A Crisis in Police Leadership? Lessons from Project Urbis

Overview

• Thinking about police and policing
  ◦ What are the problems?

• Police leadership of policing problems?
  ◦ The case of ‘urban security’

• Lessons from project Urbis
  ◦ Priority problems, responsible authorities and relevant expertise
Thinking about police and policing
What is the problem?

• From a concern with ‘the police’ as a modern institution ...

• ... to a concern with ‘policing’ different kinds of problem.

• Re-frames the question of police leadership:
  ◦ On what grounds ought the police to have lead responsibility for responding to particular kinds of problem?

Police leadership of policing problems?
The case of ‘urban security’

• Limits to, if not a ‘crisis’ of, police leadership in relation to the problem of crime prevention;
  ◦ The case for multi-agency responses to multi-faceted problems;

• Limits to police leadership in relation to a further broadening of the policing agenda:
  ◦ From crime prevention to ‘urban security’;

• Investigating responsibility and expertise for problems of urban security:
  ◦ Project Urbis, construct validation and the Delphi Method
Project URBIS:
Urban Manager for Security, Safety and Crisis Management
Project number:
518620-LLP-1-2011-1-IT-LEONARDO-LMP

- Lifelong Learning Programme:
  - Sub-programme Leonardo da Vinci of the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency of the European Commission

Aims of project URBIS:
www.urbisproject.eu

- Recognise the ‘state of the art’ in managing urban security
- Identify the need for the further professionalization of this role, specifically through higher educational qualifications
- Design a comparative programme of teaching and learning about managing urban security
- Test out this programme via a pilot course amongst current and prospective urban security managers
- Develop and disseminate personal and professional specifications for the emerging role of urban security management, including skills and competencies in multi-agency working
- Define criteria for the mutual recognition of education and training in urban security management across the European Union
About project URBIS

- Work Package 3 (Cardiff University):
  - What can ‘urban security management’ mean?
  - Which authorities are or ought to be empowered and legally obliged to manage urban security?
  - What skills and competencies do they have or could they have to undertake this responsibility?
  - What educational and training provision currently exists or should exist in support of their work?

Methodological challenges of comparative research on urban security

- Drawing on our work in:
How do Europeans talk to each other about urban security?

- Established approaches:
  - The science of experiments, surveys and impact evaluations
  - Grand sociological narratives
  - National case studies
  - Local case studies

Comparative European criminology revisited

*The Delphi Method: Basic propositions (Ziglio, 1996)*

- Informed judgement
- Structured dialogue
- Iterative group communication
- Common referent for debate and dialogue
The Delphi Method cont.:
Basic propositions (Ziglio, 1996)

• Defend or revise initial judgements following panel feedback
• Respondent and construct validation
• Provoke constructive criticism and debate around issues of public policy
• Anonymity of panellists
• Ensure the representation of competing policy agendas and to organise dialogue between their advocates

Findings from the URBIS Delphi panels

• Three expert panels:
  ◦ (1) Educational and social scientific community (ESC)
  ◦ (2) National-level policymakers: European Crime Prevention Network (EUCPN)
  ◦ (3) Local-level practitioners: European Forum for Urban Security (EFUS)
Findings from the URBIS Delphi panels

- Three notable areas of consensus and disagreement:
  - (1) Problems, approaches and contexts of USM
  - (2) Strategic and operational responsibility
  - (3) Expertise, and educational and training needs

Questionnaire 1

1. What can ‘managing urban security’ mean?
2. What are the current challenges for managing urban security in your region?
3. What are the potential challenges for managing urban security in your region in the coming decade?
4. Who is currently responsible for managing urban security?
5. Who ought to be responsible for managing urban security?
6. What expertise and training currently equips these authorities to respond to these problems?
7. What expertise ought to be entailed in this response?
8. How might this expertise be best developed in educational and training programmes?
Rounds two and three of the Policy Delphi

- Q2
  - Ranking and prioritisation
  - Likert scale: agreement/disagreement with statements on themes emerging from Q1
  - ‘Is’ vs. ‘Ought’

- Q3
  - Construct validation of Q2 ‘Ought’
  - Structured in terms of problems identified in Q1 and prioritised in Q2
  - Generative vs. symptomatic vs. other problems
  - Supra-problem strategic management
  - European-wide training

So, how can Europeans talk to each other?

- Iterative group communication

- Transforming subjective constructions of criminological problems into collective intelligence about them
Interim findings from the URBIS Delphi panels

- Three notable areas of consensus and disagreement:
  - (1) Problems, approaches and contexts of urban security management (USM)
  - (2) Strategic and operational responsibility
  - (3) Expertise, and educational and training needs

Interim findings on the ‘problems’ of urban security management

- Following ranking and prioritisation there was clear convergence by the three panels towards common problems despite diversity of problems (n: 25) identified in Q1 (see table 1)

- 5 problems prioritised by all three panels (see table 2):
  - Violence against the person, including DV
  - Social exclusion and youth unemployment
  - Incivilities and anti-social behaviour
  - Property crime
  - Alcohol and drug misuse
### Interim findings from Q1

#### TABLE 1  Delphi Round 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESC</th>
<th>EUCPN</th>
<th>EFUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problems identified</strong></td>
<td><strong>Problems identified</strong></td>
<td><strong>Problems identified</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Street crime</td>
<td>- Street crime</td>
<td>- Street crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Incivility</td>
<td>- Urban disorder and incivility</td>
<td>- Public disorder and incivility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Violence against the person</td>
<td>- Illicit drugs markets</td>
<td>- Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Property crimes</td>
<td>- Property crimes</td>
<td>- Corruption of public officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Criminal gangs</td>
<td>- Criminal gangs and conflicts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Immigration</td>
<td>- Immigration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- State crimes</td>
<td>- Organised crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Corruption of public officials</td>
<td>- Terrorism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organised crime</td>
<td>- Safety crimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Terrorism</td>
<td>- Environmental crimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Safety crimes</td>
<td>- Threats to critical infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Environmental crimes</td>
<td>- Firearms-related crimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Threats to critical infrastructure</td>
<td>- Police corruption and violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Firearms-related crimes</td>
<td>- Corporate/white-collar crimes including fraud and tax evasion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Police corruption and violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Corporate/white-collar crimes including fraud and tax evasion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Strong focus on ‘management’ as opposed to ‘problems’ per se

### Q2 Priority problems of urban security management

#### TABLE 2  Delphi Round 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESC</th>
<th>EUCPN</th>
<th>EFUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High consensus &gt;75–100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>High consensus &gt;75–100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>High consensus &gt;75–100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Violence against the person, (including DV)</td>
<td>- Violence against the person, (including DV)</td>
<td>- Violence against the person, (including DV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Moderate consensus >50 – <75%** | **Moderate consensus >50 – <75%** | **Moderate consensus >50 – <75%** |
| - Social exclusion and youth unemployment | - Social exclusion and youth unemployment | - Social exclusion and youth unemployment |
| - Incivilities and anti-social behaviour | - Incivilities and anti-social behaviour | - Incivilities and anti-social behaviour |
| - Property crime | - Property crime | - Property crime |
| - Alcohol and drug misuse | - Alcohol and drug misuse | - Criminal damage (vandalism, graffiti) |
| - Immigration and social cohesion | - Criminal gangs and organised crime | - Degradation of governing capacity through public expenditure |
| - Criminal gangs and organised crime | - Immigration and social cohesion | |
Q3 Interim findings from the social science panel

Interim findings on the **policy approaches to problems** of urban security management

- Consensual recognition of the limited role of reactive and punitive criminal justice responses (see figure 2)

- Cross-panel consensus on importance of social and economic policies for addressing ‘generative’ problems (of decline in social cohesion, segregation, unemployment and marginalisation of vulnerable populations) (see figure 4)

- Support for targeted social and situational preventive interventions (see figure 3)
Interim findings on ‘responsibilisation’

• Responsibility varies by problem and by type (strategic or operational)
• E.g. taking the problems prioritised by the panel of social scientists there was a consensus agreeing police operational leadership for action on (see figure 8):
  ▫ Criminal gangs and organised crime;
  ▫ Property crime; and
  ▫ Violence against the person, including DV

• ... but not for other problems prioritised by this panel:
  ▫ Social exclusion and youth unemployment
  ▫ Incivilities and anti-social behaviour
  ▫ Alcohol and drug misuse
  ▫ Immigration and social cohesion
  ▫ Degradation of governing capacity
  ▫ Protection of critical infrastructure

Interim findings on ‘responsibilisation’

• For the operational management of these other priorities there was a high consensus in favour of leadership by an office of urban security management in a framework of shared responsibility (‘partnership’) (see figure 7);

• There was also a high consensus amongst this panel in agreement with strategic leadership from elected representatives (see figure 6);

• There was also a high consensus in agreement with the need for ‘supra-problem’ strategic management (understanding and governing the inter-relationships between specific problems, e.g. alcohol misuse and domestic violence) (see figure 9).
Figure 8: Operational management: Which agencies ought to have operational independence for the identified problems?

Figure 9: Supra-problem strategic management

1. It is possible to identify the interrelationship of urban security problems and to plan their reduction over the medium (annual) to long (electoral cycle) term.
2. Urban security managers ought to have primary responsibility for identifying the interrelationship of urban security problems and planning their reduction over the medium (annual) to long (electoral cycle) term.
3. Scientific advisors ought to have primary responsibility for identifying the interrelationship of urban security problems and planning their reduction over the medium (annual) to long (electoral cycle) term.
4. Elected politicians ought to have primary responsibility for identifying the interrelationship of urban security problems and planning their reduction over the medium (annual) to long (electoral cycle) term.
Interim findings on ‘expertise and training’

- Science, politics and administration as distinct vocations but strong desire for closer ties between policy and social scientific institutions and communities (see figure 10)

- Cross-sector and inter-disciplinary training

- Not criminology as ‘king-maker’

- Urban security manager as interlocutor between worlds of social science and politics

Figure 10

- Educational and training programmes ought to be tailored to fit the particular contexts of Urban Security Management in different European countries
- Educational and training programmes ought to be tailored to fit the particular contexts of Urban Security Management in different European cities and localities
- It is both possible and desirable to pursue policy convergence in Urban Security Management across Europe around a common standard set of problems, responsibilities and expertise in future EU training programmes
- Education and training for prospective urban security managers should be based on a standardised, country specific educational programme with a core curriculum
- Education and training for prospective urban security managers should be based on a standardised, European-wide educational programme with a core curriculum
- Education and training for prospective urban security managers should be based on a standardised, city specific educational programme with a core curriculum
Concluding thoughts

- Unevenness of experience and expertise

- Challenges for multi-agency, inter-sectoral and strategic problem-solving in times of austerity (vs narrow policing function)

- The irony of the ‘abolition’ of the British experiment and European lesson drawing....

- ‘Groundhog day’ … the recourse to a failed police leadership of policing problems?