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Abstract

Community safety features prominently in modern societies, particularly in the West. In the United Kingdom (UK), much emphasis is placed on the concept of “community”. Beginning in the late 1990’s, Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) were tasked with the job of reducing crime, increasing quality of life and reaching out to disengaged communities. The foremost reason for the creation of CDRPs is to encourage community discourse at the local level and to enable the community to be a part of the decision making process in matters that would affect them. However, there is very little evidence that communities are engaged; this conclusion is marred by the fact that there has been no comprehensive assessment of this community dialog and decision-making process within CDRPs. CDRPs continue to function throughout the UK despite the aforementioned shortcomings.

Inequality in public health and resources available to early immigrants, in particular Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups in the UK were as a result of racism. This manifested itself through institutional racism. Unfortunately, this inequality led to the breakdown of entire communities. The resolve of BMEs to riot over the past five decades has been an attempt to get recognition of the social injustice that they have been subject to. CDRPS would also come to include Safer Communities Teams (SCTs) created specifically to manage hate crime. This included addressing matters of racism in communities, as a result of ongoing institutional prejudice and injustice.
This paper will outline the path to social cohesion within a multicultural society as dictated under the leadership of the British New Labour government. Social cohesion has been bolstered through CDRPs using the policy framework of New Labour. This document will address social cohesiveness as it pertains to the health of a nation. CDRPs have been tasked with the responsibility to ensure safe and healthy communities. There will also be an account of the first-hand experience of the function and nature of a CDRP. This will be from an insider’s point of view; a reflection based on experience against the most recent Framework that the CDRPs are currently working towards.

Introduction

Integration in the UK has come at a price, and multiculturalism hasn’t always been embraced. For many years Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups have been subject to racist discrimination. The discrimination that BMEs face is as a result of the racist attitudes that many natives to the UK felt towards them. The political divide that developed in the UK when the first influx of immigrants arrived meant that institutional racism was an inevitable part of the problem. There were many natives, particularly in positions of power, who disagreed with the government’s immigration plans. Many felt as though the country was simply not ready for integration at the time and somehow this became a self-fulfilling prophecy as the ill treatment of immigrants to the UK ensued (McLaren & Johnson 1997).

Inadequate access to housing and jobs resulted in unfair treatment experienced by BMEs. Exacerbated by the lack of resources, the physical health and safety of BME communities
declined. These disparities were noted by public health representatives and sociologists at the time (Black Report 1980, Acheson Report 1997, McLaren & Johnson 1997).

BME communities were fingered by the police as being problematic. BMEs felt that the police targeted them just because they could. As time went on, this unequal treatment and status resulted in social unrest by way of conflict between BMEs and the authority figures responsible for maintaining social order, the Metropolitan Police (Lea, J. 2000, Jan-Khan, M. 2003).

Prior to the late 1990’s, crime and disorder was the sole responsibility of the Metropolitan Police (MET). For many years the MET police had been the quintessential “boys club”, labeled as “bigoted, racist, sexist, bored, dishonest and often drunk” (as cited in Sked & Cook, 1990, p. 353; Bleich, E. 2007). This behaviour was the result of years of unchanged autonomy. The METs lack of effectiveness was made clear by the high rates of crime being recorded across the UK by the early 1990’s. The government decided that new initiatives needed to be put in place to address the power struggle between public institutions and the community (Hughes, G. & Rowe, M. 2007).

Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) created a new structure of “accountability” by central government in the UK. Initiatives such as CDRPs were set up in order to manage social disorder and illegal criminal activity at the local level. Thus CDRPs were forged to assist the MET in their daily tasks and to reinforce regulation to which the MET and other partnership organizations would have to conform (Mclaughlin, E. 2005).
Several Home Office Reports outlined the need for stronger leadership from institutional structures. The multi-agency design was thought to have potential to be a more successful strategy in the restoration of fractured community relations. Particularly with the police, who had previously shouldered all of the responsibility (The Scarman Report 1980; MacPherson Report 1997). This paper analyzes the initiatives of the government in the UK to address matters of social cohesion via CDRPs. I will delineate the successes and failures of the CDRPs in relation to their competence in fostering social cohesion.

The health and safety of communities is imperative to the success of the country overall. There will a brief discussion of the general health dynamics of the BME population in the UK. This will establish the connection between the self-worth of an individual to function to their fullest capacity in their own life with that of being a successful participant in social cohesiveness if individual prosperity is achieved. Thus the creation of the healthy communities that the CDRPs have helped create and to see thrive is important to both social justice and attention to public health.

As a previous employee to a CDRP I have some valuable insight into some of the arguments that scholars are at present engaging in with regard to the constitution of the working CDRP. Finally, I will end the paper with recommendations of leadership steps that need to be taken in order to address community groups.

Introduction of Immigrants from British Colonies into the United Kingdom
An historical change was taking place in British society in the mid to late 1950’s. It was during this period that native communities in the UK were introduced to their colonial counterparts. For many natives, this would be the first time that they had encountered people of color. The “Windrush” era of the mid to late 1950’s bought a spate of Caribbean immigrants, many of whom had fought for the British in World War II. Soon would follow the African Indians that had settled in Uganda, but were forced to flee in the early 1970’s under the administration of Idi Amin. The early immigrants settled predominantly in cities, in the Southeast of England (a majority in London), in the West Midlands, West Yorkshire and Greater Manchester. These places make up 75% of the minority ethnic population compared to the majority population which is 25% according to the 2001 census (Owen, D. 1992; Owen, D. 1994; The Acheson Report 2007).

The British had occupied India for some years, and Indians made the journey to England shortly after the 1970’s. The BBC note that due to the decline in the economy and the subsequent lack of availability of employment opportunities in the 1980’s, immigration was restricted by the government. Shortly after the restriction of BME immigration had taken place came a wave of Americans, New Zealanders and South Africans, a majority of whom gained entry through family ties in the UK. The only BMEs to immigrate en masse after the last significant white migration were South Indians. Due to a shortage in the medical field at the time South Indians received work permits because of their specialist medical skills (BBC website).

Immigration from other commonwealth countries ensued in 2000. The fall of the iron curtain brought with it a gradual influx of Eastern Europeans. The Eastern European populations make
up the most recent group of immigrants that seek a new life in the UK (BBC website). McLaren and Johnson explained this immigration pattern which would introduce the UK to “multiculturalism” as “an unwanted consequence of the desire to retain the British Empire at the end of the Second World War” (McLaren & Johnson 2007, pg. 710).

With the arrival of more than one million BMEs in the 1960’s, increasing hostility bubbled between the British public and their new neighbors. This feeling resonated with the traditional members of British institutions including the Police and the judicial system (Bleich, E. 2007). The competition for resources is one of the facets that McLaren and Johnson identify as the cause of hostility [in the UK] to the initial wave of immigrants from the commonwealth countries. The resources competed for included housing and employment; both resources were shrinking as a result of change in Conservative government’s policies at the time (McLaren & Johnson 2007, Stenson, K. 2007). More than a decade after the first immigrants had settled in the UK the Race Relations Act (RRA) of 1968 was introduced. This was developed to prevent the persecution of BMEs attempting to enter the workforce or access public services; it also made it illegal to refuse housing (McLaren & Johnson 2007). Despite these efforts, racial inequality continued.

It is necessary to explain that the outcome of racial inequality in the UK led to rioting, on more than one occasion and in different parts of the country. Evidence points strongly to the new wave of immigrants to the UK and their protests as being the key to the inception of CDRP’s and how they have taken shape.
The Accusation of Institutional Racism in the UK

Racial tensions within the UK are well documented; many of the worst riots that have occurred on UK soil over the past 40 years have been race riots. The first recorded race riot was in Notting Hill, London in 1958. The riot was a response to the severity of an attack by the public on a Swedish white woman married to a black man (Jan-Khan 2003). It might have been the earliest recorded modern day hate crime. Some of the examples of other race riots include those in Brixton in South London (1981), Toxteth in Liverpool (1981), Handsworth in Birmingham (1985), Totenham in North London (1985), Oldham in the North of England (2001) and Bradford (2001). In addition to these race riots were the protests as a result of a racist murder of a black teenage youth. All of these incidents ultimately led to increased scrutiny of the criminal justice system in the UK (Jan-Khan, M. 2003).

In 1981 riots broke out in South London, in an area called Brixton, which is home to predominantly black people, either from the Caribbean or from Africa. The Metropolitan Police in the UK describe this event as “the first serious riot of the 20th Century.” As a result of the riot, the MET police, civilians and a majority of the country witnessed the destruction of property, vehicles, numerous arrests, and injuries to police officers (299) and civilians (65). The MET police also noted that prior to the day in question had there been “no such event in living memory” on mainland England (The Scarman Report 1980; MET police website).

The police discussed events leading up to that fateful day on their website. A special operation to “stop and search” in an area where robberies were increasing was in effect. The police acknowledged that attitudes towards them from that particular community had, “intensified the resentment of a group who already frequently protested against and obstructed police actions on
the street” (Metropolitan Police website). Lea argues that there is legitimacy in stopping and searching members of the public. However, institutional racism presents itself not by the action of a stop and search, but with the disproportionate rate that BMEs are subject to this practice (Lea, J. 2000).

As a result of the Brixton riots, Lord Scarman - appointed by the Home Secretary at the time - was commissioned by the UK government to report on the course of an “unprecedented level of radicalized riots” (Hall, S. 1999). The report suggested that “complex political, social and economic factors” were responsible for the eruption of violence. Lord Scarman found that there was racial disadvantage in Brixton where at least half of the black population were at the time unemployed, living in poor housing conditions and had no access to amenities (Lea, J. 2000, Jan-Khan, M. 2003).

By the time the Brixton riots had occurred, ethnic minorities had been in the UK for approximately 25 years. Lord Scarman’s report points to the mistrust by Blacks in Brixton in authorities to the lack of prospects that existed for them in society at the time. The economic climate of the 1980’s only heightened the hostility of the public towards the institution of government. The government’s reluctance to acknowledge the downward spiral of social order was creating additional pressures for the police, and they were buckling under them (Lea, J. 2000).

In 1991 a young black teenager was attacked by five white youths while standing at a bus stop with a friend. He was stabbed to death. A retired judge, Sir William Macpherson, and three of his advisors published a report on the Steven Lawrence Inquiry in February of 1999, eight years after the incident. Within those eight years was a relentless campaign by Doreen and Neville,
Steven’s mother and father, who fought to get justice. There was also “a private prosecution, a flawed internal review, an inquest, a Police Complaints Authority investigation and a £3 million judicial inquiry” (Macpherson Report 1999; McLaughlin & Murji 1999). The reputation of the MET was further marred in the aftermath of the Lawrence case. A young black teenager was murdered by a gang of racists. The handling of the police investigation had been “sabotaged” by a combination of “professional incompetence, institutional racism and a failure of leadership by senior officers” (Lea, J. 2000, Hall, S. 1999, McLaughlin & Murji 1999). The mishandling of the investigation led to the emancipation of five murderers. It also further reinforced the mistrust that BME communities already felt towards the MET police and institutions that had failed in their duty as “guardians of law and order” to make people safe. This mistrust rendered BMEs powerless. Thus, rioting is how such communities asserted their rights (Jan-Khan, M. 2003).

The Oldham riots in 2001 the Northwest of England were prompted by disturbances between Asian and white youths. The white youths were from a fascist far right group known as the National Front (Ku Klux Klan equivalents without the sheets). A ban was put on them entering Oldham as they planned to march there in order to incite a disturbance in a predominantly Asian community (Jan-Khan, M. 2003).

The Asian community had in previous generations been very quiet and passive, never asserting themselves in the same way that the Blacks did in the face of adversity. Those that rioted in Brixton in the early 1980’s were the first generation BMEs that were born in England at the time. By the time the riots in Oldham occurred some of the Asian communities were the second, maybe third generation born in the UK, also referred to as “British-born Diasporas”. Their passive demeanor changed after the National Front marched. As Jan-Khan observes, the angry
black men of the 1980s were replaced in the decades to follow by young angry Asian men (Jan-Khan, M. 2003).

The next section will analyze the health of BMEs and provide some background to the circumstances that create the conditions for the race riots.

Please note that ‘Asian’ in the UK is reference to East Indians or Pakistanis, not inclusive of those from the Asian Pacific. I am noting this because my understanding is that there is a cultural difference in the observation of the term ‘Asian’ here in the US.

Inequalities and the Public Health of BMEs – A Reason to Riot?

The Black Report of 1980 was a result of a Working Group set up to assess the inequalities in health in the UK in 1977. “Inequality” in the Black Report refers to man-made social or economic outcomes that can be looked at in terms of social class in which this study stratified six social classes. The working class represents the majority, and many of the BME population are in this class. The Report suggests that the disadvantage experienced by black Britons is connected with occupational class, thus reflected in the labour market. Race is rarely assessed in any official census in the UK. This is in part due to the fact that if a BME was born in the UK their ethnicity was not recorded on the birth certificate. Therefore, there is no clear indicator that could have been used in assessment for the Report, for example skin colour, place of birth, or nationality (The Black Report, 1980; sochealth.co.uk 2011).

What is known as a result of the works of the Black Report is that rates of long-standing illness rise with falling socio-economic status. The rates tend to be twice as high among the unskilled manual workers and two and a half times as high among unskilled manual females (working class) (2.69). Mortality tends to rise inversely with falling occupational rank or status for both
sexes at all ages (2.66). Geographic and social disparities are also recognized and a severity in
the underuse of preventative services by the working class is recognized. As a result of this
underuse there has been an under provision of costs (financial and psychological) of attendance
(4.42). The working classes are also less likely to take their children to the doctors (4.44) (The
Black Report, 1980; sochealth.co.uk 2011).

The inaction of the BME working classes to attend to their health may be reinforced by their
experience of institutional racism in this period in the UK. Another finding from the Report
states that the working classes make greater use of Accident and Emergency Services (A& E;
known as ER in USA). It is thought that the 24 hour access with no need for appointments and
the certainty of the availability of diagnostics draw them in. The Report questions if the working
classes attend A & E’s because they feel that they will receive good or equal treatment? (The
Black Report, 1980; sochealth.co.uk 2011)

The Acheson Report of 1997 was another independent inquiry into the inequalities in health
created in order to address social justice almost twenty years on from the Black Report. The
Acheson Report addresses ethnicity, and findings are based on cultural identity, place of origin
and skin colour so it also includes data for whites and non-whites (The Acheson Report 1997).

The findings overall from the Acheson Report suggest that there has been an increase in
prosperity and a reduction in mortality to the UK overall. However, the gap in health between
those at the top and those at the bottom of the scale has widened and those at the bottom are
more susceptible to higher rates of violence and crime and truancy (Hseigh & Pugh 1993; The
Acheson Report 1997). The Report states that the economic and social benefits of greater
equality seem to go hand in hand. Where the quality of the social environment is worst is where
financial deprivation is greatest, such as inner cities which affect a majority of the BME population.

Some examples of financial deprivation as recorded on the Acheson report include the rate of male unemployment in African Caribbean’s (20.5 per cent), and Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups (15.9 per cent) (Office for National Statistics 1996; The Acheson Report 1997). Living in poverty is defined by living on less than half the average income; statistics which include just under a third of white households, compared to a third of Chinese, two-fifths of African Caribbean and Indian households and four-fifths of Pakistani and Bangladeshi households (Modood T, Berthoud R, Lakey J, 1997; The Acheson Report 1997).

Some minority ethnic groups find that their choice of area of residence is restricted by fear of crime and harassment (Bowes A, Dar N, Sim D 1997; The Acheson Report 1997). The British Crime Surveys have shown that South Asians and African Caribbean’s are at greater risk of being victims of crime than whites. Although social and demographic factors explained much of the difference in relation to African Caribbean’s, these did not explain the greater risk of victimization for South Asians (Aye Maung N, Mirrlees-Black C 1994; The Acheson Report 1997). The inner urban areas of the UK, home to a large majority of ethnic minorities are characterized by markers of disadvantage (Owen, D. 1992; Owen, D. 1994; The Acheson Report 1997). These markers include on-street parking, higher traffic volumes and lack of areas for play, and are associated with a high rate of traffic accidents amongst children from some minority ethnic groups (Lawson S, Edwards P. 1991; The Acheson Report 1997).

The health inequalities updated by Acheson and the recommendations made resulted in the Treasury’s “Tackling Health Inequalities: A Programme for Action” (2003). Put in place by the
government, the focus of tackling health inequalities lies in addressing matters of socio-economic class and area deprivation as opposed to ethnic inequality (Parliamentary Office for Science & Technology, 2007). This may be a mistake as recommendations of the Acheson report include service specific to the needs of the BME communities as a result of their limited access to health services and to the subsequent health risks specific to them (Parliamentary Office for Science & Technology, 2007; The Acheson Report 1997).

BMEs tend to have higher rates of cardio-vascular disease than white British people in the UK, but lower rates of many cancers. Amongst some BME groups rates of ill health is far more prevalent in those born in the UK than in first generation migrants. Factors affecting ethnic health include the long term impact of migration, racism and discrimination, poor delivery and use of health care services, differences in culture and lifestyles and biological susceptibility (Parliamentary Office for Science & Technology, 2007).

Data suggests that factors including social exclusion, discrimination and urban living are risk factors operational in the prevention of BME contact with health services. Mental Illness has greater prevalence among the BME community, in particular the Black Caribbean community where diagnosis of psychosis is up to seven times higher than the White British. Black Caribbean’s are also most likely to attain assistance for their mental health through the criminal justice system as opposed to being referred through health services (Parliamentary Office for Science & Technology, 2007).

The least beneficial social conditions coupled with the institutional racism that BMEs are subject to has resulted in their over representation within the judicial and penal system in the UK. There are 18% of BMEs in the prison population compared with 6% of the general population (Jan-
Khan 2003). This statistic can probably explain the disproportionate number of male BMEs utilizing mental health services through the criminal justice system. The 2007 census in the UK reveals that it is made up of 9.9% BMEs; therefore the remaining is the general population of 90.1% (Bleich, E. 2007). The social conditions of BMEs make them vulnerable individuals that can be easily penalized and are at the mercy of the judiciary system. However, the cumulative effect of the riots over the years and the consequent reports that they have, in turn, created, is the reason that change was on the horizon (Jan-Khan 2003, Hall, S. 1999).

Bleich notes that violence sparked as a result of racism is a problem of public order like normal crimes. Racist violence is also a problem of social cohesion and to address racist violence will not only preserve public order, it will promote social cohesion (Bleich, 2007). This social cohesion is compromised by the social conditions of BME communities. The poverty and deprivation throughout such communities mean that they are unable to play an active role in civic society (The Acheson Report 1997). Over 70% of BMEs reside in the ten poorest wards across the UK (Jan-Khan 2003).

The social conditions that BMEs were subject to certainly warranted the rebellious actions taken. It also proves that race riots are less about community breakdown and youth indiscipline. Underlying factors such as economic decline, market conditions that fail to create employment, positive discrimination, institutional racism and neglect by institutions are the culprit that spurred the BME actions (Amin, A. 2005). The next section will focus on the message that the riots sent out to the authorities. The continuation of the aforementioned underlying factors affecting BME
health would not be accepted by the people in those communities, and this was eventually recognized by the government.

Policy Implementation, Realizing the Problem

The successive arguments presented by Chief Police Officers in the years that followed some of the largest riots included verbiage that since racism existed within society it was inevitable that it existed within the Police force (Hall, S. 1999). In the early 1990’s in the UK the police were unable to manage crime. It was deemed as “out of control”; the rates were high and police resources to manage the problems were low. The responsibility for the alarming increase in criminal activity that always fell to the police had to be managed. The status of crime being the sole responsibility of the police and the bad reputation that the police had among certain groups also needed to be changed (Lea, J. 2002)

As early as 1981 in The Scarman Report, it was realized that building “race relations” and gaining public trust in government institutions had to be accomplished using community consultation. I believe that the phrase community consultation is used very broadly, to mean simply that authorities need to ascertain a way of creating dialogue with communities. The implication is that links needed to be established specifically in the areas where the rights of people were in dispute. Jan-Khan confirms the lack of legitimate participation in the decision making process for BMEs, thus reinforcing the need for community consultation. However, this resolution is seriously contested as the need for community involvement is challenged by the
mistrust that has been created by powerful institutions, especially the MET police (Jan-Khan 2003, Amin, A. 2005, Rosenbaum, D. 2002).

Fountain recently conducted interviews with a few civilians in a London borough where drug problems were rife. Stopping and searching was not always viewed as being a deterrent because the extent of the drug problems was rooted in deeply violent organized crime. Some perceived that their communities were targeted not to be made safe, but to criminalize those that lived there. People perceived police actions to be abhorrent to what they were aiming to achieve. If they were looking for sources to confide in they were going about it the wrong way (Fountain, 2007).

Lord Scarman asserted that a multi-agency approach was necessary to prevent racial disadvantage from becoming an “endemic, ineradicable disease threatening the very survival of our society.” He also reported that institutional racism “did not exist” and that positive discrimination (by way of stopping and searching individuals in Brixton) was necessary (The Scarman Report 1981; Met Police website). Contrary to Lord Scarman’s report and formed some 19 years later, (well after the tragedy of the Steven Lawrence murder), Lord Scarman’s report was contradicted by findings from the Macpherson Report that indicated that racism among the MET did indeed exist.

In 1999 Sir William Macpherson re-examined the original police report from the Lawrence Inquiry and found the police to be “institutionally racist” (Home Office). The police were outraged by the accusation. The BBC, and most minorities interested in the political unrest the murder stirred at the time, referred to this crime as a racist killing, even though there was no conviction (www.bbc.co.uk). A study commissioned by the Home Office in 2005 found that one
of the main problems within the police community was their limited understanding of
“institutional racism” (Foster, Newburn, Souhami 2005).

The official meaning of institutional racism was updated from the Macpherson report as follows;

_The collective failure of an organization to provide an appropriate and professional service to
people because of their color, culture or ethnic origin. It can be seen or detected in processes,
attitudes and behavior which amount to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance,
thoughtlessness and racist stereotyping which disadvantage minority ethnic people_ (Macpherson

A little more than three years after the Macpherson Report The Police Reform Act (PRA) of
2002 evolved. It provided the Home Office with the powers that they thought necessary to
ensure that better policing practices could be enforced across the MET police (McLaughlin, E.
2005). This was a step in the direction of ‘new localism’ on the governments agenda which
would align the MET with reform occurring in other government institutions.

Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships are an example of the new “networked governance.”
Networked Governance refers to the multi-agency approach to government organization at the
local level – “new localism” (Crawford, A. 2006, McLaughlin, E. 2005). This new way of
working would involve authorities inclusive of the MET police. Redefining the functionality of
authoritative institutional structures would take the focus off of the MET police; they had
previously been an authority unto themselves. Integrated services meant a redistribution of
involvement, and therefore power, which would inadvertently affect communities in a positive
way.
Networked Governance arose from the devolution of power from Central to local governments. Devolving greater power to Local Authorities (LA’s) to make decisions in their “localities” using their “local knowledge” made them a greater resource to deliver on policy (Crawford, A 2006). It is the modernization from old to the new, a transitioning of control down to the local level.

The next section will describe in more detail the work of CDRPs and their expansion. The expansion was as a direct result of the breakdown in community cohesion. As per the Macpherson Report and the recommendations of those that came before it, the trust of communities in government institutions needed to be repaired. CDRPs were thought to be the key to building that trust and gaining the confidence in communities in order for the MET and other agencies to assist in the health and safety of those same communities.

**Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRP’s)**

The Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership is a multi-agency approach to addressing crime and fostering social cohesion in the United Kingdom. The agencies include the Metropolitan Police (MET Police), Local Authorities (LA’s [housing, education, social services, environmental services and legal services-among others, are a part of] LA’s), Probation Services (PS), The London Fire Brigade (LFB), The National Probation office (NPO) and most recently the National Health Service (NHS). This partnership is an assembly by the order of the Labour government. The idea behind multi-agency work is that it enables key agencies to share information and resources and facilitate a holistic problem solving approach to tackling crime (Phillips et al, 2002; Crawford, 1998; Gilling, 1994).
An example of the CDRP’s at work: - A house is being used as a crack den and being occupied by a local authority housing tenant with children. The problem is criminal so it would involve the police. It is occurring in a property rented by the local authority so it falls within their remit, and the suspect/s may have a history of this behavior which might imply the need for probationary services. Social services may also be called in as the matter of the children’s safety may be in question. The National Health Service will be involved and offer a drug and alcohol program to assist the individual/s.

The previous example is a simplification of what occurs, and not all services will be required at the same time, if at all. It can, and often does get far more complicated and involve more agencies and services. However, the example gives a clear indication of why the CDRP’s are, in theory, more resourceful when working together. Prior to the formation of the CDRP’s, each organization would function as an independent unit, liaising with the relevant departments as was necessary.

Hate crime includes homophobia, domestic violence, racism and anti-social behavior (the latter can also be used for complaints as a result of the three preceding it). The Safer Communities Teams (SCTs) were a structural development by central government. They were implemented nation-wide as a result of the Lawrence Inquiry to assure that race hate crimes were recognized, recorded and, where possible, perpetrators were being prosecuted (Foster, Newburn, Souhami 2005).
Safer Communities Teams comprised relatively small teams within CDRP’s that were set up to address concerns in the communities within which they served. It is thought that the introduction of the SCTs marked the beginning of multi-agency partnership working (Hughes & Gilling). SCTs were designed to address community problems; in particular those considered hate crimes, such as racism, homophobia, domestic violence and anti-social behavior. With the exception of anti-social behavior it was considered that the others were heavily under reported and systems were put in place for better case finding in order to better record such crimes. This is where the CDRP’s were being utilized.

Online reporting mechanisms and phone numbers were advertised in public spaces to encourage the community to report the behaviors that the partnership sought to reduce. This process has certainly given rise to greater numbers recorded and each year the government can address whether hate crime has increased or decreased yearly. However, repeat victimization is rarely reported and the police’s ability to act unless an individual is in grave danger is limited (The Acheson Report 2007). Thus, record keeping is a process of “ticking boxes” to appease the government when they are audited.

There is limited information as to what happens with the database of hate crime victims once it has been collected. There have been occasions when the Met police have gone into schools to address anti-bullying which may involve forms of hate crime. However, this is not a particularly useful tool in ensuring the safety of those at risk. Especially if in the instance of BMEs they are suffering from hate-crime in the neighbourhoods in which they live. Although the upside of CDRPs is that they have the power to act on such information and facilitate a move to a different
location. The success of acting on such information would require that effective information sharing exists between the partners, and from my experience this was generally the case.

The addition of Safer Communities resulted in the expansion of CDRPs and their administrative role. ‘Networked Governance’ provided the MET police in particular, with additional resources which they desperately needed to assist in their duties beyond the front lines of serving the public. This was facilitated by the structure of partnership and this new arrangement had its pros and cons for the MET Police. The MET gained additional support by way of funding and resources. However, it lost its autonomy when the multi-agency approach was implemented.

The Home Office recognized that until there was a positive change in the pattern of crime there had to be a change in the concept of language that addressed dealing with crime. A shift from “prevention” to “reduction” occurred in an attempt to address the matter (Hughes & Rowe, 2007). The language change to “reduction” in crime was a practical one, the government was working toward targets and the statistical data would indicate if a reduction was occurring. No change or an increase in crime rates resulted in re-assessing tools to manage the problem. If after an intervention of self-assessment the targets were not being met, funding was reduced or withdrawn. This approach is applicable to the CDRPs, not just the MET police.

As a result of the multiagency approach, the police role morphed from a somewhat authoritarian role to that of a community liaison role. Thus the White Paper of 2004 (Building Communities, Beating Crime) outlined the future of Problem Oriented Policing (POP). This was achieved in accordance with the guidelines that stipulate greater accountability to democratic structures that
provide greater visibility to the communities that they serve (Bullock and Tilley 2003, McLaughlin E. 2005).

The MET police was receiving a make-over. They were the main focus for the government as they remained on the front line and had the ability to have open dialogue with those that they served: the public. Progressive measures were being taken by the MET, and embracing the liaison role versus the authoritarian role aided in communication with the public. There was an increase in dedicated neighborhood policing teams to engage communities in local priority settings (McLaughlin E. 2005). Adopting new working techniques, which included greater analysis and problem solving at the local level, were also steps towards making the MET more accountable (Barton, A. 2008).

Please note: local authorities are similar to the ‘Five Boroughs’ of New York, London has 16 boroughs comprised of roughly 22 million people. The authorities are defined as local government (local authorities [LA’s]), joint authorities or police authorities (source: office of public sector information).

The Language of Inclusion Leads to Exclusion:

The language of the Safer Communities refers to “inclusiveness” within their strategies, thus incorporating social-cohesion among the disabled, women children, BMEs and the LGBT community. The idea of local communities have transcended into global communities. Words like “inclusive” and “diverse” is being used more aggressively throughout policy as a means to engage the disenfranchised. People of interest that CDRP’s wish to engage in order to reach their targets, are those of who are perceived as being most at risk of falling prey to their environment (Amin, A. 2005).
An unexpected outcome of New Labours policy which emphasized “diversity” and “inclusiveness” has left the natives of England (white Britons) feeling neglected. Is it possible that this small minority has been subject to exclusion as a result of the governments will to create “diverse”, “balanced” communities?

In certain places in the UK turmoil is never far where matters of race are concerned. The opportunity “for a politics of nativist vengeance” has presented a further challenge to the work of identifying and addressing hate-crime in the UK (Hughes & Rowe, 2001). This can be seen in the political realm of British life with the rise of “The British National Party” (BNP - from the far right). From a baseline of 3,022 and with 17 candidates in local elections, within an eight year period, BNP support has risen to 300,000 votes for 754 candidates at the 2007 local elections. As the influx of the most recent immigrants continues into Britain, the support for the BNP continues to grow. As Wilks-Heeg correctly asserts, “this is a warning of the urgent state of local democracy in England” (Wilks-Heeg, S. 2009).

The question is has there been an error in identifying who the disenfranchised really are? Do 300,000 people make up a significant community? Some of the policies that the British National Party seek if they were to gain democratic power in the UK could include the abolition of anti-discrimination laws and the abolition of the Human Rights Act (Wilks-Heeg, S. 2009). Hall addresses the circumstances in which young white males have been drawn to the BNP. They too find themselves in poverty, without prospects for employment due to low educational attainment. The new BNP comrades are thought to feel a “deep sense of national shame and dispossession” (Hall, S. 1999 pg. 193). This has led young white working class men to believe that poverty of whites is as a result of their having to share resources with blacks (Hall, S. 1999).
It has been noted that the 300,000 people voting for the BNP are people who are voting for racism. The rise in the BNP was inevitable. After all, the cracks had begun to show some twenty years earlier in Brixton. In order to win support in neighborhoods where the police were losing ground, extra measures were taken to right certain wrongs. The support that the CDRPs provided led to the disharmony of many who felt/feel that they were neglected in this process.

The march of the National Front that sparked a riot in the town of Oldham in 2001 is an example of those that not only wanted to create racial disharmony, but felt that they too had been wronged. The young white (majority males) marching behind a fascist façade sought the same legitimacy for white working class youths who were just as alienated as their black/Asian counterparts (Jan-Khan 2003).

McLaren & Johnson’s empirical findings suggest that race is less of an issue in the UK than is the issue of the customs and values that an individual asserting themselves as British display. This is relative to the perception that being British means that you need to be white rather than black or Asian. The challenge of leading diverse communities becomes apparent. This is the point that the government drives at, ensuring that policies delivered through social cohesiveness will be based upon shared values and a celebration of diversity (McLaren & Johnson 2007).

The unrest in the UK is evident in the number of race riots that have occurred over the last thirty years have been some of the worst in the country’s history. In an effort to address the problems of social cohesion upon which the foundations of CDRP’s lay, where does the responsibility sit and can the CDRP’s serve as the conductor for this unrest? Who will acknowledge the newly disenfranchised? Rioting was the response from the BME community as a direct result of intentional inequality and deliberate discrimination by institutions in the UK. My premise here
is that alienation is familiar to the poor in British society, those who are socially and economically disadvantaged. That now includes the newly disenfranchised (white Britons), who do not suffer the consequences of neglect by default of race, but suffer just the same. Risk factors for BMEs are the same risk factors for poor whites. By no means have I suggested that one cancels out the other, but social cohesion is in the best interest of all, not just the few. CDRPs could therefore best serve society by recognizing that the approach that needs to be taken to deal with each group’s individual needs has to be sensitive to that particular group (Hall, S. 1999).

Just as the riots are an outlet for people to vent their frustrations when their basic rights are being denied, joining the BNP is an outlet for the natives of the UK who feel the same way. Instead of them realizing their powerlessness in the same fashion as BMEs by the act of rioting, whites have found a way to get acknowledgement through a legitimate means. By joining the BNP, a political unification takes an immediate effect; and social cohesion and a newly formed alliance are occurring.

CDRPs are unable to serve as a conductor for the newly disenfranchised. Purely from the perspective of not having resources at their disposal; they would be unable to manage. It should also be recognized that in modern democratic society, non-majority parties such as the BNP are not considered as a real threat and are therefore not taken seriously. The government relies on the “rational”, “educated” and “tolerant” members of a society to be the majority. Thus we need to heed the urgency in the state of British Politics as outlined by Wilks-Heeg earlier in this section.
One author that tends to disagree with the assertion that criminal activity is limited to communities is Tilley, who suggests that that it extends beyond the boundaries of neighborhoods thus making strategy aimed at prevention in such settings “impervious to the cause” (Tilley, 2000). Conceptually, CDRP’s view their immediate localities as the areas for change and progress, based on both the policy from central government instructing that there are boundaries which also have implications on resources (or lack thereof), but theoretically Tilley’s assessment is one of accuracy.

Multiculturalism or imagined forms of “multicultural intimacy” - as per sociologist Fortier - has given rise to new forms of separatism in the UK. Fortier argues that emotional unity of embracing one another and loving thy neighbor is unrealistic, and therefore the policy of community cohesion is not viable in communities where geographical boundaries and proximity somehow bound people, both physically and emotionally (Anne-Marie Fortier, 2005).

The argument for Fortier is that the government has created an ideal through its policies that British society is unable to conform to, pointing to issues of difference as the culprit. Whereas Claire Worley believes that it is through the discourse of “community” that language becomes de-racialized, a method through which considerations to policy can be made without naming the communities because it is clear who they are (Worley, C., 2005).

An individuals’ need to have his/her own identity creates a sense of belonging can be conceptualized through issues of race, ethnicity, culture, gender, religion and socioeconomic status; this in itself is recognition of the importance such factors. The BNP could be considered a “relativist community”, and as Tilley suggests, defies the boundaries of “locality” (Tilley,
2000). As unity is sought through their common goals, proximity does not reduce their ability to organize.

If the problems of recognizing disenfranchised among the UK population weren’t already difficult enough, CDRPs role of managing fear of crime also encompasses managing the threat of terrorism. The role of keeping people safe has expanded in the wake of tragedy that sadly highlights BME communities. Thus the new threat disrupting social cohesion is no longer the conflict with institutions of government, but the community itself.

Fear of Crime and the Expectation of CDRPs

The Safer Communities Team delivered policy that outlined the importance of keeping people safe and that included addressing fear of crime, which in some Boroughs is perceived as higher than crime rates actually are (Home Office website).

The way that individuals and communities form their beliefs with regard to crime, generally speaking, is as a result of the regularity that crimes appear in the media. As noted by Jan-Khan, the media seized the opportunity to misrepresent the words “Islam”, “militant”, and “fundamentalist” which led to yet another uprising of a small Pakistani community in Manningham, Heaton (2003). The foundations of Anti-social behavior stem from marginalization. Thus, the beliefs formed are based on the view point that structures need to be put into place in order to address the problem (Innes et al 2002, in Millie and Herrington, 2005, Hughes & Rowe, 2007).
Problems identifying communities include the local as the global. The multiple natures of identity means that communities of a “local” physicality can themselves remain a part of “global Diaspora populations.” An example of this could be the Muslim community who identify first with Islam and second the space in which they live locally, thus resulting in multiple networks and split loyalty (Anderson, 1983; Stenson, 2005).

Terrorism is now a remit of the Safer Communities Teams and their focus is on “prevention.” One would be hard pressed to find a scholarly paper that addresses community safety without it mentioning post 9/11 and the impact that has on communities (usually negative). After 9/11, the fear that many individuals had in the UK, became a reality on the 7th of July 2005 (known as 7/7) when terrorists linked to Al Qaeda bombed public transportation including the underground and a bus. This was to further skew the problems that CDRPs were to address, within communities that had their own structures for networking that focused around their places of worship. Such places had previously been left to their own devices, until 7/7. In order to prevent people becoming terrorists or supporting violent extremism, CDRPs are tasked to roll out educational programs and engage the support of mosques, communities, colleges and universities. A national security forum was also set up comprising members of academia and all realms of government (local and central) (Roger, C. & Coliandris, G. 2008)

Muslim communities became places of interest for CDRP’s. It was now the CDRPs position to “engage” with a community, many of who functioned outside of mainstream society. That is to say for example, that an education does not have to be received through the institution of the national school system. People within the UK are free to educate their children at home, and specific groups including, but not exclusive to, Muslim communities can provide a religion
based education as an alternative to mainstream schooling. Such communities remain isolated from the mainstream in order to strengthen their own foundations and preserve their way of life.

In the UK it became protocol for the MET police and community police officers to establish links with mosques and to have greater police presence in communities which had previously gone undisturbed. The reasons are twofold. The first is because they are the population, from which the terrorist attacks occurred which, in effect, makes anyone from that community a potential suspect. The second is that these communities were susceptible to attacks from members of the public who associate the Muslim population as potential terrorists.

Many of the terrorists attended mosques and lived and worked in these communities, therefore they are the threat and the threatened much like those identified by Raco (Raco, 2007). It resulted in natives to the UK attacking people they perceived to be a threat that did not include Muslims alone. If you were brown in skin tone, and wearing garments from a culture that was not the familiar Western way of dressing, you were at risk of an attack. Many Sikh’s and Sikh temples were randomly attacked. CDRPs were facing new problems as hate crimes increased around the time of the terrorist attacks.

Terrorism it is not a new concept in the UK. The IRA has been responsible for many bomb blasts and deaths; a few incidences found their way over to England and were just as devastating as the occurrence of 9/11 – if only on a smaller scale. It is not completely irresponsible to assert that the frenzy of the media resulted in fear mongering among those willing to listen. Attaching fears from 9/11 to immigrants, Islam, and general “foreign-ness” only aid in strengthening the resolve of natives to UK to turn to parties like the BNP. For some in the Muslim community, a
retreat in the comfort of living among their own communities helps to avoid public persecution and serves as a hiding place.

In light of the fact these atrocities are occurring all over the world and the fact that British born Muslims are voluntarily participating in such atrocities only accentuate how disengaged people are among our communities. According to Levin, conversely, New York City is one of the few places where there are better police-community relations in the aftermath of 9/11. While the UK has adopted policy to manage integration which has, in certain parts of the UK been accepted, places like New York have been working on engaging and shaping their diverse communities for over 150 years (Levin, B., 2007). Could it be that the main problem for the UK is that of time and a lack of experience? This is a possibility; we only have another hundred years to go in the UK before we can make a like for like comparison! However, I believe that the positive community response to the police is because terrorism poses a new threat, and it affects populations indiscriminately. Thus people are brought together when a tragedy takes place, and public empathy and support for the authorities at the center of the devastation was high in the aftermath of 9/11.

“In the Name of Partnership”- 2009 National Support Framework for CDRPs

Partnerships determining local solutions for local problems suggested that the government were experimenting with a bottom-up approach when the Crime and Disorder Act (CDA) 1998 came out. However, the legislation that crept in as time elapsed became more dictatorial. It would seem that the government credited partnerships with more knowledge than they ever exhibited (Gill and Schuler 2007). Increasing legislation, (the 2009 National Support Framework for
CDRPs is a prime example) was necessary for partnerships that did not have the experience to carry out the objectives in the CDA.

Within the document for National Support Framework, it is noted that “tighter resources” and “new challenges” would require action that is “anchored in strong community engagement”. However, the purpose of the framework is to ensure that partnerships seek to improve their own performance, that they should seek to be “self-improving” and where possible use the necessary tools to assess the partnerships strengths and weaknesses. The document is a guide to the delivery of the six hallmarks identified (see below). It provides an overview under each subheading of the qualities that would contribute to “good partnership working” and resources those CDRPs can seek guidance from when they need it most.

Within the renewed National Support Framework for the delivery of Safer and Confident Communities in 2009, there is a recommendation that six “Hallmarks” which are characteristic of good partnership work are to be taken on, as follow; (Home Office website).

(1) Empowered and Effective Leadership

(2) Intelligence Led Business Processes

(3) Engaged Communities

(4) Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures
(5) Visible and Constructive Accountability

(6) Appropriate Skills and Knowledge

This document is focused on making sure that the “partnership” organizations are functioning as per the government’s expectation. Obviously the partnerships have to work in order that the needs of the community are met responsively. It is in this section that I will apply my practical experience as a Project Manager/Finance Officer within a SCT on one of the London Boroughs (gained between 2003 and 2007) to the expectations of the partnership framework that has been laid out for 2009. The discussion will focus around hallmarks 1), 3), 4) and 6). I have discussed 2) and 5) to some extent with regard to the MET police and their practices previous.

I worked on the ground with many of the projects and I understood their challenges, frustrations and the pressure that they faced. I was employed directly by the local government, my salary came from central government funding and I was based in a Metropolitan Police head office. The product of the multi-partnership and armed with multiple roles (because of the limitations of resources and insight) I had the benefit (or disadvantage as the case may be) of witnessing, the dynamics, bureaucracy and agendas of those responsible for making communities a safer place to live.

1) Empowered and Effective Leadership
The Metropolitan police and local authorities take a top-down approach to their leadership. From a partnership perspective this can and has resulted in a lot of head butting. I often found that I had to be neutral because my role was central to the work among both organizations. As noted in the review of “Round One Progress” report by the Home Office which assessed audits of SCT’s, some of the problems that occur within partnerships is that there is an unequal contribution of work that is taking place through the process (Phillips et al, 2002). The network of representatives from many organizations contributing financially and emotionally to sustain and manage the limited resources within the borough is very important in achieving sustainability.

Most decisions on my team were based on a short term outcomes; “quick wins”. There was very little long term planning because funding was year-to-year and the local government did not know what would be in their pot from one year to the next. However, part of the failure in strategy was overlooking their ability to fund resources outside of government funds. There was an absolute refusal to commit to salaries outside of the budgets that were provided by central government. This compromised their strategies because if somebody left the fold, on such a small team they would have serious problems delegating and therefore planning in accordance with the set strategies. As noted by Bullock, Farrell et al., the continuity of project leadership and management is crucial in order to maintain interest and commitment to projects that may not have yet come to fruition or ones that need championing in the following fiscal year (Scott, 2006).
In order that empowered and effective leadership be achieved, the partnership has to make its
SCT a solid functioning cog in the wheel of the CDRP. Measuring the equality of each
organization at the table is a difficult thing to achieve. Clearer lines of communication and
openness can often change the dynamics of a working group. The willingness of one person to
carry out a request or execute a task should prompt the support of others. As an act of “fairness”
in meetings that follow, the gesture should be reciprocated by an alternative organization to the
one that opted to go the time previous.

However, part of the problem with a partnership is that each organization holds loyalty to its own
individual organization before it does to the partnership. Much like the concept of split loyalty
within communities, there is split loyalty within partnerships and each organization has its own
agenda. The hallmarks of partnership working are necessary because the government recognizes
this division which is perhaps most detrimental to the work that they are trying to achieve.

2) Intelligence Led Business Process

This element of the Framework corresponds with the process of analysis of the local landscape
of crime and disorder. This is referring to work of statisticians and the ability of the MET and
LA to work efficiently to use robust information sharing protocols. I am not as well versed in
this area of work; it is a specialist area and specific to those involved who are few and far
between. The MET had one individual who shared police information with partner-
organizations. In the notes reviewed on behalf of the Home Office from the first round of
funding, it is suggested that they found information sharing to be a common problem (Phillips et
al 2002). Maguire (2004, p.223) asserts that partnership difficulties of information sharing were cultural problems that stem from “agencies for whom crime was not a focus of their mainstream, activities” (Maguire, M. 2004).

3) Engaged Communities

The governments’ wish to have “meaningful involvement” by engaging the community, the third party sector and advocates are unlikely to be as successful as they would like. CDRP’s are top-down organizations. It is suggested that there will be cultural barriers to this approach of delivering policy because of an unequal power distribution and the dominance of the authorities involved (WHO 2006). The evidence on effectiveness of empowerment to improve health document guidelines written by the WHO, it is expected that organizations aim to construct “empowered communities”.

The 2009 Framework outlined by the Home Office in the UK assumes an unequal power distribution. Its language of “empowered leadership” exemplifies that it works to the benefit of the organizations involved, not to the communities. It also indicates that there is weak leadership which will negate the objective of engaging communities in the first place. It also deflects from the mission that is to successfully tackle the problems within the communities using the support of the communities.

There is an ambiguity regarding the concept of “community”. According to Clarke …“communities” are contested and changeable constructions (rather than naturally occurring
entities’ Hughes & Rowe, 2007, Clarke, 2004). Schofield went as far as suggesting that due to the nature of third way policy and with the creation of the ‘actors’ to deliver them, the discourse of community requires literally “making people up” (Schofield, 2002, Hughes & Rowe, 2007). In my experience Schofield’s suggestion is completely accurate. Part of the problem is that communities are not equipped with the skills necessary to be involved in managing the requests of the CDRP. This results in the selection of projects that may meet targets but with the aforementioned “made up” community members.

The inadequate resources of CDRPs and SCTs mean that policy is adhered to somewhat loosely. That unfortunately means that targets can be achieved by a means most convenient to CDRPs, and that does not always mean proactively engaging those communities that need it most. That is to say the “made up” actors are those in society that have a working knowledge of accessing funds, writing bids, and overall ability to fill a void that CDRPs are not resourced to manage. Rosenbaum argues that it is only people from “prosperous” communities that are engaged and take on an active role (Rosenbaum, D.P. 2002).

4) Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures

Both the Metropolitan Police and the Local Authority are very large organizations. Things can get lost in large complex systems; this not only includes the work being carried out but also the people that work within it. The latter point is more evident in local authorities than in the police, this can be attributed to the police forces organizational structure. It is very clear who does what within the police system. There are direct lines of reporting and workloads do not cross over into
other areas of work. The aspect of partnership working in my case that was truly successful was being located in a police station and away from the local government.

When I left my department four years ago, the Safer Communities team was managed under the Corporate Governance arm of the Local Authority. It is a politically led organization and the strength in this is leaders have to be accountable at some level, supposedly to the people in a democratic society. There is a lack of consistency within the upper echelons of my organization, not just due to turnover, but work load. This was further complicated by the fact that I had three managers in four years, only one of which was ever competent in the role. The problems of inconsistency for a group of people with that many changeovers are the cause of strain for all involved, the team that is being managed and the partnership. Often, new leaders come in and in order to assert themselves in the role (because nobody wants to be the new kid) they implement unnecessary changes to validate themselves within the organization. Such changes make for ineffective and unresponsive delivery structures.

This is just as complex a matter within the police force; I worked with four Inspectors in as many years. I found that within the police organization, a career means that you have to keep training and moving between departments (especially at the Inspector rank). My opinion is that this is a great method for keeping a content work force and actually investing in them. The problem however, is that the Safer Communities Team was not a great career move for a police Inspector; it was just a stop on their way where they were going. The Inspectors are supposed to serve three years in a new role before being moved, I can only guess that having four Inspectors in as many years gives weight to my observation. I also had an Inspector that was due to retire, I was
told that the reason he was with us was because he was due to retire. So while it is a functional role for the police to serve in at the ‘leadership level’, it doesn’t appear that it was high on the policing agenda at the time. That does not mean however that working relationships were not good; I think that the police were far more responsive to my requests than were the local authorities and I always appreciated working among them because they were accessible and easy to communicate with.

The demands and expectations of LA’s exceeded their working knowledge of CDRP policy deliverable to central government and it was an all-out war for power. Within the local authorities a lot of the time members of a team shoulder the burden of a large work load and are tasked with additional duties at a whim. The hierarchical nature of the MET police meant that rank was a determinant of power, so members of that organization did not vie for power within their own organization. The evaluation of multiagency crime partnerships in the USA describes an absence of leadership in partnerships as partners seek to avoid a “power grab” out of respect for other group members (Rosenbaum, D. P. 2002). There are clear culture differences working here between Rosenbaum’s assertion of US and my experience of the UK. It was far easier to work within the MET than as part of the local authority. The cohesiveness of the unit is paramount to the successes trying to be achieved in the communities.

5) Visible and Constructive Accountability

Barton argues that the tools of keeping the partnerships accountable are Evaluation and Audit. The funding that both the MET and the LAs receive has been increasingly audited as a means of the government ensuring compliance. “Best Value” is the term being applied to the system of
rolling out audit to ensure that public services are delivering core services by the most economic, efficient and the most effective means possible (McLaughlin E. 2005). The notion is that auditing is an optimal measure for self-regulating professional autonomy (Barton, A. 2008). The devolution of power from central to local governments explains the “professional autonomy” to which Barton is making reference. Micro-management (or audits) is a visible reminder that CDRPs must fall in line with the governments’ expectations or face the chopping block and have funds reduced or withdrawn.

Evaluating community partnerships have also proved to be problematic. An attempt to evaluate three community alcohol prevention programs in Scotland, England and Wales concluded that none of the partnerships organizations facilitated the collection or evaluation of statistical data. This crosses over into other areas of partnership work and as Mistral and colleagues duly note, long term funding for both interventions (projects) and evaluation are necessary. Evaluations would provide clearer evidence of how well a particular project worked, and to evaluate what could be done differently if a similar project was selected again (Mistral et al 2008). Bullock and Tilley (2003) recognize that within the police process of POP that there is also an inattention to and weakness of evaluation (Bullock, K & Tilley, N. 2003).

There really is no other way of knowing of the intervention made a difference or not. Rosenbaum suggests several basic forms of criteria that evaluations should be judged by.

a) Are they responsive to the needs of the stakeholders?

b) Are they relatively unbiased in terms of producing reliable and valid results?

c) Are they trustworthy in terms of controlling for confounding factors? And
d) Are the findings generalizable to conditions, populations and problems beyond the immediate setting? (Rosenbaum, D. P. 2002).

A point that I would like to make from my experience is as follows:

There is no way that partnerships would spend time investing in a good design, theory or a way to measure interventions. I believe that validity between the role of research and evaluating partnerships is without a doubt, necessary. However, without the resources in place to assist in such complex tasks this will not be an option in the UK.

Evaluations were not carried out in the time that I held the role as Project Manager at the CDRP that I worked for. The reason given was a lack of resources, time and financing. I can attest to this being true. I think that government should make it a priority to utilize researchers like Bullock and Tilley within the Home Office to be at the disposal of CDRPs to provide instruction on the helpfulness of evaluation.

6) Appropriate Skills and Knowledge

In the notes from the audits that were reviewed on behalf of the Home Office from the first round of funding, it was found that organizations had contracted out the audits because they felt that the data and analysis skills of the team were inadequate to carry out such a task (Phillips et al, 2002). I was a Finance Officer and a Project Manager and I compiled the audit files for internal and external auditors for 3 consecutive years. The non-commitment of resources to support roles
within CDRPs is astounding. This is not to say that my experience is typical of the situation that I found myself in.

Fortunately for my organization I had the ability to learn the skills that I needed in order to complete the assigned tasks including audit successfully. The SCT that I served on was a small team; we each had a workload that was doubled due to under staffing and willful neglect of management. I actually had to request a double title for my role as I felt it I had a right to be acknowledged for the work that I was doing and I wanted the partnership to recognize it, too. Identifying my needs to support the partnership did not occur, and my role was never clearly defined, hence the duality of the role.

Reduced resources and partnership employees carrying double workloads has a direct effect on the communities that we are obligated to serve. If my role as Project Manager was carried out to its full potential, I could have been a resource disposable to the community. This might have included teaching them the skills that could help them to gain funding and acquire the skills necessary to manage a project within their neighborhood. An example of the skills that I am referring to might include, writing and submitting a bid, creating expenditure sheets and listing resources or how to write a basic report for feedback to the partnership. I think that was what was intended by the role, it was certainly a requirement among the ‘hard to reach’ groups that were being targeted.

Discussion
There are an increasing number of disenfranchised individuals in the UK. As explored in this paper, the disenfranchised groups were initially those from the BME community who suffered directly at the hands of institutions created to protect and make them safe. Newly emerging groups from the general population have sought consolation by up taking with political organizations in the wake of their perceived marginalization. These groups have formed alliances with political parties with far right affiliation (BNP) that seek to “take England back”. This discontent has the potential to create further complications in the government’s quest for social cohesion.

I would argue that those joining the BNP are actually voting for “placism” not “racism”. The newly disenfranchised want some assurance about where they belong in the picture and they are unsure. CDRPs are indirectly responsible for such outcomes as emphasis is placed on targeted community groups, whether that be assisting them or monitoring them. The ambition of the government to appear fair and inclusive has created an imbalance of perceived power in the favour of the BME population which has resulted in undue friction among the general British population. There really is no U-turn where this policy is concerned, and the subject of terrorism only further adds fuel to the fire in the debate about security and safety in the UK.

CDRP’s are an attempt to strengthen the ties between the police and the community and re-shape the roles of LA’s around the country. The function of CDRPs is to “engage with communities” and it is assumed that this will occur where health and social problems are worst. Decision making with regard to “prioritizing” communities is supposedly a needs based assessment; however, the reality is that this matter is one made at the discretion of the CDRP. There is little
guidance from the government with regard to how community involvement is sought. Therefore, there is little evidence required from LA’s to prove that consultation with the public exists.

Communities appear to be random creations by CDRPs that facilitate and justify the work of CDRPs which is demanded of them from central government. Communities are determined by CDRPs and their interpretation of policy from central government will differ from region to region. The lack of identity of these communities can result in a certain freedom that CDRPs have to create results in order to meet their targets. The lack of external evaluations to prove the productivity of the CDRPs or the work and communities that they are engaged in make it difficult to identify or understand the problems that CDRPs face.

I would assert from my experience that there are serious problems in engaging “hard to reach” communities. The options for CDRPs without the resources to seek out and engage the “hard to reach” result in CDRPs settling for organizations or groups in the local area who are accessible, available and willing to comply with the rules. This often includes places of worship like churches who offer their space for youth programs. However, this will not attract the integration of youth from different religions, nor will it attract those youngsters who are already notorious repeat offenders.

It does not look like the structure of CDRPs will take on a bottom-up approach, although it does appear to be the initial expectation that the Labour government set out to achieve at the outset. Some of the most successful projects that influence the lives of individuals in their communities and inspire them to take control in their environment have a bottom-up approach. This can be
seen in examples of Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR), which offers the tools and guidance that communities need to educate and enable them to partake in decision making around issues that will affect them. However, the basis for most of the problems within CDRPs appears to be at the organizational level, hence the Framework that seems to exist more for the benefit of the cohesion of the partners than that of the community. Certainly issues of resources (manpower) and consistency in leadership fell short.

Despite new efforts on behalf of the police to re-engage with communities and appear more approachable, the CDRPs remain a weak link to the community. It is my opinion that the barrier that exists is relative to the communities’ perception of figures of authority as keepers of peace and safety, and as vessels to maintain social order. The long and disharmonious history that the MET police have with BME communities has certainly not disappeared over night. There are continual reminders of police “slip ups” through the media as they adjust to their new sanitized role and attempt to leave what were their social norms behind them.

I think that the leadership steps that need to be taken to address attending to communities include use of a “middleman”. There are a number of community leaders and organizations that do have access to hard to reach groups, particularly in inner cities. My aim would be to use the Project Manager in a CDRP to work alongside an “outsider” to the partnership who may be an established member of the community. The individual does not need to have roots in that community in order to distribute resources in a fair and equal manner; that would be the job of the Project Manager.
The main criteria for the individual would be that s/he had working knowledge of the criteria outlined in policy to meet targets. I would not aim to make targets out of the community. There is a lot of data at the disposal of LA’s and the Police that are not always well utilized, and attempts to literally map problems in a given locality could be better used. The middle man would serve as a neutral person reporting issues to the CDRPs and delivering policy as it is intended, not to the advantage of any one organization within the partnership. This would also reduce the self-importance of those partners who suffer from big egos and small ideas.

I am aware that some of the restrictions in the decision making process include the limited time within which CDRPs have to decide upon the yearly intake of projects. CDRPs are also given an unreasonably short notice period of their perspective yearly budgets. Given this expectation year after year, my recommendation would be to initiate work with groups early on. While this provides no guarantee to projects that they will be funded, at the very least the partnership could be prepared for the possible successes in the year ahead. While a little forward planning may be a little time consuming and perhaps resource heavy, it may actually transpire into an investment in people – the community.

I would add that local government look at the big picture and refrain from gaining quick wins by frivolously spending down on funds on projects where the outcomes are that much harder to measure. We could have greater quality in the selection of projects which could improve the overall performance of the borough in terms of the sustainability of the projects that it selects as opposed to throwing money at projects each year with no follow up.
I think that the partnership working is the key to resourcing more in the community with less. I would encourage opportunities to expand this market and encourage enterprising civilians to invest into the fold. This would not only create greater transparency in the local government, but also create greater satisfaction in the minds of the people in the community. While I don’t think that this would necessarily encourage loyalty, it would definitely boost morale.

Just as a final thought, The Met police, among others, are making cultural changes to their organization as a way of modernization, although some may think that their hand has been forced as an end result of cases like that of Steven Lawrence. I think that such measures are an important part of reconciling differences among people as a method of gaining new confidence in an old institution. It is also important that BMEs are recognized for their role in modern society as proud and accomplished people. What is evident as a result of this paper is that equal access to resources in society assist in the creation of social cohesion, and resources need to be made available and accessible to all; from health care to education and employment.
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Glossary of terms

A & E – Accident and Emergency (USA – Emergency Department)

BMEs – Black and Minority Ethnics

BNP – British National Party

CBPR - Community Based Participatory Research

CDA – Crime and Disorder Act

CDRPs – Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships

LAs – Local Authorities

MET – Metropolitan Police

POP – Problem Oriented Policing

PRA - The Police Reform Act

RRA – Race Relations Act
SCT – Safer Communities Team

**Glossary of Reports**

Scarman Report 1981 – pertaining to the Brixton riots

Macpherson Report 1999 – pertaining to the Lawrence Inquiry

The Black Report 1980 – pertaining to Health Inequalities in the UK

The Acheson Report 1997 – pertaining to Health Inequalities in the UK