



Metropolitan Police Authority

Policing Planning and Performance Improvement Unit

Analysis of consultation to inform the Metropolitan Police Authority's (MPA) review of Community and Police Engagement Groups (CPEG) - *'Ensuring influence, delivering value for money'*

The Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) is currently conducting a review of Community Police Engagement Groups (CPEGs). As part of the review, the MPA invited CPEG members, Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs), borough commanders and MPA officers and members to take part in a short survey to give their views on the work of CPEGs and the value they add to police and community safety work in London boroughs. Surveys consisted of a series of statements which respondents were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed with, and more qualitative, free text questions. This paper sets out key findings from survey responses.

There were 245 responses to the surveys in total. The majority (214) were from CPEG members. Over half of CPEG respondents were from five boroughs (see appendix one). The remainder of respondents were borough commanders (6), CSPs (7), and MPA members and officers (18)¹. Appendix one provides borough details of all respondents.

Consulting with and utilising CPEGs

CPEG responses

CPEG respondents were asked whether they were regularly consulted and asked their opinion by the borough commander, the CSP and other partners.

- Three quarters (75% or 160) of CPEG respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they were regularly consulted and asked their opinion by the borough commander.

¹ The survey was available online, via paper copy or telephone survey. Most (184) of CPEG respondents completed the survey online with the remainder completing a paper copy. All CSP respondents completed an online survey. Most (16) MPA member and officer respondents completed an online survey, with the remainder completing a paper copy. Due to website access restrictions on MPS computers, all borough commanders completed a paper survey.

- Slightly fewer respondents (69% or 148) agreed or strongly agreed that they were regularly consulted and asked their opinion by the CSP.
- Sixty per cent (or 128) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they were regularly consulted or asked their opinion by other partners.
- CPEG respondents were proportionately more likely to 'strongly agree' (rather than just agree) that they were regularly consulted or asked their opinion by the borough commander compared to the CSP and other partners (39%, 32% and 23% respectively).

Borough commander, CSP and MPA member/officer responses

Borough commander, CSP and MPA member/officer respondents were asked whether their borough CPEG was an effective way for them and their colleagues to engage with the community.

- Most (Five) borough commander respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their borough CPEG was an effective way for them and their colleagues to engage with the community. One respondent disagreed.
- Four CSP respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that their borough CPEG was an effective way for them and their colleagues to engage with the community. Two respondents agreed or strongly agreed while the remaining one neither agreed nor disagreed.
- Most (12) MPA member/officer respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their borough CPEG was an effective way for them and their colleagues to engage with the community. Four respondents neither agreed nor disagreed while the remaining two disagreed.

Borough commander, CSP and MPA member/officer respondents were asked if their borough CPEG was effective at consulting with all sections of the community.

- Four borough commander respondents agreed that their borough CPEG was effective at consulting with all sections of the community. The remaining two disagreed or strongly disagreed.
- Four CSP respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that their borough CPEG was effective at consulting with all sections of the community. Two respondents agreed while the remaining one neither agreed nor disagreed.
- Nine MPA member/officer respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their borough CPEG was effective at consulting with all sections of the community. Five respondents disagreed while the remaining four neither agreed nor disagreed.

Borough commander and CSP respondents were asked if their borough CPEG was one of the primary means through which they consulted and engaged with the community.

- Most (five) borough commander respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their borough CPEG was one of the primary means through which they consulted with the community. One respondent disagreed, citing the youth advising panel, borough Independent Advisory Group (IAG), councillors, ward panel chairs and young mayor, as other methods of consulting.
- Only two borough commander respondents responded to the question asking whether their borough CPEG was one of the primary means through which they engaged with the community. Both respondents agreed that their borough CPEG was one of their primary means of engagement.
- Four CSP respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that their borough CPEG was one of the primary means through which they consulted with the community. One agreed while the remaining two neither agreed nor disagreed. CSP respondents mentioned a number of different methods used to consult with the community. These included: partnership days, safer neighbourhoods ward panels, residents panels, borough publications, surveys, youth panels, ward councillors and 'Intelligence through Neighbourhood Security Interviews' (devised by Professor Martin Innes) to understand drivers of insecurity. Some respondents stated that these methods reached a wider, more representative audience than CPEGs.
- Four CSP respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that their borough CPEG was one of the primary means through which they engaged with the community. Two agreed or strongly agreed while the remaining one neither agreed nor disagreed. They referred to similar alternative methods outlined for consulting with the community (see above). Respondents also utilised the Council's Faith and Belief Group, borough community relations advisory group, the third sector, street pastors, voluntary services and commissioned projects.

Borough commander, CSP and MPA member/officer respondents were asked which sections of the community they thought borough CPEGs was most and least effective at engaging with.

- When asked what sections of the community they thought the borough CPEG was most effective at engaging with, borough commanders mentioned elderly or retired people, faith communities, voluntary groups, disabled people and specific ethnic groups including Afro Caribbean, Asian, Somali and Sikh. One respondent felt that, despite CPEG efforts to engage with other groups, it was often the 'usual suspects' represented at meetings (i.e. those involved in other groups or forums).

- When asked what sections of the community they thought the borough CPEG was least effective at engaging with, borough commanders mentioned young people, LGBT groups, Eastern European and 'new' communities, disabled people, African communities and professional people who are often too busy to get involved. One respondent stated that despite efforts to engage, some groups were under represented and engagement with young people was particularly difficult.
- CSP respondents generally felt that their borough CPEG was most effective at engaging with groups of people who also tended to be engaged elsewhere. One respondent felt that their CPEG was effective at engaging with minority communities.
- CSP respondents felt that their borough CPEG was least effective at engaging with 'hard to reach' groups, people not already engaged or who are too busy to attend meetings/read newsletters, young people, Black people and disabled people.
- MPA member/officer respondents cited a variety of people who they felt that their borough CPEG was most effective at engaging with including residents groups, white older people, LGBT people, faith groups, young people, BME groups, deaf and disabled communities, elderly people and transient communities. However some respondents felt that the CPEG were most effective at engaging with 'active' citizens (one mentioned the 'usual suspects') and people already interested in policing and community engagement.
- Similar to other respondents, MPA member/officer respondents often mentioned young people when asked who their borough CPEG was least effective at engaging with. Other groups mentioned were businesses, specific ethnic groups (Korean, Vietnamese, Tamil, Chinese, African and smaller BME communities), BME older people, disabled people, faith groups and LGBT people.
- Borough commander respondents were asked whether members of their borough CPEG were representative of the local community. Two respondents agreed that CPEG members were representative; a further two neither agreed nor disagreed. The remaining two disagreed or strongly disagreed. Young people were often cited as an underrepresented group. LGBT groups and specific ethnic groups (Somali and Eastern European) and new communities were also mentioned.
- Three CSP respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that members of their borough CPEG were representative of the local community. Two strongly agreed, one neither agreed nor disagreed while the remaining respondent did

not answer. Again, young people were often cited as an underrepresented group. People who work, lone parents, those not already engaged and BME groups (including 'new' communities) were also cited.

- Twelve MPA member/officer respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their borough CPEG was representative of the local community. Three respondents disagreed while the remaining three neither agreed nor disagreed. Similar to other respondents, young people were highlighted as an underrepresented group, together with some BME groups (the Chinese community were cited), faith groups, LGBT people and disabled people. One respondent felt that professional people were overrepresented on the CPEG with too few active residents.

Valuing the opinion of the CPEG

CPEG responses

CPEG respondents were asked if they thought their opinion was valued by the borough commander, CSP and other partners.

- More than three quarters (79% or 168) of CPEG respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their opinion was valued by the borough commander.
- Slightly fewer (71% or 151) of CPEG respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their opinion was valued by the CSP.
- Just over two thirds (67% or 144) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their opinion was valued by other partners.
- CPEG respondents were proportionately more likely to 'strongly agree' (rather than just agree) that their opinion was valued by the borough commander compared to the CSP and other partners (44%, 34% and 28% respectively).

Contributions made by CPEGs

CPEG responses

CPEG respondents were asked if they understood how their work contributed to making local people feel safer and more confident in their police service and whether they see changes in policing and/or community safety practices made as a result of their work.

- The majority of CPEG respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they understood how they contributed to making local people feel safer (84% or 180) and more confident (82% or 176) in their police service.
- Over three quarters (77% or 165) of CPEG respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they could see changes in policing and/or community safety practice that has been made as a result of their work.

CPEG respondents were asked to give examples of changes they had seen in policing and/or community safety practice as a result of their CPEG's work. Respondents gave a variety of examples which are outlined below.

- **Impact or influence on a specific policing/community safety initiative:** This included tackling gun and knife crime, dangerous dogs, domestic violence, burglary, hate crime, street drinkers and anti social behaviour (ASB), working with the police to improve stop and search encounters, suggestions for a local Community Payback scheme, establishing a youth panel, altering patrol times and areas, setting up third party reporting provisions, establishing a monthly crime prevention desk in the local shopping centre, ensuring police stations are open in busy areas, improving street lighting, establishing dispersal zones, a safer cycling initiative, a community speedwatch scheme, improving treatment of people in custody, providing pocket alarms to vulnerable members of the community and working with the police when planning raids on local nightclubs. Some CPEG respondents also mentioned their role assisting the borough when establishing Safer Neighbourhoods teams and ward panels.
- **Closer working between the police and community:** This included regular meetings with senior police officers in the borough, creating a joint police and community action plan, extending Neighbourhood Watch provision, improving engagement between the police and often underrepresented groups (e.g. disabled people, BME groups, local businesses and traders, Muslim groups who felt alienated post 7/7 attacks), CPEG members doing voluntary work in the police station and working with the police to ensure that changes made in the central MPS are rolled out effectively on borough (one respondent gave an example of recent changes to the Sapphire Unit dealing with sexual offences). A number of respondents mentioned closer working between the police and young people as a result of CPEG work. This included more consultation and engagement with young people and involving young people in the development of newly qualified police officers. Respondents from Haringey often mentioned 'HYPE' (Haringey's Young People Empowered), a youth forum which is part of the CPEG, aimed at empowering young people and addressing the breakdown in community cohesion and communication which can lead to violence and other issues within communities. Some of the

respondents from Haringey were young (defined their age band as 16-24 years) and spoke about the positive influence of HYPE in their lives.

- **Increase visibility of officers in the community:** Some respondents also mentioned that officers were now more approachable.
- **Better communication between the community and police:** Some respondents felt that there was also now more information provision and consultation, and that the community had a better understanding of issues and challenges facing their local police. Respondents also mentioned that the police consult with them before major events in the borough (e.g. Notting Hill Carnival) and utilise CPEG members to communicate with the community following major incidents.
- **Increased satisfaction, confidence and feelings of safety**
- **Providing support to other partners:** CPEG respondents mentioned support they provided to a local family justice centre and a psychiatric hospital.
- **Influencing priorities:** Some respondents felt that their CPEG allowed them to influence priorities and resource allocation, and that the police acted promptly on issues raised by the CPEG.
- **More accountability for local police work and actions**
- **No change:** Some respondents felt that their CPEG had made little change in their borough and that they largely ‘talked’ rather than taking any action.

MPA member/officer responses

MPA member/officer respondents were asked if they could see changes that have been made in policing and/or community safety practice as a result of the work of their link borough CPEG.

- Ten MPA member/officer respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they could see changes made in policing and/or community safety practice as a result of the work of their link borough CPEG. Six respondents neither agreed nor disagreed while the remaining two respondents disagreed.
- Seven respondents gave examples of changes they had seen. These included improvements to Safer Neighbourhoods Panels, awareness raising around burglary, youth engagement, highlighting the needs of the deaf and disabled community, guidance on working with the LGBT community, more effective stop and search monitoring and improved communication between the CPEG and stop and search monitoring group, assisting other boroughs to

improve their community engagement work, improved youth engagement and interaction with rough sleepers.

Consulting with the community

CPEG responses

Almost three quarters (73% or 154) of CPEG respondents stated that they used other methods to consult with the community, apart from regular public meetings.

CPEG respondents mentioned a variety of other methods they used to consult with the community. These included:

- Websites (some CPEGs had created their own, some had a page on the council website)
- Emails
- Focus groups/workshops
- Newsletters
- Speaking to family, friends, colleagues and people in the community
- Informal surgeries following public meetings
- Posters and flyers
- Social networking sites (e.g. Facebook, Twitter)
- Locally run and regional/national surveys (e.g. MPS Public Attitude Survey, Place Survey)
- Presentations and stalls at community events
- Visiting other partners in the community (e.g. schools, colleges, housing associations, Age Concern, Primary Care Trust, youth groups, places of worship)
- Reporting from and to other boards/committees/organisations that CPEG members are involved in (e.g. neighbourhood watch, Safer Neighbourhoods panels, stop and search monitoring groups)

Value for money

Borough commander, CSP and MPA member/officer respondents were asked whether their borough CPEG offers value for money.

Borough commander responses

- Most (five) borough commander respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their borough CPEG offers value for money. One respondent disagreed.
- Borough commanders commented that their CPEG used their funding effectively, that the administration and meeting of CPEGs was relatively inexpensive and that their CPEG is active, takes responsibilities seriously and have improved communication with residents in the borough. Despite agreeing that the CPEG offered value for money, one respondent felt that the whole consultation and accountability process should be reviewed, particularly in light of plans for elected police commissioners, and suggested that they could take responsibility for public consultation and leave police to focus solely on operational policing. The respondent who felt that the CPEG did not offer value for money felt that there were few CPEG outputs in line with borough priorities.

CSP responses

- Four CSP respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that their CPEG offered value for money; two strongly disagreed while the remaining respondent strongly agreed. There was concern from some respondents that the work of the CPEG had limited impact and did not reach a broad range of people in the borough. One respondent felt that the CPEG was well run and effective.

MPA member/officer responses

- Nine MPA member/officer respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their CPEG offered value for money. Six respondents neither agreed nor disagreed while the remaining three disagreed. Three respondents felt that the CPEG were cost effective in carrying out their duties with one highlighting how their CPEG have terminated a contract due to high costs and are undertaking administrative duties on a voluntary basis. One respondent highlighted the commitment of volunteers and their knowledgeable administrator. However three respondents felt that the cost of CPEGs was disproportionate to their outcomes/outputs.

Further comments

CPEG responses

Just over a third (39% or 84) of CPEG respondents provided further comments at the end of their survey. Themes emerging from further comments were:

- The CPEG has brought the police and community closer together and is an important method of engagement and communication. Some respondents commented that the CPEG was the only way the public could engage directly with their local police. Removing CPEGs would 'undo' a lot of good work undertaken between the police and community. There was a particular concern from Haringey respondents involved in 'HYPE' that their work could not continue without the CPEG.
- CPEGs offer value for money in terms of the work they carry out with limited resources. One respondent mentioned cross border work they were conducting with other groups to be more cost efficient.
- CPEG meetings should be more focused and should consult with the community more – rather than just inform them. Some respondents felt that decisions were often made without consultation.
- CPEGs should not be centralised. Each area has locally defined needs and these should be serviced on a local basis.
- Turnover of officers and staff in SNTs and the council was problematic for some respondents as they had to re-establish relationships and build confidence and trust.
- Work to develop relationships between the community and local police officers can sometimes be damaged by officers from central policing units.
- Some CPEG meetings are ineffective and 'talking shops'. One respondent was concerned that police officers have too many meetings to attend.
- The membership of some CPEGs is unrepresentative and some CPEGs are not inclusive of the whole community.
- One respondent felt that the MPA does not respect the work of volunteers.
- One respondent felt that the £50,000 allocated to CPEGs was not necessary and that the local authority could organise CPEG meetings at a reduced cost. They felt that this money could be used to fund another police officer post. Another respondent felt that CPEGs should not all be allocated the same funding, regardless of their performance.
- The role of CPEGs should be clarified and more widely publicised and marketed to communities.
- One respondent felt that more work was needed for the police to understand the views of the community.

- One respondent was concerned that questions in the survey were leading and included too many personal demographic questions.

Borough commander responses

Four borough commander respondents provided further comments at the end of their survey. Themes emerging from further comments were:

- Two respondents praised the commitment and hard work of their CPEG.
- One respondent felt that the MPA/MPS should consider how CPEGs can better link in with ward panels and how non-borough units interact with local communities.
- One respondent was concerned that their borough CPEG did not operate within a constitution and about the political influence of members.

CSP responses

Four CSP respondents provided further comments at the end of their survey. Themes emerging from further comments were:

- Three respondents felt that the CPEG was not an effective mechanism for engaging with a broad range of people in the borough. One felt that the CPEG budget should be held by Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRPs) to commission work.
- One respondent acknowledged that, although not the only way to engage and consult with people in the community, CPEGs played a key role in the policing and community safety portfolio.

MPA member/officer responses

Three MPA member/officer respondents provided further comments at the end of their survey. Themes emerging from further comments were:

- One respondent supported the work of CPEGs but felt that the MPA did not use their position in the community to engage as much as they could.
- One respondent felt that meetings should be moved around the borough and would benefit from a link member attending meetings on a regular basis.

- One respondent highlighted that CPEGs have suffered from poor police leadership and a lack of clear expectations and challenges.

Report author: Melissa Pepper, Policing Planning and Performance Improvement Unit

September 2010

Appendix one: Respondents' boroughs

CPEG responses

Borough	No. of respondents
Haringey	42
Brent	24
Camden	22
Westminster	20
Kensington and Chelsea	13
Sutton	9
Hounslow	8
Lambeth	8
Hillingdon	7
Barnet	6
Croydon	6
Harrow	5
Islington	5
Not stated	5
Enfield	4
Merton	4
Tower Hamlets	4
Bexley	3
Redbridge	3
Richmond	3
Southwark	3
Bromley	2

Ealing	1
Greenwich	1
Havering	1
Kingston	1
Lewisham	1
Newham	1
Waltham Forest	1
Wandsworth	1
Total	214

Borough commander responses

- Bexley
- Camden
- Croydon
- Hounslow
- Lewisham
- Southwark

CSP responses

- Brent
- Ealing
- Hammersmith and Fulham
- Hillingdon
- Kensington and Chelsea
- Merton
- Sutton

Member/officer responses

- Barking and Dagenham
- Brent
- Ealing (x 2)
- Hackney
- Hammersmith and Fulham
- Havering
- Hillingdon
- Hounslow
- Islington
- Kingston upon Thames
- Lewisham
- Newham
- Richmond (x 2)
- Southwark
- Tower Hamlets (x 2)
- Westminster

[Please note that one member/officer submitted one response covering two boroughs therefore although responses were submitted for 19 boroughs, only 18 responses were received in total.]

Appendix two: Demographics of CPEG respondents

Only CPEG respondents were asked questions about their demographics. Demographic questions were not asked in borough commander, CSP and MPA member/officer surveys.

Gender

Gender	No. of respondents	%
Male	110	52
Female	85	40
Not stated/prefer not to say	16	8

Age

Age band	No. of respondents	%
65+	60	29
55-64	53	25
45-54	39	19
35-44	24	11
25-34	16	8
16-24	7	3
Not stated/prefer not to say	10	5

Ethnicity

Ethnicity	No. of respondents	%
White British	117	56
Caribbean	16	8
Any other white background	14	7

African	10	5
Indian	7	3
Irish	7	3
Bangladeshi	4	2
Any other mixed background	3	1
Any other Asian background	2	1
Asian or Asian British	2	1
Pakistani	2	1
White and Black African	2	1
Any other African background	1	0
Any other ethnic group	1	0
Black British	1	0
Chinese	1	0
White and Asian	1	0
White and Black Caribbean	1	0
Not stated/prefer not to say	18	9

Religion

Religion	No. of respondents	%
Christian	99	47
No religion	35	17
Muslim	13	6
Jewish	7	3
Hindu	4	2
Any other religion	3	1
Sikh	3	1
Agnostic	2	1
Greek Orthodox	1	0
Humanist socialism	1	0
Spiritualist	1	0
Not stated/prefer not to say	40	19

Sexuality

Sexuality	No. of respondents	%
Heterosexual	154	75
Gay/lesbian	6	3
Bisexual	2	1
Not stated/prefer not to say	43	21

Disability

Disability	No. of respondents	%
No	125	60
Yes	33	16
Prefer not to say	51	24



Metropolitan Police Authority

**Community and Police Engagement Groups (CPEG) review:
Ensuring Influence, Delivering Value for Money**

This survey is being conducted as part of the Metropolitan Police Authority's (MPA) CPEG review, '*Ensuring Influence; Delivering Value for Money*'. The survey will help the MPA understand your views about the work of your CPEG and the value it adds to policing and community safety work in your borough. Your views and comments will be treated confidentially and survey findings will be anonymised in the final report, so please be as open and honest as you can.

If you are unable to complete this questionnaire online, please contact the MPA on 020 7202 0114 or 020 7202 0173 (minicom), leave your name and address or telephone number and we will post you a hard copy or call you back to conduct a telephone survey.

Thank you for taking part.

What borough are you responding for?

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

1. My borough CPEG is an effective way for me and my colleagues to engage with the community

Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree Don't know

2. My borough CPEG is effective at consulting with all sections of the community

Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree Don't know

2a. Which sections of the community do you think your borough CPEG is most effective at engaging with?

2b. Which sections of the community do you think your borough CPEG is least effective at engaging with?

3. Members of my borough CPEG are representative of the local community (i.e. in terms of age, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, faith/religion and disability)

Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree Don't know

3a. If members of your borough CPEG are not representative of the local community, which groups are under represented?

4. My borough CPEG is one of the primary means through which I consult with the community

Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree Don't know

4a. If your borough CPEG is not one of the primary means through which you consult with the local community, what other methods do you use and why?

5. My borough CPEG is one of the primary means through which I engage with the community

Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree Don't know

5a. If your borough CPEG is not one of the primary means through which you engage with the local community, what other methods do you use and why?

6. My borough CPEG offers value for money?

Value for money (VfM) is about obtaining the maximum benefit with the resources available and achieving the right local balance between economy, efficiency and effectiveness - the 3Es - spending less, spending well and spending wisely

Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree Don't know

6a. Please provide details of why you think your borough CPEG does or does not offer value for money

7. Do you have any other comments you would like to mention?