

RSU03/202:Community Consultation

Draft Report

April 2004

Contents

1 Executive Summary	2
1.1 Background	2
1.2 Key Findings	3
2 Introduction	5
2.1 Background	5
2.2 Methodology	6
2.3 Statistical Reliability	6
2.4 Technical Note	7
3 Results	8
4 Conclusion	23

Appendix A: Freetext Comments (available on request)

Adele Murdoch
Research Analyst
Research and Survey Unit (CPG)
Room O.3.07, Cobalt Square
1 South Lambeth Road
London, SW8 1SU
Tel: 020-7230-8164 (CO. 68164)

1 Executive Summary

1.1 Background

In September 2003 a scoping paper was produced for the MPA Consultation Committee which described the key stages for identifying community consultation and engagement activity currently existing in the MPS. Currently no clear picture exists of this activity across London, and the paper recommended that research be carried out in order to capture this data.

As a result, the MPS Strategic Consultation Unit approached the Research and Survey Unit to carry out focus groups with key members of the MPS who are involved in community consultation and to design a questionnaire based on the results of these discussions. The questionnaire can then be sent to targeted individuals involved in community consultation across the MPS and will provide a baseline for future planning.

1.2 Key Findings

- Approximately three quarters of respondents stated that requests for community consultation come from B/OCU Commanders and local authorities (77% and 72% respectively).
- Just under two thirds of respondents (65%) stated that local residents requested community consultation. Approximately half of respondents stated that Community & Police Consultation Groups, local councils, community Inspectors and Sector Inspectors request consultation (52%, 54%, 49% and 48% respectively).
- Seven in ten respondents (70%) stated that Community Inspectors carry out consultation. Just under six in ten (58%) stated that the sector teams conduct consultation, whereas just under half of respondents (49%) stated that the CPCG carry out consultation.
- The majority of respondents stated that the main reason for carrying out consultation within their B/OCU is to identify needs and to reduce the fear of crime (92% and 83% respectively).
- Approximately three quarters of respondents stated that to deliver results/advertise success, to gather intelligence on problem areas, and to be open and transparent were the main reasons for conducting consultation (78%, 78% and 76% respectively).
- Approximately six in ten respondents stated that the main reason for carrying out consultation was to establish priorities, reduce tension between police and the public and to build consensus (66%, 63% and 60% respectively). Approximately half of respondents carry out consultation to monitor the public's changing attitudes, to understand behaviour and because it is a statutory requirement for crime and disorder (50%, 45% and 48% respectively).

- The majority of respondents consult with local authorities and housing authorities (92% and 84% respectively). Three quarters of respondents (75%) consult with local businesses e.g. pubs, clubs and retailers. Approximately two thirds stated that they consult with Community Safety Units and the Education Authority (66% and 64% respectively).
- Under half of respondents consult with the health authority and the town centre management groups (48% each) whereas just over four in ten stated that they consult with IAG and British Transport Police (46% and 41% respectively).
- The majority of respondents (92%) stated that they consult with local residents. Approximately two thirds consult with minority ethnic communities and young people/children (68% and 64% respectively). Over half of respondents (54%) consult with faith groups, whilst just over four in ten (42%) consult with university/college students.
- Three in ten respondents (30%) find refugees/asylum seekers hard to reach. Approximately a quarter of respondents find people without permanent homes, tourists and lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender people hard to reach (26%, 22% and 21% respectively).
- Approximately one in ten respondents find disabled people, minority ethnic communities and young people/children hard to reach (15%, 14% and 13% respectively).
- Just under three in ten respondents (29%) find all of the specified public groups hard to reach as they do not have a direct link/contact point for them. Approximately a quarter of respondents stated that it is not easy to identify these groups and that these groups do not trust the police (23% each).
- Under one in ten (7%) stated that the specified public groups are hard to reach as they are difficult to contact or obtain contact details. Respondents also stated that they are a small population with the BOCU and these groups, once contacted, do not always attend meetings, decline invitations and do not co-operate with police efforts to consult with them (5%, 6% and 6% respectively).
- Of the respondents who answered 'other' just under a quarter (23%) stated that working closely with third party organisations could improve contacting hard to reach groups. Approximately two in ten respondents stated that identifying community leaders and having better access to contact lists would improve consultation with these groups (19% and 17% respectively).
- Approximately one in ten respondents stated that these groups would be easier to reach if relationships and trust with the police improved, additional resources were provided and language barriers were overcome (11%, 8% and 8% respectively).
- The majority of respondents use private and public meetings to conduct consultation (89% each). Approximately three quarters of respondents use partnership events, conduct informal chats with members of the public and send letters to local residents/tenants (78%, 77% and 72% respectively).

- With regard to local residents, approximately a quarter of respondents stated that they consult with this group on a monthly and quarterly basis (27% and 25% respectively). Approximately four in ten respondents consult with young people/children, minority ethnic groups, lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender people and disabled people on an ad-hoc basis (37%, 37%, 37% and 42% respectively). Four in ten respondents (40%) do not consult with disabled people.
- Approximately a third of respondents consult with people without permanent homes and university/college students on an ad-hoc basis (32% and 30% respectively), with over half of respondents stating that they do not consult with people without permanent homes (55%).
- Over three quarters of respondents (78%) do not consult with tourists.
- Approximately three in ten respondents stated that they consult with Reassurance Teams, Crime and Disorder Groups, IAG and Police Consultative Groups on a monthly basis (32%, 30%, 35% and 28% respectively). Just under a quarter of respondents (24%) consult quarterly with Crime and Disorder Groups, whilst just under half (49%) consult quarterly with Police Consultative Groups.
- Approximately a third of respondents consult with Reassurance Teams and Crime and Disorder Groups on an ad-hoc basis (32% and 28% respectively), whereas just under four in ten (37%) consult with IAG on an ad-hoc basis.
- Approximately a third of respondents (35%) stated that they formally consult with other internal groups and just under two thirds (65%) stated that they did not.
- Eight in ten respondents (80%) stated that they do not have an allocated budget for consultation. Just over one in ten (12%) stated that they have £10,000 or less available to them.
- Just under four in ten respondents (39%) who do not have an allocated budget available to them receive funds from their B/OCU. A quarter of respondents (25%) receive funds from partnerships.
- Approximately one in ten respondents stated that they fund projects through the Safer Community Funds, Local Authorities and the Reassurance Project (12%, 10% and 7% respectively).

2 Introduction

2.1 Background

In September 2003 a scoping paper was produced for the MPA Consultation Committee which described the key stages for identifying community consultation and engagement activity currently existing in the MPS. Currently no clear picture exists of this activity across London, and the paper recommended that research be carried out in order to capture this data.

As a result, the MPS Strategic Consultation Unit approached the Research and Survey Unit to carry out focus groups with key members of the MPS who are involved in community consultation and to design a questionnaire based on the results of these discussions. The questionnaire can then be sent to targeted individuals involved in community consultation across the MPS and will provide a baseline for future planning.

The scoping paper outlined 4 broad stages upon which a picture of consultation could be built.

Set up and run initial focus groups with MPS unit representatives to agree the questions to be asked.

- Carry out an electronic survey, based on the MPS Intranet, with selected MPS staff involved in consultation activity (up to 500 staff to be targeted).
- Analysis of the information collected to provide a snapshot of the current situation.
- Follow up the results of the survey with more targeted interviews and/or focus groups, based on identified good practice, patterns or gaps in the information, if deemed necessary.

As a result of the focus groups key questions regarding engagement activity and community consultation emerged. These include;

- Where do requests for community consultation originate?
- Who carries out the community consultation?
- What are the reasons for carrying out the community consultation?
- Who is consulted?
- Are there any groups of people that are 'hard to hear'?
- What methods of consultation are used?
- How frequently are internal specific groups consulted?
- What budget exists for community consultation?

The results from the questionnaire will provide a snap shot of community consultation existing within the MPS and will be used to identify good practice, identify any patterns or gaps in information and provide a baseline for further

research to be carried. The results will also be fed back to the MPA Consultation Committee.

2.2 Methodology

The focus groups were carried out in January 2004 and participants were selected from all areas within the MPS. The results of the focus group discussions were used to design a self-completion online questionnaire, which was published on the Intranet site from February – April 2004. An email was sent to all individuals involved with community consultation within the MPS. Respondents were required to complete the questionnaire online and submit the form for analysis. In total 352 staff were notified of the existence of the on-line questionnaire and 151 questionnaires were submitted, yielding a response rate of 43%. Where possible response rates have been calculated for the individual Directorates/Departments and have been listed below.

Responses were analysed by the Research and Survey Unit using SPSS for Windows. A full record of freetext comments can be found verbatim in Appendix A and the respondent profile can be found in Appendix B.

2.3 Statistical Reliability

Not all staff involved in community consultation completed the questionnaire and therefore we can not be certain that the survey results are exactly those we would have found if everybody had completed the questionnaire. However, we can predict the variation between the sample results and the 'true' values from a knowledge of the size of the samples on which the results are based and the number of times that particular answer is given.

The confidence with which we can make this prediction is usually chosen to be 95%, that is, the chances are 95 in 100 that the 'true' value will fall within a given range. The table below illustrates the predicted ranges for different sample sizes and percentage results at the 95% confidence interval.

Size of sample on which survey is based	Approximate sample tolerances applicable to percentages at or near these levels (95% confidence level)		
	10% or 90%	30% or 70%	50%
	+/-	+/-	+/-
50 completed questionnaires	8.3	12.7	13.9
100 completed questionnaires	5.9	9.0	9.8
151 completed questionnaires	4.8	7.3	8.0

For example, when considering a result of 30% among the total sample of 151 respondents, we can be 95% confident that the 'true' results among all staff involved with community consultation lies between 22.7% and 37.3% (plus or minus 7.3%)

The larger the sample size, the more confident we can be that the survey results truly reflect the opinions of the total possible sample. This means that when interpreting the results, small base sizes should be treated with caution, as we cannot assume that the opinions of small numbers of people are a true reflection of the whole group they represent.

2.4 Technical Note

Base The actual number of respondents who answered that question.

% The percentage of the base who gave that response. All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number. Some percentages may not total 100 due to the effects of rounding or multiple response.

Freetext Where possible freetext comments have been coded. A full copy of all freetext responses are available on request.

??? Denotes an illegible word in the freetext responses.

(21) A number in brackets after a quote refers to the ID number of the respondent who made that comment.

***** The percentage value is less than 0.5.

3 Results

The results from the questionnaires are presented in this section.

Table 3.1: Where do requests for community consultation from you B/OCU come from?

	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>Borough / OCU Commander</i>	77%
<i>Local Authority</i>	72%
<i>Local Residents</i>	65%
<i>Local Council</i>	54%
<i>Community & Police Consultative Groups</i>	52%
<i>Community Inspector</i>	49%
<i>Sector Inspector</i>	48%
<i>Local Businesses</i>	42%
<i>Ward Officers</i>	38%
<i>Community Liaison Officers</i>	34%
<i>Independent Advisory Group</i>	30%
<i>School Officer</i>	25%
<i>Community Development Trusts</i>	7%
<i>Step Change Community Panels</i>	7%
<i>Other (please specify)</i>	11%
<i>Base</i>	151

Approximately three quarters of respondents stated that requests for community consultation come from B/OCU Commanders and local authorities (77% and 72% respectively).

Just under two thirds of respondents (65%) stated that local residents request community consultation. Approximately half of respondents stated that Community & Police Consultation Groups, local councils, Community Inspectors and Sector Inspectors request consultation (52%, 54%, 49% and 48% respectively).

Table 3.2: Where do requests for community consultation from you B/OCU come from? (OTHER)

	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>Sector Working Group</i>	13%
<i>Local MP's</i>	13%
<i>Reassurance/Step Change Teams</i>	13%
<i>Neighbourhood Watch</i>	9%
<i>Town Centre Team</i>	9%
<i>Community & Police Consultative Groups</i>	9%
<i>Faith Groups</i>	9%
<i>Elderly/Youth Groups</i>	9%
<i>Housing Association/Health Care</i>	9%
<i>Ethnic minority representative groups</i>	4%
<i>Other</i>	43%
<i>Base</i>	23

Of the respondents who answered 'other', over one in ten stated that requests come from sector working groups, local MPs and the Reassurance/Step Change Teams (13% each). Just under one in ten cited Neighbourhood Watch, Town Centre Teams, CPCG, faith groups, elderly/youth groups and housing association/health care (9% each).

A full list of freetext comments are available on request.

Table 3.3: Who carries out the community consultation on your B/OCU?

<i>Community Inspector</i>	70%
<i>Sector Team</i>	58%
<i>Community & Police Consultation Group</i>	49%
<i>Sector Working Groups</i>	36%
<i>Gold Group</i>	25%
<i>Team of consultants</i>	5%
<i>Task Force</i>	4%
<i>Other (please specify)</i>	17%
<i>Base</i>	151

Seven in ten respondents (70%) stated that Community Inspectors carry out consultation. Just under six in ten (58%) stated that the sector teams conduct consultation, whereas just under half of respondents (49%) stated that the CPCG carry out consultation.

**Table 3.4: Who carries out the community consultation on your B/OCU?
(OTHER)**

<i>Community Safety Unit/Community Safety Officers</i>	22%
<i>Sector Inspectors</i>	22%
<i>Partnerships</i>	12%
<i>PBO</i>	12%
<i>Reassurance Teams</i>	7%
<i>Borough Liaison Officers (BLO)</i>	7%
<i>Local Authority</i>	5%
<i>Other (please specify)</i>	5%
<i>Base</i>	41

Of the respondents who answered 'other', just over two in ten stated that the Community Safety Unit/Community Safety Officers and Sector Inspectors carry out consultation (22% each).

Approximately one in ten respondents stated that consultation is conducted via Partnerships, PBO, Reassurance Teams and BLO (12%, 12%, 7% & 7% respectively).

Table 3.5: What are the main reasons for carrying out consultation in your B/OCU?

<i>To identify needs</i>	92%
<i>To reduce fear of crime</i>	83%
<i>To deliver results / advertise successes</i>	78%
<i>To gather intelligence on problem areas</i>	78%
<i>To be open and transparent</i>	76%
<i>To establish priorities</i>	66%
<i>To reduce tensions between the police and the public</i>	63%
<i>To build consensus</i>	60%
<i>To monitor the public's changing attitudes</i>	50%
<i>Statutory requirements for crime and disorder</i>	48%
<i>To understand behaviour</i>	45%
<i>Statutory requirements for the reassurance project</i>	32%
<i>Other (please specify)</i>	7%
<i>Base</i>	151

The majority of respondents stated that the main reason for carrying out consultation within their B/OCU is to identify needs and to reduce the fear of crime (92% and 83% respectively).

Approximately three quarters of respondents stated that to deliver results/advertise success, to gather intelligence on problem areas, and to be open and transparent were the main reasons for conducting consultation (78%, 78% and 76% respectively).

Approximately six in ten respondents stated that the main reason for carrying out consultation was to establish priorities, reduce tension between police and the public and to build consensus (66%, 63% and 60% respectively).

Approximately half of respondents carry out consultation to monitor the public's changing attitudes, to understand behaviour and because it is a statutory requirement for crime and disorder (50%, 45% and 48% respectively).

Unfortunately the 'other' responses were too few to code but can be found verbatim in Appendix A.

Table 3.6: Which of the following bodies / groups do you consult with?

<i>Local Council</i>	92%
<i>Housing Authority</i>	84%
<i>Local Businesses e.g. pubs, clubs, retailers</i>	75%
<i>Community Safety Units</i>	66%
<i>Education Authority</i>	64%
<i>Health Authority</i>	48%
<i>Town Centre Management Group</i>	48%
<i>Independent Advisory Group</i>	46%
<i>British Transport Police</i>	41%
<i>Other (please specify)</i>	19%
<i>Base</i>	151

The majority of respondents consult with local authorities and housing authorities (92% and 84% respectively). Three quarters of respondents (75%) consult with local businesses e.g. pubs, clubs and retailers.

Approximately two thirds stated that they consult with Community Safety Units and the Education Authority (66% and 64% respectively).

Under half of respondents consult with the Health Authority and the Town Centre Management groups (48% each) whereas just over four in ten stated that they consult with IAG and British Transport Police (46% and 41% respectively).

**Table 3.7: Which of the following bodies / groups do you consult with?
(OTHER)**

<i>Resident Groups/Associations</i>	17%
<i>Youth Groups/Schools</i>	14%
<i>Neighbourhood Watch</i>	12%
<i>Sector Working Groups</i>	10%
<i>Housing Association</i>	5%
<i>Mental Health teams</i>	5%
<i>Racial Equality Council</i>	5%
<i>Local Business</i>	5%
<i>Elderly Group Organisations</i>	5%
<i>Community Groups</i>	3%
<i>Other</i>	31%
<i>Base</i>	151

Of the respondents who answered 'other' just under two in ten (17%) stated that they consult with resident groups/associations. Approximately one in ten respondents stated that they consult with youth groups/schools, Neighbourhood Watch and Sector Working Groups (14%, 12% and 10% respectively).

Table 3.8: Which of the following public groups / communities do you consult with?

<i>Local residents</i>	92%
<i>Minority ethnic communities</i>	68%
<i>Young people / children</i>	64%
<i>Faith groups</i>	54%
<i>University / college students</i>	42%
<i>Lesbian / gay / bisexual / transgender people</i>	38%
<i>Refugees / asylum seekers</i>	31%
<i>Disabled people</i>	28%
<i>People without permanent homes</i>	24%
<i>Tourists</i>	5%
<i>Other (please specify)</i>	3%
<i>Base</i>	151

The majority of respondents (92%) stated that they consult with local residents. Approximately two thirds consult with minority ethnic communities and young people/children (68% and 64% respectively).

Over half of respondents (54%) consult with faith groups whilst just over four in ten (42%) consult with university/college students.

Unfortunately the 'other' responses were too few to code but a full list of freetext comments are available on request.

Table 3.9: Which of the following public groups do you find HARD TO REACH?

<i>Refugees / asylum seekers</i>	30%
<i>People without permanent homes</i>	26%
<i>Tourists</i>	22%
<i>Lesbian / gay / bisexual / transgender people</i>	21%
<i>Disabled people</i>	15%
<i>Minority ethnic communities</i>	14%
<i>Young people / children</i>	13%
<i>Faith groups</i>	6%
<i>University / college students</i>	5%
<i>Local residents</i>	3%
<i>Other (please specify)</i>	4%
<i>Base</i>	133

Three in ten respondents (30%) find refugees/asylum seekers hard to reach. Approximately a quarter of respondents find people without permanent homes, tourists and lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender people hard to reach (26%, 22% and 21% respectively).

Approximately one in ten respondents find disabled people, minority ethnic communities and young people/children hard to reach (15%, 14% and 13% respectively).

Unfortunately the 'other' responses were too few to code but a full list of freetext comments are available on request.

Table 3.10: Why do you find these following public groups HARD TO REACH?

<i>No direct links/contact points</i>	29%
<i>Not easy to identify hard to reach groups</i>	23%
<i>Do not trust police</i>	23%
<i>Difficult to contact/obtain contact details</i>	7%
<i>Small population of hard to reach group in BOCU</i>	6%
<i>Do not attend/accept invitations/do not co-operate</i>	6%
<i>Language difficulties</i>	4%
<i>Time/Resources</i>	4%
<i>No refugees/asylum seekers on area</i>	3%
<i>Other</i>	9%
<i>Base</i>	70

Just under three in ten respondents (29%) find these public groups hard to reach as they do not have a direct link/contact point for them. Approximately a quarter of respondents stated that it is not easy to identify these groups and that these groups do not trust the police (23% each).

Under one in ten (7%) stated that these groups are hard to reach as they are difficult to contact/obtain contact details. Respondents also stated that they are a small population within the BOCU and these groups, once contacted, do not always attend meetings, decline invitations and do not co-operate with police efforts to consult with them (6% each).

Table 3.11: What can be done to improve this?

<i>Working closely with third party organisations</i>	23%
<i>Identifying community leaders</i>	19%
<i>Have access to contact lists</i>	17%
<i>Improve relationships / trust in the police</i>	11%
<i>Provide additional resources</i>	8%
<i>Overcome language barriers</i>	8%
<i>Conduct open days/focus groups/forums</i>	6%
<i>Provide reassurance officers</i>	6%
<i>Other</i>	9%
<i>Base</i>	53

Of the respondents who answered 'other' just under a quarter (23%) stated that working closely with third party organisations could improve contacting hard to reach groups. Approximately two in ten respondents stated that identifying community leaders and having better access to contact lists would improve consultation with these groups (19% and 17% respectively).

Approximately one in ten respondents stated that these groups would be easier to reach if relationships and trust with the police improved, additional resources were provided and language barriers were overcome (11%, 8% and 8% respectively).

Table 3.12: Which of the following methods of consultation do you use?

<i>Private meetings</i>	89%
<i>Public Meetings</i>	89%
<i>Utilising partnership events</i>	78%
<i>Informal chats with members of the public</i>	77%
<i>Letters to local residents / tenants</i>	72%
<i>Policed organised events e.g. opening stations, observers in patrol cars</i>	58%
<i>Poster campaigns</i>	52%
<i>Utilising partner resources e.g. questions in Council questionnaires</i>	37%
<i>Focus Groups</i>	36%
<i>Mail shots</i>	32%
<i>Postal surveys</i>	18%
<i>Citizen Panels</i>	16%
<i>Commission external market research companies</i>	11%
<i>Electronic surveys</i>	6%
<i>Commission Universities</i>	3%
<i>Other (please specify)</i>	7%
<i>Base</i>	151

The majority of respondents use private and public meetings to conduct consultation (89% each). Approximately three quarters of respondents use partnership events, conduct informal chats with members of the public and send letters to local residents/tenants (78%, 77% and 72% respectively).

Approximately a third of respondents use partnership resources e.g. questions in a council questionnaire, conduct focus groups and use mail shots (37%, 36% and 32% respectively).

Unfortunately the 'other' responses were too few to code but a full list of freetext comments are available on request.

Table 3.13: How frequently do you carry out FORMAL consultation with the following groups?

	More than once a week	Once a week	Once a month	Quarterly	6 monthly	Once a year	Ad-hoc	Do not consult with this group	Base
Local residents	13%	9%	27%	25%	1%	2%	19%	4%	146
Young people / children	12%	6%	10%	10%	4%	2%	37%	20%	136
Minority ethnic communities	12%	4%	19%	10%	2%	2%	37%	15%	137
Faith groups	4%	8%	15%	14%	2%	2%	29%	28%	134
Refugees / asylum seekers	3%	-	5%	6%	2%	2%	35%	48%	127
Lesbian / gay / bisexual / transgender people	2%	3%	12%	10%	1%	2%	37%	34%	128
Disabled people	2%	2%	7%	7%	-	1%	42%	40%	130
People without permanent homes	2%	2%	6%	2%	1%	-	32%	55%	125
University / college students	2%	4%	11%	9%	5%	1%	30%	39%	132
Tourists	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	21%	78%	122

With regard to local residents, approximately a quarter of respondents stated that they consult with this group on a monthly and quarterly basis (27% and 25% respectively). Approximately four in ten respondents consult with young people/children, minority ethnic groups, lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender people and disabled people on an ad-hoc basis (37%, 37%, 37% and 42% respectively). Four in ten respondents (40%) do not consult with disabled people.

Approximately a third of respondents consult with people without permanent homes and university/college students on an ad hoc basis (32% and 30% respectively), with over half of respondents stating that they do not consult with people without permanent homes (55%).

Over three quarters of respondents (78%) do not consult with tourists.

Table 3.14: How frequently do you carry out FORMAL consultation with the following internal groups?

	More than once a week	Once a week	Once a month	Quarterly	6 monthly	Once a year	Ad-hoc	Base
Reassurance Team	16%	16%	32%	5%	-	-	32%	44
Crime and Disorder Group	4%	10%	30%	24%	2%	3%	28%	78
Independent Advisory Group	3%	5%	35%	18%	2%	-	37%	60
Police Consultative Group	1%	4%	28%	49%	-	4%	15%	80

Approximately three in ten respondents stated that they consult with Reassurance Teams, Crime and Disorder Groups, IAG and Police Consultative Groups on a monthly basis (32%, 30%, 35% and 28% respectively). Just under a quarter of respondents (24%) consult quarterly with Crime and Disorder Groups whilst just under half (49%) consult quarterly with Police Consultative Groups.

Approximately a third of respondents consult with Reassurance Teams and Crime and Disorder Groups on an ad-hoc basis (32% and 28% respectively) whereas just under four in ten (37%) consult with IAG on an ad-hoc basis.

Table 3.15: Do you FORMALLY consult with any other internal groups?

Yes	35%
No	65%
Base	92

Approximately a third of respondents (35%) stated that they formally consult with other internal groups and just under two thirds (65%) stated that they did not.

Table 3.16: Currently, what is your budget for community consultation?

<i>£10, 000 or less</i>	12%
<i>£11, 000 - £20, 000</i>	2%
<i>£21, 000 - £30, 000</i>	3%
<i>£31, 000 - £40, 000</i>	2%
<i>£41, 000 - £50, 000</i>	-
<i>£51, 000 plus</i>	2%
<i>Have no allocated budget</i>	80%
<i>Base</i>	123

Eight in ten respondents (80%) stated that they do not have an allocated budget for consultation. Just over one in ten (12%) stated that they have £10,000 or less available to them.

Table 3.17: If you do not have a budget for community consultation, please specify how you fund your projects and where you source funds.

<i>B/OCU funds</i>	39%
<i>Partnerships</i>	25%
<i>Safer Community Funds</i>	12%
<i>Local Authorities</i>	10%
<i>Reassurance Project</i>	7%
<i>Use of community facilities for meetings</i>	6%
<i>No budget used</i>	6%
<i>Other</i>	10%
<i>Base</i>	89

Just under four in ten respondents (39%) who do not have an allocated budget available to them receive funds from their B/OCU. A quarter of respondents (25%) receive funds from partnerships.

Approximately one in ten respondents stated that they fund projects through the Safer Community Funds, Local Authorities and the Reassurance Project (12%, 10% and 7% respectively).

Table 3.18: Which B/OCU do you work in?

<i>Barking & Dagenham</i>	1%	<i>Islington</i>	5%
<i>Barnet</i>	1%	<i>Kensington & Chelsea</i>	3%
<i>Bexley</i>	2%	<i>Kingston-Upon-Thames</i>	1%
<i>Brent</i>	1%	<i>Lambeth</i>	4%
<i>Bromley</i>	3%	<i>Lewisham</i>	6%
<i>Camden</i>	3%	<i>Merton</i>	4%
<i>City of Westminster</i>	5%	<i>Newham</i>	2%
<i>Croydon</i>	1%	<i>Redbridge</i>	3%
<i>Ealing</i>	3%	<i>Richmond-Upon-Thames</i>	4%
<i>Enfield</i>	2%	<i>Southwark</i>	3%
<i>Greenwich</i>	1%	<i>Sutton</i>	2%
<i>Hackney</i>	3%	<i>Tower Hamlets</i>	3%
<i>Hammersmith & Fulham</i>	2%	<i>Waltham Forest</i>	2%
<i>Haringey</i>	3%	<i>Wandsworth</i>	5%
<i>Harrow</i>	2%	<i>Heathrow Airport</i>	2%
<i>Havering</i>	3%	<i>TP</i>	1%
<i>Hillingdon</i>	6%	<i>DCC</i>	1%
<i>Hounslow</i>	2%	<i>SO</i>	1%
<i>Not stated</i>	3%	<i>SCD</i>	3%
		<i>Base</i>	151

4 Conclusion

Findings from this consultation survey have produced some interesting results regarding the type of consultation that is currently being conducted in the MPS, the frequency with which people are consulting and problems that arise with hard to reach groups.

With regard to initiating consultation, requests for consultation come both internally via BOCU Commanders, Sector Inspectors and Community Inspectors and also externally from local authorities. However, requests for consultation are also initiated from local residents.

Sector teams and sector inspectors are mainly involved with the actual consultation process. The main reasons for consulting include identifying community needs, reducing fear of crime, gathering intelligence and reducing tension between the public and the police.

In terms of consulting bodies/groups, the majority of consultation takes place with local councils, businesses and authorities and also with community safety teams. With regard to public groups/communities, the majority of consultation is carried out with local residents, visible ethnic minorities and young people/children.

The main hard to reach groups were identified as refugees/asylum seekers, people without permanent homes and tourists. Many respondents found it difficult to reach these groups because they did not have a direct link/contact point and also that these groups did not trust the police. Suggestions for improving consultation with all hard to reach groups included liaising closely with third parties, identifying community leaders, having access to contact lists and to improve the overall relationships between hard to reach groups and the police. If identifiable people from each group were known and contact details available, then the majority of these groups would not be hard to reach.

The most popular method for consulting was face to face via public and private meetings. These meetings usually took place in community halls and other local venues.

The frequency of consultation with some groups does need improving. For example, consultation with disabled people, people without permanent homes, the young and lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender need to be increased as it is apparent that these groups are only consulted on an ad-hoc basis at present.

The majority of respondents do not have a budget for consultation. Funds are obtained from BOCUs and through partnerships. Therefore, the amount of funding should be increased on all BOCUs to ensure that consultation is conducted with all sections of the community and is done so in a timely manner.