeant and most times they don't even get through to it because they don't know where to phone. But certainly from the Lisburn and Castlereagh area it has been, I think, to the detriment of community policing with the restructuring.*
> *I: Is that a common experience of the group?*
> *GRs: Yes. (PCSP focus group 1)*

People don't know who to contact; don't know who is their local officer for that area; 101 number – sometimes slow to answer and area most of the area has no knowledge of the new policing plan. (Case Study 6)

GR1: Whereas we just keep saying, well you ring 101 now. We don't like, we don't know who that is. So who are we talking to? We don't know them.
GR2: And it's also an off-putting process. The mechanised responses and blahdeblah and then - who are ya?
GR1: And what did you have for breakfast?
GR2: And what did you have for breakfast? Before you take your statement. All I want is!... And I just tell them, tell them you want to report anonymously. If you are doing that, tell them you want to report anonymously. To try and cut back that, but instead it's off-putting. (PCSP focus group 2)

Small rural communities feel that they are missing police officers and the loss of specialisms – the Domestic violence officer - who was well known and trusted by the community and case officers – because for a lot of people school engagement with the police is possibly their first engagement that they have and that can have a profound effect on how they view things going through the rest of their lives. (Case Study 6)

Relationships build confidence and if you don't have those relationships or don't have time to build those relationships with police officers then that confidence suffers. But the youth diversion officers, and that's a specialism that's still in place are very good… Our recommendations are: local police officers who have specialisms and or training around engagement; more regular contact between community groups and the same officer; going back to aspects of the neighbourhood police model pre 2015. (Case Study 6)

Although most respondents reported concern at the loss of police visibility, the ability to access the police is seen as inconsistent across areas, with some districts (N=3) reporting availability of phone numbers for assigned leads, and the remainder complaining that they have no specific point of contact:

GR1: Right ok, we just have a duty sergeant number. (inaudible due to background noise)

GR2: We would send out about 7,000 quarterly neighbourhood watch leaflets and they give us the leads and the mobile numbers of every one of those staff and their areas of responsibility, and they go on the back of every single one of them and its updated constantly because there might have been a change since the last one. But it does go out with mobile numbers and dedicated names for different issues and that works well. It's been well received.

GR1: Yeah, it would but we don't have that.

GR2: We don't have that.

GR1: We don't know who the police officers are.

GR3: We've done some over in Derry with each neighbourhood watch coordinator has a specific point of contact.

GR4: We have that but it's only for neighbourhood watch. (PCSP focus group 1)

It is likely that different levels of access to known police officers at local community level relates to the maintenance of neighbourhood teams in some areas, but not in others. However, the rationale for the withdrawal of some teams is not well understood and is generally perceived as some communities having been disadvantaged or unfairly treated over others.

Stretched resources

At a practical level the model is seen as unworkable. The policing districts are now much bigger and the number of dedicated community police officers has been reduced. Where call levels are manageable then time can be allocated to the development of good local relations; however the experience reported in a number of districts is that the volume of calls and the expectation that all calls will be treated with the same degree of urgency reduces the potential for relationship building work.

The new model, the new model on a plan can work. Plan on a page it's fine. In practice it can be very difficult depend, depending on, for example, peak demand of calls… At high demands of calls they may be tasked to do other, other tasks, ok? And that's simply down to resources, ok? That's not because the will or the fact that they would rather not engage. Of course they want to engage, that's why they joined the police. It's simply maybe because they haven't got time or there's other priorities or other article 2 issues; more serious calls for demand to deal with. But at other occasions officers do, you know, have limited time to problem solve, to try to get to know their neighbourhood, and trying to get to know the persons who have influence in the neighbourhood etc. Teams, depending on where the teams are, the teams may

be with neighbourhood teams prior to commencement of duty and they know what problems are. (Interview 5)

I think the theory of it, you know, when you see it on paper, you know, you have as D*** said, a dedicated, 24/7, you have consistency with officers, but to me the dominance has been response and that's where the downfall of it has been because of the large volume of calls, our busy districts, the officers have been unable. Because of the way their roles have been joined and amalgamated they are responsible for diversity and equality and policing and response, you know? There has been no specialists. (PCSP focus group 1)

I: Ok, I'd like to hand this over to the police who are at this table to hear what their perspective is.
NIPB member: Tell the truth guys, come on.
GR1: Ok, so basically what's been our experience? Change from response to LPT and (inaudible) cars all changed as well as the reduction in neighbourhood officers from 12 to 6 in our area… So what has been the experience of the group? A lack of resources compared to what we were. There's more work as well as a greater area and a lot of that has been picked up with people doing backfill and overtime which also impacts on the officers' family lives etc. Delay and response teams, particularly if they are in my areas, and there's changeover time for us, response… there's maybe people coming from LPT who are maybe going away to (inaudible) half an hour even 45 minutes depending on what time of the day it is. There's a reduction in response teams. The centralisation of stations is contributing to that. Stations closing is reducing the ability of LPTs to be in the community where they need to be and we understand that there are restrictions on that. Lack of personal policing, because of the lack of stations within the areas, obviously the community are not going to see you as much and we see more now that people say to us in the streets, neighbourhoods, we don't see you around as much. We are half the numbers we were before so it's very hard for us to maintain that level when we are on patrol. And obviously there's timeframes during that period where there can be very few police in the area while a change overs going on and we see criminals using that as an opportune time to carry out their activities. The third one was more or less covered already. There's the same number of officers in the LPT but because we're covering a bigger area it makes things a bit more stressful. (Case Study 2)

Police/community relations

There was a general perception that the loss of neighbourhood teams would have a detrimental effect on police/community relations in some areas and could lead to an increased in anti-social behaviour and criminality. In every Case Study area, trust building and confidence in local officers were cited as key advantages of local neighbourhood policing, particularly where it involved softer 'getting to know the community' type engagement, such as no uniform and first name contact, and interventions like Pizza with the Peelers.

> *GR1: I have a young group who were very bought into the police. Love it, love the neighbourhood team. They were down every Friday night, knew them all by names. See now they don't like the police, they'll even go out as far to say we hate the police, we don't want anything to do with them.*
> *GR2: Can't put a name to a face now.*
> *GR1: They are only out there to do us. There's nobody out there making a relationship with us. (PCSP focus group 2)*

The value of soft police work is seen to relate to the more comprehensive local knowledge held by officers of local issues, and the fact that many neighbourhood policing officers had established relationships of trust with local residents and young people. A number of examples were reported of officers having the respect of local young people, being able to quickly quash disruptive or anti-social behaviour and activity that had the potential to escalate and lead to harm.

> *The old model worked because the police were engaging with community centres, with community groups. Everybody knew who the police were; young people knew who they were, and if something was happening, they knew the young people's names. You know there was a relationship there. (Focus Group 3)*

> *My overriding sense is that the police footprint from what it was 10 years ago, 5 years ago is slightly more removed from the neighbourhood sense that I would have understood it as being a local, being locally available, being locally that sort of I'll call it intelligence to quickly resolve issues is removed. And issues now become much more pushed up in terms of a more… it has to be a response, it has to be an action, as opposed to a much more, it wasn't laissez faire but a much more on the ground dealing with issues as they arose and a local broader knowledge of police on the ground. Where I think it is a bit more removed now (Interview 1)*

The risks of breaking community trust was highlighted on a number of occasions, with some expressing less willingness within their communities to support the police.

> *GR1: There's a lot of people saying, well I rung the police and nobody came out. You know, and they said, oh there's no police available, and that totally and utterly, you know, erodes away the trust and confidence in policing and that does occur now from time to time and then word gets about and you know people talk and find that very difficult to come back from. Again, it's about police engagement, engaging with communities, you know, knowing who they are, and knowing where to get them but it is very difficult now.*
>
> *GR2: I think it's not, I think it's something that can be repaired. I don't think we're too far down the line yet that, you know, trust or confidence has been severely eroded. But I think if we continue, so as the model currently sits, you may find that that becomes an issue, you know. We are relatively new into it and people are expressing concerns, you know, they are getting on with it as well. (PCSP focus group 1)*

Preventative and early intervention policing

There was a view expressed that whilst community policing might be resource intensive at the point of delivery, in the longer term it is likely to be cost saving. Preventative work and early intervention policing, particularly with young people was seen to protect them from first engagement with the criminal justice system, reducing the likelihood of less risky and costly decision-making in the future:

> *GR1: I'll give you one example of where the police are missing a trick here and its actually costing them more time and more effort. The old neighbourhood officers were in and out of the schools quite a bit and knew what was going on. An example that happened years ago, or it happened a wee while ago anyway, where there was a bit of a riotous assembly happening in one of the hardline estates and it really got out of control and there was a stack of officers pulled in. Now, in complete contrast a similar scenario had happened in that very square in that estate years back - the officer called out goes, what are you doing here, John what are you doing here, Robert, why are you out here?*
>
> *GR2: He knew them, knew them.*
>
> *GR1: Head to their feet, oh we're just bored and this has happened. Well, do youse not want to go home? They turned around and walked home. It saved cops a fortune.*

Simply because the neighbourhood officer knew his target audience, he knew the buttons to press, and there was no riot! It was solved. (Case Study 1)

GR1: I was out in K*** estate a couple of months ago and talking to the local community groups there and the Alternatives and the other people and they were bewailing the fact that they had named officers in the past, they had a telephone number, where incidents occurred they could actually head it off at the pass so that it didn't get out of control, so the young person did not get into as much trouble, so that the community itself was saved a lot of grief with that young person off and doing other things. And they really were despairing and they really thought that the PSNI had missed a trick because there had been a good engagement between PSNI and people in the estate.
GR2: The number one thing we hear when we are out and about, we don't know any of the police anymore. They are more likely to tell the police stuff if they know who they are.
GR1: That's right. (Case Study 1)

There has been good work done, but that work has gone due to the changes and I think if people are honest about it, that is the reality. Community policing eradicates a lot of other problems. I'm not saying it's panacea but at the end of the day it goes a long way in helping everyone and making the community safer. (Case Study 2)

Harder to reach communities

It was also noted in most focus groups that policing *with* the community had helped garner confidence in policing in those more vulnerable or harder to reach communities where relations with the police have been historically poor. There was concern expressed that in such communities, relations with the police remain fragile, and that a risk of moving to less community-focused approach would be the diminution of hard-won trust. The precarious political context and the ongoing status of Northern Ireland as a transitioning society were mentioned as reasons for not moving too quickly to a model of policing that might be seen as reminiscent of times when the police were viewed less as offering a service and more as a state law enforcement agency:

And in areas where confidence is low they were having massive inroads within (PT) officers and they were known faces over a period of time, even in really difficult areas relationships were built up and there was connection you know and that is diminished. (PCSP focus group 1)

And decisions being made going forward as well. It can't remain at the status quo because, particularly in a country where there's political instability, you know, all the time, you know, you lose those relationships. We've already talked about examples of that. They don't just be built again overnight. You're talking years. You know? (PCSP focus group 2).

In one focus group it was also noted that a perceived return to a harder and more exclusively law enforcement model of policing could threaten sensitive mediation work undertaken by some community/voluntary sector organisations which has been aimed at mitigating the risk of a return to violence by dissident and other paramilitary groups:

I've had three stop and searches within the last month and I've asked the policeman why are you stopping and searching me, and he has said, well you're a terrorist, and I have said, well what gives you the understanding that I am a terrorist? Well, you associate yourself with x, Ok right, and does that make me a terrorist? Well choose who you put in your car. So I stopped the policeman and I gave him an example of what I believed a terrorist was post peace process…you have people who had been convicted of a crime, who got out…I've had them in my car for years, and I was never stopped once, and they were convicted terrorists. I've had other people that I'm working with throughout the community and I can't go anywhere without being stopped, because I'm working through a mediation process to try and move them groups to a different stage of thinking…And you're nearly viewed as a supporter of them. I've tried to highlight this at a high level within the police service, and I have to be honest with you, it came out as if I was playing chess with them…and I was being honest and frank about the situation…I'm just saying that in the past there was leniency towards people who wanted to move from violence to peace. (Case Study 3)

Anti-terrorism policing

Relatedly, in some cases (N=3) there was concern that in some areas neighbourhood policing has been replaced by a much more controversial 'anti-terrorism' form of policing, and this was viewed with a high degree of suspicion

I think police have gone down more of an enforcement role now. It's reacting to crimes and the PCSPs seem to be left to pick up the slack about, you know. (PCSP focus group 1)

43

If they are community policing they need to be visible in marked cars, not this anti-terrorism – sitting in car parks in unmarked cars, dressed in baseball caps. It's got nothing to do with individuals. It's got to do with the area…It's a nationalist area - and I'm aware people here are from different parts of the community… It's anti-terrorism policing (Case Study 3)

Worries about how the reforms had impacted policing in harder to reach communities were not shared by all respondents and there was also a view expressed in one focus group that policing in some areas had become so 'community focused' that it was almost antithetical to law enforcement.

So for example if you have good connection to bad people you get treated a lot more leniently than other people would, so that creates a perception of sort of a two-tier approach of certain people being treated better than other people. And as far as the impact on how all that goes, that creates a lack of confidence in policing and there's a perception that the rules aren't rolled out quite equally. (Case Study 4)

From 'community friendly' to hard edge policing

More generally, most respondents said there had been a notable change in the approach to policing in their areas with many more officers adopting a more abrasive approach to dealing with the community. This was attributed to a shift from neighbourhood to response policing and was characterized by officers with limited local knowledge, often from some distance away, arriving within a community to deal with sometimes relatively minor local issues. Response teams by definition respond to incidents as they occur, but they can also be detailed to undertake softer community level work. These roles can sometimes conflict leading to frustration at community level

So they are struggling even with the teams they are putting out and that's having an effect on, a knock on effect because obviously they'll be dealing with response, which comes first. And they make it very clear when they come in - we are response and we're on call and if we have to go, we have to go which makes it very difficult then as a PCSP to have them detailed to do a stand or something with you. You know, they could be there 5 minutes get a call for an RTC and they're away and you're left standing there. (PCSP focus group 1)

Continuous policing

The current form of neighbourhood policing is seen to be less invested in the local community, and due to shift patterns and the wide geographical areas covered by local policing teams, was seen less able to offer the type of 'continuous policing' that is valued within communities. Continuous policing was defined as the same officer or officers seeing the resolution of a reported incident through from start to finish, such that he or she would be a constant point of contact for the citizens involved.

> *GR1: I suppose, I think about all those people who used to be in the station, you now see they are out but there's no continuity and that's what people want; especially in our area, a lot of it would be rural. You know, people want continuity and they want to know [their officers]. And I'm actually very supportive but we're losing all that now because it's just a different face every time.*
>
> *GR2: And that's what they are doing. Because, see for example, if we have an event on they'll say, you know, all this planning, they'll say, you know we'll detail whoever's on. So, it could be somebody you've never seen before and the next time it'll be somebody different, it'll be somebody different. And that's not the way…*
>
> *GR1: But even for them, that whole intelligence and that whole constitution and building up relationships. That must all be completely different for them, you know? (PCSP focus group 1)*

> *GR1: Impacts problem solving. We had two, we had an issue we had to resolve with, you just brought it to my mind there P***, with the youth club level and we had to meet the youth leaders and we had to meet them separately during the day and two LPT officers came along. Two great people, you know, nice people and all that. Had no knowledge of the area at all. I mean none whatsoever. And they were sitting in the meeting and they actually turned and said, look I'm sorry this is our week. We were told we were doing community engagement this week. And they said, look we don't know anybody. We don't know the area. And it was no reflection of them but it was just…*
>
> *GR2: It's not their fault! It's the system.*
>
> *GR3: It is. (PCSP focus group 2)*

It was also noted that continuous policing has been damaged by a rapid turnover of officers holding key positions and a surge in experienced officers retiring or taking redundancy. New and less experienced police recruits moving into community facing positions, has exacerbated the sense of loss at community level.

And because of the you know change in the structure there's been a lot of (change),
so there's been a lot of people who had excellent knowledge of a specific area,
maybe they've left or they've been moved or you know taken up a different post so
you've lost all that policing intelligence and those relationships that have been built
up over a number of years. So because of the restructuring they might of taken
redundancy or taken another post or… so they've lost all that. At the minute, you
know, a lot of the neighbourhood police teams and local policing teams are fairly new
recruits and they are a bit apprehensive. They haven't got that experience. They
don't know, should I be doing this or should I be doing that? (PCSP focus group 1)

Measuring the effectiveness of the model

There was a view expressed that senior police are well-aware that the model is unpopular
and that it has been detrimental to police-community relations and more general sense of
community well-being. However, some reported that in community feedback, the model is
often (mis)represented by senior police as having had a positive impact because it is
associated with the reduction in some crime statistics. Using crime statistics as a single
measure of healthy community was criticized by some respondents who were of the view
that such an approach is at best partial and at worst can misrepresent the fear of crime that
impacts the lives of many residents, particularly the elderly.

GR1: And I know local police will say, you know, crime's gone down we must be
doing alright. But, the fear of crime's not gone down and people never see the police
officers in the street unless they are on a call for ASB and burglary and theft or
something. So they are responsive rather than preventative at the minute.
I: Has anything improved as a result of the new model?
GR1: As in the new PCSP model or?
I: The new local policing teams or model.
(silence)
(PCSP focus group 1)

I suppose too based on that too is if you think of elected members that are on PCSPs
and have for a long time and even going back to the old DPP days and back there,
they know, they don't believe what senior command in the PSNI are saying, I don't
mean at area command level, where PSNI, they are saying they are working with the
community and everything is going well and we're all working hand in hand whereas
they know downrightly themselves that from the feedback from the community and

themselves that it's not working right on the ground because the numbers aren't there and the structure can't work on a practical level. (PCSP focus group 2)

Some respondents were scathing of what they saw as a discrepancy between pervasive police PR and the reality of policing experienced by communities and expressed concern that the inability of the police to deliver on expectations would ultimately lead to a more profound deterioration in relationships.

So I think a big thing for me is that there's the police kind of, kind of PR and generation of an expectation - but the capacity is way back. I think the police have to find the right balance in terms of aggressively promoting themselves as an organisation which can, I think, lead to unrealistic community expectations about their capacity to deliver on the ground. (Interview 2)

The longer term

There was an acceptance that the new model represents a major transition in local policing and that it is still 'bedding in'. There was some optimism that once roles are more clearly defined negative perceptions may shift. However, respondents were consistent in their concern that police-community relations are currently eroding to an extent that will be difficult to recover.

But I suppose there's something about understanding this is a model that's bedding in and it's in transition. Transition for people from the outside looking in and transition for the police officers who are trying to manage it and make sense of it. And whether it is it needs more time to bed in and that we need to kind of review and reflect and look at who are the people, is it LPT? Is that an open discussion that needs to be had in terms of how we understand our role and what the interface is and what our contribution is in relation to reducing offending or preventing offending? But that's a question. But I don't know if while that process of bedding in and transitioning is happening that the public have the patience to wait on it all to get righted. (Interview 3)

It was also reported that opportunity for community to engage with the police is generally now more limited, with both the frequency of community engagement meetings and the location of them sited as key concerns in some areas:

We don't have community police at all. They do have community engagement meetings…. I know of four that happened in my area, not as often at the CPLCs

47

would have met. They would have met once a month. Yeah, but you were meeting them for your particular area, whereas now, you know, we might go to D*** and you have people there talking about D*** and all the rest, and you are sitting there for an hour while they do all their business and by the time they come round to you they don't want to listen. Nobody's interested in your problems. (Case Study 3)

CHAPTER 5

Working in Partnership

In this chapter we detail themes emerging from interviews with community organisations and statutory bodies, as well as focus groups with PCSPs, on experiences with the new model and the impact the model has had on partnership work between these organisations and the PSNI. These insights are thematically organised around a number of key challenges, including issues around roles, funding and the implementation of the new Outcomes Based Approach, as well as opportunities moving forward, including the necessity of sharing best practice, the promotion of the new model, the role of community planning, and examples of effective collaboration that should be encouraged moving forward. These themes are briefly discussed below.

Challenges

Community/voluntary sector response

To some extent the loss of community policing teams is compensated by the work of others such as neighbourhood watch, street pastors, or safe-zoners. In some cases PCSPs liaise with local senior police officers to coordinate a street presence of volunteers who engage with the community and provide reassurance to residents in areas where anti-social behaviours is prevalent.

> *Now what we have is PCSP actually host a meeting, a weekly meeting over in the police station between the safe-zoners, the street pastors, the PSNI inspector S***, and our council colleagues to basically work on hot spots and figure out how the gaps at weekends can be covered. What kind of boots will be out on the street and how the PCSP and the community projects that PCSP fund can actually help local policing over the weekend and that sort of a coordination and rationalisation seems to be working. (PCSP focus group 1)*

Although such interventions are welcome, the approach is seen very much as a compromise on the best practice model that was held to exist prior to the reforms.

> *GR1: Now we would go out and we would hold meetings with PACTs and CPLCs and neighbourhood watchers and all the rest and we would bring along police with us*

and they do engage with when they are there. But the majority of police that actually come with us and work with us are, oddly enough, the old neighbourhood watch officers that are now attached to the LPTs - and they volunteer to come out and to talk to the community and the community people know them and know that they are still around. But we are still talking about 12 to 14 people.

GR2: It's funny that you should say that because the neighbourhood watch, as you know, that's people in the community who are giving up their own free time and who are happy to take on that role and they are no longer seeing the local police officer… [But] it's the police officer uniform that's who they want to see on a regular basis and that contact to me has gone completely. (PCSP focus group 2)

And we have tried to counter that in Armagh, Banbridge and Craigavon we work very, very well with our community planning sergeant and what we try to do is if we are looking for an officer for an engagement event that we're doing, we'll go through him and he'll find us somebody who's on that day and stuff. But the neighbourhood watches, the neighbourhood watches used to have an officer who's number they had, who they could ring up and say, hey Billy this is going on what do you know blah blah blah blah and had a relationship with them. We knew that was going to go because our neighbourhood teams were slashed and in some places taken away, but what we tried to do was we tried to get our community sergeant to identify an LPT officer who would be the link officer for each of the neighbourhood watch schemes. And although we thought that would work but even that isn't working. (PCSP focus group 2)

Other examples of how the community has responded to the perceived loss of regular and dedicated community policing, include district meetings held at various locations in a council area where the police can be updated on local level issues. Whilst this is seen as one way of retaining community level engagement with the police, it is seen very much as a compromise on the more effective engagement that had existed before the NPTs were replaced with LPTs.

GR1: We also have an LPT, we anticipated those who were used to a neighbourhood police officer knocking on their door or every few days coming in for a cup of tea, chatting about this that and the other, that wasn't going to happen - we needed to provide a forum for engagement that was consistent and regular and that police were at. So we hold every quarter a district electoral area, DEA, there's 7 DEAs in the ABC

and every quarter there's one community engagement meeting where the local neighbourhood inspector will come along.

GR2: Is guaranteed to come along.

GR1: Give them an update on local issues and provides an opportunity for people to come along and say what they want, air their grievances. Numbers are varied on who attends just like every sort of public meeting but people can't then say they haven't been given the opportunity to come along and have a chat with the police. And we move those around to all various locations all around the borough as well as best we can and neighbourhood watch are invited to it. We use our (inaudible) service. We invite the general community and the public at large as well so it's one way of trying to address the gap that appeared over night when we switched to LPTs and NPTs and everybody knew who their local officer was. (PCSP focus group 2)

The role of other agencies

Some resentment was expressed that other agencies, also with limited resources, are having to 'take up the slack' or 'plug the gaps' left by the reorientation of policing away from preventative and early intervention work.

We have the feeling that the new model there's more expectations of neighbourhood watch and there are, there could be, there's a danger in… we cannot be perceived as police personnel. We are civilians. We are volunteers. (Case Study 2)

Others (N=8) offered examples of good partnership working with police, but felt that the extent of change and reorganization within the police was militating against good partnership working, with the organization is currently too inward looking to engage in effective collaboration,

I suppose the issue there is about, we're talking about the implications for partnership work and we're saying we don't experience them as that good at the moment but that's then, you know, I think… Say it's an organisation in turmoil wouldn't be accurate, but it's an organisation that's inward looking and still trying to sort itself in light of these changes. And while you are trying to get your own house in order, in any organization, your ability to stretch out and look at what partner's needs are is limited because you feel like you're still trying to sort your own house. And there may be big elements of that. (Interview 4)

Taking a slightly different tack, one of the key statutory agencies referred to a tendency within the police to 'take over' and rather than work collaboratively with other agencies, sometimes taking on responsibility for areas that are outside of a perceived police remit.

I think police have managed to get themselves into things I don't think they necessarily should be doing in the way they should be doing it. Police are wanting to become social workers and probation officers and youth workers and all sorts of things and I think they should stick to delivering their statutory function in a proficient way. And I guess a lot of that is being collaborative. But being collaborative doesn't necessarily mean then you do [everything], and I think that's where they are missing potentially an opportunity with the voluntary community sector and with other statutory organisations to say, well actually this is what we'll do and you are in a better place to do that. I haven't often heard the police say, you're in a much better place to do that. Are you with me? Because they have a big picture that I think they need to get back to, ok whatever it is we're doing well we'll do that really well. Best in class with the resources we have. But that [other issue] is really for somebody else and we need a clear line of communication. (Interview 1)

Somewhat contradictorily, police interviewees accepted that as an organization they had often taken the lead in resolving challenging community level issues. However, this was represented as a necessity in the context of other agencies not always meeting their responsibilities. A number of examples of inappropriate or wasteful use of police time were provided, alongside assessments of how other agencies could help mitigate some of the problems

R: Because years and years ago we had, we had the resources. We had 14,000 police. Years ago.
I: What is it down to now?
R: Down to under 7,000. 6,800 6,700. But so now we need our partners to live up to their responsibilities and we need our managers and leaders within, you know, our strategy makers if you like, to use their influence. And the policing board to use their influence to chat to the other partners to ensure that they can use the other, to use their influence to encourage the other partners to come on board as fast as possible. Because if we get, if we get reduced demand, so we stop dealing with things that maybe aren't a particular police issue then it will free us up to engage more. Are you with me?
I: Creating that balance.

R: Correct. Creating that balance, creating that space so that police officers can engage, catch more criminals, catch more bad guys, get more confidence from the community. Reduce that fear of crime. Get more people in the community to buy into policing. (Interview 5)

There's an awful lot going on. An awful lot of energy being spent on multiple work streams across this city and probably across the province. If they were maybe more efficient, you know, we could take a bit of learning from elsewhere in Western Europe and across the world and get down and solve problems and make the thing work. (Interview 4)

There's an awful lot of police resources for example looking after people filling in gaps of society where other partners, the perception is they are maybe not doing enough. So police, the draw on demand is really, really noticeable because when you've got so few resources and some of our police officers are sitting in hospitals for 6, 7, 12 hours looking after a particular person because a parental health issue or a different issue, and you have very few officers to start with and that's very noticeable. We can't afford to continue like that. So the police service in Belfast and the policeman of the community are trying to find ways to work better with partners where the partners can realise, hang on a minute, the PSNI don't have responsibility for this. We need to encourage other partners to take their share of the responsibility. (Interview 5)

Funding

A key challenge is how to retain the commitment to community engagement within the wider contexts of reduced funding for community policing and increased pressure on PCSPS, many of which now have responsibility for wider geographical areas than was the case prior to 2015. In respect of the latter, a particular concern is the fact that different agencies represented on PCSPs have remits for regions that are not coterminous, making it difficult to identify and extract information and data relevant to associated PCSPs. Aside from the overall budget reduction of 10% for 2017, the one-year funding cycle is seen as a challenge to planning and is viewed as an obstacle to the implementation of the Outcome Based Approach.

The Outcome Based Approach (OBA) which is being rolled out across all areas of public sector provision places demands on PCSPs that many within partnerships feel are beyond

their capacity to deliver. The OBA focuses on outputs as opposed to outcomes of interventions, with an emphasis on wider community impact. As an impact measurement tool, the OBA entails the development of an evaluation plan, with clear operationalized objectives, interim goals and outcome and output measures. The approach also requires tight monitoring of intervention delivery, formative and summative evaluation and the availability of relevant community level statistics to measure impact. The following have been presented as key challenges by members of PCSPs in respect of this model.

Lack of relevant expertise and training. Many PCSP members work in a voluntary capacity and do not have the relevant skills to undertake such rigorous and high-level intervention evaluation. Even with training, some expressed concern that the time and commitment entailed would be beyond that which most would be able and willing to give.

Nature of effective projects. Projects supported by PCSPs are often very small in scale, involving only low numbers of participants. This being the case it will be difficult to extrapolate wider community impact, and there is an associated risk that small scale focused projects will be dropped in favour of those that can be seen to make a demonstrable difference.

Availability of relevant statistics. As noted, statutory agencies often have a wider remit than that of the PCSP. Identifying, extracting and making available the relevant statistics will be onerous and complex. It is not currently clear how this can be managed.

Distraction from core activity. There is some concern that the OBA focus will concentrate resources on bureaucratic and administrative activity, when much of the strength of the PCSP relates to the ability of members to connect directly with the community and build confidence within it. The potential shift is seen by some as being detrimental in respect of the core aim of community engagement.

Opportunities

Sharing good practice

PCSPs tend to work in isolation and this is seen to mitigate against the potential to learn from good practice. There are currently no cross-PCSP forums and engagement between PCSPs is very limited. However, it is clear that initiatives that are known to work well in one

region could have applicability in other areas, and the sharing of good practice could help generate a more targeted approach to resource allocation. Examples of good practice shared at the conference included a scheme in mid-Ulster where young people who have become intoxicated during travel to an event are assisted and taken to a facility where their parents are called and asked to collect them. As a follow-up, the young people are required to undertake a drug-awareness course. Also shared was a project in Newry where different agencies work collaboratively to identify vulnerable individuals who are then referred to a 'Concern Hub'. Here statutory and other bodies can respond in a coordinated manner to meet their particular needs. Early intervention and wrap around support is seen as key to the success of this scheme.

Promoting the model

Current models for engaging with the public are proving challenging, and it remains the case that most people who come into contact with policing do so for negative reasons. Efforts to adopt a more proactive and preventative approach have been met with only a lukewarm response, with public meetings and other events often poorly attended. It was acknowledged by PCSP respondents that more should be done to encourage support for policing from local communities. Social media was suggested as an effective means of information sharing and there was evidence from some partnerships that the community is more willing to engage on policing issues in virtual space. Other suggestions included the importance of high profile individuals coming to local communities to sell the importance of local level engagement in reducing crime and making communities safer.

Community planning

The Community planning process now underway is considered to reduce the load currently carried by PCSPs, and should facilitate a more joined up approach to community policing. However, gaps remain and it is not always clear that there is consistency between the Programme for Government, community planning and the PCSP planning process.

Effective collaboration

There were also examples of effective collaborative relations between police and other agencies and an acknowledgement that in the absence of necessary resources, such relations are increasingly important.

> *In communities you know we have public meetings and a community can be quite animated. Now the other side of that is when everybody coalesces around the*

problem and you get the likes of ourselves and the police and maybe a voluntary organisation, you can get good things can happen but maybe it doesn't happen enough you know for the community. (Interview 3)

There has been a huge reduction in resources but due to that there has been more collaborative working between the statutory agencies and a better use of everyone's resources through that collaborative working, so if that's a positive thing… Because it's all very negative (Case Study 2)

There are a number of PACTs that have been established over in East Belfast and they are fairly new. I mean there were two PACTs many years ago that worked very, very well. I think there's a real opportunity here. You know what I mean? They say it takes a whole village to raise a child. There's a real opportunity for community and police and all the other statutory public bodies to come together and make something of that. Now, they're fairly new but I suppose for me it's not always just about the police. Those PACTs need to be supported by elected representatives, local community workers, and others as well. And I think, I mean, there is a real opportunity. I just don't want it all to be negative, negative, negative tonight. But there's a huge opportunity there to make those work but it's about everybody pulling together to make them work. (Case Study 2)

CHAPTER 6
Recommendations

Based upon specific recommendations provided by respondents, discussion with Independent members of the Northern Ireland Policing Board, and our own reading of the data we provide the following set of recommendations, and where appropriate potential implementation strategies, to improve the new PSNI local policing model to ensure that it is fit for purpose.

Return to previous model

The new model is seen as unsustainable and the consistent call was for a return to the former model of community policing where engagement with the community is the pervasive ethos, informing policing at all levels. The value of the former model was seen to include greater community confidence; good flow of information between police and community and higher levels of trust.

> *I think there needs to be greater emphasis on community engagement and building up relationships with the communities because for 5 or 6 years they were good at that and then somebody dropped the ball. (PCSP focus group 1)*

> *Better communication and approachability of police officers is needed in the new model. An improvement would be the return of community policing…We think we should agitate for that, as it is a key need …Why? Because it builds up that close relationship with people in villages and housing estates, and with that close relationship you get more confidence and you get a better flow of information because you build up that trust of confidentiality and people like to see a friendly face within their community that they can trust and approach quite readily, and that is a crying need, and we need that back. A small response team to deal with local issues, which ties into that…People need to effectively, be able to communicate. I think we need to look at ways to improve accessibility to the police, and the need for complete confidentiality. (Case Study 2)*

From a police perspective funding cuts to the organization significantly reduce capacity to offer the desired level and quality of neighbourhood policing and there is acknowledgement

that in the straightened fiscal circumstances that prevail, restructuring and the prioritization of objectives may have compromised the quality of provision at neighbourhood level. One obvious response is to lobby for additional resources.

> *I think that the PSNI need to come up with a capacity plan. I don't think it's good enough to be saying, we'll just have to prioritise with the resources we have. That won't work. It won't be good enough. We'll lose confidence. So there's other ways and other means we have… And maybe one is to get some money secured today and don't lose anyone (Case Study 4)*

Accepting that in a vacuum procuring additional funding will be difficult, preliminary recommendations include,

It is recommended that more comprehensive research is commissioned to assess the full and longer term impact of diminished neighbourhood policing.

We also recommend that consideration is given to adopting an alternative policing model (previously considered) that reprioritizes community based policing and seeks to deliver the majority of policing through a community centred and locality focused approach.

Continuous policing

It was noted by both police and community representatives that some of the issues with continuous policing, where the same officer or officers deal with an issue through from beginning to end, were less to do with restructuring in some cases than with high turnover of staff and levels of retirement. One practical solution is to fix employment periods for some posts. This relatively minor and internal adjustment has been applied to some extent within the organization and more widespread use of the approach, particularly in respect community facing positions could help assuage concerns that policing of local issues is piecemeal and inconsistent.

> *R: I mean with the high turnover of people we've had in the last number of years it's an unfortunate factor. The spinoff of that, it's very difficult… very difficult to meet, you know?*
> *I: How can you manage that difficulty?*

R: Well there is, there is posts for example, if somebody gets a post you must have a minimum commitment period of 12 months or 24 months or 36 months or whatever that may be. So there is sometimes a minimum commitment period for a particular post. So if you want to go for a beat officer you may be expected to have a minimum commitment period of 2 years or 3 years so that is in existence. How often that is paired off with a particular job role, I'm not sure. I don't know if it's every job role or just local police officers, I just don't know. That's one way I think the organisation has tried to address it. Or possibly if a man or woman gets promoted in a certain role, he or she is expected to stay in that role before they move on. I have heard of that before in the past and I know that it, you know, that people have been subject to that minimum commitment period so they haven't been able to move elsewhere. I think that the organisation have tried to address it that way. (Interview 5)

Preliminary recommendations include,

We recommend a review of internal HR structures with a view to adopting best practice with respect to retaining the same officer/officers in community facing positions for longer and more continuous employment periods. Such an approach should clearly be consistent with internal reward systems, so that such officers are not disadvantaged in respect of promotion and career enhancement.

Ethos and training

Almost without exception, interviewees spoke of the need to build relationships between police and community.

I think it's relational so not just responding to incidents but I think police have to be visible to give assurance. That's not patrolling in a car but maybe popping into a shop or pop into a community group, how you doing? But they also have to be responsive timely as well to give the community assurance (Interview 2)

Preliminary recommendations include,

We recommend that whatever model of policing is adopted going forward, the community dimension of policing should be ingrained and form a central tenet of

training programmes for new recruits and continuing professional development programmes.

We also recommend that commitment to community friendly policing is reflected in the organizational approach at all levels, such that it is writ large in communication and publicity, and is built into the measurement criteria for police effectiveness and other accountability structures.

Communication

The need for improved communication between the police, statutory agencies and the public is seen as critical, particularly in a context of reduced resources. Some interviewees referred to concern over duplication of practice/initiatives because there had not been information shared between police and other agencies; others referred to the need for data sharing on individuals/issues that could inform a more holistic and inter-agency approach to community safety and crime prevention issues.

Preliminary recommendations include,

We recommend a review of current communication policy and practice with a view to determining what constitutes information relevant for sharing and with whom should such information be shared to ensure best outcomes for crime prevention and resolution.

We also recommend that consideration is given to the most appropriate mechanisms for information sharing with different stakeholder groups including, other statutory agencies, relevant community/voluntary sector organizations, and the general public.

Sharing good practice

Police and community interviewees stressed the need for the sharing of good practice to mitigate wasteful use of resources and duplication of effort and to distil what works best.

> *We can see the work that is done in South Armagh there a few pilots come from there, that's basically what everybody else is trying to achieve. (Case Study 2)*

I: Sharing of best practice?

R: Correct. Correct. And how they went about it. Who do we involve? And you know, the practical things about how do we deal with that task and how do we bring the community in? Do we consult with the community? You know problem solving, you know, regardless of what model you are using, and the PSNI have a particular model, but regardless of what model you are using, it's all about communication and listening to people and reviewing and gathering information and assessing and actioning and reassessing and… You know, so there's different models out there but you know what? The PSNI don't have the answers on their own. We can't do it on our own. And we need, we really do need our partners to step up to the mark and we need our leadership to use their influence to make that happen. (Case Study 2)

Related to this point, it was noted by a number of interviewees that relatively inexpensive initiatives can yield disproportionately positive outcomes

GR1: They used to have money a community engagement budget. That has gone. And that was really… It was a really small pot of monies but it did a lot.

GR2: But it was really good to hear back saying in the communities that historically didn't engage with the police but you know that was that foot in the door and get in and start building relationships and they don't even have that now. If they did have it, they don't seem to have the resource or appetite to go in and start building those relationships. (PCSP focus group 1)

Preliminary recommendations include,

We recommend that a forum or platform for establishing and sharing best practice should be established, where effective practice can be determined, catalogued, and easily accessed.

We also recommend that consideration is given to reviewing current communications strategies to ensure they are fit for purpose in respect of all intended beneficiary groups.

More effective use of resources

From a police perspective the more economic and efficient use of resources across the statutory and community/voluntary sector is critical, as the police who for many years often took the lead in dealing with challenging issues in local communities, no longer have the resources to do this. A number of examples of inappropriate or wasteful use of police time were provided, alongside assessments of how other agencies could help mitigate some of the problems that divert police resources from more effective community engagement.

> *R: We gotta get, we gotta get smarter with the partners as well. Not necessarily PSNI but partners have got to come on board.*
> *I: Do you mean community groups?*
> *R: Not necessarily community groups. Partners such as Health Trust, Public Trust Agency, with regards to missing persons, children's homes (Interview 5)*

> *When there's less funding there's all these meetings, all these talking shops, with the housing executive and other bodies, but why not do something more proactive. Say we've 5% of the funding, you have 5% of the funding and do it… Outreach work for example… (Case Study 3)*

Preliminary recommendations include,

We recommend that consideration is given to how limited resources can best be maximized where different organisations are involved in problem identification, operational response and resolution.

We also recommend that guidelines as to the potential for and limits of police engagement with other organisations are produced and disseminated

Police morale

The issue of police morale was raised by a number of interviewees, who were understanding that the changes have also been frustrating for officers, many of whom are clearly dedicated to community policing and as a consequence of the changes felt less able to offer the quality of service they understood was needed. The sense from both community and police interviewees is that the organization is under considerable pressure and that current levels

of resourcing are inconsistent with delivery expectations. A number of interviewees mentioned that pressure to deliver a new model that has had such a negative public response is affecting the well-being of some officers and that morale within the police is currently at a low ebb.

Preliminary recommendation includes,

We recommend that research is undertaken to determine levels of police morale and the issues that are most affecting well-being.

References

Bullock, K., & Leeney, D. (2013). Participation, 'responsibility' and accountability in neighbourhood policing. *Criminology and Criminal Justice, 13*(2), 199-214.

Gill, C.E., Weisburd, D., Bennett, T.H., & Telep, C. (2014). *Community-oriented policing to reduce crime, disorder, and fear and increase legitimacy and citizen satisfaction in neighbourhoods: a systematic review paper* presented at The ASC Annual Meeting. Washington Hilton, Washington, DC.

Gill, C., Weisburd, D., Telep, C. W., Vitter, Z., & Bennett, T. (2014). Community-oriented policing to reduce crime, disorder and fear and increase satisfaction and legitimacy among citizens: a systematic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *10*(4), 399-428.

Home Office (2004). Building Communities, Beating Crime: A better police service for the 21st century. (Cmnd. 6360). London: The Stationery Office.

Innes, M. (2007). The reassurance function. *Policing, 1*(2), 132-141.

Innes, M., & Fielding, N. (2002). From community to communicative policing: 'Signal crimes' and the problem of public reassurance. *Sociological Research Online, 7*(2).

Jannson, K. (2006). British Crime Survey: Measuring Crime for 25 years. London: Home Office.

Karn, J. (2013). *Policing and crime reduction: The evidence and its implications for practice*. London: The Police Foundation.

Kempa, M., & Shearing, C. (2005). *Post-Patten reflections on Patten*. Public lecture, 8 June, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, UK.

Lloyd, K., & Foster, J. (2009). Citizen focus and community engagement: A review of the literature. London: The Police Foundation.

Longstaff, A., Willer, J., Chapman, J., Csarnomski, S., & Graham, J. (2015). Neighbourhood policing: Past, present and future. London: The Police Foundation.

Lord Scarman (1981). The Brixton disorders. London: HMSO.

Mason, M. (2009). *Findings from the second year of the national Neighbourhood Policing Programme evaluation. Home Office Research Report 14: Key Implications*. London: Home Office.

Morash, M., & Ford, J.K. (eds.) (2002). *The move to community policing: Making change happen.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Morris, J. (2006). *The National Reassurance Policing Programme: A ten-site evaluation (findings 273)*. London: Home Office.

Mulcahy, A. (2006). *Policing Northern Ireland: Conflict, Legitimacy and Reform*. Willan.

Myhill, A., & Rudat, K. (2006). *Community engagement in policing: Case Study evaluation of a demonstration project in Chesire.* London: Home Office.

Patten Report (1999). *A new beginning: Policing in Northern Ireland: The report of the Independent Commission on Policing for Northern Ireland.* Belfast: Independent Commission on Policing for Northern Ireland.

Quinton, P., & Morris, J. (2008). Neighbourhood policing: The impact of the National Reassurance Policing Programme. *Policing, 1*(2), 149-160.

Savage, S.P. (2007). Neighbourhood policing and the reinvention of the constable. *Policing, 1*(2), 203-213.

Sherman, L., & Eck, J. (2002). Policing for crime prevention. In D. Farrington, D., MacKenzie, L. Sherman, & B. Welsh (Eds.), *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises.* London: Sage.

Skogan, W. (1998). The police and the public. In H. Schwind, E. Kube, & H. Kuhune (Eds.), *Festschrift fűr Hans Joachim Schneider.* Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Skogan, W. (2006). Asymmetry in the impact of encounters with police. *Policing and Society, 16*(2), 99-126.

Stewart, D. W., & Shamdasani, P. N. (2014). *Focus groups: Theory and practice* (Vol. 20). Sage publications.

Sussman, S., Burton, D., Dent, C. W., Stacy, A. W., & Flay, B. R. (1991). Use of focus groups in developing an adolescent tobacco use cessation program: collective norm effects. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21*(21), 1772-1782.

Topping, J. (2008). Community policing in Northern Ireland: A resistance narrative. Policing & Society, 18(4), 377-396.

Tuffin, R., Morris, J., & Poole, A. (2006). *An evaluation of the impact of the National Reassurance Policing Programme. Home Office Research Study 296.* London: Home Office.

Turley, C., Ranns, H., Callanan, M., Blackwell, A., & Newburn, T. (2012). *Delivering neighbourhood policing in partnership. Research report 61.* London: Home Office.

Weisburd, D., & Eck, J. (2004). What can police do to reduce crime, disorder, and fear?. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 593*(1), 42-65.

Weisburd, D., & McElroy, J. (1988). Enacting the CPO role: Findings from the New York City Pilot Program in Community Policing. In J. Greene & S. Mastroski (Eds.), *Community based policing: Rhetoric or reality?* (pp. 89 – 101). New York: Praeger.

Appendix I

Interview/Focus Group Protocol

Introductions

- Researcher and research objectives
- Explain the focus group and what we'll be looking at
- Explain use of audio recorder
- Explain confidentiality and reporting procedures
- Any questions before starting?

Questions

- What has been your experience with the new local policing model?
- What impact has the new policing model had on the local community?
- How does the current model compare with previous local policing arrangements?
- What recommendations would you make for change to the model so that it better meets your needs and the needs of this community?

Appendix II

Neighbourhood Watch Questionnaire

Experiences of the Local Policing Model

The Centre for Shared Education has recently been awarded a tender from the Northern Ireland Policing Board to undertake research on experiences of the new PSNI local policing model. In doing so, they seek,

"To gain an understanding of the impact that the changes to local policing have had within a sample of communities across Northern Ireland since its implementation, and how this compares to the arrangements in place prior to August 2015."

It is our aim to provide as representative a picture as possible of community experience with the new model to the Northern Ireland Policing Board by conducting a series of interviews with key stakeholders and local community representatives and leaders, as well as conducting a series of focus groups with community members in differing local districts. As a member of a Neighbourhood Watch, we feel that the unique insights that you can offer will be invaluable. Before you decide, please read the following information about the project and your potential role.

What will participation involve?
If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete the following questionnaire which asks a number of questions about your views on the new model, what you feel that the impact of the model has had on the local community, and how the new model compares to previous models. It is anticipated that the questionnaire will take approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete.

How will the information be stored?
If you agree to participate, the questionnaire you will complete will be stored in a secure, locked filing cabinet at Queen's University. Only the researchers will have access to this. The questionnaire is completely anonymous so your name will **not** be used in any reports that are written and published about the research, **but the name of your organisation may be listed** in the published report as one of the organisations which was involved with the consultation. In accordance with Queen's University policy all materials will be held for a period of no less than 5 years and then destroyed.

What will happen with the information?
The findings of this research will be reported in several ways. The final report and verbal presentation will be given to Northern Ireland Policing Board at the end of August 2017. Also, data gathered from the project may be analysed following the consultation for presentation and publication in academic conferences and journals.

Are there any risks?
We will take whatever steps are necessary to ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of those who take part in the research – this means we will not tell anyone you have

participated and we will remove your name from all reports and raw data. To disguise each person's identity, we may combine your responses with other people's responses so that bigger ideas and issues are reported to the Northern Ireland Policing Board. However, you should be aware that the names of organisations which have agreed to participate will be listed in the final report in the interest of transparency.

You should know, however, if you do discuss illegal activity or issues of child protection we are obligated to report them to the designated officer in your organisation. To make sure we are keeping everyone's information safe, this research project was reviewed and approved by the School of Social Sciences, Education and Social Work's ethics committee.

What are the benefits of taking part?
It is important that the Northern Ireland Policing Board understands local experiences with the new policing model and whether or not the model has had the intended impact that was anticipated. By taking part in this research you will be doing just that. It is also hoped that you would find the questionnaire to be an enjoyable opportunity to express your opinions and share your experiences and knowledge relating to community-police relationships.

Voluntary participation and right to withdraw
Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You are free to refuse to participate. The decision to participate, or not, will bring no negative consequences to you or impact your relationship with the researchers, Queen's University, the PSNI or the Northern Ireland Policing Board. Please be aware that the research team has **not** been provided with any of your details. Further, the questionnaire does not ask for you to provide information that may reveal your personal identity. As such, we cannot remove your information after you have participated.

Contact details
If you have any further questions about the study or about what your involvement might require, please do not hesitate to contact Danielle Blaylock via phone, email, or the postal address below:

Dr Danielle Blaylock
d.blaylock@qub.ac.uk
Queen's University Belfast, School of Social Sciences, Education and Social Work
Centre for Shared Education, 20 College Green, Belfast BT7 1NN

As part of the Review of Public Administration which came into effect on 1 April 2015 there are now 11 Policing Districts within which each Local Policing Team is embedded.

What policing district is your Neighbourhood Watch located and who is your Local Policing Team? (Please circle both your district and your local policing team)

DISTRICT	LOCAL POLICING TEAM			
ANTRIM & NEWTOWNABBEY	Antrim	Newtownabbey		
ARDS & NORTH DOWN	Newtownards			
ARMAGH CITY, BANBRIDGE & CRAIGAVON	Armagh	Lurgan		
BELFAST CITY	Lisburn Road	Strandtown	Tennet Street	Woodbourne
CAUSEWAY COAST & GLENS	Coleraine	Limavady		
DERRY CITY & STRABANE	Strabane	Strand Road		
FERMANAGH & OMAGH	Enniskillen	Lisnaskea	Omagh	
LISBURN & CASTLEREAGH	Lisburn and Castlereagh			
MID & EAST ANTRIM	Ballymena	Larne		
MID ULSTER	Dungannon	Magherafelt		
NEWRY MOURNE & DOWN	Crossmaglen	Downpatrick	Newry	Newtownhamilton

When did you first become involved in your local Neighbourhood Watch? _____

Has your Neighbourhood Watch communicated with or interacted with a member of your local policing team?

      YES   NO   I'm not sure

Has a member of your local policing team been invited to a meeting with your Neighbourhood Watch?

      YES   NO   I'm not sure

If yes, how many meetings have they attended? _____

Are you aware that the local policing model changed in 2015?

      YES   NO   I'm not sure

If yes…

In your opinion, what are three _positive_ aspects of the new local policing model?

1. _____
   _____
2. _____
   _____
3. _____
   _____

In your opinion, what are three _negative_ aspects of the new local policing model?

1. _____
   _____
2. _____
   _____
3. _____
   _____

Overall, what has been your personal experience with the new local policing model?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

In your opinion, what impact has the new policing model had on the local community?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

In your opinion, how does the current model compare with previous local policing arrangements?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

DEMOGRAPHICS

Finally, we would like you to answer a few background questions about yourself. These enable us to check that we have obtained a proper cross section of the Northern Ireland public. They also allow researchers to analyse whether there are differences in attitude between different groups of people.

What is your gender? (Please circle your response)

MALE   FEMALE   OTHER   Prefer not to say

What is your age? _____

What ethnic group do you belong to? (Please circle all that apply)

WHITE   IRISH TRAVELLER   INDIAN   PAKISTANI   BANGLADESHI   CHINESE

AFRICAN   CARIBBEAN   ARAB   Prefer not to say   OTHER *please describe* _____

What is your community background? (Please circle your response)

CATHOLIC COMMUNITY   PROTESTANT COMMUNITY   OTHER   Prefer not to say

Thank you so much for your help!

Your insights are incredibly valuable and we appreciate your time. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us by email at d.blaylock@qub.ac.uk or by phone 028 9097 3264.

Northern Ireland Policing Board

Waterside Tower
31 Clarendon Road
Clarendon Dock
Belfast BT1 3BG

028 9040 8500

information@nipolicingboard.org.uk

www.nipolicingboard.org.uk

policingboard

@nipolicingboard

nipolicingboard

Northernirelandpolicingboard