



DELIVERABLE 3.1

Unity – Report on Existing Approaches and Best/Effective Practices to Community Policing

Executive summary

Due date: 31st October 2015

Date of submission: 31st October 2015

Lead beneficiary: Centre of Excellence in Public Safety Management/Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University Rotterdam

Project Title: Unity

Grant Agreement: 653729

Funding Scheme: Research and Innovation action – Safeguarding Secure Society

Duration Time: 36 months

Start date: 01/05/2015



Project funded by the European Commission within the H2020 Framework Programme

Introduction

Community policing (CP) is by definition embedded in its respective communities. Therefore, the success factors and enablers of community policing are contingent on the requirements and expectations of each of these communities. WP3 (Policing and Community Requirements and Best/Effective practices) enables the identification of overarching themes and concepts to describe the commonalities and differences of community policing (CP) concepts and practices. The purpose of this first WP3 deliverable is to capture current practices of community policing including the identification of best practices in the interplay between communities, LEAs and other relevant stakeholders.

Methods

We follow the goal of comparing and synthesizing cross-context data to develop a tool that is ideally usable across a wide set of contexts. We also aim at detailing highly context-specific information to identify context specific tool requirements. We therefore adopt both the quantitative etic and qualitative emic methods. All country teams conducted an (emic) study within their own cultural context and summarized the data according to their own country's internal understanding in standardized interview reporting templates. The EUR team categorizes the data (imposed etic) and discusses their overall perspective in joint meetings with the country teams on how the data can be compared (Emic A vs. Emic B). The current report is the first step in this process and provides a mainly emic perspective on the different countries. The emic data created in this process will be used to develop evaluation criteria and comparisons that will be discussed with all countries and thus allow for a comparison between countries based on a true cultural understanding of the differences (derived etic). Table 1 provides an overview of the number of interviews per country that were available for analysis at the time of writing.

Table 1. Number of interviews available for analysis in D3.1 per country and group¹

Country	Community	Police	Total per country
Belgium	9	6	15
Bulgaria	28	10	38
Croatia	28	10	38
Estonia*	--	--	--
Finland	21	10	31
Germany	29	8	37
Macedonia	28	10	38
United Kingdom	27	10	37
Total	170	64	234

* At the time of writing, interviews had been conducted, but not yet translated into English. Therefore, Estonian interviews could not be analyzed.

In this first WP3 report, we focus on those parts of the interviews directly related to the identification and description of CP practices. These are:

1. Definition of community policing
2. Main goals and core tasks
3. Main stakeholders and target groups
4. Examples of 'good' and 'bad' community policing practices
5. Success criteria/indicators

¹ Additional data that arrived after the deadline for D3.1 will be analyzed for the following deliverable.

Results

Belgium

Definitions of CP centered on working together with local partners and communities, understanding and addressing local needs and issues, policing performance and communication and interaction. As such, a strong emphasis was placed on communication and cooperation with the local communities and partners to address local needs and issues as well as promoting local safety and security. Two additional important elements of community policing highlighted by the participants are human aspects and empowerment and trust, confidence and understanding.

The primary **goals** of community policing as reported by the Belgian participants were related to performance, namely crime fighting and ensuring safety, prevention and protection, and citizens feeling safe. Further important goals included fostering trust, confidence, understanding and respect, increasing and improving cooperation and creating social cohesion and embeddedness. Lastly, problem solving and addressing citizens' needs emerged as a further important goal in community policing. The **tasks** which netted the most mentions were presence, patrolling and visibility, crime fighting/ensuring safety and security and prevention and protection against crime and delinquency. The second and third most mentioned community policing task categories were communication, availability and accessibility and capacity building.

The most mentioned **group or organization** for community policing was the citizens. Of these citizens most concerned specific age groups, migrants and minorities, and victims and witnesses.

Regarding the **good and bad practices** of community policing mentioned by Belgian participants no specific element stood out. Structural, technological and human capacity were mentioned most often for both.

The most prominent **indicators** of successful community policing pertained to the way of operating by police, primarily consisting of availability and visibility and communication and cooperation.

Bulgaria

The **definitions** of community policing in Bulgaria centered on the elements of policing performance and fostering trust, confidence and understanding. Communicating and interacting with communities also stood out. Fostering trust, confidence and understanding stands out as it predominantly consisted of improved public image and trust, which suggests that community policing in Bulgaria is not only defined by its goals pertaining to fighting crime and protecting the local population, but also by improving the public perception of the police force. Community policing is also defined by Bulgarian participants as communication and information sharing with- and between the police and local communities.

The primary **goals** of community policing as reported by the Bulgarian participants pertain to the traditional goal of police performance as well as fostering trust, confidence and respect and communication, availability and accessibility. The main reported **tasks** are clustered under performance, fostering trust, confidence, understanding and respect and capacity building. Fostering trust, confidence, understanding and respect largely consisted of professionalism. Finally, capacity building consisted of information gathering and management and officer capacity and education.

The most mentioned **groups or organizations** for community policing were citizen groups. The most prominent intermediaries mentioned by the Bulgarian participants were community-group leaders and civil representatives.

Examples of **good and bad practices** pertained to maintaining peace and order and enforcing the law, information sharing and education and contact and communication. The elements of 'bad' community policing practices were clustered around failure to act on or solve crimes and police image. This further emphasizes the perceived need of professionalism of the Bulgarian participants.

The Bulgarian participants reported a range of **indicators** for community policing performance, where the categories way of operating by police, features of police and police officers, outcomes and police performance and relationship building between police and other groups were mentioned equally.

Croatia

The **definition** of community policing in Croatia focused on policing performance. This included promoting peace, order and wellbeing, prevention, protection and intervention and fighting crime and improving safety.

The **goals** of community policing focused on policing performance. Other notable goals included assistance and service, fostering trust, confidence, understanding and respect and communication, availability and accessibility. The **tasks** focused on Policing performance, followed by improve information exchange and sharing, capacity building and increase and improve cooperation.

The most important **group or organization** for community policing was the citizen group. Of the intermediary groups the greatest number concerned parents and parent-support organizations.

The largest number of examples of **good and bad policing** referred to maintaining peace and order and enforcing the law. Within this category, protection and prevention and providing assistance and service were mentioned most frequently. Most examples of 'bad practices' related to a failure to act on or solve crimes. A distinction was made between inability and unwillingness to solve crimes as bad practices of community policing

Indicators of successful community policing mentioned by Croatian participants mostly pertained to outcomes and police performance. Other important indicators were relationship building between police and other groups and ways of operating by police.

Finland

Finnish **definitions** of community policing had three foci: that police should be accessible and visible, ensure communication and interaction between police and communities and aim for crime prevention, protection and intervention.

The most frequently mentioned **goals** were prevention and protection, fostering trust and capacity building in the sense of information gathering from the public. To a lesser extent, participants also addressed crime fighting. For main **tasks**. Again, capacity building and availability and accessibility played a large role.

Finnish participants listed a broad variety of **groups and organizations** involved in community policing. They reached from specific age groups to migrants, religious groups, NGOs, volunteers, government actors and private companies. Children, adolescents and the elderly were the most prominent partner groups followed by migrants and minorities.

One area with both **good and bad practices** was visibility and availability and the cooperation with external partners.

Indicators of successful community policing in Finland were strongly focused on internal aspects, either in terms of features of the police and police officers or in terms of ways police forces operate.

Germany

Definitions of community policing in Germany focused on improving cooperation with local communities and partners with the aim to fight crime, improve safety and protect citizens. A further important aspect was the intent to foster trust and confidence in police as well as a better mutual understanding, with a particular focus on improving the image of police.

The primary **goal** of community policing was crime prevention and the protection of citizens. The concept of prevention demonstrated a broad perspective with a variety of facets. Increasing cooperation and fostering trust emerged as further important elements. Fostering trust was

mentioned primarily in terms of changing the attitude of the public towards the police to something more positive. In terms of **tasks**, the prevention of crime and the protection of citizens were reported most frequently. Improving cooperation – especially with external stakeholders – and improving communication and contacts came back in the description of community policing tasks; as did the fostering trust and confidence with a focus on accountability and transparency. A new element was the emphasis on concrete activities such as patrolling the streets and being present on the streets.

Citizen **groups** were the most frequently mentioned category of important groups and organizations. To a lesser extent participants mentioned service providers such as educational institutions (schools, kindergartens), health, fire and transport services and local/regional media, the local government and private businesses/industries.

Good practices were mentioned mostly in the areas of contact and communication, and related to this, cooperation. **Bad practices** centered on threats to the police image.

The most frequently named **indicator** to assess good community policing performance was Citizens' perceptions. Linked to this subjective indicator of safety perceptions were more concrete expectations of crime reduction, including an increase in the number of solved cases. A third group of common indicators were improved relationships, closer cooperation and an increase in citizen participation.

Macedonia

Definitions of community policing in Macedonia put a strong emphasis on fighting crime, improving safety and on crime prevention, protection and intervention. Collaboration between police and other groups was also mentioned frequently.

Goals focused on the areas of crime fighting, ensuring safety, prevention and protection. Another aspect returning from definitions was cooperation. Cooperation seemed, however, not focused on the explicit promotion of community engagement and participation in police work; the focus seemed rather on information gathering and to a lesser extent on the fostering trust. A similar picture emerged for **tasks**, where crime fighting and prevention as well as ensuring citizens' safety and security again were amongst the most prominent categories.

As with most countries, for **groups and organizations** for community policing citizen groups were the largest category. As main citizen groups in Macedonia emerged migrants and minorities, followed by specific age groups and offender/suspects of crimes. This was followed by service providers, with an emphasis on health, fire, transport, security and education.

Most **good practices** in Macedonia relayed events about communication and cooperation, whereas **bad practices** focused strongly on operational issues such as law enforcement and maintaining the peace as well as threats to the police image.

Indicators of successful community policing performance in Macedonia circled around three topics: (1) features of the police/police officers with a focus on officers' skills, abilities and knowledge, (2) outcomes in terms of general 'good performance' and crime reduction/prevention, and (3) relationship building in terms of improved relationships and closer cooperation.

United Kingdom

The **definitions** of community policing by UK participants had a strong focus on understanding and working in local contexts, including the expectation to address local problems and needs. Community policing definitions also included regular references to crime fighting and prevention indicating that preventing or reducing crime was seen as an important aim of community policing. Next, UK participants also identified fostering trust as an important aim.

The biggest number of primary **goals** mentioned by UK participants focused on three topics: (1) information gathering from the public, (2) creating an environment in which citizens feel safe, and (3) crime fighting/ensuring safety. **Tasks** also put a strong emphasis on officers' presence and visibility on the street.

When asked for the most relevant **groups and organizations** for community policing, UK participants listed primarily citizen groups. Very few intermediaries were mentioned. The majority of citizen groups had to do with specific age groups. Of the intermediaries, parents or parent-support organizations were mentioned most often.

Narratives of **good and bad practices** frequently concerned cooperation and communication as well as attitudes, skills and abilities of officers.

UK participants provided a considerable range of **indicators** to determine the success of community policing. While crime reduction was named the most frequently, this was closely followed by citizen participation.

Conclusions

With this report we provide the emic description of community policing of the pilot countries involved in Unity. Based on this compilation of emic descriptions we will in further steps identify the (lack) of comparability across all analyzed settings. Similarities will be identified together with the cultural and content experts of the Unity consortium in future deliverables.