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Introduction

This chapter deals with the implementation of community policing. Implementation is dealt with here in a separate chapter since it is one factor that often determines whether community policing will, or will not, be successful. Therefore, the implementation of community policing is addressed from the perspective of British Columbia police departments, although findings are incorporated from other jurisdictions across North America in order to help place provincial initiatives in context. This helps to describe the current state of affairs. As Chief Richardson of the Victoria Police Department said in his submission to the Commission, "I view this [the Commission] as much more than a report card on municipal policing. It is an opportunity to reflect on recent positive developments in B.C. policing". These are also the objectives of this chapter.

The reform of police agencies toward community policing is neither straightforward nor without significant difficulties. In fact, this type of reform is characterized by apprehension and some initial failure. Many police executives believe they have been "doing" community policing all along and that nothing new is to be done. The research here questions this conclusion. Not only are many community policing initiatives new, they require considerable effort toward planning and change in administrative policy and
operational structure when implementing them into police agencies.

This chapter sets out to provide some clear definitions and directions for the implementation of community policing in British Columbia. The group discussions and Commission background research that led up to this paper focussed around some key issues, all which are included into this document. These discussions lead us to conclude that in order to implement community policing and system-wide problem-solving police agencies must, at a minimum, do the following:

1. Redefine the police role with the community and establish core values;

2. Develop a problem-solving mission statement and characterize problem-solving, in conjunction with responding to immediate emergencies, as the primary police mission;

3. Create external and internal planning groups and viable implementation plans and develop a flexible time-table for system-wide adoption;

4. Commence an organizational restructuring including decentralization and despecialization;

5. Create internal support systems for problem-solving and community policing including new promotion, evaluation, and training systems and more sophisticated crime analysis capabilities for patrol officers;

6. Conduct and evaluate pilot projects and then develop systems to continually evaluate agencies total community policing and problem solving efforts.
Implementation

There are many possible ways police leadership can overcome implementation difficulties. This paper presents some lessons of success so that strategies currently underway in the province can be compared to the components cited here. Therefore, this paper should be considered a "roadmap" for agencies embarking upon community policing reform.

This paper is divided into seven sections. The first describes the methods and data that were used to compile this implementation research. It is followed by six sections that define the components necessary to implement community policing.

The first section provides a background definition to community policing and problem-oriented policing. It includes a definition of the purpose of community policing and it presents the 80/20 rule as a way of thinking about problem-solving.

The second section describes the planning for community policing. This is an area that has been the source of implementation failures in the past. It also introduces other important elements including the role of new leadership skills, core values, internal and external planning groups, and planning styles.

The third section outlines the important link between organizational structure and organizational culture in the
implementation process. It accords both decentralization and despecialization as tactics that have been successful to obtain empowerment throughout the organization. It also discusses department-wide versus pilot project implementation.

The fourth section deals with training and it has been purposely kept brief as it is dealt with in comprehensive fashion in the Commission report on Hiring and Training. However the role of training in all levels of the organization and the community is highlighted including the important role of performance measures to monitor the implementation process.

The fifth section describes the internal support systems that are necessary for the implementation of community policing. This includes the promotion of credible and informed personnel into key positions and the need to change internal operating procedures, such as the weighting criteria on both entrance and promotional exams so that they more accurately reflect community policing principles.

The last section refers to the role of evaluation. This includes acknowledgement of the ineffectual role of "crime fighting" as a police activity and the fact that crime rates and crime clearances are inappropriate measures of police performance. In other words "counting widgets isn't enough".
A note on methodology

The components discussed here were developed from the proceedings of focus group meetings on implementing community policing. The meetings were held at the Commission offices with key representatives from agencies who have been successful implementing some of these reforms. This focus group helped to confirm the validity of preliminary findings from the Commission's research on the topic of community policing in British Columbia.

The focus group representatives were initially identified by Commission members through literature searches and also at conferences, meetings, and site visits across North America. They represented some of the agencies across North America that are widely recognized as the most successful in implementing community policing.

The focus group members have personally played an important role in implementing initiatives in their own agencies. They included Nancy McPherson, San Diego Police Department, California, former police Superintendent Chris Braiden, Edmonton Police Service, Captain Mike Masterson, Madison Police Department, Wisconsin, and Deputy Chief Ron Glensor, Reno Police Department, Nevada. Members of the RCMP, municipal police agencies, Commission members and the Commissioner also attended the discussions.

In addition to the focus group, there were other methods used to develop this chapter. The literature on
Community policing is brought into this discussion which includes the most recent evaluation studies, as well as preliminary findings from the Commission's own research on the topic. This includes summaries of submissions at the Commission's hearings across the province, interviews and meetings with municipal and RCMP officers, surveys of police agencies, and analyses of data on the effectiveness of community policing initiatives.

When the preliminary data collection and analysis was complete, the focus group discussions provided an efficient means to gauge the accuracy of the Commission's preliminary findings based on the experiences and expertise of recognized leaders in community policing. The focus group discussions also assisted in determining future implications for British Columbia police agencies. In technical terms this is known as "external validity" and it helps to strengthen the conclusions of research.

Background definitions

1. Redefine the police role with the community and establish core values

The role of police in British Columbian society can be defined in a relatively straightforward fashion. For example the B.C. Chief's submission to the Commission of Inquiry defines the role of police: 1) to protect life and property; 2) to control and prevent crime; 3) to enforce law; 4) to
apprehend offenders; and, 5) to maintain community peace and order.

Unfortunately, the day to day activities of police officers in the province show that this role is not as clearly defined in practice. This is because the public call on the police to perform a wide variety of services. Some high crime communities require the police to emphasize crime control while others may need emphasis on maintaining order. To further complicate affairs, some agencies in the province place more emphasis on one role versus another.

The fact is that most urban policing in British Columbia is based on reactive policing. Community policing is based on something quite different. The Police Executive Research Forum has called this "community wellness".

Police organizations...are not structurally organized to prevent crime or to address the issues that cause crime. The basic structure of the municipal police organization is built on the trilogy of patrol, investigation, and support services. These basic elements of police organization evolved out of a reactive police theory and have not changed to any significant degree since the 1800s. When new programs or ideas are developed, they are often doomed from the start because they are forced into an organizational structure that is not designed to accept them (Wadman and Olson 1992:18-19).

Definitions of community policing

The main starting place in defining community policing involves police officers as problem solvers. Some focus group participants thought that patrol officers who are
regularly engaged in community problem-solving is one way to determine whether community policing is a normal way of doing business in a community.

This basic principle of community policing is expanded by the International Association of Chiefs of Police who define it as:

1. policing based upon a set of values;
2. a commitment to problem-solving;
3. a move away from dependence on 911;
4. a focus on the city’s neighbourhoods;
5. the involvement of neighbourhood residents;
6. increased accountability; and,
7. empowerment of police officers.

It is sufficient here to note that these elements portray an ideal form of community policing. The remainder of this chapter discusses successful examples of implementing some of the above items.

**Problem-solving is the key**

2. Develop a problem-solving mission statement and characterize problem-solving as the primary police mission

How does the reform of police to community policing fit into this? The movement toward community policing does not change the roles that have been defined for police in society. Rather, the movement toward community policing enhances the capacity of police agencies to respond to these
roles. For some agencies it requires understanding the reality of day-to-day policing beyond the sole focus of fighting crime and answering calls for service.

The Commission focus group participants, and the literature, generally agree on the principle that in the future police officers should be long-term "problem-solvers" versus short-term call responders. Furthermore, all officers must eventually be involved in problem-solving on a day-to-day basis.

Focus group participants felt that the primary definition of community policing should encompass police officers as problem-solvers. Problem solving is the main strategy by which police should train officers, deploy resources, redesign organizational structures, refine operating and promotional procedures, and hire employees. It is the most effective way in which police agencies will address community crime and disorder during times of fiscal restraint and increasing demands for service.

The 80/20 Rule and problem-oriented policing

As a general rule of practice, it has been found that the causes of community problems that generate the police workload resemble the example of the iceberg -- most of them are submerged under the surface. This is known as the 80/20 rule.
Community-oriented policing recognized that underlying conditions and circumstances create policing problems. Incidents are usually symptoms of deeper problems. Incidents will continue as long as the problem that creates the incident persists. If you want to eliminate the problem you have to attack the 80% that is not so visible, yet is the underlying cause and condition that allows the 20%, or tip of the iceberg, to exist (Vaughn 1992:35)

This is the issue that community policing tries to address. Most police agencies deal with community problems by dispatching patrol officers to incidents when the public calls for police service. The officers, burdened by increasing call workloads, deal with the incident quickly and then move onto the next call for service.

A number of officers interviewed by Commission researchers in small agencies indicated that they felt they were doing community policing because they responded to all incoming calls for service. This was in contrast to the larger departments who categorized non-emergency, low priority calls for a delayed response or no response at all. Responding to every request for service was thought to be community policing. This form of policing is driven by calls for service and it is called incident-driven policing. Incident-driven policing frequently deals only with the surface symptoms of many problems -- the 20%.

Community policing as it is defined here enables all police officers to collaborate with community residents to tackle the roots of problems -- the 80%. Currently police agencies in British Columbia use independent liaison teams, crime prevention officers, or community storefront officers
to do community policing. In contrast, the focus group discussions concluded that all officers, from patrol personnel to detectives, must be regularly involved in problem-solving strategies aimed at some of the causes of those problems. This is known as problem-oriented policing. While the individualistic approach of the police specialist or liaison team is a necessary first step, this piecemeal approach is not by itself a complete shift to problem-oriented, community policing.

Problem-oriented policing is a key strategy of community policing. Focus group participants generally felt that in order to implement community policing, it was first necessary to make changes to the structure of police organizations to allow more patrol officer problem-solving.

Workload

Commission interviews with patrol officers across British Columbia revealed that as a rule most officers were not regularly engaged in the community-based form of problem-solving described here. Most officers were still call response officers. Obviously this varied from community to community. Some agencies were making significant efforts to adopt a problem-solving approach, others were having difficulty implementing community policing initiatives, while still others thought they had always done this form of policing and therefore nothing new needed to be done.
The Commission research revealed that some police agencies in the province use liaison teams, crime prevention specialists, or police supervisors, to develop problem solving strategies with communities. General patrol officers, who comprise the bulk of police in the province, were not typically involved in these activities. Some police managers responded to this by saying that patrol officers in the province were too busy answering calls for service (the 20%) to do any community problem solving. In submissions to the Commission it did not appear that, among police leaders in the province, there was any consensus that workloads could be reduced through intensive problem-solving tactics (the 80%).

It would seem that one of the first steps before implementing community policing is an extensive workload analysis. There is a need for police agencies to conduct regular, and detailed, workload analyses to determine which calls can be addressed by problem-solving tactics and which cannot. In the police agencies represented at the focus group, this analyses is typically conducted by police managers in conjunction with patrol personnel. The results are then circulated among community representatives in order to balance appropriate police responses and actual community needs with the available resources.

At the Commission, the focus group participants tackled the workload issue in some detail. This is discussed further in the decentralization, despecialization, and evaluation
sections. However it was the general consensus that resistance for change has more to do with leadership issues and the organizational culture rather than the size of the workload. Workload, from this point of view, can be seen as an incentive to change to something more effective rather than an impediment to community policing. This was reflected in Chief Richardson's submission to the Commission.

We continue to carry the highest criminal case loads in the province. To say the least, we have an overworked police force...our department is short 17 officers. It is unreasonable to expect City Council to approve an additional $1 million in taxes to accommodate that staff increase. We must, therefore, look to new technology and programs which will make our officers more efficient and hopefully reduce case loads. We must rely heavily on public assistance.

Accountability

Another response to increased patrol officer authority to solve problems had to do with accountability. Some police managers indicated in interviews with the Commission that they were concerned about "losing control" of patrol officers and that this lack of control might result in officer inefficiency, or worse, misbehavior.

The focus group participants felt (and this was confirmed in site visits) that patrol officer accountability can actually increase through community policing. For example, community residents and senior police managers in Edmonton were questioned about a particularly successful community station storefront in that city. Responses
indicated that the permanently assigned officers (and their habits) were well known by a large number of community residents. When misbehavior arose it was dealt with immediately at the community level face to face with officers, or it was immediately reported to the officers supervisors. In these cases, officer accountability was increased, not reduced. In effect, when officers are constantly in direct contact with community members their accountability can increase. Edmonton police supervisors indicated that all they had to do to monitor officers activities was to ask community residents who lived in the area of the community storefront. This suggests storefronts can become one community policing initiative that can increase accountability without making changes to provincial law or departmental disciplinary regulations.

The focus group talked about the commonly expressed fear that increased local accountability can result in political interference from local authorities. No such problems were documented in any of the Commission research projects on this topic. Furthermore, focus group participants also confirmed that these problems have not developed in any of their respective agencies in past years.

Class-Based policing?

Police must recognize that in some communities there is no sense of "community", nor is there any community to
organize. But a lack of community does not invalidate the need for community policing initiatives. In communities such as these officers often must take a leading role in organizing community members and solving problems. Who is accountable for this type of problem-solving? Consider one submission to the Commission by a senior police executive:

While the police will accept the responsibility for being the facilitator to mobilize the necessary government and social agencies...it will only be when a particular neighbourhood or community comes together and works as a unit to solve the problem that community based policing will indeed prove successful.

From this point of view it seems that "coming together" focuses on the ability of a community to organize itself. It is the community that is accountable to itself. Unfortunately, in troubled and disorganized community's (where police services are in most demand) this is not likely to happen. The version of community policing that has been successfully implemented by the focus group participants means that it is the role of the police to encourage community residents to "come together". The police themselves should be accountable to help this to happen. The question is, how is this to be done?

Ideally, with an organization that enables officers to work independently, you can still have officers equipped with problem-solving skills who can take a leadership role to actually do something. The "coming together" is enabled through the efforts of rank and file patrol officers working in their permanently assigned neighborhoods. This requires
training officers in enhanced community mobilization skills. Focus group participants felt that problem-solving such as this is an ideal and it is important to recognize that there are rare exceptions to those communities without consensus.

Linked to this is an accountability issue that has been called "class-based" policing. The literature identifies that there have been some criticisms raised about this form of "community-development" in communities where little consensus is available. The problem lies when officers might rely more on the vocal groups in the community rather than the silent members.

Clairmont (1990) calls this "social class bias" of community policing a topic that has been scarcely researched. For example Clairmont indicates that "there is some evidence in Canada of storefront police becoming involved in the recommendations of tenant evictions and of advisory groups pressing for aggressive order-maintenance against pan-handlers and other street people" (Clairmont 1990:481). At least one focus group participant felt that rarely do problems tackled by problem-oriented policing affect a society at large. Rather it is the intent of community-based problem solving to attack problems at their root level and in a specific neighborhoods.

Class-based policing was not seen as a major concern of the focus group participants. Patrol officers were generally viewed as intelligent problem-solvers who, given the proper discretion and leeway, can mediate these broad issues more
effectively under community policing than under the current system. In fact, police officers must constantly balance the rights of the individual with the collective good of the community. Under a community policing model police officers are still obligated to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Community policing does not fundamentally alter this responsibility.

Social class bias was not identified as an issue for community policing in the four jurisdictions represented at the focus group, throughout the Commissions research, nor in studies reviewed about community policing.

Planning

Leadership skills, key leaders and core values

The role of key leaders is one of the most crucial factors influencing the success or failure of community policing initiatives. Some police organizations may be less resistant than others to make fundamental change. The focus group participants continually highlighted the importance of a "champion", or a "core executive group", within the organization to continually maintain pressure for change.

This has been described by Malcolm Sparrow, former Chief Inspector of Kent County Constabulary, England.

A chief executive may be fortunate enough to inherit an organization that is already susceptible to change. For instance, he may arrive shortly after some major
corruption scandal... In such a case the chief is fortunate, in that leadership is required and expected of him.

A chief executive who inherits a smoothly running bureaucracy, complacent in the status quo, has a tougher job... the need for change is less apparent" (1992:52).

Focus group participants agreed that this certainly does not mean that corruption, or some other major crisis, is absolutely necessary in order for significant change to occur. Rather it means that implementation will take longer in some organizations compared to others. But it will certainly require some innovative, risk-takers at senior levels to keep momentum. It is not clear whether this means that police boards must be educated on the importance of hiring appropriate Chiefs, of whether Chiefs should be aware of the importance of this style of leadership and should promote accordingly. In practice, it probably means both.

The focus group discussed the use, by the risk-takers, of implementation "anchors". These are devices that can be used to demonstrate to the resistant members of an organization that community-based problem solving can be more effective than incident-driven policing. For example, successful demonstration projects that are properly documented can serve as effective implementation anchors. Commission researchers found that this was one method used successfully by some police agencies in British Columbia.
Bottom-up or Top-down?

In one police department, patrol officers told Commission researchers that they were merely "informed" about the community policing initiatives after the plans had been made. They were then instructed to carry out the directives of the Chief. They also indicated that they had no intention of actually doing so, although they were giving the impression that they were. This top-down planning was identified during the focus group as a serious flaw with implementation.

An example was cited during the focus group meetings by a participant who was told by one police agency they had been doing community policing for some time but when the rank and file patrol officers were asked, they didn't know anything about it. This was one theme that occasionally emerged in some of the research visits across British Columbia. Although agencies claimed that many initiatives were underway, most patrol officers were unaware of, or unaffected by, these initiatives.

Rank and file officers must eventually drive the community policing reform agenda. This was a common theme from Edmonton to San Diego. But initiatives that are developed by patrol officers in conjunction with community residents require two key ingredients:

1) executive level and mid-management commitment to reform; and,
2) operational managers and supervisors who are trained and capable of providing effective management, such as "troubleshooting" the inevitable failures, of such initiatives.

Although there is a crucial need for an innovative Chief, or another senior executive officer with considerable authority, there is also a need to balance the actual planning process with the perceptions and aspirations of all members of the organization. In effect, this represents a balance between the bottom-up and the top-down implementation styles.

**Social marketing: How to do it?**

3. Create external and internal planning groups and viable implementation plans and develop a flexible time-table for system-wide adoption;

It is important that any new initiatives are explained clearly to those who will be affected by changes -- officers inside the organization and community members outside. One ideal method of explanation is through effective social marketing.

There are many forms of social marketing such as advertising, community forums, news media accounts. However the methods used most effectively by the agencies represented at the focus group was the use of internal and external planning/implementation groups.
The Internal Group

The internal group usually consists of a core group of employees from throughout the organization. In the business world this has been called the "quality work circle" and it typically involves representatives from each rank and area. In a number of police agencies this group is called the "core executive group" and it usually contains approximately 15 members.

It is as necessary to have key executives in this internal group as it is to have civilian employees and union representatives. Middle management and rank officers must all be participants as well. In many cases it was useful to have media relations experts to assist in technical advise on how to market new strategies.

By far the most successful implementation strategy was the involvement in as many organization members as possible in the planning and development process. Only through the participation of all members in the organization can empowerment and commitment to new programs be encouraged. Focus group participants saw this as an effective way to avoid the resentment by mid-managers and rank and file officers resulting from the top-down planning that characterized some of the initiatives currently underway in the province. It was an implementation style that combats internal resistance from the earliest stages.
These internal groups often began with an intensive two or three day planning session which to map out some initial policy. The group then developed tactics to bring in as much of the organization as possible as further development and implementation proceeded. Meetings occurred every four or six months and as implementation proceeded the internal groups occasionally turned over authority and development to other portions of the organization. This also enhanced ownership at all levels.

The continuing role of the internal group in advanced stages of implementation was meet periodically to monitor the progress of initiatives. It was acknowledged that the implementation process constantly evolves and changes. This group can help to provide guidance about these changes to the Chief.

The External Group(s)

Another effective tactic to enhance implementation was the use of external groups. These groups had two primary purposes: 1) to enhance the social marketing capacity of community policing initiatives; and 2) to help to develop the internal agenda based on community needs and expectations. In effect, the external group represents the community involvement in setting police values and mission statements. Focus group participants felt this must not stop
with implementation, but must be an on-going process if the community policing reforms are to succeed.

There were numerous examples provided of such groups. In Reno the external groups are currently called the Neighbourhood Advisory Groups which operate as community forums to help educate the public about community policing. Officers interviewed in the Vancouver Police Department described community forums over the past few years in a very similar fashion to these external groups. The main difference is that in places like San Diego and Reno they are a regular and permanent fixture for the police department. They are a way of doing business.

These external groups also appear to be successful. For example one Reno evaluation found that just under one in ten survey respondents in that city had attended a neighborhood advisory group meeting and over 90 percent of those who did were satisfied that it was worth their while. Almost half of those city residents responding to the survey also indicated that they were willing to attend such an advisory group in the future (Glensor 1992:16).

Such efforts resemble recent efforts made by the RCMP to introduce community consultative committees across British Columbia. Although few systematic evaluations about the effects of these groups have been conducted, it would appear that they have great potential to provide feedback to police agencies engaged in community policing.
There were also examples of internal groups described during the focus group sessions. Both Edmonton's and Reno's police agencies used internal groups to begin their community policing planning and implementation. This indicated a strong commitment by police administrators to monitor and evaluate the implementation of community policing. For example, in the Reno Police Department, an agency of slightly over 300 sworn officers, these groups included:

1) a Media Liaison Group which included representatives from the media to collaborate on marketing programs. This marked a more productive relationship between the police and the media, while still maintaining the journalistic independence required by the media;

2) a Professional Technical Advisory Group which included professionals with expertise on the application of community policing. This included representatives from the Washington based think-tank, the Police Executive Research Forum; and

3) a Quality Assurance unit which conducts continual community surveys to monitor and evaluate the progress of community policing initiatives. This includes two major community attitude and confidence surveys of approximately 700-800 residents and 24 mini-surveys a year.

Commission researchers found that surveying to this extent was not being done in the province. However, some surveying is being done in British Columbia. For example a
community survey of about 400 residents in each community is conducted by the B.C. Police Commission on one or two municipal departments each year. Also a few community surveys had been conducted by police agencies themselves on occasion. For example, the Port Moody Police Board conducted a random, but non-representative sample of 150 residents in 1992.

These internal planning groups appear similar to efforts by agencies such as Vancouver and Saanich Police Departments to incorporate citizen-police advisory forums. However, it would seem that these groups appear to be generated on an as-needed basis. What is suggested here is that they be explicitly developed for the purpose of implementing and monitoring community policing initiatives.

*Ingredients for Planning/Implementation Groups*

It is also important to identify the proper people to establish these groups. These persons must have credibility both among officers and also in the community.

External groups seemed to be most effective when rank officers themselves participated in developing coordinating the groups, at least in the initial stages. Commission research has shown that programs in the Lower Mainland to establish external groups have typically resulted from senior officer's efforts. Only infrequently have rank and file officers been used to employ these techniques, and in
most cases these officers were members of special liaison units assigned to do just that. Only rarely have average patrol officers been involved in this planning approach.

Furthermore, either as external or internal groups, the development of liaison units are similar in many respects to the "team policing" programs of the 1970s; which were touted as an early form of community policing. However, these policing teams did not work well. Bayley and Skolnick have criticized these teams for their lack of community involvement.

Team policing may or may not stress the intensive cultivation of local communities for crime prevention purposes. There is a tendency for senior police officers to assume that coordinating police services within small areas automatically produces close community relations. That is not so. Highly professional integrated teams can be just as attached to the old reactive crime-fighting modes as traditional patrol personnel. It is a mistake to confuse structural changes in command with reorientations of operating philosophy (Skolnick and Bayley 1986:211).

The issue here is one of credibility. External groups require significant community outreach in helping to set police agendas. That is how they gain credibility in the community. Internal groups need committed and respected senior executive officers who are risk-takers. The Commission focus group called these people internal "champions" for community policing. The credibility of these champions within the department was a theme that emerged in a number of the agencies represented at the focus group.

Another important ingredient in successful implementation/planning groups was the involvement of
special interest groups from the community at large. Because there are many external groups that influence the police ability to both combat crime and neighborhood disorder, group membership was important. These groups include the media, citizen's rights groups, neighborhood committees, business associations, and a host of others. Group membership depends on the dynamics of each neighborhood where the group is to operate. It was noted that proper representative members were easy to identify when rank officers collaborated with mid-managers in developing and coordinating the groups.

Depending on the needs of these groups or the problems confronting each community, incorporating the assistance of these groups is absolutely necessary for the planning of community policing. It is essential for three key reasons:

1. to share the burden of crime and disorder;
2. for fiscal accountability purposes; and
3. to exchange information and concerns with the police in order to enhance policy making about operational and administrative issues.

These groups do not replace the Police Board. Rather they represent a significant "feedback loop" in the planning and implementation process to provide information to help define the problem-solving agenda for the police. Decisions may involve budget expenses in one area and cutbacks in another. These groups can provide police leaders with the
necessary feedback on the relevance and importance of each decision.

This is the nature of long-term community problem solving in the future. These planning and implementation groups serve the community and the police organization and they are related to each other. The internal groups generally set policy, while the external groups provide direction for the policy. Local social and political circumstances will dictate the most appropriate form for these groups.

The form for these groups also depends on the size of the community. Obviously the requirements for a three officer detachment in a small town are significantly different from those of a 100 officer police department in a larger city. Nonetheless, the need for such groups is crucial for the successful planning and implementation of community policing.

*Style of Planning*

There are a number of approaches an agency can take in developing plans for community policing. These approaches are characterized by open styles versus closed styles of planning. The community policing philosophy is, by definition, open and flexible. In the past, traditional policy planning in bureaucratic organizations, such as the police, has been closed. Senior executives laid out policy
that other employees were to follow. The focus group discussions highlighted the shortfalls of closed planning versus open planning styles in the implementation process.

Strategic Planning

The most current form of planning in police agencies is a style of planning called "strategic planning". Typically, this style typically sets out some clear objectives and then seeks to establish strategies to obtain each objective. It is the style that has been adopted by many Canadian police agencies and it includes an analysis of future trends, identifying values and mission statements, setting clear objectives, implementing strategies, and evaluating results. The attractiveness of this approach to police managers is described by David Sunahara in the Canadian Police College publication Strategic Planning for Police.

A strategic plan gives a police service a sense of direction. It is a statement about the organization's future and it helps to guide decisions in a tumultuous environment. A strategic plan shields a police service from the danger of responding willy-nilly to every upset in its environment (Sunahara 1991:125).

This does not describe whether this is an open or a closed style. That depends on who sets out the objectives and establishes the strategies. "It is important that as many employees as possible play a part, an active part, in defining their function and visualizing their future" (Ogle 1991:9).
In practice, organizations have great difficulty incorporating the ideas and opinions of all employees. This is especially true of paramilitary organizations, such as the police, where the traditional role of the employee was to follow the instructions of the leader.

Strategic plans have appeal precisely because they give the appearance of a well defined, predictable plan in which there is control. They often tend to have final completion dates attached to them. Strategic plans are problematic for the same reason. The control that senior managers often would like to have over things such as completion dates is precisely the condition that has led to many of the problems in the first place. This is explained below.

Closed, "Systems Thinking", Styles

According to Madison Police Chief David Cooper, contemporary police planning styles are distinguished by "systems thinking or the quality method" (Cooper 1993:108).

In the systems thinking version of planning, there is a concerted effort on developing precise, distinct steps in the implementation process. It is a process by which individual police leaders attempt to "narrow the gap between the way things are supposed to work and the way they actually do work". They typically do this by subjecting the planning process to a rigorous cycle of research, decision-
making and evaluation. Many rigid strategic plans fit into this systems-thinking model.

Chief Cooper states that the problem with this systems approach is the North American belief that the individual is better suited to do this kind of planning.

We are led to that dangerous belief and we don’t realize what the research shows out there about team work and groups of people, that the team can always make a better decision that the individual... That type of collaborative decision making works very well. (Cooper 1993:107-8)

Often this version of planning results in a closed system that can be insensitive to input from all ranks. Focus group members were generally not receptive to this style of planning as a means of implementing community policing.

Open, "Quality Method", Styles

One of the key reasons for planning cited by focus group members was to obtain community input and to help educate the public to the new directions that their police agency is going. This requires an open system of planning, whether or not it is called strategic planning. It is a style of planning that is adaptive and flexible rather than closed and inflexible. This is similar to contemporary organizational management approaches of adaptive planning
and strategic thinking that stress "how coherent strategy can evolve from systematic small steps" (Morgan 1993:3161).

One open version of planning is called, in the business community, Total Quality Management (TQM). This involves a more flexible form of team building in which all employees are involved in developing and researching new plans. In effect, it is an open-style of planning from the inside-out. This is in line with Cooper's belief that collaborative-decision making works well.

Focus group members generally felt that flexible and open forms of planning were the most successful styles in their respective agencies, although some felt that an overall organizational vision (possibly in the form of mission statements and core values) was also essential to begin the planning process. Planning groups were one method successful agencies had used to incorporate open styles of planning. During the Commission research it was noted that the Saanich Police Department had recently begun an internal team-building approach which was reminiscent of TQM, although it was too early to determine the effects of these efforts.

---

1. There are a number of contemporary management approaches which describe this in detail. The Canadian example cited here is Morgan's, Imaginization: The Art of Creative Management (1993). Others include articles by Mintzberg and Waters (1985), Beer, Eisenstat, and Spector, (1990) and a Ph.D. dissertation by Pava (1980).
Organizational Structure and Organizational Culture

4. Commence an organizational restructure including decentralization and despecialization

There is a strong link between an organization's structure and what has been called the organizational culture. Organizational culture is determined by the values and attitudes held by members of the organization.

Focus group members agreed that the traditional role of the police bureaucracy, with its military focus on command and control over its employees, can hamper the implementation of community-based policing.

Historically, the accountability of police officers was one of the reasons for the existence of a paramilitary structure\(^2\). The thinking was that officers who followed orders and did what they were told could be kept from corruption and held accountable by the Chief. Accordingly, from the time recruits marched in drill practice during basic training, to the time they were coached by training officers on patrol, rules were reinforced for the purpose of accountability.

In community policing, discretion and the empowerment of patrol officers is key. Accountability also means that officers have personal ownership over community problems and are accountable for the solution to those problems. This results in a conflict between traditional police

\(^2\) See also the Commission sub-report on the History of Policing in British Columbia.
paramilitary accountability and the decision-making authority patrol officers need to solve problems through community policing. In other words, it is a conflict of traditional organizational culture.

It was the focus group's contention that the police organizational culture must be shifted to allow patrol officer empowerment. Accountability does not disappear, it merely takes another form. As with the Edmonton community police stations, neighbourhood citizens have a much better opportunity to know what's happening with their police officer than is currently the case under the paramilitary model. This is a more subtle form of accountability, but it is more responsive to the public. To encourage this form of accountability and this shift in organizational culture, two methods of organizational restructuring were highlighted — decentralization and despecialization.

Despecialization

The first style of organizational restructure as a means to implement community policing was called despecialization. This is a department-wide strategy that has been successfully used in Halton Regional Police near Toronto, Ontario. The intent is to reduce the number of specialty bureau officers and add to the patrol division where the bulk of community problem solving occurs. For example, Commission researchers learned that Halton Regional
police in Ontario downsized their detective unit to get more officers on the street. They then reassigned detective investigations to patrol officers in order to allow officers more latitude to complete investigations from start to finish. Traditionally many investigations are simply turned over to the detective bureau, which decreased patrol officer ownership over the investigation. This is similar to the current situation in many British Columbia police departments.

Despecialization is a strategy to increase patrol officer ownership of community problems. Some B.C. police agencies, such as Vancouver, have previously attempted to decentralize detectives during the "team policing" experiments in the 1970's. These met with mixed success. Patrol officers, detectives, officers specializing in young offenders, and others were given responsibility for policing small geographic areas in teams. However, the tactics of teams often did not involve community residents or organizations in solutions. Law enforcement was often the primary tactic used.

The Halton despecialization experience was designed to empower all officers to solve problems alongside community residents and organizations. Rather than specialist teams who are decentralized, the focus is on a broader range of community problem solving. This appears to be a more successful tactic than the team policing experiments of the 1970s.
Civilianization and the extensive use of volunteers represents another organizational strategy that helps to despecialize the police. This may mean hiring a volunteer coordinator to free up officer time to deal with community problems. In Vancouver, for example, volunteers in victim services are used on mobile patrol to respond to domestic disputes after the patrol officers have defused any potential violence. The use of civilians is also being gradually implemented in the province. Civilian police planners, financial managers, physical fitness trainers, fingerprint, photographic and forensic technicians, and a host of others have gradually (and successfully) been replacing sworn police officers in traditional police specialty areas.

If community policing is to be successfully implemented, police leaders, police unions, police boards and city councils must be supportive the fact that these initiatives need to be expanded. More officers must be made available from current personnel levels to free up time away from increasing numbers of calls for service. Police unions must also be an integral part of planning for these changes in order to address their bargaining concerns.

Decentralization

Despecialization is not the only organizational strategy that has been used. The Edmonton Police Service,
for example, has not yet significantly despecialized. But they have decentralized. There are at least three forms of decentralization: geographical, functional, and authoritative.

Geographical Decentralization

Physical decentralization geographically places officers into neighbourhoods throughout cities and towns in a full-time, problem-solving capacity. One example of this is Edmonton's sixteen community storefronts and suboffices that operate in virtually every neighbourhood in the city. Officers are posted full-time to these decentralized offices along with civilian volunteers. Non-emergency calls from neighbourhoods are forwarded to the storefront office where community residents can speak personally to their own community constable. Community constables, in turn, have considerable latitude to make decisions and solve problems by tailoring strategies to fit their own neighbourhoods.

The Victoria City Police have also decentralized with a number of community police stations. The Victoria program began a few years before Edmonton but they operate their stations somewhat differently. Other police agencies in the province have made varying levels of commitment to this form of decentralization.

Focus group participants felt storefronts help personalize service at the neighborhood level, but they are
not a panacea. In themselves, storefronts do not represent the actual organizational restructure. They are simply one element in a more complex service delivery system. Police agencies that implement storefronts, without additional organizational changes, cannot realistically say they are involved with full-scale community policing.

The semi-permanent assignment of officers to specific areas of the community is another form of decentralization. The intent is to decentralize more permanent patrol assignments into geographic beats for fixed periods of time. In Edmonton this was evolving into a patrol style called the "ownership car". The focus group felt this type of decentralization is crucial in order to implement ownership at the line level. Officers need time to get to know the community better. The period of time officers were being assigned to these fixed areas ranged from one to five years. Obviously, in British Columbia this form of beat decentralization would apply more to larger communities than to smaller communities such as Oak Bay, Port Moody, Esquimalt or Nelson where the whole community is one single patrol area.

In contrast to this, the Commission found that some police agencies in British Columbia have transfer policies that move officers every few years or, in one case, every three or four months from one area to another. This is contrary to the underlying philosophy of community policing and it makes implementation more difficult.
Functional Decentralization

Another form of decentralization is functional decentralization. This constitutes having non-police agencies respond to traditional police functions. These alternative responses have been called the "differential police response" system and it has been adopted by a number of police agencies such as the Calgary Police Service and the Peel Regional Police in Ontario. This form of decentralization involves the police agency implementing a computerized call management and prioritization system. Currently, most police agencies in B.C. utilize at least the basic forms of the differential response system.

The differential police response system sends calls for service to other agencies such as by-law officers for traffic or parking complaints, social workers for neighbourhood or domestic disputes, conservation or humane society authorities for wildlife complaints, security companies for alarms, and insurance investigators for minor traffic accidents. Some of these initiatives are already underway in British Columbia and, if community policing is to succeed, police leaders and police boards must continue to reexamine the role of the police in their community. This may mean that they recategorize many traditional police duties as non-police. This is necessary so that patrol officers' time is made available to allow them to solve more serious community problems.
Authoritative Decentralization

Proprietary ownership by patrol officers and community residents over community problems requires, first and foremost, that senior police leaders must let go of their traditional control. This means that problem solving projects should be coordinated and conducted by patrol officers, with supervisors acting as facilitators for the constables.

The Commission research revealed that in one municipal police agency in B.C., only three problem-solving projects were permitted by supervisors at any one time. Furthermore, every officer in that agency was supposed to be responsible for all three projects. In other words, individual patrol constables had not yet been empowered to the point where they were allowed to make mistakes and correct their own errors on individual problems. It is unlikely that, in this system, patrol officers will significantly develop ownership over individual community problems.

This was in stark contrast to the Edmonton Police Service where patrol sergeants were encouraged to act as facilitators for constables and in the first year over 60 independent and successful problem-solving projects were completed by 30 patrol officers.

Another form of authoritative decentralization was the ability of patrol officers to have access to information such as crime analysis. Some departments use crime analysis,
and the associated computer resources, as a management tool to examine yearly statistics. However, community policing and problem-solving requires that patrol officers have accurate and detailed crime information. To the focus group participants this meant that the crime analysis function must be decentralized so that it is accessible for patrol officers.

Commission researchers found that, in the agencies that utilized crime analysis, patrol officers did not use this information to solve problems on a frequent basis. Often the crime analysis constituted pin maps or charts of statistics. The data was typically based only on police records. Many problems facing police officers require information from a variety of non-police sources. Therefore, there seemed to be a need to improve the sophistication of police crime analysis procedures.

These three forms of decentralization can easily be combined in creative ways. For example, in Reno, the police agency put a storefront into a small run-down commercial mall. They deployed full-time beat officers to the storefront whose main job was to obtain community consensus and determine the needs of the local neighbourhood. They began to provide the convenience of a range of police services tailor-made to the community. These included programs to help new immigrants identify gang problems in their own families, parenting classes, gang diversion classes, and a range of others. Eventually storefront
personnel were able to translate other crime prevention information into the ethnic languages of that community. These efforts were all aimed at specific problems which inflated the police workload and influenced the "community wellness" of neighbourhoods around the mall. It was a decentralized way of providing police services and enhancing the quality of life.

Occasionally there are problems in finding qualified civilian complaint takers who are familiar with police reporting procedures. Volunteers cannot be used for every function in the storefront. One tactic that police leaders used to overcome this in Reno was to use police dispatchers as report takers in storefronts to take complaints. The dispatchers could spend a given period of time in the storefront, they knew the police computer systems, and they were familiar with police administrative procedures. They were also experienced at dealing with the public, a necessary quality for storefront operations. In time the dispatchers became effective office managers, a skill which also helped to enhance their overall job interests.

In general, the focus group participants agreed that it is necessary to incorporate hiring procedures as outlined above, and other administrative practices, that will help recapture time for officers. Accordingly, internal policies must change to allow this to happen. For example, in Edmonton administrators changed their dispatching procedures so that minor complaints and low priority calls would no
longer require a mobile police response at all. Instead citizens were asked to walk to their local neighbourhood storefront to speak in person to their own community officer. This increased their familiarity with their own community officer and also improved police-community relations. It also helped to reduce the patrol officer workload.

*Crime and Problem Analysis*

Focus group discussions generally concurred with the BC Police Chiefs' submission that more research needs to be done and that the focus of research should be on "infrastructure support for the police and the development of advanced community-based policing techniques, management practices and generic policies" (Municipal Chief Constables' Interim Submission, June, 1993).

In San Diego, police analysis advisory committee (PAAC's) have been established to conduct on-going problem assessments in each community. These committees constitute both police and other governmental agencies, which also helps to market the delivery of community based police services. Membership includes the Chief, other selected police administrators, representatives of other city departments and community residents. Meetings are held frequently, usually every month when 20 to 50 PAAC members engage in brainstorming sessions about the problems which
are brought to them. The agenda includes brief presentations of neighbourhood problems by rank-and-file patrol officers followed by input from other governmental agencies on how they might help officers solve these problems.

While there are similar models to the PAAC in British Columbia, one of the unique San Diego characteristics includes the presentation by one or two patrol officers who present problems which they have encountered to the committee. The patrol officers use a standard format for presenting the problem which is called the SARA model. SARA stands for scanning, analysis, responding, and assessment. The community problem is presented to the PAAC by the officers with details about how they reviewed (scanned) and analyzed the problem. They then begin brainstorming about possible responses to the problems with the PAAC and later provide an evaluation (assessment) about whether the solutions worked.

Another form of crime and problem analysis used by focus group participants is called hot spot analysis. This includes the extensive use of crime analysis and computers to determine where and when certain problems congregate. The times and areas of these problems constitute "hot spots" for the police which generate a significant proportion of the weekly police workload. Commission researchers found that hot spot analysis was conducted in the province on a few occasions, but only rarely was sophisticated computer analysis and technical support available for the analysis.
Hot spot analysis was a key method to allow the effective deployment of police resources. Effective deployment means that officers can spend more time on the most persistent community problems. Hot spot analysis is an important method to determine which community problems can be most effectively addressed with available resources.

Training

Training is a major component of successful implementation. Anothy Lukin, program coordinator of the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission, told Commission researchers that Washington State began their community policing by exposing every single officer and department to a state-sponsored training package.

Commission researchers discovered that the Justice Institute of British Columbia and the RCMP Fairmont Training Academy have been in the process of implementing community-based and problem-oriented policing training. Yet current academy training cannot reach thousands of serving officers in the province in a short timeframe. Furthermore, academy training cannot contend with each department’s hiring philosophy.

For example, some municipal police agencies in British Columbia are still hiring recruits using preliminary entrance exams marked on 138 points for basic math, spelling, grammar and memorization but only 44 points for
reasoning/comprehension and 1 point for logic. This is in spite of the fact that community policing and problem solving profoundly depend on reasoning, comprehension and logic. Although entrance exams are only a preliminary step later supplemented with further interviews and tests to investigate a recruits reasoning and logic, it is interesting that the first exam that many recruits complete hardly examines these factors at all.

**Who Needs Training?**

Focus group participants felt that all members of the police organization must be trained both in the philosophy of community policing and in the tactics of problem solving. In many of the agencies represented at the focus group this training included rank, middle, and senior executive police officers, civilian employees, and especially the public. It was also determined that, in the local context, this training should extend to police board members and civic officials and politicians. The key is that it is important not to train only specialists for community policing. Specialists tend to become segmented from everyday policing. They also can be elitist. This will hamper the implementation of community policing.

Training in these new tactics is just beginning to emerge in the province. Patrol officer and first line supervisor training in community problem solving began in
1993 at the police academy at the Justice Institute of British Columbia. After this program was implemented, the Vancouver Police Department also began training their patrol officers in problem-oriented policing. These initiatives must be expanded and additional resource funding should be made available by the provincial government to do so. But patrol officer training alone is insufficient.

Civic officials, politicians, police board members and the public must also be educated about the limitations and realities of policing, so that they know what to ask of local police departments and their police Chiefs. There are obvious differences between an emergency and "crime fighting" role versus community problem solving activities. Police board members in particular should be knowledgeable about these issues. The training of police board members could fall to the Ministry of the Attorney General, the B.C. Police Commission or the Police Academy.

Anthony Lukin advised Commission researchers that the command staff of police organizations also require education from a planning and policy perspective. Executive training courses must cover the theory, planning, and facilitating of long-term flexible plans which are necessary for the successful implementation of community policing.

First line supervisor training must address difficult issues such as, how to allow, and encourage, rank officer autonomy while still maintaining a supervisory role? What is
the role of the supervisor in community problem-solving versus traditional law enforcement?

Furthermore, training internal specialists and detectives in the philosophy of community policing and the tactics of problem-solving is another important step.

A key question for managers is, what kinds of performance measures are useful? Strictly quantitative measures such as the number of tickets issued are inappropriate under community policing. Rather rank officers need retraining in conflict management, problem-solving, cultural diversity, crime analysis, critical thinking, facilitation training, and how to mobilize community groups. These topics are absolutely crucial if community policing is to be implemented.

Performance Measures

Along with this retraining, police leaders must develop means to evaluate the degree to which officers demonstrate these skills. Peer evaluations, community resident satisfaction ("customer satisfaction"), and other contemporary management methods should become part of executive development training. In other words, police leaders should join the professional executive in
contemporary business, in advanced managerial competency training\textsuperscript{3}.

It was also generally agreed that public education is another crucial area for successful implementation. This means educating community members and neighbourhood groups. It also means other forms of community consensus-building (which the external planning groups can enhance). All these community members must be made aware of the limited capacity of police to tackle all social disorders and ills. This education process represents a "reality-check". It is necessary because there needs to be a buy-in by local community residents to share the burden and take local responsibility, and to use the police as one part of their own problem-solving. This will require the police to facilitate community consensus and it will likely involve better communication and cooperation with local media. Means to evaluate whether these educational efforts are successful include regular focus groups and community surveys.

While police leaders may not be able to do this alone, they can search for other community leaders such as religious officials, community group administrators, social planners, social workers and local politicians to assist in the implementation process. From this point of view, the Commission focus group participants agreed with a

\textsuperscript{3} See also the Commission sub-report on Promotion and Leadership or Hiring and Training.
recommendation of the recent provincial Community Policing Advisory Committee Report which states:

Although the impetus for community policing may come from community or police leadership, the ongoing support should come from the community and its elected representatives (Ministry of Attorney General, 1993).

These community representatives should be aware of, in fact they should participate in, the core values and mission statements for their police agency. These values are the center of any training or educational package.

In conclusion, training and evaluation must be department-wide. It is important not to isolate individual officers as specialists. Everyone in the agency, including dispatchers, civilians, patrol officers, supervisors, senior managers and police board members, must know why community policing and problem solving is important. Above all, community residents themselves should be informed, they should participate in these changes, and they should be involved in the evaluation process.

Internal support

5. Create internal support systems for problem-solving and community policing including new promotion, evaluation, and training systems and more sophisticated crime analysis capabilities for patrol officers;

Internal Structural Change

One observer has noted that "traditional organizational values may pose one of the most significant obstacles to
community policing since, in order to implement community policing, the very core of the organization’s culture must change" (Rush 1992:52). Unfortunately it is one thing to talk about the necessity of changing the culture of organizations, and quite another for it to actually occur.

Many of the innovations described here are already underway in some police agencies in British Columbia. Therefore, the beginning of a significant cultural change has already begun in the province’s police agencies. But if these innovations are to be successfully adopted by officers in the province, the focus group felt that each police agency must change internal structures to allow implementation to occur. This involves the promotional system, evaluation system, rules and regulations, and the organizational structure. Some agencies use rewards for innovative officers. Others use special hiring and training procedures for field training officers. The important point is that members inside police organizations must see that significant changes are occurring. If officers continue day-to-day reactive call response and maintain the status quo, nothing will change.

Planning Groups for Internal Support

Another purpose of planning groups was to enhance the internal support for community policing initiatives. For
this reason planning groups require cross-membership both internally and externally.

Some of the police agencies represented at the focus group used larger neighbourhood advisory groups as external groups to provide input to the planning process. They also helped to educate the public about community policing. These larger groups were more global in nature. They did not deal with specific neighbourhood problems that individual officers confronted. Rather, they concerned themselves with broader issues of concern to the community. The Vancouver police community forums which were conducted in 1992 constitute one version of these external planning groups although, unlike the San Diego groups, they do not appear to be a continuing or regular part of the on-going planning process on a monthly or yearly basis.

For more local problems, smaller external planning groups have been used. In these smaller groups rank and file officers themselves would set up their own neighbourhood committee’s to tackle problems on a site by site basis. The local committee’s often dove-tailed onto existing community associations. They would focus on specific neighbourhood issues or problems, they were not necessarily permanent, and they often had members participate in the larger external planning groups to facilitate communication.

In British Columbia the Commission research found significant inroads being made with these smaller external planning groups. For example, the RCMP has been committed to
community consultative committees which form smaller external planning groups in a number of detachments across the province.

Evaluating and Promoting Key People

Employee evaluations are important to determine how employees look at their jobs. The focus group felt that appraisal and evaluation systems must encourage officers to do regular community problem solving. The Commission research found inconsistent use of appraisal systems across the province. Some agencies utilized appraisal systems to help promote creative problem-solving while others still relied on the numbers of tickets issued or files processed, or seniority. In some agencies, no space was provided on evaluation forms to note independent problem-solving efforts of patrol officers. Accordingly, patrol officers told Commission researchers that they felt no need to engage in any community problem-solving initiatives.

Awards and recognition by supervisors for successful community policing initiatives were identified as key motivators that could increase job satisfaction. It was clear that personnel in a police agency are the most important resource available and managers must make the job as satisfying as possible. Promoting community problem solvers was one effective means to help implement community policing initiatives. This is an objective that can be
identified by a police board and encouraged by the Chief Constable.

Therefore, appraisal systems, awards and recognition of patrol officers were means by which continued attention and support from upper and mid-managers could be directed at enhancing internal support for community policing. It is crucial that community policing be done from bottom-up and strongly supported from the top-down.

Evaluations of community policing

6. Conduct and evaluate pilot projects and then develop systems to continually evaluate agencies total community policing and problem solving efforts.

Evaluating Problem-solving Projects

Focus group discussion and the literature on community policing emphasizes the need for independent evaluations of problem-solving projects. Regular evaluations of these projects demonstrate the degree to which community policing is implemented within agencies. For example, an evaluation of the Victoria Police storefront project was concluded in 1992 (Walker, Walker, and McDavid 1992). Similar evaluations have been conducted in Edmonton (Hornick 1990, 1991), Madison, (Wycoff and Skogan 1993), Winnipeg (Linden, 1989), Halifax (Clairmont 1990), and other cities.

Smaller agencies often find independent evaluations costly and difficult, due to a lack of technical and financial resources. Two responses to this dilemma that were
discussed during the focus group and these included the use of senior college and university students in work study programs to assist in surveying. Another response to this was the agencies themselves learning the technical aspects of proper community surveying in order to evaluate their own efforts and to then reflect back on their planning process when implementing community policing.

Commission researchers found that many community policing initiatives in the province were of recent vintage and few had been evaluated in the province. A number of senior managers, particularly in smaller organizations, told Commission researchers that they did not feel that it was necessary to formally evaluate their programs. They felt that they knew if their initiatives worked or not.

Evaluation studies that focussed on crime rates alone do not obtain the full effects of many community policing initiatives. Focus group discussions highlighted that evaluation studies must acknowledge that "crime fighting" shouldn’t be the only focus, but that fear reduction and quality of life are also important. Such measures must be part of any evaluation study.

It is important to evaluate measures that are an intrinsic part of organizational goals. These goals can be articulated initially through core values and mission statements, although these statements in themselves mean little. Evaluations must be conducted of the success or
failure of various initiatives in order to give substance to community policing initiatives.

Core Values and Mission Statements

There was discussion during the focus group on the role of establishing "core values" and "mission statements" in accordance with community policing. Many British Columbia police agencies have already done this. But not many have made the organizational changes necessary to allow these values to percolate throughout the whole organization. Commission research revealed that most organizations in the province are in the early years of making such changes.

To create these core values and mission statements it is important that all employees be involved in all aspects of planning in order to develop "ownership" during the progression to full community policing. It is not enough to have a selected sample of ranks develop "plans" and then attempt to train and sell them to the whole agency. During the Commission’s research this problem was identified on a number of occasions. Officers interviewed indicated that there was significant resistance or skepticism about plans that appeared to be generated from the "top-down".
Counting Widgets Isn't Enough

The focus group discussed the need to emphasize regular evaluations of problem-solving projects. These evaluations should examine the degree to which community policing is implemented within agencies across the province. They should also include an open acknowledgement that "crime fighting" is not the only police focus, but rather that fear reduction and quality of life are also important. This points to the community wellness aspect of community policing. Only when a community is on the path to developing its own solutions to problems can crime fighting be truly proactive.

Traditional evaluations of police activities center around how efficient the police are at responding to incoming calls for service, response times, and the number of crimes that are solved. Recent studies into police performance have found that these quantitative measures are insufficient yardsticks of police effectiveness. This is because policing not only deals with solving crimes but in fact a good portion of police activity deals with minor issues and more general community problems, such as noise complaints.

Therefore, evaluations of community policing must consider the effectiveness of the police in dealing with "customer satisfaction". Many police administrators told the Commission that their community residents were satisfied since they responded to every call for service received.
too small" and that community residents in fact wished to see officers at every single complaint, community surveys or forums in which these sentiments were documented were infrequent or nonexistent. Senior officers often seemed content to rely on the word of mouth and their own personal contacts to obtain this information.

*Successful Demonstration Projects at Line Level*

Many successful community policing initiatives began with pilot projects that developed meaningful evaluative criteria. These criteria ranged from surveys of officer perceptions and community satisfaction questionnaires to fear of crime surveys and other similar measures.

It is significant to note that many agencies involving themselves in significant restructuring to community policing discover a minimal impact of community policing on traditional measurement criteria such as crime rates and response times.

Data from Halifax indicates that departments' adoption of CBP [community-based policing] has not had much impact on response times and traffic ticket production nor on clearance-by-charge rates for break and enter and auto theft (Mercer Ltd. 1989). The latter finding is significant given the elimination of specialist detective teams for break and enter and auto theft as part of the CBP implementation in Halifax and the fact that these investigative activities are now conducted by decentralized squads of uniformed officers working a shift schedule (Clairmont 1990:478)

It takes a long time and significant investment of resources and personnel before long lasting impacts are
likely to be forthcoming. Preliminary data have only recently begun to show positive results (Eck and Spelman 1987, 1989). In the meantime the challenge for managers is to look for relief for the calls for service loop.
Recommendations

There are a number of obvious areas where recommendations can enhance the implementation of community policing in British Columbia. Generally these support the 16 recommendations of the 1993 provincial Community Policing Advisory Committee Report, but as this chapter deals specifically with implementation there is a slightly different focus here. The recommendations are as follows:

Problem Solving

1. It is recommended that the the British Columbia Police Act be amended to expand the role of police boards to include monitoring police agencies progress towards community policing. The board should use "core values" that are developed in the early stages of the planning process as a basic means of setting evaluation criteria. The core values should include a basic statement about police officers as problem solvers, in conjunction with their role in law enforcement and responding to emergencies.

2. It is recommended that Police Chiefs examine and, if necessary, modify their internal organizational definitions of community policing to encompass police officers as problem-solvers. Problem solving is the strategy by which police should train officers, deploy resources, redesign organizational structures, refine operating and promotional procedures, and hire employees. It is the most effective way in which police agencies will address community crime and disorder especially during times of fiscal restraint and increasing demands for service.

3. It is recommended that police agencies, assisted by the provincial government through appropriate bodies including the Ministry of the Attorney General, the Justice Institute of British Columbia, and the provincial Community Policing and Problem Solving technical support team (see recommendation #10) embark upon a modernization of their crime and problem analysis to include techniques such as applied statistical methods of determining hot spots and data collection from non-police sources. This can include the extensive use of computers to determine where and when
certain problems congregate. The intent is to determine which calls, areas and persons generate a significant proportion of the weekly police workload so that officers can develop problem solving tactics to address them.

Planning and Core Values

4. It is recommended that the British Columbia Police Act be amended to indicate that the duty of municipal police boards is to participate in the planning for community policing by assisting in the development community-police "core values" and organizational mission statements. These core values and mission statements should constitute the criteria on which community policing programs and problem-solving initiatives are based.

5. A piecemeal approach is an inappropriate way to implement community policing. It is recommended that each police agency develop a comprehensive plan to implement more extensive community policing and problem solving initiatives. Furthermore, the plan and the planning process must be flexible, open, and adaptive. It must allow for changes in direction and continual updates. A rigidly defined strategic plan is unlikely to garner the necessary support.

6. One of the first steps to be undertaken before implementing community policing is an extensive workload analysis. It is recommended that police agencies conduct regular, and detailed, workload analyses to determine which calls can be addressed by problem-solving tactics and which cannot. Police agencies can be assisted in either conducting these analyses, or in setting up planning groups to conduct the analyses, by the provincial Community Policing and Problem Solving technical support team (see Recommendation #10).

7. It is also recommended that the workload analyses be conducted by police managers in conjunction with patrol personnel. The results should then be circulated among community representatives in order to balance appropriate police responses and community needs with available resources.

8. It is recommended that police agencies encourage and develop open systems of planning, whether or not they are called strategic plans. Planning should be adaptive and flexible rather than closed and inflexible. There are a
number of forms of this in which all members of the police agency and representatives of the community can participate including Total Quality Management, internal planning groups, and external planning groups.

Organizational Restructure

8. Centralized control by police leaders of problem-solving projects hampers effective problem-oriented policing. Autonomy and ownership of problems by individual officers is crucial. Therefore, it is recommended that the duties of police supervisors should be reoriented to encourage line officers to take responsibility for community projects.

9. It is recommended that police boards and the Attorney General provide patrol officers and first line supervisors with the necessary resources and support, in areas such as crime and problem analysis, and updated training, to enhance problem solving so that officers can continually update their skills.

10. It is recommended that the Ministry of the Attorney General form and provide necessary resources for a Community Policing and Problem Solving Technical Support Team. This team should include both civilians and police officers with technical expertise in advanced crime and problem analysis, computing skills, surveying, research, and evaluation skills, the development and facilitation of planning groups, media relations and marketing skills, management and leadership tactics pertaining to community policing, and other areas pertinent for the successful implementation of community policing and problem solving.

11. It is recommended that the Community Policing and Problem Solving technical support team be made available to any police agency in the province for the purpose assisting in the development, implementation and evaluation of community policing and problem solving initiatives.

12. It is recommended that police boards and Chief's consider despecialization in their agencies as a means to decrease the patrol officer workload. The purpose of this despecialization is to transfer the number of specialty bureau officers and add to the patrol division where the bulk of community problem solving occurs.
13. Civilianization and the extensive use of volunteers represents another organizational strategy that helps to despecialize the police. It is therefore recommended that police boards and Chiefs, in negotiation with police unions, investigate ways to employ more civilians and volunteers in their agencies. This should include hiring civilian volunteer coordinators to free up officers' time to deal with community problems in police storefronts and hiring civilian crime and problem analysts to work with patrol officers.

14. Proprietary ownership by patrol officers and community residents over community problems requires, first and foremost, that senior police leaders must let go of their traditional control. It is recommended that the operational procedures within the 12 municipal police agencies be modified where necessary to allow the coordination and ownership of projects by patrol officers alongside community residents. These operational procedures should outline the duties of first line supervisors as facilitators who encourage and assist constables in developing and implementing problem solving projects and who evaluate constables performance accordingly.

Training

15. Focus group participants felt that all members of the police organization must be trained both in the philosophy of community policing and in the tactics of problem-solving. It is therefore recommended that police agencies in conjunction with the Police Academy at the Justice Institute of British Columbia develop and expand appropriate training for rank-and-file, middle managers, and senior executive police officers, civilian employees, and other members of the public as necessary.

16. It is also recommended that this training should extend to police board members and civic officials and politicians. This training should be updated, coordinated and administered on a regular basis by an appropriate provincial body such as the British Columbia Police Commission.

17. It is recommended that training for new police board members should be incorporated into an initial orientation package by an appropriate government body such as the Police Commission, and it should include knowledge about the limitations and realities of policing so that board members know what to ask of local police departments and their police Chiefs. This training should focus on the emergency
and "crime fighting" role versus the community problem solving role and how they fit together.

18. It is recommended that the patrol officer and first-line supervisor training in community problem oriented policing that began in 1990 at the Police Academy at the Justice Institute of British Columbia should be continued and expanded and the provincial government should provide additional resource funding to further develop these initiatives for officers across the province.

19. It is recommended that training for community policing and problem solving should include operational tactics for first line supervisors, and also supervisory training that addresses issues such as the role of the supervisor and how to encourage rank-and-file officer autonomy?

Internal Support

20. It is recommended that external consultative groups be developed by each police agency. If these groups are already in existence it is recommended that they: a) meet regularly to develop shared ownership of problems; b) constitute membership from the main geographical areas of each jurisdiction; and c) undertake on-going reviews of problems and assist in developing appropriate police-community responses.

21. It is recommended that all advisory, planning and consultative groups include both community members and rank-and-file patrol officers.

22. It is recommended that internal employee evaluations should include significant portions that are dedicated to community problem solving.

23. Entrance exams and hiring guidelines should be examined and, if needed, should be amended by police agencies so that they also focus on recruit characteristics that include reasoning, logic and problem-solving skills.

24. Promoting community problem-solvers was one effective means to help implement community policing initiatives. It is recommended that Chief Constables and other police leaders develop appraisal systems, awards, and other forms of recognition for patrol officers who demonstrate
commitment to community problem-solving and community policing strategies.

Evaluations

25. It is recommended that all police agencies implement a system of on-going, comprehensive evaluation studies of problem-solving projects and other community policing initiatives. These evaluation studies can be coordinated and conducted with the assistance of the provincial Community Policing and Problem Solving technical support team.

26. It is recommended that evaluations of community policing and problem solving projects should not focus on crime rates alone. It is recommended that evaluation studies must acknowledge that "crime fighting" is not the only focus, but that fear reduction and quality of life are also important measures. Evaluative criteria should range from surveys of officer perceptions, community satisfaction questionnaires, fear of crime surveys, and other similar measures.

27. Many successful community policing initiatives began with pilot projects incorporating meaningful evaluative criteria. It is therefore recommended that police agencies continue to develop community policing and problem-solving pilot projects.

28. It is further recommended that all demonstration projects and other community policing initiatives be presented to police boards, planning groups and executive officers for review. The provincial Community Policing and Problem Solving technical support team should provide the technical assistance in developing and implementing these evaluation studies.
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Current Community Policing Initiatives
The State of Affairs in British Columbia

Gregory Saville

Introduction

There are vast differences between what various police agencies call community policing. The differences are partly due to the broad nature of the police role in society. By their very nature police officers must deal with the community on a regular basis, especially in the smaller communities in British Columbia where they have daily contact with residents. However, recent reforms to a community based model of policing refers to a role for the police that is not similar to the traditional urban role in which the police find themselves in Canada.

The most common urban policing role in B.C. involves a style of policing where officers are deployed in patrol vehicles and wait for radio calls for service. Complaints received from the public are dispatched to officers by radio and officers react by responding to the complaints. At the scene, officers then attempt to resolve the situation by mediation or, if necessary, by arrest. In most circumstances the complaint is minor in nature and a police report is filed, for example when a theft or break-in has occurred. This is called reactive, incident-driven policing.

In incident-driven policing officers attempt to use moments when calls are scarce to randomly patrol their patrol areas. They may also enforce traffic laws. However, when calls are received on the police radio, these other proactive activities come to a halt. In interviews across the province officers told Commission researchers that this is usually the case regardless of the nature of the call for service. The call for service was the mainstay of urban British Columbian policing.
In fact in smaller departments one of the phrases commonly heard by researchers was "no call too small".

The general view of officers was that this is what the public wants from their police - rapid response to calls for service and a sympathetic ear once they arrive. Many officers considered this community policing.

Many submissions to the Commission of Inquiry suggested that this was only part of what they wanted from police. Submitters stated that they wanted to see more of their police, but not more patrol cars. They wanted more police contact and input into solving some of the problems in their communities. In response to this police agencies across the province have established crime prevention and community relations specialists. They have also developed officers who specialize in school visits or, as in Vancouver, school liaison officers who work out of schools.

Unfortunately, even with the specialists and various crime prevention programs such as Blockwatch, the main preoccupation of policing in the province is still incident-driven. This is because the vast majority of police officers in the province are mobile, call responders. Only a tiny minority are involved in these specialist positions. It is true that Commission researchers found that officers across the province working in small, ten-officer-or-less detachments were frequently more able to have greater contact with community residents. But this was not necessarily the case. A number of smaller detachment officers also spent a great deal of their time involved in random vehicle patrols.

Community residents ***** (insert something here from citizen survey)

****** certainly did want the police to be available for, and to respond to, immediate emergencies. However when they were asked what they wanted the
police to do in more common problems they face, the incident driven style of policing was not what they wanted. (insert responses from officer and citizen surveys scenario question). Clearly the public would like the police to be involved in solving community problems in conjunction with enforcing the criminal law.

This is the intent of community policing reforms across North America. It is an attempt to allow police officers to become more in touch with residents in neighbourhoods and to collaborate on solving community problems. From this point of view, community policing is not merely proactive activities of mobile call responders. It is much more. It begins with a clearly defined role of a police agency in a community and a mission statement that outlines that role.

In order to investigate the state of community policing in British Columbia, a number of research activities were conducted by Commission researchers. The intent of this investigation was to determine the means of developing policy about community policing the types of plans agencies are establishing to implement community policing. The purpose of this chapter is to determine how far police agencies across British Columbia have come, where they are going, and how they might be assisted in their efforts to reform.

Results of Mail-out agency questionnaire

Of the 105 responses to the mail out questionnaire, there was a wide variety of types of police agencies. For example the agency size was broken into four categories: agencies with over 1000 sworn officers (20 responses), between 200 and 999 (14 responses), between 50 and 199 (24 responses), and less than 50
Responses were received from all ten provinces and a dozen U.S. states. There did not appear to be any distinct patterns between provinces or between the U.S. and Canada in terms of agencies that had adopted community policing versus those who did not. There was a general sense that community policing was being, or had already been, adopted across North America.

Furthermore, in terms of the size of the police organization there did to be some patterns. It was noted that agencies with more than 200 officers and agencies with more than 1,000 officers were more likely to identify their agencies as having adopted community policing (93 percent and 82 percent, respectively). On the other hand agencies less than 200 officers and less than 50 officers were not as likely to answer that they had adopted community policing (55 percent and 50 percent, respectively).

Overall, 64 percent of the responding agencies indicated that they had adopted community policing while 29 percent indicated either that they planned to adopt it sometime in the future or they had not adopted it at all. This was a surprising finding, that one in four of the police agencies surveyed across North America did not currently have community policing in place. There could be a few possible reasons for this.

First, the reform to community policing is relatively recent phenomenon. It has been made popular in police conferences, publications, in the media, and as a result of a number of pioneering police projects. The Police Executive Research Forum estimates that interest in the research into community policing has been increasing steadily in the past decade.
Secondly, many smaller police agencies indicate that they have been "doing" community policing all along and that nothing new needs to be done. In site visits by Commission researchers this seemed to be true in a number of communities. This was especially the case in small towns (for example in two or three officer RCMP detachments) or in the smaller municipal police agencies where officers lived in the towns that they policed (for example Nelson City Police).

The survey responses were then broken down into the police to population ratio's. This was done because many police administrators indicate that they do not have enough officers and that they are understaffed. The question was, were communities with fewer per capita officers less likely to indicate they have community policing?

The responses were broken into five categories: agencies with between 100 to 399 persons per officer (8 responses), between 400 to 499 (16 responses), between 500 to 599 (17 responses), between 600 to 699 (27 responses), and over 700 persons per officer (20 responses).

Although the numbers were too small to be statistically significant, on cursory examination it did appear that the agencies with the highest per capita officers were more likely to indicate they used community policing (88 percent). However, beyond this general observation, the answers were almost identical across all categories (between 57 and 67 percent indicated they had community policing). One explanation for this is that the highest per capita officer communities tend to fall into two categories: large American cities with very high numbers of officers (Boston, New York, or Chicago); and the smallest communities in rural areas (Luseland, Saskatchewan, or Rivers, Manitoba). In the smaller rural
communities officers generally indicated that they had regular contact with most members of the community since these communities were quite small. In the large American jurisdictions crime rates, and community problems, are far worse than in most Canadian jurisdictions.

However agencies in the remaining four categories generally fell into medium sized and larger communities. These categories showed little differences between those who indicated they had community policing and those who did not. It appears that the number of per capita officers in a community does not, by itself, indicate whether community policing will be part of the delivery of police service. Unfortunately, a full workload analysis was not possible in the timeframe of the Commission. The workload analysis might have been able to determine whether agencies with higher officer workloads were more or less likely to indicate they did community policing.

The questionnaire asked about the percentage of incoming calls that were dispatched to patrol officers compared to the percentage of calls that were screened out for an alternate response. The general pattern emerging seemed to be that police agencies in medium sized or smaller communities tended to answer all calls for service (over 90 percent), regardless of the nature of the call. Larger agencies, such as the Vancouver Police Department, tended to screen more calls for service and dispatched far fewer calls. However, there did not appear to be a relationship between whether an agency indicated they had implemented community policing and the percentage of calls dispatched to officers. There seemed to be a wide range of agencies that indicated they were involved in community policing.
This led to the adoption of a five-stage model that defined different styles of community policing for closer analysis of police agencies across the province.

Five stages of community policing

It was determined at initial stages of designing the research for this project that clarifications would have to be made about the types and purposes of community policing programs. The general model of community policing discussed in the implementation chapter of this report involves police officers as problem solvers. In this chapter the focus is broader, since many agencies across the province define community policing in different ways. In fact, during the mail-out questionnaire, a specific question was asked about each agency's definition of community policing.

There were 46 responses to this question. In some cases agencies included a definition of community policing in their mission statements and statements of values. In other cases agencies described what they considered community policing in their training materials. These definitions were collated and appear in Appendix 2.

Of the agencies who did not provide any definitions to community policing, most gave reasons similar to those provided by the Aylmer Police Department in Aylmer, Ontario. They claimed that "We do believe in community policing, however, we do not view it as a set of programs or a concrete idea, but rather as a philosophy." Indeed, a large amount of the literature refers to community policing as a philosophy rather than a set of tactics. [refer to Cheryl's literature review chapter here]

Of the agencies who did provide a written definition of community policing, many were quite similar. For example the Collingwood Police Service in Collingwood, Ontario defined it as the "community and police working together to address identified
needs." This was similar to the Cornwall Police Service from Cornwall, Ontario who defined it as the "police and citizens working together against a common concern."
The Saskatoon Police Service in Saskatchewan define it simply in their motto as "in partnership with the community", while the Vancouver Police Department have adopted the phrase "community policing is the police and the community working together to help address community issues."

A few of the definitions were lengthy statements with specific goals. Some focussed on the geographical decentralization of patrol officers in specific neighbourhoods. For example the Sudbury Regional Police in Sudbury, Ontario provided for "community policing is the philosophy of involving a police officer in a specific section of the community, with ownership, on a long range basis." This was also reflected in the statement provided by the Waterloo Regional Police in Cambridge, Ontario who claimed that one of their force principles was the "geographic stability of the patrol officer to an assigned area encouraging members to develop accountability to their specific area."

The definitions provided by respondents outline vague and general principles about the role of the police. They do not, with the exception of the statements about geographical decentralization, make any statements about how these goals are to be achieved. There was clearly a need to clarify the objectives of the community policing agenda within police agencies. A useful model was adopted from the Police Executive Research Forum (Eck 1992) which described five styles of community policing initiatives. They provide a useful method to describe the findings of the research here. They are as follows:
1. **The deployment perspective.** In this style of community policing, police agencies attempt to redeploy their resources into the community. For example, foot patrol and bicycle patrols are one typical method of redeploying officers out of patrol cars and into communities. Police storefronts have also been used to redeploy the delivery of police services physically into different neighbourhoods.

2. **The community service perspective.** In this style of policing the agency makes an effort to focus on the quality of service provided by the officers on patrol. No formal changes to patrol methods are made. Rather officers are encouraged to attend every call for service, regardless of the seriousness of the call, and to be helpful and courteous during their contact with the public. Training in multi-ethnic relations, public relations, victims assistance, and other community service programs are methods of delivering this community policing style.

3. **The problem solving perspective.** In this style of community policing officers are encouraged to tackle the root causes of community problems. Resources and training are made available to allow officers to collaborate with a wide variety of community organizations and residents to tailor-make solutions to community problems. This is also called problem-oriented policing and it is done by all officers on patrol.

4. **The community revitalization perspective.** In this style of community policing the police agency and community residents cooperate to clean up run-down neighbourhoods. The idea is to encourage neighbourhood residents to take personal "ownership" of their neighbourhood. This style of community policing was made identified by police scholars Kelling and Wilson in their theory of "broken windows" (Kelling and Wilson 1982), which states that the more delapidated a neighbourhood
becomes, the more it gives of cues that anyone can control that space. Neighbourhood gangs often move in and graffiti begins an eventual process of decline.

Clean-up programs and programs to "take back the streets" have been used to implement this style. Even in areas that are not particularly run-down, but with persistent crime or nuisance problems (such as break and enters), police agencies have implemented Blockwatch crime prevention programs to get neighbours to know one another and to exert some control over the activities in their neighbourhoods.

5. **The legitimacy perspective.** This is an infrequent style of community policing. It deals with police attempts to reach out to minority groups or ethnic communities in order to make their actions more in touch with minority concerns. These outreach efforts attempt to legitimize the police with groups who may be critical of police intervention without some shared understanding.

Examples include community storefronts that are located in ethnic neighbourhoods, crime prevention programs that are provided and translated into multicultural languages, and programs such as the RCMP Special Constables program (now disbanded) which gave employment to aboriginal constables to work in aboriginal communities.

These five perspectives of community policing are not exclusive. Many are conducted in conjunction with others. In some police agencies, there may not be a need for one while there is for another. They are included here merely for the purposes of describing the types of community policing activities occurring across British Columbia.

It should also be noted that the different perspectives do not in themselves clarify how much of an agencies resources are dedicated to their community policing.
efforts. For example, an agency that uses deployment methods such as a handful of officers on bicycle patrols and a few storefronts, might claim that they are a community policing agency. However, the majority of the police organization may still be involved in vehicle patrols and responding to telephone calls for service and very few of the organizations resources may actually be dedicated to community policing in this perspective.

During interviews, researchers attempted to obtain impressions from officers about the level of commitment by that agency to community policing. This information did not arise from the mail-out questionnaires.

A Note on Method

The community policing research team comprised internal Commission researchers Cheryl Angelomaitis and Greg Saville. External research consultants also included Constable D. Kim Rossmo and Inspector Rick Stevens, Vancouver Police Department. Constable Steven Hess, Vancouver Police Department also assisted with field interviewing and Dr. William Glackman, was a Commission research advisor who also assisted in the research.

The research for this chapter involved a number of research methodologies. A mail-out questionnaire was sent to 183 large, medium and small police agencies across Canada and the United States. This included rural and urban agencies in every province of Canada. One hundred and five responses were received from this mail-out which is a response rate of 57 percent. All municipal police agencies in the province were also sent the questionnaire ***** (see appendix A) *****.
First, an extensive literature review was conducted on community policing and problem-oriented policing. This material was reviewed and incorporated into the research methodology.

Telephone interviews were conducted with executive officers in each municipal police agency about their planning for community policing. Requests for formal policies and plans were also made during these interviews. These policies were obtained and examined in during the research.

All public and agency submissions made during the Commission hearings across the province were also collated as they regarded community policing. In the case of many agencies, such as the RCMP, police agency profiles were submitted for selected detachments and departments. These profiles outlined current programs and initiatives underway. The submissions about community policing were reviewed.

Supplementing these information sources, randomly selected personal interviews were conducted with approximately a hundred officers across all ranks in each of the 12 municipal policing agencies in the province, including a number of RCMP detachments from each major region of the province. These interviews were designed to obtain additional detailed information about how each agency approaches the development of policy and the practice of community policing.

In addition to the above methodologies, telephone interviews were conducted with a random and representative group of community residents about community policing, and other topics. The information from the telephone interviews are included in another chapter ***** (see Kims chapter) ******, however they supplement the findings reported here.
A lengthy mail-out survey was sent to every serving municipal police officer in British Columbia to solicit their views on a wide range of issues, including community policing (see Kims chapter). Over 800 responses were received. The RCMP declined to participate in the mail-out survey.

Finally, Commission researchers spoke informally to officers across the province, observed courses at the police academy, attended conferences and seminars about policing, and spent time on patrol and in police stations across British Columbia. These discussions and observations helped to confirm the conclusions from the other sources of data collection. They represented an external check on the validity of the research.

Site Interviews

The following information was obtained from telephone interviews, submissions to the Commission hearings, and interviews with officers in the site visits. It represents a general profile at the time of the research, which was the summer and fall of 1993. It should be noted that many police agencies were still in the process of developing and implementing initiatives and could not comment on the effectiveness of the programs. Other respondents indicated that given the nature of their particular community, it was only realistic to provide one or two styles of community policing.
Given these guidelines, the following descriptions were obtained from the twelve municipal police agencies in British Columbia, eight RCMP detachments, and three larger municipal police agencies in Alberta and Ontario.

Central Saanich

Profile:

* Small police agency with approximately 20 members.

* A rural policing jurisdiction of approximately 52 square miles.

* Problems that the police contend with were described as property crimes such as theft and break and enters. Some nuisance calls and occasional problems with theft from an industrial area and a nearby tourist attraction. General traffic complaints were also part of their activities.

* Degree of specialization: Central Saanich is a small department and most officers are call response officers. They did use one crime prevention officer. The Chief involved himself personally in community meetings, such as the Rotary Club, and also City Hall committees, such as a Traffic Committee.

* Workload: No formal workload analysis was done on a regular basis. Senior officers and the duty Sergeants reviewed occurrences each shift to monitor calls. Patrol officers were informed by managers about trends, although officers indicated that in such a small department it’s hard for patrol personnel not to know what is going on in the community.

Deployment
Central Saanich did not use the deployment style of community policing. With such a large geographic area to provide police services and so few officers, the respondents indicated that it did not make sense to decentralize any further.

**Customer Service**

Responses generally indicated that the Central Saanich police place most of their emphasis on providing good community service. This means responding, and completing reports on, almost all calls for service. There were some differences among officers regarding the amount of time available for patrol officers since no formal workload analysis was being done. Some patrol officers indicated that there was a fair bit of uncommitted time but that their workload was dominated by the excessive amounts of paperwork.

The paperwork was an especially vexing issue for officers, especially the lengthy Reports to Crown Counsel reports which must be filed on every arrest. While some provinces in Canada require only a general arrest report (two pages) to be filed until the accused indicates a plea in court, this is not the case in British Columbia. Partly as a result of the provincial crown charge approval process, lengthy (six pages or more) reports are now required regardless of whether an accused person pleads not guilty and asks for a trial.

Officers in Central Saanich felt that reducing the paper workload would free up officer time to improve their ability to do other forms of community policing. Problem-oriented policing was specifically mentioned by one officer as something patrol officers don't currently have time to do.

**Problem solving**
Problem solving, as a form of community policing, was not common in Central Saanich. The patrol officers in Central Saanich seem to be focused on responding to calls for service and writing reports. One officer felt that problem-oriented policing was a good idea that could be done in Central Saanich but that the call loads and paperwork prohibited it.

Problem solving in this jurisdiction was conducted mostly by the Chief Constable who involved himself personally in the city Traffic Committee. This was a form of community-based problem solving about traffic issues.

The crime prevention officer was involved in school liaison visits. The crime prevention role began in 1982 and general crime prevention programs have been formally active since that time.

Community Revitalization

This style of community policing was not identified during the research of the Central Saanich police department.

Legitimacy

This style of community policing was not identified during the research of the Central Saanich police department.

Oak Bay

Profile:

* A small police agency with 23 officers, a few civilian employees and some reserve officers.

* The policing jurisdiction is part of the capital region area and is primarily a middle to upper-middle class, residential community with a small commercial area.
* The general problems in the community were described as minor. They were property crimes such as break and enters, thefts from autos, and minor incidents with youth in the area. Very few violent offences, although the occasional robbery or violent break-in does occur.

* Degree of specialization: Oak Bay is a general patrol police agency. There are only two special sections - the community service officer and a detective.

* Workload: No formal workload analysis is conducted on an on-going basis although all occurrences are reviewed by senior officers on a daily basis. Computer facilities were available for formal crime analysis and indications were that this was available for patrol officers if requested. Patrol officers did not appear to use this function, however it did appear to be a part of any specific projects conducted by officers.

**Deployment**

The deployment style of community policing is not part of the Oak Bay police department. A bicycle patrol was recently implemented as a result of requests from the Police Board and is coordinated by the Community Service officer. It was not clear that the bicycle patrol had the full support of the department.

**Customer Service**

The Oak Bay police places great emphasis on responding to every call for service. Paperwork is completed on almost every call and officers seem to take pride it attending to all matters they are dispatched to. One officer described spending time with an elderly complainant mopping up water in her home as she was unable to do this herself.
Another form of customer service was programs such as the Alzheimer's Registry in which persons suffering from this illness would be registered in case they went missing. This assists police in locating these persons. The Chief is particularly a strong supporter of this form of community policing.

The Chief also personally sits on various community organizations such as the Rotary Club and gets regular input from local officials.

**Problem solving**

The Oak Bay police department was primarily a call response agency. Daily problem solving appeared to be hampered by the amount of paperwork required on each call. However officers did indicate that they attempted to take the time to deal with problems at the scene of incidents. This form of problem-solving included one officers description of apprehending a mentally ill person breaking into a residence and taking this person to the hospital for treatment.

Most of these incidents appeared to be short lived and were based on incident driven policing. There were exceptions to this and they involved crime prevention projects in which officers would become involved, often on the advice of patrol sergeants. For example one project involved persistent bicycle thefts from a nearby school. An officer spent time at the school attempting to fashion an appropriate solution to this problem. However, projects such as this were not done by patrol personnel on a daily or weekly basis but were conducted as the need arose.

**Community Revitalization**

There was no indication that this was a normal form of community policing in the Oak Bay police department.
Legitimacy

There was no indication that this was a normal form of community policing in the Oak Bay police department.

Port Moody

Profile:

* Small town police agency with 31 sworn officers.

* A port town with some industrial, residential and some light commercial facilities. There is approximately 18,000 residents, many of whom commute to surrounding communities to work in the daytime.

* Problems: Officers described Port Moody as quiet with minor problems. Traffic problems, and minor property crimes such as break and enters were mentioned most frequently. Some officers described responding to family fights and violence in the home as an occasional problem.

* Degree of specialization: Port Moody police are a general patrol police organization. There is one crime prevention officer and a detective. Occasionally some specialization regarding narcotics enforcement. Most policing activity is general patrol. Port Moody police have just hired the second policewoman in their history.

* Workload: No formal workload review is conducted on an regular basis, however the senior officers review the daily occurrences. All calls for service are responded to and there is no formal crime analysis.
Deployment

Port Moody police are an incident driven department that primarily responds to calls for service. They, along with the City Council, have a Community House facility which is used for community programs such as traditional crime prevention programs and meetings. In previous years a constable in the department brought forward an idea for a bicycle patrol however this was not initially supported. Indications are that this bicycle program will go forward.

Customer Service

This is the primary method of delivering police services in Port Moody. Officers indicated that they were proud to attend every call for service and that "no call is too small". Responses indicated that officers felt this was the function of small town policing. Attending all calls allows officers the opportunity to speak to the residents who summon the police for problems.

The new Chief in Port Moody has also been making attempts to have his officers outreach into the community. An example was the Property Reference Project in which each community business was visited by the officers on the department to obtain reference information in case of future problems.

The department has a long history of customer service programs, such as the Deputy Chief who began doing school visits in 1976 and shortly after a "date rape prevention" education program.

Problem solving

It was not clear whether problem-solving was a regular method of delivering police services in Port Moody. In general the department was an incident driven agency, however there were examples of problem-solving projects in the past. For
example, the department recently began policing a large regional park that had a number of persistent problems, mainly with youthful offenders. The department assigned a team to solve the problems. This included surveys, foot patrols, and regular enforcement. Although it did not appear that a workload analysis had been done to determine the specific outcome, the general perception was that the initiatives seemed to resolve many of the problems.

One sergeant interviewed indicated that in future he would like to see enhanced training available for officers in the province, especially in relation to problem-oriented policing. He felt this was necessary in order to expand the capacity of officers to engage in this form of community policing.

**Community Revitalization**

This did not appear to be a regular way of delivering police services in Port Moody.

**Legitimacy**

This was not a form of community policing used in Port Moody.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depl</th>
<th>Serv</th>
<th>Prob</th>
<th>Revit</th>
<th>Legit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small- Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nelson RCMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Port Moody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Esquimalt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- C Saanich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oak Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Matsqui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abby RCMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coq RCMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surrey RCMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PrGeo RCMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kelowna RCMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N Van RCMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Van PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delta PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saanich PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pt Alb RCMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halton PS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Vancouver PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmonton PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calgary PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>