

## 7 Police Performance and Accountability

- 7.1 This report highlights at many points the mounting pressures on the police to raise their performance coupled with the limits within which extra funds are likely to be available to contribute to better performance (notwithstanding the relatively generous allocation of funds to the police in the 1995 budget).
- 7.2 In much of the public sector higher performance has been sought by means of privatisation. In the police service increased civilianisation and the contracting-out of some services have contributed much to raising performance while keeping costs within bounds. **There is no case, however, for privatising the police service as a whole.** We believe that such a course would not be acceptable either to Parliament or to the public, essentially because the police are seen as charged with preserving the conditions in which a democratic state can continue to exist and its citizens can live in freedom, a responsibility that cannot be handed over to organisations whose basic motivation is profit.
- 7.3 **Parliament has chosen to exercise close control over powers:**
- **to arrest, detain and search citizens, and to search and seize property;**
  - **to bear arms and exercise force for the purpose of policing; and**
  - **to have access to criminal records and criminal intelligence for the purposes of operational policing.**

**In our view, Parliament should be very slow to relax its control over these powers, and we have no proposals for it to do so in relation to policing and security work.**

### ***Relationship between Home Secretary, Police Authorities and Chief Constables***

- 7.4 We see the relationship between the Home Secretary and his department on the one hand and the police authorities and Chief Constables on the other as holding the key to enabling police performance to be steadily improved in the period ahead. Both share a responsibility and concern for the preservation of law and order and for the effectiveness and efficiency with which police forces discharge their role and responsibilities. Much can now be done to develop their relationship in a way which will encourage and make possible continually rising performance.
- 7.5 It is necessary here to recall the police service's statement of common purpose which we endorse at the beginning of this report. This reads as follows:

The purpose of the police service is to uphold the law fairly and firmly; to prevent crime; to pursue and bring to justice those who

break the law; to keep the Queen's peace; to protect, help and reassure the community; and to be seen to do this with integrity, common sense and sound judgement.

- 7.6 It must be said at once that carrying out a 'mission statement' of this kind calls for a wide variety of skills at all levels in the police service including, especially at senior levels, management skills of a very high order coupled with excellent judgement. It is not the sort of task that can be turned into a set of cut and dried instructions from the centre to be carried out by each police force. It is scarcely necessary to add that **the degree of success in performing an individual police force's mission cannot be adequately measured solely by reference to a series of quantitative objectives and performance indicators decreed from the centre.**
- 7.7 To illustrate this last point, an example of a performance indicator might be the number of arrests per officer in a police force, something that might be relatively easily measured. If however a police force is successful in reducing crime, the number of arrests per officer ought logically to decrease, not rise; and there is an obvious danger that, as a result of encouraging a high level of arrests per officer, other responsibilities of the police may be put at risk – notably those for reassuring the community and for operating with integrity, common sense and sound judgement. At a deeper level, how would 'keeping the Queen's peace' be made the subject of mandatory objectives and quantified indicators? Or indeed 'preventing crime'? The simple and straightforward answer is that they cannot.
- 7.8 These considerations do not at all suggest that performance indicators have no useful purpose; far from it, as we stress later in this chapter. They do, however, point to something of fundamental importance, namely that the relationship between the centre (the Home Secretary and his department) and those responsible for implementation locally (police authorities and Chief Constables) cannot properly be expressed either in *command* terms or in *contractual* terms. Instead, it needs to be expressed in other terms which fully recognise both the national, leadership task of the centre and the role and responsibilities which the police are called upon to discharge through the way they operate in practice.
- 7.9 The nature of this relationship is more appropriately defined as a *partnership* between the centre and the police, or as a *covenant* binding them together. Both subscribe fully to the 'mission statement' for the police – or, if they do not, that needs to be made the subject of a searching joint study until agreement on the terms of the police's mission is reached. It is then for the centre to make clear its overall view of the main priorities, as seen nationally, for developing the way police forces carry out their mission over the period ahead, and to allocate public resources to the police for that purpose. Again, given that the relationship is one of a partnership or covenant, the terms in which those priorities are expressed and the allocation of resources need to be the subject of full discussion with representatives of police authorities and the police before they are promulgated.

- 7.10 The existence of a basic relationship of this nature by no means rules out elements of a mandatory kind intended to improve performance. For example, it does not suggest that there is anything improper about requiring the Home Secretary's approval for the appointment of Chief Constables. Nor does it suggest that the centre should relinquish its interest in performance indicators; on the contrary, it is very important indeed that it should continue to work with the police to improve and refine performance indicators and to monitor what effects, both benign and unwelcome, they may be having when applied operationally. Again, there are many areas, such as for example developments in the use of IT (information technology), where joint action between the Home Office and the police is not merely appropriate but highly desirable or even essential in the quest for continually improved performance.
- 7.11 A major responsibility for encouraging better performance falls on HM Inspectorate of Constabulary. There is of course no incompatibility between the use of inspection to monitor the performance of the police and the kind of basic relationship between the centre and the police which we propose. Inspection is essential to safeguard standards in police operations, and is a necessary aid to Chief Constables, police authorities and the Home Office alike in ensuring that corrective action is quickly taken where standards are deficient. In addition, however, we would particularly underline its positive role in identifying best practice and encouraging its wider adoption throughout the police service.
- 7.12 To this we wish to add two comments. First, **we have been impressed by the quality and practical usefulness of the work of the Audit Commission in its studies of police operations and we would like to see this exploited still further in future.** Secondly, **we think that there is a strong case for involving others in the work of police inspection.** Just as we want to see local communities to be much more actively involved in the promotion of community safety, **we consider that inspection teams should include members drawn from a much wider range of backgrounds so as to reflect more fully the concerns of communities with police work, and we recommend that this should become accepted practice.**

### ***Knowledge-led policing***

- 7.13 As to the way in which the work of individual police forces is organised, we see important opportunities for development which offer a real possibility of meeting more nearly the pre-occupations of the public, while at the same time preserving and enhancing the high level of regard and trust which is so important to both public and police.
- 7.14 Profound changes are now sweeping through organisations of all kinds and revolutionising their ability to carry out their functions effectively and efficiently. This is both the cause and the result of the 'knowledge revolution' which is taking place in countries throughout the world, a process in which the possession of knowledge and the ability to apply it to desired ends is supplanting the possession of capital as the mainspring of economic and social advance.<sup>57</sup>

7.15 The type of organisation which emerged from the industrial revolution and which proved highly successful for perhaps as long as two centuries was typified by:

- multi-layered management structures designed to ensure accurate compliance by employees with plans and orders formulated and transmitted from the top
- reaction to problems rather than anticipation of them
- acceptance of change only when made inescapable by outside events
- a requirement for obedience by employees in the performance of well-defined tasks, with little or no room for any contribution by them to the development of the working of the organisation.

7.16 In recent decades organisations so organised have increasingly been supplanted by *learning organisations* which have proved themselves far more capable of adapting to and taking full advantage of the knowledge revolution.<sup>58</sup> Most learning organisations have some or all of the following characteristics:<sup>59</sup>

- they have a clear mission
- they have set themselves clear goals as a means of pursuing their mission
- their ethos is active rather than reactive, and they communicate positively and continuingly with the outside world
- they constantly initiate change rather than respond to it
- internally they rely less and less on rigid command structures and more and more on flexible working methods and extensive teamwork
- they use both 'hard' and 'soft' performance indicators to gauge their progress, always alert to the likelihood that 'proxy' indicators will tend in time to distort and harm their performance overall
- they recognise that in the modern world success already lies, and will in the future more and more lie, in collecting and applying information in a focused way to achieve desired outcomes
- and, accordingly, they continually invest both in advanced technology and in the development of the capabilities of their employees.

7.17 There is unceasing pressure on companies in the private sector, wherever open competition is the order of the day, to anticipate, capitalise on and adapt to changes in their markets and environment. They have no guarantee of survival and they have to take often most drastic steps to secure that they do survive. They have in particular to ensure always that the 'bottom line' – the financial results they achieve – are sufficient to enable them to continue in business.

7.18 In a well-led organisation in the public sector the ethos of public service is a great stimulus to good performance and to the fulfilment of a mission which is in the end to be reckoned not in financial terms but in terms of service to fellow-citizens. Such an ethos is capable of stimulating a deep

sense of loyalty and a willingness to carry out demanding and dangerous work with courage and determination when the needs of the public require it. These are benefits of immense value to the community. Nevertheless, in the absence of a financial 'bottom line' which brooks no argument, it takes the most strenuous efforts on the part of those responsible for public sector organisations to ensure that they continually adapt to changing circumstances and develop fast enough to meet the rising expectations of the public and so retain its trust and goodwill.

- 7.19 These considerations apply in full measure to the police, and the question must continually be asked whether individual police forces and the police service as a whole are learning organisations in the fullest sense of the term, and exhibit the characteristics of learning organisations listed above. Our work has led us to conclude that there are encouraging signs of how the police are embracing change and moving in this direction. Many forces are now placing increasing emphasis on the use of information-based strategies – in surveillance, in crime-pattern analysis and in improved forensic techniques, for example – together with the watchful management of resources in order to improve the prevention and clearing up of crime. An approach developed with the help of the Audit Commission, often referred to as the 'crime management model', is now being adopted in several forces and holds the promise of marked success.
- 7.20 The crime management model itself suggests new possibilities for improving the effectiveness of police operations. Central to the model is the idea of targeting highly persistent criminals, since Home Office studies suggest that a small proportion of persistent criminals commit a greatly disproportionate number of crimes. The approach could, we believe, be much reinforced if greater attention were also paid to repeat victimisation since, according to the 1992 British Crime Survey, the 4 per cent of all victims who are most frequently victimised suffer 44 per cent of all reported crimes. As the National Board for Crime Prevention has pointed out: 'A history of victimisation against a person or place provides the police with an opportunity to combine their investigative and preventive tasks to improve detection rates and victim protection.'
- 7.21 It is possible that the Citizen's Charter can also make a useful contribution to improving police performance by heightening the public's awareness of what it is entitled to expect of police service. There are however limits to what can realistically be expected of the Charter. Many of those who most need the help of the police are, for a variety of reasons, least able to insist on the rights embodied in it. Moreover, the police are routinely confronted by situations involving two or more parties, where the question at issue is not of ensuring that all concerned are able to exercise their rights but of resolving conflicting interests.
- 7.22 We consider that there is a most important opportunity now, which we hope will be seized, to extend the kind of knowledge-led strategy exemplified by the crime management model to cover the full range of activities which the role and responsibilities of the police require them to carry out. The prime need in order to make the most of this opportunity is for the Home Office, the police authorities and Chief Constables to

develop their relationship on the basis of a partnership or covenant so as to foster the development of police forces as learning organisations in the fullest sense. To this end we wish to see leadership exercised by the Home Secretary and the Home Office in a manner which explicitly recognises the role and responsibilities of the police in their entirety and the commitment of all concerned to the performance of that mission to the full.

7.23 We recommend that every police force should be expected to develop and operate as a true learning organisation. We recommend further that the Home Office and the police should develop criteria covering the full range of their role and responsibilities by which to judge the extent to which individual forces have progressed in this direction. To suggest a few examples only, such criteria might cover such matters as the following:

- whether a force is investing in and making full use of advanced technology essential for gathering and processing information so as to direct and focus its activities to best effect
- whether a force is so organised and managed that it is continuously seeking step-by-step improvement of its operations and responding flexibly to new opportunities to do so
- whether a force reaches the Investors in People standard in its approach to training its staff and developing their capabilities<sup>60</sup>
- whether a force shows by its actions that it is committed to listening and responding to the wishes of the local communities which it serves.

It would follow that particular efforts would be made to persuade and assist those forces which are identified as having furthest to go to make satisfactory progress. There should be suitable incentives for success, as well as appropriate sanctions for failure.

7.24 Finally, again **we emphasise that, while performance indicators must always be used with great care because of their inherent openness to distortion, they are an indispensable aid to progress. They should be vigorously developed by the Home Office and ACPO in collaboration and should be constantly reviewed and refined in the light of experience. We recommend in particular that special attention be given to developing indicators of public satisfaction with the police.** In these, the views of all sections of the public, including especially young adults, minority groups and those who have been the victim of crime, must be clearly reflected. These indicators above all will help to inform police authorities, the police service and the public about the extent to which the police are successfully fulfilling their essential role to the satisfaction of their fellow-citizens.

## Notes

1. Audit Commission (1993) *Helping With Enquiries: Tackling Crime Effectively*, London: HMSO
2. The information contained here is based on the paper prepared for the Committee by David J Smith entitled 'Explaining Crime Trends', which is contained in Saulsbury, W., Mott, J. and Newburn, T. (1996) (eds) *Themes in Contemporary Policing*, London: Police Foundation/PSI, the companion volume to this report.
3. These processes are discussed in some detail in Bottoms, A.E and Wiles, P. (1994) *Crime and Insecurity in the City*, Paper presented at the International Course organised by the International Society of Criminology, Lueven, Belgium, May 1994
4. Home Office, (1993) *Digest 2. Information on the Criminal Justice System in England and Wales*, London: Home Office
5. Home Office Statistical Department (1985) *Criminal Careers of those born in 1953, 1958, 1963*, Statistical Bulletin No.5/85, London: Home Office Statistical Department
6. See for example Sampson, R.J. and Laub, J.H. (1993) *Crime in the making: pathways and turning points through life*, Camb/Mass: Harvard University Press
7. 'Explaining Crime Trends', which is contained in Saulsbury, W., Mott, J. and Newburn, T. (1996) (eds) *Themes in Contemporary Policing*, London: Police Foundation/PSI, the companion volume to this report.
8. HM Customs and Excise (1995) Memoranda of Evidence to the Home Affairs Committee, Home Affairs Committee 1994-95, London: HMSO
9. ACPO, Superintendents' Association and the Police Federation (1995) Memoranda of Evidence to the Home Affairs Committee, Home Affairs Committee 1994-95, London: HMSO
10. Downes, D. and Morgan, R. (1994) 'Hostages to Fortune'? The Politics of Law and Order in Post-War Britain. In Maguire, M., Morgan, R. and Reiner, R. (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
11. At para 5.3
12. See Bottoms, A.E (1995) Philosophy and politics of punishment and sentencing, In Clarkson, C. and Morgan, R. (eds) *The Politics of Sentencing Reform*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
13. Shearing, C.D. and Stenning, P.C. (1983) Private Security: Implications for social control. *Social Problems* Vol.30 No.5
14. Jones, T. and Newburn, T. (1995) How big is the private security sector? *Policing and Society*, Vol. 5, pp.221-232
15. See for example the evidence given by ACPO to the Home Affairs Committee, HMSO 1995
16. Johnston, V., Shapland, J. and Wiles, P. (1993) *Developing Police Crime Prevention: Management and Organisational Change*. Police Research Group Crime Prevention Unit Series paper No. 41, London: Home Office Police Department, p.5.
17. Laycock, G. and Heal, K. (1989) *Crime Prevention: The British Experience*. In Evans, D.J. and Herbert, D.T. (eds) *The Geography of Crime* London: Routledge.
18. The results are contained in: Brown, D. and Iles, S. (1985) *Community Constables: A study of a policing initiative*. Research and Planning Unit Paper 30. London: Home Office; Burrows, J. and Lewis, H. (1988) *Directing Patrolwork: A study of uniformed policing*. Home Office Research Study No.99 London:HMSO; Chatterton, M. and Rogers, M. (1989) *Focused Policing*. In, R. Morgan and D. Smith (eds) *Coming to Terms With Policing*. London: Routledge; Irving, B., Bird, C., Hibberd, M. and Willmore, J. (1989) *Neighbourhood Policing: The natural history of a policing experiment*. London: Police Foundation; Husain, S. (1988) *Neighbourhood Watch in England and Wales: a locational analysis*. *Crime Prevention Unit Paper* No.12 London: Home Office; Bennett, T. (1990)

- Evaluating Neighbourhood Watch*. Aldershot: Gower; and McConville, M. and Shepherd, D. (1992) *Watching Police, Watching Communities*. London: Routledge.
19. Hope, T. (1985) *Implementing Crime Prevention Measures*. Home Office Research Study No.86. HMSO
  20. Though see Graham, J. and Bennett, T. (1995) *Crime Prevention Strategies in Europe and North America*, Helsinki: European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control.
  21. Hope, T. (1994) Community Crime Prevention, In Farrington, D.P. and Tonry, M. (eds) *Crime and Justice*, vol. 19, Chicago: University of Chicago Press
  22. Forrester, D., Chatterton, M. and Pease, K. (1988) *The Kirkholt Burglary Prevention Project, Rochdale*, Crime Prevention Unit Paper 13, London: Home Office
  23. See Tilley, N. and Webb, J. (1994) *Burglary Reduction: Findings from Safer Cities Schemes*, Crime Prevention Paper No.51, London: Home Office
  24. See Liddle, A.M. and Gelsthorpe, L. (1994a) *Inter-Agency Crime Prevention: Organising Local Delivery*, Crime Prevention Unit Paper, No.52, London Home Office; and (1994b) *Crime Prevention and Inter-Agency Cooperation*, Crime Prevention Unit Paper, No.53, London Home Office.
  25. Blagg, H., Pearson, G., Sampson, A., Smith, D. and Stubbs, P. (1988) Inter-agency co-operation: rhetoric and reality. In, Hope, T. and Shaw, M. (eds) *Communities and Crime Reduction*. London: HMSO
  26. Morgan, R. (1987) The local determinants of policing policy. In, Willmott, P. (ed) *Policing and the Community*. London: PSI
  27. Birley, D. and Bright, J. (1985) *Crime in the Community* London: Labour Campaign for Criminal Justice
  28. Hope, T. and Murphy, D.J.I. (1983) Problems of implementing crime prevention: the experience of a demonstration project. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*. 22, pp.38-50
  29. Saulsbury, W. and Bowling, B. (1991) The multi-agency approach in practice: the North Plaistow Racial Harassment Project. *Research and Planning Unit Paper* NO.64 London: Home Office
  30. The difficulties involved in this should not be underestimated. See, for example, Chatterton, M. and Rogers, M. (1989) Focused Policing. In, R. Morgan and D. Smith (eds) *Coming to Terms With Policing*. London: Routledge; Horton, C. (1989) Good practice and evaluating policing. In Morgan and Smith (eds) *Coming to Terms with Policing*. London: Routledge.
  31. The recent Home Office Review of Police Core and Ancillary Tasks itself recommended the development of a national crime reporting system and standardisation of force crime pattern analysis. *Review of Core and Ancillary Tasks*, London: HMSO, 1995
  32. Standing Conference on Crime Prevention (1991) *Safer Communities: The local delivery of crime prevention through the partnership approach*, London: Home Office.
  33. Stewart, J. and Stoker, G. (1995) Local government restructuring 1979-94: An evaluation, In Stewart, J. and Stoker, G. (eds) *Local Government in the 1990s*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
  34. Stewart, J. and Stoker, G. (1995) *ibid*.
  35. Their creation and operation is described in Loveday, B. (1987) Joint boards for police in Metropolitan areas – A preliminary assessment, *Local Government Studies* 13:3, 85-101.
  36. Bright, J.A. (1969) *The Beat Patrol Experiment*, Home Office Police Research and Development Branch, unpublished.
  37. Kelling, G., Pate, T. Dieckman, D. and Brown, C. (1974) *The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment*, Washington DC, Police Foundation.
  38. Police Foundation (1981) *The Newark Foot Patrol Experiment*, Washington DC: Police Foundation.
  39. Trojanowicz, R.C. (1986) Evaluating a neighbourhood foot patrol program, In Rosenbaum, D.P. (ed) *Community Crime Prevention: Does it work?* London: Sage.
  40. Kansas City Police Department (1980) *Response Time Analysis: Vol.II, Part I, Crime Analysis*, Washington DC, U.S. Government Printing Office; Spelman, W. and Brown,

- D.K. (1981) *Calling the Police: Citizen Reporting of Serious Crime*, Washington DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
41. Sherman, L. (1990) Police crackdowns: Initial and residual deterrence', In Tonry, M. and Morris, N. (eds) *Crime and Justice: A review of research*, vol.12, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
  42. Hough, M. 'The police patrol function: What research can tell us', contained in Saulsbury, W., Mott, J. and Newburn, T. (1996) (eds) *Themes in Contemporary Policing*, London: Police Foundation/PSI, the companion volume to this report; Hesselting, R. (1994) Displacement: A review of the empirical literature, In R.V. Clarke (ed) *Crime Prevention Studies Volume 3*, Monsey NY: Criminal Justice Press.
  43. Stockdale, J.E. and Gresham, P. (1995) *Combatting Burglary: an evaluation of three strategies*, Police Research Group, Crime Prevention and Detection Series, London: HMSO.
  44. Hough, M. (1996) *Anxiety about crime: findings from the 1994 British Crime Survey*, Home Office Research Study, London: HMSO.
  45. Wilson, J.Q. and Kelling, G. (1982) Broken Windows, *Atlantic Monthly*, March.
  46. See Jones, T. (1995) *Policing and Democracy in the Netherlands*, London: Policy Studies Institute.
  47. See for example the evidence given by ACPO to the Home Affairs Committee, HMSO 1995.
  48. See de Waard, J. (1993) The private security sector in fifteen European countries: size rules and legislation, *Security Journal*, 4, pp.58-63.
  49. ACPO (1988) *A Review of the Private Security Industry*.
  50. Home Affairs Committee, *The Private Security Industry*, para. 48.
  51. George, B. and Watson, T. (1992) Regulation of the private security industry, *Public Money and Management*, 12, pp.55-57.
  52. Cabinet Efficiency Scrutiny (1995) Administrative Burdens on the Police in the Context of the Criminal Justice System, para 7.6.
  53. Eames, B., Hooke, A. and Portas, D. (1994) Court Attendance by Police Officers, *Police Research Group Paper, No. 9*, London: Home Office Police Research Group.
  54. *Prison Disturbances April 1990*, Report of an Inquiry by the Rt Hon Lord Justice Woolf (Parts I and II) and His Hon Judge Stephen Tumim (Part II), Cm 1456, London: HMSO, paras 10.157-10.188.
  55. Home Office, Lord Chancellor's Department, Crown Prosecution Service, Police Service (1995) *Administrative Burdens on the Police in the Context of the Criminal Justice System*, June.
  56. den Boer, M. and Walker, N. (1993) European policing after 1992, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 31,1, pp.3-28.
  57. Drucker, P.E. (1993) *Post Capitalist Society*, London: Butterworth-Heinemann; Hayes, C., Fonda, N. and Hillman, J. (1994) Learning in the New Millenium, *National Commission on Education Briefing*, New Series No. 5, London: National Commission on Education.
  58. The Report of the RSA Inquiry (1995) *Tomorrow's Company*, June.
  59. Pedler, M., Burgoyne, J. and Boydell, T. (1991) *The Learning Company: A strategy for sustainable development*, New York: McGraw Hill.
  60. The Investors in People programme backed by the Government sets a world class standard for employers in developing a skilled and flexible workforce. See, for example, the *Investors in People Pack* available from: Metrotec (Wigan) Ltd, Lancashire WN3 5ZZ.

---

# INDEPENDENT COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE POLICE

---

## Annex 1 Findings and Recommendations

- In our view, the definition contained in the police service's Statement of Common Purpose remains a helpful one. It is as follows:

The purpose of the police service is to uphold the law fairly and firmly; to prevent crime, to pursue and bring to justice those who break the law; to keep the Queen's peace; to protect, help and reassure the community; and to be seen to do this with integrity, common sense and sound judgement.

We endorse this definition. [Para 1.4]

- It has become increasingly clear that the police can have only a relatively limited impact on aggregate crime statistics and, indeed, that the whole criminal justice apparatus can only ever be one part in an overall strategy to reduce crime. [Para 1.9]

### ***Crime prevention and community safety***

- Any proposals must clearly be designed to complement and strengthen the work of the police authorities and not to cut across the new arrangements introduced in the 1994 Act. [Para 3.24]
- We propose that a statutory obligation be placed upon unitary local authorities (which will form the majority of local authorities) to prepare a draft community safety plan for submission to the relevant police authority. In order to prepare such a plan the local authority should be required and empowered to bring together all the relevant local authority departments, agencies and other bodies within its borders to draw up the plan. [Para 3.26]
- In order that this process should be compatible with, and not cut across, new police authorities, we propose that Police Community Consultative Groups (PCCGs) established under s.106 of PACE should be adapted so that the areas they cover coincide with the boundaries of local authorities (as is already the case in London) rather than police administrative areas (as is generally, though not exclusively, the case outside London). [Para 3.26]
- We propose also that where there are two-tier local authority organisations, responsibility for taking the lead in formulating plans should normally fall on District Councils, with of course contributions from the appropriate responsible heads of services run by County Councils as well as from other relevant agencies. [Para 3.27]
- We consider that in order for such groups to be effective, the police would have to make available crime and incident pattern analyses to each PCCG

for their area and would also have to be responsive to demands for information made on them by the PCCGs. [Para 3.27]

- There exists no national system for crime recording or for crime pattern analysis except for serious crimes, and there are no national standards for the sharing of information. These are important deficiencies, and we recommend that the Home Office and ACPO, who acknowledge their urgency, should give very high priority to remedying them. [Para 3.13]

### ***Preventive patrol and its enhancement***

- Although in strict control terms it is clear that there are considerable limitations on the effectiveness of patrol, its popularity, its potential impact on insecurity and the likelihood that it may help sustain public confidence in the police all suggest that a visible uniformed presence must continue to play a significant part in modern policing. [Para 4.8]
- There is the possibility of augmenting the reach of police patrols by forms of 'eyes and ears' patrol provided by local authorities, as in the case of Sedgefield. We believe that local authorities should continue to be free to take advantage of this kind of possibility. [Para 4.19]
- We consider that, if local authorities wish to experiment with the use of private patrols, they should be free to do so. [Para 4.20]
- We do not believe that there is sufficient evidence at present to warrant the establishment of patrols in public places generally with powers that go beyond those of the private citizen if they are not under the direct control of the Chief Constable. [Para 4.21]
- We would wish to emphasise at once that we would not favour any development which could justifiably be stigmatised as introducing a 'two-tier' element into the police service because some police officers would be expected to operate with powers inferior to those available to the police generally. [Para 4.22]
- We consider that wider experimentation with ways of enabling more public patrolling to be provided by police forces would be valuable and we recommend that the Home Office, police authorities and Chief Constables should be alert to the need to initiate and to encourage such experimentation. [Para 4.24]

### ***Private security***

- Clearly there need to be important reasons of public interest to introduce statutory regulation into a sector of activity which has hitherto been free of it. Here, as throughout employment, the labour market should be allowed to function with the minimum of regulation compatible with the public interest. [Para 5.8]
- Because the public should feel assured that those responsible for their safety and security in 'private' locations are suitable for the job and, furthermore, because the police should be able to feel confident that the private security agencies with which they work in partnership are credible and trustworthy,

we consider that official or statutory regulation should be introduced. [Para 5.12]

- The Committee has heard no convincing arguments, or found any convincing evidence, to suggest that private security personnel require powers greater than those of the ordinary citizen for dealing with the types of situation with which they are likely to be confronted when guarding or even when on patrol. Indeed given the concerns that exist about private security guards patrolling public streets, the fact that only citizen's powers are available should itself provide a check on the actions of such personnel. [Para 5.14]
- Any new form of regulation should certainly cover the work of private security guards (including contract and in-house guards). [Para 5.15]
- Given their role in relation to either private property or private space to which the public have access, both nightclub door staff and installers of electronic surveillance/security equipment ought also to come within a new system of regulation. [Para 5.15]
- As to how the licensing should be done, the Committee agrees with the recommendation of the Home Affairs Committee of the House of Commons that an independent licensing authority should be established. [Para 5.16]
- Licensing should be of the firm rather than the individual employee. However, the issuing of a licence would be dependent on compliance with a set of standards which would include vetting of staff, the provision of adequate training, the holding of appropriate insurance, and the investigation of complaints against staff. [Para 5.16]
- A system of independent and rigorous inspection would also need to be instituted, as would the establishment of an independent complaints mechanism – though the latter could also be an arm of the licensing authority itself. [Para 5.16]

### ***The organisation of the police service***

- We endorse the conclusions of the Cabinet Efficiency Scrutiny of Administrative Burdens on the Police that what is required is a greater recognition of the interdependence of the individual agencies, both nationally and locally, and a greater willingness to work together, both bilaterally and across the criminal justice system. Our own view is that without closer congruence between the geographical areas into which the major agencies are organised, attempts to establish common goals will probably be poorly rewarded. [Para 6.7]
- We welcome the fact that further thought is being given to the establishment of an operational national crime squad. Such a squad should have its responsibilities clearly articulated and have proper lines of accountability (all the more so if this is to involve MI5). We favour direct accountability to Parliament through the Home Secretary. [Para 6.16]

### ***Police performance and accountability***

- There is no case for privatising the police service as a whole. [Para 7.2]

- Parliament has chosen to exercise close control over powers:
  - to arrest, detain and search citizens, and to search and seize property;
  - to bear arms and exercise force for the purpose of policing; and
  - to have access to criminal records and criminal intelligence for the purposes of operational policing

In our view, Parliament should be very slow to relax its control over these powers, and we have no proposals for it to do so in relation to policing and security work. [Para 7.3]

- The degree of success in performing an individual police force's mission cannot be adequately measured solely by reference to a series of quantitative objectives and performance indicators decreed from the centre. [Para 7.6]
- We have been impressed by the quality and practical usefulness of the work of the Audit Commission in its studies of police operations, and we would like to see this exploited still further in future. [Para 7.12]
- We think that there is a strong case for involving others in the work of police inspection. [Para 7.12]
- We consider that inspection teams should include members drawn from a much wider range of backgrounds so as to reflect more fully the concerns of communities with police work, and we recommend that this should become accepted practice. [Para 7.12]
- We consider that there is a most important opportunity now, which we hope will be seized, to extend the kind of knowledge-led strategy exemplified by the crime management model to cover the full range of activities which the role and responsibilities of the police require them to carry out. The prime need in order to make the most of this opportunity is for the Home Office, the police authorities and Chief Constables to develop their relationship on the basis of a partnership or covenant so as to foster the development of police forces as learning organisations in the fullest sense. To this end we wish to see leadership exercised by the Home Secretary and the Home Office in a manner which explicitly recognises the role and responsibilities of the police in their entirety and the commitment of all concerned to the performance of that mission to the full. [Para 7.22]
- We recommend that every police force should be expected to develop and operate as a true learning organisation. We recommend further that the Home Office and the police should develop criteria covering the full range of their role and responsibilities by which to judge the extent to which individual forces have progressed in this direction. [Para 7.23]
- We emphasise that, while performance indicators must always be used with great care because of their inherent openness to distortion, they are an indispensable aid to progress. They should be vigorously developed by the Home Office and ACPO in collaboration and should be constantly reviewed and refined in the light of experience. We recommend in particular that special attention be given to developing indicators of public satisfaction with the police. [Para 7.24]

---

# INDEPENDENT COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE POLICE

---

## Annex 2 Terms of Reference

### **1 Objectives**

- 1.1 To carry out an independent inquiry into the role and responsibilities of the police in the light of the work of the Royal Commission, the Sheehy Inquiry, and the internal Home Office inquiry ordered by the Home Secretary.
- 1.2 To encourage informed discussion among those who have a particular interest in policing policy including police officers, local authorities, private sector organisations with an interest in security, the probation service, statutory and voluntary social service agencies, and academics.
- 1.3 More generally, to raise the level of public understanding and debate about the role and responsibilities of the police and how they may be best fulfilled.

### **2 Terms of reference**

- 2.1 The Committee of Inquiry is asked to consider: what the core tasks of the police should be; how and by whom they should be defined; what systems are most appropriate for accomplishing these tasks; the role of other agencies – voluntary, statutory and private – in delivering what might broadly be termed policing services; and whether the boundaries and division of labour between these agencies and the police are properly drawn, properly regulated and in practice workable.
- 2.2 The Committee of Inquiry is expected to decide its own mode of working, which may in particular include:
  - a. inviting testimony from individuals and organisations felt to have relevant perspectives on issues under discussion;
  - b. commission briefing papers relevant to its discussions;
  - c. advise on the themes for the research papers to be undertaken by the Policy Studies Institute;
  - d. convene conferences of interested parties for the presentation and discussion of findings;
  - e. publish briefing papers, research papers and reports as may be thought appropriate; and
  - f. devise a coordinated plan for the dissemination of the findings of the Committee of Inquiry.

### **3 Structure of the inquiry**

- 3.1 The Committee of Inquiry has been established jointly by the Police Foundation and the Policy Studies Institute and is expected to work in partnership with those bodies.
- 3.2 The Police Foundation and the Policy Studies Institute will use their best endeavours to provide the Committee of Inquiry with the resources essential to carrying out its work.
- 3.3 The Police Foundation will serve as secretariat of the Committee and take responsibility for commissioning the background papers or external studies required by the Committee.
- 3.4 The Policy Studies Institute will produce, with the guidance of the Committee, a series of research papers intended to evaluate the options for future change in the three broad areas of:
  - a. the core functions of the police;
  - b. the boundaries between public and private policing;
  - c. the balance between central and local control and the issue of accountability.
- 3.5 The Police Foundation and the Policy Studies Institute will have joint responsibility for implementing the coordinated plan for disseminating the findings of the Committee of Inquiry.

---

# INDEPENDENT COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE POLICE

---

## Annex 3 Themes in Contemporary Policing

As part of its deliberations the committee invited leading scholars in the field to submit briefing papers on key issues. These papers are published in the committee's companion volume, *Themes in Contemporary Policing* (Saulsbury, W., Mott, J. and Newburn, T., eds, 1996). The following papers appear in the volume:

Explaining Crime Trends  
*David J. Smith*

Crime and Policing in a Changing Social Context  
*Anthony Bottoms and Paul Wiles*

What Do the Police Do?  
*David H. Bayley*

Enforcement, Service and Community Models of Policing  
*Nigel Fielding*

The Police Patrol Function: What Research Can Tell Us  
*Michael Hough*

Public Opinion and the Police  
*Wesley G. Skogan*

Public and Private Policing  
*Clifford Shearing*

Opportunities for Crime Prevention: The Need for Incentives  
*Ken Pease*

The Regulation and Control of the Private Security Industry  
*Trevor Jones and Tim Newburn*

Police Accountability  
*Tim Newburn and Trevor Jones*

---

# INDEPENDENT COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE POLICE

---

## Annex 4 Individuals and Organisations that Submitted Evidence or Participated in Seminars

*Acton, Jack*, Director, Home Office Crime Prevention Centre and Assistant Chief Constable, West Yorkshire

Age Concern

*Alderson, John*, Retired Chief Constable, Devon and Cornwall Constabulary

*Almonds, John*, Director, Security and Investigations, British Telecom

Association of British Insurers

Association of Chief Officers of Probation

Association of Chief Police Officers of England and Wales

Association of County Councils

Association of District Councils

Association of Metropolitan Authorities

Audit Commission

Avon and Somerset Constabulary

Barrow Borough Council

Bath City Council

*Bayley, David*, Professor of Criminology, School of Criminal Justice, State University of New York at Albany

*Bensley, J.P.*, Chief Constable, Lincolnshire Police

Blaby District Council

Blackburn, Borough of

*Blair, Ian*, Assistant Chief Constable, Thames Valley Police

*Blakey, D.C.*, Chief Constable, West Mercia Constabulary

Blyth Valley, Directorate of Central Services, Northumberland

*Bodfish, Ken*, West Sussex Police Authority

*Boileau, G.P.*

Boothferry Borough Council

*Bottoms, Anthony*, Wolfson Professor of Criminology, University of Cambridge

*Bottoms, David*, Croydon Consultative Group

*Bright, John*, Crime Concern

Brighton Borough Council  
British Transport Police  
Bromsgrove District Council  
*Burrow, John H.*, Chief Constable, Essex Police  
*Butler, A.J.P.*, Chief Constable, Gloucestershire Constabulary  
Cambridgeshire Constabulary  
Caradon District Council  
*Castree, Allen*, Assistant Chief Constable, Greater Manchester Police and  
Vice Chair, ACPO Crime Prevention Committee  
Centre for Studies in Crime and Social Justice, Edge Hill University College  
*Chatterton, Michael*, Henry Fielding Centre, University of Manchester  
Cheshire Constabulary  
City of London Police  
*Coe, A.T.*, Chief Constable, Suffolk Constabulary,  
Colchester Borough Council  
Commission for Racial Equality  
Crawley Borough Council  
*Crew, Edward*, Chief Constable, Northamptonshire Police  
Criminal Bar Association  
*Crompton, D.*, Chief Constable, Nottinghamshire Constabulary  
*Cutler, David*, Hammersmith and Fulham Community Safety Office  
*de Wulf, Phillipe*, Gendarmerie, Belgium  
Devon and Cornwall Police Authority  
*Dickinson, David*, Marketing Director, Group 4 Total Security Ltd  
*Dyer, Alan*, Chief Constable, Bedfordshire Police  
Ealing Community and Police Consultative Group  
East Hampshire District Council  
East Devon District Council  
*Elliott, A.G.*, Chief Constable, Cumbria Constabulary  
Elmbridge Borough Council  
*Emery, Jerry*, Home Office  
Fareham Borough Council  
*Faulkner, David E.R.*, Fellow, St John's College, Oxford  
*Fielding, Nigel*, Professor of Sociology and Deputy Dean of Human Studies,  
University of Surrey  
*Flannery, Kate*, Local Government Studies Directorate, Audit Commission  
*Francis, David J.*, Superintendent, South Wales Constabulary  
Fylde Borough Council  
Gillingham Borough Council

*Grange, Terence*, Assistant Chief Constable, Avon and Somerset Constabulary

*Golder, N.A.*

Group 4 Total Security Ltd

Gwent Constabulary

Gwent County Council

*Hadfield, Sir Ron*, Chief Constable, West Midlands Police

*Hale, Chris*, Professor of Criminology, Canterbury Business School, University of Kent

Hampshire Constabulary

*Hancock, Paul D.*, Superintendent, Derbyshire Constabulary

Harborough District Council

*Harris, Sandy*, Fylde Victim Support Scheme

Hastings Borough Council

*Hedges, Michael*, Assistant Chief Constable, South Yorkshire Police

*Hellawell, Keith*, Chief Constable, West Yorkshire Police

H M Inspectorate of Constabulary

Hertfordshire Police Authority

*Hoare, M.A.*, Chairman, Risk and Security Management Forum

*Hope, Tim*, Reader in Criminology, University of Keele

*Hough, Michael*, Professor of Social Policy, South Bank University

Humberside County Council

*Jenkins, Simon*, The Times

*Johnson, Les*, Principal Lecturer, School of Human Studies, University of Teeside

*Jones, Trevor*, Policy Studies Institute

Justices' Clerks' Society England and Wales

*Kelly, C.H.*, Chief Constable, Staffordshire Police

Kent Police Authority

Lancashire Constabulary

Lancaster City Council

*Landriau, Michael*, Greater Manchester Victim Support

*Lawrence, W.I.R.*, Chief Constable, South Wales Constabulary

*Laycock, Gloria*, Home Office

*Lewis, Michael J.*, Chief Superintendent, HMIC

*Long, Stephen M.*, Superintendent, Suffolk Constabulary

*Loveday, Barry*, Principal Lecturer, IPCS, University of Portsmouth

*Lustgarten, Lawrence*, Professor of Law, Department of Law, University of Southampton

Luton Borough Council

Maidstone Borough Council

*Marmoch, Alex E.*  
*McClellan, John*, Post Office Investigation Division  
*McKinnis, Kenneth*, Chief Superintendent, Strathclyde Police  
 Mediation UK  
 Merseyside Police Authority  
 Merseyside Police  
 Mid Bedfordshire District Council  
 Ministry of Defence Police  
*Morgan, James*, Morgan, Harris, Burrows  
 National Association of Special Constabulary Officers  
 New Forest District Council  
 Newark and Sherwood District Council  
*Newing, John*, Chief Constable, Derbyshire Constabulary  
*Neyroud, Peter*, Superintendent, Hampshire Constabulary  
*Nicholl, Caroline*, Chief Superintendent, Thames Valley Police  
*Norendal, Halvor*, Cumbria County Council  
 North Yorkshire County Council  
 North Wales Police  
 North Warwickshire Borough Council  
 North West Leicestershire District Council  
 Northamptonshire County Council  
 Norwich City Council  
*Patten, Robert*, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States  
*Payne, Ronald*  
*Pease, Ken*, Professor of Criminology, Huddersfield University  
 Peterborough City Council  
*Phillips, John David*, Chief Constable, Kent County Constabulary  
 Police Superintendents' Association of England and Wales  
*Pollard, Charles*, Chief Constable, Thames Valley Police  
 Poole Borough Council  
 Portsmouth City Council  
 Post Office Investigation Department  
*Powell, George*  
*Prichard, David*, Managing Director, Resolution Security Ltd  
*Priestly, Daphne*, Thames Valley Police Authority  
 Purbeck District Council  
*Reddington, J.*, Ministry of Defence Police  
 Redditch Consultative Forum  
*Reiner, Robert*, Professor of Criminology, Department of Law, London School of Economics

*Ross, Nick*, Crimewatch UK  
Royal Ulster Constabulary  
*Sandell, Graeme*, National Association for the Care and Rehabilitation of Offenders  
Scarborough Borough Council  
*Scott, Ingrid*, Wandsworth Police Community Consultative Committee  
*Sewcharan, Monica*, Derby Safer Cities Project  
*Sharpe, P.S.*, Chief Constable, Hertfordshire Constabulary  
*Shearing, Clifford*, Professor of Criminology, University of Toronto, Centre of Criminology  
*Skitt, B.H.*, Chief Constable, Hertfordshire Police  
*Skogan, Wesley*, Professor of Political Science, Centre for Urban Affairs & Policy Research, Northwestern University  
*Smith, David*, Professor of Criminology, University of Edinburgh  
*Smith, Sir John*, Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police  
*Smith, Peter*, Chairman, Securicor Group plc  
South Lakeland District Council  
South Wales Constabulary  
South Staffordshire Council  
Southwark Council  
Staffordshire County Council  
*Stanko, Betsy*, Reader in Criminology, Department of Law, Brunel University  
*Stevens, J.A.*, Chief Constable, Northumbria Police  
Surrey Police  
Surrey County Council  
Surrey Heath Borough Council  
Sussex Police Authority  
*Sweeney, Vincent*, Assistant Chief Constable, Greater Manchester Police  
*Taggart, Neil*, West Yorkshire Police Authority  
Tamworth Borough Council  
Taunton Constituency Labour Party  
*Taylor, Frank W.*, Chief Constable, Durham Constabulary  
*Todd, Michael*, Assistant Chief Constable, Nottinghamshire Constabulary  
*Todd, Peter*, Chief Superintendent, Bedfordshire Police  
*Truman, Crispin*, Revolving Door Agency  
*Uglow, Steve*, Law Department, University of Kent  
Victim Support  
Wandsworth Policing Consultative Committee  
Wansdyke District Council  
*Watson, Malcolm*, Association of County Councils

*Weight, B.H.*, Chief Constable, Dorset Police  
West Oxfordshire District Council  
Weymouth and Portland Borough Council  
*White, R.*, Chief Constable, Dyfed-Powys Police  
*Whitehouse, Paul*, Chief Constable, Sussex Police  
*Wickens, Peter*, Director of Personnel and Information Systems, Nissan  
Motor Manufacturing (UK) Ltd  
*Wilding, Barbara*, Assistant Chief Constable, Kent County Constabulary  
*Wiles, Paul*, Professor of Criminology and Dean of the Law Faculty,  
University of Sheffield  
*Williams, Alan*, Director, Finance and Administration, Bedfordshire Police  
*Williams, David J.*, Chief Constable, Surrey Police  
*Williams, K.R.*, Chief Constable, Norfolk Constabulary  
*Wilmot, D.*, Chief Constable, Greater Manchester Police  
Wiltshire Constabulary  
Wycombe District Council  
*Yuen, John*, Royal Hong Kong Police  
*Zander, Michael*, Professor, Department of Law, London School of  
Economics