

Evaluation of Neighbourhood Policing in the BTP

The following is a skeleton version of how the report may look. Comments on the structure (including the order) indicated by this draft will be gratefully received as will comments on the headline assertions made and pointers to anything missed and to evidence that underpins what we can say as well as the reasons why other statements can not be substantiate. PH

Chapter 1: Introduction

Why an evaluation? - The Police Authority asked for it for reasons of [scale of investment and suitable time period since initial launch].

The evaluation seeks to provide answers to important questions around impact both to inform strategic and operational decisions about where NP should go from here but also to help determine how BTP should pursue its business in terms of tackling crime and disorder on the railways and maintain the safety of passengers and contribute to the economic success of the railway, underground and relevant tram networks.

Something on the BTP – a specialist national force, comparable but distinct governance arrangements to other forces and industry funded.

Outline the scope of the evaluation – what it does and does not cover. Railways but not London underground (though references to the latter may appear). Set out the objectives of the review and describe in passing how data accessed. List the areas – including control areas – looked at.

Chapter 2: Summary of findings

[Should we provide an executive summary? To do so may allow us to adapt and circulate this separately to those who are unlikely to access the full report and thus achieve a wider impact]. Most of the statistical claims will be “positive indicators” rather than firm attributions, although the material from Paul Nicholas at Southeastern is pretty robust.

Chapter 3: Neighbourhood Policing – a survey of research literature

What Home Office NP is, what it is intended to do, findings from evaluations thus far.

What BTP NP is, what it is intended to do, findings from evaluations thus far.

Comparisons between the two.

Chapter 4 NP and the railways

A highly visible policing presence in the community addressing locally expressed concerns is not new. It is well expressed in the public and media mood as the norm of a golden age, even in areas which historically saw little in the way of a visible police presence [DN can we justify this statement? If not, then amend]. Current models of neighbourhood policing in England and Wales owe their origin to a more recent initiative: the National Reassurance Policing Programme of 2003 - 5 set up to help bridge the gap between significant falls in recorded crime and persistent public belief that crime is rising. This in turn was influenced by the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy of the mid-nineties: the visible tackling of those crimes that most mattered to local people (see chapter 11).

Why the succeeding neighbourhood policing programme is distinct – systematic, has an overarching approach driven by ACPO with field officers, products, conferences, surveys, professional and political leadership, dedicated funding, linked with the roll out of PCSOs. A good deal of political and professional capital is tied up in the success of neighbourhood policing.

The BTP model: to apply the neighbourhood policing concept to defined geographical areas on and around major transport hubs, satellite stations and connecting lines. A dedicated resource of staff is then tasked with problem solving and priority setting on those issues raised by TOCS, rail staff, passengers and (where present), business tenants.

NP strategy for BTP.

Describe roll-out of NP on railways.

Similarly describe roll-out on underground.

[Suggest inserting methodology chapter]

Chapter 5 Focus group findings

Summary of outputs from focus group work – data complete and supplied by BTP.

Chapter 6 Impact on crime

Analysis of crime data in North West (July 08 paper). Crime falling in both non-NPT sites and NPT sites (16.1% and 7.2%) in 05/06 to 06/07. Prior to launch faster in the former than the latter (presumably a factor in the choice of sites for NPT). Crime then falls marginally faster in new NPT sites than non-

NPT sites (17.2% and 19.7%). *May we make tentative comments on this – not on basis of whether the fall was greater in NPT to non-NPT but on the increase in reduction in NPT sites)?*

Further work on crime data pending from Declan?

Note Southeastern report that the deployment of NPT on Lewisham line saw increase in reported crime. Describe phenomenon of access to police increases reported crime and that some recording of crime (possession of knives or drugs) is driven almost exclusively by police activity. *Any research recognition of this?*

Chapter 7 Impact on the travelling public

Refer to increase in footfall in Southeastern data for Lewisham line compared with other stations.

Data also shows a peak in feelings of personal security after introduction of NPT but recent data not available and other factors cannot be ruled out. Increase from 37% to 53% for daytime and 13% to 26% for night time.

Northern Line (Southport) shows increase of 4% of passenger footfall in 2007 but this cannot be tied specifically to NPT.

Chapter 8 Impact on partners

Note community engagement and problem solving reports for Northern Line (Stockport), Pontypridd, and Birmingham Cross City. Needs to bring out the differences found e.g. on the usefulness of PACT but common features such as: widespread feeling by partners that BTP is more engaged with the crime and disorder they face than before and altogether more responsive, “NPT is experiencing our reality rather than just occasionally responding as BTP used to do.” (Stockport), “abuse and swearing at staff virtually non-existent”. References to traditional policing at Pontypridd and Stockport.

Notable reduction in staff assaults in Three Valleys (Pontypridd). Incidents now being reported by staff at Cross City when previously they would not have bothered.

Use of staff and depot surgeries at Stockport.

Partners now more aware of NPT activity. PACT meets key to this.

Familiarity of BTP officers and staff much improved in all three areas.

Other issues – Pontypridd – partners not aware of BTP abstraction policy and some dislocation between rail staff and BTP staff shifts. BTP staff changeover at Cross City affected the consistency of PACT.

Chapter 9 Impact on problem solving

At Stockport, partners feel ownership of problems and solutions through PACT. All sites reported that evidence and documentation from BTP helped them argue within their organisations for implementation of solutions. All [three sites] feel themselves engaged in priority setting.

Chapter 10 Impact on resources

Describe resource decisions of BTP and PA. Relate to Frontlinefirst and commitment of PA on increases in charges to TOCs. Strategic Plan.

Cite the Southeastern report significant increases in footfall and revenue at NPT stations compared with control sites. From Sept 06 – Sept 07 station revenue increased by 20.7% on NPT stations and by 10.6% in non-NPT stations. 13.6% and 6.9% respectively in the year after. Passenger journeys increased by 12.6% and 2.5% respectively in the first year and by 7% and 1.2% in the second. A consistent two-fold increase in the rate of increase for revenue and five-fold in passenger journeys. The Southeastern report does give BTP as a factor and probably the predominant one.

Northern Line (Southport) in 06/07 and 07/08 show a 14% and 13% increase in revenue but without control sites it is not possible to attribute this specifically to NPT.

Cross City line has third lowest ticketless travel rate at 1.7% on London Midland City Route and the lowest revue loss per 1,000 passenger journeys. Positive indicators but not definite and sole cause and effect.

Three Valleys (Pontypridd) saw increases in footfall of 7.3% in 06/07 and 4.2% increase in 07/08. A positive indicator but can not be clearly attributable to NPT.

Chapter 11: HMIC Inspection Report and BTP's response

Will concentrate on the HMIC recommendations and force action plan.

Chapter 12: Neighbourhood Policing and the role Police Authority

Chapter drafted following evaluation against APA template – awaiting comments from SR&CS members at 20.01.09 meeting

Appendix 1: Acknowledgements [may shift to start of the report]: contribution of those, particularly in BTP, who have ensured the evaluation was successfully undertaken. May add to this how the project was structured.

Appendix 2: Methodology employed in the evaluation e.g. may copy the questions used for focus groups.

DRAFT