Technological University Dublin

ARROW@TU Dublin

Dissertations   Social Sciences

2011-9

Partners Against Crime A Review of Partnerships in Joint Policing Committees

Dermot Harrington
Technological University Dublin

Follow this and additional works at: https://arrow.tudublin.ie/aaschssldis

Part of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons

Partners against Crime

A Review of Partnerships in Joint Policing Committees

A thesis submitted to the Dublin Institute of Technology in part fulfilment of the requirements for award of Masters (M.A.) in Criminology

By

Dermot Harrington

September 2011

Supervisor: Dr. Matt Bowden

Department of Social Sciences, Dublin Institute of Technology

Declaration

I hereby declare that the material which is submitted in this thesis, towards the award of the Masters (M.A.) in Criminology, is entirely my own work and has not been submitted for any academic assessment other than part fulfilment of the award named above

Signature of Candidate _____

(Dermot Harrington)

Date _____

Acknowledgement

Firstly, I must thank my supervisor, Dr. Matt Bowden for his ongoing support and encouragement right up to the end, his valuable input kept me on the right track.

The academic staff in the Dublin Institute of Technology Mountjoy Square, who provided me with the opportunity to undertake a Masters in Criminology.

I would like to thank the research participants for taking the time to contribute and for their honesty and trust.

My fellow students, for their support and advice throughout the months of researching and writing the dissertation.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Sheila and my family for their patience and encouragement throughout the year and without whose practical support, I could not have completed this thesis.

ABSTRACT

Recent developments of policing in Ireland have seen a shift towards local crime prevention initiatives through local partnerships. The principle aim of this study is to explore the effects of the partnership model of policing with the recent introduction of Joint Policing Committees (JPCs). This dissertation seeks to examine the opinions of members of JPCs towards this model. The research employed a qualitative methodology obtained through semi-structured interviews of JPC members and observational studies. In addition, this thesis reports on literature regarding partnership, security and governance in modern society.

While this research project found that informal partnerships between An Garda Siochana and Local Authorities existed prior to the formation of JPC, since their establishment, partnerships have become more formal and accountable. There is strong evidence to suggest that elected representatives were slow to fully engage in the partnership model of policing, the councillors were against community representatives involvement on JPCs as they were 'not elected'. The councillors felt that local authorities and Gardai attended JPCs meetings to answer councillor's questions and report to them. They did not view their role as part of policing partnerships, working together with other agencies to find solutions. Research found that the main strength in the JPC model was local Policing Fora's which were based in local communities. These foras were less formal in structure and involved real community participation, which dealt with local policing issues. It is important for JPCs to establish a system of communication to inform residents of development in relation to the policing of their local area.

The principle conclusion has revealed that all participants agreed that the JPC model of partnership is the way forward for policing. This model is capable of developing and involving other agencies, as well as the community in the policing of their local areas. There is a constant need for ongoing monitoring to facilitate the evaluation of Joint Policing Committees processes. In summary it is hoped that this research into the partnership model may be the catalyst for more extensive research to be carried out in the future.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1.1 Context

Policing Partnerships are a feature of the governance of crime and security in, late modernity. This has developed for the different forms of risk, uncertainty and instability in modern society and the way it is perceived, which has resulted in a rethink of the techniques of policing, security and social controls. This study seeks to examine policing partnerships in Ireland, where Joint Policing Committees (JPCs) were established recently in each local authority area as a result of enabling legislation in An Garda Siochana Act 2005.

The researcher intends to carry out the study by exploring the experiences and perceptions of JPC members from the various agencies involved. The aim of the study is to establish if the partnership approach to policing is successful, and secondly to examine community participation in the process.

The methodological approach is one of theory construction, where the aim is to build theory through observation and interview.

1.2 Rational for the Study

The establishment of Joint Policing Committees in legislation resulted in a major change within An Garda Siochana as an organisation, where senior officers are now required under legislation to attend regular JPC meetings, present a report on policing of their area of responsibility and answer questions relating to it. They are also obliged to work in conjunction with other agencies in partnerships to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour. This is a major challenge especially for officers who would not have been community oriented or used to sharing Garda information.

Policing is changing and with limited and reducing resources, a 'thinning blue line', the state police are unable to carry out the policing function on their own. The local authority is regarded as a key partner in the successful operation of JPCs by taking steps to prevent crime and anti-social behaviour within their area of responsibility.

1.3 Organisation of Chapters

In chapter 2, the researcher will conduct a review of the literature relating to policing, partnerships and the governance of security in modern society. The researcher will examine partnership models in other jurisdictions and existing policing partnerships in Ireland prior to the introduction of Joint Policing Committees. The researcher will also review the JPC guidelines and codes of practice and the little research that has been conducted into the operation of JPCs since they have been established

Chapter 3 with outline the research methodology implemented and the rational behind its selection. The research approach employed qualitative research by way of semi-structured interviews of a sample group of individuals from different agencies who are on Joint Policing Committees. Research by means of observational study was also carried out by the researcher through attending at a JPC meeting, in which he observed proceedings to familiarise himself with the process. The fact that the researcher is employed by one of the agencies on the JPCs was also considered by the researcher. The data obtained during the interviews was analysed, which consequently informed the findings.

Chapter 4 has the findings of the research outlined and discussed in conjunction with relevant literature, comparing and contrasting finding with other research conducted, while Chapter 5 contains the conclusion and recommendations relating to the study.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter the researcher will examine the reasoning behind the introduction of Joint Policing Committees, the legislation that enacted them and the guidelines and codes of practice established for the effective operation of JPCs. The researcher will examine the limited research that is available since their introduction.

The researcher will examine policing partnership models in other jurisdictions as well as partnership models in Ireland prior to the establishment of JPCs. The researcher will examine the models of partnership, policing and governance of security in modern society.

2.2 Background and Context for Joint Policing Committees

In 1999 the Dublin North Inner City, Community Policing Forum was established to develop a co-ordinated strategy in response to drug dealing and anti-social behaviour in that area of Dublin. The Community Policing Forum provided local residents with an opportunity to raise concerns with representatives from An Garda Siochana and Dublin City Council. It also provided for these agencies to respond to the concerns and to account for their activities. This Forum proved to be a successful partnership model (Connolly 2002).

In a report, the National Crime Council recommended the setting up of a partnership model to allow for the development of a more holistic approach to crime and crime prevention in which expertise, knowledge and resources can be shared. They concluded that successful responses to crime are beyond the competency of any single agency (National Crime Council 2002).

In drawing up legislation, the government would have been aware of the Patten report of policing in Northern Ireland which was published in 1999. The report was described as,

'the blueprint for modern policing worldwide' and a model for reform, due to its focus on accountability and community involvement in policing (Mulcahy 2006). The reports overriding view of policing, is one where the police are seen as partners with the public in the joint production of safety and security.

The Tribunal of Inquiry into complaints concerning some Gardai of the Donegal Division, known as the Morris Tribunal was established in 2002, subsequence reports published by the Tribunal resulted in the most significant reforms of An Garda Siochana since the foundation of the state. The Garda Siochana Act 2005, was described by the Minister for Justice at that time as *'the most powerful piece of legislation relating to An Garda Siochana in the history of the state.'* Section 36 of the act provided for the establishment of Joint Policing Committees (JPCs) in each local authority area.

2.2.1 JPCs and Guidelines.

The purpose of these committees is to provide a forum where local authority officials and senior Garda officers, with the participation of Oireachtas members and community interests, can consult, discuss and make recommendations on matters affecting policing. Section 36(2) of the Garda Siochana Act, 2005 sets out JPCs function which is, to serve as a forum for consultations, discussions and recommendations on matters affecting the policing of the local authority's administrative area by keeping under review levels and patterns of crime and anti-social behaviour and also the factors underlying and contributing to them. They can also advise the local authority concerned and the Garda Síochána on how they might best perform their functions. JPCs can also establish in consultation with the local Garda superintendent, within specific neighbourhoods of the area, local policing fora to discuss and make recommendations to the committee concerning crime and anti-social behaviour in so far as those matters affect their neighbourhoods.

The first JPCs were established on a pilot basis in 2006 across twenty-nine local authority areas including Dublin City Council. Following an internal review of the pilot phase, guidelines were issued on the 28/09/2008 to all local authorities enabling the establishment of JPCs in all one hundred and fourteen local authority areas throughout

the country. These guidelines together with a code of practice (appendix 1) outline the function, composition and operation of JPCs in accordance with An Garda Siochana Act 2005. The Local Authority is highlighted as a key partner in the operation of JPCs, as Section 37(1) of the Garda Siochana Act 2005 states,

A local authority shall, in performing its functions, have regard to the importance of taking steps to prevent crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour within its area of responsibility.

The guidelines also provide for the establishment of local policing fora's in each of the Local Authority areas. The internal processes for local policing fora's are similar to those for the JPCs, but to the greatest extent possible, more informal. It is envisaged that there would be a number of local neighbourhood fora within each JPCs area.

The chairperson of each JPC is a local authority elected member and has a term of two years as chairperson. Meetings are to be held in public, members of the public and the media are allowed to attend JPC meetings. Agendas and minutes of previous meetings should be circulated in advance of a meeting. Non-members may be invited to attend and speak on a specific agenda item. The JPC code of practice states that JPCs are intended to be a forum for discussion and a means of building confidence and trust, thereby bringing communities together through a process in which all participants feel comfortable. Each JPC, may establish a maximum of three sub-committees for a specific period to deal with specific issues. The number of members of each JPC is set by the number of elected members of the relevant county, city or town council.

The code of practice states JPCs should be strategic, set priorities and be action oriented. It highlights the requirement for training, regarding the role and responsibility of members and the spirit of partnership. It also highlights training for chairpersons of JPCs as they are seen as having a central role in the efficient and effective conduct of meetings.

At the time of writing, JPCs have been established in 109 of the 114 local authority areas throughout Ireland. Not later than three months after the end of a calendar year, each JPC must submit to the local authority a report on the performance of its functions during the

preceding year, supply a copy to the Minister for Justice, Minister for Environment and the Garda Commissioner.

2.2.2 Garda review of the workings of JPCs

In considering the official Garda position in relation to JPCs it must be remembered that JPCs were established by legislation and therefore An Garda Siochana is mandated, as are other agencies to carry out its functions in relation to JPCs. An Garda Siochana have shown their commitment to JPCs by including in their Strategic Statement 2010-2012 entitled 'Working with our communities' an objective under the heading, 'Ensuring a peaceful community', committing themselves to.

Engage directly with communities, to understand and respond to their concerns and to ensure a peaceful and safe environment for everyone and also to work in conjunction with Joint Policing Committees and local fora to development partnerships.

In 2007 An Garda Siochana set up a National JPC Monitoring Office under the control of the Chief Superintendent based in community relations and community policing. The national monitoring office functions is to co-ordinate and advise Garda members regarding ongoing policy development, as well as managing a database of contact details and record general information regarding JPC meetings countrywide.

Most recently in 2009, the National Garda monitoring office conducted a survey of senior garda officers involved in the JPC process regarding the workings of JPCs. Of the 85 survey forms distributed, 29% were completed and returned. The results showed;

> ➢ 92% stated that JPCs were effective ways of developing inter-agency relationships.
> ➢ 80% agreed that community issues were best deal with through the JPC process.
> ➢ 50% felt that community groups were actively engaging in the process.
> ➢ 50% stated that JPCs had no set action plan for the year ahead.

The recommendations from the analysis of the feedback were;

1. Develop a programme for senior Garda Officers to provide necessary skills to operate successfully within the JPC framework.
2. Monitoring office should exchange good practice with all JPCs.
3. Department of Justice and Department of Environment in partnership with the Garda monitoring office should formalize meeting structures to ensure proper oversight of JPC standards and that legal requirements under Section 36 of An Garda Siochana Act are complied with.
4. That the Garda Public attitudes survey should include questions relating to JPCs with a view to understanding public prospective of their impact and development.

(Garda National Joint Policing Committees Monitoring Office, 2010)

2.3 Partnerships and Community

Community and Partnership is very much the ethos of the newly established Joint Policing Committees. The researcher is locating the literature review in the ongoing debate in the crime literature on crime prevention, safety and the governance of security. Thus the sections to follow will explore issues surrounding community, partnership, neighbourhood watch, community policing, governance of security and the late modernity shifting of emphasis from police to policing.

2.3.1 Community

Crawford (1998) states that community has become the policy buzzword of the 1990's. He outlines a dual understanding of community, as both a shared locality and a shared concern or sense of community where the prevailing idea that crime results from a failure or breakdown in community life. This is reflected in the 'broken windows' theory (Wilson & Keeling 1982). Minor issues like anti-social behaviour if left unaddressed, may spiral into bigger things and become crimes, this occurs when the community does not care enough to insist upon core normative standards of behaviour (Wood & Shearing 2007). Community is viewed as a social and moral good in itself, as well a means of achieving certain policy goals. With increasing social fragmentation and disenchantment with public institutions, community appears to offer alternative. Crawford (1998)

highlights the elasticity of the term community, which appears to offer attractive means of recreating cohesion across a fragmented society. Braithwaite highlights the failure of the Criminal Justice System, which in practice fails to deter or correct criminals from re-offending. He advocated a system of restorative justice, which calls for a de-centring of the police role, while ensuring that communities play a central role (Braithwaite, as cited in Wood & Shearing 2007, p48).

2.3.2 Partnership

The partnership approach has been one of the most dramatic developments in crime control policy in recent decades all over the world. Society has broken away from the vision of the public depending on the police, to a new model of partnership and shared responsibility. In many societies the development of partnerships has now become a pre-requisite before public funding is made available. Partnerships go to the heart of what is meant by community safety. It is now accepted that crime prevention and community safety lie beyond the competency of one single agency (Crawford, 1998). Partnerships in policing may be defined as the police taking a proactive leadership role in bringing various community groups and other agencies together to focus on crime and community disorder problems. McLaughlin (2007) described this as the re-conceptualising of policing as a 'service' and the re-designation of the community as 'customers' whose needs are prioritized.

In recent years there has been major changes governing the regulation of crime, with more of a focus on prevention, community and partnerships (Crawford, 1999). Institutions, which previously saw crime control as outside their concerns, have joined the fight against crime. The old established Criminal Justice Institutional framework has shifted to crime prevention and community involvement. Crime control now involves a multi-agency partnership approach made up of statutory, commercial and voluntary bodies (Hughes, 2007).

In late modernity, there has been an increase in crime and disorder, with a breakdown and fracturing of the social order in countries throughout Europe. Community safety has become a significant concern for governments, with local partnerships now seen as the

primary means of delivering community safety politics. Crawford (1998) describes where a 'juggernaut' of globalisation has challenged and uprooted many of the previously taken for granted certainties of social relations. There is limited capacity for state action and new politics of community safety is concerned with quality of life issues.

In modern society individuals' concerns about social change, personal identity and safety, require issues to be dealt with at a local level. Hughes (2007) describes how the insecurities of late modernity, increase the risk and fear of crime, which in turn lead to demand for a law and order politics. The emergence of crime prevention methods to reduce crime was introduced in the 1980's when the crime rates began to rise. Since then methods to reduce crime and more importantly the fear of crime have become high government priority. In recent years crime research has been associated with other issues, such as social problems, education and health, requiring a local partnership approach to address these issues.

Up to recently in many countries including the USA and the UK, more police and more prisons were seen as a solution to increasing crime. Researchers have concluded that crime rates have not been significantly altered by the efforts of the criminal justice system and the most promising methods for reducing crime levels are to be found in preventative efforts, particularly at community level. In modernity, it has been realized prevention and control of crime and insecurities are no longer regarded as the sole responsibility of the police. Garland (2001) discusses the 'strategy of responsibilisation' where the government promotes active involvement of other actors and agencies in prevention and control of crime and insecurities.

2.3.3 District Policing Partnerships in Northern Ireland

One of the most authoritative reports on police accountability and engagement was the Report of the Independent Commission on Policing for Northern Ireland (1999), commonly known as the Patten Report. Of relevance to this research was the call for the creation of District Policing Partnerships (DPPs) stating that *'policing should be decentralised, and that there should be constant dialogue at local levels between the police and the community'*. It envisaged that the DPPs should be advisory, explanatory

and consultative in nature. Their primary function is to bring policing closer to the community, to give people a say on local policing issues to help make communities safer and policing more effective. Mulcahy (2006) highlights how the report focused on policing rather that 'the police' and sought to promote a broad-based vision of how safety would be ensured, beyond traditional police-centred activity. It considered new partnerships and networks, of which the public police would be only one part. This is a fine balance, as research suggests that the core practice of policing remains the maintenance of social order and in crisis situations this dominates over good community relations.

The Patten reports recommendations were criticized by all political parties in Northern Ireland. When the Police (Northern Ireland) Bill (2000) was published, there had been many changes made to the recommendations in the original report. Shearing and Johnston (2003) stated that the report had been undermined everywhere with many recommendations diluted. Mulcahy (2006) is of the view that although all the recommendation contained in the Patten report were not fully implemented, it represented a fundamental shift in the institutional landscape of policing, one that also impacts on police-community relations in significant ways. Ryan (2008) in a review of the partnerships is of the view that DPPs are functioning in a manner comparable with Patten's participatory vision and now with the participation of Sinn Fein, the policing structures are more inclusive. Finally the Patten report has been acclaimed as a model for reform in the future due to its extensive focus on accountability and on community involvement in 'policing' in it's broadest sense (Mulcahy, 2006).

2.3.4 Neighbourhood Watch

Neighbourhood Watch Schemes were first established in Ireland in 1985. It is still as relevant today in reducing opportunities for crime and in building safe and sustainable communities; this is achieved by people in the community working in close co-operation with Gardai. Neighbourhood Watch promotes community participation and good citizenship, by encouraging communities to adopt a quality of life approach through partnership, teamwork and good neighbourly relations, which reduces the impact and fear of crime. Neighbourhood was re-launched by An Garda Siochana with the publication of

a Neighbourhood Watch Handbook (2007). Although Neighbourhood Watch in numerical terms has become the most successful crime prevention initiative, Shaftoe (2004) highlights two significant problems. Firstly, its popularity is mainly in areas with comparatively low crime rates; and secondly, the schemes have high attrition rates, starting off with considerable activity and then petering out to no more than a name and a number on the police's crime prevention statistics. Research has shown that neighbourhood watch had little success in achieving a reduction in crime; it did address the communal fear of crime and produced greater levels of trust and confidence in relations between the public and police. Various other schemes developed as a result, business watch, campus watch and school watch.

Research by McKeown & Brosnan (1998) found the majority of schemes were organised and co-ordinated by older people from middle class areas where there was little crime. In high crime urban areas neighbourhood watch was not introduced and was in fact regarded with suspicion, if not stigma in many of these communities. The research found that scheme organisers have a view of community policing which requires a greater willingness by the Gardai to share information and to be more open and supportive. A survey of Gardai showed they had a positive attitude towards neighbourhood watch schemes, believing they are effective in achieving their core objective. Neighbourhood watch schemes are more likely to be successful in low crime, organised, and homogeneous communities that perceive themselves as being under threat from outsiders. Neighbourhood Watch schemes serve a purpose in helping people feel more secure and improving relations with An Garda Siochana, but evidence shows that in order to establish and sustain Neighbourhood Watch, Garda assistance and support is vital.

2.3.5 Community Policing

Critics of community policing such as Gordon (1987) have argued that community policing is an attempt at surveillance and control of communities by the police, under the guise of the police offering assistance. Although the argument is cynical, it highlights past perception of community policing. Traditionally, the contacts police have with the public tends to be reactive and conflict ridden, leaving a relationship which has little space for consent. Recent developments in community policing seeks to improve

relationships between police and the community, placing much greater emphasis on working for and with local communities, and downplaying the extent to which policing is a set of activities imposed upon communities. Consequently community policing became not a single concept, but a catch all phrase for a variety of organizational strategies aimed at improving the quality of service provided by the police.

Crawford (1999) provides a useful outline of Weatheritt's (1993) three characteristics of community policing. Firstly, the greater use of foot patrols and the posting of police to geographic areas for which they have continuing responsibility. Secondly, the development of partnerships in crime prevention and finally the establishment of structures and processes for consultation with local communities about their policing priorities and problems.

While there is agreement that police officers on foot beat provide reassurance and reduce the fear of crime, statistics shows that the public are no less likely to be a victim of crime. A new initiative under the umbrella of community policing is the idea of police as 'problem solvers'. This emanated from the work of Herman Goldstein (1990), he described it as 'problem-oriented policing' where police look for connections and patterns, with the aim of finding lasting solutions to ongoing problems. Similar policing strategies focus on dealing with prolific offenders, repeat victimization and hotspots policing. Reiner (2010) describes good local policing as finding out what residents are worried about, tackling it and telling people what has been done.

2.3.6 Benefits of the Partnership Model

For the police to perform their constitutional role of maintaining law and order, they need the help of the community, if they are to develop a service-oriented approach which responds to community needs. The police are dependant on the community for the reporting of crime, and they need community co-operation for the investigation of crime and also for its successful prosecution. In order to secure this co-operation, they need a good understanding of communities and also the trust of these communities.

The basis to establish a proactive and meaningful partnership must be the recognition by all participating agencies, that they have something to gain by working together. They must recognise their joint responsibilities, with each agency making a contribution to combating crime with the principal of finding local solutions to local issues. A successful partnership requires the following; an equitable distribution of power between all agencies; mutual trust, honesty and a sharing of information and views; as well as the involvement of local government at local level. The local authority as the provider of a range of services that has a direct impact upon the causes of crime, such as education, housing and recreation, has a major role to play. Oakley (2001) suggests successful partnership models are about three things, valuing each other, sharing and equal power. Successful Partnerships recognise that to provide public service effectively it involves not only valuing and respecting all sections of that public, but working together with them on an equal basis to achieve that goal.

2.3.7 Problems with the Partnerships Model.

Terpstra (2008) carried out research into local security networks operating in the Netherlands, where the police, local government and citizens are the main participants. She concluded that full participation is achieved only to a limited extent. While the local community police have a positive attitude towards co-operation, the police itself see participation as a secondary role, they concentrate on their core business, which has more measurable outputs and fits more with real police work than participating in local security networks. The research shows local government as having a bureaucratic and legalistic attitude and paying too much attention to formal procedures. They have too many separate departments, which lack co-ordination and are in competition with each other. The role of citizens in the networks is also a concern, some see it as just a frequent and pleasant social meeting, while others are seen as troublesome with their own personal agendas. Participation of citizens is hampered by a range of problems, like conflict of interest between different groups of citizens, problems of limited representation and the lack of resources and information.

Problems with partnerships have been discussed by Crawford (2007). He highlights the issue of trust, where there is a mutual suspicion between personnel from different

agencies who may have different strategies. Power relations are a central aspect in the study of inter-agency networks, the police and local authority by their size and structure can try to assume lead positions and use the treat of withdrawal.

2.4 Governance of Security

In many Western European countries the level of crime today is much higher than it was during the 1950s and 1960s. In these 'high crime societies' (Garland, 2001), crime and insecurity have become major concerns to large numbers of citizens. It is no longer just the national governments and public police that have sole responsibility for community safety. In recent years there has been a shift in crime control practices away from police towards policing and more broadly from government to *governance* (Loader & Walker, 2007). The states role is now more in setting up strategy frameworks, while local governance through partnerships is tasked with delivering policing on the ground. There are different models of community justice and the best model depends on factors in the community, the model has to fit the needs of the community (Clear et al., 2011).

Governance is defined by Braithwaite (2000) by the fact that individuals and non-state organisations are configured as active participants in their own government and increasing governance involves the reshaping of institutions in ways that encourage individuals to regulate themselves. Zedner (2004) defines security, as being protected from threats or danger, a subjective feeling of safety. The pursuit of security is not always compatible with, and must be balanced against other valued social goods such as liberty and privacy (Shearing & Johnston, 2003).

Growing demands for policing and security has outstripped the resources of public providers. There has been a rise in private policing which relates to the expansion in mass private property where citizens increasingly live, work and shop and socialize in commercially owned and governed spaces. This gives owners the right to exclude, which has major implications for the powers of private governments regarding their control over citizens. Commercially owned spaces are concerned with promoting safe and amenable environment for the better-off, therefore the working class are more likely to be subject to active exclusion (Loader & Walker, 2007).

McLaughlin (2007) also refers to the postmodern consumer society driving the growth and influence of private security and mass private property, where loss prevention is enforced by compliance and exclusion rather than the traditional methods of punishment and censure. They create secure and controlled environments where self-regulation is promoted. Loader and Walker (2007) cite Markell (2003:181) when referring to inequalities between rich and poor as a 'relationship of privilege and subordination'. Shearing and others put forward a more relaxed view about the rise in gated communities and other risk managed security practices, while they prioritize a strategy that strives to include poor communities by providing them with resources to enhance their own security rather than seek to 'dismantle or attenuate the privilege itself' (Loader & Walker, 2007).

In modern society, contemporary social life is increasingly organised around attempts to predict and prevent future harm by situational crime prevention methods of minimizing opportunities for crime, and increasing the risks of being detected. This has resulted in the displacement of crime from wealthy areas to disadvantaged neighbourhoods, where there is an increasing likelihood of a further expansion of offending and incivilities.

There has been a change in policing priorities to problem-oriented policing (POP) in attempting to forge solutions to deep-seated problems of which crime and disorder are merely symptoms (Goldstein, 1990). Society is moving away from National Institutes of Criminal Justice and towards new methods of crime control, community safety, harm reduction and risk management through multi-disciplinary organisations (Hughes, 2007). 'Nodal' governance best captures the way government is now undertaken in contemporary society, where the state has become but one 'node' among several now engaged in the governance of security. The state is no longer the main player in efforts to control crime but part of a security network of state, commercial and lay actors, the state is doing less 'rowing' as in delivering policies on the ground but more 'steering' as in setting strategic frameworks (Shearing & Johnston, 2003). With nodal governance, as you move through different space, you are governed by different sets of state and non-state agencies (McLaughlin, 2007). A disadvantage of this type of governance is that poorer communities may be unable to avail of the same type of policing and security

resources that more economically advantaged groups can access. There is a need to empower local communities to build their own security arrangements and to draw upon local capacities and knowledge. Loader, as cited in Wood & Shearing (2007) suggests the establishment of 'Policing Commissions' to co-ordinate and monitor the range of bodies involved in policing and security provisions. They would have a statutory responsibility to ensure that all citizens receive a fair share of policing services. The JPCs would have a similar oversight to ensure that all citizens are treated equally regarding the policing of their locality by the national police force.

2.4.1 Moving from Police to Policing

The researcher feels that it is important in the overall context of the research to define the concept of policing. Shearing and Johnston (2003) defines policing as activities, which aim to provide assurances of peace and security to subjects, while security is defined as the presence of protection and promise of future absence of risk, stating that policing is by no means the prerogative of public police. They go on to state that security is a social practice that involves a network of numerous actors from civil society, arguing that state-centric approaches fail to protect the marginalized. Policing is about the provision of security more than it is about enforcement of law and control of crime. Their aim is to reduce fear, disorder and incivility and to take account of community feeling in setting enforcement priorities. The reforms proposed by the Independent Commission on Policing for Northern Ireland (1999) reflected the view that policing has become increasingly 'multilateralised' and performed by a range of providers and are concerned with shifting the emphasis from police to policing. This approach to policing would be similar to the stated aims of JPCs as outlined in the guidelines.

The primary location of policing lies in civil society, rather than in the state. The state police are valuable for their law enforcement role and capacity to be bandit-catchers, but crime prevention and community safety is the role of civil policing. Johnston (2000) quotes Shearing (1994:143). 'We should be doing community policing by taking the police out of community policing'. Similarly, there is not a purely policing solution, to the problem of crime and the fear of crime. We should not be advocating more policing but find a method to dissolve the demand, by developing initiatives from other areas of

public policy to enhance safety. Those who provide security have a stake in the enlargement of public fear and causing dangerous excesses in policing.

Mulcahy (2006) refers to the 'new beginning' in Northern Ireland, where the purpose was to remove policing from politics. The Patten report recommended a commitment to 'policing' rather than 'the police' by focusing on the activity rather than the institution. Shearing & Johnston (2003) believes the Patten reports template for 'nodal conception of governance' as significant, where policing is to be decentred and provided by and regulated through a network of 'nodes' or organisations in which the public are actively involved. The full reforms as outlined in the Patten report, with the idea of the nodal governance model were never fully implemented. Loader & Walker (2007) have criticized this model decisive shift away from a state-centred framework of policing. They highlight the key set of continuing regulatory, allocative and coercive intervention roles for the state in shearing's model which indicates important areas of overlap. They also argue for the public provision of security, describing it as a 'public good' which is hard or even impossible to produce for private profit. Security cannot exclude the less well protected areas, as it will contribute to ghettoization and social marginalization.

The public police cost a lot of money yet their effectiveness is limited. Reiner (2010) view is that policing is a socially necessary function, but state structured police bureaucracy is not. In the current economic climate, they must been seen to give value for money, as they face competition. To this end the commission on policing in Northern Ireland recommended that the policing board control a security rather than a police budget, implying that the police would be required to compete for contracts within a policing market (Wood & Shearing 2007). Globalisation and localization have increasingly stretched public policing, resulting in increasing cases of public dissatisfaction. This results in 'security' ceasing to become guaranteed to all citizens by a sovereign state, it then tends to become a commodity, which, like any other, is distributed by market forces rather than according to need (Garland 2001).

Bayley (1994) whilst asking the question, what is it police should be asked and expected to do? He describes 'Honest law enforcement' as police stating that they alone are unable to provide primary crime prevention and they still do old fashioned policing, which

consists of authoritative intervention, symbolic justice, traffic regulation with some administrative responsibilities. Whereas 'Efficient law enforcement' involves the reallocation of resources to work with communities by developing problem-oriented policing methods, targeting hot spots and repeat offenders. Morgan & Newburn (1997) states the police depend on public trust, co-operation and assistance regarding the public's knowledge of incidents and identity of offenders. He goes on to call for a public debate on policing, stating it is too important an aspect of public policy to be left to the police as it is fundamental to our quality of community life. It is important that police have knowledge about their communities and their different needs; this can be achieved through methods of engagement and consultation.

2.5 Summary of Chapter

To summarise, the literature outlines that crime prevention and community safety is no longer regarded as the sole responsibility of the State and the State Police. Policing partnerships are now a feature of crime and security. It is important that local communities are empowered to build their own security arrangements and draw upon local capacities and knowledge through a model of network governance at local level to develop crime prevention and community safety and avoid social marginalization.

The researcher is now moving to develop his methodology to examine policing partnerships in Ireland with the establishment of Joint Policing Committees, by exploring the experiences and perceptions of JPC members from the various agencies involved.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

3.1 Introduction.

This chapter presents the methodology used to answer the research question regarding the partnership approach to Joint Policing Committees (JPCs) and how they contribute to the governance of security. Little has been written on the topic, as the majority of JPCs have only been set up recently following legislation enacted in the Garda Siochana Act 2005. JPCs were established as a forum for consultation, discussion and recommendation on matters effecting policing of the local authority area.

As the research question relates to relationships and communication between different stakeholders a qualitative research strategy has been chosen. This is in the form of semi-structured interviews with members on JPCs. This chapter presents the methodology engaged during this study. The chapter commences by outlining the research approach and design, then the sampling and analysis methods are explained and reasons for their selection justified. Ethical considerations of the research question are also discussed.

The methodology chapter aim is to create an understanding of the types of research methods employed to produce a comprehensive and trust worthy piece of work that addresses the research question posed in this thesis. It aim's to eliminate ambiguity and clearly outline the methods used to gather results.

3.2 Research Approach and Design

Cohen & Manion (1994) describe methodology as a range of approaches used in research to gather data, which are to be used as a basis for inference and interpretation, for explanation and prediction. This research was carried out by using a qualitative approach, by means of semi-structured interviews with experienced members of JPCs. Neuman (2003) says that qualitative research is appropriate when the research question involves

learning about, understanding or describing a group of interacting people. Each interview consisted of open ended probing questions. May (1997) states that interviews yield rich insights into people's experiences, opinions, aspirations, attitudes and feelings. In a semi-structured format, the interview is more than an interesting conversation, the author needs certain information and methods have to be devised to attain that information if at all possible. The respondents were allowed the freedom to talk about what is of central significance to them, but the interviewer ensured all topics were covered by guiding and focusing the interview.

Bell (2009) discusses the advantages and disadvantages of interviews, one of the major advantages is its adaptability, in that the interviewer can follow up on ideas, probe responses and investigate motives and feelings, which a questionnaire can never do. On the other hand interviews are time consuming and with constraints one can only interview a relative small number of people. It is a highly subjective technique and there is also a danger of bias in Cohen's words, 'like fishing, interviewing is an activity requiring careful preparation, much patience and considerable practice if the eventual reward is to be a worth while catch' (Cohen as cited in Bell 2009 p.157).

This research project aims to develop theory during the data collection process. The research built theory from the qualitative research, around the theoretical framework of security and governance. Punch (2005) describes question asking as being at the heart of interviewing, it is important the way questions are delivered, their sequence, the wording that is used and type of questions asked. May (1997) states the importance of the design of interview questions in that to construct them unambiguously and be clear in ones own mind, what the question is for, who it is to be answered by and how you intend the interviewee to interpret it. By using semi structured interview methods the author asked specific questions and was able to seek both clarification and elaboration on the answers given. This allowed the author to probe beyond the answers and enter into dialog with the interviewee.

By conducting interviews, it enables face-to-face discussions with human subjects, which facilitates a rapport between the interviewer and the interviewee and allows greater flexibility of coverage. It is a good way of accessing people's perceptions, meaning and

construction of reality. Punch (2005) describes interviews are one of the most powerful ways of understanding others. The questions posed were open ended, where the interviewee were asked to provide their own answers. Probes were used to elicit responses where a sufficient response was not received initially. The researcher interpreted the data by giving it meaning, translating it and making it understandable. At all times the researcher was aware that meaning given must be from the point of view of the person been interviewed.

3.3 Sampling

The author selected participants based on a non-probability sampling approach. The method of sampling was purposive sampling, by targeting people who were knowledgeable about the subject being studied. The reason the author had selected members of JPCs was because they were the best people to produce the most valuable data. Neuman (2003) quotes Flick (1998) regarding qualitative researchers *'it is their relevance to the research topic rather than their representativeness, which determines the way in which the people to be studied are selected'*. Cohen & Manion (1994) highlight that while this may satisfy the researcher's needs to take this type of sample, it does not pretend to represent the wider population and it is deliberately and unashamedly selective and biased. The target groups within JPCs were senior Garda officers, local authority officials, local councillors, and local community representatives. This was seen as giving a cross-section of views from the various agencies that make up JPCs. Marshall & Rossman (1995) describes this as elite interviewing as it focuses on persons who would be considered influential and well informed.

3.3.1 Collection of Data

The interviews were conducted at a location suitable to the interviewees. For the purpose of accuracy, the interviews were voice recorded using a dictaphone. By recording interviews, it allowed the researcher to concentrate on the conversation and the recording of non-verbal gestures of the interviewee. It also guards against interviewers substituting their own words for those of the person being interviewed. The researcher must

remember that the interview is about data collection so relevant information can be obtained for coding and analysis.

Neuman (2003) describes multiple forms of data recorded during the various stages of qualitative research. The first form is collected from listening and observing during the interview. This leads to the second form, which is recorded data, either by sound, visual, or note taking. The third form is the analysed data, which involves sorting, classifying and coding the recorded data.

A number of individuals sitting on JPCs were indentified from different agencies. A personal letter outlining the nature of the study and requesting their participation was sent by e-mail to eight persons. Six agreed to participate, one was not available and there was no reply from one. The researcher then contacted them by phone and agreed a convenient time and location to meet. The researcher interviewed the majority at their place of work. The researcher was conscious of portraying a profession image and was well dressed when meeting these professional people. The researcher was also aware of the need to build a rapport and gain the trust of the research participants, one did this by being polite and explaining the purpose of the interview and addressing any concerns before commencing the interview. One of the participants was known to the researcher as they had worked together previously.

Before the interview commenced, informed consent was obtained from the participants by asking them to sign a copy of the letter they had received outlining the purpose of the research. Confidentially was assured and the researcher indicated that any information provided which may identify the participant will not be divulged to any other party. This was emphasised to encourage the participants to be open and frank in their answers during the interview.

After completion of the interviews, the researcher did observational research by attending at a JPC meeting. Five of the participants were in attendance at this meeting. The researcher's reason for attending at the meeting was to validate evidence gathered at the interview stage. The researcher should be aware of the dangers of bias or misinterpretation, in particular when you are researching in your own professional area.

Your role is to observe and record in an objective way as possible (Bell 2009). The researcher prepared in advance, permission was obtained to attend and the researcher was as unobtrusive as possible. The researcher recorded details of interactions between individuals as well as the nature of their contributions, with a view to present the information observed and comment on its significance.

3.4 Analysis

In analysing the interviews, the researcher selected what is relevant and pieced it together to create tendencies, sequences and patterns. Structured and semi-structured interviews are preferred because of the greater ease of comparative analysis. Neuman (2003) refers to analysis of data as involving inferences from the empirical details of social life. It involves passing a judgement and using reasoning to reach a conclusion based on evidence. All researchers identify multiple process, causes, properties or mechanisms within the evidence. In general data analysis means a search for patterns in data, recurrent behaviour, objects or a body of knowledge. Researchers have to be careful in the course of data analysis to avoid errors, false conclusions and misleading inferences. Researchers using qualitative research methods rarely know the specifics of data analysis when they begin a project. They begin the analysis early in the research project, while they are still collecting data. The results obtained from early data analysis guides subsequence data collection.

Regarding the observation study of the JPC meeting, the researcher analyses the results, as regards the formalities, chairperson's controls as well as the contribution and interaction of those present. The researcher should also report on the influence of certain key members of the group and the effect on the way the meeting and discussions are conducted and decisions reached (Bell 2009).

3.4.1 Coding of Data

Bell (2009) describes coding as a method of clustering key issues in the data, which allows you to take steps towards drawing conclusions. Coding is a general term for conceptualising data; it includes raising questions and giving provisional answers about categories and their relations. The data is indexed under toppings and headings and

searched for key phrases and regular words. Neuman (2003) describes a number of steps in coding, the first being open coding, which is an attempt to condense the data into categories which helps to bring themes to the surface. Axial coding follows this, which stimulates thinking about linkages between concepts and themes. Finally there is selective coding which elaborates more on one major theme. The researcher was conscious of time and transcribed the six interviews from the recording, so as to get a better feel and understanding of what was said. By sorting and arranging the data, the researcher was then able to analysis the material, identify themes, glean insight and develop meaningful conclusions.

3.5 Ethical Issues

All the participants in the research were given sufficient information, so that they understood the aims of the research. This was done by explaining the object of the project on a coversheet and by explaining the object of the interviews to the interviewees. The researcher assured them that their personal opinions and views will be anonymous and used for this particular research project only. Anonymity and confidentially were guaranteed to all respondents. The researcher was conscious that one's own personal opinions cannot affect the research when compiling a list of questions. By providing the cover sheet to all participants the researcher believed that this was sufficient to gain informed consent. Each interview was given a unique reference number. Overall the researcher felt that there were no major ethical implications of this research, as the researcher was looking for general opinions and views of participants. Dublin Institute of Technology code of ethics and the British Society of Criminology code of ethics were observed regarding any ethical issues and guidelines

3.6 Summary of Chapter

In this chapter the research methodology employed in the study was presented and justified. The significance of the proposed research is that JPCs are now a form of partnership approach to policing in Ireland and the author believes that this research will establish if there is a partnership approach to Joint Policing Committees (JPCs) and how they contribute to the governance of security.

CHAPTER 4

Findings and Discussion

4.1 Introduction

The Garda Siochana Act 2005 made provisions for the establishment of Joint Policing Committees. After a pilot phase, guidelines were issued to enable the establishment of these committees in each of the 114 local authority areas. As part of the research into the research topic, 'Policing and Partnerships, A review of Joint Policing Committees,' the researcher interviewed a total of six members who are sitting on JPCs. Two were senior Garda Officers with over thirty years work experience, two local councillors, who were elected in the 2009 council elections, a local authority employee and a community representative. The researcher also did an observation study by attending one of the JPC meetings, where the proceedings were observed.

As JPCs have only recently been established, there is little research on their operation and there is no literature and little research findings. This chapter presents the research findings from interviews with the six JPC members regarding their experiences of the workings of JPCs. The researcher also refers to comments by the general public regarding JPCs, in the course of regional meetings undertaken as part of the consultation process for the Department of Justice and Equality white paper on crime. This chapter identifies major themes within the research and uses quotations from the sample group to illustrate themes.

The findings are discussed in detail drawing comparison with literature for analysis and comparison relevant to the themes of partnership, role of policing and community involvement. The findings discussed come under the heading of partnership, community involvement through Local Policing Fora's and the strategic approach of JPCs. The researcher examines how partnership works and JPC member's perception of the partnership model.

4.2 Interviews

There were six people interviewed for this research, the demographic of the interviewees were four males and two females all between forty and sixty years of age. The researcher obtained some of the participants contact details from the Local Authorities websites. The researcher knew one of the participants, who put the researcher in contact with two of the other participants. This type of snowball sampling can introduce a form of bias into the sample, the researchers was aware of this. Most were interviewed at their place of work. All participants agreed to allow the interview be voice recorded and all signed a document giving informed consent. Each interview lasted on average thirty minutes with on average fifteen interview questions being asked of each interviewee. All interviewee were very forthcoming with their answers, even though the researcher felt some were conscious of the interview being recorded but they relaxed as the interview developed.

The community representative was very keen to do the interview, but inclined to go off the topic as she was determined to give her view on what her concerns were in relation to JPCs. The local councillors were relaxed as they are used to giving interviews, one wanted to highlight the good work he did as part of a sub-committee of the JPC. They are members of JPCs in different areas of Dublin. The researcher knows one of the Garda Officers. Both Garda officers are members of a number of JPCs, as their areas of responsibility (divisions) cover a numbers of JPCs in the Dublin area. The researcher felt that the Garda officers spoke more openly with the researcher, as he is also a member of An Garda Siochana.

4.3 Observations

The researcher received permission to attend and observer at a Joint Policing Committee meeting. The meeting took place in a conference room with participants seated around a large conference table, these meeting were previously held in the council chamber, but the location and set up was deemed too formal for partnership style discussions. In attendance were thirteen elected representatives, two community representatives, three

local authority staff, three co-ordinators of the LPFs (all local authority staff) and five senior Garda officers. There were no members of the public or press present.

The atmosphere was relaxed and informal with refreshments available for participants. All participants intermingled beforehand and were on first name terms. The chairperson opened the meeting on time with the agenda displayed on PowerPoint. The meeting adhered to the agenda, using PowerPoint for all presentations and finished at the appointed time. The chairperson controlled the meeting and any issue that was controversial, for example, concerns about horses roaming local authority estates was put off until the next meeting. The participants who contributed included, the two Garda Chief Superintendents, two community representatives, four of the elected representatives and one local authority representative. There was a fifteen minute presentation by a voluntary organisation regarding the issue of monitoring racist incident. This was organised by a community representative who had concerns about the increase in racist incident in the area. The three co-ordinators from the local policing fora's gave short reports with gardai, local authority officials and councillors contributing to the discussion. There were two garda reports, which had been made available to all participants before the meeting.

The researchers view was that overall the meeting was informal and relaxed. Nothing controversial was discussed and there was good interaction between all groups.

4.4 Themes

The main themes that developed from the answers to the interview questions were the following,
1. The different relationships between members on the JPCs
2. Examples of working through partnership
3. Community involvement
4. Concerns about the direction of JPCs
5. Local Policing Fora as the driver of JPCs

4.5 Partnerships

'The partnership between An Garda Siochana and Local Authorities will be central to the effective operation of each committee.' (JPC guidelines)

It is now accepted that crime prevention and community safety lie beyond the competency of one single agency (Crawford, 1998). The partnership approach has been one of the most dramatic developments in crime control policy in recent decades all over the world. The Patten Report on policing in Northern Ireland resulted in the establishment of district policing boards with the aim of bringing policing closer to the community, by giving the community a say on local policing issues.

In Britain the Morgan Report (Standing conference on Crime Prevention 1991), deemed it inappropriate for the police to own the crime problem. The report highlighted that local authorities should be the lead agency as they had powers in relation to planning, tenancies and leisure, all of which impacted on crime prevention. Morgan proposed that Local Authorities assume statutory responsibility for community safety. A further development of partnership policing in Britain was the establishment of local crime and disorder reduction partnerships as a result of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. Partnerships between the police and local authority were required by legislation to consult with citizens to devise local strategies. This conflicted with Morgan's view of the local authority being the lead agency, with its views that the principle of partnership required collective responsibility (Byrne & Pease, 2008).

There is huge communication here with the Guards, partly because we are located right across from them, both Chief Superintendents on the JPC are particularly easy to contact, everyone can contact them, housing estates management have always had contacts with community Guards, Sergeants and Inspectors, they would be all on first name terms, that contact is there. There is huge contact, before the JPCs were ever there we've had that partnership (Interview 4; local authority).

Garland (2001) contends that we find ourselves in societies where high crime rates are perceived to be normal and it requires new ways of thinking, where state and non-state agencies co-ordinate their practices in order to enhance community safety.

Policing partnerships have been in place in Northern Ireland and Britain for a number of years and the partnership approach in Ireland has been put on a formal legislative standing as a result of the Garda Siochana Act 2005.

From the findings, the perspective of senior garda management and senior local authority officials who are members of JPCs, is that they are fully in support of the partnership approach, stating that there was good relationships between the organisations even before the establishment of JPCs. The garda members are in agreement that they cannot address crime prevention and community safety on their own and want more agencies involved.

There is no doubt we were dealing with the local authority informally, this has put a formal base on it and I know from experience we cannot do the policing function on our own, we need the local authority and local community and I think JPCs have brought this on immensely. There is more of a focus and more accountability as well (Interview 1; garda).

Say in relation to our JPC we have an excellent relationship between the council and ourselves and we work very well together. We would want more agencies to come on board, definitely the HSE should come on board and other agencies as well, the guards alone can't deal with all issues, the council alone can't address all issues, but by developing a partnership approach, we sit down with other agencies to do things together, that's the way to go forward (Interview 5; garda).

Partnership in the JPCs between An Garda Siochana and Local Authorities are very strong, this may be down to personalities in both organizations. When the researcher had completed his first interview, the interviewee who the researcher would have known contacted the local authority official on their mobile phone and to arrange an interview for the researcher. In the researchers finding, there is an excellent working partnership between An Garda Siochana and local authorities at JPCs.

All interviewees describe how the JPC meetings in one county were at first held in the Council Chambers. They described the situation as too formal. The feeling was that in the chambers, the elected representatives were in control and treated it like a normal council meeting.

Initially we had the JPC meeting in the council chamber, which was my first time to see how council structures worked, there extremely ineffective, people just asking questions

for the sake of just having their name acknowledged that they asked a question and they were very much individual incidents (Interview 3; community rep).

It was ran like a council chamber where the guards were asked questions. There wasn't a strategic approach, it was asking what's happening with 'May Murphy's dog that went missing last week', and really it was not of any great benefit (Interview 5; garda).

There was an element, when JPCs started they had meeting in the council chamber the main problem there was that Gardai sat where management would sit at normal council meetings and councillors sat were councillors would normally sit and it became us and them. It became combative and there might have been a bit of grandstanding of people making speeches and challenging and this wasn't helpful (Interview 6; elected rep).

This occurred in the initial stages shortly after the JPCs were set up and the feeling amongst those interviewed was that the elected representatives were not participating in the process as the guidelines intended. The Garda officers on the JPC highlighted the issue as they were able to make comparisons with other county JPC that they were also members of.

What the councillor's feel, they initially looked at it as the guards being accountable to them, for what they did, against them all together looking at solutions. It was very much you tell us what you're doing, so they have got out of that habit now and it's looking at collective responses to problems, so it's moved on from that……We get a lot of feedback from the Guards, they said ours was far too political, kind of run like a council meeting. The Chief Superintendents are on two or three different JPCs, so they can compare. Our meeting use to have about twenty questions from councillors (Interview 4; local authority).

In a study of police accountability, McLaughlin (2007) highlights the role of local councillors in delivering on this approach, stating that councillors will ensure effective democratic representation of peoples concerns and empower people to work with the police and other agencies. The study found that initially elected councillors focused solely on Garda accountability, not realising that partnerships involve all agencies letting go a certain amount of control and power as well as sharing resources, skills and information. The councillors were set on the adversarial approach in their power base of the council chamber, while the other agencies promoted a strategic approach and network governance. The Parks sub-group is an example of how all agencies including councillors worked together to analysis the problem and understood that the solution was not the responsibility of one agency alone.

4.5.1 Parks Sub Committee.

An example of all the agencies working together on a specific issue is illustrated in the working of the parks sub-committee. This sub-group was established by the JPC in November 2009 to examine methods to deter crime and anti-social behaviour in public parks. The sub-group comprised of local authority representative, Garda representative, elected representative and community representative. In the Local Authority area of the JPC there is in excess of 1,700 hectares of public parkland. Certain parks suffered from serious anti-social behaviour as well as damaged caused by anti-social behaviour. This resulted in people disconnecting from certain parks, resulting in them becoming no-go areas.

The parks, where we would have had a lot of problems in some areas with anti social behaviour and drinking alcohol, if you can get the park rangers, the LA and Gardai together you can get a co-operative attempt to tackle the issues and that works quiet well. Same with young lads on scrambler bikes on playing fields. I feel it has worked well from that prospective (Interview 2; elected rep).

For nine months the working group engaged in a comprehensive work program, involving meeting and on-site inspections as well as examining best practice in other areas of the county. In September 2010, the group produced a detailed report of their findings and recommendations, which was presented at the JPC. These included the establishment of 'Park safety teams,' the better use of technology, like remotely monitored cctv with live voice warning and the use of time locking devices on gates as well as updating existing park bye-laws and a recommendation that existing road traffic legislation be amended in relation to Garda powers regarding the use and seizure of mechanically propelled vehicles in parks. The JPC then established an implementation group, which is currently working on implementing the proposals. In general the interviewees felt this was an example of where JPCs can work in partnership for the good of the community.

We looked at what barriers prevent them working successfully together e.g. we identified problems within the council bylaws, where Gardai could not do certain things which maybe the public thought they could do…….I was disappointed as it seemed to be coming from the top a form of hesitance, it took nine months to get an implementation group established (Interview 6; elected rep).

So it helps get everyone round the table that they are all partners in it, not just the council does things, the Guards does things, the community does things, but councillors tended not to be part of that. Whereas now the parks group had guards, local authority, councillors and community reps, so that was the way and everyone took responsibility (Interview 4; local authority).

Oakley's (2001) description of successful partnerships as everyone working together on an equal basis to achieve a goal, is demonstrated by the successful works of the Parks sub-group.

4.5.2 Benefits of Partnership

Community policing encourages the formation of partnerships between police and other agencies with the aim being, to further crime prevention and enhance community safety. The state police should focus exclusively on crime rather than the social function and community policing. The police should only get involved once there is a breach of the criminal law with no discretion, in the mode of zero tolerance policing (Johnston, 2000)

Johnston (2000) describes it as a 'dual policing' model of enforcement and prevention. The law enforcement role of the state police, with the crime prevention and community safety role of civil policing. He argues that in modern society, police should be regarded as a product of a network of security institutions and as security networks are located outside the states sphere, the primary location of policing lies in civil society rather than in the state. The responsibility for the co-ordination of local policing networks would be with local democratic government. The JPC guidelines refer to this by stating the *a local authority shall, in performing its function, have regard to the importance of taking steps to prevent crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour within its area of responsibility.*

Loader (1997) agrees that there is no pure policing solution to the problem of crime and the fear of crime. The answer is not more police, but to dissolve the demand by developing policies and initiatives for other areas of public policy to enhance safety. Civil society should take direct responsibility for policing by creating genuine partnerships between state and civil policing in local areas. The state dealing with enforcement and community policing performed by commercial, municipal and voluntary element. This

was evident in the data where one councillor spoke of everyone policing their community and the actual police dealing with more serious matters.

I think we have to get away from the idea that the police do policing and the rest of us sit back and complain, when there is not enough police on the beat or this, that and the other is not done, whereas, we are all policing our communities and the police are the people we employ to carry out the heavy lifting, so to speak (Interview 2; elected rep).

Johnston (2000) agrees stating that if community policing is to have any relevance in late modern conditions, it must embrace the diversity of communities. It would mean a different and more complex conception of community policing and would not necessarily operate under the leadership of public police.

Everybody realizes that nobody is on their own, not in isolation, all the agencies and councillors sitting around the table and I think there is more respect for everybody's area of responsibility……the councillors sitting down with senior management of the Local Authority and An Garda Siochana. They know exactly what, first of all we are able to do and secondly, that we cannot do it all ourselves (Interview 1; garda).

The parks sub-group which involved different agencies working together to find a solution is a good example.

As part of a regional consultation process in May / June 2011 for the government's white paper on crime, JPCs were discussed and the public's views obtained, some of the comments were that JPCs were a good forum to get everyone involved and a great way to share views and allow for open communication. It was also felt JPCs should remain at local level as this is where you have real discussion on local issues.

4.5.3   Barriers to Partnership

Research into local partnerships identifies four challenges.

1. Prevent the partnership meeting from becoming just 'Talking Shops'
2. Elevate the community involvement from it usual present role to more active participation.

3. Move from 'short-termism' to a monitored assessment of impacts on crime and disorder.

4. To realize the ideology of unity, and escape tensions and rivalries in partnerships.

(Skinns, as cited in Newburn 2008, pp. 354)

The main barriers to successful partnership includes a reluctance of some agencies to participate, such as health authorities, education and social services and the issue of data exchange between partners can often prove very contentious (Crawford 2007). Although these agencies do not have members on the JPC as currently set up, they could be requested to sit on sub-committees to address certain issues.

The researcher in this study did not find evidence of a reluctant on behalf of Garda management or local authority management to participate fully with JPCs, there was evidence, especially shortly after JPCs were established of the elected representative not participating fully with the partnership model.

One councillor didn't really get it that his role involved planning things / changing things. He saw it more as you bring us the stuff and we agree it. So it helps get everyone round the table, that they are all partners in it, not just the council does things, the Guards does things, the community does things, but councillors tended not to be part of that (interview 4; local authority).

One local TD sent questions directly to the guards and got answers but sent the same question to the JPC. This was to look after his constitutions, we were letting JPCs be run by politicians so we had to pull back from that………I think the councillors have to find their feet and I think that's our responsibility to make opportunities for them. Some of them don't want to get it, they don't like community involvement as they feel they are elected representatives and others are not elected (interview 4; local authority).

I think they were all making their own party political points really and often times we could be sitting there for an hour where they were arguing amongst themselves and we had no input whatsoever. It was a waste of our time (interview 5; garda).

4.6 Community Involvement

Joint Policing Committees are intended to be a forum for discussion and a means of building confidence and trust, thereby bringing the communities together through a process with which all participants feel comfortable. A JPC should engage with local community groups to the greatest degree possible (JPC, code of practice).

Johnston (2000) talks about policing and that people regard personal security as a right, a measure of civilized life. Individuals have been encouraged to engage in acts of 'responsible citizenship' in order to maximize their own security.

In late modernity, there is a fear of a breakdown of the public system of policing. In order to prevent individuals committing acts of 'autonomous citizenship' by engaging in vigilante activity a partnership approach to policing is encouraged.

We had no local input into policing and I think JPCs allow for that and give the local community a feeling that they have an input into how the police are run and how community is policed (interview 2; elected rep).

JPCs were established to help achieve this by developing a partnership model of policing and by getting the community involved in the process in the form of 'responsible citizenship' especially at local level in the local policing fora's. One participant representing the marginalized community highlights the importance of work in the community and making space for all members of the community to participate. This is important as Loader & Walker (2007) highlights the dangers of marginalized communities become more isolated and excluded in modern society.

Our experience is that there are excellent relationships in our community with community gardai. We worked together to find a solution that is partnership. ………You need partnership to find the solution but to make sure that everyone is included. We have to work as a partnership because no one has a solution on their own. My main priority is social inclusion and to include people (interview 3; community rep).

They have children themselves and they have the same safety concerns as any other member of the community but they are not viewed as the same because they are drug users, but we make sure they participate in safety forums. I represent them but ultimately I want those people to represent themselves (interview 3; community rep).

4.6.1 Barriers to community involvement

Bowden (2006) describes a coalition of people including police, local authority officials and resident committees having a powerful governing network over residents in the urban periphery of Dublin. Garland's (2001) view is that a large population of marginalized, criminalized poor may lack political power and command little sympathy, but they have the negative capacity to make life unpleasant for everyone else. Although the JPCs were not in operation at the time, the comment could easily refer to them as some communities feel excluded from the process. What is required is strong community representation for marginalized groups on JPC, especially local policing fora's which gives residents the opportunity to voice their concerns, have them recorded and forwarded for consideration to the county JPC if not address locally.

Intimidation was highlighted in the finding and the fear certain families create by intimidating others within their community. Many times these matters are not reported because of fear of further intimidation and the fact they feel nothing will be done about it. This is an area where informal meeting can take place between families suffering from intimidation and agencies through the JPC process to successfully deal with the issue by way of partnership. One of the interviewees discussed community participation

The public meeting that are part of JPCs, in certain area's they can get two hundred to attend but in our area it is difficult enough to create a safe enough space for people to attend a public meeting on policing especially in areas where there is high levels of intimidation (interview 3; community rep).

We organised meetings for residents with the council and gardai away for the area first, but afterwards went back to the local community hall. The people became more open and threatened youths that they would ring the gardai. People stood together against the intimidation by groups of fifteen / sixteen year old youths (interview 3; community rep).

As part of a regional consultation process in May / June 2011 for the government's white paper on crime, JPCs were discussed and the public's views obtained, participants highlighted the lack of community participation in certain areas because of the fear of intimidation from particular families living in the area and the fact if people complained they put themselves at risk.

There may be reluctance on the part of community groups or individuals to participate in JPCs because of a fear of the dominance of large state agencies, who may be unwilling to

share information and try and control the agenda (Crawford 2007). This is reflected in the following comments were the community representative expresses concerns about meeting of the steering committee and fearing these meeting are designed to control the JPC meeting, other agency representatives highlight the need to meet to agree agendas and control meetings.

There is openness by all agencies to work together, but sometimes there are meetings outside of the meeting so you don't always know what is going on or what decisions are been made (Interview 3; community rep).

I mean I'm not criticizing but certain JPCs work better; a couple of them have steering committees which consist of chairperson, rep from local authority and Chief Superintendent. We dictate, not dictate but look at what is going to happen at the next meeting and try to progress it (Interview 1; garda).

Our JPC has four meetings a year and the steering committee have met before them all where we agree an agenda with the chairperson, county manager, directory of housing and the two chief superintendents. The local authority takes the lead and the Guards go along. There is a tendency to want to control the meetings, but I suppose all meetings are controlled (Interview 4; local authority).

4.7 Strategy

JPCs should be strategic, it should not be a forum for addressing matters of detail, it should set priorities and be action oriented, it should focus on outcomes (JPC code of practice).

Kotter (1982) places the responsibility for determining this strategy with senior management, when he states that the primary responsibility of top management is to determine organizations goals, strategy and design, therein adapting the organization to a changing environment.

We don't need to know about minor issues. We need to know what are the trends and what are the key issues therefore you can then progress the working programme. I would like a more task focused discussion, like what is the outcome of this, how do we deal with this (Interview 6; elected rep).

In An Garda Siochana's corporate strategy under goal six community engagement, one of the initiatives designed to assist in achieving the stated goal is, '*that the organization will*

fully engage in JPCs and LPF'. All interviewees were in agreement that JPCs should have a strategic approach with better connections to the Local Policing Fora, which should be more informal, dealing with local issues and be the driving force of JPCs.

We need to deal with the bigger picture of mass public order, drugs in the whole area and what we can do for everyone going forward. There's still is a difference in certain ones of them but I see them changing and coming more focused, we are trying to change them. ………I am not saying any are wrong and its important to get them to think strategically, really, this is where we are at up here and other stuff may be for the council chamber and the LPF with local superintendents or whatever (Interview 1; garda).

The reason we were struggling with strategy is because it was local, people were going locally about specific problems instead of looking at the likes of the parks as a wider issue. It would only concentrate in one problem on one park. I think the idea is they look at things, and if it's a good thing or bad thing they plan it for everywhere, so there, it's about forward planning (interview 4; local authority).

Participants highlighted the need for the main JPC meeting attended by senior management to be strategic, dealing with serious issues and looking at trends so as to allow for progress and not clog up theses meeting with minor issues which should be deal with at other forums.

4.8 Local Policing Forums

Section 36 of An Garda Siochana Act 2005 allowed for JPCs to establish local Policing Fora's (LPF). The internal procedures of LPF are similar to that of JPCs, but to the greatest extent possible they should be more informal. *By establishing LPF, it allows the JPC to engage with local communities to the greatest degree possible (JPC code of practice).*

In consultation meetings on the white paper on crime, some of the people working in community based groups voiced dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of JPCs and felt that LPF would be much more effective than JPCs, which they believed tended to be politically focused and did not have enough community members involved.

Participants in this study had similar views stating more works needs to be done to establish LPFs where the real business should be done and suggest that issues should be first raised at LPFs and if not dealt with feed into the JPCs. Hughes (2007) highlights that

in modern society, individual concerns about social change, personal identity and safety, requires issues to be dealt with at a local level. Clear et al, (2011) states the best model of governance depends on factors in the community, the model has to fit the needs of the community. The provision of security should be available to all citizens as of right by being members of the community (Loader 1997)

Deal with issues locally first through you local garda superintendent, then if not satisfied fed into the LPF and then JPC, that's the way it works (Interview 1; garda).

There is a kind of disjunction between local policing forums and JPCs and that JPCs are top heavy with less community representation than should be… …the local policing forums have only been established and more work is needed to make them more effective (Interview 3; community rep).

A JPC is hit at a fairly senior level and many residents may not be aware of it. They are probably more aware of the local policing fora, that's where the real business should be done………. you can do far more business in fora's that you can do in JPCs because they are less formal and more local. The superintendent attends the LPF, he is in charge of his district and he has to deal with the issues on the ground, he is accountable (Interview 5; garda).

There are lots of safety groups around the country, they would feed up into the local policing fora and then the LPF would feed back to JPC. That's the structure we think is the best way to do it. People are encouraged to go to the LPF, they are advertised door-to door in local areas (interview 4; local authority).

I had real concern when they were bringing in the LPFs, rather than the organic way as in (Blank) as there were been prescribed by guidelines and regulations. I was concerned that it would become too formalized and lose what it was e.g. the original local community forum, which had just developed and was successful. I think to be fair that hasn't happened (interview 6; elected rep).

4.9 Summary of Chapter

The main finding of the research is that there was a good working relationship between the two main agencies, the local authority and An Garda Siochana. This was there informally before JPCs were established and the partnership has continued on a more formal basis since the establishment of JPCs.

The elected representatives do not see the community representatives on JPCs as representing their communities as they have not been democratically elected, while community representatives are of the opinion that councillors do not connect with the people living in marginalized communities. The elected representatives found participation in a partnership model like JPCs difficult, as they are used to the adversarial role in the council chamber of asking question and getting answers. Moving the meetings from the council chamber made them less formal and promoted partnership. The work done by the parks sub-group was a good example of partnership and networks developing between all agencies.

The research findings highlight the importance of Local Policing Fora's in the overall process. This is where there is genuine community involvement in dealing with local issues. These are seen as the driver of JPCs and there should have proper reporting structures, to ensure local concerns are dealt with at LPF and local issues of significance are reported to JPCs. These local partnerships represent a shift towards a model of network governance at local level. The overall findings suggest that the main JPCs in each area, attended by senior management should be dealing with more strategic issues effecting crime prevention and community safety in the county.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Introduction

This dissertation explored the issue of partnerships within the Joint Policing Committee model and also JPCs connection with the local community. Policing in modern society is ever changing and with ongoing cutbacks in State services, the option of extra police officers to deal with increasing levels of crime and anti-social behaviour is not available.

5.2 Research

The research in this dissertation explored the experiences of a selected group of key individuals who were actively involved in Joint Policing Committees. Each were interviewed and asked a series of questions to determine their views on their role on JPCs regarding, partnerships, strategy, policing and community involvement. Comments from members of the public to a regional consultation process for the government white paper on crime regarding their views on JPCs were also included.

5.3 Reflective Awareness

As a member of An Garda Siochana, the researcher has experience of the workings of JPCs and has been involved in making presentations to a local community-policing forum. The researcher was conscious of this in the course of the research. Robson (1993) describes insider research as being where the researcher has a pre-existing level of knowledge into the area of research that an outsider may only require after extensive research. It is important to balance your professional role and your research role to eliminate bias. Bell (2009) highlights the dangers of bias in research carried out by individual researchers, particularly those who have a strong view about the topic that they are researching. One has to be careful not to fall into the bias trap, by selecting only items, which support your point of view.

The research knew one of the participants and this raised the concern of a potential bias being introduced into the responses. Coghlan & McDonagh (1997) discusses performing research in ones own organisation and the difficulties in maintaining an objective stance. The author however, is satisfied that these concerns are not substantive and are off set by the professional standing of the individual.

Establishing rapport and developing trust with participants is vital for all research to allow for the free flow of information in qualitative studies. The researcher did this by taking seriously the data collection phase placing emphasis on ones appearance and credentials.

The research feared some of the interviewees may tow the party line and give their own organisations view point rather than their personal views in answering the questions. This did not occur and all interviewees were open and honest in their views.

5.4 Conclusion

The society in which we live is constantly changing. This change and the increase in the rate of change are reflected in almost every aspect of society and in particular evident in the modern policing environment. The Garda Siochana Act, 2005 along with the reports of tribunals was the main driver for major change and reform in policing in Ireland. The Joint Policing Committees were established to develop greater consultation between An Garda Siochana, Local Authorities, elected representatives and community representatives on the management of policing, public safety and crime issues. Each of the JPC partners has its own distinct perspective and inputs to offer, along with its own responsibilities in ensuring that society's policing needs are effectively met. The Joint Policing Committees process is a radical departure, as it requires them to work in partnership to better address the policing needs of the community. In the researcher's opinion, even though JPCs are at the stage of development, they are and will in the future have a positive influence on the partnership approach to crime prevention.

5.5 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the research in this dissertation, the learning from the review of literature and similar models in other jurisdictions, the following recommendations are proposed;

1. Establish a National Monitoring Board for Joint Policing Committees to monitor meeting, examine annual reports, organize training, promote best practice and develop the Joint Policing Committee initiative nationally.

2. Streamline partnership committees to avoid duplication of effort and establish links between the various committees to create synergies and maximize impact.

3. A review of the membership of Joint Policing Committees, with a view to increasing the involvement of other agencies on sub-committees to deal with specific issues, for example, Probation Service, Health Service Executive and Education as well as voluntary groups and the business sector.

4. Focus on the establishment of Local Policing Fora's with better reporting structures as these are seen as the driving force of community involvement in the JPC model.

5. Each Local Authority should establish a system of communication to inform residents of developments. They should consider advertising meetings locally and dedicate a section of their website to provide up to-date information on county JPCs and LPFs. There should be a facility for the public to forward concerns for consideration by JPCs. A county newsletter should also be considered.

5.6 Dissertation Summary

The Joint Policing Committees process is in its early stages but already its impact has been substantial. In the area of my research, there was very good communications and relationships developed informally between An Garda Siochana and Local Authority Officials even before the establishment of Joint Policing Committees. This I believe was down to the personalities involved but this may not be the same in all local authorities. There is no doubt the establishment of JPCs has been a positive development in creating

a partnership approach to policing. JPCs have developed better relationships between participants and an understanding of each others position. Serious consideration should be given to involving other agencies in the JPC model that should have a role in policing. This would allow the expected outcome of effective and meaningful community and Garda engagement through partnership, which is the ethos of the Joint Policing Committees initiative. After all preventing crime is everybody's business.

REFERENCES

Bayley, D.H. (1994) *Police for the future*. Oxford University Press

Bell, J. (2009). *Doing your research project,* 4th Ed. Open University Press.

Bowden, M. (2006). *'Youth governance and the city: Towards a critical urban sociology of youth crime and disorder prevention'.* Youth Studies Ireland 1(1); pp 19 – 39

Braithwaithe, J. (2000). *The new regulatory state and the transformation of criminology.* The British Journal of Criminology, 2000, 40 (2); 222 - 238

British Society of Criminology, *code of ethics for researchers in the field of criminology* (2008).
http://www.britsoccrim.org/codeofethics.htm (accessed 8th June 2011)

Bryett, K. (2007). *Publication review, problem-oriented policing and partnerships British Journal of Criminology*, 2007, 47(5) 840-842.

Burke, R.H. (2004). *Hard cop, soft cop, dilemmas and debates in contemporary policing.* Willan Publications.

Byrne, S. & Pease, K. (2008). Crime reduction and community safety. In Newburn, T. (Eds.), *Handbook of policing,* 2nd Ed. Willan Publishing.

Clear, T.R. & Hamilton Jr.J. & Cadora, E. (2011). *Community justice.* 2nd Ed. Routledge

Cohen, L. & Manion, L. (1994). *Research methods in education,* 4th Ed. Routledge, London.

Connolly, J. (2002). *Community policing and drugs in Dublin, the North Inner City community policing forum.*

Coughlan, D. & McDonagh, J. (1997). *Doing action research in your own organisation,* Oaktree Press, Dublin.

Crawford, A. (1998). *Crime prevention and community safety, politics, policies & practices.* Pearson Education Limited.

Crawford, A. (1999). *The local governance of crime, appeals to community and partnership.* Oxford University Press.

Crawford, A. (2007). Crime prevention and community safety, In Maguire, M. & Morgan, R. & Reiner, R.(Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of criminology (pp.884-909)* 4th Ed. Oxford.

Crime and Disorder Act 1998,
http://www.legislition.gov.uk (accessed 18th August 2011)

Dublin City Council. http://www.dublincity.ie/yourcouncil/jointpolicingcommittees.aspx.

Dublin Institute of Technology guiding principles (2010).
http://www.dit.ie/researchandenterprise/ethicsindit (accessed 8th June 2011)

Ellison, G. (2007). *A blueprint for democratic policing anywhere in the world? police reform, political translation and conflict resolution in Northern Ireland*. Police Quarterly, Vol. 10 No. 3 Sept. 2007 Pg. 243-269.

Garda Siochana Act 2005. SI No. 370 of 2005. Government Publication Office.

Garda Siochana, (2010). *National Joint Policing Committees Monitoring Office, Analysis of feedback on the operation of Joint Policing Committees*

Garda Siochana, (2007). *Neighbourhood Watch Handbook.*

Garda Siochana, (2010-2012) *Strategic Statement*.

Garland, D. (2001). *The culture of control; crime and social order in contemporary society.* Oxford University Press.

Gilling, D. (1997). *Crime prevention, theory, policy and politics.* UCL Press

Goldstein, H. (1990). *Problem-oriented policing*. London, McGaw-Hill.

Gordan, P. (1987). *Community policing, towards the local police state*? in Scraton, P. (ed.) Law, Order and the Authoritarian State. Open University Press, 1987,

Government White Paper on Crime (2011), *Report on proceedings of regional consultation meetings on 'the community and the criminal justice system'* May / June 2011, Institute of Public Administration.

Home Office, Morgan Report (2001). *Safer communities; the local delivery of crime prevention through the partnership approach*.

Hughes, G. (2007). *The politics of crime and community*. Palgrave, MacMillan.

Hughes, G. & McLaughlin, E. & Muncie, J. (2002). *Crime prevention and community safety, new directions.* The Open University.

Independent Commission on Policing for Northern Ireland, (1999). *A new beginning: policing in Northern Ireland, the report of the independent commission on policing in Northern Ireland.* Belfast: Northern Ireland Office

Johnston, L (2000). *Policing Britain, risk, security and governance*. Pearson Education Limited.

Kotter, J. (1982). *'What effective general managers really do'* Harvard Business Review (November – December 1982, p156-157)

Loader, I. (1997). *'Private Security and the Demand for Protection in Contemporary Britain',* Policing and Society, 7:143-162

Loader, I. & Walker, N. (2007). *Civilizing security.* Cambridge University Press.

Maguire, M. & Morgan, R. & Reiner, R. (2007). *The Oxford handbook of criminology.* 4th Ed. Oxford.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. (1995). *Designing qualitative research,* 2nd Ed. Sage Publications

May, T. (1997). *Social research issues, methods and process,* 2nd Ed. Open University Press.

McKeown, K. & Brosnan, M. (1998). *Policing and communities; an evaluation of neighbourhood watch and community alert in Ireland*.

McLaughlin, E. (2007). *The new policing*. Sage Publications.

Morgan, R. & Newburn, T. (1997). *The future of policing*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Mulcahy, A. (2006). *Policing Northern Ireland, conflict, legitimacy and reform*. Willan Publishing.

National Crime Council (2002). *Tackling the underlying causes of crime; A partnership approach.* Government Publication Office.

Neuman, W.L. (2003). *Social research methods, qualitative and quantitative approaches,* 5th Ed. Pearson.

Newburn, T. (2008). *Handbook of policing,(Eds.)* 2nd Ed. Willan Publishing.

Oakley, R (2001). *Building police-community partnerships: UK and European Experience,* paper presented at the conference of commissioner of police of Australia on 25-26 October 2001.

Punch, K.F. (2005). *Introduction to social research, quantitative and qualitative approach,* 2nd Ed. Sage Publication Ltd.

Reiner, R. (2010). *The politics of the police, 4th Ed*. Oxford University Press

Robson, C. (1993). *Real world research; a resource for social scientists and practitioners – researchers*, Oxford Blackwell

Ryan, B.J. (2008). *Northern Ireland district policing partnerships.*
Irish Political Studies. Vol 23. No 3. 344-361 September 2008.

Shaftoe, H. (2004). *Crime prevention facts, fallacies and the future*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Shearing, C. & Johnston, L. (2003). *Governing security, exploration in policy and justice.* London Rutledge.

Squires, P. (2006). *Community safety, critical perspectives on policy and practice.* Policy Press.

Terpstra, J. (2008). *Police, local government, and citizens as participants in local security networks.* Police, Practice and Research Vol. 9, No. 3, July 2008, 213-225

Walters, R. (1996). *The 'Dream' of multi-agency crime prevention, pitfalls in policy and practice.* In R. Homel (Ed.), *The policies and practices of situational crime prevention.* (Vol 5, PP 75-96) Monsey, NY Criminal Justice Process.

Wilson, J.Q. & Kelling, G.L. (1982). *The police and neighbourhood safety, broken windows.* www.manhatten-institute.org/pdf/_atlantic_monthly-broken_windows.pdf

Wood, J. & Shearing, C. (2007). *Imagining security*, Willan Publications.

Zedner, L. (2004). *Criminal Justice*. Oxford University Press

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Joint Policing Committees Guidelines and Code of Practice

Appendix 2 Letter sent to interview participants

Appendix 3 Questions asked of interview participants

GARDA SÍOCHÁNA ACT 2005

JOINT POLICING COMMITTEES

GUIDELINES

Preface

The Garda Síochána Act 2005 makes provision for the establishment of Joint Policing Committees. It does this against the background of a rapidly changing Ireland and with the awareness that not only central government must respond to the issues faced by local communities. The changes we are facing present both central and local government with many challenges. We see the Joint Policing Committees as offering an outstanding opportunity to address these challenges.

It is against this background that the Committees are now being rolled out to all 114 local authority areas. They will offer local authority elected members, An Garda Síochána, members of the Oireachtas and members of the public, through a partnership model, the opportunity to make what we believe will be a significant impact on the quality of daily life for all members of the community in each local authority area.

In the course of the last two years, 29 Joint Policing Committees have been established in representative local authority areas throughout the country. The practical experience gained through the operation of these pilot Committees, and the lessons learned in the course of a consultation process, which commenced with a seminar for representatives of these pilot Committees in November 2007, have made a significant contribution to these new and comprehensive Guidelines.

The partnership between An Garda Síochána and the local authority will be central to the effective operation of each Committee. However, as with any committee, it is essential that the role of each member is recognised and that there is a collective approach to assigning and accepting responsibility. Co-operation between town and county will also be essential to ensure that duplication and overlap are avoided and that the activities of Committees are complementary. The development of a close liaison between a Committee and its County or City Development Board will also be vital. Only with such a collective and co-operative approach can a Joint Policing Committee work effectively for the benefit of its local community.

We believe that the Joint Policing Committees have the potential to make a major contribution to the improved policing of the areas they represent to the benefit of all its residents and to realising the objective of the Garda Síochána Act 2005.

Dermot Ahern   John Gormley
Minister for Justice,   Minister for the Environment,
Equality and Law Reform   Heritage and Local Government

1.   Introduction

1.1   These Guidelines replace all previous Guidelines, which are now withdrawn.

1.2   A reference in these Guidelines to a joint policing committee (JPC) is to be construed as a reference to a Dublin City area subcommittee also.

1.3   The purpose of these Guidelines is to set out in detail the functions, composition and operation of joint policing committees in accordance with the Garda Síochána Act 2005. The Act (section 36) provides for the establishment of a JPC in each local authority administrative area. The purpose of these JPCs is to provide a forum where a local authority and the senior Garda officers responsible for the policing of that area, with the participation of Oireachtas members and community interests, can consult, discuss and make recommendations on matters affecting the policing of the area. It is intended that the JPCs be partnerships which are co-operative in nature and operate in accordance with paragraph 2.1 below with the minimum of formality to identify, raise awareness of and find solutions for issues impacting on, or causing concerns for, the local community. Through the work of a JPC both partners – the local authority and the Garda Síochána - along with Oireachtas members and community interests have the opportunity to contribute to the improved safety and quality of life of the community.

1.4   JPCs should accordingly be established for the administrative areas of all 114 local authorities in the State. In the case of Dublin City, five area subcommittees, corresponding to the operational areas of the City Council, should also be established to progress the work of the JPC in an effective, efficient and manageable way. (See section 16 for details of JPC membership.)

1.5   The establishment of the JPCs should not detract from, or substitute for, either regular day-to-day contact or consultation at ground level which is a feature of ordinary policing or the maintenance and development of suitable local liaison between local authority and Garda representatives not requiring a formal structure.

1.6   It is desirable that demands on the Garda Síochána and the local authorities arising from participation in the JPCs should be kept within manageable proportions. There should be flexibility to adapt to particular local circumstances, such as population, the nature of the area and policing priorities, and there should be proper linkage between the JPCs and their local authorities.

1.7   Each member of a JPC should receive a copy of these Guidelines.

1.8   Copies of the Guidelines should be available at all local authority offices for consultation and reference by elected members and staff of the local authority and by members of the public. Copies should also be available at all operational Garda premises for consultation and reference by Garda officers, civilian employees and members of the public. Local authorities and An Garda Síochána should ensure that awareness of the JPCs, subcommittees and the Guidelines is as widespread as possible.

1.9   Greater detail in respect of certain aspects of the Guidelines is provided in
       Appendix 1 – Code of Practice.

2.   Functions

2.1   The function of the JPCs is set out in section 36(2) of the Garda Síochána Act,
       which states:

       "The joint policing committee's function is to serve as a forum for consultations,
       discussions and recommendations on matters affecting the policing of the local
       authority's administrative area, and in particular to –

       (a)   keep under review -

              (i)   the levels and patterns of crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour
                     in that area (including the patterns and levels of misuse of alcohol
                     and drugs), and

              (ii)   the factors underlying and contributing to the levels of crime,
                     disorder and anti-social behaviour in the area,

       (b)   advise the local authority concerned and the Garda Síochána on how they
              might best perform their functions having regard to the need to do
              everything feasible to improve the safety and quality of life and to prevent
              crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour within the area,

       (c)   arrange and host public meetings concerning matters affecting the policing
              of the local authority's administrative area,

       (d)   establish, in consultation with the local Garda superintendent, as the
              committee considers necessary within specific neighbourhoods of the area,
              local policing fora to discuss and make recommendations to the committee
              concerning matters that it is to keep under review under paragraph (a) or
              on which it is to advise under paragraph (b), in so far as those matters
              affect their neighbourhoods, and

       (e)   co-ordinate the activities of local policing fora under paragraph (d) or
              otherwise."

2.2   Section 37(1) provides:

       "A local authority shall, in performing its functions, have regard to the importance
       of taking steps to prevent crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour within its area
       of responsibility."

2.3   As a result of the work of the JPCs, decisions which are made by any of the
       interests represented on the JPC should be better informed ones as a result of the
       discussion of local needs and circumstances. In particular, the JPC acts as a

mechanism through which, firstly, the local authority can have a role in conveying information and views to Garda Divisional and District officers to assist them in the formulation and operation of their annual policing plans and, secondly, Garda Divisional and District officers can convey information and views to the local authority to assist it in carrying out its duties, functions and activities.

3. Establishment

3.1   Section 36(1) of the Garda Síochána Act provides:

"A local authority and the Garda Commissioner shall arrange for the establishment of a joint policing committee in accordance with guidelines issued …"

3.2   A local authority shall, after consultation with the Garda Commissioner or an officer authorised by him or her to consult with the local authority, by resolution establish a JPC.

3.3   The Garda Síochána representatives on the JPC shall be appointed by the Garda Commissioner. The other members first appointed shall be appointed by resolution of the local authority by which it was established, and subsequent appointments shall be by such resolution or in such other manner as that local authority may provide for by resolution.

4. Chairperson

4.1   Section 35(2)(c) of the Garda Síochána Act provides that the chairperson of a committee will be drawn from the elected members nominated to the JPC by the relevant local authority.

4.2   The local authority elected members of the JPC shall appoint the chairperson of the JPC.

4.3   The term of office of a chairperson shall be not less than two years and, after the first term, rotate between the local authority elected members of the JPC. In view of the central role of the chairperson in the success of the JPC, JPCs are encouraged to consider a term of office longer than two years.

4.4   The chairperson of a JPC has the key role in ensuring that these Guidelines are followed.

4.5   It shall be open to a JPC to appoint a vice-chairperson from among the local authority elected members. The local authority elected members of the JPC shall appoint the vice-chairperson of the JPC. The JPC shall ensure that, as far as is practicable, the offices of chairperson and vice-chairperson are at all times held by elected members of different political groupings.

5. Members of Oireachtas who are not Members of JPCs

5.1   A member of the Oireachtas is entitled to be present without notice at a meeting of a JPC, subject, as appropriate, to section 45(3) of the Local Government Act, 2001 or regulations made under section 54 of that Act.

5.2   A JPC shall make available without charge to members of the Oireachtas who are not members of the JPC the notice, agenda and minutes of meetings of the JPC, reports made by and to the JPC, where a member informs the JPC in writing or electronically that he or she wishes to receive such documents.

6.   Meetings of a JPC

6.1   The presumption is that members of the public (any person who is not attending the meeting at the JPC's request) and representatives of the media (including accredited representatives of local and national press, local and national radio and local and national television) are entitled to be present at a meeting of a JPC and information and documents produced for the JPC are to be available to them, unless it would not be possible for legal or confidentiality reasons or would not be in the public interest to have such persons present or make such information or documents available. (See paragraphs 6.2 and 6.3 following.) JPCs should endeavour to make their reports and documents publicly available to the widest degree possible.

6.2   Where a JPC is of the opinion that the absence of members of the public and representatives of the media from the whole or part of a particular meeting is desirable, for example, due to the special nature of the meeting or of an item of business to be, or about to be, considered at the meeting, the JPC may decide to meet *in committee*.

6.3   Meetings to plan future business, including public meetings, shall be held *in committee*.

6.4   Particular efforts should be made by a JPC in its initial phase to advertise publicly:

-       its establishment, purpose and functions;
-       the date, time and place of its initial meetings;
-       an invitation to the public to attend, taking into account the provisions of paragraphs 6.2 and 6.3.

6.5   Efforts should be made to ensure that meetings take place throughout the local authority area or operational area, as appropriate.

6.6   It is envisaged that quarterly meetings for each committee would prove adequate in most circumstances. Meetings should be held at times and in locations which facilitate maximum attendance.

6.7   If the chairperson and a Garda representative agree that for urgent reasons an additional meeting would be of value, such a meeting may exceptionally be held.

6.8   In setting the date and time of a meeting, a JPC should endeavour to ensure that a date and time are set which would allow a member who is a member of a House of the Oireachtas to attend a meeting of that House.

7.   Public Meetings

7.1   Section 36(2)(c) of the Garda Síochána Act provides that the function of a JPC is, inter alia, to "arrange and host public meetings concerning matters affecting the policing of the local authority's administrative area".

7.2   The emphasis of public meetings shall be on general policing rather than individuals and on obtaining the co-operation of the public in preventing crime.

7.3   It is envisaged that JPCs would hold public meetings at regular intervals and at least once a year. Care should be taken to ensure that the venue is varied.

7.4   When considering arranging and hosting a public meeting, a JPC should consider whether the business of the meeting should focus on a particular topic, age group or geographic area or a combination of these.

7.5   Procedures for public meetings should have a minimum of formality and should reflect the co-operative nature of the JPCs.

7.6   Decisions on holding public meetings shall be made at meetings of the JPC. At least 14 days before a meeting, advertisements should be placed informing the public:

-       of the date, time, place and purpose of the meeting;
-       that they are welcome to attend;
-       that they have the right to make their views known and ask questions of the members of the JPC;
-       of the procedure for submitting written questions, including an address for doing so;
-       of an alternative means of submitting a question (for those who have difficulty in providing written material), for example by recording a question via a telephone number for setting down in writing;
-       that questions will be accepted from any person affected by the policing of the area;
-       that questioners should give their name and address, which will not be publicised;
-       that the JPC welcomes the public's views on what should be discussed at the meeting and how the meeting should be conducted and also on previous public meetings held (the formulation used should take account of any decisions subsequent to paragraph 7.4);
-       that in some circumstances it may not be possible to provide information requested (see paragraph 7.12 and section 8 below).

7.7   As public knowledge of the meetings grows, the JPC may consider that it is not necessary to provide the same level of detail in all such advertisements.

Dissemination of Information Regarding Public Meetings

7.8   Appropriate provision should be made to ensure that marginalised and hard to reach sections of the community are made aware of the meetings. Particular care should be taken to choose a date, time and place which maximise the opportunity of the community to attend the meetings. In this respect, use should be made to the greatest possible extent of active community networks and local groups and any relevant RAPID Programme Area Implementation Teams.

7.9   Representatives of the media may attend public meetings, subject to the provisions of section 45 of the Local Government Act, 2001.

Procedure for Tabling Questions

7.10   In order to increase the productivity of meetings, the public should be encouraged to give to the greatest extent possible advance notice of questions to be raised.

7.11   In certain circumstances, for legal reasons or because it would not be in the public interest to do so (see section 8), it may not be possible for either the Garda representative or the local authority to reply to a question.

7.12   Furthermore, in some circumstances it may not be possible to provide information or respond to a question because to do so would involve the disproportionate use of resources and the meeting should be informed accordingly.

7.13   If information cannot be provided for any of the above reasons the chairperson should encourage the questioner to rephrase the question in order to create a greater opportunity for information to be provided. This may involve the questioner submitting a general rather than a specific question.

7.14   A record should be kept of all written questions submitted. Questions and the answers provided form part of the official records of the JPC. Such records should be stored appropriately.

8.   Subject Matter of Meetings

8.1   The subject matter of meetings should be in line with section 2 of these Guidelines. There is, however, a range of matters which <u>may not</u> be discussed. These are set out in the following paragraphs.

8.2   Section 36 (4)of the Garda Síochána Act provides:

"Neither the joint policing committee nor any of its subcommittees may consider matters relating to a specific criminal investigation or prosecution or matters relating to the security of the State."

This also applies to public meetings arranged and hosted by a JPC.

8.3   A JPC should not consider a matter if:

-       it would endanger the security of one or more individuals;
-       it relates to an individual;
-       it involves information received by the Garda Síochána or the local
        authority in confidence;
-       it would, or would be likely to, prejudice the prevention or detection of
        crime or the apprehension or prosecution of offenders; or
-       it is deemed prejudicial to a Garda operational matter, such as the
        deployment or composition of specialist units, or involves material of a
        sensitive nature.

8.4   Individuals shall not be discussed or named. An individual's right to privacy and
        the provisions of the European Convention on Human Rights Act 2003 must be
        adhered to.

9.   Reports

9.1   Section 36(5) of the Garda Síochána Act provides:

"Not later than 3 months after the end of each year, the joint policing committee
shall –

(a)   submit to the local authority a report on the performance of its functions
        during the preceding year, and

(b)   supply a copy of the report to the Minister [for Justice, Equality and Law
        Reform], the Garda Commissioner and such other persons as may be
        specified in the guidelines issued under section 35."

9.2   In addition, a copy of the report should be supplied to the Minister for the
        Environment, Heritage and Local Government.

9.3   In particular, the report should set out how it carried out its function under each of
        the headings set out in section 36(2) of the Garda Síochána Act and the outcomes
        from strategies adopted by the JPC.

10.   Support

10.1   Some funding to support the work of the JPC will be available from the
        Departments of Justice, Equality and Law Reform and the Environment, Heritage
        and Local Government.

11.   Steering Group

11.1   In view of the scale of the activities of JPCs for city and county administrative
        areas, such JPCs are urged to establish a steering group, consisting of the
        chairperson of the JPC, a representative of An Garda Síochána and the city/county

manager or a person nominated by him or her. The function of the steering group will be to facilitate the efficient functioning of the JPC. In particular, it will arrange procedures for the appointment of any new or replacement members, draw up the agenda and arrange for documentation for meetings (see paragraph 15.7), be the point of contact for co-operation and joint action with other JPCs (see section 13) and with any subcommittees of the JPC.

12.   Subcommittees

12.1   If a JPC considers it necessary to establish a subcommittee, it may do so. Care should be taken to avoid a proliferation of subcommittees, which would represent an unproductive use of scarce resources. No JPC shall establish more than three subcommittees. In the case of Dublin City Council, these would be in addition to the five area subcommittees. These area subcommittees may each establish no more than three working groups.

12.2   A subcommittee should focus on a specific geographical area within the local authority's administrative area or have a thematic remit (see Appendix 1 – Code of Practice) or be a combination of both. It should not be regarded as equivalent to a local policing forum (see section 14).

12.3   Subcommittees, other than a Dublin City area subcommittee, should be for either a specified period, eg. as a result of a specific problem arising, or an undetermined period, eg. when it has a thematic remit, and should be highly outcome focused.

13.   Co-operation and Joint Action with Other Joint Policing Committees

13.1   If two or more JPCs consider it appropriate to do so, they may, by resolution of each of the JPCs, co-operate and perform joint actions. A JPC may co-operate and perform joint actions with more than one JPC or group of JPCs. A Dublin City area subcommittee may co-operate and perform joint actions with more than one Dublin City area subcommittee or group of Dublin City area subcommittees.

Town and County Joint Policing Committees
13.2   In particular, a JPC for a town shall co-operate and act jointly on matters of common concern with the JPC for the county in which it is located and with the JPCs for any other towns in the county. The JPC for the county shall similarly co-operate and act jointly with the JPCs for the towns in the county.

13.3   It is essential that town and county JPCs take all steps necessary to ensure that there is no duplication or overlap in their work, but that their activities complement each other. In addition to the matters set out in paragraphs 13.1 and 13.2, these could include exchanges of agendas (in advance of meetings) and minutes of meetings; joint meetings from time to time of the chairs of town/county JPCs together with representatives of the Garda and local authorities to ensure an efficient and effective approach by and across the JPCs within the county.

13.4   The work programmes and reports of the JPCs within the county should clearly demonstrate how such co-operation is being achieved.

13.5   Where a town is located adjacent to the border of a county, other than the county within which it is situated, co-operation and joint action by the JPC for the town and the JPC for the adjacent county should also take place. Co-operation would be facilitated by meetings between the chairpersons where considered necessary.

County/City Development Boards and County/City Joint Policing Committees

13.6   The JPC for a county or city and the County/City Development Board (CDB) for the same area should ensure that effective linkage is maintained between them. Such linkage should include copies of the JPC reports for the county or city being provided to the relevant CDB.

14.   Local Policing Fora

14.1   Section 36(2)(d) of the Garda Síochána Act (see paragraph 2.1) provides for the establishment of local policing fora by JPCs. The internal procedures of such fora should be similar to those for the JPCs, but to the greatest extent possible be more informal.

14.2   As a general principle, JPCs should ensure that in establishing local policing fora they do not divert scarce resources from the work of the JPCs themselves.

14.3   In accordance with action 11 of the National Drugs Strategy 2001 – 2008, Guidelines for the operation of local policing fora in Local Drugs Task Force areas, tailored to address particular issues faced by those areas, will be issued separately prior to their establishment. Guidelines for the operation of local policing fora in other areas will issue subsequently when JPCs are well established and prior to their establishment.

15.   Internal Procedures

15.1   A code of practice is attached as Appendix 1, section 1 of which sets out principles and approaches which JPCs should adhere to in their functioning.

15.2   JPC members shall declare to the JPC if they have an interest in any matter under discussion and shall withdraw from the meeting while that matter is being discussed.

15.3   JPCs should always bear in mind the importance of clear, comprehensive and ongoing communication between their members.

15.4   Procedures should have a minimum of formality and should reflect the co-operative nature of the JPCs. It is envisaged that decisions would be taken by agreement rather than by voting. However, in the exceptional event of a vote being taken at a meeting of a JPC, each member present at the meeting shall have

one vote. A member may abstain from voting, and such abstention may be recorded in the minutes. Where there is an equality of votes, a matter before a meeting shall be determined by a second or casting vote of the person chairing the meeting.

15.5   A quorum shall be such as applies to a committee of the local authority.

15.6   In order to facilitate JPC members, a date for the following meeting should be set at each meeting, save in exceptional circumstances. In any case, members of the JPC must be notified in writing of the date, time and place of a meeting at least 21 days before the meeting. A meeting, when arranged, should not be cancelled, save in exceptional circumstances and with the agreement of the chairperson. When a meeting is cancelled, the date, time and place of the next meeting should be fixed, with the agreement of the chairperson.

15.7   An agenda and related documents, including minutes of the previous meeting, should be circulated in advance of a meeting. Agendas should be focused, clear and the number of items included should reflect the time available. They should strike a balance between the role and responsibilities of each stakeholder. A template for the agenda is included in the code of practice (Appendix1). The setting of an agenda should not prevent the raising of an item of business (in advance of the meeting) that is, in the opinion of the person chairing the meeting or, if the chairperson is not available, the vice-chairperson, and the Garda representative, particularly urgent.

15.8   If considered appropriate by the JPC, a non-member may be invited to attend a meeting and speak to a specific agenda item. This applies in particular to representatives of statutory agencies or persons with specific expertise where the JPC considers that their expertise at a particular meeting is required.

15.9   At JPC meetings, the Garda representative presents a report which includes general information in relation to the commission of crime and to crime prevention matters in the area. The Garda representative should, to the greatest extent possible, endeavour to provide statistical data which is appropriate and relevant to the local authority's administrative area.

15.10   The city or county manager, as appropriate, or an official nominated by him or her, will also present a report in relation, or ancillary, to their functions and the work of the JPC.

15.11   Members of the JPC have the opportunity to ask the relevant Garda and local authority representative questions on matters contained in their report or on other matters. Questions should be asked only in respect of the work of the JPC and should not take up a disproportionate amount of the time available for the meeting.

15.12   In order to increase the productivity of meetings, reports, documentation and copies of presentations should be circulated in advance of a meeting. Such

documents should be treated as confidential until the meeting takes place. Advance notice of questions which it is intended to ask should also be given.

15.13 In some circumstances, it may not be possible to provide information or respond to a question because to do so would involve the disproportionate use of resources, and the JPC should be informed accordingly.

15.14 When confirmed, with or without amendment, the minutes of a meeting shall be signed by the person chairing the meeting they were submitted to for confirmation and any minutes claiming to be so signed shall be received in evidence without proof.

15.15 Any public statements by a JPC should be made on an agreed basis and issued by the chairperson on behalf of the JPC or, if the chairperson is unavailable, the vice-chairperson.

15.16 The actions, decisions and proceedings of a JPC shall not be invalidated only because of a vacancy or vacancies in its membership or of the disqualification or want of qualification of any of its members.

15.17 The actions, decisions and proceedings of a JPC shall not be invalidated for the reason only that the number of members of the Oireachtas who have registered their interest in being a member of the JPC, and hence the number of such members on the JPC, is less than the number provided for in these Guidelines.

15.18 In the event of disorderly behaviour at a JPC meeting, the procedure set out below should be applied.

If
(a)   in the opinion of the person chairing a meeting ("the chair"), any member has been or is disorderly by persistently disregarding the ruling of the chair, or by behaving irregularly, improperly or offensively, or by otherwise obstructing the business of the meeting, and

(b)   the chair has conveyed his or her opinion to the members present by naming the member concerned,

then the chair or any member may move "that the member named leave the meeting" and the motion, if seconded, shall be put and determined without discussion.

Where a committee decides in accordance with (a) and (b) above that a member leave a meeting, that member shall immediately leave the meeting and shall not be entitled to speak or to take any further part in that meeting on that day.

Where in the opinion of the chair -
(a)   there is general disorder which impedes the orderly transaction of business, or

(b)   where a member against whom it was resolved that he or she leave the meeting by virtue of this paragraph refuses to do so,

the chair may adjourn the meeting for such period as he or she considers necessary in the interests of order.

16.   *Membership of Joint Policing Committees*

16.1   The number of members of each JPC is based on the number of elected members of the relevant county, city or town council and shall be as follows:

Number of Elected Members of Council	Number of Members of JPC
County Councils	
32 or more	28
26 – 31	27
20 – 25	26
City Councils	
52	28
31	30
17	26
15	24
Borough/Town Councils	
12	22
9	19

Membership of JPCs shall therefore be as set out in the following paragraphs.

16.2   **County Councils**

16.2.1   **County Councils with 32 or more Elected Members**

The JPC membership shall consist of:

- 15 local authority elected members with at least 2 from each local electoral area. In addition, the Cathaoirleach shall be an ex-officio member of the

JPC. Each political grouping on the County Council must be represented on the JPC. Where there is an equality of votes, a matter before a meeting shall be determined by a second or casting vote of the person chairing the meeting;

- 5 members of the Oireachtas, chosen from among their number by those members of the Oireachtas who have registered with the County Council their interest in being a member. The Oireachtas membership shall rotate every second year on a basis to be decided by the Oireachtas members who have registered. The selection process shall be facilitated by the County Council. Each political grouping represented by Oireachtas members for the County Council area shall to the greatest extent possible have representation among the five. If the members of the Oireachtas registered are unable to choose five members from among their number, they shall be chosen by lot;

- The county manager, who shall be an ex-officio member, and a person nominated by him or her. They may be accompanied to meetings of the JPC by such other officials as he or she considers appropriate, having regard to the agenda for the meeting;

- 2 Garda officers nominated by the Commissioner, accompanied by such Garda officers as they deem appropriate;

- 3 persons representing the community and voluntary sector in the county, selected in accordance with local arrangements which may include consultation with the community and voluntary forum and any relevant RAPID Programme Area Implementation Teams or Community Safety Sub-Groups.

16.2.2 County Councils with 26 – 31 Elected Members

The JPC membership shall consist of:

- 14 local authority elected members with at least 2 from each local electoral area. In addition, the Cathaoirleach shall be an ex-officio member of the JPC. Each political grouping on the County Council must be represented on the JPC. Where there is an equality of votes, a matter before a meeting shall be determined by a second or casting vote of the person chairing the meeting;

- 5 members of the Oireachtas, chosen from among their number by those members of the Oireachtas who have registered with the County Council their interest in being a member. The Oireachtas membership shall rotate every second year on a basis to be decided by the Oireachtas members who have registered. The selection process shall be facilitated by the County Council. Each political grouping represented by Oireachtas members for the County Council area shall to the greatest extent possible have representation among the five. If the members of the Oireachtas registered are unable to

choose five members from among their number, they shall be chosen by lot;

- The county manager, who shall be an ex-officio member, and a person nominated by him or her. They may be accompanied to meetings of the JPC by such other officials as he or she considers appropriate, having regard to the agenda for the meeting;

- 2 Garda officers nominated by the Commissioner, accompanied by such Garda officers as they deem appropriate;

- 3 persons representing the community and voluntary sector in the county, selected in accordance with local arrangements which may include consultation with the community and voluntary forum and any relevant RAPID Programme Area Implementation Teams or Community Safety Sub-Groups.

16.2.3 County Councils with 20 - 25 Elected Members

The membership of the JPC shall consist of:

- 13 local authority elected members with at least 2 from each local electoral area. In addition, the Cathaoirleach shall be an ex-officio member of the JPC. Each political grouping on the County Council must be represented on the JPC. Where there is an equality of votes, a matter before a meeting shall be determined by a second or casting vote of the person chairing the meeting;

- 5 members of the Oireachtas, chosen from among their number by those members of the Oireachtas who have registered with the County Council their interest in being a member. The Oireachtas membership shall rotate every second year on a basis to be decided by the Oireachtas members who have registered. The selection process shall be facilitated by the County Council. Each political grouping represented by Oireachtas members for the County Council area shall to the greatest extent possible have representation among the five. If the members of the Oireachtas registered are unable to choose five members from among their number, they shall be chosen by lot;

- The county manager, who shall be an ex-officio member, and a person nominated by him or her. They may be accompanied to meetings of the JPC by such other officials as he or she considers appropriate, having regard to the agenda for the meeting;

- 2 Garda officers nominated by the Commissioner, accompanied by such Garda officers as they deem appropriate;

- 3 persons representing the community and voluntary sector in the county, selected in accordance with local arrangements which may include

consultation with the community and voluntary forum and any relevant RAPID Programme Area Implementation Teams or Community Safety Sub-Groups.

16.3 **City Councils**

16.3.1 **Dublin City Council**

16.3.1.1   The membership of the JPC shall consist of:

- 13 local authority elected members, of whom one shall be nominated by the City Council from each of the 13 electoral areas. There will to the greatest extent possible be representation from each political grouping represented on the City Council. In addition, the Lord Mayor shall be an ex-officio member of the JPC. Where there is an equality of votes, a matter before a meeting shall be determined by a second or casting vote of the person chairing the meeting;

- 6 members of the Oireachtas, chosen from among their number by those members of the Oireachtas who have registered with the City Council their interest in being a member. The Oireachtas membership shall rotate every second year on a basis to be decided by the Oireachtas members who have registered. This selection process shall be facilitated by the City Council. Each political grouping represented by Oireachtas members for the City Council area shall to the greatest extent possible have representation among these six members. If the members of the Oireachtas registered are unable to choose six members from among their number, they shall be chosen by lot;

- The city manager, who shall be an ex-officio member, and two other officials selected by him or her. They may be accompanied to a meeting of the JPC by such officials as the manager may consider appropriate having regard to the agenda for the meeting;

- 2 Garda officers nominated by the Commissioner, accompanied by such Garda officers as they deem appropriate;

- 3 persons representing the community and voluntary sector in the City Council area, selected in accordance with local arrangements which may include consultation with the community and voluntary forum and any relevant RAPID Programme Area Implementation Teams or Community Safety Sub-Groups.

16.3.1.2 The JPC shall establish five area subcommittees corresponding to the five operational areas of the City Council. The membership of each area subcommittee shall consist of:

- The local authority elected members for the operational area. The Lord Mayor shall be an ex-officio member of all the area subcommittees;

- 6 Oireachtas members chosen from among their number by those members of the Oireachtas who have registered with the City Council their interest in being a member of that area subcommittee. The Oireachtas membership shall rotate every second year on a basis to be decided by the Oireachtas members who have registered. This selection process shall be facilitated by the City Council. Each political grouping represented by those Oireachtas members who have registered their interest in being a member of that area subcommittee shall to the greatest extent possible have representation among these six members. If the members of the Oireachtas registered are unable to choose six members from among their number, they shall be chosen by lot;

- The city manager, who shall be an ex-officio member, and a person nominated by him or her. They may be accompanied to meetings of the area subcommittees by such other officials as he or she considers appropriate, having regard to the agenda for the meeting;

- 2 Garda officers nominated by the Commissioner, accompanied by such Garda officers as they deem appropriate;

- 2 persons representing the community and voluntary sector in the area, selected in accordance with local arrangements which may include consultation with the community and voluntary forum and any relevant RAPID Programme Area Implementation Teams or Community Safety Sub-Groups.

16.3.2 **Cork City Council**

The membership of the JPC shall consist of:
- 16 local authority elected members, of whom at least 2 must be selected from each electoral area of the City Council. In addition, the Lord Mayor shall be an ex-officio member of the JPC. Each political grouping on the City Council shall be represented on the JPC. Where there is an equality of votes, a matter before a meeting shall be determined by a second or casting vote of the person chairing the meeting;

- 6 members of the Oireachtas, chosen from among their number by those members of the Oireachtas who have registered with the City Council their interest in being a member. The Oireachtas membership shall rotate every second year on a basis to be decided by the Oireachtas members who have registered. The selection process shall be facilitated by the City Council. Each political grouping represented by Oireachtas members for the City Council area shall to the greatest extent possible have representation among these six members. If the members of the Oireachtas registered are unable to choose six members from among their number, they shall be chosen by lot;

- The city manager, who shall be an ex-officio member, and a person nominated by him or her. They may be accompanied to meetings of the JPC by such other officials as he or she considers appropriate, having regard to

the agenda for the meeting;

- 2 Garda officers nominated by the Commissioner, accompanied by such Garda officers as they deem appropriate;

- 3 persons representing the community and voluntary sector in the city, selected in accordance with local arrangements which may include consultation with the community and voluntary forum and any relevant RAPID Programme Area Implementation Teams or Community Safety Sub-Groups.

16.3.3 Limerick City Council

The membership of the JPC shall consist of:

- 13 local authority elected members, of whom at least 3 must be selected from each electoral area of the City Council. In addition, the Mayor shall be an ex-officio member of the JPC. Each political grouping on the City Council shall be represented on the JPC. Where there is an equality of votes, a matter before a meeting shall be determined by a second or casting vote of the person chairing the meeting;

- 5 members of the Oireachtas, chosen from among their number by those members of the Oireachtas who have registered with the City Council their interest in being a member. The Oireachtas membership shall rotate every second year on a basis to be decided by the Oireachtas members who have registered. The selection process shall be facilitated by the City Council. Each political grouping represented by Oireachtas members for the City Council area shall to the greatest extent possible have representation among these five members. If the members of the Oireachtas registered are unable to choose five members from among their number, they shall be chosen by lot;

- The city manager, who shall be an ex-officio member, and a person nominated by him or her. They may be accompanied to meetings of the JPC by such other officials as he or she considers appropriate, having regard to the agenda for the meeting;

- 2 Garda officers nominated by the Commissioner, accompanied by such Garda officers as they deem appropriate;

- 3 persons representing the community and voluntary sector in the city, selected in accordance with local arrangements which may include consultation with the community and voluntary forum and any relevant RAPID Programme Area Implementation Teams or Community Safety Sub-Groups.

16.3.4 City Councils with 15 Elected Members

The membership of the JPC shall consist of:

- 11 local authority elected members, of whom at least 3 must be selected from each electoral area of the City Council. In addition, the Mayor shall be an ex-officio member of the JPC. Each political grouping on the City Council shall be represented on the JPC. Where there is an equality of votes, a matter before a meeting shall be determined by a second or casting vote of the person chairing the meeting;

- 5 members of the Oireachtas, chosen from among their number by those members of the Oireachtas who have registered with the City Council their interest in being a member. The Oireachtas membership shall rotate every second year on a basis to be decided by the Oireachtas members who have registered. The selection process shall be facilitated by the City Council. Each political grouping represented by Oireachtas members for the City Council area shall to the greatest extent possible have representation among these six members. If the members of the Oireachtas registered are unable to choose six members from among their number, they shall be chosen by lot;

- The city manager, who shall be an ex-officio member, and a person nominated by him or her. They may be accompanied to meetings of the JPC by such other officials as he or she considers appropriate, having regard to the agenda for the meeting;

- 2 Garda officers nominated by the Commissioner, accompanied by such Garda officers as they deem appropriate;

- 3 persons representing the community and voluntary sector in the city, selected in accordance with local arrangements which may include consultation with the community and voluntary forum and any relevant RAPID Programme Area Implementation Teams or Community Safety Sub-Groups.

16.4 Borough/Town Councils

The membership of the JPC shall consist of:

- All local authority elected members of the Borough/Town Council;

- 3 members of the Oireachtas, chosen from among their number by those members of the Oireachtas who have registered with the Borough/Town Council their interest in being a member. The Oireachtas membership shall rotate every second year on a basis to be decided by the Oireachtas members who have registered. The selection process shall be facilitated by the Borough/Town Council. Each political grouping represented by Oireachtas members for the Borough/Town Council area shall to the greatest extent possible have representation among the three. If the members of the Oireachtas registered are unable to choose three members from among their number, they shall be chosen by lot;

- 2 officials nominated by the county manager, one of whom may be the county manager. They may be accompanied to meetings of the JPC by such other officials as he or she considers appropriate, having regard to the agenda for the meeting;

- 2 Garda officers nominated by the Commissioner, accompanied by such Garda officers as they deem appropriate;

- 3 persons representing the community and voluntary sector in each town, selected in accordance with local arrangements which may include consultation with the community and voluntary forum and any relevant RAPID Programme Area Implementation Teams or Community Safety Sub-Groups.

16.5   General Membership Matters

16.5.1 In order to facilitate as wide a representation as possible of Oireachtas members, no Oireachtas member may register for membership of more than one JPC at county/city level. In the case of Dublin city, no Oireachtas member may register for membership of more than one area subcommittee. However, where there will be a substantial under representation in the number of Oireachtas members on a particular JPC, by reference to what is specified in these Guidelines, the Minister will consider proposals to set aside this requirement for that JPC with a view to increasing the number of Oireachtas members on it.

16.5.2 Members of JPCs subcommittees shall not be entitled to appoint substitutes to attend and participate as members of any JPC, with the exception of officials and members of the Garda Síochána as provided for in these Guidelines.

6.5.3   Section 35(3) of the Garda Síochána Act provides:
"In nominating members of the Garda Síochána for appointment to a joint policing committee, the Garda Commissioner shall have regard to the need to ensure that such members are of appropriate rank and seniority."

16.5.4 A person appointed to fill a casual vacancy shall hold office for the remainder of the term of the person in whose place he or she is appointed. A member who is a local authority elected member shall cease to be a member of the committee if (i) he or she resigns by notice in writing to the local authority; (ii) he or she becomes disqualified for membership of the local authority; or (iii) he or she ceases to be a member of the local authority. A member other than a local authority elected member shall cease to be a member if (i) he or she resigns by notice in writing to the local authority; or (ii) he or she ceases to be a member of the grouping which originally nominated him or her to the committee. A person whose term of office expires or who has resigned shall be eligible for re-appointment subject to compliance with membership requirements outlined in this section.

16.5.5 To the greatest extent possible, the principle of gender equality in membership

should be adhered to.

_____

Dermot Ahern
Minister for Justice,
Equality and Law Reform

, 2008

<u>**Appendix**</u>

Joint Policing Committees – Code of Practice

1.   Joint Policing Committees (JPCs) are intended to be a forum for discussion and a means of building confidence and trust, thereby bringing communities together through a process with which all participants feel comfortable. A JPC should engage with local community groups to the greatest degree possible. Such groups are an important resource in tackling the issues addressed by the JPC.

2.   <u>Operation</u>

It is recognised that JPCs should be allowed to develop their own agendas and approaches, since one size does not fit all. Nevertheless, JPCs should have regard to the following principles and approaches in their operation.

2.1   A JPC should be strategic. It should not be a forum for addressing matters of detail. It should set priorities and be action oriented.

2.2   It should draw up an annual work programme, which would include realistic targets and indicators to measure implementation. The work programme should set out tasks for each stakeholder in the JPC.

2.3   It should not become a "talking shop". Discussion of issues should be outcome focused and, in this context, should be of a constructive nature. An excessive amount of meeting time should not be spent on questions and speeches. An oral report or presentation and related questions should last for no longer than 15 minutes. (See paragraph 15.11 of the Guidelines).

2.4   A JPC should aim at developing a cross sectoral strategy and building consensus. Meetings should focus on delivering a partnership approach and not on question and answer sessions directed particularly at any one set of participants. A JPC should not concentrate on presentations and crime statistics.

2.5   While the Garda and local authority partnership is central to the effective operation of the JPC, it is essential that there is a collective approach to assigning and accepting responsibility. JPC members should indicate what they will contribute to its work. All stakeholders have a role to play.

2.6   Possible issues a JPC could focus on are: illegal drugs; CCTV; public order; anti-social behaviour; underage drinking; drinking in public places; consideration of drink licensing applications; vandalism; safer neighbourhoods; estate management (including tenancy enforcement and public lighting); youth diversion; traffic management; planning of major events attracting large crowds, eg. fleadhanna; casual trading; litter; community-based crime prevention

initiatives. Consideration of issues should be data and research based – it should not be emotion based.

2.7 A JPC should consider consulting on District/Divisional policing plans and relevant local authority initiatives.

2.8 A JPC should focus on outcomes. It should make recommendations, eg. suggest varying bye-laws or changes to policies and regulation, and set out the reasons for its recommendations.

2.9 Each item on the agenda of a meeting should have an action outcome. Provision should be made at an early point on the agenda of each meeting for a review of the status of implementation of recommendations made at the previous or earlier meetings.

2.10 The following is a template for JPC agendas:

1. Minutes of previous meeting
2. Progress on actions agreed at previous/earlier meeting
3. Reports by An Garda Síochána and local authority representatives, followed by questions on reports
4. Discussion on specific topics
5. Actions agreed
6. Date of next meeting
7. Any other business

2.11 Minutes of each meeting shall be submitted for confirmation as an accurate record at the next following ordinary meeting and recorded in the minutes of that meeting. Responsibility for preparing the minutes should be assigned to a specified person.

2.12 Following each JPC meeting, a document should be prepared and circulated to members, setting out the issues discussed; the actions to be taken and by whom; a target date for completion; and the date, time and place set for the following meeting (paragraph 15.6 of the Guidelines).

2.13 JPC and local authority council meetings should not be held so close together that there is a risk of their agendas and consequent discussions becoming intertwined. When scheduling meetings of the JPC, regard should be had to scheduled meetings of other bodies in which members are involved.

2.14 While JPCs should have the flexibility to adapt to particular local circumstances (paragraph 1.6 of the Guidelines), it is desirable that they work as far as possible to similar standards.

3. Training

3.1   Training should be on a collective basis. It should give participants a thorough knowledge of the potential of the JPCs and the role and responsibilities of members, thereby enabling them to operate the JPCs to their full potential and in the spirit of partnership.

3.2   Training of chairpersons is particularly important, as they have a central role in the efficient and effective conduct of meetings. Training should be given inter alia in how to act effectively as facilitator of committees and smaller groups.

4.   Joint Co-operation

4.1   JPCs are encouraged to bear in mind on an ongoing basis the provisions of section 13 of the Guidelines and, if they consider it appropriate to do so, co-operate and perform joint actions.

LETTER TO RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

Dear_____.

By way of introduction, my name is Dermot Harrington. I am a member of An Garda Siochana attached to Store Street Garda Station in Dublin. As part of my studies for a Masters of Arts in Criminology, I am required to complete a research project. I am writing this letter to request you to participate in my research project.

The topic I am researching is "Joint Policing Committees as a partnership model and its contribution to policing." I am requesting you to participate in this study because of your experience as a member of a JPC. If you are agreeable, I intend to conduct an interview with you at a location convenient to you. The interview should last no longer than thirty minutes. The interview will be recorded using a dictaphone and the recording will be destroyed once my research has been accepted in fulfilment of my MA in Criminology.

Participation in the research is completely voluntary. All information provided will be treated in the strictest confidence and all materials relating to the research will remain in my possession and only discussed with my thesis supervisor, Dr Matt Bowden a lecturer at the Dublin Institute of Technology, (matt.bowden@dit.ie). No personal identifying information will be revealed in the study, nor will you name be associated with any direct quotations used in the study. The research is to be carried out in accordance with the ethical guidelines as set out by the Dublin Institute of Technology. The ethical guidelines referred to can be viewed at www.dit.ie under the section research and enterprise.

I would appreciate if you would favourably consider my request for an interview. You can contact me by e-mail or telephone.

Yours faithfully

Telephone;   _____

E-Mail;

Dermot Harrington

NUMBER	INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
1.1	What is your role in JPC?
1.2	How do you find it when there are a number of senior management at a meeting covering different areas?
1.3	Would you prefer to have your own JPC, your own boundaries for your division?
1.4	In the partnership approach to tackling crime, previously gardai were left on their own, as regards partnership do you see it working as a partnership with the local authorities?
1.5	Is there a shared vision between yourselves and other members on the JPC?
1.6	What is the reason for JPCs that you see to work well?
1.7	Are steering committees very important?
1.8	JPCs they are new, is it still a learning process?
1.9	JPCs look at a lot of figures and details regarding crime figures, is there a crime prevention strategy on how to prevent crime in the first place?
1.10	Is there a method of sharing good ideas with other JPCs?
1.11	AGS annual policing plan for the division, do JPCs have input
1.12	Community involvement in JPCs seems very small compared with politicians.
1.13	People may come to JPC with own agenda, how do you deal with that?
1.14	Have LA a role in crime prevention.
1.15	Is everyone one on the ground aware of JPCs?
1.16	Other agencies, business persons can you see them buying into JPCs, can they be part of it?
1.17	Up to now what are the main achievement of JPCs in this area.
1.18	Is there drawbacks?
1.19	What is the future of JPCs?
2.1	What is your role in JPC?
2.2	Is the Role of chairperson important?
2.3	Is there a partnership approach to policing?
2.4	Are Gardai more accountable now with JPCs?
2.5	Garda report to meeting is it challenged or is the report just accepted?
2.6	Are there different issues in different JPCs?
2.7	Are JPC guidelines been followed?

2.8	Partnership, What about other groups, probation, HSE?
2.9	Are JPCs well known in communities i.e. hard to reach areas?
2.10	The name JPC, do people see it as just dealing with police issues?
2.11	How are local issues dealt with at JPCs?
2.12	There is a lack of community reps on JPCs V Councillors. What is their role?
2.13	Are business communities representatives on JPC?
2.14	What is the major achievement of JPCs?
2.15	Is there area's for improvement?
2.16	Where do you see JPCs in five years?
2.17	Do JPCs have teeth if agencies are not performing?
2.18	Your view on local governance and JPCs?
3.1	What is your role in JPC?
3.2	Partnerships do you think its working?
3.3	Councillors on committees, they will tell you they represent the community. Do you agree?
3.4	You are alone, Do you need support to get issues done?
3.5	The name JPC, is it the right name?
3.6	Should JPC be strategic, set priorities and be action orientated.
3.7	Community groups can have their own agendas.
3.8	Should other groups be on JPCs?
3.9	How influential are community representatives?
3.10	What are your views on Local Governance?
3.11	Are JPCs advertised, are locals aware?
3.12	What are the main achievements of JPCs
3.13	Does everyone involved in JPCs participate equally?
3.14	Where do you see the JPC in five years?
4.1	What is your role in JPC?
4.2	With your neighbouring JPC, do you link in with JPCs them?
4.3	So, from what you are saying the partnership model is there already? This is just placing it on a formal footing.

4.4	Partnership, is there a shared vision between all groups at JPCs?
4.5	What was the community platform Seminar organised for?
4.6	Policing of areas is it challenged?
4.7	Should JPC be strategic, set priorities and be action orientated.
4.8	Is there a crime prevention strategy and is it looked at seriously?
4.9	How do you plan for meetings?
4.10	How do you get feedback about how JPC is working compared to others?
4.11	Community involvement, how do they get involved?
4.12	Is there room for other organisations e.g. HSE?
4.13	Is the community aware of JPCs?
4.14	What are the main achievements of JPCs
4.15	Where do you see the JPC in five years?
5.1	What is your role in JPC?
5.2	Are there differences between the three JPCs you are involved in?
5.3	As regards partnership, do you think everyone is buying into this partnership?
5.4	How do JPC influence the overall Policing process?
5.5	Is policing challenged at JPC meetings?
5.6	Is policing more accountable?
5.7	Do guards challenge local councillors, if they feel they can do more?
5.8	Is there a requirement for evaluation of JPCs?
5.9	Steering groups, what is your view on Steering groups?
5.10	Is there room for other agencies like HSE probation?
5.11	How influencing are local reps on JPCs?
5.12	What are the main achievements of JPC you are involved in?
5.13	In five years time where do you see JPCs?
6.1	What is your role in JPC?
6.2	How was this sub-group established?
6.3	Do you see JPCs working as a partnership model?

6.4	Should all areas in LA be covered by LPFs?
6.5	How do you deal with different concerns within the community?
6.6	Is policing challenged with regards to goals actions and accountability?
6.7	JPCs, do they look at a crime prevention / reduction strategy?
6.8	Is there a need for Joined up thinking between all JPCs?
6.9	Is there community involvement at JPC level?
6.10	Regarding deprived areas, the community reps will say they are representing people who are socially excluded and don't even vote?
6.11	You are a local councillor, you represent people but you also represent you party.
6.12	Do you think JPCs are known in communities, are people aware of them?
6.13	In five years, where do you see JPCs?