The Pioneers

Police and Crime Commissioners, one year on

A collection of essays

Edited by Max Chambers

Policy Exchange

The Pioneers

Police and Crime Commissioners, one year on

A collection of essays

Edited by Max Chambers

Policy Exchange

Policy Exchange is the UK's leading think tank. We are an educational charity whose mission is to develop and promote new policy ideas that will deliver better public services, a stronger society and a more dynamic economy.

The authority and credibility of our research is our greatest asset. Our research is independent and evidence-based, and we share our ideas with policymakers from all sides of the political spectrum. Our research is strictly empirical and we do not take commissions. This allows us to be completely independent and make workable policy recommendations.

For more information please contact us at: Clutha House, 10 Storey's Gate, London, SW1P 3AY. Alternatively we can be contacted on 020 7340 2650 and at info@policyexchange.org.uk

Published by
Policy Exchange, Clutha House, 10 Storey's Gate, London SW1P 3AY
www.policyexchange.org.uk

ISBN: 978-1-907689-61-1

Printed by Heron, Dawson and Sawyer
Designed by Soapbox, www.soapboxcommunications.co.uk

Contents

Foreword

Rt Hon Theresa May MP, Home Secretary

This collection of essays is testimony to police and crime commissioners' (PCCs) desire to make a real difference, and the extent to which they are thinking long and hard about how they can work more effectively to cut crime. It demonstrates exactly why PCCs are such an improvement on the old police authorities. It is difficult to imagine any of those bodies involving the public in decision-making or thinking about new and innovative ways to cut crime; and harder still to imagine them systematically considering how they might be able to do more with less.

PCCs are an essential part of my police reforms. And those reforms are working. Crime has fallen by more than 10% since the last election, and policing is now more accountable and responsive to local concerns.

When I took office three years ago, it was clear to me that the police had become disconnected from the public they serve. Central government had taken power and responsibility away from local forces; instead imposing targets and bureaucratic procedures on them. Officers spent too much time filling in forms rather than fighting crime. Targets prevented officers from using their judgment and stifled innovation. And that had an impact on their effectiveness. That is why giving back responsibility to local police forces has been at the heart of my reforms.

The first thing I did was to scrap targets. Now the only objective the police have is to cut crime. But police reform is about more than the election of police and crime commissioners and the abolition of targets. I have introduced greater flexibility to police employment; a more independent HMIC; and created the College

of Policing to set the standards for professional practice. I am strengthening the IPCC so it can investigate all serious and sensitive complaints; and for the first time there is a single national agency – the National Crime Agency – harnessing intelligence to relentlessly disrupt organised criminals. This amounts to the most radical package of policing reform in the last 50 years, and it is working.

The foundations of British policing are built on the concept of policing by consent. That is why giving the public a direct say, and reconnecting them with the police has been so important. Last year's election of PCCs was the start of that process. And in the digital era, it is important that we harness the power of the internet and social media to drive up engagement even further. Through Police.UK, the public can now measure how well their force is doing. It has had over 600 million hits since it was launched. And I am pleased to see PCCs making innovative use of social media to connect with the electorate.

PCCs are far more open and transparent than police authorities ever were. Only 7% of the public knew police authorities existed. Yet public awareness of PCCs is currently at 73%. Above all, the public now has a democratically elected individual who is accountable for the performance of the police in their area. As people begin to realise that they now have the power to make a difference to their local force, their engagement in policing should increase further. That is going to drive up standards. And this model could work for other public services.

Greater integration between the emergency services could deliver significant savings and considerable gains in efficiency. PCCs are ideally placed to take over responsibility for the other emergency services because of their clear accountability at the local level. This is something the Government is considering carefully.

Police reform is working, but there is more to do to improve effectiveness, increase public engagement, and above all, cut crime even further. In suggesting new ways to promote these goals,

this collection of essays represents another step towards achieving them. For that, I am extremely grateful to the authors.

1. Doing More with Less

Innovation, collaboration and efficiency: doing more with less

Adam Simmonds, Police and Crime Commissioner for Northamptonshire

It was that infamous Italian Machiavelli who said, there was nothing harder to achieve than a "new order of things."

Described simultaneously as a once-in-a-generation opportunity to effect real change and as a calamitous change that threatens to undermine police independence, the one certainty is that the new Police and Crime Commissioners are being watched. There is tremendous opportunity in something new. If we get this right, this is a reform which will not only deliver real change for local communities through reducing crime but also injecting a change of pace across public service reform and a step change in local accountability. Some of us have approached the role carefully, it isn't hard to spot that the policing profession is quite keen to keep Commissioners in their place. But to me this is not a moment for taking little tentative steps.

Much of what needs to be done to achieve big falls in crime sits beyond core policing. I have chosen to interpret the 'and crime' aspect of my role boldly, broadly, perhaps controversially. It needs to cover criminal justice and community safety, drugs and alcohol, early intervention and prevention activities, enhancing wellbeing, galvanising local communities in cultural change. Getting upstream, tackling the root causes of crime. There is strong evidence which illustrates the relationships between crime and health, wellbeing, housing and education. A growing evidence base demonstrates

that early intervention activity works, especially *very* early with young children at risk. For most of us working in and around the criminal justice system, this is not news, but both the opportunity to think differently and the greater freedom to act that being a Commissioner brings real fresh opportunity to put such knowledge into effect, rather than just plodding along with the tired, clunky and reactive criminal justice system we have inherited.

The truth is that the criminal justice 'system' we Commissioners inherited last November is not really a system at all. It is a series of largely autonomous organisations and loosely aligned partnerships with a mess of different priorities, targets and funding streams and not a lot of collective ownership. Ask the senior managers gathered around a Local Criminal Justice Board or attending a Community Safety Partnership who is ultimately responsible for the overall experience of victims of crime, and no one hand goes up. Ask them who is ultimately responsible for managing local offenders. For reducing crime. For protecting neighbourhoods. For tackling drugs. For changing cultures around drinking, or hate crime, or domestic abuse. The answer has been a mushy collective sense of accountability; everybody, and nobody. Police and Crime Commissioners change all that. I believe the PCC should now be personally responsible for each of those things. For the first time ever one individual is directly and democratically accountable to local people for delivering the big outcomes across the whole of community safety and criminal justice. The shallow minded and politically motivated make silly comparisons between the costs of Police Authorities and Commissions, but in reality the role is simply not the same and the scale of the job is not comparable at all. This is exciting stuff, very different, truly a new beginning.

So what have I learnt from my first year in Office? Radical innovation is required. It isn't possible to be radically innovative one professional group or one agency or one force at a time; genuine innovation needs to be shaped around outcomes, not be

constrained by existing structures. It isn't possible to be innovative without radically engaging victims and communities, and without opening up the delivery of public services beyond the stultifying grip of public sector organisations and their thinking. Innovation won't work unless it is evidence-based. It won't take hold and sustain unless cultures change. And, of course, as Machiavelli said achieving real change is never easy!

New formations

Beginning by integrating our police and fire services in Northamptonshire I am demonstrating the possibilities for new partnering; the ambition is to deliver the most effective, efficient services which meet the needs of communities. The public will receive high standards of service. We will save valuable resource to sustain the frontline, handling emergency calls once, sending once the required resources and commanding them in a joined up way. The future of redesigning emergency services is truly pioneering. Integrated leadership will create an environment in which new, informed thinking about the future of service delivery could take place, in one room, with one budget. For those on the front-line, this is the best way to prioritise and preserve the vital services they provide.

> "Policing is complicated, they say; perhaps I just didn't really understand?"

Central to our thinking is community engagement and prevention. This is not just about getting smarter at emergency response. More importantly, it is about getting smarter at reducing the demand for that emergency response. Better protecting communities. Helping people be safe. And giving people more of a say, and enabling them to be more involved.

More will be done at a national level to support this, making flexibilities in legislation and statutory frameworks to evolve this bold brave new world.

Setting ambitions, changing thinking

Creating a bold new vision was not difficult. Developing and communicating that vision and how we might get there, without receiving raised eyebrows or rolling eyes, has been and remains the biggest challenge. Setting a target to reduce violence by 40% over five years, talking about 'eradicating drugs'; such ambitions are new in criminal justice contexts and have probably taken a bit of getting used to. The consensus at first was that my sense of ambition was unhelpful, setting people up to fail and risking morale. Policing is complicated, they say; perhaps I just didn't really understand?

That was at first. Things are better now. What my Chief Constable and the force have grown to understand is that I was shifting boundaries; I was seeking to change the parameters of thinking. This requires the force to change, not a little bit of tweaking of processes or some new structures, but radically. I have learnt that I will not achieve big changes without force leaders delivering with me; their expertise, their experience, their immense passion and commitment for what they do. The challenge is taking people on that journey with you. Changing the mindset of a public sector that 'does to' and 'decides for' communities and service users, and putting behind us the process-driven and somewhat feeble previous approaches to reform criminal justice. That is the real job here.

Engaging victims

I am taking the approach of 'giving voice' to victims, witnesses, service users and communities, to design a system based on meeting their needs and expectations. Delivering on this has been an interesting experience. I commissioned *Victims' Voice*, a campaign to hear the views and experiences of victims and witnesses in Northamptonshire.

As an aside, paying a highly able, experienced and passionate person to independently champion this work was the right thing to

do, although it drew criticism. I think one thing we need to change is the reality check that when we need new thinking and when we need seriously big things to happen, they won't unless we have the right people and the right expertise, and sometimes this needs to be paid for. There is a desire for the flair, flexibility and bottom-line delivery of the private sector, but the rules of operating are much more constrained. Ultimately this needs to change. If the people who've always been around the system haven't previously delivered the big changes, there is probably a reason why.

The *Victims' Voice* report has been a wakeup call; it is an uncomfortable and in places a distressing read. With 79 recommendations across the entirety of the criminal justice system, there is a lot for us to do. Unsurprisingly those recommendations have received some challenge, primarily along the lines of 'how much of this is actually within your remit?' The report essentially describes a broken system. I now chair the Local Criminal Justice Board which puts me in a great position to start moving forward and redesigning a local justice system which seems more committed to its history than to its purpose. I want to make a difference by fundamentally rethinking how the justice system works; how the police, courts, Crown Prosecution Service, probation, youth justice and victim support agencies work together, collaboratively, to provide the best possible service to victims and witnesses and ensure justice is achieved. I have taken away single agency, short-term crime reduction and process targets and created outcomes that are meaningful for victims and for my local communities.

I have also created an Office for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives to bring communities into the action. The contribution from faith groups and community groups in Northamptonshire is incredible and humbling to see. Enhancing the capacity of these groups and helping them to work with agencies in the justice sector to deliver crime prevention and early intervention activity can only be positive. Community action is crucial. Ultimately

it is not more and more van-loads of police officers on a Friday and Saturday night that will combat violence. It is cultural change around alcohol. It is big shifts in attitudes to domestic abuse.

Using evidence

The evidence-base for creating better partnerships between justice, health and education is growing and shows significantly improved life-courses for young people where intervention is joined-up and holistic across their needs. However, slow progress has been made, which appears to be due to silo working at both national and local levels and a significant amount of work needs to be done to bring researchers, policy-makers and practitioners together, to generate joined-up solutions.

Communicating a vision, even when backed by evidence, across the police force and the wider justice system is a big challenge. Taking this to audiences across health, wellbeing and education is harder still. Addressing predisposition to alcohol or drug use before adolescence reduces the likelihood of violent or acquisitive crime in adulthood. Increasing educational attainment and building confidence, resilience and values reduces antisocial behaviour in adolescence, reduces uptake of smoking and misuse of substances and again reduces offending behaviours in adulthood. The right kind of restorative approaches can have a huge impact on a range of outcomes. Justice, health and education work in their silos, creating micro partnerships where outcomes cross over, but never committing to genuine pooling of resources, a shared drive towards the same mission and a commitment to genuinely effecting change together. This is the type of collaboration that I want to see. I as vice-chairman of our local Health and Wellbeing Board, I hope to exert an influence to help make this come about.

Committed to evidence and to this model of cross-sector collaboration around outcomes, I am establishing the new Police, Crime

and Justice Institute within a University. It will bring together under one structure cutting-edge academic research activity alongside practical translation of research evidence into practice. This requires courage from agencies to work together in ways beyond how they have in the past and to place considerable confidence in a new model that is rooted in evidence, community engagement and problem-solving.

The future

Innovation and collaboration are central to our goals of delivering safer communities, and of delivering better public services with reduced resources. But this will only be realised if we fundamentally redefine what both innovation and collaboration mean, and where it's needed have the courage to form something entirely new and different. Police and Crime Commissioners are in an excellent position to pilot new ideas and drive new models. Being much closer to local communities and to victims, they can better shape the future approaches they build to the needs of local people. The challenge for the new Commissioners is to prove that we are up to the task. The challenge for national policy-makers is to give us a clearer, broader remit beyond policing and therefore the formal leverage and the tools to do the job. These are exciting times. There's not a moment to lose!

Protecting neighbourhood policing: how PCCs can value what matters in challenging circumstances

Tony Lloyd, Police and Crime Commissioner for Greater Manchester

There's no denying that Police and Crime Commissioners haven't had an easy time of it. Even before we were elected, the role courted controversy. There was a disgraceful scarcity of information about what Commissioners were there for and candidates weren't allowed to send a free postal communication to voters, as happens in other UK elections. This lack of information, combined with the decision to hold the election itself on a cold, dark day in the middle of November, led to a turnout that was woeful. It was not our finest democratic hour, something recognised by the Electoral Commission, which has said that the low turnout is a concern for anyone who cares about democracy.

So from the very start, Commissioners faced an uphill struggle in establishing an understanding of their role. This hasn't been helped by some parts of the media lambasting Commissioners at every opportunity. We've faced accusations of cronyism, profligate spending and the impression is given that every Commissioner spends each day having a stand-up row with our chief constables. The media have an important role in holding us to account – it's one of the hallmarks of our free society – but I would rather see Commissioners subjected to genuine scrutiny than a sensationalist, often inaccurate, headline.

Despite all this, it hasn't stopped Commissioners from getting on with the job we were elected to do. The wider remit of the role, compared to the largely anonymous police authorities we replaced, means we have a responsibility, not just for law enforcement, but setting the strategy for crime prevention and community safety. That is the challenge for each of us.

Now a year in, it's time to reflect on the impact of Police and Crime Commissioners. I'll admit I was sceptical to the idea as it's

a new way of doing politics in this country. In other democratic societies, notably the United States, directly elected executive roles are commonplace, but here they are something new. As the year has gone on, I have seen more and more how Commissioners have the potential to be an effective catalyst for change, and how local people can be involved in decision-making and policy-formation on a level that has simply never been seen before.

For the first time there is a single person, who holds the public mandate and so the authority to bring together agencies locally and the success of individual Commissioners can be judged on their ability to do just that, with tangible results.

Politics vs. policing?

Some have argued that the introduction of Police and Crime Commissioner brings politics into policing, with theories of Commissioners interfering in operational policing for the sake of political point scoring. Arguments over the politicisation of the police is nothing new, and those arguments often overlook the fact there has always been democratic oversight of policing in the United Kingdom. It is a necessary check and balance to the system as, ultimately, all of the organs of the state in our country must be answerable in some way or other to the electorate. Prior to the introduction of Police and Crime Commissioners this was done through police authorities. The authorities comprised elected representatives from councils and some independent members. While these bodies did a lot of good work, they were largely unseen. Most people in the street were unaware of their existence and didn't really understand what they did. Commissioners, on the other hand, have been put there directly accountable to the public. Yes, we are politicians and, yes, many of us were elected on a party political ticket. None of us left our political values at the door when elected – that would have been perverse given we were elected on a mandate. But those val-

ues are no more something to be feared than in any other election. Rather, they should drive us to do the best for local people and build safer communities.

The Home Affairs Select Committee has rightly made the point that there needs to be effective checks and balances in the system to ensure that Commissioners don't get drunk with power. Of course, Commissioners face the ultimate sanction – they can be thrown out by the electorate at the ballot box. However, I believe there does need to be further checks in the system to ensure that when they are in office Commissioners continue to act in the best interests of the people they represent. There's a number of ways this can be done, but the most straightforward is to give the Police and Crime Panel – the body that scrutinises the work of Commissioners – more teeth to hold Commissioners to account.

> "I hope that the support that I have been able to provide has actually made this job easier"

I've touched on Commissioners' relationships with chief constables, the nature of a handful have played out in the national media. But the reality is that most Commissioners have a good relationship with chief constables. That is certainly true in Greater Manchester. Greater Manchester Police's Chief Constable Sir Peter Fahy shares the same commitment when it comes to building the safest communities in Britain and putting the police at the heart of our neighbourhoods. He has led GMP through difficult times, particularly the unprecedented and swingeing budget cuts, and despite this crime has fallen and public confidence has increased under his leadership. I hope that the support that I have been able to provide, in particular in the arena of bringing other agencies together, has actually made this job easier.

As budgets continue to shrink and the landscape of policing and wider public sector continues to reform, it will get harder and harder to maintain our high standards. The cuts to public spending risk inflicting real and lasting damage on our communities with the current Government showing no sign of letting up on its attack

on the budgets of policing and the public sector as a whole. But that will not lessen my, nor the chief constable's, determination to maintain good services.

As we continuously strive to do more with less, we have to reduce demand on the police, and this is a continuing challenge. Shrinking budgets mean the police are increasingly becoming the agency of first response and last resort. Mental health is one area where the police are called on time and time again as the first responders. Not only does this take up hours of police time if there is no capacity to hand over to more appropriate services rapidly, it's not the appropriate response for someone who's suffering mental health problems. In a time of crisis, they need care and support of the health service, not a night in a police cell. That's why I allocated £200,000 in this year's budget to invest in partnership working with the NHS and develop different, innovative and, importantly, more effective ways to deal with issues that cross many agencies, including mental health, and drug and alcohol addictions – some of the main drivers of crime.

In my budget, I took the difficult decision to raise the police element of council tax bills. It was not an enormous increase – £5 per year for the average home in Greater Manchester – but in these challenging times this kind of decision cannot be taken lightly. The increase will generate £3.3m in extra revenue, and We will use every penny of that to invest in people – with 50 new police officers and 150 support staff who will help all police officers spend more time where they should be, on the front line, and less behind a desk filling in forms. It's nowhere near enough, but at least it helps to mitigate against the reckless cuts being imposed by government.

Partnership working

Partnership working is central to Greater Manchester's police and crime plan. It's a concept that's existed for a long time but it's fair

to say it hasn't always delivered. In this time of austerity that is no longer an option. Police and Crime Commissioners have to harness and above all enhance the existing relationships between the police, local authorities and other community safety partners so they add extra value, as well as building new partnerships. Complex issues such as child sexual exploitation and domestic abuse are challenges the police can't deal with on their own. It's here that the role of the Commissioner can be pivotal. The value of having one local figure who takes a strategic view across both the criminal justice system and the community safety agenda, who brings together all the different agencies together around the table to find better ways of working, is central in building better neighbourhoods partnerships.

Previously it was rare to see doctors and lawyers in a room together to discuss and debate how their respective agencies can work together to achieve this goal. But since I was elected that's precisely what we've been able to do in Greater Manchester. I've brought together the Courts, prosecutors, probation, police and other criminal justice system partners in one room to have a pragmatic discussion about how to improve the service to victims. I want to emphasise that it's not just a talking shop – it's coming up with real solutions. We're starting to see real results and partner agencies are equally getting the chance to demonstrate that their commitment to working together is more than just words.

It's this partnership working that is central to building safer neighbourhoods, and at the heart of this lies the neighbourhood policing model. There are some good examples of how this works in Greater Manchester.

Neighbourhood policing must be embedded in local communities, and that is something I want to protect and that's why I've maintained the number of police community support officers and invested in additional police staff to support local officers and keep them out in the community and not left sitting behind a desk. Detectives are now based with neighbourhood policing teams,

giving local officers the capacity to deal with serious offenders as well as community issues, providing a policing response that best suits the needs of that community.

In Wythenshawe, South Manchester, neighbourhood policing is being taken a step further. As part of a pilot, call handlers and radio operators are now based with neighbourhood officers at local police stations, instead of in one centralised location, giving them direct access to local knowledge of the part of the community the caller comes from. The project is in its early stages but it is improving the service offered to communities, enabling incidents and issues to be investigated and resolved more quickly and more effectively.

> "By pooling resources we can work together to deal more effectively with the same people who are a huge drain on the public purse"

Co-location of services is another example of agencies working better together and sharing information in real-time. In Tameside, Greater Manchester, police and probation are based together to manage offenders and put preventative measures in place to deal with the with the revolving door of reoffending, by addressing the underlying causes and temptations that lead people back into crime and inevitably repeat visitors in our prison. This strong partnership working has seen improvements in the way services are delivered and I will work to try to protect these effective partnership relationships as the Ministry of Justice proceeds with the Transforming Rehabilitation reforms which will give us a very different probation service.

An initiative to dismantle organised crime networks in north and east Manchester takes this even further. Operation Challenger is a multi-agency operation that has so far resulted in hundreds of arrests and the seizure of millions of pounds-worth of property and drugs. Bringing together all the emergency services, councils, the Serious Organised Crime Agency, NHS, Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs, and the Illegal Money Lending Team, among other public bodies, the team can widen their investigations into every

area of a criminal's life, such as their business interests, properties, benefits and associates. The biggest response to organised crime of its kind in the country, each agency is now better equipped to share information and intelligence and use their powers to make it difficult for these criminals to operate, which includes arrests, freezing their assets, evicting them from their homes, seizing their cars or stopping their benefits. By pooling resources we can work together to deal more effectively with the same people who are a huge drain on the public purse.

Building public confidence

But neighbourhood policing and partnership working between agencies would be redundant without local people on board. Without public confidence in the police and community safety partners, we would be fighting a losing battle against crime. Neighbourhood Watch, or Home Watch as it is known in Greater Manchester, is an example of the community working with police to build safer communities, looking out for their neighbours, being eyes and ears for the neighbourhood and helping to prevent crime. We have to do more to encourage and support groups like these. I've met with many Home Watch groups and in the summer I brought them together, from all corners of Greater Manchester, to share ideas, best practice and build on the vital links they already have with the police and their communities.

While Home Watch is an invaluable tool for the police to engage with the public, police and community safety partners have to make the effort to build links across all communities. From the basics of residents knowing who their local bobby is, to encouraging people to pick up the phone and report crime, police have to make sure the public have confidence that they will be listened to and something will be done. That's where Police and Crime Commissioners are critical – to hold police to account, identify

blockages in the system and work with police and others to unplug them. We have to get the response right first time.

Confidence in the police service has also taken significant hits recently in light of revelations surrounding the Hillsborough tragedy and the Stephen Lawrence inquiry, plus the ongoing Plebgate saga. Behind the headlines are genuine and concerning issues of integrity and accountability that we have to address if we are to rebuild trust between the public and the police.

Both the Chief Constable and I have committed that Greater Manchester Police will be Leveson-compliant and my office leads by example in being transparent, declaring all gifts and hospitality and involving the public in the scrutiny of GMP through public forums. Not dissimilar to the Select Committee system in Parliament, these meetings take an in-depth look at an issue of significant public interest – such as fraud or stop and search – hearing evidence from senior police officers and partner agencies and laying out the best way forward, to affect real change and show the public that the police are addressing the issues that matter, in an open way.

There is also the issue of confidence – or lack of it – in the complaints system. The day-to-day challenges faced by the police means sometimes things go wrong. That doesn't make it acceptable and it's important we take steps to put things right. Making a complaint to the police about poor service or incivility for example, should be a straightforward process with a swift resolution. But instead it's shrouded in bureaucracy, creating barriers for the public who are already unhappy and frustrated. Increasing the effectiveness of the complaints system will help to strengthen the openness, integrity and accountability of policing. That's something I'm doing in Greater Manchester, to ensure that malpractice is dealt with robustly and complaints are dealt with sensitively and transparently. Achieving this is a fundamental building block to improving public confidence.

We also need to do more to make sure the police service reflects the rich diversity of the communities we serve. The best way of policing any area is when people feel the police are there for them, not against them and that's why it's important police officers, PCSOs and staff are drawn from those neighbourhoods, so they can understand the issues of local people, and build trust within our hard-to-reach communities.

The reality of the challenge we face in achieving this was laid bare in the light of recent disclosures surrounding the Macpherson inquiry and, now almost 15 years on from the publication of the Stephen Lawrence inquiry report, black and minority ethnic communities are still dreadfully under-represented in the police service.

That is something we have to take firm steps to address, but this is made even more difficult in a time of austerity when police numbers are shrinking significantly. In Greater Manchester, with the handful of new posts I've been able to create in this year's budget, we are refreshing the approach to recruitment, adopting best practice from the private sector, streamlining the process and, importantly, going out to those communities and actively encouraging those communities to get involved in their local policing service. I believe we must go further. It may be time to give police the power in law to rebalance the workforce to make it truly representative of the diverse communities we serve.

All of this work shows that, despite the bumpy start, Police and Crime Commissioners have a unique role to play in driving improvements in policing, bringing partner agencies together and removing barriers between the public and all parts of the criminal justice system.

The electorate has given us the opportunity to modernise and improve policing and reduce crime, and they will decide in 2016 who has delivered and who has not.

2. Cutting Crime

Changing police culture: the role of the PCC in driving performance

Julia Mulligan, Police and Crime Commissioner for North Yorkshire

When people think about police performance, their benchmark is probably the headline crime rate – is it up or down? Certainly, this statistic is politically very significant; over the past 20 years, politicians of various hues have been quick to take the credit for falling crime.

After one of the warmest summers on record, and austerity tightening its hold on the police, partners and people's pockets, we are faced with the very real prospect that crime may be on the rise again.

The temptation could be to prioritise short-term problems. Especially because budgets are shrinking and reforms to partner agencies are having local consequences.

In North Yorkshire, the tightening of some services may be increasing demand, most obviously through more calls to the force control room but also in actual jobs such as missing from homes, Section 136 detentions, suicides, serious road casualties, and so on. It is also without doubt that the dismantling of the Crown Prosecution Service team dedicated to the county is causing very real issues for the police and victims. There is also a risk that the effectiveness of local offender services will be impacted due to the centralisation of probation and the imminent closure of North Yorkshire's local prison.

Given this context and the fact that local police performance is a *raison d'être* for Police and Crime Commissioners, their ability to drive improvements is going to be very closely scrutinised indeed.

But some things don't change. As ever, the answer will lie in achieving a balance between short-term 'grip' and long-term solutions.

'Grip' must be fundamental to the day-to-day business of policing and mounting pressure on operational targets is bringing this into even sharper focus.

In North Yorkshire, every morning close to 170 people are emailed the daily summary. Covering the past 24 hours, it includes an overview of notable crimes and incidents, as well as setting out performance by district against targets.

The daily summary is an important practical tool for senior officers to focus and task their teams – to grip performance through a range of actions on a daily basis, including the Chief's comments on performance and service delivered. Traditionally, it has been the purview of the operational side of the business.

But now, by about 6.30am every morning, the Commissioner can see what's happened where and how performance is progressing.

In itself, this may seem a small thing – the Commissioner being copied on the daily summary. But culturally it is noteworthy because it caused discomfort and disquiet. Why does the PCC need this information? Won't it compromise operations? No not at all, but it does signal a step-change away from the old 'arms-length', report-based scrutiny, to scrutiny which is immediate and imminent.

It is also significant the new Chief Constable introduced the change. Officers and staff do a difficult and demanding job and strong leadership is essential. So to see the Chief actively supporting the new modus operandi is especially important; it is evidence that he and the Commissioner are 'in it together', that the performance of the police service is a core responsibility of both.

This small practical measure is one of a number of others, including the establishment of a new, formal 'Corporate Performance and Scrutiny' group. At this monthly meeting, heads of service from operations and support talk openly and frankly about key issues

facing the organisation. As much as is possible, rank is left at the door and people are encouraged to challenge and problem-solve.

> “In North Yorkshire our mission is to be ‘the most responsive police service in England’”

Crucially, the Chief and Commissioner jointly chair this group. Staff and observers were initially a bit bemused by this approach but it goes to the heart of the culture change being driven through the organisation.

And culture change is a necessity, particularly in North Yorkshire.

Over a prolonged period of time, a series of issues surrounding the behaviour of some senior police officers had led to significant consequences for the relationship between chief officers and the governing body.

It contributed to an at times ‘adversarial’ atmosphere and way of working between the two – trust had been eroded. This issue was also material in the development of a particularly risk adverse culture, which hinders transparency, increases bureaucracy and contributes to the organisation being process-led rather than people-focused.

The development of risk adverse cultures across the public sector, including policing, has contributed to a creeping, insidious, bureaucratization. Rolling this back is not just a question of removing central and local targets: it demands root and branch culture change.

In North Yorkshire our mission is to be “the most responsive police service in England”. And it is our mission: a joint endeavour by the Chief Constable, the Commissioner and gradually, as we make changes, everyone within the service. North Yorkshire Police is a high-performing force – we are the safest area in England – but if we are to achieve our mission, we have to tackle the deep-seated cultural issues that risk emasculating genuine service and the dedicated individuals delivering it.

Around the country, Police and Crime Commissioners are facing similar cultural pressures and are dealing with them in different

ways. We also all share an immediate operational imperative to focus on 'grip'.

PCCs need to ensure they have in place the resources, structures and people to deliver 'grip' – not least a Chief Constable firmly focused on operational performance, rather than protecting his or her territory.

It was always going to be interesting to see the reaction of some senior police officers to Stage 2 transfers and what might be interpreted as a 'bid for power' by PCCs, overly 'intrusive' scrutiny and perceived incursions into operational policing.

We do not live in a black and white world. Grey areas exist, particularly operational issues in the public interest. The policing protocol is sacrosanct and Commissioners must respect the operational independence of the police. Much has been made of the potential for political interference in policing, but PCCs acting outside the protocol risk undermining their own role – they would be on a very sticky wicket indeed.

Like anything new, there will be sticking points along the way and mistakes made. But the service will be the better and stronger for adopting a pragmatic, collaborative approach between Chief and Commissioner, with shared aims and objectives.

Such a way of working also enhances scrutiny, openness and transparency – in other words, the ability to get close up and personal with the police force.

The public expects this of us – we are their champions. Sometimes this leads us into delicate situations, not least when things go wrong or services change in local communities. Operational officers need to understand this new dimension. For the first time there is an obvious individual to whom the public can turn. This has significant cultural and practical implications. It also creates opportunities to improve the service to the public and drive performance by being more responsive to local people. By working through live situations – as is happening within specific

communities in North Yorkshire – police officers are beginning to see that Commissioners can both challenge their performance, but also support them in helping the public navigate their way through complex and difficult situations – similar to the role MPs play in supporting constituents.

With this in mind, PCCs have a real chance to start unravelling some of the cultural issues that prove so frustrating to both the police service and the public, who are sometimes left vulnerable and adrift in a seemingly unfathomable sea of complexity and bureaucracy.

Looking beyond police performance per se, PCCs also have a new, potentially powerful tool – commissioning.

In terms of tackling some of the longer term drivers of crime, we need to develop a sophisticated, evidence-based approach to commissioning.

In North Yorkshire, our first step has been to create the right environment and structures for effective commissioning. This has been done in partnership with the police service, starting with the recruitment of a new Head of Commissioning and Partnerships. A member of the OPCC team, the post-holder will work hand-in-hand with the Deputy Chief Constable, who was instrumental in the recruitment process and is responsible for partnerships within the police service.

Part of the preparation has also been to explore and analyse past performance. Due to the complexity of the two tier local authority structure, funding and processes, it has proven extremely difficult to identify who has had what, from whom, and why. With a few exceptions, it has also been particularly challenging to identify the impact of funding within local communities – outputs are noted but outcomes are nigh on impossible to evidence. The need for reform is overwhelming.

In order to drive performance, we have to make sure that every penny is spent effectively – on services that tackle the key drivers of

crime, and those which help deal with its consequences, especially for victims.

The need for culture change thus transcends the police force, into the wider partnership arena. What's more, many partners are increasingly willing to challenge the status quo in order to deliver more effective and efficient services. This is particularly so in areas of higher need, such as the City of York and coastal districts like Scarborough, where innovation is thriving.

In these areas, innovation is focused on dealing with the all-important cross-cutting problems which drive crime and anti-social behaviour. These include alcohol and drug misuse, mental health issues, reoffending, and travelling and organised criminals.

However, across the policing area as a whole, the approach is mostly tactical and reactive. The key to long-term performance is a targeted and co-ordinated strategy that strikes at the heart of these fundamental issues.

In order to develop this strategic approach, the Community Safety Partnerships are being reformed. A refreshed Community Safety Forum, chaired by the PCC is being established that operates at a senior level across the whole policing area. It will be responsible for developing the evidence-based strategy and co-ordinating with other bodies such as the Health and Wellbeing and Local Criminal Justice boards.

Underpinning the Forum and CSPs, will be a new 'insight hub' that will be the vehicle for assessing and analysing evidence, areas of need and ultimately performance and outcomes. The hub will pool data from the police and partners, seeking to overcome some of the data-sharing issues that have historically prevented partners working together as effectively as might otherwise be possible.

The challenges associated with these changes are very real. In particular, there is a need to convince partners to eschew traditional barriers and protectionism towards their local areas. With a diverse political landscape, and increasing jealously between 'rural' and

'urban' areas over finite resources, trust needs to be built, as well evidence produced and support given.

However, where partners are working together effectively and innovating, the evidence points clearly to enhanced performance. This can only be in the interest of all concerned, not least the public and victims of crime and anti-social behaviour.

It is evident that Police and Crime Commissioners have the potential to be catalysts for change across their policing areas in multiple ways – both within the police service itself and beyond.

We also need to be more effective at championing the public's causes at a national level, shaping policy and driving change, for example by commissioning a review of ACPO, or fighting for local services. We can take heart in that results are possible, even in austere times. In North Yorkshire, after years of inaction on the part of the NHS, a Place of Safety for people detained under Section 136 of the Mental Health Act will open this year – a direct result of an effective campaign led by the PCC, alongside partners.

But one difficulty all Police and Crime Commissioners face is that change takes time, especially cultural change. Locally, this is happening in North Yorkshire, with for example, previously skeptical police officers providing positive feedback as they retire; "it's a change for the better"; "you've made us think differently".

Looking ahead however, especially in the full and at times hostile glare of the media, it is incumbent upon all PCCs to 'keep calm and carry on'. As we develop our roles, performance will increase and value for money will be improved. But most importantly of all, the public should have greater confidence in a more responsive service and there will be fewer victims of crime and anti-social behaviour.

Police and Crime Commissioners: an opportunity to bring joined up working to complex issues

Matthew Ellis, Police and Crime Commissioner for Staffordshire

When I started as Staffordshire's Police & Crime Commissioner 12 months ago the old adage which says 'there are few community issues that can be dealt with by a single agency' was yet again proven beyond doubt.

I found early on the remarkable similarities which exist between the complexities of my previous role as political lead for social care & health in Staffordshire and this new role. The mantra of Early Intervention, Prevention and engendering a greater sense of Personal Responsibility were the focus in my old 'world'. They are clearly also at the heart of reducing crime, improving criminal justice and community safety. Even the need for focus on the 'here & now' as well as the next decade and beyond is similar. So legacy and reform, not just tweaking bits of the system, are both critical in this role too.

Much is linked to human traits, social or generational trends and demography. That brings us back to needing multi agency problem solving with a sector wide approach to delivering services and influencing societal trends that could reduce future demand for those services.

That is why the role of Police & Crime Commissioners might, indeed should, make a critical difference by bringing new dynamics and opportunities resulting from taking a 'helicopter view' of relevant parts of public and other sectors. Doing that means a PCC can be a catalyst acting as an honest broker to achieve more joined up working, collaboration or even integration around common challenges, and crucially, shared outcomes.

After all, while efficiencies in the operational delivery of services and the organisations that provide them can secure some welcome

savings, it is fair to say that it will be managing and reducing demand for those services in the future which will have the biggest impact. In fact, far from having an adverse effect on services, the squeeze on finances and the need to work more collaboratively should result in better outcomes and 'the system' fitting an individual's needs rather than an individual having to fit 'the system'.

Some say the powers of PCCs aren't wide enough or sufficient to be able to contemplate a change of that magnitude but in my view that belief is misplaced or misguided. It ignores the uniqueness of an individual office-holder with an electoral mandate that's not only large (hopefully larger still next time) but is also very different to what went before. It is also different to, for instance, a council leader because it comes without the need to manage the internal politics of a group and so brings individual accountability to decision making and any views expressed.

PCCs do have powers but it is influence that will make the difference. That unique platform to speak more openly, more directly and sometimes controversially on difficult issues is a new and powerful chance to instigate wider debate about areas which need reform, aren't working or would benefit from a more collaborative approach. That in itself stimulates action on breaking down any organisational silos which might well have been more difficult to achieve before PCCs were on the scene.

The media also appear to see the role of PCCs to be different and in some ways simpler for them to engage with, because it's more personal. Interest from newspapers, radio and television is far more intense now than in my previous council role. That of course presents new challenges but it also provides wider opportunities to influence public opinion and ensure issues that have historically ended up in the 'too difficult to do box' are debated and addressed.

One example of that is the difficulties in Staffordshire (and wider) around incidents involving people with mental health conditions. The issue was raised at events called Straight Talk

sessions which I held across Staffordshire in my first three months in office.

The events were an opportunity for groups of 10 to 20 Police Officers (including Specials), PCSOs and Staff below the rank of Inspector or equivalent to meet with me under Chatham House rules to discuss what their working lives are really like. Open access, which some Chiefs would call risky, set the foundations for the relationship with my Chief Constable and was invaluable in turbocharging what has been a steep learning curve.

“There is little doubt that police officers are often best placed to stabilise some incidents relating to mental health”

Issues of mental health and its impact on policing were raised consistently in a professional and measured way in every local policing area I visited for the Straight Talk sessions. It was clearly something which had been a constant problem that had not been addressed with the health and social care sector seeming content that the police service simply coped with whatever they were asked to do. The very real frustration from officers was obvious as was a strong sense of resignation that there was nothing likely to change anytime soon.

Whilst national evidence to confirm that police spend a significant amount of time on this issue is easily available I wanted to understand in more detail the practical day to day impact on policing across Staffordshire. To do that I commissioned the police to provide a case by case study recording specific details of every incident over an eight week period which involved mental health. The results proved beyond doubt the scale of the issue but also the level of complexity across multiple agencies. The ‘Staffordshire Report’ has since been used by the Home Secretary and others in relation to this issue.

There is little doubt that police officers are often best placed to stabilise some incidents relating to mental health. Too often, however, the specialist expertise and facilities needed to support individuals with complex conditions after that initial response is

not available, particularly outside normal 'working hours'. The impact that can have on frontline policing was calculated to be 18% over the eight week period. It also meant that some individuals who had not committed any offence were potentially criminalised unnecessarily or their condition made significantly worse as a result of being in a custodial not a health orientated environment.

Managing mental illness is a growing challenge with one person in four experiencing mental health problems at some point in their life. Mental health legislation provides a framework which places the 'best interest' of individuals at the centre of professional practice, whether a police officer, a mental health professional or hospital and community clinicians. However, this does not automatically translate into effective, joined-up high quality services that meet the needs of individuals with complex conditions being available at local level.

In Staffordshire, similar issues exist as to other areas with a growing number of people detained in a police environment under Section 136 because of a lack of hospital based 'places of safety' and long waits for assessment by mental health professionals. The increasing numbers of people being held in police cells when they need other services places pressure on policing and damages lives. However, the answer to this problem is more complex than only expanding these services and facilities. Whilst that is one aspect, earlier intervention and a more joined up approach across services is now being developed for Staffordshire. It could be argued that this area isn't the responsibility of a Police & Crime Commissioner but I believe this is exactly where an honest broker approach could act as a catalyst for change. I've now funded a specialist programme manager post to develop:

- Governance arrangements providing strong and effective multi-agency and multi professional input in delivering strategic change with a remit that cuts across organisational silos and pathways and is genuinely capable of transformational activity;

- Engaging with stakeholders across health, social care and the voluntary sector so that a 'whole system' approach is developed that results in people receiving a timely and appropriate response when they are in distress;
- Ensuring access to mental health professionals attached to policing activity that are able to assess and divert people to services that meet their needs e.g. having access to 'community triage' that brings the skills of mental health professionals onto the front line working alongside police officers;
- Providing robust training for all professionals, including police officers that extends beyond process and into building expertise and a knowledge base;
- Improving access to mental health advice, support and interventions through a streamlined single point of access to local services and also improving access and availability of information about services.

This is not a programme of work providing a short-term quick fix. It will mean sustainable improvement that in the longer term will deliver more comprehensive outcomes for individuals and the wider public sector.

Crucial is freeing up police officer time to maintain visibility in communities and reduce crime. By investing in work to ensure that the right professionals who understand the complexities of mental health are available more easily at all times, there will be human and social benefits but also potentially reduced demand for higher cost public services more generally.

Harm reduction: using a public health approach to tackling crime

Alun Michael, Police and Crime Commissioner for South Wales

It's a great irony that one of the two great clarion calls for common sense on combating crime came from a Conservative Leader while the other came from a Labour Leader – over 150 years apart.

Each offered powerful slogans based in clear principles and borne out by evidence. They show that neither political theory nor populist rhetoric can adequately define the role of the police in meeting the prime responsibility of the State – to protect its citizens.

My first champion for common sense is Sir Robert Peel whose nine "Peelian Principles" (distilled by later commentators from his speeches) boil down to two key principles:

- "The basic mission for the police is to prevent crime and disorder"
- "The Police are the public and the public are the police"

My second champion is Tony Blair whose approach was famously summed up in a single message:

- "We must be Tough on Crime and Tough on the Causes of Crime"

Actually, it nearly didn't become famous. Tony became tired of repeating the message, and as his deputy I had to keep reinstating it in one speech after another until a sarcastic comment by Michael Howard (Home Secretary at the time) provided the oxygen of media attention and we were able to expand on the practical issues that underpinned the slogan.

We identified widespread public concern with low-level anti-social behaviour and not just with serious crime. Thankfully few people are directly affected by homicide but large numbers of people in South Wales know about litter and graffiti and noise nuisance and the trauma of living next to the "neighbours from hell".

And we also recognised the complexity of the public response to crime and disorder. During dozens of meetings on run-down estates up and down the country I heard the authentic voice of local anger about local youngsters being out of control, only for the same person to say later in the meeting "… and there's nothing for the kids to do around here". Many of those who most passionately asked us to be "tough on crime" also demanded action to "tackle the causes of crime". Our "slogan" grew out of listening to local experience.

The imperative for sophisticated and responsible police leadership became clear after the polarised period of the Miners' Strike, when many Chief Constables sought to re-connect the police with the community. They also gave enthusiastic support to the principles of partnership set out in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. Crime and Disorder Partnerships, Youth Offending Teams, the Youth Justice Board and preventative interventions like the Anti-social Behaviour Order have all helped to make a real and lasting impact on crime levels across England and Wales. As Peel rightly said, **"the efficiency and effectiveness of the police is proved through the absence of crime and not through the evidence of police action in dealing with crime".**

The most significant statement of evidence-based principles came in December 2009 with a unanimous cross-party report from the Justice Select Committee after a major investigation into "Justice Reinvestment". If you had all the money that goes into the Criminal Justice System today, would you spend it in the same way? Simple answer: "No!"

It showed that most of the public policy factors that affect levels of crime and disorder are outside the hands of the police and the Criminal Justice System. Education, skills training, jobs, opportunity, housing, substance misuse, alcohol abuse, mental health and early intervention to "nip things in the bud" do affect crime levels.

In particular, mental health is an issue that is raised regularly. Research has shown that 70% of the prison population has two or more mental health disorders. So we are failing to identify people with mental health conditions and failing to get them to the help they need. Individuals with mental health needs often end up in police custody instead of getting the help they need. In contrast the NHS is expected to help those with other ongoing (or even "untreatable") conditions, like diabetes or a heart condition. A crisis for them may result in fast transit to A&E, but not a trip to police cells. That can't be right.

So if most of the levers are outside the hands of the police how can a Police & Crime Commissioner make a real impact?

For me, it comes down to three key approaches:

- A victim-based "public health" approach to crime
- A passionate commitment to an evidence-based approach
- A partnership approach to prevention

Here's what they mean in practice:

A victim-based approach

When the Justice Select Committee enquired into the needs of victims, I asked the then Chief Executive of Victim Support to summarise what victims want and need. She answered that what victims want, more than anything else (other than not to have become a victim in the first place) is to know that it's not going to happen again.

We need to make sure that victims are treated properly within the criminal justice system. Going to court is too often an experience of re-victimisation, and that must change. But it is also imperative that we prevent offending, reoffending and re-victimisation.

The police role is vital – not on their own, but as part of the team with other agencies. Victims need to see the police as being "on their side" and I strongly support my Chief Constable's commitment to improving victim satisfaction with the police response to crime and anti-social behaviour.

Restorative justice too must be victim-centred, enabling the victim's voice to be heard while challenging the offender and tackling the "relational deficit" which is exhibited by so many offenders.

Evidence-based approach

Preparing evidence for the court is central to police professionalism, so it may seem redundant to demand an evidence-based approach to policing. But an evidence-based approach to crime reduction is different and for a time was not seen as central to the police as a "blue light" service. The "blue light service" of reactive policing is essential to the public and central to the role of the police – but it is "reactive" and not "preventative".

The "can do" attitude of the police to tackling problems is a great strength. When a problem arises, their instinctive response is "let me take that away and sort it". However this can be a weakness if the levers of preventative action lie with other people. So the big challenge for a Commissioner is to endorse the action-orientated approach while leading the search for "what works" and taking a clinical approach to asking "why does this bad stuff happen?" and bringing about change.

My passionate belief in the partnership approach comes from a history of working across different agencies long before I entered

Parliament. I worked with young offenders, I sought to reduce offending locally, I worked in an analytic interagency context as a youth worker and I chaired the city's Juvenile Bench (as it then was). An "action research" project in the Ely area of Cardiff with a young researcher – now Prof Howard Williamson of the University of South Wales – made a massive impact on me. Intensive work proved that people in different professions "knew" the area in general, but totally misunderstood the detail at the granular local level. It also proved that a silo approach by agencies and professions is not just ineffective but totally counter-productive.

"Analysing incidents which brought victims of violence to A&E led to significant and sustained reductions in the number and seriousness of violent incidents"

Earlier, being involved in a major project on "Working Together for Children and their Families", led by the late great Barbara Kahan, opened my eyes to the ineffectiveness of a great deal of public policy.

We now have ample proof that an evidence-based approach to partnership works. The Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships required by the 1998 Act (Community Safety Partnerships in Wales) are a clear success, although the methodology of audit, evidence collection and analysis has not been as methodical as I intended.

The effectiveness of a rigorous approach is shown by the Cardiff Violence Reduction Programme led by Prof Jonathan Shepherd of Cardiff University's Medical School. Jonathan approached me in the mid-90s to argue that a scientific approach could cut violence significantly. His in-tray for treatment of facial injuries from car accidents was going down (in number and seriousness) but his in-tray of victims of violence was escalating.

It's a long story, but analysing incidents which brought victims of violence to A&E led to significant and sustained reductions in the number and seriousness of violent incidents. Peer-reviewed published evidence puts this beyond doubt. A crucial aspect of my

Police and Crime Plan, supported by the Welsh Health Minister, Mark Drakeford AM, is to take a similar baseline approach to all Accident and Emergency Departments across South Wales.

Commitment to partnership and preventative approaches

So an analytic approach is vital and partnership works – provided partnership is much more than different professionals just feeling comfortable with each other. I am convinced that other aspects of crime will respond to a similar clinical and rigorous approach. That's why partnership needs to permeate all agencies and translate into activity on the ground – as happens in the late night triage in Cardiff where health, police, local authority and Third Sector staff work amazingly well together.

The benefits are obvious and borne out in the statistics: If police have fewer crimes to deal with, they can focus their limited resources on improving interventions, increasing the sanction-detection levels, improving victim satisfaction and improving engagement with the wider public. That's consistent with Sir Robert Peel's messages. It's good for a surgeon to have fewer cases in his in-tray, for courts to deal with fewer cases and subsequently for police officers to be spared wasteful hours in court, and it's good for those who do not become victims.

I can only speak for South Wales, where the police have pursued this approach for several years and we have the enthusiastic engagement of local councils and others. The 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review's severe cuts, compounded now by further cuts, put this success at risk. Above all, we need to avoid what I saw in previous recessions when many agencies narrowed their focus and reduced interagency cooperation. Certainly in Wales there is good evidence that things are different this time: Welsh Government, local councils and others understand that in tough times you need more joint working, not less.

That's where the Police and Crime Commissioner can add value.

So if many crime reduction levers are outside the hands of the police, are the police less important as a Force and as a Profession? Certainly not: The role of police officers is enormously complex, coping with an amazing range of demands from local antisocial behaviour to terrorism and extremism, from traffic to the night time economy, from helping vulnerable elderly people to tackling thugs and crooks and much, much more. Clear operational direction by the chief constable is vital, complemented by the role of the individual police officer – a citizen to whom we have given powers to act on behalf of the rest of us.

Ministerial statements and Media headlines about Police and Crime Commissioners talked of "powers" and "holding chief constables to account". That's important, but any interested observer should study the "Commissioners Oath of Office". An MPs oath refers vaguely to serving the Queen as some sort of proxy for public service, whereas the Commissioner's Oath is detailed, complex and specific. It reflects the complex role of a Commissioner which in turn reflects the complex role of the police and I have promised specifically to serve the people and communities of South Wales.

Our formal duties as Commissioner are important, but it's the "and Crime" part of the role that allows an imaginative and enthusiastic Commissioners will make a real impact as a real partner for the Chief Constable, mutually challenging but with clear areas of responsibility. The Commissioner can make the connections across public bodies in general and carry out the explicit duty to provide an "efficient and effective criminal justice system" in the local police area. Our leadership is about driving down crime and supporting excellence in policing.

The way forward is clear – it's through a "public health" approach to policing. The Media portray well the excitement of "blue light" activities in the NHS and in the police, but it's the

hidden, painstaking, evidence-based approach to making things better that matter for victims and patients. To put it another way, fewer victims and fewer patient spells success.

There's just one problem.

For years I believed that cutting crime would lead to people feeling safer, but that's not how it works. When I ask public meetings whether the centre of Cardiff is safer or less safe than it was ten years ago, most people say "worse". In fact it's far safer – shown by the reduced number and seriousness of injuries that take victims of violence to A&E.

So I want to add a "Tenth Principle" to Peel's nine:

> *"We must understand the real levels of crime, not just what is reported, and share this knowledge with the public to reduce the fear of crime".*

As newspapers struggle to survive, as aspects of social media become shrill and intolerant, and as the cacophony of public opinion becomes ever more deafening, it sometimes seems hopeless to argue for trusting the public with the facts. Churchill described democracy as the worst form of government, except for all the others that have been tried. That applies equally to the public health approach to cutting crime and disorder.

It won't make headlines, but having been given leadership responsibility, that's the direction in which any Police and Crime Commissioner should lead the police and the public.

3. Delivering for Victims and the Public

A criminal justice service: how PCCs can improve the experience of victims of crime

Martyn Underhill, Police and Crime Commissioner for Dorset

I am deeply honoured to have become Dorset's first ever PCC. I am also very grateful to have been asked to write this essay – it covers a topic that is very important to me. This isn't an academic essay, more an essay from the heart, detailing experiences I have gathered as both a police officer and a PCC.

To take on a new role, to help carve a new direction for policing, has been a humbling experience, and an experience I have thoroughly enjoyed.

Here I will outline some of the things that I have introduced in relation to victims. I will also outline the journey that I still think we need to take, before a victim can truly have an improved experience.

A year on, and I, like most PCCs, have placed victims at the heart of my agenda. I like to think that I am one of the more radical in seeking to achieve change.

My reasoning behind this is because I compare a victims position in 2013 to that of a patient in the 1960's NHS.

Some of you will remember the NHS in the 1960s, where the Ward sister had a Godlike appearance and role, an NHS where nurses and doctors knew better than the parents. Parents were told to "stop being emotional, your child's in good hands, leave it to

the professionals". This was an NHS where decision making was largely removed from the parent.

In 2013 of course, all that has changed. Parents now undergo a shared journey with their child in hospital, they can choose the hospital they want, stay with their child, and they can be involved in decisions, and ask for medical briefings, all of which was unheard of many years ago.

The changes took place because the world learnt that professionals don't always know best, and the world learnt that professionals do make mistakes.

And that realisation, that step change in perception, of the NHS, gave a lot of control back to the parent.

And it's exactly the same for the victim.

It's time the Criminal Justice System accepted that, in relation to victims, professionals don't always know best, and professionals do get it wrong.

Control

Ultimately, victims want more involvement, they need more control.

Yes, things have got better. I think we all accept that victim status is now recognised far more than a decade ago. But there is still a long way to go.

So why do victims want to be more involved?

It is because becoming a victim means that you lose control.

Whilst some crimes such as sexual offending or domestic abuse are all about power and control, even acquisitive crimes have an element of it. And we, as people, do not like to feel out of control, helpless and humiliated.

The irony here is that most criminals have no idea they are removing other peoples control, when they commit a crime. A burglar who randomly chooses a house to steal from, to feed an

addiction, often has no concept that they are removing the victim's security, their routine and ultimately their control over their safety and their life.

Burglars I have interviewed as a police officer have been shocked to hear how much their crime affected the victim's lifestyle.

That is why it is important to work with offenders to help to develop empathy for their victims. Offenders have mindsets and feelings too. Change the mindset, and you can change their offending.

Services need to be commissioned to enable offenders and victims to meet face to face in a supported environment to enable the offender to learn about the impact of their crime and to enable the victim to take back control of their lives.

Information

I speak to victims most days, I have been a victim of crime myself, and it is quite clear that knowing what happened, and why it happened, is often more of a driving force to the victim than retribution.

That is why Restorative Justice, Community Resolution and Neighbourhood Justice Panels (NJP's) have proved so popular with victims. And that is why all such options and remedies should be made available across Dorset, available to all victims.

Putting a victim in a room with the offender, hearing their side of the story, and having a say on the punishment gives the victim their control back. It is also gives the victim the most desired thing of all – information.

The Victims Bureau

In Dorset, we are introducing a Victims Bureau. This is the second such system in England and Wales, the first one opened a while ago in Northumbria.

The idea of the Victims Bureau is to give the victim information. As the famous quote goes, "With knowledge comes power". And it is knowledge, the information about a crime, their crime, that victims want most of all.

The Bureau caters for most victims, updating them on their crime, tailoring their needs individually. If a victim asks for weekly updates, by email, that's what they will get. Equally if a victim asks for a tweet saying "call us", so that they can be updated when it suits them to call, then we will do that to.

"These victims are just as traumatised, just as needy for support, and want to get their control back"

The Bureau will not just give the victim information; it gives them the right to make choices.

The Bureau will also offer support, and signpost victims to information and help.

Whilst Phase 1 of the Victims Bureau is nearly here, it is Phase 2 that really excites me. Phase 2 centres on the "forgotten". The people who suffer a crime, and for whatever reason, cannot find the strength to enter the criminal justice system.

These victims are just as traumatised, just as needy for support, and want to get their control back. There are charities out there that offer valuable support, but the "system" really doesn't cater well for this huge swathe of people who deserve as much of a service as those that do find the strength to pick up the phone and report their crime.

Phase 2 of the Victims Bureau will be in a non-police building, and will contain other linked services such as the Sexual Assault Referral Clinic (SARC) and other agencies. It will provide a "wrap around service" to victims, whether they enter the criminal justice system or not.

The second phase of the Victims Bureau will also draw in all of the other criminal justice agencies so that we can provide an 'end to end' service. In other words, a seamless partnership working together to update, support and value victims.

In parallel to the Victim's Bureau, and to make sure that there are positive changes to victim outcomes, expectations and services there is a need to consult directly with victims.

One way of doing this is to create Victim Forums. These forums are an opportunity to meet a victim, and gauge if their experience was good, and should be celebrated. Or if the service experience was poor, whether there is a need to learn from that. It is important to be prepared to say sorry to victims if a mistake is made. It may not always change the outcome, but the ability to apologise, and to learn from your mistakes are both empowering to the victim in question as well as to the organisation.

I am also mindful of the huge void out there of information specific to a victim. As well as launching the Victims Bureau, and Victim Forums, I am also exploring a pan Dorset website, purely for victims.

The site should cater for all crimes, whatever their nature. A victim should be able to go to the site, enter a crime type, and be led to sections on their particular crime. The sections should outline local and national support groups, plus the FAQ section we all wished we had right now – from "I've been burgled, will my house insurance premium go up?" to "I want to report a historic child abuse case, how can I do that?"

The site should also allow on line reporting of certain crimes.

And whilst that is all good, there is still a need to go further. To see a day where a victim can easily challenge any Police, Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) or judicial decision.

The Police

Currently, if the police decide they have "insufficient evidence", and the victim disagrees, the only recourse for the victim is to lodge a complaint about the nature of the investigation. The complaint takes months to resolve itself, and rarely gives a different outcome.

It is vital that police explain what "lines of enquiry" they have undertaken and why, as a matter of routine. If a line of enquiry is not followed, because of financial reasons or because they are not proportionate, then the victim needs to be told that in a timely manner.

Speak to a burglary victim, and they all know about the forensic angle, but most have never heard about "house-to-house", police scanning of antique dealers, crime pattern analysis or the other work the police do routinely.

This sharing of information doesn't just reassure a victim; it also professionalises the police and helps the victim understand the process, the investigation, and makes the victim feel valued.

Some sections of the police and other Criminal Justice agencies do not like the "public" peering into their world. We need to change that culture to one where public scrutiny is the norm.

The Crown Prosecution Service

The new victim Right to Review process is welcomed. This is the right for a victim to challenge some CPS decisions, but it doesn't go far enough.

It is important that there is scrutiny and the ability to challenge at all stages of the criminal justice process and this should include all CPS decisions. If a decision is taken to charge an offender with handling stolen goods, rather than burglary, then the burglary victim needs to be involved in that process. This is their crime, their journey. The day of the State "owning" these issues must change.

Currently, some parts of the Criminal Justice System are surveyed (The Police for example) and other parts are not. Victims should be given the opportunity to rate the services provided to them by all agencies within that system.

The Judiciary

The Judiciary are resistant to change, and fiercely hold onto their right to independence and neutrality. The problem is that their current stance does not embrace some of the changes that victims want.

For example, the opportunity to have Magistrates across England and Wales chairing a Neighbourhood Justice Panel, using their experience and knowledge to create useful, victim based outcomes would be invaluable.

> "One year in, we now know PCC's can make things happen, especially locally"

There should be more opportunities for a Judge to talk privately to a victim in a criminal court, as they often do to parties in a family court.

A day when victim satisfaction is measured across the piece, where the Courts, the Judiciary and CPS are as answerable as the other agencies.

A day when Judges and Barristers have to meet victims, like I do, to hear about their experiences in the courtroom, hear about how they felt when a Judge excluded evidence or ruled a particular way.

In brief, the victim's voice must be heard.

And finally, with the Bulger case still ringing in our ears, there needs to be a system where Independent members of a Parole Board represent victims more than they do now.

A Parole Board where an offender being considered for release for murder has a murder victim's parent or partner sitting on the Board.

A Parole Board where an offender being released for a violent crime, has the victim of a violent crime sitting on the Board adding to the information and deliberation of that panel.

A Parole Board where the needs and views of victims are equal, if not higher, than the needs of the offender.

In summary, we still have a long way to go, but we are moving in the right direction. One year in, we now know PCC's can make things happen, especially locally.

Equally, when it comes to other agencies and the Parole Board, there is a role for the PCC to lobby Government to recog-

nise and improve victim's services. Across the whole Criminal Justice System.

I truly believe we will get there.

Opening the castle gates: how PCCs can deliver the public's priorities

Chris Salmon, Police and Crime Commissioner for Dyfed-Powys

Letters. E-mails. Phone calls. Tweets. Facebook messages. Public meetings. Police and Crime Commissioners have brought many changes to the public's relationship with the police in the last twelve months. Perhaps most striking is the volume of public correspondence. My office receives in a day what the former police authority used to receive in a month. Messages come in all forms and on all media. Many are complaints about perceived failures of service. Some are about problems across the criminal justice system and local government. They are evidence of perhaps the most pressing of the public's priorities. That is, to be heard.

To an outsider, our relationship with the criminal justice system can seem distinctly mediaeval. If you are a victim or unhappy with something, you face impenetrable walls of bureaucracy to challenge decisions. Very quickly you find yourself a latter-day plaintiff at the castle gates, petition in hand, waiting to be heard. Inside, the machinery of law and order whirs with little heed to the world beyond the drawbridge.

Meanwhile we live in a world of instantly tweeted gossip. We share news online much as our ancestors must have shared theirs at the village pump: unfiltered, unsubstantiated and laced with personal perspectives. In crime terms, our perception of security in Milford Haven this afternoon is affected by murders in Machynlleth or Manchester this morning. All our national institutions are struggling to adapt. The police are no different.

PCCs are part of the answer to this challenge. By putting public priorities first they go some way to connecting the public with their policing and justice institutions. They have the potential to breach the castle walls. Or at least to open the gates.

Listening to the public

What emerges from public correspondence is often frustration. Frustration that organisations do not seem to talk to each other. Frustration at not being taken seriously. Frustration at delays. Frustration at a system that seems too often to back the perpetrator, not the victim.

This has more than individual importance. No matter that crime is falling. No statistic will convince a burgled middle-class homeowner or a council estate plagued by antisocial behaviour that the world is getting safer. Crime is local. Its tentacles may stretch to Lagos but its consequences are felt in Lampeter or Luton. To retain confidence policing and justice must respond to public perception.

Listening is the first step. Very little of the public's contact with police relates directly to crime. But this contact shapes public perceptions and sense of shared values, so important to public confidence.[1] PCCs are a key part of the mechanism to keep those public and institutional values aligned. By delivering the public's priorities they build trust in the institutions of our justice.

Different PCCs are experimenting with different approaches to engagement. Reaching people where they are, rather than expecting them to come to us, is a feature of many engagement strategies. So is better use of technology. All PCCs hold public meetings. Tony Lloyd, in Greater Manchester, holds regular public meetings with his Chief Constable, in accordance with a public contract.[2] In Humberside, Matthew Grove launched his first weeks in the job with a series of pop-up surgeries. My Chief Constable and I took a roadshow around our major towns to explain our roles and answer questions.

Social media and the internet are increasingly important, though still evolving faster than most of our abilities to use them. In Sussex, Katy Bourne publishes webcasts of her scrutiny meetings with the Chief Constable.[3] PCCs are avid tweeters; they run blogs or write columns for local papers. As public figures, they are able

1 Bottoms and Tankebe (2012) in The Police Foundation, Policing and Crime Reduction

2 Public contract between Tony Lloyd and the Chief Constable, accessed 26/8/2013 http://tinyurl.com/l8g4xup

3 Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner Webcasting, accessed 26/8/2013 http://tinyurl.com/lhkfr66

increasingly to influence public debate. Olly Martins recently challenged the government on GPS tagging contracts. A number of PCCs are exploring more robust local resolution mechanisms for police complaints.

Social media has a magnifying impact where it can be harnessed. One Facebook user in Cardigan recently placed an angry post about a speeding police car. A short response explaining that the driver had received a formal warning led to a further post, this time complimentary, about how the complaint had been taken seriously.

Small exchanges like this have the potential to create huge good will. They are public, after all. Conversely, comments ignored or avoided breed suspicion and resentment.

But traditional methods are still critical. People may not engage with government as they once did, but they do respond to issues that affect them. In the last few months I have attended meetings on speeding motorcycles and a localised mephedrone problem. Both expressed real local concern. They created an opportunity for me to ensure the police and – crucially – other partners like councils and school heads listen and respond.

Public priorities: Police and Crime Plans

The first, obvious, point to make about priorities is that they are different in different places. They are captured in Police and Crime Plans, which each of us is obliged to publish. My priorities for Dyfed Powys are designed for some of the most rural areas in Britain.[4] They are bound to differ from those in Greater Manchester or Essex. The creation of PCCs and scrapping of central targets has strengthened that local connection.

Our challenge in Dyfed Powys is less the volume of crime than geography. Policing vast areas is as important to our public as tackling gang crime is to metropolitan forces. It is also just as much of a professional challenge.

4 Dyfed Powys Police and Crime Plan, accessed 26/8/2013 http://tinyurl.com/kvffanm

Drugs and antisocial behaviour threatened public spaces in urban and rural areas alike. Fear of violence and abuse lurks in villages as it does in cities. In some cases, the impact of is greater as we learnt in Machynlleth when April Jones was murdered last year.

The challenge before policing is the same as the challenge before all public service: how do we involve the public in protecting themselves?

David Lloyd, in Hertfordshire, called his police and crime plan 'Everybody's Business' for the obvious reason that it is.[5] Crime and antisocial behaviour affects us all. We all have a part to play in reducing it.

> "The challenge before policing is the same as the challenge before all public service: how do we involve the public in protecting themselves?"

Other PCCs are promoting crime reduction funds and prevention initiatives, using their powers to commission wider services. These involve the public directly in protecting their own areas. These initiatives will grow as further money, like victims' funding, is devolved in future.

Avon and Somerset PCC has distributed £2.4 million of community safety funding, including support for projects tackling racism, domestic violence and female genital mutilation. Cheshire has committed £100,000 to community groups via a Crime Prevention Fund. Dyfed Powys has a Commissioner's Fund that puts money at the disposal of front line officers to support projects they feel will prevent crime. The aim is twofold. Firstly, to empower junior officers to make decisions and engage further with their communities. Secondly, to contribute to the objectives of the Police and Crime Plan, not least prevention. We are exploring how mediation can help prevent civil disputes becoming criminal cases. That requires specialist skills and outside input. Trained volunteers, solicitors and charities all have a part to play. This is where Police and Crime Commissioners' wider commissioning powers come in use. A test scheme will give early results in 2014.

5 Everybody's business: The Police and Crime Plan for Hertfordshire, accessed 26/8/2013 http://tinyurl.com/l9lgzkv

The public's team: Chief Constables and Police and Crime Commissioners

Relationships between Police and Crime Commissioners and Chief Constables have received a huge amount of attention. The vast majority are working well, though they rarely attract public comment.

We have differing and complementary roles. The power of the relationship is that accountability is clear and decision-making far quicker than under the previous regime. The Chief Constable is accountable to the Police and Crime Commissioner, who in turn is accountable to the public. Nothing has changed about the independence of the police in law.

My Chief Constable, Simon Prince, and I talk regularly. Formal Policing Board meetings enable transparent decision-making between us and other senior staff. Once a month we meet for extended scrutiny of force performance. The Board does not vote or make joint decisions; rather it acts as a forum where we each discharge our responsibilities in a transparent manner. It is designed to tackle one of the more pervasive and damaging habits of past police governance. That was the tendency for decisions to be taken in corridors and for pre-cooked answers to be passed to the Police Authority for approval.

Perhaps the clearest example of the relationship in action concerns recent changes to police front desks. A number have recently been closed. They were barely used, some with fewer than 10 visits a day. But the result has been even more perverse. Manned mobile police stations have ended up within spitting distance of closed front desks, in one case in a station car park itself. People might be happy to queue beside one in good weather. In the rain – not unheard of in West Wales – that is a less appealing prospect.

The problem is the approach, not resources. Ask residents of some small towns with no police front desk whether their station is open and often the answer is, "yes, just not today try them tomorrow". Ask the same question in a much larger town with a fully

manned station where the front desk is closed and the answer is an emphatic "no". The difference is perception, not numbers.

Improving access to police services is a key public priority, captured in our plan. The Chief Constable, in making his operational decision to deliver it, has granted greater discretion to local commanders and instructed that stations should be open when they are manned: "when we're in, we're open." Small decisions like this, with minimal cost have a huge impact on public perception.

Similar decisions will have been made in forces across the country. That is how PCCs and the police, in partnership, deliver for the public.

Public money

"There's no money left" was the epitaph of the last government. It has become etched onto the consciousness of every public service. The police are no different. Budgets have shrunk by around 20% since 2011 and they continue to fall. But so has crime. The challenge is not just to find savings. The more important challenge is to find better ways of working.

PCCs are approaching this in different ways. Some are pursuing collaboration, as in Surrey, Sussex, West and North Yorkshire to name but a few. Some will be able to show an increase in police accessibility as a result of sharing resources with local councils. Wiltshire's PCC is well advanced in discussions with local councils.

Like many PCCs, we have cut 15% from the cost of governing the police. The total bill for the top three positions employed by the PCC – Chief Constable, Chief Finance Officer and Chief of Staff – has fallen from £420,000 per annum in November 2012 to £330,000 from November 2013, a cut if over 20%. Greater internal transparency has revealed repeated under spends and far higher reserves than previously thought. Stronger governance means we are able to use public money better.

Delivering our priorities is a joint enterprise. Every one of the priorities in our Police and Crime Plan relies on local partners in some form. From preventing crime to saving money, local authorities, housing associations, health boards, the voluntary sector, business and communities themselves are as important in delivering success as the police themselves.

Of all partners criminal justice partners – the CPS, courts, magistrates', prisons and probation services – are perhaps the most important. PCCs do not have direct powers over these areas, though some suggest they might in due course. For now, PCCs can speak on behalf of the victims where, as too often happens, different parts fail to speak to each other.

Police-led prosecutions, restorative justice and community sentences will expand in coming years. They present huge opportunities to deliver local justice and avoid the expense of custodial sentences. Ensuring confidence in them will become increasingly important if they are to survive in public eyes as a just alternative.

Some PCCs are already looking for ways to involve magistrates in local justice to insure independence and robustness. The Policing and Justice Minister, Damian Green has suggested something similar in a recent speech to the Magistrates Association.[6]

What next?

PCCs are still young. I am one of them. My experience is that of someone who believes in what they can – and already do – deliver. I see enormous potential in our ability to bring local accountability and public focus to the most critical of government activities, namely policing and justice. PCCs are on the public's side because the public hold the keys to our jobs. That is not to say there will not be problems. There will be. But the rewards are greater.

We have a lot of work ahead of us to show the public we are on their side. Come May 2016, successful candidates will be those

6 Speech given by Minister of State for Policing and Criminal Justice Damian Green, on the role of magistrates, 14/8/2013 http://tinyurl.com/kd3d3so

who have engaged public attention and delivered accordingly. The innovation they bring will soon spread as PCCs eager to impress their voters copy ideas.

In the meantime, we are here to speak for the public, to remind our institutions who they serve, open the castle gates and to make sure the voices from outside are heard within.

On your side: how PCCs are improving public confidence in the police

Ann Barnes, Police and Crime Commissioner for Kent

Personal reflections

It seems like a whirl wind. The campaign, the election and the early days of holding Office have flashed by like a fast moving train. The first anniversary is indeed a moment to reflect. The fact that I had 6 years as Chair of the outgoing Kent Police Authority and that I stood for what is a high profile public Office as an Independent, unprotected by any party political machine, are factors that have shaped my experience.

The nature of the post as Commissioner is profoundly different than that of Chair of the Authority. Whilst serving as Chair of the Authority gave me experience of policing and police governance, it also landed me with an unexpected difficulty. As Chair, I was like 'Chair of the Board', primarily tasked with developing a consensus from Authority members, each of whom would have their own opinions and, often, their Political Party perspective. The role of Commissioner is very different. It is a very 'singular' post and the need for 'consensus' has therefore been much reduced. However, engagement with, and reflection of, public opinion is an exceptionally important part of the role of Commissioner. It is an elected public role. The relationship with the 'public' is of paramount importance. So much so, that to some extent it defines the role. This has given an unexpected dimension to my own experience. I still looked like the previous incarnation of Ann Barnes the 'Chairperson', but in reality my whole approach and perspective is radically different. I feel this has led to those involved in both the Force and the Criminal Justice System struggling to adapt to my new priorities and my new perspective as a publically elected figure rather than 'corporate' overseer. They see what looks familiar, but my wishes and priorities are different.

The immersion in what was a hard fought election was a searing experience. The face to face, eyeball to eyeball, encounters that are the very essence of campaigning and canvassing do have the effect of bolting one's feet firmly on the ground. It is often light on sophisticated argument. But what you do get is the 'no holds barred' brutal hard hitting truth of public opinion. The police world quite rightly applies logic and business thinking extensively in its culture. But it needs to remember that it is most definitely not a business and that public opinion is not always logical. But here's the really challenging point for those accustomed to the rigid disciplines of business cases and logic – by not being logical, public opinion is no less valid. This is where one of the greatest differences of the old regime of Police Authorities and 'Commissionerland' can be seen. As Commissioner, my hinterland, the people to whom my first loyalty lies is the 'public'. It's my duty to reflect their sometimes 'illogical' sometimes conflicting wishes and priorities to deliver the service they want. It's not my role to explain to them that they shouldn't want what they want.

The conflicting views about 'visibility' and 'intelligence led' are perhaps the best illustration of my point. It's widely accepted by policing professionals that patrolling Officers solve few crimes compared to officers who are targeted and who are tasked under more scientific processes. That said, any survey of public opinion will clearly show that visible community policing is not just a high priority for the public, but the highest. As Commissioner, being the conduit of this public view into the corridors of the Policing world is one of my most challenging but rewarding roles.

Culture

The police in general have taken a battering in recent months with a succession of scandals and controversies reaching from 'Plebgate', through 'hacking' right back to Hillsborough. There's never been a

more vital time for trust to be reaffirmed. In a world of inquisitive 24/7 media, in an era in which citizens are ever more empowered to seek justice for perceived wrongs, there is only one direction of travel that can offer success for our Police forces. It's simply this, an ever greater acceptance of openness and transparency. I liken my role to prising the lid off a tin of paint. You have to keep rotating the tin and apply gentle persuasive pressure around the rim.

Delivering for the public

I was elected on a platform of being open, transparent and accessible. Right from the start, I told the people of Kent that I would not be desk bound. To make good on these pledges, I've set in place an ambitious and demanding programme of public engagement.

On most Fridays I set out in my Community Outreach Vehicle and visit local communities, charities and shops. I do this to meet people in their own areas. Why should I expect people to come to me? I go to the big Town Centres, I go to the hamlets. So far, I've visited over 60 communities.

> "I do not see the media as a 'threat' but as a valuable way of interacting with the people of Kent"

Every 8 weeks I secure a church hall or public building and hold a 'Meet the Commissioner' event. The events are open to all. I'm joined by the Chief Constable or his Deputy and take unscripted questions from the floor. These events are sometimes challenging, always informative and very effective.

Every 8 weeks, I also go to a part of the County and hold a 'surgery'. Members of the public can attend and discuss policing and community safety issues in private.

I make myself as accessible as possible to the local and regional media. I do not see the media as a 'threat' but as a valuable way of interacting with the people of Kent. Even if the topic is difficult, I will normally always make myself available.

All this interaction and engagement has to have an outcome. Listening to concerns and problems is vital, but it's only part of the mission. Having engaged, having listened and having interacted, I have to act. I learn so much from my engagement. It informs a multitude of my decisions. But the one thing that it constantly reaffirms is that whatever the difficulties, whatever the cuts, whatever the conflicting demands on scarce resources, the priority for the people of Kent is visible community policing – and I will deliver that!

Victims

I've been a victim of crime myself. It is a draining and emotional experience. If the Police and criminal justice system don't handle it well, you end up being a victim twice. Once at the time of the crime, then later as the whole process unwinds. You can be left with the feeling of being a silent member of the audience watching a play – when you are in the play!

I am committed to using my commissioning powers to re-shape victim services. One of the most sobering experiences was my attendance at a 'Lean' event covering Victim's services. At this event, practitioners from all across the criminal justice landscape set out the full range of services. The professionalism and dedication of all involved shone through. But the 'map' of services that they laid out on a giant chart was breath taking in its complexity. It looked like some great organic molecule full of crossing paths and convoluted curves. In stark contrast, the same professionals set out their vision for how it should be. This new way forward was ambitious in the scale of change required to deliver it. However, it was much simpler, more straightforward, and crucially with the needs of the victims embedded at its heart.

My mind is set on a Victim's Centre to forge this new vision into reality.

There's one particular victim related issue that I have addressed separately and in advance of these more strategic reforms. This relates to the fact that until my intervention Kent has not had a fully comprehensive 24/7 Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC). This meant that victims of serious sexual assault would either be taken to the poor existing facility such as it was, or, even worse, be taken 'out of County'. This was a totally unacceptable and shameful situation.

As Commissioner, I used some of my own commissioning budget but just as importantly I was able to 'lever in' significant funding from other agencies such as the NHS.

Youth Commissioner

No account of my first year in Office could be considered complete without some reference to my Youth Commissioner initiative. I remain committed to this initiative despite the widely reported difficulties experienced by the first candidate. Such was the furore surrounding this position, that I commissioned an independent report into the recruitment process which is now freely available on my website. In summary it concluded that my Office didn't ask for Social Networking vetting, and the Force, who provided HR support, didn't advise it. On reflection, the post attracted a lot more media interest than I had anticipated and the outcome obviously suggests that Social Networking should have formed part of the vetting process. I refuse to let the initiative fade because of these issues with the first recruitment. A good idea should not fall because of difficulties with implementation.

I refuse to let the initiative fade because of these issues with the first recruitment. A good idea should not fall because of difficulties with implementation. With a national headline recently revealing that over 1 million young people in Britain are at risk of 'cyber crime', the need for my Youth Commissioner is increasing,

not diminishing. As just one example of an initiative that I will look to the Youth Commissioner to take a prominent role, I have announced a major new primary schools initiative. I will be funding 3 full time PCSOs to deliver an existing Force package into later year's primary schools. If the Youth Commissioner saves just one young person from becoming either a victim or a perpetrator of crime, it will be money wisely invested.

The role

With no 'job description' we 'first time' Commissioners have had to develop the role in the light of what local people expect and local factors.

On the one hand, I am the voice of local people, holding firm on keeping visible community policing and other matters close to the heart of the public. My 'holding to account function', means that I have to insist that the Force face up to difficult news.

I was the first Commissioner to use new powers relating to Police Governance when I called in HMIC to investigate crime recording practices in Kent. Concerns had been raised during the election campaign. The review found that there were serious issues that needed to be addressed on crime recording, 'no crime-ing' and on Force performance culture. The investigation revealed serious issues. Some victims had been let down and the activity of some Officers had been distorted to meet numeric targets. The findings vindicated my decision to act. To the credit of the Force they have reacted positively and a rigorous improvement process is now in place. Bringing in HMIC was a tough decision, but the right decision. I firmly expect two significant outcomes. The first will be that the issues surrounding crime recording and culture will be addressed and the people of the County will be able to have confidence in the crime numbers and in the culture of the Force. However, this work has opened the door to a further very signifi-

cant development. I am now minded to make a very significant move in relation to targets. The investigation and its outcomes have made me re-think my role in the 'target' culture. If I can be assured that a robust culture of continuous improvement is embedded in the Force I am minded to remove all numeric targets from my Police and Crime Plan when it is next reviewed in February 2014.

On the other hand, I need to stand shoulder to shoulder with the Force when they need a champion for new and more resources. I am the one to who will have to articulate to local people that in the face of Government cuts and a rising workload local people may have to face a higher Police precept.

So it is one position, but with many roles. At various times a public advocate, communicator, bridge builder, Force champion. As an Independent charged with the governance of a major public service in times of unprecedented financial challenges, it is sometimes intensely challenging but always rewarding. I wouldn't swap the experience for the world.

The future

It may be early days in the evolving role of Police and Crime Commissioners but certain trends are already emerging. As Commissioner, I have considerable powers in Police strategy and Police Governance. However, so much that involves victims' falls under the Criminal Justice System. My ability to comprehensively re-shape victims' services is hampered by my lack of direct control over these areas. I certainly would support moves to widen the scope of elected Commissioners in the Criminal Justice System.

Partners in crime: leading local agencies in tackling violence against women

Vera Baird QC, Police and Crime Commissioner for Northumbria

In the run up to the PCC election, as every commentary since has said, the public were not told what the role was and the Government would not pay for the normal letter to electors to set out candidates' policies. People neither knew what the job entailed nor which PCC candidates were standing for what. No wonder they didn't vote. Some people deliberately didn't buy in to what they saw as politicizing the police, thinking we were voting for a Chief Constable and were actively worried at the consequences. Only the aficionados had a clear view of the role therefore and they were pretty well confined to the candidates themselves, since even the political parties were only half interested.

I was eager to win to be a champion for local residents, ensuring that police deliver for our communities. I saw a chance to change the power dynamic in favour of the public and the opportunity to quickly bring change where it was needed. Few had a bad word to say about my predecessor Police Authority. I knew and respected many members. However, 17 people, none necessarily with policing as their first priority, meeting bi-monthly in 7 sub-committees were unable to lead dynamically, nor could they apply the keen-eyed perpetual scrutiny which is vital to keep in check the juggernaut that is the powerful police establishment.

If you are the one visible elected Police and Crime Commissioner you will be fully committed to the role and, although there is an obvious democratic deficit from electing only a single individual, police governance has been professionalized and sharpened through this change. The statutory obligation is to make the police deliver what the public wants and as my post bag and the hundreds of meetings I go to make clear, the public is now well aware of the

presence of PCCs and very interested to hear about them and hold them to account.

Northumbria Police is a high performing force, with the trust and confidence of most local residents. The cuts are swinging in our area, with more to follow for at least the next two years. Northumbria has the lowest local precept in the in the country so though local people are willing to pay more, the proportion I can raise by the percentage increase the Government allows is tiny compared to everywhere else. So the loss of central government cash is the loss, in reality, of almost our only means of funding. Yet throughout our Chief Constable, Sue Sim has committed to protecting neighbourhood police. I support her in that now, in pursuit of community confidence, putting victims first and cutting crime by early intervention both in particular in anti social behavior and domestic and sexual abuse. These are my core Police and Crime Plan commitments and it is a tribute to her professionalism and the opportunity for a sound partnership offered by the role of PCC that we can pursue our joint aims with dexterity, despite my obligation publicly to scrutinize everything she does.

To date, amongst my many tasks I have reviewed Northumbria Police complaints procedure and it should improve vastly, held an enquiry about how the local force handled the recovery of an escaped convicted killer from a secure hospital, cut my office costs so they are more than £1 million less than those of the Police Authority and reviewed many contracts to ensure Northumbria Police get best value for money. The list goes on but one issue, in particular, highlights the potential of this new role.

Newcastle has a vibrant night-time economy. Many of our 57,000 students and the local population have a good time especially at the weekends. Sunderland, Berwick, Blyth and other places also have busy pubs and clubs but Newcastle is the biggest. As on all such scenes, the police are well aware that there are predatory men hanging around, looking for vulnerable prey, be they young

females or males for sexual fodder or to steal wallets and mobile phones from people too happy, however that's defined, to be focused on danger.

A 17 year old girl in Newcastle galvanized me into action. The youngster had been on a night out with friends, got separated from them and was ejected from a nightclub for being drunk. I think the doorman would have thought he had gone the extra mile since he walked her to a taxi rank but she was very unsteady and a driver or two would not take her. A lad helped the doorman to hold her up and assured him when the doorman felt his duty called him back to the club that he would take care of the girl. But he raped her and passed her on to two other men, who did the same. For many years I have campaigned to stop violence against girls and women.

"It seemed little known that having sex with a person who is too drunk to decide whether to consent or refuse is the criminal offence of rape"

Although there had been an enormous amount of work done in Newcastle City Centre by the local area command and the Safe Newcastle Partnership, it was clear that we had to do more. People said if only the door staff had had different learning, if only the taxi drivers knew of the danger…. we had to make hindsight become foresight.

I don't have to take a Bill through Parliament to deliver change, my role as Police and Crime Commissioner let me call together all the responsible partners who could make a difference, the police, local authorities, the health service and the business community. It was clear that people wanted to know how their actions could stop future attacks. Door staff needed to see that their work obligation could not oust their ordinary duty of care to another person needing help Their employers had to agree. The police officers who see a woman, worse for drink, walking down an unlit alley with a man, need to check if all is well. It seemed little known that having sex with a person who is too drunk to decide whether to consent

or refuse is the criminal offence of rape. It was clearly too little appreciated that an ordinary-looking male who says he is seeing a woman safely home, may be a predator not a Samaritan.

We developed what is truly a simple training package for all police officers and door staff. Once awareness is switched on, well-meaning people are ready to help. Nobody left out of account the need for people in the night time economy to look after themselves, and there have been many campaigns to that effect, but being ready to take a protective step for someone who isn't safe is all that we were encouraging.

The course, developed by Northumbria Police ,Safe Newcastle, the local authority safeguarding and licensing teams, Tyneside Rape Crisis and Phoenix Security, our leading local door staff company, ensures that door supervisors learn how to assess triggers of vulnerability, assess how much alcohol someone has consumed. Of particular importance was the inclusion of a core conversation for both police and supervisors around how to recognize what was troubling and what was not and how to intervene in a range of ways if the former might be the case.

Phoenix Security made sure that all their staff took this training within weeks. Other security firms quickly followed suit. The police were with us step by step. One tireless local police trainer is the star of this show although I view this scheme with great pride too, it is fantastic that as a PCC I have been able to lead from the front and bring partners together to bring about change. This programme is now being rolled out across the whole force area. In all the towns and cities of Northumbria, If someone is out and about, those who work in the night time economy now have the insight to spot potential problems and the skills to take action.

A lot of research and effort went quickly in to developing this programme. As we tuned it, of course the truth became very clear, Currently, no door staff anywhere were being trained in safeguarding skills. The national Security Industry Authority had no such

requirement in order for people to be accredited with a SIA door supervisor licence.

This clearly had to change

PCCs are of interest to the government for a range of obvious reasons and Theresa May spoke to a group of us who do come together, as a rudimentary grouping. I asked the Home Secretary whether she knew and approved of what I called a gap in SIA training. To her great credit she responded strongly and asked me to talk to her senior staff who oversee the SIA. In short, the outcome of this work is that Northumbria's "Vulnerability Training" has already become a compulsory part of Security Industry training. The SIA were as keen as anyone to support this work. City by city and town by town over 100,000 door staff in the UK are acquiring the safeguarding skills which every citizen would want to have available to keep members of their family safe in any night time economy.

Sharing Learning

But even though it is required by the SIA, Northumbria vulnerability training will not work without the buy-in of police. Clearly they are learners themselves but they also have to see that door staff who may call them more frequently, now they have a safeguarding role, should not get criticism nor their premises a bad name for being in too much contact and seen as a source of disorder.

PCCs are proud of their own areas and we want to showcase good practice with each other. A briefish presentation at a Commissioners' conference brought in pledges of commitment from almost every one of the 42 other Commissioners. Finally the College of Policing and the key ACPO portfolio- holder have joined in and are determined to drive the training thoroughly and at speed

through the police so that they and the door staff work compatibly in partnership on nighttime economy safeguarding issues.

The next stage

This training has now been taken up additionally by our street pastors, hotel staff, transport workers and British Transport Police, so our cities are acquiring more eyes and ears open to keeping people safer. The street pastors are particular stars. They do invaluable work, often freeing up the police, but they, and the other "eyes and ears" need somewhere to take people for longer that they can easily be accommodated on club or pub premises, until their friends or family can be contacted. So in Newcastle, we are working, again with partners, to create a "SafeHaven" in the very middle of the city's nightlife to be staffed by professionals from the health sector, funded by savings to be made on ambulance call outs and bridging any gaps between the capacity of the trained, but busy, staff and the target of safety for all.

Lessons

In my view, the Police Authorities, however well-intentioned could not, through their part-time committee-based role, have brought about such a sea-change so quickly. Partners can see and hear the PCC very clearly. Commissioners have wide local reach, some budgetary power, can make clear, swift decisions and are equipped with a statutory duty, shared by all the main crime and safety agencies to work together to attain common aims.

This isn't just about the night time economy, recent high profile sexual exploitation cases in Rochdale and Derby and the tragic case of Daniel Pelka harmed by the very people entrusted with his care, highlight the continuing need for us as PCCs to find new ways in which we and our colleagues can identify risk and respond effectively.

We are community champions, our police & crime plans reflect the diverse communities that we serve – no matter what our party politics, we want to bring change for the better. If another Commissioner has a good idea in their area, which I think will benefit Northumbria, I will be going to them for information with every expectation of progress.

4. The Future for PCCs

Vocal and local: maximising PCCs' influence at the national level

Olly Martins, Police and Crime Commissioner for Bedfordshire

The Electoral Commission, the Home Affairs Select Committee, the Electoral Reform Society, and many others have highlighted that the elections last November were little short of calamitous, particularly given that the introduction of Police and Crime Commissioners represents the most significant reform to police governance in modern times. It is therefore understandable that I arrived at Police Headquarters in Bedfordshire somewhat apprehensive about how I would be received. But it is typical of the professionalism that characterises British policing generally and Bedfordshire Police in particular, that regardless of the circumstances there will be a positive 'can do' response.

Indeed, the Force had already identified that, notwithstanding the circumstances of the election, compared to an unelected Police Authority a Police and Crime Commissioner could be a useful ally in the field of partnership working and escalating issues into the political realm.

Very early in my tenure I was persuaded of the case for GPS tagging of offenders by a combination of the then Chief Constable Alf Hitchcock and Assistant Chief Constable Andrew Richer. They showed me evidence from Bedfordshire's Integrated Offender Management (IOM) Programme which runs a voluntary pilot tagging certain persistent and prolific offenders. They explained that one of the most frustrating aspects of being a police officer today is the extent to which so much time is spent recycling the

same cohort of offenders through the criminal justice system. So last year 600,000 crimes were committed by those who had offended before and nearly half of those released from prison go on to re-offend, in many cases not just once but time and again. I quickly began to recognise that the evidence for GPS tags really makes their use something of a no-brainer.

The initial voluntary pilot in Bedfordshire showed during the first 18 months of wearing the GPS tag the 14 offenders committed a total of three offences, compared to being collectively responsible for 459 crimes prior to being tagged. Not only do the tags alter offenders' behaviour and support effective rehabilitation as part of the wider IOM scheme, they also provide the police with strong evidence to persuade the transgressing offender to admit the offences and made apprehension more straightforward, a real win-win all round. In the most pointed case in Bedfordshire to date a serial burglar decided to commit a further burglary whilst wearing the GPS tag. The tag data placed the offender inside the burgled property at the time of the offence. When arrested the offender denied the offence but when confronted with the evidence from the tag he confessed to the burglary, and was subsequently sentenced to a lengthy term of imprisonment.

So having already identified the need to tackle the revolving door and break the cycle of offending I have become an enthusiastic supporter of our IOM programme and, in particular of GPS tagging, because I believe it will:

- Cut crime and reduce the numbers of victims
- Support effective rehabilitation, particularly of persistent offenders by helping tackle the revolving door of the criminal justice system
- Provide the public with greater confidence in community sentencing which provides better outcomes and better value than incarceration

- Make our diminishing number of police more effective in fighting crime and protecting the public
- Better exploit available technology and deliver a more effective use of public money.

I appreciate the potential of this technology not least because I wear a GPS watch to track my own movements when I go running. On my return I download the data which is then plotted onto a map and used to provide performance analysis. This replicates how the data from GPS tagging is used with most offenders, which is to say retrospectively. However, in exceptional cases offenders can be tracked in real time. Tagging is as good at showing where the wearer has not been as for where he has been. It can therefore be of as much benefit to a wearer who has refrained from offending, as to the crime investigator.

"Tagging is as good at showing where the wearer has not been as for where he has been"

As a result of the success of their voluntary pilot the Force was very keen to test the potential of GPS technology by piloting the compulsory tagging of offenders bailed pending sentence and those released from prison on license. In relation to the former the Force identified a tendency for offenders who know they will receive the maximum tariff for burglary to go on a crime spree for which they can confidently predict there will be no additional consequences. Of course this is a perverse situation that should be addressed centrally but tagging such offenders would at least reduce the harm these offenders are causing locally in the interim.

Certainly the dynamics of compulsory tagging would be different from those of the voluntary scheme, but the evidence of the current pilot is so strong it is quite reasonable to expect compulsory tagging to have a significant impact.

By the time I arrived as Police and Crime Commissioner in Bedfordshire a lot of work had already been done with local part-

ners in the criminal justice system to support such a pilot but the force's leaders found themselves repeatedly banging their heads against a brick wall when it came to getting the green light from central government.

The biggest stumbling block was the existing National Electronic Monitoring Contract, the shortcomings of which Policy Exchange highlighted in their September 2012 report *The Future of Corrections*. This report highlighted how the contract was long, inflexible, provided extremely poor value for money and stifled innovation. Bedfordshire Police had worked hard to find a work-around that would enable the use of tags other than the RF proximity tags specified and made compulsory by the national contract and associated legislation. However, the Ministry of Justice was resistant and in typical Whitehall style displayed adeptness for finding reasons not to facilitate a pilot rather than ways to help it happen.

As a consequence of this situation, the Force was pleased to have an incoming Police and Crime Commissioner who was capable of putting the issue into the political arena. This is precisely what I set about doing, publicising the issue in the media, recruiting the support of local MPs and sending a letter to the Justice Secretary co-signed by 26 of my Police and Crime Commissioner colleagues, of all three shades (Conservative, Independents and Labour).

This was the first occasion on which Police and Crime Commissioners came together to lobby the government. It was quite an achievement at such an early point in the relationship between the 41 PCCs as a whole. The adrenalin of the election campaign was still in evidence and there was wariness between the three groups. Six months on I think there is now greater trust between colleagues and an appreciation that, although our philosophies may differ, we are all engaged in doing the same things. This is evidenced by my current joint work with my Conservative neighbours Adam Simmonds (Northamptonshire), David Lloyd (Hertfordshire) and Sir Graham Bright (Cambridgeshire) as part of the four county

contract package area specified by the government's Transforming Rehabilitation proposals. Despite our different political viewpoints it has been quite straightforward to come to a singular perspective about how we take forward the work to ensure a strong continuation of rehabilitative services within our collective area.

There is far more that unites than divides Police and Crime Commissioners, particularly the growing realisation that all too often it is what Whitehall does or does not do that frustrates us. This is not a party political point but a fact of life to which many of our more established partners in criminal justice and beyond can attest.

But then this underlines the opportunity that the election of Police and Crime Commissioners provides to give localities a more powerful voice against the centre and to be the catalyst for local innovation that meets local needs.

And in relation to the letter to the Justice Secretary that two-thirds of PCCs co-signed, it may have taken the best part of two months for the Ministry of Justice to reply, and we may have been none the wiser upon reading it, but I am pleased to say that along with the activities of Policy Exchange and others, the exercise does appear to have had an impact. Although Police and Crime Commissioners have not been empowered to locally innovate and secure best value in relation to tagging, the government did nonetheless alter the contracts it originally sought to re-let. Apparently the Ministry of Justice has learnt some of the lessons from the previous arrangements by splitting equipment, application, monitoring, and support to prevent market domination, opting for a far shorter equipment contract to allow for technological development, and specifying greater flexibility than previously around quantities and pricing. Mid-process revisions must have been very frustrating and costly for the bidders but the outcomes should be better having learned the lessons of the old arrangements.

However, having improved the technology we are still hidebound from realising its full potential because the legislation is

lagging. It is rather like driving a Ferrari with the handbrake on. Currently tags can still only be used on a compulsory basis to enforce curfews. The government says it will legislate to enable GPS tracking functionality to be used on a compulsory basis as part of a community order or suspended sentence order. This fails to tap into a whole range of further possible applications such as those Bedfordshire Police wished to pilot (offenders bailed pending sentence and released from prison on license), and for example the protection of victims of harassment, stalking or domestic violence, and in relation to sex offenders. GPS tagging technology is already being put to such exclusion and enforcement zone uses in other countries. Why must the UK lag behind again and why must arguably hundreds of people who could be protected from harm become victims nonetheless.

Some months after becoming a staunch advocate of GPS tagging, and through no fault of my own, I found myself working with my second chief and I was pleased to discover that Chief Constable Colette Paul is a similarly strong supporter of tagging. This further confirms me in my belief that GPS tagging is the way forward as two excellent and experienced Chief Constables cannot be wrong.

On the one hand the government (Home Office) has charged Police and Crime Commissioners with cutting crime; on the other hand the government (Ministry of Justice) is reluctant to support the very innovations that would allow us to do this. And there is a further frustration. This is not the place to debate the merits of government economic policy, but having demanded that policing faces its share of austerity and makes efficiencies, why do the government not demonstrate a greater sense of urgency in providing the tools needed to do so? It is hardly as though there is a packed legislative agenda and I'm sure Parliament could miss a recess or two in the name of protecting the public from crime. It really is exasperating to have such a powerful crime fighting tool but not to be able to use it effectively.

It is also surprising that, as they plunge headlong into 'Payment by Results' (PbR), the Ministry of Justice has failed to identify the support that GPS tagging could provide to their Transforming Rehabilitation agenda. I am extremely sceptical about the PbR approach not least because of the risks involved. But those risks could be mitigated with the use of GPS tagging. PbR may effectively mean 'offender does not get caught' rather than 'offender desists from offending', but there could be far greater assurance if the offender was wearing a GPS tag.

The alternative is a situation where PbR effectively incentivises the service providers not to provide intelligence to the police about offending. If this is also addressed through incentives then the service providers are in a win-win situation that simply turns Transforming Rehabilitation into a cash cow. GPS tagging would therefore provide powerful protection of taxpayers' interests.

Police and Crime Commissioners can be the catalyst for change, and furthermore they can be the hub that brings people together for action. With tagging we have support from all sides – police, probation, community safety partners, local authorities, the judiciary and offenders and ex-offenders themselves. Locally, if we were able to add Central Government to this list, we would be able to deliver the further significant reductions in offending and victimisation to the people of Bedfordshire, which is surely what the government itself desires?

Blazing a trail: London as the outrider for future PCC developments

Stephen Greenhalgh, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime

The London context

The Mayor's Office for Policing And Crime (MOPAC) replaced the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) on 16 January 2012 as a direct consequence of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011. The formal oversight of Scotland Yard including budget-setting, performance scrutiny and policy development is the core responsibility of MOPAC. However, the role of MOPAC is broader than policing. Unlike its predecessor body, the MPA, it has overarching responsibilities for crime reduction, and significant powers to commission services and assign budgets. In addition, as MOPAC's legal remit covers "crime" and envisages a general responsibility for public safety, MOPAC has opportunities not previously available to any single London agency.

The Mayor is the occupant of MOPAC and has several key roles such as setting the strategic direction and accountability for policing in addition to the commitments made in his manifesto. My role in London – that of Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime (DMPC) – is analogous to the elected Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) position in police forces outside London. Although not directly elected, the legislation is clear that once the Mayor, as occupant of MOPAC, delegates his authority, the DMPC has the same powers and duties as a PCC, except for a limited number of functions retained by the Mayor, including the issuing of a Police and Crime Plan; and the appointment and removal of the most senior Met officers.

MOPAC has strong advantages in being linked to City Hall and the Mayor. For instance, the public safety policy team immediately transferred to MOPAC from the Greater London Authority, enhancing our strategic policy development capacity – one of the

key functions of MOPAC. However what really counts, and what makes London unique compared to other elected Police & Crime Commissioners, is the visibility of the Mayor, Boris Johnson, and the size of his democratic mandate for policing. This gives MOPAC the permission to challenge and scrutinise not just policing but the capital's entire criminal justice system to improve crime prevention, seek swift and sure justice for victims and reduce re-offending.

The first challenge

Before MOPAC was created, the reputation of the MPA with the Met was at a very low ebb. The first priority was to establish the office and build awareness, based on a credible brand. Early on, the Met were known to refer to the MOPAC Chief Executive and Deputy Mayor as "the Mopsy 2" – this acronym needed to go. We rebranded the MOPC as MOPAC, to recognise the importance of the wider "And Crime" role and this small change stopped the organisation from being ridiculed as a fluffy character from Beatrix Potter.

Next the organisation needed to change to reflect our wider responsibilities. MOPAC was reshaped into 3 distinct business units – strategy and policy, police performance and resources and finally, integrated offender management (IOM) and neighbourhoods in order to reflect MOPAC's mission and priorities.

The culture of the old police authorities was to provide a scrutiny function and there were politicians from all parties sitting on a committee. In contrast, MOPAC is a strategic oversight body with executive heft and over the first year this has required the wholesale creation of a new senior management team and the need to bring in new skills in commissioning services and performance oversight.

Winning the argument

Alongside the creation of a new office, the last year has seen MOPAC driving a key set of reforms, and making the argument for change.

Crime and public safety matter to everyone in London. When changes to vital public services like the police are proposed, it is right that they are explained and that people have the chance to contribute to and influence those plans. In producing London's first Police and Crime Plan – which was launched in March – MOPAC took the opportunity to set some bold targets and to truly consult with Londoners.

In that Plan we have challenged the Metropolitan Police Service to reduce key victim-based neighbourhood crimes by 20%, boost public confidence in the police by 20% and cut costs by 20%, all by 2016. This can be summarised as a 20:20:20 approach – which is now well known throughout the Met.

Next we undertook the most extensive public consultation on policing in recent memory because we realised how vital it is to get these decisions right for London. With the support of the Commissioner, between January and March I visited every borough in London with Assistant Commissioner Simon Byrne, who heads up local policing, and we spoke to almost 3,000 people at 34 public meetings. In addition MOPAC received hundreds of written responses and engaged with scores of community groups.

The consultation raised particular concerns in each borough and provided the local context that has helped us to refine the final Plan. There was strong support for increasing police numbers and putting more officers into neighbourhoods (over 2,600 by 2015). Reforms to the local policing model mean the police in London will be more visible and available with more police officers out on the street where the public want to see them. With fewer senior officers, the Met can afford to recruit the highest number of bobbies in Scotland Yard's history (26,000) and have more officers at borough level in every part of London.

However, residents wanted reassurance about the future of the police presence in their area and clarity on the ways in which they could access the police. Therefore the final version of the plan was

amended to improve the overall public access offer to Londoners whilst still closing front counters and selling buildings in order to help balance the budget. Local police are now available for longer hours and visit more people by appointment.

"There was huge support for the guaranteed offer by the Met of a personal visit to all crime victims that want one"

Putting bobbies before buildings

As part of the consultation it was vital to test public opinion, so we commissioned one of the largest polls of public attitudes to policing and crime in London. In a survey of over 4,000 Londoners, 8 in 10 agreed that maintaining police officer numbers should be the main priority for spending over keeping police buildings open. This supported our plan to put bobbies before buildings and to get the police out of underused and inadequate stations and back into communities where they can prevent crime and keep the public safe.

The poll by TNS also found that when asked what would make them feel safer, the top priority for Londoners was "more police around on the streets" and when asked what would improve the work of the local neighbourhood police teams, the top priority was for "more constables dedicated to neighbourhood policing", followed by "neighbourhood officers available for longer hours in the day and evening" – all are key reforms in the new Local Policing Model that the Met is now rolling out. Londoners' priorities for improving public safety in their neighbourhood included tackling gangs and preventing youth violence. There was huge support for the guaranteed offer by the Met of a personal visit to all crime victims that want one, backed by 8 in 10 Londoners, and this is now happening right across London.

This extensive consultation reassured us that the crime priorities spelled out in the plan were the right ones. The 20:20:20 targets to cut seven neighbourhood crimes align with 5 of the top 10 crimes that Londoners are most worried about. In the final plan, whilst

retaining the focus on the "MOPAC 7", we stress that these are not the only mayoral crime reduction priorities. Gangs and serious youth violence, making London safer for women, and business crime are all key mayoral priorities and we made sure the final Plan spelled out our approach in these areas.

Many responses to the consultation told us that people really wanted the criminal justice system to work together to support the police and victims of crime, so we used the Plan to go one step further. For the first time, MOPAC proposed new criminal justice goals which the public wanted action on, including curbing delays in the criminal justice system and cutting reoffending.

So the final Plan, drawing upon the Mayor's mandate, confirmed the goals to make the wider criminal justice system more efficient and effective and set out the aim to establish a robust performance framework for the whole criminal justice system and not just for policing with a 20% reduction in delays getting cases to court, a 20% improvement in compliance rates for community sentences and a 20% reduction in youth reoffending for those leaving custody.

If we achieve the objectives laid out in the plan, then the prize for London is a big one. It offers a golden opportunity to reverse decades of declining police contact with the public and to reconnect the Met police and Londoners. And if we strengthen crime prevention, deliver swift and sure justice for victims and cut reoffending, then we can make London even safer and build the foundations for a prosperous future for our great capital city. Every year, as Deputy Mayor I am planning to report to Londoners on the progress we have made as MOPAC works to deliver on the Mayor's mission for London to be the greatest and safest big city on earth.

A new era

We have entered a new era for policing and for criminal justice oversight in London. London's first Police and Crime Plan sets out a vi-

sion for London that is both ambitious and exciting. What made the Police and Crime Plan and the London-wide consultation so important for MOPAC and for Londoners was that it demonstrated a real commitment to get the public's permission for important changes that the budget challenge for the Met had thrown up. Unlike the old MPA, the Mayor's office seized the opportunity to combine a strategic four-year plan for policing and crime with other long-overdue changes – including to the police estate and the rank mix of the Met – so that the difficult financial decisions we faced were framed in an honest way that gave the public a meaningful choice.

The Mayor's clear manifesto pledge was to keep officer numbers high, at around 32,000, but with an unprecedented budget challenge, that meant finding savings in other areas, like the police estate. The alternative – which a majority of Londoners rejected – was to keep open old, expensive police stations that the public did not visit, and as a result see police numbers fall, leading to fewer cops in neighbourhoods to fight crime. The police reforms that gave oversight to the Mayor allowed that important argument to be made, and won, in an open and fair consultation.

So our plan was driven by Londoners' priorities and it will strengthen the Met, whilst making the required savings. And the whole process demonstrated the value of direct democratic governance of the police – with clear political leadership providing the means to win an argument for change, so that much needed reforms could happen and the Met could continue to police London with the consent of the public.

The future

The reforms that created MOPAC recognise that the police alone cannot prevent crime. The effectiveness of London's wider criminal justice system is critical to public safety, which is why MOPAC's mission extends beyond policing. As a complex city with many

thousands of state, private and voluntary sector actors providing justice services, in the future MOPAC is seeking to provide strategic leadership and an evidence-based approach to public safety, built upon collaboration, innovation and smart crime policies.

However we remain one of the most centralised nations on earth. Further devolution of criminal justice services is happening – but it is slow and on the margins. We must ensure that any devolution of budgets – for instance victims funding from October 2014 – is done intelligently, and truly reflects the demand in such a diverse, densely-populated and complex world city like London.

Over the longer-term, it must make sense for MOPAC to gain more formal responsibility for crime reduction in the capital, as Policy Exchange has recently argued. We are therefore actively seeking additional powers from central government to take over formal oversight and control more of the funding of London's criminal justice agencies. Only then will it be possible to deliver the real step-change that is needed to join-up responses, drive-out waste, and improve the service at every stage for victims and the wider public.

If MOPAC was given oversight and budget responsibility for probation and local prisons, Londoners could truly hold the Mayor to account for keeping the city safe. A clear parallel is New York. New York's City Hall has budget and performance oversight over not just policing but also the city's district attorneys, the court buildings, probation and finally, is the city's gaoler. This gives the New York Mayor's Office real power and opportunity to shape the whole system and be held to account by the public. We need to close the gap on the Big Apple. The reforms are still new and we have some way to go in London, but all this will happen in time.

One year ago, the first Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) were elected across England and Wales. Charged with setting strategic policing priorities, holding Chief Constables and forces to account and improving public confidence in law enforcement, the 41 new PCCs form an integral part of the Government's wide-ranging police reform agenda.

Policy Exchange has consistently argued that single, democratically-elected figures have the potential for renewing the police governance model and revitalising the relationship between the public and the police.

As these important reforms continue to bed in and the pioneers get to grips with their new roles, we asked a cross-party group of PCCs to share their perspectives on their first year in office, highlight the key initiatives they are leading, outline the challenges and opportunities facing policing, and describe how their new leadership can help the service to succeed.

£10.00
ISBN: 978-1-907689-61-1

Policy Exchange
Clutha House
10 Storey's Gate
London SW1P 3AY

www.policyexchange.org.uk