BRITISH TRANSPORT POLICE AUTHORITY

Report to:	**Stakeholder Relations & Communications Strategy Committee**
Date:	**6th April 2009**
Subject:	**Update on progress with the Neighbourhood Policing Evaluation**
Sponsor:	**Committee Chair**
For:	**Information**

1. PURPOSE OF PAPER

1.1 To update Members on progress with the BTP/A review of the Force's approach to Neighbourhood Policing (NP). Also to provide some explanation as to why not all of the intended outcomes of the evaluation have been delivered to date.

1.2 To also provide an overview of the headline findings of the work carried out thus far and to offer some suggestions for the focus of future work. These suggestions are made both to fully answer those questions which have not been covered by the review to date and to enable us to address some new issues which have emerged as a result of the review.

2. BACKGROUND TO THE REVIEW

2.1 The Committee (and previously the Force) originally undertook to carry out a review of BTP's approach to NP in order to answer a number of questions about the appropriateness of Force's approach to Neighbourhood Policing and what outcomes it had delivered for the Force, passengers and rail industry partners.

2.2 In July 2008 the Committee received an interim report from consultants commissioned by the Force to carry out an initial evaluation of BTP's approach to Neighbourhood Policing. The consensus of both the Committee and Force representatives present was that, while elements of the interim report were of interest, it had not delivered the outputs required and was unlikely to do so in the second phase of the evaluation. As a result the Committee and ACC Pacey undertook to bring the evaluation in-house and

requested that the Force and Secretariat carry out a joint evaluation of the Force's approach to Neighbourhood Policing to date.

2.3   The revised project brief developed at that committee meeting recommended that the evaluation gather and evaluate evidence of the following[1];

- Why neighbourhood policing had been introduced
- The issues associated with adapting neighbourhood policing to the railway environment
- The early neighbourhoods that had been set up and the results of these
- How stakeholders were engaged in neighbourhood policing
- How targets were set for neighbourhood policing teams
- The lessons learned so far
- The outcome of the HMIC report into neighbourhood policing
- A data review of where neighbourhood policing teams started from and where they are now
- The way forward

2.4   A project board, Chaired by ACC Pacey, was set up and work packages allocated to both Members of the BTP Strategic Development Department (SDD) and the Authority Secretariat. Broadly the work was allocated as follows;

SDD:

- Primary qualitative data collection including focus groups with passengers, rails staff, NPT members, non-NPT Members
- Identification of secondary data sources including existing internal crime and survey data, securing submissions of quantitative and qualitative evidence from industry partners

BTPA Secretariat:

- Preparation of background chapters including literature review, background to the nature of fear of crime on the railway
- Review and secondary analysis of data provided
- Identification of additional primary and secondary data sources
- Drafting & revision of analytical chapters
- Preparation of the final report

2.5   The ToRs for this work were not formally presented to the Committee or the Lead Members for comment and approval. No opportunity was provided for a

---

[1] See section 35/2008 of the minutes of the meeting of the SR&CS Committee 01.07.08

Committee member to attend the project board meetings as an observer; the Deputy Chief Executive was a member of the steering group. As a result the scope of the work undertaken thus far is narrower than the SRCS Committee had anticipated but nevertheless has usefully informed the scoping of a wider review.

2.6 The scope of the current piece of work covers:

- A background to Neighbourhood Policing
- BTP's approach to Neighbourhood Policing
- An evaluation of two early neighbourhoods against two later implementations and two control sites, with indications of the impact of NP on: industry, problem solving and engagement, and passengers

3. PROGRESS TO DATE

3.1 While progress with data collection for the initial stage review has largely been to plan, a number of issues arising within the Secretariat have meant that there have been some significant delays with producing the final report. Some additional lessons have also been learned around the Secretariat's approach to project management which will be evaluated and progressed elsewhere.

3.2 In carrying out the review the Force and Authority have considered a range of data sources including;

- Outputs from an internal (BTP only) workshop facilitated by BTP and attended by both NPT and non-NPT staff
- Outputs from in-depth focus groups with NP team members from the case study sites
- Outputs from a series of interviews/focus groups and electronic surveys with partners from the case study sites
- Outputs from a baseline perceptions survey carried out with passengers and staff
- Evidence of good practice supplied by the NP teams as case study summaries
- Additional evidence submitted by Southeastern Trains
- Outputs from TOC research – Arriva trains 'code of conduct' study
- Findings and recommendations of HMIC inspections of BTP in 2006 & 2008
- Assessment of the Force and Authority's progress against APA good practice guidance

3.3 In view of the stage the initial work has reached it has been decided to conduct a review of what has been learned to date. Whilst the evaluation is not totally complete it is clear that the work carried out so far has produced some very useful data and has helpfully scoped what might be covered by a wider review. It particular, the work of the Force's Quality of Service team has produced some excellent qualitative data via its focus groups carried out with industry representatives and passengers.

3.4 A first draft of the full report and an executive summary have been produced which will be available for Members to review shortly.

4. NEXT STEPS

4.1 As set out above, progress to date has enabled us to answer some of the original evaluation questions to some extent and has highlighted further issues which may be worthy of further attention. The following is a list of the outstanding questions and issues Members may wish to approve further work on.

- What NP means in a strategic BTP context, examining adherence to a corporate NP model and understanding strategic management
- A data review of where neighbourhood policing teams started from and where they are now
- Performance management – how the force manages NP performance and effectiveness
- How locations for neighbourhood teams are decided and reviewed – criteria for nomination & (de)selection
- How targets are set (and monitored) for neighbourhood policing teams & integration with local tasking. Also consider involvement of stakeholders in target setting and feedback.
- Intelligence handling
- How much Neighbourhood Policing costs the Force (to include on costs and back office/support costs)
- Stakeholder engagement, branding and communication of neighbourhood policing (including how NP teams engage hard-to-hear groups)
- Abstraction policy & management
- Staff development and training
- Recommendations for BTP NP

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1　There are no specific financial implications arising from the information or recommendations presented in this paper.

6.　RISK IMPLICATIONS

6.1　Although the evaluation has identified some useful information about what NP is capable of delivering and what some of the ongoing challenges are likely to be for BTP, it is insufficient upon which to base significant decisions about the future direction of the Force's policing style. Further work is necessary to fill the gaps in the outputs of the evaluation identified thus far and to explore some of the emerging issues.

7.　DIVERSITY ISSUES

7.1　There are no specific diversity implications arising from this paper.

8.　RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1　Members are asked to note this paper.

8.2　Members are also asked to consider and comment on the recommendations for future work set out in section 4.1 above.