Modernising Neighbourhood Policing
Guidelines for consultation
Foreword

The Policing Vision 2025 describes how the link between the police and the public will continue to form the bedrock of British policing. The defining features of neighbourhood policing can be traced back to the Peelian principles; the emphasis on prevention and the recognition that the police are part of the community and that their power depends on public approval, are as important today as they were at the inception of the police service. There have been different approaches to neighbourhood policing, and, on occasion, different names, however, connection to the original foundations has remained throughout.

Previous guidelines were based upon the National Reassurance and National Neighbourhood Policing programmes and supported by substantial investment in dedicated neighbourhood resources. The focus was on establishing public priorities to reduce crime and the fear of crime and improve public confidence in the police, recognising the importance of this for maintaining police legitimacy.

The context now is different. Demand on policing services continues to escalate at a time of decreasing resources, particularly those dedicated to local roles, strengthening the need to find sustainable system-wide solutions across public services. Increased reporting of crime committed in private spaces, often against the most vulnerable in our communities, coupled with new and emerging threats means that the day-to-day activities of neighbourhood policing teams have changed dramatically. At the same time, they are using new technologies to engage communities and solve crime and strengthen partnerships, for example, around mental health and social care.

When implemented effectively, the benefit of neighbourhood policing, whether directed at geographic communities or communities that share an interest, include:

- A flow of vital community intelligence on a range of issues, from neighbourhood to national security
- Promoting community safety, and feelings of safety
- Prevention of crime and disorder
- Protecting the vulnerable and reducing repeat demands
- The opportunity to create resilient communities less reliant on police support
- The legitimacy necessary to enable policing by consent.

In its 2016 Police Effectiveness Report, Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue (HMICFRS) raised concerns that local policing had been eroded and that many forces had failed to redefine “neighbourhood policing in the context of reduced budgets and changing demand. These guidelines have been developed to directly address that concern. While they do not cover force structures and neighbourhood policing resources, as these are matters for chief constables and police and crime commissioners, they do provide an evidence base, supported with practical examples, to assist forces in designing and implementing a modern neighbourhood policing function to get the best from local investment.

In developing these guidelines, we sifted over 1,600 studies for relevance and quality, supplemented with a call for practice evidence which received over 200 responses from forces and local partnerships. Their development was overseen by a guideline committee of frontline practitioners and subject matter experts, who shared their experiences and views to augment the research material. This is, however, just the starting point. While the guidelines are based on the best available current evidence, we intend to develop a comprehensive set of in-practice examples to enable forces to identify how the guideline principles are being used to practical effect. In addition, where there is an absence of evidence for newly emerging neighbourhood policing practice, we will work with forces to fill that gap.

Neighbourhood policing remains an essential element of modern policing. These guidelines focus on enabling the whole of the policing system to operate and ensuring forces have the best available evidence on which to implement it effectively.

DCC Gavin Stephens
Guideline committee chair and NPCC lead for neighbourhood policing
Summary of guidelines

A guideline committee—consisting of frontline practitioners and subject matter experts—has, with the support from the College of Policing, developed seven guidelines on implementing effective neighbourhood policing.

The guidelines cover the following areas:
1. Fostering the right culture
2. Engaging communities
3. Building analytical capability
4. Solving problems
5. Targeting activity
6. Developing officers and staff
7. Developing and sharing learning.

The guidelines are informed by the best available evidence, be that practitioner knowledge and experience and/or social research. Ratings indicate the overall strength of research evidence (1) underpinning each guideline, and the availability of practice-based evidence (2).

The main body of the guidance presents summaries of the research evidence on effectiveness and details on how the guidance was developed.

---

1. **Fostering the right culture**
   - **Chief officers** should foster an organisational culture in which all police encounters with the public demonstrate procedural justice in order to encourage people to support and participate in problem solving.
   - Procedural justice involves:
     - giving people a chance to tell their side of the story and listening
     - making impartial decisions and explaining how they were reached
     - being open and honest
     - treating people with dignity and respect.

2. **Engaging communities**
   - **Chief officers** should ensure neighbourhood policing is built on effective engagement with communities.
   - Effective community engagement:
     - requires a clear, defensible and transparent purpose
     - is regular and consists of both formal and informal contact
     - should use methods that are tailored according to communities’ needs and preferences, not just meetings and surgeries
     - enables the police to develop a better understanding of communities and their needs, risks and threats
     - should inform local problem-solving activity by the police and their partners
     - provides an ongoing mutual exchange of information, including feedback on police and partner activity.

3. **Building analytical capability**
   - **Chief officers** should ensure there is sufficient analytical capability and analytical capacity and capability necessary for problem solving.
   - This should include:
     - having and making available the appropriate analytical tools
     - providing access to skilled analysts
     - building relationships and processes to share data and analysis between police and partners
     - supporting dissemination of good practice in force, across the service and with partners.

4. **Solving problems**
   - **Chief officers** should ensure officers and staff use problem-solving techniques to deal with locally identified priorities.
   - Effective problem-solving in policing requires:
     - officers and staff to adopt a structured approach and systematically use recognised problem-solving methods (e.g., SARA)
     - chief officers to support, enable and resource this approach and foster local partnerships
     - local communities to be involved in identifying priorities, helping to understand their nature, extent and causes, taking action against those problems, and/or assessing the action has helped
     - detailed problem specification based on multiple sources of information.

---

Evidence base:

- Good
- Moderate
- Limited

See page 9
See page 10
See page 11

continued
### 4 continued

- Use of evidence-based, innovative and targeted responses that tackle the underlying causes of a problem, and not just enforcement.
- Integration with other parts of the force to support delivery.
- The support of partner organisations by sharing data and delivering responses.

**Evidence base**

- **Good**
- **Moderate**
- **Limited**

See page 12

### 5 Targeting activity

Chief officers should ensure policing activity is targeted towards the people and places with the greatest needs based on an assessment of threat, risk, harm and vulnerability. This assessment should:

- Inform resource deployment/decisions
- Enable greater focus in community engagement and problem solving
- Reduce duplication between partners
- Enable the police and partners to take an evidence-based approach to targeting early interventions aimed at prevention.

**Evidence base**

- **Good**
- **Moderate**
- **Limited**

See page 13

### 6 Developing officers and staff

Chief officers should work with the College of Policing to ensure that the appropriate officers and staff receive learning and continuing professional development on the areas identified in these guidelines. This will ensure their development is evidence-based and in line with the modern demands of neighbourhood policing. The learning should include:

- **Procedural justice**
- **Community engagement**
- **Partnership working**
- **Problem solving.**

**Evidence base**

- **Good**
- **Moderate**
- **Limited**

See page 14

### 7 Developing and sharing learning

The College of Policing should work with forces and the NPCC, APCC and HMICFRS to identify, support the evaluation of, and disseminate learning about:

- The role of neighbourhood policing in preventing the exploitation of vulnerable people or groups.
- Identifying those people and places with the greatest needs based on threat, harm, risk and vulnerability.
- How social media can support local outcomes, including enhancing visibility and assisting community engagement.
- How neighbourhood policing can make communities stronger and more cohesive.

**Evidence base**

- **Evidence gap**

See page 15
Introduction

What is this guidance for?
The guidance sets out the best way to implement neighbourhood policing. It specifically focuses on activities and processes most likely to be effective at:

- improving community safety
- reducing crime, disorder and harm
- improving public perceptions
- building stronger ties within communities.

What does the guidance include?
The guidance will also include supporting ‘in practice’ materials to bring the guidelines to life. These resources will consist of case studies, practitioner advice, and example tools and templates, which will be developed from submissions to a call for practice, practitioners’ knowledge and experience, and research on implementation issues. An indication of the type of supporting information to be included in the guidance is presented in the Annex to Modernising Neighbourhood Policing: Planned ‘in-practice’ material.

Who is this guidance for?
The guidelines are specifically aimed at chief officers responsible for setting the strategy for neighbourhood policing because of their strategic focus. They will also be relevant to all police officers and staff involved in supporting its implementation and delivery as they refer to effective practice. The in practice materials in the guidance will be especially relevant to practitioners as they will draw out the implications for policing practice.

The guidance may also be relevant to local authorities and other statutory partners as well as voluntary organisations and local community groups which support community safety.

How strong is the evidence underpinning the guidance?
The guidelines are informed by reviews of the research evidence, supplemented by practitioner knowledge and experience. In addition to the evidence rating given to each guideline, the type of research included in the evidence summaries has been clearly labelled:

- evidence from systematic reviews – exhaustive reviews of quantitative studies – selected for their relevance and methods – that make overall assessments of what worked in a range of contexts.
- evidence from rapid evidence assessments – time-limited reviews of studies – selected for their relevance and methods – that provide general overviews of the literature on impact and implementation issues.
- evidence from impact evaluations – quantitative studies that make assessments of what worked in particular contexts.
- evidence from other research – studies that provide insights on implementation or other issues in particular contexts.

Defining neighbourhood policing

The following definition describes neighbourhood policing in the current context.

The defining features of the current generation of neighbourhood policing are:

- a relationship with our communities that builds trust and confidence
- a connection that links our communities directly and seamlessly to specialist policing services, at local, regional and national level
- engagement in two-way dialogue with communities in order to identify opportunities to intervene early to:
  - protect local neighbourhoods, communities and individual people
  - safeguard the vulnerable
  - manage or divert offenders
- integrated working with the public, third sector, and public and private sector partnerships to deliver collaborative problem solving and targeted early interventions aimed at prevention
- using evidence-based practice to have a sustained impact on harm, repeat demand and community resilience.

The focus of this definition ensures that neighbourhood policing helps tackle changing and rising demand and is informed by reviews of the international evidence on neighbourhood policing, community-engagement, problem solving and targeted policing.

This approach is directly in support of the Policing Vision 2025. Levels of investment and organisational structures are matters for police and crime commissioners and chief constables but, in order for neighbourhood policing to be effective, it must be supported by active political and operational leadership at senior levels.

Sharing data between different agencies and sectors is essential for risks and problems to be identified and understood, and for effective decision-making and action at the neighbourhood level. Analytical support to define problems with precision, help target action and assess its effect is important in ensuring effort is not wasted on ineffective solutions. There is also a need to ensure sufficient capacity, capability and continuity of resource – in line with agreed priorities and needs – to enable forming productive and trusting relationships.
Overall evidence on neighbourhood policing

There is good evidence in support of neighbourhood policing as an overarching strategy. It is also highly adaptable and can be combined with other crime reduction strategies, such as hotspots policing.

Overall, neighbourhood policing has been shown to reduce public perceptions of disorder, improve feelings of safety, increase trust and confidence in the police, and increase the perceived legitimacy of the police in a range of contexts. Individual impact evaluations also show that neighbourhood policing can reduce crime in particular contexts and can have a sustained impact on a range of outcomes over time.

The effective elements of neighbourhood policing can also be identified from these studies, such as:

- delivering targeted foot patrol, community engagement and problem solving in combination at a local level
- community and partner involvement in problem solving
- strong governance, accountability and support processes help maintain a focus on delivery and address known problems with implementation.

There can be significant challenges with implementing neighbourhood policing at scale (eg in all areas of a force) and over time, particularly the community engagement and problem solving elements. Given these challenges, it might be better – at least initially – to focus implementation in priority neighbourhoods. However, sustainability is likely to require wider organisational change so that other departments support neighbourhood policing.

Successful implementation requires the ongoing commitment and visible support of chief officers and other senior leaders, as well as buy-in from supervisors. There is a need for them to ensure that neighbourhood policing is not inadvertently undermined by other priorities and processes.

This extends to:

- defining the aims of neighbourhood policing locally
- clarifying the roles and responsibilities of officers and staff
- ensuring the right balance is struck between response and neighbourhood policing, such as in performance frameworks and tasking processes.

Chief officers should foster an organisational culture in which all police encounters with the public demonstrate procedural justice in order to encourage people to support and participate in problem solving.

Procedural justice involves officers and staff

- giving people a chance to tell their side of the story and listening
- making impartial decisions and explaining how they were reached
- being open and honest
- treating people with dignity and respect.

Evidence base

- Overall, police interventions that adopt elements of procedural justice – like neighbourhood policing – can improve public trust in the police and increase public participation in policing.

- People who perceive the police to be fair are more likely to see the police as legitimate and, as a result, report crime and suspicious activity, provide information and not break the law.

- This relationship has been shown to extend to:
  - increased support for counter-terrorism policing
  - reduced support for using violence to solve personal goals.

- Informal public initiated contact with the police can have a small, positive effect on trust if the experience is good. Bad experiences tend to have a large, negative effect on trust.
  - police efforts to increase informal contact with young people can have a positive impact on their willingness to help the police.
  - foot patrol – without community engagement, problem solving and perceived police fairness – is unlikely to lead to improvements in public trust.
the police.
Engaging communities

Chief officers should ensure neighbourhood policing is built on effective engagement with communities.

Effective community engagement:
- requires a clearly-defined and transparent purpose
- is regular and consists of both formal and informal contact
- should use methods tailored according to communities’ needs and preferences, not just meetings and surgeries
- enables the police to develop a better understanding of communities and their needs, risks and threats
- should inform local problem-solving activity by the police and their partners
- provides an ongoing mutual exchange of information, including feedback on police and partner activity.

Evidence base
- Overall, the police collaborating with the public for the purposes of problem solving can reduce perceived disorder, improve feelings of safety, and increase trust and perceived legitimacy in the police.
- Community engagement in policing may have a positive impact on crime and disorder.
- Community engagement reduced criminal victimisation and disorder, improved feelings of safety, increased trust and improved public perceptions of policing when implemented with targeted foot patrol and problem solving in ward-level pilots.
- Non-traditional, more proactive methods of engagement designed to reach a broad cross section of the community (e.g., planning events, open forums, door knocking) may lead to improved public perceptions.
- Public involvement through beat meetings to help focus the police’s problem-solving activities was a key feature of the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy, which was linked to reduced crime and improved public perceptions over a 10-year period.

Chief officers should ensure there is sufficient analytical capacity and capability necessary for problem solving.

This should include:
- having and making available the appropriate analytical tools
- providing access to skilled analysts
- building relationships and processes to share data and analysis between police and partners
- supporting the dissemination of good practice in force, across the service and with partners.

Evidence base
- ‘Shallow’ problem solving that lacks the systematic application of the SARA model—which links action to a detailed understanding of the problem—may explain why, overall, community policing has not been found to reduce crime across a range of contexts.
- The evaluation of the National Reassurance Policing Programme shows that pilot sites were more effective when the response to problems was tailored as a result of a very detailed problem definition based on multiple sources of information.
Solving problems

Chief officers should ensure officers and staff use problem solving to deal with locally-identified priorities.

Effective problem solving in neighbourhood policing requires:

- Officers and staff to adopt a structured approach and systematically use recognised problem-solving methods (e.g., SARA)
- Chief officers to support, enable and resource this approach and foster local partnerships
- Local communities to be involved in identifying priorities, helping to understand their nature, extent and causes, taking action against those problems and/or assessing what action has helped
- Integration with other parts of the force to support delivery
- The support of partner organisations by sharing data and delivering responses
- Detailed problem specification based on multiple sources of information
- Use of evidence-based, innovative and targeted responses that tackle the underlying causes of a problem
- Use a range of responses and not just enforcement.

Evidence base

Using a structured process to understand and tackle the root causes of local problems, the police can reduce crime and disorder overall and in a diversity of situations. n n n
- Problem solving in hotspots was more effective than increased police presence in hotspots at reducing crime. n n n
- Community problem solving was more effective than aggressive enforcement when policing disorder. n n n
- While targeted police presence can reduce crime in the short-term, problem solving can have a much larger impact in the longer term. n

The public’s involvement in identifying and defining the problems has been identified as a key element of successful neighbourhood policing programmes. n
- The quality of problem solving may be related to improved outcomes. n

Targeting activity

Chief officers should ensure policing activity is targeted towards the people and places with the greatest needs based on an assessment of threat, risk, harm and vulnerability.

This assessment should:

- Inform resource deployment decisions
- Enable greater focus in community engagement and problem solving
- Reduce duplication between partners
- Enable the police and partners to take an evidence-based approach to targeting early interventions aimed at prevention.

Evidence base

Overall, the police targeting of crime hotspots can reduce crime and has tended to result in crime reduction benefit in neighbouring areas rather than crime displacement. n n n
- Problem solving has been shown to be more effective when focused on particular crime types rather than total crime. n n n
- Multi-faceted police-led programmes focused on deterring high-risk offenders through targeted enforcement, awareness raising and provision of alternative pathways, can be effective at reducing serious crime. n n n
- Police-led programmes to deter high-risk offenders used analysis to effectively identify the highest risk neighbourhoods and offenders to target and tailor strategies towards their specific needs. There may also be a relationship between the intensity of implementation and outcomes. n

Neighbourhood policing may have had a large, positive impact on public trust in the police, in part, because community involvement in problem solving meant the police were able to target the problems that mattered the most to the public. n
- Targeted foot patrol is more likely than random or vehicle patrol to have a positive impact on public perception, especially when implemented alongside community engagement and problem solving. n
Chief officers should work with the College of Policing to ensure that the appropriate officers and staff receive learning and continuing professional development on the areas identified in these guidelines. This will ensure their development is evidence-based and in line with the modern definition of neighbourhood policing.

The learning should include, but not be limited to:
- procedural justice
- community engagement
- partnership working
- problem solving.

Evidence base
- Training can have a positive impact on knowledge, attitude and behaviour.
- Training integrated into routine practice is likely to have more of an impact than traditional classroom training on behaviour.

The College of Policing should work with forces and the NPCC, APCC and HMICFRS to identify, support the evaluation of, and disseminate learning about:
- the role of neighbourhood policing in preventing the exploitation of vulnerable people or groups
- identifying those people and places with the greatest needs based on threat, harm, risk and vulnerability
- how social media can support local outcomes, including enhancing visibility and assisting community engagement
- how neighbourhood policing can make communities stronger and more cohesive.

Evidence base
The specific areas covered in this guideline were all identified as gaps in the research evidence.
Development process

How the guidelines were developed

The guidelines were developed by a guideline committee, which followed a process recently piloted by the College. This process involves bringing together an independent committee of practitioners and subject matter experts who collectively review the best available evidence and agree whether any guidelines for policing practice can and should be made. The committee was presented with summaries of the research evidence, plus overviews of submissions to a call for practice and the initial results from focus groups with practitioners.

Research evidence review

What is a rapid evidence assessment?

A rapid evidence assessment (REA) uses transparent, structured and systematic processes to search for, sift and bring together research on a particular topic. These processes should help reduce bias and enable others to replicate the review. An REA is not an exhaustive summary of the literature as limits are placed on the review process in order to deliver results rapidly. While REAs are typically used to review quantitative studies, they can also be used with other types of research. REAs are able to identify relevant evidence that can be used to support decision-making and practice, as well as highlight any gaps in the evidence base.

Review questions

The research evidence underpinning the guidelines was identified through two REAs on neighbourhood policing and related policing strategies. They sought to answer the following questions:

1. What constitutes effective neighbourhood policing?
2. What acts as a facilitator or barrier to the successful implementation of neighbourhood policing?

Review process

The REAs both followed the process outlined in the figure below.

1. Draft the REA protocol setting out the scope of the review and the procedures to be following (e.g., the search terms and inclusion criteria to be used)
2. Search literature databases using the search terms plus approach international academic experts for recommendations and check relevant websites
3. Screen abstracts of all the identified studies and reject any that do not meet the inclusion criteria
4. Screen the remaining studies again, this time applying the inclusion criteria to the full paper
5. Extract key information from each study such as research methods and findings
6. Synthesise information from the studies into summary evidence tables
7. Present the summary evidence tables to the guideline committee for review, discussion and inform the drafting of the recommendations

Evidence flow

The figure below shows the flow of studies through the different stages of the review process. Both REAs are presented together, although they were carried out separately, besides some transfer of studies between the two.

The full references of the studies included in the reviews are available on request.
Development process

Evidence rating
Each guideline has been given an overall evidence rating. The purpose of the subjective rating is to give some indication of the type, relevance and consistency of the evidence underpinning the guideline. The research evidence for a guideline was rated as ‘good’ if it was informed by a combination of systematic reviews and primary research studies, and as ‘moderate’ if systematic review evidence was not available.

Practice evidence review
The College carried out a call for police practice to identify current force approaches and practical examples of neighbourhood policing in order to build on the evidence-base underpinning the guidelines and, in the final guidance, share practice across the police service. The call for practice specifically sought examples of the following:
- a policing or partnership initiative or intervention
- a problem-solving technique that has been applied to a local policing issue
- a summary of local practice
- a project or evaluation
- training or continuing professional development.

In addition to the call for practice, two 10,000 Volts (10KV) focus groups were carried out in November 2017. 10KV is a web-based debriefing tool that has been used to debrief over 300 operational incidents. Participants use tablets to contribute anonymously to an online discussion, usually responding to a series of pre-set questions. All responses are recorded and analysed to understand any common themes or key issues raised.

The 10KV focus groups aimed to develop an understanding of the contribution of neighbourhood policing and the impact it has made to counter-terrorism in order to fill an expected gap in the research evidence. The focus groups – which included counter terrorism specialists and neighbourhood officers in separate sessions – discussed the current contribution of neighbourhood policing, barriers and facilitators and areas of good practice. Where appropriate, the outcomes from the 10KV groups will be woven into the practice examples included in the final guidance.

Further 10KV focus groups will be used to draw out practitioner knowledge and experience under each of the guidelines.
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Annex to Modernising Neighbourhood Policing

Planned ‘in practice’ material

This annex contains supporting materials that may be included in the full guidance to help officers and staff put the guidelines into practice.

The following indicates the type of material that is being developed.
1. Fostering the right culture...

For this particular guideline, the supporting material might include:

- an example of explaining high-impact police tactics to communities
- community involvement specifically in relation to enforcement (e.g., listening and responding to public concerns and explaining ‘why’)
- participation in problem solving by people from socially-excluded groups
- learning and development in procedural justice.

In addition, the research evidence on implementation issues will be developed and expanded, and implications for practice drawn out in full.

### Evidence on key implementation issues

- **Sustainability** – There is a need to maintain a focus on implementation because public confidence in the police is likely to decline if people think that police fairness, foot patrol, community engagement and/or problem solving is getting worse.

- **Public mistrust** – More time and energy may have to be invested with vulnerable people or people who lack trust in the police to improve their perceptions. Historical mistrust can prevent some groups from wanting to engage with the police, but officers and staff may be able to break down barriers by demonstrating procedural justice. There is a risk, however, that people who already think the police are fair, will respond better to police efforts than those who think the police are unfair.

- **Officer resistance** – There is a need to address the perception that some officers and staff think that neighbourhood policing is ‘soft’ and not ‘real’ policing. Whereas it actually involves challenging work with communities, targeted enforcement and difficult decisions which can reduce demand.

- **Targeting** – Care is required when implementing highly targeted approaches to ensure they do not have a negative effect on the public’s perceptions of police fairness. Effort may also be required to resolve tensions between enforcement and building positive relations with some groups.

Case studies drawn from the call for practice and ongoing field visits will also be included. The following are illustrative examples of practice submitted so far.

### Nottinghamshire – community prof es

**Approach**

Nottinghamshire police developed comprehensive neighbourhood area community profiles to ensure more effective engagement with the community. These included new and emerging or hard-to-reach communities.

Profiles and engagement plans are centrally stored on the ECINS system which is accessible to partners. Nottinghamshire are developing plans with partners to share information better, including a pilot community scrutiny group in one force area. The group will give the community the opportunity to scrutinise their approach to engagement and help them develop this further with the intention of spreading this across the force.

**Reported benefits**

- Enhanced use of social media alongside more traditional face-to-face engagement forms part of a new strategy to achieve better engagement with fewer resources.
- More effective targeted engagement with a clear audit trail.
- The implementation of a twice yearly ‘support and challenge’ meeting process with neighbourhood policing leaders to embed a new strategy and continue to develop this approach.
- The force is reportedly better placed to focus on specific hard-to-reach communities.
- The force now measures performance data for digital engagement on a monthly basis.

### Greater Manchester – community review panels

**Approach**

An independent, impartial group of professional experts and community advocates is providing assessment, suggestions and reflective learning for improvement of key areas of policing functions. Review panels have been held for community engagement, communicating with diverse communities and the use of force.

**Reported benefits**

From feedback from the review panel on the use of force, additional categories for the type of force used were incorporated. The data from these additional categories are now incorporated into force management information. The impact of the changes will be communicated to communities, one year post-implementation.

Feedback from the review panel on community engagement is being incorporated into the force’s new community engagement strategy and plans.

Early indications are that, when focused on a specific policing function, valuable community feedback is gained which informs policy, strategy and practice.
2. Engaging communities…

For this particular guideline, the supporting ‘in practice’ material might include:

- an example of a community engagement strategy
- a local community engagement plan
- how engagement has been tailored to meet local need
- use of innovative approaches
- how engagement informs local policing priorities.

In addition, the research evidence on implementation issues will be developed and expanded, and implications for practice drawn out in full.

### Evidence on key implementation issues

- **Barriers to engagement** – Community engagement should be broadly representative and look to involve people from marginalised groups. This may require identifying and taking steps to address the barriers that prevent some people from engaging with the police (eg, language, gender, concerns about immigration status, as well as historical mistrust of the police), and using informal methods of engagement. It is not always the case, however, that people from poorer and more diverse neighbourhoods that suffer from crime and disorder problems are less willing to participate. In

- **Tailoring** – Use of tailored methods of engagement will be important for engaging different groups of people, rather than simply relying on beat meetings, surgeries and other more passive methods.

- **Ownership** – Communities should feel they have some ownership of engagement processes which may require them to be involved in their planning and development, feel empowered by the process, and think that their values are respected. Engagement should also focus on developing a two-way dialogue, as a failure to do so can be a barrier to people engaging.

- **Sustainability** – The effectiveness of community engagement may decline over time, highlighting the need to reinvigorate efforts when people start to become disengaged. Staff turnover can also be a challenge to maintaining long-term engagement.

- **Existing networks and partnerships** – Community engagement may be made easier by drawing on existing networks of community groups and working with partner organisations to carry out community mapping, so that any quality of life issues raised by the public can be referred on.

Case studies drawn from the call for practice and ongoing PC visits will also be included. The following are illustrative examples of practice submitted so far.

### Thames Valley – intensive engagement in Milton Keynes

**Approach**

Intensive engagement builds on existing problem-solving experience and models (eg, SARA, ‘have your say’, ‘world cafes’) but intensifies and enhances those basic steps with a focus on procedural fairness, legitimacy and confidence in policing, and community resilience.

The Locally Identified Solutions and Practices (LISP) Intensive Engagement toolkit is an eight-step process of systematically engaging with vulnerable neighbourhoods to develop solutions and ongoing practices that have been co-produced with community members. It is seen as a repeatable and legitimising process that allows for the uniqueness of each neighbourhood to create different solutions that fit the needs and capabilities of the community, and reduce demand. The framework embeds community-based impact evaluation into the intervention.

Forty PCSOs were trained in intensive engagement using the LISP toolkit. The PCSOs were then tasked to trial the intensive engagement approach in four different locations, generating five LISP pilots, with different policing challenges. PCSOs, sergeants and inspectors in the local policing area were interviewed in detail regarding their use of the toolkit.

LISP has been evaluated by the University of Northampton.

**Reported benefits**

PCSOs reported significant improvements in their relationships with community, business and statutory partners. It is too early to establish whether crime rates in the pilot areas decreased, but the interviewees were confident that the approach made their work more structured, robust and sustainable. All ranks valued the focus on specific area of performance and reported a change in the nature of the relationship with the public.

### North Yorkshire – community messaging

**Approach**

North Yorkshire Community Messaging (NYCM) uses modern technology to make communications between the police and public more intuitive, relevant and accessible to all. The public are encouraged to register for the community messaging service that will then enable them to receive regular updates at a local level about issues relevant to their community or specific interest. The messages can be tailored to individual preferences for both the type of messages received and the means of communication, directed through a preferred channel of phone, email or text message.

**Reported benefits**

Introducing NYCM has reportedly shown a willingness from the general public to assist the police in information/intelligence gathering, providing direct and relevant responses to appeals made. There are records of crime enquiries which have been brought to swift and successful conclusions as a direct result of public involvement triggered through using NYCM.

A satisfaction survey sent out to all registered users of NYCM showed that:

- 87 per cent were satisfied that neighbourhood policing teams were keeping them informed of crime, anti-social behaviour, and suspicious activity
- 87 per cent were satisfied overall, with how NYCM was working
- 91 per cent would recommend NYCM to others.
3. Building analytical capability... ...planned ‘in practice’ material

For this particular guideline, the supporting ‘in practice’ material might include:

- an example of an analytical tool in practice
- using local knowledge banks to share practice
- a copy of a data-sharing protocol.

In addition, the research evidence on implementation issues will be developed and expanded, and implications for practice drawn out in full.

### Evidence on key implementation issues

- **Demand reduction**—Looking at patterns and trends in data can help officers and staff to uncover and address long-term or repeat problems that generate demand, rather than continue to respond to one-off incidents and events. Such analysis should draw on multiple sources of information, including from partners, to develop a rounded view of the problem.  
- **Analysts**—A lack of dedicated analytical support and a shortage of skilled analysts have been identified as major barriers to problem solving. Problem solving is more likely to be implemented successfully when officers and staff have access to analysts and analytical tools that help them gather data, carry out and understand the results of analysis, plan action to address problems, and assess its impact. This may require supervisors and senior leaders to understand the approach (e.g., by mentoring from analysts) if they are to support implementation.  
- **Assessment**—Problem solving often suffers from a lack of assessment. This can be a barrier to understanding the effectiveness of the actions taken to address the problem which is important for informing future problem solving activity and ensuring it is evidence-based. There is a need for regular monitoring and assessment, which does not have to be complicated or overly formalised.  
- **Partners**—There may be a need to develop the understanding of partner organisations around data sharing, for example, by clarifying their roles and responsibilities. Establishing information sharing agreements to share data with partners are also likely to be important, particularly in respect of people who are at risk or vulnerable.

Case studies drawn from the call for practice and ongoing visits will also be included. The following are illustrative examples of practice submitted so far.

### Cleveland—ECINS multi-agency case management

**Approach**

ECINS is a multi-agency case management system. It supports multi-agency problem-solving approaches through facilitating inter-agency information sharing and inter-agency tasking and document sharing. Aligned to good business processes, it can enhance problem solving through increasing timeliness of information sharing, ensuring all parties are updated of key developments and streamlining meeting processes.

ECINS is being routinely used in multi-agency problem-solving groups by police, local authority community safety teams and housing associations. Cleveland also has agreement to extend the use of ECINS to multi-agency groups undertaking problem solving around young persons at risk of child sexual exploitation and/or are missing from home. A partnership steering group is in place to manage governance and agree expansion of the system. There are a number of other forces using similar systems, such as the SafetyNet system in Hampshire and Surrey.

### Hampshire—evidence-based neighbourhood policing tool

**Approach**

The tool is an IT solution that provides officers with access to crime and disorder data, repeat callers and repeat missing persons to support the scanning and analysis stage of SARA. It is comprised of a suite of reports that are built around identifying vulnerable people, victims, offenders and locations. The system draws in data from their crime recording system, NICHE record management system and their command and control system. The report is searchable by the force geography, crime type and other variables (such as hate crime, domestic abuse, licensed premises and offender/victim relationships).

The reports are available to all ranks within their neighbourhood policing structure. Staff are trained in its use and expected to use the available data to support problem solving, identify repeat callers to reduce vulnerability and demand and to target pro-active policing activity. The force is able to use the management information derived from the solution to support local tasking and co-ordination processes. This is not a scorecard or a traditional policing performance framework, but is more of a guidance and question facility to ensure users make use of evidence in their discussions and decisions to tackle crime and vulnerability.

**Reported benefits**

HMICFRS has recognised the processes around the use of the data as an effective and empowering tool.
4. Solving problems...

For this particular guideline, the supporting ‘in practice’ material might include:

- an example of problem solving using an IT solution
- a participatory approach
- use of an evidence-based approach
- tackling root causes

Identifying different problem solving models and approaches.

In addition, the research evidence on implementation issues will be developed and expanded, and implications for practice drawn out in full.

West Yorkshire – review, development and implementation of a problem-solving process

**Action taken**

The problem-solving process has been reviewed and streamlined in conjunction with frontline staff. The process has been aligned to the national decision model, while retaining and integrating the principles of SARA and associated opportunity-reducing theory.

Masterclasses have been delivered across the force in order to embed problem solving across the frontline policing districts. They are attended by frontline officers across the force, as well as colleagues from specialist units. The feedback so far has been excellent.

Problem solving initial assessment forms are required for each occurrence in order to provide a framework for the process to be conducted, as well as guiding officers through the process in an efficient and effective manner. Outcomes for each occurrence are measured locally via supervisory integration into the process. The impact from individual occurrences is measured at a local level in relation to the problem that they were designed to address. The impact of the practice also features in the force accountability framework (ie, local accountability meetings).

**Reported benefits**

Ongoing efforts are now reported as more empowered to make decisions in relation to implementing problem-solving occurrences by using the national decision model to initially identify the requirement to implement a full occurrence and record on the NICHE record management system. Problem-solving occurrences can be used to address any crime type or community concern and the ongoing masterclasses ensure an informed and structured approach.

Durham – crime prevention through problem-solving operating model

**Action taken**

Durham’s approach to crime prevention has been commended by HMICFRS. The philosophy is widespread across the basic Problem Oriented Partnership (POP) principles.

The principles are applied to strategic and tactical issues with a range of active formal POP plans, enhancing the basic structure of early intervention and diversion initiatives.

Durham’s strategy:

- persuade individual officers of the value of problem solving, for example by the Chief Constable delivering problem solving training
- concentrate on emphasising that the core function they have is not simply to respond to the call for assistance but to achieve sustainable solutions through tackling underlying causes – it’s the right thing to do
- give everyone a basic understanding of SARA principles and encourage them to learn through doing it and giving them freedom to innovate
- celebrate the efforts of staff and their achievements through events like the annual POP conference.

The force uses SARA as the basic methodology. Response and in particular the recording detail, are proportionate to the scale of the problem and level of activity. Current and archived POP plans are held on a central folder accessible by all staff and some partners as a learning resource, maintaining a register of all systemic problem solving and traditional primary crime prevention initiatives.

**Reported benefits**

The reported success of the model is an underlying culture with all individuals, regardless of command or role, being motivated to innovate and apply problem-solving principles in all areas of the business. HMICFRS concluded the following:

The force places an emphasis on preventative approaches such as restorative justice and problem solving. It has equipped its workforce with the knowledge and skills to use these approaches and to work with partner organisations. The force routinely shares knowledge of practices that are effective in solving problems and in preventing crime and anti-social behaviour.

Case studies drawn from the call for practice and ongoing visits will also be included. The following are...
illuminates examples of practice submitted so far.
5. Targeting activity…

For this particular guideline, the supporting ‘in practice’ material might include:

- An example of an evidence-based local deployment/patrol plan
- Use of data analysis to inform local resourcing decisions
- A partnership early intervention based on threat, harm and risk
- Use of different models (i.e., THRIVE, THOR or the Cambridge harm index).

In addition, the research evidence on implementation issues will be developed and expanded, and implications for practice drawn out in full.

### Evidence on key implementation issues

- **Neighbourhood size** – If neighbourhoods are too large, it can be difficult for officers and staff to develop a good working knowledge of the area, engage with communities and set neighbourhood priorities.
- **Mission creep** – There is a need to maintain a focus on delivery in the longer term as targeted interventions often suffer from ‘mission creep’.
- **Resourcing** – Forces need to consider how they resource community engagement and problem solving. Previously, officers and staff have been given dedicated, permanent neighbourhood assignments to build relations and problem solve over time.

Case studies drawn from the call for practice and ongoing field visits will also be included. The following are illustrative examples of practice submitted so far.

### West Yorkshire – predictive analysis

#### Approach

West Yorkshire Police (WYP) has been working with the Jill Dando Institute of Security and Crime Science at University College London (UCL) to develop an algorithm to run with WYP data. The output from the algorithm was used via the force’s Cadcorp geographic information system to produce preventative policing plans, which used the coordinates for street segments where crime was predicted to occur, displayed on a street-level map.

An automated activity analysis system has been developed by a private supplier, which supports the evaluation of police presence on crime in the area and crime displacement. Professor Ken Pease (UCL) will evaluate the dosage throughout the life of the project.

#### Reported benefits

The results from a 12-week pilot in Bradford East suggested:

- 25 per cent reduction in burglary dwelling during the pilot period compared to proceeding months
- 36 per cent reduction in burglary dwelling during the pilot period compared to the previous year.

### Staffordshire – local policing team problem-solving document

#### Approach

The automated problem-solving document is in two parts. The first part is for neighbourhood officers and staff. It provides them with crimes on their area for the last 7 days, as well as details about repeat victims, offenders and locations. It also reminds them which powers they have used recently and how often, how many packages they have on a bespoke problem-solving system and when they were last updated.

The second part is for the local policing commander. It provides a breakdown of each ward (e.g., the number of problem-solving packages per ward, the use of powers, those wanted on each ward).

#### Reported benefits

This automated document reportedly contains all of the information local officers and staff need to effectively police their patch. Additionally, it enables the local policing commander to monitor and support their officers and staff, and ensure a proportionate and risk-based approach across their area.
6. Developing officers and staff...

For this particular guideline, the supporting ‘in practice’ material might include an example of recording continuing professional development in neighbourhood policing.

Although forces will have developed their own learning for neighbourhood policing, there is a need for the College to explore the possibility of developing a national product and provide an update in April 2018.

In addition, the research evidence on implementation issues will be developed and expanded, and implications for practice drawn out in full.

Evidence on key implementation issues

- **Selection and supervision**—Neighbourhood policing has shown to be effective when officers and staff were selected because of their desire to be part of the programme. Officers and staff support for neighbourhood policing can, nevertheless, be encouraged by empowering them to make decisions, involving them in decision-making processes and providing supervision and feedback.

- **Formal learning**—There is a need to ensure that new and existing officers and staff receive training in community engagement and problem solving in order for neighbourhood policing to be effective. Re-fresher training may need to be provided to ensure skill levels are maintained. Training in communication skills (e.g., chairing meetings and negotiating) may also help officers and staff to engage with different community groups. Involved partners in training delivery can introduce officers and staff to new ideas and ways of working, and may help develop relationships.

- **Informal learning**—In addition to formal learning, it is important for officers and staff to develop their own knowledge of their local area in order to successfully implement neighbourhood policing.

- **Recognition and reward**—Providing professional recognition for training can help to strengthen officer and staff commitment to neighbourhood policing. Training can also be reinforced by supervisors and should be reflected in assessment and promotion processes.

Case studies drawn from the call for practice and ongoing field visits will also be included. The following

North Yorkshire—the Skills for Justice Neighbourhood Management Award

**Approach**

The Neighbourhood Management Award (NMA) is designed to help police personnel professionalise their working practice around partner engagement, problem solving and supporting victims and vulnerable people. The Level 3 Award introduces the purpose of neighbourhood management, looks at signal crimes, introduces concepts and practice around community engagement and anti-social behaviour, and provides models for collaborative problem solving. The Level 5 Certificate is a new qualification. It is more strategic, and covers the development of neighbourhood and community plans, local communications strategies, plan management and evaluation. The certificate is a recognised national qualification.

The NMA reportedly ensures officers have the requisite knowledge to enable them to perform their role which has become ever more demanding with more focus on vulnerability and problem solving. The training includes sessions on many of the topics that officers and PCSOs have highlighted as a training need, bringing in specialists from across North Yorkshire Police.

The NMA is a compulsory qualification for all PCSOs, constables, sergeants and inspectors to complete as part of their role profile. Level 5 is a new qualification aimed at inspector level and above. All officers and staff have to complete a portfolio surrounding a problem-solving scenario they have initiated, which are then independently assessed. The training and qualification have been offered to local authority partners. Some of their staff have participated at Level 3 and Level 5. This has been helpful in sharing experiences and joint learning.

Humberside—problem-solving training and continuing professional development

**Approach**

Extensive training has been delivered to officers and staff in community policing. Home managers and PCSOs all received bespoke problem-solving training and attend an annual community policing conference. All courses were run by subject matter experts who used real life examples to explain and demonstrate a problem-solving approach in practice.

200 staff have received specific training on how to conduct a retail crime reduction survey as part of Operation Sodium.

 Sergeants have received problem training from the Jill Dando Institute in preparation for introducing Police Now constables into Humberside.

Training in rural crime has been provided to operational officers and special constables.
are illustrative examples of practice submitted so far.
For this particular guideline, the supporting ‘in practice’ material might include:

- an example of local policing activity building community capacity
- social media supporting enhancing visibility
- identifying and supporting vulnerable people and groups.

Case studies drawn from the call for practice and on-going field visits will also be included. The following are illustrative examples of practice submitted so far.

**Surrey – Operation Makesafe**

**Approach**

Operation Makesafe is an initiative designed to increase awareness and reporting of incidents in hotels. An information pack and training is provided so that officers and staff can identify potential victims of:

- child sexual exploitation
- human trafficking
- domestic abuse
- female genital mutilation
- honour-based violence
- sexual assault.

**Reported benefits**

This operation has the potential to safeguard vulnerable members of society and ensure police intervention at the earliest opportunity. For example, as a result of the operation, staff members at a hotel in Egham recently reported suspicious guests and visitors to the police. This has allowed timely investigations to occur, one on suspicion of modern slavery and another on suspicion of child sexual exploitation.

**Greater Manchester – Programme Challenger**

**Approach**

Programme Challenger was launched in 2012. It has evolved to tackle the wider issues surrounding organised crime and unites Greater Manchester Police with local authorities, probation, immigration enforcement, emergency services and other partner agencies. As well as detecting and disrupting criminality, its purpose is to protect the vulnerable and safeguard those at risk from becoming victims – or perpetrators – of organised crime; identifying this link between vulnerable individuals and families and organised crime, and uncovering new ways of seizing the fire behind such activity.

In a move towards prevention and early detection, agencies under Challenger provide training, conduct harm reduction visits and spend time providing support and advice to local people and businesses. Seventeen specially trained Challenger PCSOs are now embedded in communities, preventing incidents of crime, addressing concerns from residents and gathering intelligence.

**Reported benefits**

The partnership working allows Programme Challenger to use a wide range of civil tools and powers to disrupt criminal activity. Since January 2014, the Illegal Money Lending team has worked within Challenger to deliver a wealth of neighbourhood reassurance and education relating to loan sharks, leading to a number of arrests and increased community resilience.

Environmental Health and the Fire Service have conducted hundreds of inspections around safety issues, uncovering potential criminality and ensuring regulations are adhered to. This has reportedly resulted in substantial fire being imposed and a number of people protected through successful convictions.

**Merseyside – Operation Respect**

**Approach**

A six-week plan focusing on one community which had victims and offenders linked with serious and organised crime. Merseyside police worked alongside approximately 15 partner agencies concentrating on cleansing, enforcement, engagement and organising activities. This approach allowed the community to observe these agencies working together to increase confidence and deal with issues identified via a survey for an extended period.

To ensure an evidence-based approach, liaison took place with all partner agencies to ensure the project and that joint aims were being met. Post-operation, Merseyside held a debrief and discussed what had been achieved when looking at each aspect. This included engagement with the community to gain their opinion of the project’s impact. The feedback was positive from all involved and it was evident the operation had a positive effect on the community whether it be cleansing, crime reduction or engagement.

**Reported benefits**

Before and during the operation, residents were consulted to identify particular issues which were addressed using a multi-agency approach. Post-operation, the feedback from the community was that the confidence they had in the relevant agencies had improved, crime in one high-rise multi-occupancy building had decreased and the respect for their own community appeared to have improved. This was evidenced by the community attempting to set up a HomeWatch scheme in one particular area.