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Summary and issues

The evaluation has shown that Community Support Officers (CSOs) were providing a service that was highly valued by the public, businesses and police officers. They have a key role to play in neighbourhood policing and their provision of reassurance and visibility has been welcomed by local communities. Their contribution to tackling anti-social behaviour (ASB) has been highlighted by the evaluation. The report highlights areas which raised concerns, although many of those identified, for example, training, designation of powers and recruitment standards, are being addressed.

Introduction

CSOs were introduced as part of the Police Reform Act 2002. There are now over 6,000 CSOs in all 43 Home Office forces and the Government has given a commitment that there will be 24,000 CSOs by 2008. It was expected that CSOs would have a key role to play in the implementation of neighbourhood policing. The Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) described the role of the CSOs as contributing to

the policing of neighbourhoods, primarily through highly visible patrol with the purpose of reassuring the public, increasing orderliness in public places and being accessible to communities and partner agencies working at local level. The emphasis of this role, and the powers required to fulfil it, will vary from neighbourhood to neighbourhood and force to force.

(ACPO, 2005)

This study was carried out by the Home Office between July 2004 and June 2005. Its key aims were to:

- provide a national profile of CSOs in terms of their activities, deployment, designated powers and demographics;
- provide indications of the impact of CSOs on the public in terms of their levels of reassurance, their perceptions and an understanding of their role;
- provide indications of the impact of CSOs on low-level crime, disorder and ASB.

The study used a wide range of data. Survey data were collected at national and local levels and case studies were carried out in three force areas. Within the case study areas
interviews and focus groups were conducted with CSOs, force members, local residents and businesses; local crime, incident and activity data were also analysed.

**Part 1: Role, deployment and impact of CSOs**

**Role and activities**

This evaluation has shown that CSOs were carrying out activities that were crucial to both the concept behind neighbourhood policing and its effective implementation. They provided visible and accessible policing and engaged with the public. CSOs spent the majority of their time in contact with the public, through visible, usually foot, patrol. They spent much of their time dealing with youth disorder, alcohol-related issues, low-level crime and anti-social behaviour.

Many CSOs were skilled in engaging with the community. They have proved to be valuable in gathering information from the public. Local people were often more prepared to approach CSOs than police officers, because they were accessible through foot patrol and people felt they had time to listen and were not too busy to handle more trivial problems. Neighbourhood police officers spent little time on patrol, whereas CSOs were able to spend most of their time on foot patrol and in the community.

There was local variation (between and within forces) in CSOs’ activities that reflected force level and more local priorities, for example collecting evidence for Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) and responding to low-level incidents. Some forces had responded to the challenge of CSOs being used for a wide range of tasks by developing specialist roles, for example deployment CSOs so that locally based CSOs could provide a dedicated service to the local neighbourhood.

**Powers**

At the time of the fieldwork, forces had designated different powers to their CSOs. This was an area that was developing during the evaluation and is still under review with the Home Office consultation on the introduction of a standard set of powers. The numbers of powers ranged from over 40 to none, with 90 per cent of forces having designated powers relating to lower-level ASB, including the confiscation of alcohol and tobacco from those under-age and the powers to demand the name and address of a person acting in an anti-social way. This accorded with the views of many respondents in the forces who felt that CSOs needed sufficient powers to tackle the routine tasks they encountered most frequently, for example dealing with low-level ASB, without having to call on police officers.
Deployment
There were variations in the ways CSOs patrolled and the shift systems in operation in the forces. There was evidence in some forces that the hours worked by CSOs did not allow for maximum visibility or alignment with neighbourhood policing colleagues. The evaluation found evidence that regardless of how well targeted their deployment was, many CSOs felt they occasionally encountered situations where they were vulnerable. A large minority had experienced some level of physical abuse and most had experienced verbal abuse. This raised issues about appropriate levels of training and equipment for CSOs.

Impact
The evaluation examined the impact of the work of CSOs on the numbers of recorded crimes and reported incidents in the neighbourhoods to which they were deployed, compared with control areas. No discernable differences were found in the trends in the numbers of crimes and incidents between areas with and without CSOs, before and after their introduction. This may be because the level of reporting was influenced by how easy it was to report low-level incidents, as well as by the limitations of data, in particular because many of the incidents dealt with by CSOs were not categorised as crimes.

The evaluation also considered the impact of CSOs in terms of public perceptions, since an important part of their role was providing reassurance. The evidence from the case study areas showed that CSOs spent much of their time dealing with youth nuisance, the main issue for the public in all the areas. The time that CSOs spent in getting to know the community and talking to young people was appreciated by local residents, businesses and police officers. This was the foundation of their success in tackling problems with young people. There was strong evidence from two of the case study areas where the CSOs were well known by name to the community, that the residents and businesses felt that CSOs had made a real impact in their areas especially in dealing with youth disorder.

The ability of CSOs to make residents feel safer was confirmed in areas where they had been deployed for longer periods of time. However, in some areas little publicity about their role had reached residents, although businesses appeared to be better informed. This led to confusion among many people, particularly in areas without CSOs, about their status and remit. Many members of the public, whilst appreciating the role of CSOs, would have preferred to have had fully sworn police officers.
Part 2: Implementation and human resource issues

Recruitment and retention
The comparatively large number of CSOs recruited in a relatively short time led to some problems and concerns in the forces, particularly with regard to training, induction and supervision. CSOs were employed by police authorities on local terms and conditions. This resulted in some variations in pay and conditions of service between forces, in particular in the use of shift allowances.

CSO recruitment was successful in attracting a wide range of people from a variety of backgrounds. They tended to be older and more diverse in terms of ethnicity than police recruits and their past work experience was more wide-ranging. The comparatively high numbers of CSOs from minority ethnic groups may help to increase the representation of some groups within the police service.

Generally, CSOs were satisfied with their job, although there was some dissatisfaction with the repetitive nature of the work. Those who were most satisfied with the job were generally older and female and these were most likely to say that they intended to stay in post. Many CSOs expressed concerns about career progression and saw being a CSO as a step towards becoming a police officer. Whilst this is positive for the service as a whole, particularly if the demographics of CSOs feed through to sworn officers, the downside could be the loss of a familiar and consistent presence on the streets.

Training
The evaluation found that insufficient time had been provided to build a national training model before the introduction of CSOs. At the time of the study, each force had developed its own programme of training, which meant that the length and content of training varied, although there was considerable overlap in content across forces. Central support has now been developed for CSO training in the form of a Centrex (National Centre for Policing Excellence) training manual available to all forces.

Many CSOs expressed concerns about training, in particular wanting more practically based teaching methods and additional or refresher training on some of the practical skills, especially self-defence. There were different approaches between areas in how they introduced new recruits to the neighbourhood and the team. Some areas had wide-ranging induction training and mentoring programmes that were appreciated by the CSOs.
**Supervision and organisational structure**
In most cases, the supervision of CSOs was by sergeants who retained their existing management workloads, and many CSOs felt that their supervisors did not have sufficient time to support them. The provision of training for those who manage CSOs did not appear to be routine, meaning some supervisors did not fully understand the CSO role.

CSOs were found to be working in a range of organisational structures with many working in relative isolation from the community policing teams. This, together with the fact that CSOs were often on different shift systems to their policing colleagues, and in particular their supervisors, raises issues of co-ordination and effective use. The evidence suggests that CSOs should be managed within neighbourhood policing teams. This would provide day-to-day support and supervision, whilst giving CSOs the opportunity to be more fully involved with neighbourhood policing, for example using problem-solving tactics. In locations where this was in place CSOs felt greater job satisfaction from the increased variability of the work, integration with colleagues and their effectiveness at problem solving.

**Integration**
CSOs and police officers, often working alongside each other, had different employment status, with different terms and conditions; in particular CSOs police staff had the right to strike while police officers, as office holders under the Crown did not.

CSOs generally felt accepted by their police colleagues and where there was resistance to CSOs it tended to come from police officers who did not work closely with them. A factor in this resistance may have been that communication within forces prior to the arrival of CSOs was not always adequate to prevent officers from feeling threatened and thinking that their jobs were being taken. However, acceptance of CSOs tended to improve with increased contact and understanding of the value of the work of CSOs. It was, however, clear that much of the good will and acceptance of CSOs was dependent on the numbers of police officers remaining stable.

**Part 3: Conclusions and good practice**
The evaluation showed that CSOs were providing a service that was highly valued by the public, businesses and police officers. They were more of a visible and familiar presence than police officers, who had other demands on their time. The accessibility and approachability of CSOs meant that the public were more likely to pass on information to
CSOs that they may have felt was too trivial for a police officer. The public appreciated the CSOs’ role in engaging with young people and dealing with ASB. The diversity of CSOs, particularly in terms of ethnicity and age, has been one of the successes of the implementation of the role.

There is evidence that CSOs have the potential to be, and have been, successful in many neighbourhoods. They have carried out high visibility patrol that has led to greater levels of reassurance amongst the public, the tackling of youth disorder and more contact and engagement with the community. However, there are some aspects of deployment and staffing that need consideration if their role is to be fully effective in the local area. These include:

- the turnover of staff, in particular the number of CSOs wanting to become fully sworn officers and the impact on the provision of service within the neighbourhood;
- the implications of CSOs carrying out tasks that fall outside their main role of patrol and community engagement;
- how to balance the advantages of close team working with police colleagues and the importance that times of deployment allow for maximum visibility;
- how to ensure adequate supervision for CSOs without overburdening sergeants;
- how to deliver training and induction that meets the needs of CSOs.

The evaluation found two key factors to the successful and effective use of CSOs. These were the embedding of CSOs within the forces’ organisational structures and ensuring that police officers and members of the public fully understood the unique role of CSOs.

The evaluation identified elements of good practice for CSOs working in a neighbourhood. These included having a clearly defined role, having appropriate deployment and powers, working in a fixed location, being deployed within the local area through the National Intelligence Model (NIM) and being accessible to the public. The report makes recommendations for the training, recruitment, communication and health and safety of CSOs in forces.
Background

The level of crime in England and Wales, as measured by the British Crime Survey (BCS), has fallen consistently since a peak in 1995. The risk of becoming a victim of crime has fallen from 40 per cent in 1995 to 26 per cent in 2003/04, the lowest level recorded since the BCS began in 1981. However, at the same time, two-thirds (65%) of the public believed that crime in the country as a whole had increased in the previous two years with a third thinking it had risen ‘a lot’ (Dodd et al., 2004).

The thematic report Open All Hours by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) explored this disparity between success in crime reduction and the apparent lack of an equivalent impact on the public’s confidence in the police and perceptions of crime, and identified a ‘reassurance gap’ (HMIC, 2001). When asked what would improve their feelings of safety, satisfaction and confidence in the police, surveys consistently highlighted the public’s desire for greater levels of foot patrol. However, the role of the police officer has changed over the years, with less time being spent on the beat. An examination of how officers time was spent (PA Consulting Group, 2001) confirmed that most time outside the station was spent responding to incidents and making enquiries, and that most patrol was carried out from cars. Many activities keep police officers off the beat, for example making an arrest could tie up an officer in the station for three and a half hours. There was a gap between the public desire for visible patrol and the ability of the police service to provide that function.

Neighbourhood policing

Consequently, the issue of how to reassure the public has been high on the agenda in recent years. CSOs were introduced as a way of increasing the visible presence of the police organisation through patrol on foot. An international review of research into reassurance found that

In relation to improving perceived police effectiveness, the mechanisms of increasing police visibility and familiarity were found to be most effective. In relation to feelings and perceptions of safety, increased levels of foot patrol were found to be most effective.

(Dalgleish and Myhill, 2004).
The Government has made a commitment to deliver neighbourhood policing to all communities. The aim is to ‘make communities feel safe and secure by reducing crime and anti-social behaviour in their area’ (Home Office, 2005), through the work of visible and accessible neighbourhood policing teams that are responsive to local priorities. Successful implementation of neighbourhood policing involves engaging the public and using local intelligence to target deployment of the teams. CSOs now have a key part to play in the local mixed teams that include officers, special constables, wardens and others. This evaluation examined the high visibility role of CSOs, as well as a range of other functions they carry out.

The legislation

The introduction of CSOs in the Police Reform Act 2002 represented a fundamental change in policing. The Act extended the role of police staff (personnel employed by a police organisation who do not have the sworn status of a constable) to assist sworn police officers and fill many front-line roles, giving authority to the chief officer of a police force to designate any person who is employed by the police authority as a Community Support Officer and confer on that person any of a list of powers given in the Act. This list has subsequently been added to through the later legislation (See Appendix 3 for full list). CSOs were particularly intended to provide a visible uniformed patrolling presence and tackle anti-social behaviour. The statutory term is Community Support Officer, but to emphasise that they are part of the police service and to distinguish from other agencies’ staff involved in community safety, they are invariably called Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) by police forces.

In order to assist with the introduction of CSOs, Home Office funds were made available from 2002 onwards and implementation of the CSO initiative was rapid. There are now over 6,000 CSOs working in 43 forces in England and Wales. This figure is set to continue increasing as the White Paper Building Communities, Beating Crime (2004) outlined proposals for the Neighbourhood Policing Fund which aims to provide 24,000 CSOs by 2008.

The research

CSOs have now been in place for nearly three years, but to date there has been no national evaluation of the use and effectiveness of their role. The HMIC thematic inspection Modernising the Police Service (HMIC, 2004) found that CSOs were being deployed in
diverse ways across different forces and recommended that the Home Office undertook a national evaluation. The White Paper Building Communities, Beating Crime also stated the Government’s commitment to national and local evaluation (Home Office, 2004).

This present report represents this national evaluation. It aims to fill the knowledge gap by detailing how CSOs are being deployed nationally and indicating what their impact has been. This evaluation will provide a key source of data to inform the future direction and development of the CSO role, something of particular importance given the decision to increase their numbers. The key aims of the evaluation were to:

- provide a national profile of CSOs in terms of their activities, deployment, designated powers and demographics;
- provide indications of the impact of CSOs on the public in terms of their levels of reassurance, their perceptions and an understanding of their role;
- provide indications of the impact of CSOs on low-level crime/disorder, incidents and anti-social behaviour.

Data sources

The evaluation drew on a number of data sources at both a national and local level applying both quantitative and qualitative techniques to build up a picture of the implementation and impact of CSOs in forces. Using both quantitative and qualitative methods and multiple data sources allowed the researchers not only to validate their findings, but also to widen their understanding of the issues. In presenting the findings the authors have, wherever possible, used data from more than one source. The sources used are outlined below. More details of the data sources and methods of analysis are provided in Appendix 1: Methods.

At a national level, data were collected from two sources:

Force survey

A detailed survey was sent to all forces in England and Wales to obtain basic information regarding numbers of CSOs and the force policy on the implementation of CSOs including issues such as shift patterns, areas patrolled, terms and conditions, powers designated and the main function of CSOs within force. Thirty three of the 43 forces responded, which represents a response rate of 77 per cent.
**CSO survey**

The survey aimed to build a detailed understanding of who CSOs were (in terms of demographics and past careers) as well as seeking their thoughts on career intentions and views on all aspects of their role, ranging from supervision and training through to job satisfaction. It was sent to 5,125 CSOs, which is the total number of CSOs who had been in post for at least three months, with 2,647 completed surveys returned. This represented an overall response rate of 52 per cent. The survey was analysed using a Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS).

**Local level**

At a local level a more qualitative approach was adopted. This enabled the researchers to build up a detailed picture of the implementation and operation of CSOs at a local level and to explore a range of views from a variety of sources. Three forces, Sussex, Merseyside and Northumbria were chosen for case study work. The selection of forces was based on a number of factors. Firstly, it was vital that forces chosen had the following characteristics:

- employed large numbers of CSOs;
- the deployment of CSOs varied between the forces chosen in terms of the types of duties involved and the range of powers delegated; and
- were geographically diverse in terms of location and make-up (urban/rural).

In addition, because the work would require significant resources from forces in terms of provision of data it was vital that the case study forces were keen to be involved.

Within each force four locations were then chosen for detailed study – two experimental areas where CSOs had been deployed for some time and two control areas where CSOs were not currently deployed. These areas were roughly ward-sized and were matched in terms of demographic and socio-economic indicators using the Neighbourhood Statistics from the 2001 Census. More detail on the individual locations is provided in Appendix 2.

Within each force there were:

- interviews with key personnel;
- focus groups with police officers and CSOs;
- focus groups with residents and businesses.
The transcribed data were imported into NVivo, a qualitative data analysis package, which was used to analyse the data. The coding was developed through an iterative process. Quotations have been included in the report where they represent the views of a number of participants and illustrate the themes that were developed. The quotations used are representative of the range of views in all three case study forces.

Additional information was collected for the control and experimental sites:

- activity analysis data for CSOs and neighbourhood police officers
- crime and incident data.

To supplement these data, in the experimental areas diaries were completed by CSOs.

**Structure of the report**

The report is presented in three parts:

**Part 1: The role, deployment and impact of CSOs**

This includes sections looking at the range of activities carried out by CSOs, what powers forces had designated to CSOs, how they were deployed, and an exploration of their impact on crime and anti-social behaviour and on public perceptions.

**Part 2: Implementation and human resources**

This includes sections looking at the recruitment and retention of CSOs, training, supervision, organisational structures and their integration within the policing family.

**Part 3: Conclusions and good practice**

This draws together the findings from each of the chapters and presents the issues raised as good practice.

Appendices: Additional information is presented in the appendices.
1. Details of the methods used in the study.
2. Descriptions and demographics of the forces and case study areas.
3. Powers – list of all powers available to CSOs and powers designated by case study forces.
Part 1: Role, deployment and impact of CSOs

**Introduction**

CSOs were introduced to perform a high-visibility, patrolling role providing reassurance to local communities. They were to focus on lower-level crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour and were seen as an important weapon in the Government's drive to crack down on anti-social behaviour and nuisance (www.policereform.gov.uk). CSOs took on a new role and forces were given discretion how to develop the role locally. The Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) described the role of the CSOs as contributing to

> the policing of neighbourhoods, primarily through highly visible patrol with the purpose of reassuring the public, increasing orderliness in public places and being accessible to communities and partner agencies working at local level. The emphasis of this role, and the powers required to fulfil it, will vary from neighbourhood to neighbourhood and force to force.  

(ACPO, 2005)

This part of the evaluation examines the role of CSOs, looking at evidence on how CSOs were being used in different areas. The range and balance of activities carried out by CSOs varied between local areas depending on the assessment of local priorities. The first section describes the activities carried out by CSOs, comparing the case study areas. At the time of the field work there were a number of powers that could be designated to CSOs and the second section outlines the powers that could and had been designated to CSOs by police forces. The third section looks at the different deployment patterns of CSOs and considers the health and safety implications. The final section explores the evidence on the impact of CSOs on crime and anti-social-behaviour, including public perceptions.

**Role and activities**

The key role for CSOs when they were introduced was to provide high-visibility patrol. Forces agreed about their core role. All forces responding to the force survey stated that providing a visible presence was one of the main priorities for CSOs, with 85 per cent of forces stating that visibility was the number one priority for CSOs. Interacting with the community and dealing with anti-social behaviour/low-level crime were considered to be the next most important functions. However, there were substantial differences in the range
of activities and the time spent on these activities between and within forces. Some CSOs were used almost exclusively as dedicated patrol officers, whilst others were used to support police officers in carrying out some day-to-day tasks. Crawford et al. (2005) in their study of visible patrols recognised these potentially competing models of the use of CSOs.

This section looks at the range of activities carried out by CSOs, making comparisons between areas and with neighbourhood police officers. It uses data from activity analysis, diaries, interviews and focus groups in the three case study forces, supplemented by information at a national level from the CSO and force surveys (see Appendix 1 for description of methodology and the scope of activity analysis).

**Patrol and community involvement**

Table 1.1 presents comparisons of the percentage of time spent by CSOs and police officers on specific tasks. It compares the percentage of their total available time spent by CSOs and neighbourhood officers on incident linked activities, patrol and community engagement and other activities. Incidents include any event that requires police action; it can be reported by the public or come across by police on patrol.

Activity analysis confirmed that in each of the case study forces over a half of CSOs’ time was spent in the neighbourhood on visible patrol and community involvement, with CSOs spending between 57 per cent and 50 per cent of their time on these activities and neighbourhood constables between 30 per cent and 16 per cent (Table 1.1). In addition CSOs spent between 14 per cent and three per cent of their time dealing with incidents, most of which were within their beat area.

**Time on patrol**

In the case study forces visible patrol was the activity that CSOs spent the majority of their time on. Activity analysis data from the case study forces showed that, generally, police officers spent more time dealing with incidents than did CSOs; indeed in one force neighbourhood officers spent over half of their time dealing with incidents (Table 1.1). They therefore had less time available for non-incident-linked activities than CSOs and spent less of this on any sort of patrol.

There were wide variations between case study areas in the amount of time CSOs spent on patrol; these variations between beat areas were wider than those between forces. For example, the percentage of non-incident time spent on visible patrol in the case study areas ranged from 44 per cent to 70 per cent – both examples came from areas in Northumbria.
Table 1.1: Percentage of total time spent on attending incidents and on patrol and community engagement by CSOs and neighbourhood police constables (PCs) in three forces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Force</th>
<th>CSOs</th>
<th>PCs</th>
<th>CSOs</th>
<th>PCs</th>
<th>CSOs</th>
<th>PCs</th>
<th>Average^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% all time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident-linked activities</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol and community involvement</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other activities (inc. refreshments, briefings, time in station)</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Force figures not available, average of Halewood and Heswall areas.
Source: Force activity analysis.

What CSOs do on patrol

Patrol is multifaceted. The aim of patrol is not just to provide a ‘visible presence’, its effectiveness is also dependent on those patrolling being ‘accessible and familiar’ (HMIC, 2001). Whilst on patrol CSOs meet with a variety of people and deal with a range of situations, this gives the opportunity for CSOs to get to know the community and for residents and businesses to get to know the CSOs. CSOs in two of the case study forces filled in diaries for a week, to record what they did whilst on the streets in addition to patrol (see Appendix 1 for methodology). The most frequently carried out activity was talking to people either through chance meetings or by popping into such places as shops or schools to introduce themselves (36% of encounters). CSOs responding to the survey also reported that they spent much of their time interacting with residents, with 75 per cent saying they did this daily and 88 per cent reporting they did it at least once a week. The presence of CSOs on the streets seeming to be available can lead to the building up of relationships with the community. Police officers in the focus groups recognised the importance of the perception of the approachability of CSOs, in particular for members of the community passing on information.

Whereas the CSOs fill that void, people think the CSOs have actually got time to stop and speak to us. So they’ll pass on community intelligence, and community information to the CSOs that otherwise they may not give to us because they perceive us to be too busy.

Police officer
The role of CSOs in getting to know the community as a result of foot patrol and the passing on of intelligence was commented on and valued by respondents at all levels within all case study forces. The types of intelligence range from low-level information about gangs of youths hanging about to looking out for those suspected of serious crimes. This has been found by other evaluations of CSO; Innes (2004) spoke of CSOs performing the role of ‘community intelligence conduits’.

**CSOs gather intelligence**

Their offender intelligence is brilliant – they often know more than the cops – have intimate knowledge of whereabouts of offenders – what they are wearing, their name, where they live – can take months to build up that level of knowledge.

Police officer

They are a massive strand of our intelligence gathering – they enable us to micro target below the level of NIM – they get emerging problems and emerging trends. Some of that community intelligence, such as where the youths are currently congregating, where the dens are, isn’t necessarily criminal intelligence, doesn’t necessarily need to be fed into a formal system, but informal passing of information, exchange of information during the course of the joint parades and things of that nature.

Police officer

They do encourage people to report where they wouldn’t do normally. We get intelligence that we wouldn’t otherwise get. PCSOs are phenomenally good at providing local intelligence.

Police officer

The police officers get sent to a rape or an attempted rape, then the PCSOS can hear the description … these two people come out and think oh they look very much like … picked them up. So we know, they’re eyes and ears for us.

Implementation team

**What CSOs deal with on patrol**

Residents and businesses in all the case study areas identified anti-social behaviour by groups of young people as being the key issue in their local area. The main problems cited included drinking, drug-taking, aggressive and/or abusive behaviour and intimidation. One of the aims of CSOs was to help to reduce anti-social behaviour. Police officers within the case study forces also saw this as an important part of the CSO role, for example a BCU commander listing the problems they dealt with said
...general yobbish behaviour you know, people finding kids kicking around, making life difficult for them. And they’ve gone and tackled that and they’ve seen a big difference.  

Police commander

The evidence from this evaluation showed that CSOs did spend a lot of their time dealing with ASB and with youths. CSOs in the survey reported that dealing with youth disorder/nuisance was one of the tasks they most frequently carried out, with over a half (54%) saying they did it daily and 81 per cent at least weekly. Two of the powers reported as being most frequently used were requiring the name and address of those behaving in an anti-social manner and confiscating alcohol from those aged under 18.

Where they patrol

There are two aspects to successful foot patrol, familiarity and targeting. One of the main tenets of neighbourhood policing is ‘people seeing and having regular contact with the same officers – week in and week out’ (www.policereform.gov.uk). CSOs are in an excellent position to build up this trust and the importance of CSOs becoming a familiar face by patrolling the same neighbourhood was recognised by many interviewees in the fieldwork.

They go to the same areas, they know where these young people are, they become friends with them, they’ve built up the trust and the only way you do that is the time that they’ve got to be visible, to be there and know where they all congregate.  

Union representative

However, research over a number of years has shown foot patrol by police officers to be more successful when intelligence-led and targeted at crime hot spots (Sherman and Weisburd, 1995; Sherman and Eck, 2002). In the CSO survey only 14 per cent of CSOs said that they were tasked through the National Intelligence Model that would result in them being deployed to problem areas. There were however indications from the case study forces, in particular Sussex, that CSOs were deployed to hot spots, although the CSOs may not have recognised this as tasking through NIM.

There is a balance to be drawn between CSOs providing reassurance through being a visible and familiar presence in the area by patrolling the same beat and CSOs responding to crime hot spots by being deployed through NIM. At present some forces are responding to this challenge by deploying CSOs to hot spots only within their beat areas.
Community activities
CSOs did not just get to know communities through being on the streets; they were involved in community activities, such as attending meetings of residents’ associations and visiting schools. The time spent by CSOs on community involvement as recorded by activity analysis in the case study forces varied from five to eight per cent of the time not spent on incidents. It is not clear how much this variation reflected different practices between areas or different ways of recording. If the percentage of their total time spent on patrol is combined with that spent on community involvement, this accounts for between 50 per cent and 57 per cent of CSOs’ time spent in the community in the case study forces (Table 1.1).

The sorts of community activities carried out by CSOs varied among areas. In the CSO survey over 40 per cent of respondents said that they regularly (at least once a week) visited community centres, elderly people, victims and witnesses of crime and schools. CSOs completing the diary exercise had been involved with various public events including drug awareness and personal safety talks and visits to youth centres. There were examples of CSOs within case study forces using a range of approaches to involving the community from visiting schools to setting up diversionary activities for young people.

CSOs and community involvement – Merseyside
I do a lot of work with schools in the area – we have school liaison programmes and we are [inaudible] to work with the school and the teachers – so if the school are particularly worried about a pupil I can then go in and talk to them.

CSO

They set up sort of diversionary tactics for the youths as well like a skateboarding initiative. We had problems with skateboarders in town and they’ve set up a committee along with the town centre beat manager who’s a police officer, and they take the kids skateboarding now to [one word] Liverpool by coach. And they’ve actually got a few thousand pounds in an account to help them to fund them [inaudible] and they’ve raised £10,000 I believe to, off the borough council, to set up a skateboard park in Gayton which should be going live at the end of this year. So they’ve been involved in all those sort of things.

Police officer

Previously there had been a lot of trouble with kids playing tricks etc. on Halloween but this year the PCSOs organised a party for local kids which reduced the problem.

Police officer
Another approach to community involvement is through the establishment of self-help schemes. Representatives from local businesses in the focus groups in the case study areas emphasised the impact of ASB on their businesses. CSOs appear to have responded to their concerns, through maintaining informal contact with them; the CSO survey showed that over two-thirds (67%) of CSOs visited local businesses at least once a week. In most case study areas CSOs had been instrumental in setting up or facilitating the operation of such schemes as shop watch or pub watch. These schemes are similar to neighbourhood watch for shops, pubs and businesses which meant that businesses notified each other if they experienced any problems with anti-social behaviour or crime.

**Other activities**

**Attending incidents**

CSOs spent less time dealing with incidents than neighbourhood officers and in the case study forces the percentage of time spent on responding to incidents by CSOs ranged from three per cent to 14 per cent whereas for neighbourhood police officers it was between 28 per cent and 54 per cent (Table 1.1). Generally CSOs spent less time dealing with crimes, spending between 21 per cent and 48 per cent of the small amount of time in which they dealt with incidents, on crimes compared to well over a half for neighbourhood officers (58%-69%). This was partly because forces had specific policies about the use of CSOs in attending incidents and their tasking by the control room in response to calls from the public. Sussex and Northumbria both had a policy of CSOs generally being deployed by the control room for non-urgent incidents; Merseyside, at the time of the fieldwork, was considering a similar policy.

Looking in detail at the type of incidents attended by CSOs, there were differences between the forces. In a two-week period, CSOs were deployed to incidents in both experimental areas in Northumbria and one in Sussex. Table 1.2 presents the number of incidents that were reported to the control room for two weeks in 2004 in both areas in Northumbria. There were 356 incidents reported in the period, of which 177 occurred when CSOs were on duty and of these 139 were attended. Fifty-six of these (40%) were attended by CSOs, or CSOs with police officers. Thirty-three (59%) of the incidents attended by CSOs were categorised as concerning youths or fireworks, indeed nearly all such incidents if attended, were dealt with by CSOs. Within Northumbria, CSOs were mainly used to deal with reports of disorder by youths and to some extent as an additional resource within the area for large scale incidents, for example searching for a wanted man.
Table 1.2: The number of incidents attended by CSOs in two areas in Northumbria (two week period in October 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total incidents</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents 16:00 to midnight</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents attended 16:00 to midnight</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents 16:00 to midnight attended by CSOs</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents attended by CSOs – youths/fireworks</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, within the ward in Sussex where they were deployed, CSOs only attended 13 of the 146 attended incidents in the two-week period. They were also used for a wider range of incidents, from a medical incident to motor vehicle crime.

There are various considerations to be taken into account when deciding on the extent of the deployment of CSOs by the control room. Generally CSOs attend low-level incidents, many of which may not otherwise be attended by police officers, and the advantages of deploying CSOs to these types of incidents are:

- the public feel reassured if there is a speedy response to their call about an incident;
- the perpetrators get sent a message that their behaviour has consequences;
- if CSOs attend rather than police officers it reduces the burden on police officers

Possible disadvantages are listed below.

- Attending the incident could take CSOs away from their core task of visible patrol and if out of their area or if the incident requires additional action or paperwork the CSOs may be away from their beat for a considerable time.
- The evidence from the evaluation is that if the call is about youth disturbance, the young people have often dispersed before the CSO arrives.
- Many of the low-level incidents would not be attended by police officers – so there is little reduction in the burden on officers.
- CSOs have limited training and powers and there are risks in deploying them to situations where the circumstances may not be clear.

The Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) have recognised the importance of responding to low-level incidents without taking CSOs away from patrol and community engagement. They
have a project employing ten deployment support CSOs who work with response teams to lead on the 33 per cent of calls from command and control that do not require a sworn officer, but nevertheless require a service response (e.g. bail enquiries, abandoned vehicles). There is a fixed list of call codes that has been determined for control centres. If this approach is taken it is very important that control room operators are trained to recognise the limitations of CSO powers, as evidence from the CSO survey suggested that they often did not understand the CSO role, with only 47 per cent of CSOs thinking that control room staff understood their role and deployed them appropriately.

**What else they do**

There was a range of activities carried out by CSOs that did not fall into the main tasks of patrol, community involvement and responding to incidents. These tasks include innovative uses of CSOs, responses to local and national initiatives and to relieve police officers of some tasks.

There was little evidence of widespread abstractions of CSOs from their areas to be used for special events. The evidence from activity analysis in the case study forces showed that a small proportion of time was spent by CSOs and neighbourhood police officers (less than 2.5%) on special events and operations including sporting and other public events. Most forces occasionally used CSOs for some special tasks: the force survey indicated that 26 of the 33 forces that replied had used CSOs for some of these tasks – house to house enquiries, sporting events, other public events, traffic cordons, crime scene cordons and road traffic accidents. This picture was confirmed by the CSO survey with 22 per cent of CSOs saying that they were frequently used for house to house enquiries, with only one per cent saying they had been frequently deployed to sporting events. There was wide variation between forces in their use of CSOs for such tasks. Some forces explicitly stated that they would only use CSOs for such tasks if the work was within their beat area and many CSOs were not trained for formal house-to-house enquiries for major crimes, but may be used in more informal ways.

Within the case study forces there was evidence of CSOs being used in different ways for example, collecting and collating evidence for Anti-Social Behaviour Orders and Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABCs) and giving crime prevention advice. In Merseyside they were being used to leaflet areas with crime prevention advice after a spate of burglaries. The greatest use of CSOs away from their beat area in the case study forces was in Sussex where on weekend nights they were used as an additional resource for Operation Safer Streets, an operation targeting trouble late at night in the town centre. CSOs were mainly used for looking at CCTV and late night working was optional.
Examples of different uses of CSOs

Merseyside
- Leafleting area after burglary.
- Crime scene cordons.
- Minor house to house enquiries.
- Guarding scenes.
- Events (usually on beat).

Northumbria
- Collection of evidence for ABCs and ASBOs.
- House to House enquiries.
- Crime prevention advice.

Sussex
- CCTV surveillance.
- Major events (e.g. Operation Otter) (very occasionally).
- Witness support.
- Evidence for ABCs.

Some forces had created specialist roles for CSOs, for example as discussed previously MPS have deployment CSOs, they also employed security CSOs in central London. Merseyside had travel CSOs that were introduced in response to particular incidents that were occurring on the buses. From a range of interviews in Merseyside travel, CSOs were generally considered to be very effective:

*The relationship between transport companies and the police blossomed. It started in Kirkby – as a result of some stoning incidents the buses were withdrawn in the afternoon/evening …The impact was that crime went down, satisfaction from public, drivers and revenue protection went up ‘Real dolly mixtures of staff on the operation – officers, specials, volunteers’.*

Police officer

Time in the station
The core role for CSOs is to provide a visible presence; time spent in the police station takes them away from this. Generally CSOs spent less time in the station than neighbourhood officers. In the case study forces the amount of time spent in the station by CSOs varied from 22 per cent to 29 per cent and for neighbourhood officers it varied from 36 per cent to 60 per cent. Looking in detail at the case study forces, police officers not only spent more time
in the station than CSOs, but they did different things. In Merseyside and Northumbria where there was a detailed breakdown of police officers’ and CSOs’ time in station, between 13 per cent and 37 per cent of neighbourhood police officers’ time in the station was spent dealing with incidents. CSOs, as would be expected, spent much less of their time in the station dealing with incidents (less than 10%). However, not all time spent in the station was dealing with paperwork or administration, for example, in one area in Merseyside 25 per cent of CSOs’ time in the station was spent in neighbourhood forums, and in Merseyside force although neighbourhood police officers spend nearly 60 per cent of their time in the station, about a quarter of this is spent in the enquiry office dealing with the public, something not mentioned by other forces.

The evaluation has shown that CSOs spent much less of their time dealing with incidents and that they spent less time in the station than did neighbourhood officers. Therefore there are implications for CSOs if they are deployed to more incidents and in particular crimes, as this may mean that they will spend less time in the community with the need to spend more time on administrative matters. Other activities of CSOs also had a knock-on effect on how much time CSOs spent in the station, for example CSOs in one area spent 24 per cent of their time in the station on issues relating to community involvement; most of this time was collating evidence on ASBOs.

**Impact on the role of police officers**

CSOs were intended to supplement and support the role of neighbourhood constables. ACPO in its guidance on CSOs makes this clear,

> The role of PCSOs is to reinforce, not replace our other methods of policing. PCSOs are able to increase our capacity to perform high level policing functions by increasing the ability of community constables to tackle quality of life and community safety issues.

(ACPO, 2005)

In the course of interviews and focus groups respondents from the case study forces suggested that CSOs carried out activities that police constables did not have the time to do, in particular spending a large portion of every shift on visible patrol and in the community. Many different people commented that CSOs could fulfil the role that many felt had been carried out in the past by the ‘local bobby’. For example a CSO in a focus group said,

> A new service, yeah.. We’re not doing what the bobbies have been doing… There’s an element of doing what the bobbies used to do …back in the olden days.
This view was echoed by both police commanders and police constables who laid particular emphasis on the importance of foot patrol, which some areas had not had for many years. Many police officers at all ranks who worked with CSOs and CSOs themselves were clear that they were doing a different job to police officers.

*It’s that you need to differentiate what a PCSO does to a police officer. …So we know what the gap in the market is, visible reassurance, … and we know that providing a visible presence and reassurance, being active, out in the community is the main job of a PCSO.*

ACPO

Members of the public commented that, not only were CSOs on the streets, they were accessible and willing to spend time with the local community.

*They’ve got the time to talk to people. The real police will be in and out... they respond don’t they? The community police can spend half an hour talking to you. Yeah. It’s as if it was like the local bobby when you were a kid.*

Resident, experimental area

**Summary**

- CSOs spent the majority of their time in contact with the public, through visible, usually foot, patrol and through being involved in the community.
- CSOs carried out activities that police officers, with other demands on their time were not able to. CSOs spent more time on patrol and attended fewer incidents than neighbourhood police officers.
- The evidence from this evaluation showed that CSOs spent much of their time dealing with ASB and with youths.
- Forces recognised that the presence of CSOs on the streets and their involvement with the local community was providing invaluable intelligence.
- There was local variation between and within forces in the activities carried out by CSOs.
- Some forces had developed specialist roles for CSOs, for example deployment CSOs, that meant that locally based CSOs could provide a dedicated service to the local neighbourhood.

**Powers**

Ensuring that CSOs have appropriate powers is fundamental to making the most effective use of them. The evaluation found that forces had designated different numbers of powers and
there were diverse views about the use of powers by CSOs. This section describes the powers that had been designated to CSOs in forces and considers the different views about the extent of the powers that it was appropriate to give to CSOs. At the time of the fieldwork, early in 2005, forces were able to designate any number of powers from those listed in various Acts of Parliament. At the time of writing the report, the Home Office had recently carried out a consultation exercise on whether to establish a set of standard powers that all CSOs would have, regardless of their force area, and this proposal was being taken forward.

### The designation and use of powers

Section 38 of the Police Reform Act 2002 gave authority to the chief officer of a police force to designate any person who is employed by the police authority as a Community Support Officer and confer on that person any from a list of powers given in the Act. New powers have been added by the Anti-social Behaviour Act 2003, the Serious Organised Crime Act 2005 and the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 (that have not yet commenced). (See Appendix 3 for a list of the powers, and the powers given to CSOs in the case study forces). The range of powers available to forces to designate to CSOs allows them to deal with an array of issues, including environmental, young people behaving in an anti-social way, general anti-social behaviour, misuse of alcohol and some traffic infringements. CSOs can use a range of sanctions including issuing Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs), confiscation, requiring names and addresses and detentions. From a survey of forces (updated October 2005), of the 41 forces responding the following was found.

- Most forces had delegated between 14 and 28 powers from over 40 that were available.
- A quarter of forces had designated 30 or more powers, a quarter 28 to 19, a quarter between 18 and 15 and a quarter between 14 and nine.
- One force had not granted any powers to their CSOs.
- The powers most often designated were the powers to confiscate alcohol and tobacco from under age persons, the power of entry to save life and limb, the power to demand the name and address of a person acting in an anti-social manner and fixed penalty notices. Over 90 per cent of forces had designated these powers.
- The power to detain was originally only available to six forces that were part of a pilot project; this is now available to all forces. At the time of the updated survey an additional eight forces had designated the power to detain. One of the forces in the pilot project had revoked the power to use reasonable force to detain, but had retained the detention power.
From the CSO survey, CSOs reported on the powers they most frequently used. Figure 1.1 shows the percentage of CSOs responding to the survey who had used the powers very often (more than once a week) and often (at least once a week). The powers most frequently used were requiring the name and address of those behaving in an anti-social manner, dealing with abandoned vehicles, requiring the name and address for penalty offences and confiscating alcohol from those under the age of 18.

**Views on the use of powers**

This evaluation found diverse views in the case study areas among the public, police officers, other professionals and CSOs themselves about the designation and use of powers. The case study forces had designated different numbers of powers (Appendix 3). Sussex had given their CSOs a wide range of powers, but that did not include detention or Fixed Penalty Notices for disorder (PNDs); Northumbrian CSOs also had a comparatively wide range of powers that included PNDs; Merseyside had designated officers no powers at the time of the study, but this was under review.

At the time of the fieldwork, within Merseyside there was some support for CSOs to continue to have no powers, however most participants in the research in Merseyside wanted limited powers to deal with anti-social behaviour.. It was considered important that CSOs had the powers to deal with the situations they most commonly faced without having to back down or having to call on a police officer.

*The CSOs that I’ve spoken to have highlighted that they feel that in order to do the job that they’re doing at the moment more effectively, the powers such as the seizure of alcohol, seizure of tobacco, things of that nature, will allow them to deal with youths a lot more effectively without requiring a police officer. …We want to do what we’re doing but those limited powers will actually allow us to do what we’re doing more effectively without having to call in a police officer.*

Police officer

This view was reiterated in the other two case study forces. In the two case study forces where CSOs had some powers, most participants felt that the level of powers they had been designated was about right to enable CSOs to carry out their key tasks of visibility, reassurance and community engagement, without straying too far into enforcement policing.
Figure 1.1: The percentage of CSOs using the following powers at least once a week

Power to require name and address of person acting in an anti-social manner
Power to deal with abandoned vehicles
Power to stop vehicles for testing
Power to enter to save life or limb or prevent serious damage to property
Power to stop and search vehicles in authorised areas under the Terrorism Act 2000
Power to enforce cordons under the Terrorism Act 2000
Power to control traffic for purposes of escorting a load of exceptional dimensions
Power to carry out road checks
Power to require name and address for penalty offences
Power to confiscate alcohol from under 18s
Power to disperse groups in designated areas
Power to confiscate alcohol from individuals drinking in designated areas
Power to confiscate tobacco from under 16s
Power to issue FPNs or PNDs
Power to require name and address of person acting in an anti-social manner
Power to seize vehicles used to cause alarm or distress
Power to use reasonable force under section 38(8)
Power to detain
Power to deal with abandoned vehicles
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[The level of powers are] currently suitable, if we were to give them more then they will be police officers but this will lead them into confrontation situations which will mean calling on officers and they will lose the faith of officers.

Police officer

This view was endorsed by some residents, particularly those in areas with CSOs, who felt that CSOs should have fewer powers than the police. Reasons given for this were generally either because it was felt CSOs had a different role, one requiring a less ‘heavy-handed’ approach, or because they had less training than the police.

I wouldn’t like them to have too many powers that should be left to a professional police officer.

Resident, experimental area

The main issues raised by those who did not want the number of powers for CSOs to be substantially widened, were that if they had more powers:

- CSOs would have less time on the street because they would be more likely to be deployed to incidents and the increased use of sanctions would possibly lead to more paperwork;
- there would be increased risks for CSOs and the public by putting CSOs in potentially more confrontational situations;
- there would be a need for increased levels of training and equipment;
- the main role of CSOs – providing reassurance and visible patrol – would be compromised and become less distinct from that of a police officer.

However, there were also some strong views expressed that CSOs could only gain the respect of the public, especially youths, if they had a wide range of powers. This view was less frequently expressed in the focus groups, but was held strongly by some police officers who did not work with CSOs.

Or alternatively, give them some more powers, that wouldn’t bother me. I feel sorry for them sometimes when you see them out there walking about and they’re just going to move kids on.

Police officer

Similarly, some participants in the residents’ focus groups were generally ill informed about the range of powers of CSOs. When told of the powers they were often surprised, feeling their scope was limited and thus fairly ineffective.
If they’ve got the same powers as the police, great. If they haven’t, save the money.

Business, control area

The main issues raised by those who thought CSOs should have more powers were that:

- people, in particular youths, do not take CSOs seriously when they realise their limited powers;
- this would increase the range of activities that CSOs could carry out;
- CSOs would be able to take more of the burden from police officers.

Some of those who wanted CSOs to have a wide range of powers, recognised that what they really wanted was more police officers. One police officer encapsulated this argument:

When you send out CSOs you are relying on the fact that nothing is going to happen. If you give them more powers they become police officers.

At the time of the fieldwork the power of detention was only available to six forces taking part in a pilot study. The power of detention means that where a CSO has reason to believe that a person has committed a relevant offence and the person does not give a valid name or address they may require that person to wait with them for up to 30 minutes pending the arrival of a constable. The evaluation of the use of detention powers (Singer, 2004) concluded that: ‘The evidence collected and analysed in this evaluation indicates the absence of any adverse effect on either the CSO or the detainee when the power to detain is exercised’.

However, within the case study forces the general feeling was not in favour of giving CSOs the power to detain. The main concerns were about the level of confrontation that attempts to detain, and in particular, the exercise of reasonable force, may lead to and the implications for CSO and police officer time. Even those in favour of CSOs having the power to detain were aware of the possible implications for health and safety and the increased level of training and possibly equipment that would be needed. However, some members of the public were in favour, seeing the ability to detain as a core role of policing.

Summary

- At the time of the fieldwork forces had designated different numbers of powers to their CSOs, ranging from over 40 to none.
- Ninety per cent of forces had designated powers relating to lower level ASB, including the confiscation of alcohol and tobacco from those under-age and the powers to demand the name and address of a person acting in an anti-social manner.
Most respondents in the forces felt that CSOs needed sufficient powers to tackle the routine tasks they encountered most frequently, for example dealing with low-level ASB without having to call on police officers. However, there were more diverse views about the appropriateness of CSOs being given a wider range of powers.

**Deployment**

This section looks at how, when and where CSOs were deployed. It considers the health and safety implications and the need for equipment raised by different types of deployment. The differences between the tasks carried out and the risks faced by CSOs at different times of day is encapsulated in this quote from a CSO in a focus group,

*For me there are two jobs for a CSO – there is the day category – visiting schools etc – then there is the night time, dealing with alcohol related disorder – for the day time I don’t need powers at all ..I see the CSO role as integrating into the community – but when we are going to situations where there are lots of youths gathered round us – feeling very uncomfortable – they are drinking alcohol umm – hard to reason with them we do need something to fall back on – now whether that’s powers – or body armour I’m not sure.*

**Shifts**

The hours that CSOs are on the streets impacts on their visibility and their activities. The situations that a CSO deals with early in the afternoon are very different to those at midnight, with different levels of risk and potential confrontation associated with them. There was a range of different shift systems in operation in the forces. The force survey showed that the majority of forces responding deployed CSOs between 08.00 and 22.00, with all forces providing CSO cover between 16.00 and 20.00. Only the MPS provided 24-hour cover with CSOs. However, some of the views expressed in the focus groups were inconsistent about the appropriate hours for the deployment of CSOs. In one force where CSOs worked from 16:00 to midnight, there was concern that many of the public were not aware of their presence during the winter when the evenings were dark and few people were on the streets. Also there were concerns that many situations they could deal with, especially with young people happened outside these hours. However, in another area there was demand for CSOs to work later to deal with young people in the evening.

In all three case study forces, the shifts that CSOs worked were different to neighbourhood officers. This meant that CSOs were generally briefed and tasked separately from police
officers which can lead to isolation from the rest of the team of officers. This will be discussed in more detail in part 2 of this paper. There is a balance to be drawn between the advantages of close team working with police colleagues that can be facilitated through alignments of shifts and the importance that times of deployment allow for maximum visibility and impact. The Accenture report into rostering in the police service (Accenture, 2004) highlighted this: ‘Until there is much greater clarity on what PCSO roles and objectives should be, it is not possible to make recommendations about how they should be rostered’.

**Crewing**
Evidence from the CSO survey showed that the majority of CSOs (61%) said that they sometimes patrolled singly and sometimes in pairs, with 13 per cent always patrolling alone and 25 per cent always paired. This varied between forces, in two forces over 50 per cent of CSOs said that they were always paired and in two forces about half of CSOs said that they always patrolled singly. In Northumbria, activity analysis gives details of how CSOs patrol: 96 per cent were double crewed compared with police officers where 22 per cent of foot patrol officers were double crewed.

There was some concern in the interviews about the cost-effectiveness of having two CSOs patrolling together, but generally it was considered most appropriate.

*There’s always two of them, which, it isn’t as cost effective as it should be. But there’s some synergy between the two, two may be better in some circumstances.*

*Police authority*

The decision made about single or double crewing was based on risk assessments of the particular situations. However, CSOs themselves were concerned about not having adequate back-up in some circumstances if they were deployed singly. The unions also expressed their concern about deploying CSOs singly, in particular because they did not have the same level of training and equipment as sworn police officers.

**Health and safety**
There are different levels of risk associated with when and how CSOs are deployed. Although all forces had carried out risk assessments, there was some evidence from the CSO survey and the fieldwork to suggest that CSOs felt vulnerable at times. Throughout the interviews and focus groups, CSOs expressed some concerns that they had found themselves in situations where they felt that they were vulnerable, in particular where they
felt intimidated by groups of youths. This issue was also raised by other members of the case study forces during interviews.

*I mean I’ve had one where they’ve [CSOs] gone to maybe a youth disorder and the kids have started getting out of hand and they’ve got no protective equipment whatsoever. Whereas we would be able to restrain them arrest them, handcuff them, detain them and take them in, they can’t do anything, they’ve got to stand there and take it and it makes them very very vulnerable.*

Police officer

Despite this it was found in the responses to the CSO survey that the majority (84%) of respondents had never experienced serious physical assault. However, 41 per cent stated that they had on at least one occasion been subject to minor physical abuse. In fact, 175 respondents to the survey (7%) stated that they had been injured seriously enough whilst on duty to take time off work. For those that had experienced physical abuse 67 per cent said that they had called for police assistance.

When asked about verbal abuse only 17 per cent said that they had never experienced serious verbal abuse and of those that had, 35 per cent stated it happened often or very often. This was confirmed in case study forces where many talked about CSOs being subjected to verbal abuse especially from youths.

*They do get the odd… verbal, but actually when you talk to PCSOs I think they’ve almost come to realise that it’s part of the job.*

Implementation team

Some CSOs felt concerned that they were unable to do anything about the verbal abuse and this made them look ineffective and increased their vulnerability. They also worried that it increased the workload of police officers if they were called on to help.

CSOs were concerned about levels of training and equipment in relation to their safety on the streets. Although the vast majority of forces provided self-defence training, many CSOs mentioned that additional self-defence training would make them feel less vulnerable.

The force survey indicated that all CSOs had been issued with a radio and 82 per cent with stab vests, but only 21 per cent of forces had made them compulsory. There were mixed feelings amongst CSOs in the case study forces about what equipment was most appropriate for a CSO. In particular, views varied on the desirability of stab vests. Many
CSOs and most police officers felt that CSOs were very vulnerable and expressed the opinion that they should have protective clothing and additional equipment particularly when deployed to certain locations and late at night.

...if you’re going out on the street, then you should have exactly the same equipment as a regular police officer, apart from handcuffs obviously, bits and pieces like that. They should certainly have protection and again there shouldn’t be a distinction.

Police inspector

However, some CSOs felt that stab vests made them less approachable and were not necessary in many areas during the day. There was no evidence on whether the public shared this view.

Being in a stab vest I think it will make me feel that I am putting out an aggressive, even though I’ve got a smile on my face, as if I am possibly expecting someone to stab me maybe because I’ve got a stab vest on.

CSO

There were issues raised in many interviews and focus groups about how similar the CSO uniform should be to that of a police officer. Some officers felt that too close a similarity to that of police officers confused the public and could possibly put CSOs in danger.

...obviously people see the uniform, and think they’re police officers.

Police officer

Others, however, felt that it needed to be as close to the police uniform as possible to identify them with the police rather than other local authority or agency workers.

Summary

- There was variation in the shift systems in operation in the forces, with evidence in some forces that the hours worked by CSOs did not allow for maximum visibility or alignment with neighbourhood policing colleagues
- There was evidence that regardless of how well targeted their deployment was, many CSOs felt they occasionally encountered situations where they were vulnerable.
- A large minority had experienced some level of physical abuse and most had experienced verbal abuse.
Evidence from the CSO survey showed that the majority of CSOs (61%) said that they sometimes patrolled singly and sometimes in pairs.

Impact

The focus of this section is on an exploration of public perceptions and attitudes in the case study areas, where there is evidence that members of the public recognised the importance of CSOs in getting to know the community, engaging with young people and tackling ASB. The evidence that was available of the impact of the work of CSOs on the number of recorded crimes and reported incidents of ASB is also examined.

Impact on crime and disorder

It has been acknowledged in the literature that evaluating the impact on crime and disorder of a single intervention is notoriously complex (ODPM, 2004). In this evaluation of CSOs the authors are attempting to separate out the impact of the introduction of CSOs from other initiatives taking place at a similar time often in the same areas, including changes in policing style (more emphasis on neighbourhood and community policing) and the introduction of other patrols (by wardens and others). The authors also found it difficult to isolate the impact of CSOs from other members of the policing family when there is joint targeted action on particular crimes in neighbourhoods.

This section reports on an analysis of the numbers of recorded crimes and reported incidents of ASB in the case study areas. The authors were aware of the limitations of using recorded crime figures, but because of time constraints were not able to carry out a ‘before and after’ survey of residents’ experiences of crimes, that in other evaluations has been shown to be more likely to indicate changes in levels of crime. Data were collected on incidents of ASB and on low-level crimes – criminal damage, vehicle crime, violence against the person, burglary, theft and robbery; crimes that are most likely to be impacted on by visible patrol. The figures were from the control and experimental areas from 2002/03 to February/March 2005, so that trends in the levels of crime and ASB before and after the introduction of CSOs for areas where CSOs were introduced and ones where they were not could be compared (see Appendix 1 for methods).

From the analysis of the recorded crime data in the case study areas it was not possible to discern any sustained differences in trends in the number of crimes between the areas with and without CSOs following their introduction. For example Figure 1.2 illustrates the trends in recorded crimes of criminal damage for two areas in Merseyside, one with CSOs and one without.
A similar exercise was carried out for ASB incidents that were reported by the public in Northumbria (the data from the other forces were not considered to be robust enough). Again it was not possible to discern any sustained differences in trends in the number of ASB incidents between the areas with and without CSOs following their introduction. Figure 1.3 illustrates the trends in the numbers of reported incidents of ASB, relating to the misuse of public space, this includes loitering and alcohol-related incidents.

The finding that trends in recorded crimes and reported incidents of ASB have remained similar in areas with and without CSOs could lead to a number of interpretations. It may be that it is too early to expect CSOs to have had a measurable impact. Recorded crime data may be too blunt an instrument to measure the impact in small areas. This evaluation has shown that, generally, CSOs were dealing with youths and low-level ASB that although important to residents’ quality of life is not always captured in the recorded crime figures. Low-level crimes and ASB often go unreported, for example the British Crime Survey found that only 31 per cent of acts of vandalism were reported to the police in 2003/04 (Dodd et al., 2004). Therefore any changes in trends identified could be due to changes in either the number of crimes or incidents reported or the numbers of crimes actually committed. There is some evidence from the case studies that there may be an increased number of incidents reported; people said that they would be more likely to report incidents, in particular low-level ASB incidents, to CSOs than police officers.
I thought ‘should I ring the police?’ Well what’s the point? They can’t come and do anything but if there was a community bobby [CSO] that could maybe come and have a look and says ‘yeah, that means something to me.

Business, experimental area

Now you wouldn’t go up to a Bobby and say ‘so and so’s being doing this’, they wouldn’t take the slightest bit of notice. Their attitude is ‘well what do you want me to do about it?’

Resident, control area

Other evaluations of local interventions aimed at reducing levels of crime and ASB have found some limited evidence of an impact of local interventions on recorded crime and ASB (see interim report for discussion of local evaluations, Home Office website). There are early indications from the National Reassurance Policing Programme (NRPP) (Tuffin et al., 2006) that in some of the project areas where neighbourhood policing has been introduced there had been a fall in recorded crime compared to the basic command unit (BCU) as a whole. A recent evaluation of neighbourhood warden schemes (ODPM, 2004), where one of the aims of the schemes was to reduce ASB and levels of crime, found a mixed picture in terms of changes in recorded crime since the introduction of wardens, with some schemes
showing a decline in crime rates and others an increase. As the authors themselves commented it was difficult to interpret the trend data because, for example, increases in recorded crime may reflect success in increased levels of reporting. However evidence from residents’ surveys from the same evaluation suggested that there had been a decrease in the number of residents saying that they had experienced property and personal crime in the areas with wardens compared to control areas.

These studies however, generally found evidence that local interventions had an impact on aspects of public reassurance. For example early indications from the NRPP showed that in many of the study sites where neighbourhood policing had been implemented there was increased confidence in the police, there were significant decreases in perceptions of many aspects of ASB and worries about some crimes had decreased (op cit). The ODPM evaluation of neighbourhood wardens (op cit) showed that in successful schemes there were reduced levels of fear of crime, and a small decline in residents perceiving youth ASB as a problem.

The findings from these evaluations are in accord with calls for the success of neighbourhood policing not simply to be measured by counting crime, numbers of arrests or tickets issued, but that new measures should be included, for example, quality of life indicators like fear of crime (Eck and Rosenbaum, 1994; Rosenbaum and Lurigio, 1994; Leighton, 1995). This approach was supported in respect of CSOs in an interview with a senior police officer in one of the case study forces,

So actually the measure of a PCSO is trust and confidence in policing, not how many tickets you issue or how many ASBOs you issue or anything else. … And it’s starting to pay dividends already so the Police Authority recognise it, the public recognise it.

ACPO

Police officers in the case study forces recognised the value of CSOs.

And what’s great now is people coming back and saying…‘CSOs are fantastic’.

ACPO

The officers on the ground really appreciate the work they do.

Police commander

So although no evidence was found for the impact of CSOs on recorded levels of crime and disorder, this is not unexpected given the findings of other evaluations and the limitations of the data. It does not mean that CSOs were not a valuable resource in the fight against crime and ASB.
**Impact on public perceptions**

In the rest of this section the public’s perceptions are investigated, in particular their awareness of and attitudes towards CSOs, whether they feel reassured by their presence and their perceived impact on anti-social behaviour and low-level crime. In order to assess the impact on the public in terms of their perceptions of reassurance, levels of anti-social behaviour and fear of crime the study undertook a series of focus groups with residents and local businesses in the case study areas, including those with and without CSOs (see Appendix 1 for methods). The evidence in this section mainly draws on these focus groups, but it is supplemented by other sources.

**Views of the areas**

The local areas varied widely from the very deprived to the more affluent and included small villages and town centres (see Appendix 2). Most participants in the focus groups were generally happy with their area, but in some of the more deprived areas participants were typically more negative, mainly due to issues of crime and anti-social behaviour by young people. The most commonly perceived problem in all areas was young people hanging around. This issue was raised spontaneously in all areas, although the problems ranged in seriousness depending on the type of area.

> Anything at all, like in the evenings when you get the kids going about and there’s a few times we’re getting eggs splattered all over, you know, shop fronts and everything’s tipped over, and that kind of thing. That’s something that I’ve noticed that’s happened quite a few times.

Business, experimental area

These findings reflect those in the British Crime Survey (Dodd et al., 2004) where, respondents who were concerned about young people’s behaviour had most commonly experienced youths being loud or rowdy on the street, swearing, drinking, blocking the pavement, dropping litter, and being abusive.

Businesses in the case study areas typically had more direct experience of anti-social behaviour than residents, particularly those with businesses open late such as off-licences or local grocery stores. A study of businesses (Taylor, 2004) found that a third of retailers said that teenagers hanging round were a serious or fairly serious problem.

Most residents in the case study areas had a poor view of policing, expressing dissatisfaction with current policing both in terms of lack of a visible presence and responsiveness to local need. They wanted more ‘bobbies on the beat’, with residents from
more deprived areas being the most negative. There was a great deal of sentimentality about people’s sense of security and safety during ‘the good old days’ when the local bobby who everyone knew and respected patrolled the area.

I mean when I was a kid we knew the police always as uncles, uncle Jack, uncle Jim, you know you had respect for them. I think there is no respect for them these days.

Resident, experimental area

Visibility and accessibility of CSOs
Generally awareness of CSOs was higher in the experimental areas, although when prompted, at least a few participants in all areas had some knowledge of CSOs. This knowledge however, was often limited and confused. Participants used various names to describe CSOs, such as specials, voluntary police, community police or wardens, and in some cases there was uncertainty around who funded and organised them, with some residents believing that they were council employees.

You’ve got police, you’ve got street wardens, you’ve got the specials, it’s very difficult to tell them apart.

Business, experimental area

The only ones I ever see are, you know, the volunteer ones, the community police.

Resident, experimental area

One of the local authorities was concerned by the lack of understanding shown by local residents:

…even there some people don’t understand the role even though we have made efforts to market them – not sure PCSOs have been marketed effectively.

Local authority representative

Few participants in the residents’ focus groups, even in the experimental areas, had come into personal contact with a CSO. Business participants were often likely to have higher awareness of CSOs than other participants, partly due to their need for them, in many cases, being greater during the day (the time when CSOs are perceived to be around – few participants believed them to be around in the evening). There was evidence from the focus groups that business owners and managers had in general received more information by way of literature or an informal visit than had residents, who often felt the need to be informed about developments in policing of their local community to help reassure them.
However, in two areas, almost all participants in the focus groups were able to identify their local CSO by name. In these areas respondents were uniformly positive about the role of CSOs. These were key examples of high profile and successful relationship building. In one of these areas a resident said:

They [CSOs] have worked. When we see [CSO] walking around the village, we talk to her. People are ready to talk to her and she’s got it all up here, collating all the info she’s been given.

Resident, experimental area

Accessibility is also crucial to making contact with and gaining the confidence of the community. There was evidence that many CSOs were known in their local community, nearly two-thirds of CSOs (65%) said that more than 20 of the local community addressed them by name. The CSO survey asked a number of questions about ways in which CSOs communicated with the public. Sixty-two per cent of CSOs who responded to the survey had a landline telephone number that was known and advertised within the community and of those over half (55%) stated that the public contacted them on that number. Some methods of improving familiarity and accessibility were obviously less well used as only 29 per cent of CSOs stated that their photograph was displayed in their local community and only 28 per cent had a mobile telephone number for public use.

Attitudes towards CSOs
Attitudes towards CSOs varied considerably across and within the sites, but those members of the public who had little contact with or knowledge about CSOs tended to view them more negatively. Almost all participants agreed on the need for a visible patrolling presence, but those with negative perceptions tended to express the view that CSOs were not as good as police officers and were therefore an ineffective patrolling presence. This view was particularly strongly held in the areas where there were no CSOs.

They’re being used instead of police at the moment which is all wrong, because they’re out there, patrolling round and everything and the police aren’t.

Resident, control area

Those seeing CSOs as a valuable resource felt the main benefit of their presence was in tackling anti-social behaviour. This was because they were seen to have the potential to get to know and be known by local residents and provided a useful link between the community and the police. Many participants expressed the view that not only would they be more likely to report this type of crime to a local CSO, but that the CSO may be more likely to
have an ear to the ground and keep tabs on unruly behaviour, perhaps, where necessary, engaging with parents on a more personal level. Some respondents saw CSOs as being better positioned than police officers to build strong links with the community, for example through liaising with schools and businesses. Many participants felt that CSOs had the time and opportunities to spend time with, and get to know, the community.

**CSOs have more time to talk**

They should get to know the community more, to report back to police officers maybe. Show the police they can help and learn more about the needs of the community, because the police are just there to go to crimes and that. They maybe don’t have time to learn about what the community needs.

Resident, experimental area

The officers have more leisure time, shall we say. They’ve got to do their beat but they can stop for five minutes and talk. They can find out the feel in the community, pass it on to the senior officers then it can be actioned, so then let the professional get stuck in hopefully.

Resident, experimental area

This approach was also valued by police officers:

The beauty of PCSOs is that they can talk to the community… the people will tell PCSOs things they won’t tell cops… On a daily basis they are talking to the community and can provide the cops with a lot of intelligence.

Police commander

**PCSOs are dealing with issues that the community are most concerned about** e.g. kids on street corners – areas of concern are not big crimes e.g. car crime and the like – they are things like ASB and the lack of visibility of police officers so if a PCSO can deal with issues like that then the public are happy with that.

Police commander

The discussions in the focus groups showed that differences in personal experiences of CSOs tended to influence an individual’s perceptions of the value of CSOs. Some of those who had not had personal contact saw CSOs as doing a policing role, but without the powers, equipment and training of the police. However, in areas where people were familiar with CSOs the evidence showed that CSOs were perceived positively for what they have been doing, or could be doing in the community.
Generally I think the police, you know the [CSOs], have made a massive difference...they really have.

Business, experimental area

In all areas there were some negative views expressed about how CSOs did not match up to the police, but most participants, particularly in the control areas, felt that ‘anything is better than nothing’, although they would have preferred more police patrols.

If it’s a choice we would prefer to have more police patrolling... If we can’t have more police I’d say the alternative is to have these community officers.

Resident, control area

Attitudes towards crime and ASB

Some participants in the focus groups felt that it was still too early to gauge the impact of CSOs on levels of crime and disorder. It should also be remembered that for many participants, the key to success of CSOs is their ability to tackle anti-social behaviour. Their actual impact was often allied to the community’s perceptions of their effectiveness in this area.

Linked to their role as a visible patrolling presence is the view expressed by some that they can act as a deterrent simply because of their similar appearance to police officers.

They are authority figures and will deter crime from happening, so they’re good.

Visitor, experimental area

I don’t think a lot of the kids would realise that they weren’t actually police officers.

Business, control area

If you were going to commit a burglary or a robbery and you see two of them walking along, you think ‘oh police’ and you’d be gone.

Business, control area

However this deterrent effect was thought to have limits, especially for the older or ‘tougher’ young people. In other words it was thought that CSOs might deter only ‘certain’ young people from bad behaviour i.e. ones amenable to authority. Some residents felt that more ‘hardened’ young people would be undeterred by CSOs, either because they were more aware of the limits of CSO powers, or simply because they would resist policing at any level.
I think they’ll deter the much younger ones but when you get to the age group of those between 13 and 16 they would give two fingers to everybody no matter, even if it’s a proper policeman.

Resident, experimental area

There were some very positive examples of where residents felt that CSOs had made a real difference to their area. In most cases this related to addressing perceived anti-social behaviour of groups of young people.

**CSOs can tackle ASB**

Primarily a lot of the work has been down to our Community Support Officer who’s been in the thick of that. The reason it has been better is because she knows them [local troublemakers] and they know she knows them. And that comes back to the importance of having someone regularly involved in the community.

Resident, experimental area

I called them once when I saw a boy getting his head kicked in and they were there within less than five minutes.

Resident, experimental area

They go through…shopping centre to see if everything’s alright and if it’s not alright, you just go up to them and report it and they see to it straight away.

Resident, experimental area

There were also specific instances of CSOs being an effective support to local businesses.

Oh I must admit they have made some effect. For instance there was a fight, there were a gang of kids. I had to run out, the two [CSOs] they were actually coming round my shop at the time and they were popping in the shop to make sure everything was alright. And they do stop the gangs of kids congregating.

Business, experimental area

Generally, CSOs themselves felt that they had made a difference to the areas in which they worked, with a large percentage (83%) of CSOs in the survey agreeing that they had made a positive impact on anti-social behaviour, with only five per cent disagreeing.

A recurring theme mentioned by residents and businesses in the areas was the ability of CSOs to adopt a more consensual style in dealing with young people, talking with and
getting to know them. Equally, informally chatting to residents and ‘keeping an eye out’ was felt by some to have made a difference.

**CSOs engage with young people**

*They actually talk to children, they get to know them and that’s the important part I think.*

Resident, experimental area

*He [CSO] says ‘hiya lads, if you’re going to be doing this, can’t you go up Fisher Lane, is there nowhere you can go that’s quiet so people can’t see you and you’re not making a nuisance of yourself?’ He has that sort of approach and he actually gets on with the youth.*

Resident, experimental area

*What they’re [CSOs] doing is they’re going and they’re getting the respect of the kids, so that they don’t feel as bad about being bollocked about something and told to move on.*

Business, experimental area

The importance of this approach was also mentioned by police officers

*You know people sort of saying I actually know that if there’s an issue then I can talk to the PCSO, that they can feed into somebody, so intelligence is fed and we hear PCSOs are taking leads or making arrests happen because – because they find out parts of you know, things do happen as a result.*

Implementation team

**Impact of CSOs on reassurance**

The National Policing Plans (NPP 2003-06, NPP 2004-07) described reassurance as the ‘primary objective’ for policing. CSOs were seen as crucial to this; the Home Office website describes CSOs in terms of reassurance: ‘CSOs are police authority employed support staff who can perform a high visibility, patrolling role providing reassurance to the communities they serve’ (www.homeoffice.gov.uk). Reassurance has been defined in the research literature as ‘the intended outcome(s) of actions taken by the police and other agencies to improve perceived police effectiveness (mainly confidence in, and satisfaction with, the police), and to increase feelings of safety (including reducing fear of crime)’ (Dalgleish and Myhill, 2004). The review of the literature found that ‘in relation to feelings and perceptions of safety, increased levels of foot patrol were found to be most effective’.
This evaluation has shown that CSOs in the case study forces spent the majority of their time in the community, mainly on foot patrol. A large majority of CSOs responding to the survey (89%) agreed with the statement that they felt that they had made a positive impact on public reassurance. The evidence from the focus groups with residents and businesses is that in areas where the presence of CSOs was apparent they have improved feelings of safety in the community. The evidence from the evaluation is limited, however, because of the comparatively recent introduction of CSOs in some of the areas.

CSOs make residents feel safer

You see two policemen, or community police, walking along and you just feel safer don’t you? Knowing that if there’s anybody going to be hiding round the corner, they’re not going to jump on you because there’s two community police or two police walking along.

Business, experimental area

They do give some reassurance to certain people because they see a uniform.

Resident, experimental area

This was also the view of the police authorities:

What we are doing is providing the presence that people say they want. Now whether that leads to reductions in crime or increases in detection rates, I don’t know. But if the test is do communities feel safer and happier, because they’re around, I think the answer is yes, a resounding yes.

I think they did fit very much with what the Authority’s priorities were which were about reassurance and reducing the fear of crime.

Summary

- The evaluation found, in line with other locally based initiatives that were aimed at low-level disorder, that there was no evidence for the impact of CSOs on recorded levels of crime. This is mainly because of the limitations of data; many of the incidents dealt with by CSOs would not be categorised as crimes and the level of reporting may not reflect the number of such incidents.
- Whilst on patrol CSOs spent much of their time dealing with youth nuisance, the main issue for most of the public in the local neighbourhoods.
- Residents, businesses and police officers appreciated the time that CSOs spent in talking to the community and getting to know local young people.
In two areas where the local CSOs were well known to the community, the perceptions of residents were very positive.

In areas where CSOs had been deployed for periods of time many residents said that they felt safer.

Businesses appeared to be better informed than residents in some areas about CSOs. There was some confusion among many members of the public, particularly in areas without CSOs, of their status and remit.

Many members of the public, whilst appreciating the role of CSOs, saw them as less valuable than fully sworn police officers.
Introduction

This part of the study examines the process of the implementation of CSOs, looking in particular at the human resources issues – recruitment and retention, training, supervision and integration with police officers and other members of the policing family. The introduction of large numbers of CSOs (over 5,000 in two years) is a significant addition to the policing family. The role is new – they are police support staff, with limited powers, undertaking a variety of uniformed patrolling tasks. Before the introduction of CSOs the only means for the police service to provide routine patrol presence was with police officers (with support from special constables and traffic wardens).

At the outset certain issues had an immediate effect on the recruitment and employment of CSOs in particular the timescales for implementation of the early recruitment rounds and the funding arrangements. The creation of the neighbourhood policing fund has provided more stability for funding, but at the time of the fieldwork this had not filtered through effectively to all appropriate levels of the forces concerned. The timescales for implementation were tight. In round one there was only eight months from the announcement of funding for this new role to having them in post. There was evidence from the case study forces and from research into the introduction of CSOs into the Metropolitan Police Service, (Johnston, 2005) that this put forces under pressure.

Recruitment and retention

This section examines a number of issues relating to the recruitment of CSOs, including the pay and conditions of service and the success of forces in recruiting a diverse workforce. It also looks at matters that will impact on retention including the reasons that CSOs joined the service, how satisfied they were and their future career plans.

Pay and conditions of service

CSOs were employed by police authorities on terms and conditions which were determined locally. The forces had used different job evaluation schemes in looking at the role of CSOs, and this together with local pay scales resulted in variations in the salaries of CSOs in
different force areas. The force survey showed that for the 33 forces responding, the minimum basic pay scale ranged from £14,094 – £19,626, and the maximum from £15,408 – £25,356, however over a third (39%) of forces offered a minimum basic salary of £15,732. The top of the range can be reached in between two and eleven years. The basic pay for police constables is set nationally and is £19,803 on starting service and from £22,107 on completion of training to £31,092 after 11 years.

Table 2.1: Salaries of CSOs and police constables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Type</th>
<th>Basic Salary (£ a year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSO (median)</td>
<td>15,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO (top)</td>
<td>25,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO (bottom)</td>
<td>14,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police constable (year 3)</td>
<td>22,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police constable (top)</td>
<td>31,092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Salaries of CSOs and police constables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th><a href="http://www.policecouldyou.co.uk">www.policecouldyou.co.uk</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Source: | RDS Force Survey 2004    |

The salary costs presented in Table 2.1 are the basic salary per year for a police constable on completion of training and for a constable at the top of salary scale. For a CSO, three salary points are presented: the median starting salary for CSOs, the lowest basic starting salary for CSOs and the highest salary point for CSOs (from the CSO survey). As can be seen it is possible for a CSO near the top of the pay scale, in one of the higher paying forces, to earn more in basic salary than a police constable who has just finished his or her probation. However, it is difficult to compare the overall pay packages, in particular because there are differences in the pension provision for police officers and CSOs and both are paid allowances in addition to their basic salary.

Shift allowances can make a considerable difference to the pay of a CSO and in some cases appear to have been used as a way to enhance the salary rather than as a payment for unsociable hours. For example, one force had a poor response to an initial advert for CSOs, but saw a significant improvement in response to a later advert that included a shift allowance of 14 per cent. This mirrors what was found by a study on rostering (Accenture, 2004), where in some areas CSOs had been recruited with the expectation they would receive a full shift allowance of 12.5 per cent. However, the shifts that allowed for this enhancement of salary were not available in all areas and this had the potential to cause local difficulties.
The uncertainty around future funding led to the recruitment of some CSOs on short-term contracts. From the force survey, 13 of the 33 forces responding employed some CSOs on fixed term contracts. Data from the CSO survey showed that at the time of the survey 37 per cent of CSOs were on fixed term contracts; of those that stated the length, just under half (44%) were on contracts of two years or less. Short-term contracts can lead to low morale as the insecurity can affect other aspects of life and can impact on retention. For example, in one focus group a CSO said that he was unable to get a mortgage. Unison, the union that represented many CSOs, was concerned about the implications of short-term contracts for its members and supported the use of permanent contracts in order to improve stability and commitment.

Some forces worked around the issue of long-term government funding by obtaining a larger proportion of funding for CSOs from local authorities and other agencies. Sussex and Merseyside in particular had worked closely in partnership with their local parishes, police authority, and county councils, and in Merseyside, travel companies, to secure some additional funding in return for either full-time (Merseytravel) or pro rata CSO time. For example, in Sussex, funding was moved from street wardens to CSOs, partly in response to a resident vote but also because the street wardens kept changing, which created a lack of stability.

**Diversity of the workforce**

From the outset the introduction of the CSO role was seen as an opportunity to increase the diversity of policing staff within forces. The Home Office publication *Neighbourhood Policing: your police; your community; our commitment* (Home Office, 2005) describes how important it is for those involved in neighbourhood policing to have strong connections with the communities they serve in order to increase public trust and confidence. The potential for CSOs to improve those links was reiterated by interviewees in the fieldwork:

> There still seems to be this lack of trust of the police, particularly from the Asian…and Black communities and we’ve got to address that. I think CSOs could be the ideal way of doing that.

  Police authority

The case study forces expressed their desire to recruit CSOs from their local communities, for example, the implementation team at Merseyside said:

> I think the essence of it was trying to get people from the local communities and ideally where possible deploy them within their own communities as well.
There was evidence that some of the forces had advertised in the minority ethnic press and local papers to improve the diversity of those recruited.

Figures from the annual data return (ADR 2004/05) showed that CSOs were more diverse, in particular in terms of ethnicity than other groups in the police service (Table 2.2). A higher proportion of CSOs (15%) were from a minority ethnic background than were other police staff (6%), police officers (4%) or new recruits (6%).

A higher proportion of CSOs was female (41%) than police officers (21%) or police recruits (35%), but this was lower than for other police staff (62%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.2: Ethnicity and gender of CSOs and police officers (full time equivalent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (FTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO strength (31.03.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer strength (31.03.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police standard direct recruits (constables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police staff (excluding CSOs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RDS ADR data 2004/05

The age profiles of CSOs and police officers were different. As shown in Figure 2.1, CSOs tended to be more evenly distributed than officers in terms of age, with a larger proportion in the youngest (under 25) and oldest (over 55) age categories. The CSO survey reported a wide range in the ages of CSOs, from 18 to 63. From the survey the average age of CSOs was 35 compared with 27 for police recruits (data provided by the Centrex, using the average age of those successful at an assessment centre in 2003/04).
Past experience of CSOs

As would be expected from their age profile, many CSOs joined the police service with considerable previous work experience and came from a variety of occupations. The CSO survey showed that many had previously worked in the administrative and service sectors (46%). Almost a quarter (23%) had previously worked in occupations related to the police, including traffic wardens, police staff and in the private security industry.

CSOs had a wide range of educational qualifications: 42 per cent had GCSE level as their highest qualification and 22 per cent had a degree, higher degree or professional qualification. As a group, CSOs were diverse in terms of gender, ethnicity and age and many brought a wealth of life experience to the role. The importance of this diversity was acknowledged by many within the forces.

The variety and the spread of skills and experience is one of the successes I think.

ACPO

There are great things that young in service officers can learn from PCSOs – they have a great deal of life experience – e.g. working as teachers/ family/ knowledge about
working in public spaces that officers don’t have – they can talk themselves out of situations.

Police commander

Part-time working
It was intended that the CSO role would attract a diverse range of applicants and providing flexible working arrangements is likely to increase the applicant pool. However, ADR data showed that as of the end of March 2005, very few (2%) CSOs worked part-time, and the majority of these (83%) were female. The proportion of CSOs working part-time was considerably less than other police staff (19%).

Why CSOs joined the service
The rest of this section looks at why CSOs joined, how satisfied they were and their future career plans. These factors were looked at by gender, age and ethnicity and where reported as significant, the results were statistically significant at p<0.05, which means that there is only a one in twenty likelihood or less of the result having been obtained by chance.

CSOs joined the service for many different reasons. The survey presented CSOs with a number of options regarding what attracted them to the role. The three most frequently given reasons were that it was a varied role (71%), that it allowed close working with a local community (67%) and that it involved working outdoors (65%) (Figure 2.2). There were significant differences by gender and age for those attracted to the role for various reasons.

- Older joiners and women were more likely to have joined because they considered the working culture of a CSO was more appealing than that of a regular officer. A higher proportion of those aged 35 or over, than those aged under 35 were attracted to the role for this reason (25%:13%) as were a higher proportion of women than men (23%:16%) .
- Over two-fifths (42%) of CSOs joined because they saw the role as a stepping-stone to becoming a police officer. Men were significantly more likely than women to give this reason (46%:36%) as were those aged under 35 than older CSOs (61%:23%).
Figure 2.2: What attracted CSOs to the role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A variety of different tasks and responsibilities</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enables me to work closely with a local community</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves outdoor work</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General interest in policing and security</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and conditions</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepping stone to becoming a regular sworn police officer</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to previous work I have done</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role and working culture more appealing that the role of a police officer</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status and recognition afforded to the role</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents could tick more than one option so overall response to question totals more than 100%

Satisfaction with role

The CSO survey contained a series of attitude statements designed to explore job satisfaction. A number of the attitudinal statements were combined to form a job satisfaction scale (see Appendix 1 for description of methodology). This scale showed that over two thirds of CSOs (68%) were satisfied with their work. However, those aged under 35 were significantly less satisfied than those aged 35 or over (63%; 73%). CSOs from minority ethnic communities were less satisfied compared with White CSOs (60%;69%); however this may be partially explained by their younger age profile (minority ethnic CSOs were underrepresented in the CSO survey, see Appendix 1 for further details on minority ethnic respondents to the CSO survey).
Looking at some of the constituent parts of the scale:

- the vast majority of CSOs (86%) said they were proud to work for the organisation and that they enjoyed their job (82%);
- more than half agreed that working as a CSO had met their expectations (55%);
- however, over one fifth said that they were bored at work (21%).

Generally, younger CSOs reported that they were more likely to be bored, and that the role had not met their expectations.

- Those aged 35 or over were significantly less likely to say that they were bored than those who were younger (17%: 25%).
- Those who wanted to become police officers in the next two years were significantly more bored at work than those with other career intentions (27%: 18%).
- Those aged under 35 were significantly more likely to say that the role had not met their expectations compared to older respondents (48%: 42%).

There was some evidence from focus groups that CSOs were becoming bored with the role. For example, in one focus group a CSO said:

_Just lately I’m feeling a little bit disillusioned with it. [The work is] a little bit repetitive._

This impression was endorsed by some police officers and duty inspectors who agreed that some CSOs were bored and wanted to do something more proactive. They also had concerns about lack of variety in the work. For example, one said

_I cannot see…the younger ones wanting to walk around for 40 years on foot_

However, there was some evidence that CSOs who were more fully engaged with a range of community activities found the work interesting and rewarding.

_That’s just brilliant – you get hugs of them and all sorts – at the end of the day you’d like to think that they know me as [first name]…_
Future career plans
The CSO survey showed that the majority of CSOs were currently happy with their job but did they intend to stay in the role? The government has emphasised the importance for neighbourhood policing of ‘people seeing and having regular contact with the same officers – week in and week out – who stay in the job long enough to build lasting and trusting relationships with the communities they serve’ (Home Office, 2005).

The level of resignations for CSOs was similar to other police staff, although much higher than for police constables. The most recent ADR data (2004/05) showed that nationally, the percentage of CSOs voluntarily resigning was eight per cent, compared with seven per cent of police staff and less than one per cent of police constables (0.7%). Data from case study forces showed that not only were there very different levels of resignations in the forces, different proportions of those who left joined the regulars (see Appendix 2 for more details). However, it is not clear what the level of resignations of CSOs will be after some of the initial difficulties around implementation and funding have been resolved.

CSOs were a new role and the CSO survey sought to better understand their future career aims. Of those responding, only three per cent said that they planned to leave the organisation during the next two years and 40 per cent said that they planned to remain in their role. However, the majority (71%) felt there was not an appropriate career path for them to develop their skills as a CSO. This view was also expressed in focus groups.

CSOs are stuck. We can’t proceed or do anything to diversify our role. There is no career progression and we are treated as a separate body. 

CSO

Many saw career progression in terms of joining the regular police force, over a third (36%) of respondents indicated that they were considering becoming sworn officers in the next two years. In line with the findings on those who saw being a CSO as a stepping-stone to becoming fully sworn officers, the CSO survey showed that significantly more men than women (40%:30%) and more aged under 35 than those who were older intended to become sworn police officers (55%:17%).

The relatively high numbers of CSOs wishing to become sworn police officers raises a number of issues. If all of those who wish to become police officers leave the role of CSO, this will affect the stability of the workforce. A rapidly changing body of CSOs will impact on the provision of a consistent and familiar policing presence that has been found to be a
factor in reassuring the public. And if not all of those who wish to become regular officers are successful, this may impact on morale, as these were most likely to say that they were bored in their job. There may be implications for the future profile of CSOs with younger officers and men being more likely to leave to become regular officers. It may be that older CSOs and women, who are more likely to stay in post, are those who will provide continuity in the service. These are the CSOs who generally had expressed more satisfaction with their job.

However, there are benefits for the police service as a whole if CSOs become fully sworn officers. The CSO role may operate as a ‘realistic job preview’ for the role of police officer, with CSOs having direct experience of working for a force and understanding the working culture. Very similar proportions of CSOs from White and minority ethnic backgrounds planned to become sworn police officers (36% and 38% respectively) and this suggests that the CSO role is a good way to attract certain under represented groups to become fully sworn police officers.

The discussion in focus groups and interviews in the case study forces also highlighted that a balance was needed between recruiting motivated and knowledgeable people to be fully sworn officers and the importance of having CSOs providing a familiar face for the community. Evidence from case study forces showed that the CSO role is being used by some as a testing ground:

*It’s good for deciding if you want to be a police officer; we are doing what a lot of police officers wanted to do when they joined.*

CSO

*They’ve used it as a stepping stone, they’re coming in, dipping their toes in the water, seeing what it’s like, enjoying what they’re seeing and then jumping in and are taking on the role of the police officer.*

Police Federation

The experience of working as a CSO was considered valuable for those wanting to become police officers:

*They’re certainly going to get a tick in the box for a lot of the skills.*

Human resources
I hope that any interview panel would give credit to the fact that these people have been working with the police doing a job that at least has some hallmark of a police officer.

Implementation team

However, concerns were also expressed about the number of people who may leave the CSO role to become police officers. There was recognition that in order to provide a service to the community, it was important to have stability within the workforce to build links with the local communities. This view was echoed by a senior police officer in one of the case study forces.

It would be nice to take people through but what I’m actually looking for is to provide some stability in the CSOs for the sake of the communities they work for. We can fast track people through, but then again, do we want to attract people who want to be future regular officers or do we want them to have the stability and remain within the organisation. And I think strategically you have to make a decision which way you want to do that.

ACPO

Summary

- There were some variations in pay and conditions of service between forces that resulted from CSOs being employed by police authorities on local terms and conditions.
- The use of shift allowances also varied and in some locations had been used to enhance pay and thereby increase the attractiveness of the job, but at the cost of reducing the flexibility of deployment.
- The role of a CSO attracted a wide range of people from a variety of backgrounds. They tended to be older and were more diverse in terms of ethnicity than police recruits and their past work experience was wide ranging.
- Generally, CSOs were satisfied with their job, although there was some dissatisfaction with the repetitive nature of the work and the lack of a career path within the role. Those who were most satisfied with the job were generally older and female and these were most likely to say that they intended to stay in post.
- Over 40 per cent of CSOs, many of them younger and male had joined as a stepping stone to joining the police. The relatively high numbers of CSOs wishing to become sworn police officers raises a number of issues for the stability, diversity and morale of the workforce.
Training

This section considers a range of issues concerned with training, including initial training, induction onto division, and ongoing support for CSOs. In this evaluation training has been highlighted as a crucial issue, not just in terms of ensuring that CSOs have the knowledge and skills to carry out the new role, but in terms of their safety on patrol and the changing demands of an evolving role. The fieldwork was carried out in a climate of change, for example in February 2005, Centrex formally launched a CSO training manual that provided a detailed overview of training plans and subjects to be covered. In addition CSOs have been targeted for training on ASB through the Together Academy action days.

Force training packages

CSOs were a new role within forces and there was insufficient time to build a national training model before their introduction, so each force developed its own training programme. The majority of forces (85%) provided initial training internally, with initial training ranging from ten to 30 days in length, but was typically 20 days. This compares to police officers who have a much longer period of training and are not considered fully trained until the completion of their two year probationary period. The standard length of training for a police officer recruit was 31 weeks over two years (HMIC, 2002). Although probationer training is now locally delivered this is still the best estimate of time spent on initial training. Police officer training is wide ranging reflecting the different tasks they may be asked to perform and their multifunctional role.

The local training programmes were able to respond to the local situations, although in practice there was considerable overlap in their content. Force training courses covered a broad range of practical skills and professional standards (Figure 2.3). All forces responding to the survey provided training in diversity, ethics and community awareness. The vast majority included training in first aid, powers and procedures and statement taking. Training in fire awareness and investigative interviewing was not routinely provided, and was only covered by 33 per cent of forces responding.

There were some concerns expressed about the scope of the training from both CSOs themselves and from police officers. Only 38 per cent of CSOs responding to the survey felt that their initial training had prepared them well enough to do their job and 59 per cent of CSOs felt they had encountered situations they did not feel properly trained to deal with. This limitation of initial training was also raised by CSOs and police officers in focus groups:
### Figure 2.3: Training provision in forces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Percentage forces providing module</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity, ethics and community awareness</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking statements</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCSO powers and procedures</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comms &amp; radio procedure</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First aid</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate induction</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene management</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self defence</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; safety</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence gathering and witness skills</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data protection</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasking and intelligence gathering</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim needs and management</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT systems</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic management</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making an Arrest</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrolling under supervision</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative interviewing</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire awareness</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Force Survey (30 forces replied to this question)
You would just like to know that you’re trained adequately to deal with it really and I don’t…feel like it has been, like I feel it’s been sort of neglected as far as self-defence training.

CSO

In particular, there were some concerns that training in practical areas such as the use of radio and IT was insufficient. It was also felt that more clarification of the role in terms of what CSOs can and cannot do was required. For example, one officer said:

They need more training about boundaries…they haven’t been given clear training.

Police officer

This view was reinforced by other force personnel (constables, duty inspectors and BCU commanders) during the fieldwork.

There were also concerns about the ways in which the training was delivered, some CSOs felt that the training was too intensive and that a more practical approach may be more appropriate for those not used to classroom-based learning.

It was intensive – and there was a lot to take in but when you arrived at the areas personally speaking I felt I needed more guidance when I got there – someone saying – right, this is what happens, this is how it is.

CSO

Some forces have updated their training programmes since the intake of CSOs. Sussex, for example, revised their training from an initial two-week programme to a six week programme. Their programme uses practical training interspersed with classroom learning.

**Good practice in training**

In Sussex training is split into three two-week blocks. Weeks one, two, five and six are spent in the classroom. On weeks three and four, CSOs go out on patrol with a more experienced CSO which provides immediate practical application with support for the consolidation of skills and knowledge covered in the classroom. This approach has been found to work well, particularly with those who have not studied for some time. Following the six week training programme, CSOs go out with a tutor for approximately five weeks.
Induction training

After initial training, CSOs work in local areas. The range and depth of the induction programme in the local area was very important in helping CSOs to understand their role and to quickly establish contacts in the local community. Induction on division varied considerably even within forces, tending to be a locally arranged process.

What I think we need to do and look at in a little bit more detail is what happens after the CSO goes operational,... we may have a gap there where we’re just initially training them and then they go out to their neighbourhood and then we sort of seem to hand it over and then, I just have that feeling that there’s a piece of work there for us to do to make sure that.

Implementation team

Good examples were found in each of the case study forces but these did not necessarily happen across all areas. CSOs who had had good induction on division considered themselves lucky. In one force, CSOs in one area who had been given information about the area, including local contacts, had a better understanding of the community and appeared more motivated and committed. CSOs in the other case study area in the force who had not had any induction on division would have welcomed it.

Good practice – induction

In one of the case study areas in Merseyside CSOs attended an additional two week course devised by their sergeant. The course included meeting local councillors and business people as well as visits to the custody suite and control room. It is accompanied by an information pack which contains details of all local schools, youth clubs and their opening times. This was felt to be very helpful. One CSO said:

For two weeks we didn’t go out on patrol. We went to the custody suite, went to Westminster House where all the CCTV footage is. Went to control room, listening in to the calls – that was just amazing. It was practical training which is what we needed.

In Sussex, new CSOs are paired with a tutor CSO for the first five weeks on division, a tutor explained:

They have certain tasks which they must complete satisfactorily within a five week period. It’s not set in stone but that’s the guidelines...any time you get somebody that you feel is not quite up to it, you can send them back for training or if somebody shows after two or three weeks they’re brilliant at it, you can sign them up.
Mentoring

Mentoring is often used to help an individual settle into an organisation through regular contact and support from a more experienced employee. Where it works well, there are benefits for mentee, mentor and ultimately the organisation. The CSO survey showed that 61 per cent of respondents had a tutor or mentor following basic training. A regular sworn officer mentored just under two-thirds (64%) of CSOs, while a fellow CSO mentored a third (33%). Typically, mentoring lasted less than a month (53%) while almost a third (30%) were mentored for up to two months.

All case study forces used mentoring of new CSOs, and fieldwork found support among CSOs and officers for the use of mentoring or tutoring. For example, one CSO who didn’t have mentoring said:

I was thrown in at the deep end in X, they didn’t know what I was supposed to do…it was an absolute nightmare.

CSO

Officers thought mentoring useful to develop CSOs’ judgement and so consequently result in less calls on their time, to assist with what turn out to be minor incidents:

I think we would have to team up the new CSOs with some of the older ones…so the new ones…see the mechanics of that role and see how it work and learn how to judge incidents…because…to start with, they weren’t really quite sure…whether what they were seeing was a big deal.

Police officer

However, while there is clear support for it, views in case study forces were mixed regarding the feasibility of mentoring large numbers of CSOs. One force thought formal mentoring would be useful with the imminent rise in CSO numbers, while another thought it would be unsustainable on a larger scale.

Additional training

After initial training and induction on division, CSOs require additional training if their role or powers change and refresher training to ensure that their skills and knowledge are maintained. Some forces provided refresher or specialist training, but this varied both between and within forces. Just over half of respondents (52%) to the CSO survey said they had had refresher training. During fieldwork, a number of suggestions were made about
what refresher or additional training was thought to be useful. The most commonly mentioned were self-defence skills and use of the radio; others were practical skills such as how to restrain, first aid, health and safety and how to use IT, as well as developing knowledge of the law and statement taking. Although most of these topics had been covered in initial training, the range or depth of the training appeared insufficient for the needs of the CSOs.

**The future of training**

There have been recent developments in plans for future CSO training that may help to bring together the training of CSOs with the wider policing family. This has the potential to make a positive impact in terms of less duplication of training processes, bringing CSOs and probationers together at an earlier stage to improve contact and understanding of each other’s roles and the potential for the modules of training undertaken by the CSO to count towards future entrance to the police service.

The Home Office has set up a Wider Policing Learning Development Programme (WPLDP) in response to the White Paper *Building Communities, Beating Crime – A better police service for the 21st Century* (Home Office, 2004). The WPLDP aims to assist forces to implement neighbourhood policing through ‘modernised training’ and subsequent provision of highly skilled neighbourhood officers to support police officers. The programme will have close links with the Initial Police Learning Development Programme (IPLDP). It focuses specifically on CSOs and Specials and is being revised on an ongoing basis, for example the Home Office has updated the module on ASB to reflect new developments.

**Summary**

- At the time of the fieldwork each force had developed its own programme of training, but with considerable overlap in content across forces. Central support has now been developed for CSO training in the form of a Centrex-produced training manual available to all forces.
- There were some concerns expressed about the training; in particular many CSOs wanted more practically based teaching methods and additional or refresher training on some of the practical skills especially self-defence.
- CSOs appreciated the wide-ranging induction training and mentoring that introduced new recruits to the neighbourhood and the team that was implemented in some areas.
- The planned developments in police and police staff training that mean that CSO training will be more closely linked with police probationer training.
**Supervision and organisational structure**

This section looks at a range of issues that were identified in the CSO survey and fieldwork interviews regarding the supervision of CSOs. These were concerned with the adequacy of supervision in terms of who supervised CSOs, how well trained these supervisors were and the organisational structure in which CSOs were placed.

**Who supervises CSOs?**

The CSO survey reported that the majority (87%) of CSOs were supervised directly by a sergeant. From Table 2.3 it is clear that different types of supervisors were used within the same force.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>% from CSO survey</th>
<th>Number of forces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSO supervisor</td>
<td>4% (104)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>87% (2,192)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>5% (133)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4% (91)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CSO survey

Since the majority of CSOs were managed by sergeants, this will have implications for their management workload if CSO numbers are increased further. Sergeants supervised sworn officers in addition to CSOs and the force survey revealed a wide variation in numbers of staff managed. This ranged from five to twenty, and in three-quarters of cases supervisors had line management responsibility for ten or more staff. The fact that recent increases in police officer and police staff numbers appear not to have been matched by an increase in supervision and management support was identified in the HMIC thematic inspection *Modernising the Police* (HMIC, 2004).

There was evidence from the fieldwork that some sergeants found managing CSOs added considerably to their workloads. For example, one inspector said a sergeant’s current management workload was unsustainable with a number of police officers and CSOs to manage:
A lot of his time has been monopolised by managing the eight CSOs but he also has five CBMs [police constables] …fortunately the CBMs are very experienced…but they still need development and support which it is becoming difficult to give.

Police inspector

Evidence from the CSO survey showed that generally CSOs found their supervisors approachable. The majority (70%) felt that they received sufficient support from their manager and again most (73%) said they would tell their manager if they felt out of their depth at work. However, responses to the CSO survey also showed that there were implications of the high workload of CSO supervisors. Over a third of CSOs (34%) agreed with the statement that their manager was always overstretched and only half (52%) felt that their supervisor had sufficient time available to monitor their work. Just under half (46%) received regular feedback from their supervisor. These views varied little between those managed by sergeants and other supervisors. CSOs have the same performance appraisal process as regular officers, in the form of a Performance and Development Review (PDR), but the completion rates of PDRs varied widely across forces, from eight per cent to 100 per cent as recorded by the force survey. However, most CSOs in the focus groups said they found PDRs a useful and constructive exercise.

Some CSOs in the focus groups expressed concerns that they did not have regular contact with their supervisor. The frequency and type of contact varied considerably between forces. CSOs reported keeping in touch with their manager in person, as well as by radio and e-mail. In one force, there appeared to be a lack of dedicated sergeants which left CSOs feeling unsupported.

We’ve been there for…16, 17 months and we’ve never had a dedicated supervisor within that whole time. We’ve had acting sergeants who’ve been there for like six weeks, but each one’s got their own way of doing it so…you don’t know where you stand.

CSO

One of the main barriers to the contact time CSOs had with their supervisors was the lack of alignment between their shifts. This lack of alignment meant that some CSOs had very little opportunity to spend time with their sergeant and this often resulted in CSOs being briefed and tasked separately from police officers. The fieldwork found that tasking and briefing by supervisors varied both within and between forces.
An example of CSO shift working

In …parade is at 08.00 but CSO shifts begin at 09.00. Here, CSOs are briefed on arrival in the morning by the duty sergeant, but often come back to the station to attend the afternoon parade at 14.00 or 15.00. One duty sergeant said his CSOs are very capable and don’t really require him to supervise them – what they do need is for him to direct them and focus their activities. On the evenings he is off, he leaves briefing sheets for the CSOs. They write an update of progress which he reviews in the morning. However, there does not appear to be a typical pattern, as there is some variation in contact time with managers. While some have daily contact, others rarely see them.

Organisational structures and neighbourhood policing

From the fieldwork, CSOs were found to be working in a range of organisational structures. Some were working as a team with their own tasks and beat areas to cover, separate to and in relative isolation from both the regular police shift and the community beat teams. Others were embedded within neighbourhood policing teams either being supervised or supported by community beat managers (CBMs). Of the case study forces, the embedding of CSOs within neighbourhood policing teams was most apparent in Merseyside. There were teams comprising of one inspector, two sergeants, 20 constables, six CSOs, a number of travel CSOs (TCSOs) as well as volunteers and specials. This is similar to the MPS where many CSOs work as part of Safer Neighbourhood teams typically comprising one sergeant, two constables and three CSOs.

During interviews in the case study forces, the future sustainability of the management and supervision of CSOs was often raised given the proposed increase in their numbers. It was suggested that the only practical and sustainable option would be for CSOs to be managed in a neighbourhood policing team structure possibly supervised directly by police constables. For example:

*I mean for me the supervision of them should work in with the neighbourhood constables…so that’s how I would see the…neighbourhood constable, PCSOs working with them and to them in dealing with the neighbourhood problems.*

ACPO

*They should be part of a Neighbourhood Policing Team with PCs as beat managers managing them.*

Police Federation
This would provide day-to-day support and supervision, whilst giving CSOs the opportunity to be involved with neighbourhood policing, for example using problem-solving tactics. This approach is in accord with the government intentions that CSOs should not only form part of integrated neighbourhood policing teams, but that leadership training should be available to all levels in the police service. The White Paper *Building Communities, Beating Crime* (Home Office, 2004) contained proposals for leadership training for officers from the rank of constable so that they could take on line management responsibility and considerably expand a force’s management capacity.

There was very little support for alternative organisational structures in the interviews in the case study forces. In particular it was thought that the creation of a CSO supervisor role or ranks structure would create difficulties in integration of CSOs within neighbourhood policing teams.

*You run the risk of creating a second element of policing that is almost independent and that causes difficulties.*

Implementation team

**Training of supervisors**
The role of supervisors is to manage, appraise and identify the training needs of CSOs and for this they themselves need training. Where the supervisors are police officers they have a particular need for training to understand the role and terms and conditions of a CSO who is a member of police staff, so that they can be appropriately tasked and deployed. The evidence from case study forces showed that only one force provided training for sergeants, although another had initially run some training for the first intake of CSOs. It emerged from fieldwork that in some cases the CSO role was not well, or in some cases, at all understood by duty sergeants and officers. Some managers were unaware of CSO terms and conditions, although, the CSO survey found that the majority (72%) of CSOs believed their supervisor understood their role.

**Summary**
- In most cases the supervision of CSOs was by sergeants who retained their existing management workloads.
- Many CSOs felt that their supervisors did not have sufficient time to support them, in particular because they were often on different shift systems.
- The provision of training for those who manage CSOs did not appear to be routine, meaning some supervisors did not fully understand the CSO role.
CSOs were found to be working in a range of organisational structures with many working in relative isolation to the community policing teams. The evidence suggests that CSOs should be managed within neighbourhood policing teams that could provide day-to-day support and supervision.

Integration

For CSOs to be fully effective members of the policing family, they need to be accepted by, and work with, their police officer colleagues as part of the team delivering a service to the public. This section looks at the differences between CSOs and police officers in terms of their employment status and goes on to consider how well CSOs have been accepted by police officers and the factors that may affect their level of integration. It then looks briefly at partnership working between the police forces and local authorities.

Employment status

In focus groups and interviews with police officers and supervisors in the case study forces, there was some confusion and lack of understanding about the differences between CSOs and police officers in terms of employment status. Police officers are not employees in the traditional sense, but hold the office of constable under the Crown. CSOs however are police staff and are employees. As such they have different terms and conditions to those of officers. This has a number of implications in terms of differences in the discipline procedures, codes of conduct and the representation of the two bodies of policing staff.

Complaints and discipline

There is a difference in the discipline procedures for CSOs and police officers. CSOs are subject to the same complaints procedure as police officers but the discipline process is different because they are members of police staff. This means that for any complaint that falls within the definition in Part 2 of the Police Reform Act 2002, CSOs and police officers follow the same procedure, with the process diverging for discipline issues which, if required, will follow after the complaint has been investigated. A sanction cannot be imposed on a police officer without a discipline hearing and until that hearing an officer can be suspended on full pay. There is a wide range of sanctions available for disciplining police officers, ranging from a caution to a dismissal and including reduction in rank and a fine. This difference in the systems could become an issue with more and more CSOs working alongside sworn police officers. However one recommendation of a report on discipline (Taylor, 2005) was that the police staff council should develop a single discipline code for police staff.
An additional difference in the system is that police officers have a code of conduct as part of police regulations by which to abide but there are currently no national professional standards or code of conduct for police staff, although some forces are using the police code of conduct for CSOs as well.

**Representation**

Police officers as office holders under the Crown do not have the right to strike. They are not represented by a union; officers up to and including chief inspector are represented by the Police Federation. CSOs as employees have the right to strike and can belong to a union. CSOs are currently represented by Unison nationally, except in the MPS where they are represented by the Public and Commercial Services Union (PCS). Nationally, 60 per cent of CSOs were members of Unison although take-up rates varied by force (source: interview with Unison official). In the MPS, 90 per cent of CSOs are members of PCS (source: interview with PCS official). There was some concern expressed by police officers during the fieldwork of two people working alongside each other with different rights and terms and conditions.

**Acceptance of the CSO role**

CSOs generally felt that they had been accepted by police officers and supervisors. In the CSO survey, the vast majority (86%) of CSOs said that they found officers approachable if they needed help and just over half (54%) agreed that sworn officers with whom they worked saw their role as worthwhile and beneficial. Within CSO focus groups there was a range of views expressed, suggesting that the extent of integration within case study areas varied.

The evaluation found some evidence that officers who did not work with CSOs tended to be more negative about their role:

> Where there might be any negativity towards the employment of CSOs it’s where you’ve got sections of staff that don’t work with CSOs. For example the response patrols...have limited contact with the CSOs.

Police inspector

However, although some police officers were negative about CSOs prior to their arrival, evidence from fieldwork suggested that their views often became more positive when they worked closely with CSOs and understood their role.
I think the police officers in general were sceptical but the police officers that have worked in the neighbourhoods with CSOs have seen their value and the working relationship has built up.

Police inspector

At first I was very demoralised…I thought they might be more sort of friendly. But now it’s no problem…as long as you help them out occasionally…and they can see that you …have your use.

CSO

Overall, it appears that where police officers had contact with CSOs they saw their value. However, within the case study areas and from the CSO survey, there was evidence that many police officers were concerned that CSOs were going to replace police officers. The CSO survey showed that over a half of CSOs (53%) thought that regular officers felt threatened by their role. This was reinforced in interviews and focus groups in the forces, for example:

It takes a while for police officers to accept CSOs. There is a feeling that their work should be done by police officers.

Police officer

and uniform feel that CSOs are going to replace constables given time so there is a big resistance…PCs feel undermined.

Police Federation

There was a strong and consistent message from fieldwork that was held across forces and at all levels that CSOs were viewed positively by officers who work with them, but this was dependent on the maintenance of police officer numbers. For example:

Happy to have more CSOs so long as they do not pose a threat to the number of police officers.

Human resources

... but I don’t think there is an antipathy towards CSOs. However if you freeze officer numbers and continue to recruit CSOs, then this will change.

Police commander
Factors affecting integration

Some factors were identified that appeared to improve integration. These included good initial communication about the role and regular day to day contact and communication between CSOs and police officers. Both of these can increase understanding and appreciation of the CSO role. The fieldwork found that contact and communication could be facilitated through, for example co-location and shared facilities with police colleagues, aligned shifts and working as part of the same team.

Communication

Prior to their introduction, forces provided information about CSOs internally. For example, Merseyside made available the information shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good practice in communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Merseyside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● an awayday was organised with local councillors and inspectors;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● an article was put in the local area command magazine;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● the Police Federation put out information in the local Federation magazine;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● general training was provided for those would manage CSOs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● probationer constables heard about CSOs during initial training;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● working groups/briefing sessions were arranged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, it was apparent that this information had not always reached those who managed or worked with CSOs on a daily basis. Many interviewed in the case study forces felt they had been ill-prepared for the arrival of CSOs. One duty inspector described how he obtained most of his knowledge about CSOs from the press and television, and one CSO said:

the officers I work with didn’t know we were coming until 24 hours in advance. Considering that they’ve been really good and I’ve got no complaints, they’ve made the best of a bad situation.

The findings from the CSO survey and from the fieldwork suggested that the CSO role was not generally understood within forces. In the CSO survey less than a half (47%) of CSOs thought control room staff understood their role and deployed them appropriately and just over a half (56%) thought sworn police officers with whom they worked understood their role. Just 17 per cent of CSOs thought that other staff within the organisation with which they had little contact understood their role. Within the case study forces a similar picture emerges:
Generally speaking I would say no, I mean lots of police officers don’t understand the role of community officer...they don’t work directly with them.

Police inspector

**Level of contact**

Within the case study forces there was evidence of some CSOs having little contact with their supervisors and police colleagues. This was partly because, as mentioned previously the CSO shift system was different to police officers’ shifts and partly because of organisational structures. In one case study area there was an example of how the reorganisation of the teams within a division had led to improved working relationships,

*It is totally different with the new inspector, he’s broken up the neighbourhood into small teams. We have very close links to CSOs and neighbourhood wardens. CSOs regularly parade, we have our own briefings with CSOs. It’s working quite well.*

Police officer

Having work space that allows employees to mix is another important factor in the development of closer working relationships. For example, in one location where CSOs had their own office the lack of contact with officers was commented on:

*There is very little contact between CSOs and officers. In … they even have their own entrance so there is no contact at all – there should have been a more integrated approach.*

Police Federation

*So, occasionally you’ll just bump into them while you’re out and about on your patch or responding to certain jobs. But other than that you don’t really see much of them. They tend to go out and just do their own thing.*

Police officer

However, there was an acknowledgement in some case study areas of the importance of CSOs sharing office space with police officers so that there can be a sharing of views and information.

**Working with specials and volunteers**

There was limited evidence from this evaluation of CSOs working with members of the policing family, other than police officers. From the CSO survey only one per cent of respondents said that they carried out foot patrol with special constables. However, 36 per
cent of CSOs said that they had face to face contact with special constables at least once a week. Within Merseyside there were teams consisting of CSOs, special constables, volunteers and police officers.

**Working with local authorities**
From interviews with local authority representatives and senior police officers there was evidence of different levels of joint working between local authorities and police forces. All of the case study forces gave examples of CSOs being involved in joint local initiatives with local authority staff, for example in Merseyside there was a joint agency group considering ASB, as well as local problem-solving groups. Evidence from the CSO survey showed that many CSOs had comparatively frequent contact with local authorities. Nearly a half (49%) had contact with the local authority at least once a week and over a third (34%) of CSOs said that they had face to face contact with local authority wardens at least once a week.

**Summary**
- CSOs and police officers, often working alongside each other had different employment status, with different terms and conditions. In particular CSOs as police staff had a different discipline procedure to police officers and had the right to strike that police officers, as office holders under the Crown did not.
- CSOs generally felt accepted by their police colleagues and where there was resistance to CSOs it tended to come from police officers who did not work closely with them. Acceptance of CSOs tended to improve with increased contact and understanding of the value of the work of CSOs.
- It was clear that much of the goodwill and acceptance of CSOs was dependent on the numbers of police officers remaining stable.
- There was limited evidence of CSOs working with members of the policing family other than police officers. However, there was evidence that CSOs on the ground had comparatively frequent contact with local authorities, wardens and special constables.
Part 3: Conclusions and good practice

The successes of CSOs

Role and impact
The evidence from the evaluation shows that CSOs are providing a much wanted service and that they are valued by both the police and the public for their visibility and their accessibility. It was intended from their introduction that the main role of CSOs was to act as a visible and familiar presence through foot patrol and community engagement. This is something that police officers in general have less time for, due to the pressures of other aspects of their work, in particular responding to crimes and other incidents. The visibility and accessibility of CSOs means that not only do residents and businesses feel reassured but they are more willing to approach them about problems and with information. They feel that CSOs have time to talk and to deal with the sorts of problems that are the daily irritants that affect their quality of life, but that they feel are too trivial to bother police officer with. This ability of CSOs to obtain and pass on community intelligence was recognised by police officers as one of their key benefits.

Whilst on patrol much of the CSO’s time is spent dealing with youth disorder and anti-social behaviour, issues that the public were most concerned about in all the case study areas. The effectiveness of CSOs in handling young people who are unruly is also what members of the public most appreciate from their role. As CSOs become a consistent presence in the community, they get to know the local young people and build relationships with them. This means that CSOs are often able to deal with any problems created by the young people in a consensual way, with less conflict.

Profile of CSOs
The diversity of CSOs, particularly in terms of ethnicity and age has been one of the successes of the implementation of this new role. The evidence suggests that the experience that many CSOs brought to the role has meant that they have been able to deal with a wide range of situations. Not only has the role of CSOs attracted some underrepresented groups to forces, there are indications that a number of minority ethnic CSOs intend to become police officers. Indeed a similar proportion of White and minority ethnic CSOs (36% and 38% respectively) said that they planned to become sworn police officers. If numbers of CSOs who are familiar with the police service do become sworn officers this would bring in new recruits with valuable experience and increase the diversity of police officers.
Barriers to effective working

Evidence from the case studies shows that while CSOs have the potential to be, and were, very successful in some locations, there was a range of factors that may limit their effectiveness. Although many of the initial pressures on the forces brought about by the tight timescales for the implementation of CSOs have been addressed by the forces themselves, there are some aspects of deployment and staffing that may be barriers to CSOs carrying out their primary role of providing high visibility reassurance policing in local areas. The evaluation found that in order to build relationships with the community, it is important that CSOs become known within the neighbourhood. This means that they need to be attached to a small area, continue to work in that area for a period of time and not be abstracted from it. There are a number of factors including how they are deployed, how integrated they are and staff turnover that can impinge on these requirements.

Turnover and morale of staff

The percentage of CSOs resigning was similar to the rest of police staff; however, there is evidence from the evaluation that the majority of CSOs cannot see a clear route for career development. Although most CSOs said that they intended to stay in post for the next two years and most were satisfied with the job, about a third, predominantly young men of all ethnicities, stated that they had become a CSO with the intention of using it as a stepping-stone to joining the fully sworn police service. This same group of young men were more likely to be bored by the role and feel it has not met their expectations.

This raises two issues. The first is the importance of career development in all its forms for CSOs. For example, CSOs interviewed in forces expressed most satisfaction when they were involved with police officers in taking an active part in solving community problems not just reporting back on them. This provided a wider variety of challenges than basic patrolling and consequently had the potential to increase job satisfaction and so retain staff. The second is that consideration needs to be given to the implications of the wishes of such comparatively large numbers of CSOs wanting to become fully sworn police officers. Although there may be many benefits for police recruitment if they are taken into the service as police officers, the high turnover rate for CSOs would detract from the importance of providing a familiar presence that has been shown to be fundamental in providing reassurance to the community.
**CSOs’ activities and powers**

There are many tasks, other than the core patrol and community involvement work, that it could be appropriate for a member of police staff with some powers to undertake. There is evidence from the evaluation that many forces are using CSOs for a number of such tasks. Although this use of CSOs can reduce the burden on police officers and they are often deployed in response to local needs, if carried out by a CSO whose main purpose is visible patrol and community engagement these tasks will detract from the reassurance role that is valued by the public. Some forces have responded to this challenge by employing CSOs specifically to perform these more specialist roles and thereby ensuring that local CSOs can spend most of their time visible and accessible in the community.

Similarly, the appropriateness of the numbers and types of designated powers are dependent on the definition of the role that the CSO is to undertake. From the force survey it was apparent that there were a core number of powers that had been designated to CSOs in most forces. The designation of a wider range of powers may be appropriate depending on the role defined and the situation into which those CSOs are deployed. However, if a wider range of powers is designated there may be increased training requirements and additional health and safety considerations.

**Deployment and health and safety**

There are different levels of risk associated with when and how CSOs are deployed. Many CSOs stated that they felt vulnerable and a number had suffered some level of physical assault. It is important that risk assessments for CSOs look at such things as times and areas of deployment, levels of crewing and take into account the degree of training and levels of equipment of CSOs.

Some forces have made decisions about times of deployment that have resulted in a less flexible shift system that does not allow the deployment of CSOs to maximise their visibility and effectiveness in their neighbourhood and that is not aligned with police colleagues, militating against close team working and the benefits that that brings.

**Supervision and training**

This evaluation found that many CSOs felt that their supervisors did not have the time to support them. Most CSOs were managed by a police sergeant, many of whom had a heavy workload as they already supervised a number of police officers. The lack of time available for supervision was exacerbated in some forces by the different shift systems for police...
officers and CSOs. However, generally, police officers were not keen on having specialist CSO supervisors as it was felt that this would reduce integration and co-ordination.

Some CSOs expressed concerns about their training, particularly in terms of how it was delivered. Many of those taken on as CSOs were unused to classroom instruction and found the initial training rather intensive and not practical enough. Some CSOs felt that the courses did not include adequate training in some of the more practical aspects, in particular self defence. There was some evidence that in the areas where there had been good induction on division, in particular in terms of introductions to the neighbourhood, this gave CSOs a better start in developing their community role.

Training for CSOs has developed over the past couple of years with the introduction of a training manual by Centrex. The ongoing changes in police training will have a further impact on the training of CSOs. However, further consideration should be given to ensuring that teaching methods for CSOs are practical and that CSOs are thoroughly inducted into their neighbourhoods.

**Ways to facilitate more effective working**

There are two key factors that are crucial to the successful and effective use of CSOs: how and where CSOs were located within the organisation’s structures, and how the public and others in the force understand their role.

**Organisational structures and neighbourhood policing**

The most important method of ensuring that CSOs are used to best effect is to embed them in the organisation in a way in which they have adequate support and supervision and are part of a co-ordinated policing effort. The use of CSOs in mixed community policing teams attached to a locality and tasked with solving community problems would ensure that these conditions exist. This structure also fits with both the Government’s intention and the views expressed clearly in the case study forces. In neighbourhood policing teams CSOs can work alongside police colleagues and other members of the policing family, getting involved in a range of community problem-solving initiatives whilst retaining their ability to build familiarity and trust within a fixed area. This may help to improve job satisfaction and provide opportunities for lateral development within the role without compromising the public’s need for consistency in personnel. Locating CSOs within such a structure would provide day-to-day support and supervision in an integrated team. This structure could
provide a sustainable management framework even with the proposed increase in numbers of CSOs over the next few years.

**Understanding of the role**

There was evidence from the evaluation that those who had had contact with CSOs had a much greater understanding of their role than those who had had little contact. Police officers and members of the public who had little experience of CSOs had difficulty in seeing beyond a ‘mini police officer’ role and concentrated on what they perceived as CSOs’ limitations in the enforcement aspects of the policing role. Those who appreciated CSOs valued those aspects of the role that separated them from police officers – having the time to talk and to deal with low-level incidents. However, even amongst those who valued the role of the CSO, they did not want an increase in numbers to be at the expense of police officers.

Communication is the key to both public and within force understanding of the CSO role. In the case study areas it appeared that businesses often had a greater understanding of the roles, because they were given more information, and there was some evidence that CSOs often popped in to talk to shopkeepers. Once CSOs were in areas, it is important that there are opportunities for two-way communication with such things as dedicated phone lines for the public to contact the CSOs and to report incidents. Within the police service it is important that information about the remit and role of CSOs arrives prior to the CSOs themselves so that existing staff are prepared for their arrival. Again two-way communication is important within the service. This can be enhanced through police officers and CSOs working together, with the alignment of shifts and locations.

**Good practice – the effective use of CSOs**

This section summarises the evidence from the evaluation on the ways in which CSOs have been used to most effect. Its focus is on CSOs working within a neighbourhood, it does not consider the role of specialist CSOs who have been successful in some areas.

The evaluation has shown that locally based CSOs are most effective when used in the following ways.

- Their role within the force has been clearly defined and this role is distinct from that of a neighbourhood police officer.
Their deployment and powers are appropriate for the role.

They are part of a team with police officers and other members of the policing family, such as in a neighbourhood policing team.

They work in a fixed local area to enable the build-up of trust and familiarity.

They are working with young people and tackling low-level ASB.

Their accessibility is used by practitioners in local strategies to tackle ASB.

They are deployed within the local area in accordance with the National Intelligence Model to make most effective use of their role e.g. to hot spots of crime and ASB.

They patrol on foot, but also engage with the local community through meetings and visits.

They are accessible to the public with a contact number that is widely known and advertised in the locality.

They are supervised from within the team and have regular contact with their supervisor.

Their shifts are aligned with other members of the team.

They are deployed by command and control to incidents, and these are within their beat area and appropriate to their powers, training and priorities.

They are not given tasks that will detract from their primary reassurance role which is valued by the public.

Their role is publicised and understood by the public.

Benefits are:

- more effective impact;
- greater integration within the policing family, with police officers understanding and appreciating the role of CSOs;
- improved lines of accountability;
- the facilitation of the sharing of information and intelligence about the neighbourhood including collecting and collating evidence for Anti-Social Behaviour Orders;
- potential for greater job satisfaction and opportunities for career development.
Recommendations

Training
CSO training should be practically based.

- It should include modules in problem solving and ASB.
- It should be regularly updated and refreshed.
- It should include in-depth induction to the local area, e.g. meeting with local councillors and businesses, visits to custody suite and control room, and provision of information on local schools and youth clubs.
- It should, where possible, include pairing with a tutor CSO for the first few weeks in division.

Communication
- Communication within the force should be clear about the differences between CSOs and police officers in their terms and conditions and their roles.
- Information should be provided to all members of the force, including those who do not directly work with CSOs.
- CSOs should be briefed to an appropriate level.

Recruitment
A recruitment process should ensure that:

- a diverse workforce in terms of ethnicity, age and gender is recruited;
- local and minority communities are reached through local campaigns and advertising;
- those recruited are committed to the role and are satisfied with its remit.

Health and safety
- Detailed assessments of the appropriate levels of equipment and training for CSOs should be undertaken locally to reflect their local role.
- Risk assessments should look at things such as times and areas of deployment, level of crewing and degree of training received.
Some of the issues highlighted by the report are already being addressed by:

- the National Training Package produced by Centrex;
- ACPO Guidance on CSOs available at www.acpo.police.uk/policies.asp;
- National Recruitment Standards will be in place by April 2006;
- Practice Advice on Professionalising the Business of Neighbourhood Policing.
- community engagement in policing at www.communityengagement.police.uk
- tackling anti-social behaviour at www.together.gov.uk
Appendix 1: Methods

The key aims of the evaluation were to:

- provide a national profile of CSOs in terms of their activities, deployment, designated powers and demographics;
- provide indications of the impact of CSOs on the public, in terms of their levels of reassurance, their perceptions and an understanding of their role;
- provide indications of impact of CSOs on low-level crime/disorder, incidents and anti-social behaviour (ASB).

Data were collected from a wide range of sources to inform these aims. Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected at a national and local level to build up a detailed understanding of the deployment and impact of CSOs across England and Wales. The variety of sources and analytical techniques used in this evaluation provided opportunities for triangulation of data, enhancing the overall robustness and reliability of the findings. At a national level data were collected through a survey of forces and a survey of CSOs. At a local level three forces were selected as case studies and within each force four locations were then chosen for detailed study – two experimental areas where CSOs had been deployed for some time and two control areas where CSOs were not currently deployed.

The different data sources were used to contribute to many areas of the study as described in Table A1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>How used in report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Force survey</td>
<td>National All forces with CSOs</td>
<td>Role and activities, designation of powers, deployment, health and safety, recruitment, pay and conditions of service, retention, training, mentoring, supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO survey</td>
<td>National All CSOs in post January 2005</td>
<td>Role and activities, use of powers, deployment, health and safety, impact, recruitment, retention, demography, supervision, training, integration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following sections give more details of the data sources and the analyses carried out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>How used in report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews in forces with police officers and staff, union/staff associations, local authorities</td>
<td>Local 3 case study forces</td>
<td>Role and activities, designation of powers, deployment, health and safety, impact, recruitment, pay and conditions of service, retention, training, mentoring, supervision, integration, organisational structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups with CSOs and police officers in forces</td>
<td>Local Control and experimental areas in case study forces</td>
<td>Role and activities, use of powers, deployment, health and safety, impact, recruitment, retention, training, mentoring, supervision, integration, organisational structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups with residents and businesses</td>
<td>Local Control and experimental areas in case study forces</td>
<td>Impact – views of area, visibility and accessibility of CSOs, attitudes to crime and CSOs, perception of impact of CSOs on crime and reassurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity analysis data for CSOs and neighbourhood officers – two-week period</td>
<td>Local Case study forces, control and experimental areas</td>
<td>Role and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaries completed by CSOs for a week</td>
<td>Local Experimental areas in case study forces</td>
<td>Role and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident log of all incidents reported to control room in two-week period</td>
<td>Local Control and experimental areas in case study forces</td>
<td>Activities – incident attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers of crimes recorded for period before and after introduction of CSOs</td>
<td>Local Control and experimental areas in case study forces</td>
<td>Impact – on crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of incidents of ASB reported for period before and after introduction of CSOs</td>
<td>Local Control and experimental areas in case study forces</td>
<td>Impact – on ASB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National level

At a national level, data were collected from a survey to all 43 police forces in England and Wales and a survey to CSOs employed by police authorities in England and Wales. These were supplemented by a review of official documents, academic papers, local evaluations and government and police-related websites.

Force survey

At the beginning of the project, all 43 forces were sent a questionnaire to obtain information about the use, deployment and management of CSOs. The questionnaire was designed and administered in Excel and completed electronically by the force HR contacts. Thirty-three forces returned completed surveys which represented a response rate of 77 per cent.

The questionnaire requested information for CSOs employed by the force:

- recruitment, pay and conditions of service;
- health and safety;
- communication strategy regarding CSOs within and outside force;
- training / induction procedures;
- career development;
- management and supervision;
- shifts;
- deployment and tasking;
- activity based costing exercises;
- equipment available to CSOs; and
- powers.

CSO Survey

This survey was developed to obtain the views of CSOs regarding their role. The questionnaire comprised three sections. The first sought information on a range of issues

- recruitment;
- equipment;
- training and induction;
- deployment;
- supervision and management;
tasking;
community involvement;
partnership working; and
health and safety.

The second invited CSOs to report their attitudes to the role and covered five themes:

job satisfaction;
appropriateness of deployment, training and powers;
management and supervision;
providing what the public wants; and
integration.

The third section sought demographic details.

**Design and Administration**

The CSO survey administration was commissioned to MORI. The survey was designed by the Home Office and revised following feedback from cognitive testing/piloting which took place with ten CSOs. The CSO survey was distributed in March 2005 to all CSOs who had been in post for at least three months. There were 2,647 completed surveys, representing an overall response rate of 52 per cent. This is a good response rate in comparison with other police staff surveys. For example, a survey carried out by the Work Foundation in partnership with the Morris Enquiry (Sullivan and Diffey, 2004) on police officers and staff at the MPS in June 2004 achieved a response rate of 36 per cent and a Police Staff NOP Survey in 2002 carried out by Unison (Unison, 2002) achieved a 49 per cent response rate.

**Data analysis**

The questionnaire used closed questions, apart from an open-ended question at the end that gave respondents an opportunity to give additional information or views. There were different types of questions; some factual questions gave a series of options or asked how often they performed particular tasks. There were also a series of attitudinal statements with which respondents were asked to agree or disagree on a five-point scale.

The attitudinal statements were designed to test five themes: job satisfaction; appropriateness of deployment, training and powers; management and supervision; providing what the public wants; and integration. These formed the basis of five scales. The scope of each scale was confirmed by reliability analysis. The scale was constructed with three categories: agree; disagree; or neither agree or disagree. This was done by
calculating the highest and lowest possible scores on each scale, and then identifying the median of that range. Scores that fell half a standard deviation above and below the median formed the category ‘neither agree nor disagree’. Scores that fell more than half a standard deviation below the median formed the category ‘agree’ and scores that fell more than half a standard deviation above the median formed the category ‘disagree’. Accordingly, a low-scale score on the scales is indicative of favourable attitudes towards that area, for example, job satisfaction, while a high-scale score on a scale would be indicative of unfavourable attitudes towards that area.

A database was constructed using a Statistical Package for Social Science. The numerical data were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The authors were able to compare between groups, for example: men and women; those in different age groups; and from different ethnic groups. Significance tests were carried out across a wide range of comparisons although, generally, only those differences that were statistically significant are noted in the text. Unless otherwise mentioned these are based on the chi square statistic, using a 0.05 significance level, giving a 95 per cent confidence level that this result can be inferred to the population from which the sample was taken.

Respondents to CSO survey
The demographics of the respondents to the CSO survey were compared to the total population of CSOs within Home Office police forces across England and Wales. The Home Office asks each force to complete an annual data return (ADR) that includes information on the demographics of its staff.

ADR figures showed that in 2004/05, 59.1 per cent of CSOs were male and 40.9 per cent were female. The gender profile of the CSO survey respondents was similar, 58.8 per cent were male and 41.2 per cent were female (not significantly different). Table A1.2 compares the age profile of the survey respondents to the ADR. The age profile of the respondents was statistically significantly different from the population (at the 0.01 level), with an underrepresentation of young people aged 25 years and under and an overrepresentation of people aged between 41 and 55.
The annual data return statistics in 2004/05 show that 14.9 per cent of CSOs came from a minority ethnic background. In the CSO survey 11.7 per cent of respondents stated that they were from a minority ethnic background. The under representation of people from a minority ethnic background amongst CSOs in the survey is statistically significant (at the 0.01 level). This under representation may be accounted for by low response rates in two of the forces with the greatest numbers and highest proportions of CSO from ethnic minority groups (Table A1.3). This was compounded by lower response rates for minority ethnic than White CSOs in these two forces.

Table A1.4 compares selected characteristics of minority ethnic and White CSO respondents to the CSO survey. A higher proportion of CSOs from minority ethnic groups was male and in the younger age groups (under 40) than White respondents.
Table A1.4: A comparison of selected characteristics of minority ethnic and White respondents to CSO survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minority ethnic</th>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 25 and under</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged between 26 and 40</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged between 41 and 55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged over 55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who want to join the regular police service</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who want to use role as a stepping stone</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2,305</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38 respondents (1.4% of sample) did not state their ethnicity.

Local-level case studies

Three forces, Merseyside, Northumbria and Sussex were selected as case studies. This was to provide an in depth analysis of local implementation and operation of CSOs. The forces were selected because they all employed comparatively large numbers of CSOs, but were diverse in the ways in which they deployed them. The forces were located in different parts of the country and included rural and urban areas. The forces themselves were committed to the evaluation and were willing to give the time and resources needed for the evaluation.

Within each force, four beat areas were selected in consultation with the forces: two experimental areas where CSOs had been deployed for some time; and two control areas where CSOs were not currently deployed. The beat areas represented the lowest level of policing within the force, some were local authority wards, and others were larger being made up of two or three wards or parts of wards. The areas were chosen to cover a range of neighbourhoods, from the very deprived to the more affluent, from small villages to town centres. The control areas were drawn from the same division or sector to control for different styles of policing and were matched as far as possible in terms of their demographic profile (details of areas in Appendix 2).

Within each case study force data were collected from a variety of sources.
**Interviews and focus groups in forces**

Data were sought on a wide range of issues including CSO deployment, supervision, training, induction and integration. These data were collected via several in-depth structured interviews and focus groups within case study forces. The interviews and focus groups were conducted by Home Office researchers.

In each force the following people were interviewed:

- member of the command team;
- BCU commanders (in experimental and control areas);
- partnerships/local authority representative;
- head of human resources;
- implementation lead;
- Unison representative;
- Police Federation representative;
- duty sergeants/inspectors (in experimental and control areas); and
- Police Authority representative.

Focus groups were conducted with CSOs and police officers within each of the areas (experimental and control). There were four focus groups in each force:

- CSOs (experimental area 1);
- CSOs (experimental area 2);
- police officers who work with CSOs in experimental areas; and
- police officers who do not work with CSOs in the force areas.

There were between six and ten participants in each focus group, arranged by contacts in the forces. The groups were generally attended by as many of the appropriate officers who were on duty when the focus groups took place. In areas where there were insufficient CSOs, the groups were augmented by CSOs from adjacent areas.

A standard interview schedule was drawn up for each of the interviews and topic guides were prepared for each of the focus groups. These were used in each case study force to maintain consistency in questioning and ensure all relevant areas were covered by the interviewers. The schedules and topic guides covered similar issues.
Who are CSOs?

What do they do?

Training.

Personal safety.

Use of powers.

Support – management/supervision/unions.

Tasking.

Impact.

Integration.

Views of the future.

The force visits took place during March/April 2005. Most of the interviews and focus groups were taped and then transcribed verbatim. Only the interviews that were taped were used to provide quotations for the report.

Analysis of interview and focus group data

The transcribed data were imported into NVivo, a qualitative data analysis package, which was used to analyse the data. The researchers carried out a brainstorming session to develop the themes to be explored in the fieldwork. These formed the basis of topic guides for the interviews and focus groups. These themes were also used as the basis for the initial coding frame. The coding was developed through an iterative process (including inter-rater reliability) with the researchers noting patterns and themes within the data, comparing and contrasting data from the case study areas and looking at the strength of evidence within each theme and developing new codes if appropriate. Quotations have been included in the report where they represent the views of a number of participants and illustrate the themes. The data from this aspect of the study were verified, if possible, through triangulation with the other methods of data collection.

Focus groups with residents and businesses

MORI were contracted to carry out focus group work with the public and local businesses. Groups were conducted in each of the experimental and control areas within the three case study forces. Seventeen focus groups were run with local residents, one with visitors to the area and there were 12 mini-group discussions with local businesses in March 2005. The focus groups had between eight and ten participants. Each focus group lasted one and a half hours and was guided by the researcher using a topic guide, which had been developed by MORI in close collaboration with the Home Office. The aim of this part of the research was to identify to what extent the public were aware of CSOs, their understanding of the role, and gauge their perceptions of impact.
Participants were recruited on a face-to-face basis at home or in the street using trained field-force recruiters who were local to the area. MORI used a structured recruitment questionnaire to closely control the profile of participants and included questions confirming all quotas for the research. Participants were selected on a number of criteria:

- Gender – to ensure that each group was half male and half female.
- Ethnicity – BME groups were recruited roughly in proportion to the BME population within each area.
- Postcodes – potential participants were screened by postcode and detailed maps to ensure they lived within the relevant police neighbourhood.
- Work status – a range of people working, not working, retired (for older groups), or looking after home/children were recruited.
- General attitudes towards the police – as a group, participants held a range of views about the police.

One mini-group discussion with local businesses that typically had four participants was conducted in every area. A range of local business people were recruited, both from local shops and other local businesses.

**Activity analysis**

These data are captured routinely by all forces and provide a snapshot of how police personnel spend their time. All police officers and CSOs fill in forms over a two-week period noting down their activities at 15-minute intervals. There are some limitations with using this approach. Those completing the forms may interpret the codes in different ways and may fill in the forms retrospectively which may lead to inaccuracies in recording. However, the exercise is a valuable source of data because of its comprehensive coverage, allowing comparisons between forces and between CSOs and police officers.

Although the categories are prescribed by the Home Office, there is some local interpretation and augmentation of the categories. The pro forma differentiates activities related to incidents and other activities. Table A1.5 shows the main categorisations used in activity analysis. Some of the forces used a more detailed breakdown and some included additional categories for CSOs.
The activity data were analysed for CSOs and neighbourhood constables within the case study areas, although in Sussex the data were only available at the division level. The amount of time spent on different activities was compared for CSOs and neighbourhood constables and for CSOs in the different case study areas.

### Diary exercise

The diary exercise took place in the experimental areas and was designed to collect information which would assist the researchers to understand the sorts of contact CSOs had with members of the public. Supervisors in the experimental areas gave a pack to each CSO containing a letter explaining how to complete the diary, a simple form to fill in each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A1.5: Categories used in activity analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incident-linked activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-incident-linked activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
day for a week and a postage-paid reply envelope for the completed diary to be returned to the Home Office. One force failed to distribute the diaries to their CSOs; in the other two forces 39 diaries were distributed and 27 were completed and returned to the Home Office.

Each CSO was asked to complete a cover sheet with basic demographic information and to fill in a log for each shift worked for a week with the following information:

- what hours they worked and how long they were out of the station;
- brief description of who they met (including the number of people, rough age, gender and ethnicity);
- who initiated contact;
- whether they knew the people they spoke to;
- the reason for contact;
- the length of time they spent with the person/group of people; and
- whether any intelligence was provided, and what they did with this information.

The data from the daily logs were collated and analysed, focusing on the categorisation of the types of contacts and the age of these contacts. These categorisations were compared with the data derived from activity analysis.

**Incidents attended by CSOs**

The study looked at whether CSOs were tasked by the control room and if so the type of incidents they attended. CSOs were deployed to incidents in both experimental areas in Northumbria and one in Sussex in the period. Printouts of all the incidents reported to the control rooms for a two-week period in these three areas were obtained from the forces. The data were analysed according to the types of incidents, whether they were attended and whether by police officers or CSOs.

**Crime and anti-social behaviour data**

**Recorded crime data**

The researchers obtained from the forces data for each of the experimental and control sites on the number of recorded low-level crimes:

- criminal damage;
- vehicle crime;
- violence against the person;
The data was collected for a period before and after the introduction of CSOs in the areas, if possible between 2002/03 and February/March 2005. For each crime type and for each of the six experimental sites a line chart of the number of crimes was produced, with a comparison for the control site. The trends were compared before and after the introduction of CSOs in the experimental sites and no discernable differences were found. The researchers looked at carrying out more sophisticated analyses, for example using moving averages, and crime rates rather than numbers, but these led to similar interpretations. The researchers were aware of the limitations of using recorded crime data (briefly discussed in the body of the report), the changes in the recorded crime standards and the small numbers recorded for some of crimes in some areas, and therefore did not pursue this analysis.

Anti-social behaviour data
Most ASB incidents are not recorded as crimes and consequently recorded crime figures do not capture the extent of the problem. ASB incidents can be retrieved from the incident log (incidents reported to the police control room). There are many limitations with using these reported incidents as a source of data, in particular with the level of reporting. There may be underreporting of such incidents because they are not considered to be serious enough to be reported to the police, but there may also be multiple recording of the same incident. The categorisation of such incidents is problematic and indeed two of the case study forces were unable to reliably categorise the reported incidents, partly because of changes in categorisation over the period. Northumbria carried out a keyword search of the incident log. The keywords were based on the Home Office one day count categorisation. This provided the researchers with data on different types of ASB in the two experimental and control areas in the force between April 2002 and July 2004. These were analysed in a similar way to the crime data, but again there were no apparent differences between those areas with and without CSOs.
Appendix 2: Descriptions of the case study areas

Sussex

A profile of CSOs in Sussex and in case study areas
Table A2.1 provides a brief profile of the numbers of CSOs in Sussex and the case study areas, when they were recruited and their gender and ethnicity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A2.1: Profile of CSOs in Sussex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date that first CSO recruited:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of CSOs recruited (as of end of March 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CSOs recruited during round 1 of Home Office funding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CSOs recruited during round 2 of Home Office funding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CSOs recruited during round 3 of Home Office funding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender split within total number of CSOs within force:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity split (White/non-White) within total number of CSOs within force:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of resignations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of resigners who left to join the regular police force (any force)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CSOs within each experimental area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of CSOs employed within Castle ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number employed within Crawley Down ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of the area
Sussex Police is responsible for policing West and East Sussex, which are divided into twelve districts and the unitary authority of Brighton and Hove. This equates to an area of 4,779 square kilometres with a resident population (based on the 2001 Census) of approximately 1.5 million, which is significantly supplemented by the seasonal influx of visitors to the south coast holiday resorts, particularly Brighton and Eastbourne. In addition, there are seaports at Littlehampton, Newhaven and Shoreham, and more than 30 million passengers pass through Gatwick Airport each year. The area is demographically diverse, covering conurbations and sparsely populated rural communities.
Sussex Police has restructured as part of the recent Force Operational Review (2002), and comprises five basic command units (BCUs) known locally as divisions. Sussex Police provides a locally-based policing style with the formation of local ‘police chiefs’ with devolved authority to control Neighbourhood Policing Teams with geographic accountability for their districts, based on the concepts of accessibility, visibility and familiarity.

**Hastings area**
At the time of the Census in April 2001, the resident population of the Hastings local authority was 85,029 people. The average age of the population in Hastings was 39.6 years. This compared with an average age for England and Wales of 38.6 years.

Hastings is a comparatively deprived area ranked 38 out of 354 local authorities on the 2004 indices of multiple deprivation¹. Of the people in Hastings who were of working age (i.e. those aged 16 to 64 for men or 16 to 59 for women) the employment rate was 64.2 per cent during the summer of 2004 (June to August), compared with an average for Great Britain of 75 per cent. In Hastings there were 37,604 households in 2001. The average size of households in Hastings was 2.2 people compared with an average of 2.4 people for England and Wales.

**Castle and Silverhill**
The beat areas within Sussex were co-terminous with electoral wards. Within Hastings, Castle ward was selected for inclusion in the study because it was a town centre with CSOs and the researchers wanted a variety of settings. It was comparatively deprived. Looking at the demographic details there was no comparable town centre without CSOs within the division. However, in discussion with the local area commander, Silverhill with a local shopping centre was chosen as the control area. Table A2.2 presents some basic demographic details.

Figure A2.1 compares the number of crimes in the experimental and control areas. As can be seen, the number of crimes within Castle ward is much higher than in Silverhill, this is partly because of the more central location of Castle ward, with its shops, pubs and clubs.

---

¹ The indices of multiple deprivation combine information relating to income, employment, education, health, skills and training, barriers to housing and services and crime into an overall measure of deprivation. A score is calculated for each area: a low score indicates greater deprivation – the most deprived Local Authority is indicated by a rank of one.
Table A2.2: A comparison of selected demographic details for Castle (experimental) and Silverhill (control) wards in Hastings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Castle</th>
<th>Silverhill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (18+)</td>
<td>4,764</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of households</td>
<td>3,193</td>
<td>1,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation indexa</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Males (18+)</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Females (18+)</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 18 – 24</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 25 – 44</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 45 – 64</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 or over</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-White</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census neighbourhood statistics.

a The deprivation index score describes the Super Output Area (SOA) by combining information from seven domains and is the combined sum of the weighted, exponentially transformed domain rank of the domain score(0-100). The bigger the IMD 2004 score, the more deprived the SOA.

Figure A2.1: A comparison of the number of recorded crimes in Castle and Silverhill wards

East Grinstead area

East Grinstead falls into the Mid-Sussex local authority area. At the time of the Census in April 2001, the resident population of the Mid Sussex local authority was 127,378 people.
The average age of the population in Mid Sussex was 39.8 years. This compared with an average age for England and Wales of 38.6 years.

East Grinstead is an affluent area ranked 346 out of 354 local authorities on the 2004 indices of multiple deprivation¹. Of the people in Mid-Sussex who were of working age (i.e. those aged from 16 to 64 for men or 16 to 59 for women) the employment rate was 79.7 per cent during the summer of 2004 (June to August), compared with an average for Great Britain of 75 per cent. In Mid-Sussex there were 51,969 households in 2001. The average size of households in Mid-Sussex was 2.4 people, the average for England and Wales.

**Crawley Down and Baldwins**

Areas with and without CSOs within Sussex were compared using the 2001 Area Classification that groups together geographic areas according to key characteristics common to the population in that grouping. These groupings are called clusters, and are derived using Census data (http://neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk). Within East Grinstead Crawley Down was selected as an area with CSOs because there was a well established CSO presence in the ward. Baldwins ward was a good match demographically falling within the same grouping as Crawley Down, defined as a ‘suburb’ (grouping 7.10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A2.3: A comparison of selected demographic details for Crawley Down (experimental) and Baldwins (control) wards East Grinstead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crawley Down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (18+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation index²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Males (18+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Females (18+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 18 – 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 25 – 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 45 – 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 or over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census neighbourhood statistics.

² The deprivation index score describes the Super Output Area (SOA) by combining information from seven domains and is the combined sum of the weighted, exponentially transformed domain rank of the domain score(0-100). The bigger the IMD 2004 score, the more deprived the SOA.
Figure A2.2 compares the number of crimes in the areas. As can be seen, the numbers of crimes within the two wards were similar throughout the period.
Merseyside

A profile of CSOs in Merseyside and in case study areas

Table A2.4 provides a brief profile of the numbers of CSOs in Merseyside and the case study areas, when they were recruited and their gender and ethnicity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A2.4: CSOs in Merseyside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date that first CSO recruited: February 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CSOs in post as of end March 2005: 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CSOs recruited during round 1 of Home Office funding: 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CSOs recruited during round 2 of Home Office funding: 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CSOs recruited during round 3 of Home Office funding: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender split within total number of CSOs within force: Male 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity split (White/non-White) within total number of CSOs within force: White 98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CSOs who have left the force: 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CSOs who left to join the regular police force: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CSOs within each experimental area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of CSOs employed within Heswall: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When introduced: January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number employed within Halewood and Prescot: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When introduced: January 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The county of Merseyside is a heavily industrialised area of approximately 647 square kilometres, with a population of just under 1.5 million. The overall population is decreasing. It is diverse economically, racially and culturally. The county has the oldest Chinese community in Great Britain and it has a wide range of minority groups and populations. Over 60 different languages and dialects are spoken, and after English, the main languages are Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, Hindi, Punjabi, Somali and Urdu. In addition, the city has a comparatively high number of asylum seekers.

The force structure reflects the local boundaries and is made up of six BCUs, one in each metropolitan borough and two in Liverpool north and south. The chief constable has championed the neighbourhood policing philosophy within the force and this is well embedded. The force strategy clearly sets out the main priority as ‘improving public satisfaction and confidence’.
Wirral area
At the time of the Census in April 2001, the resident population of the Wirral local authority was 312,293 people. The average age of the population in Wirral was 40 years. This compared with an average age for England and Wales of 38.6 years.

Wirral is comparatively deprived, ranked 48 out of 354 local authorities on the 2004 indices of multiple deprivation of the people in Wirral who were of working age (i.e. those aged 16 to 64 for men or 16 to 59 for women) the employment rate was 75.9 per cent during the summer of 2004 (June to August), compared with an average for Great Britain of 75 per cent. In Wirral there were 133,345 households in 2001. The average size of households in Wirral was 2.3 people compared with an average of 2.4 people for England and Wales.

Selection of case study areas
Merseyside police employed a consultancy to identify police neighbourhoods with similar demographic profiles, two with CSOs and two neighbourhoods without CSOs to act as control sites. Merseyside Police provided a list of those neighbourhoods with CSOs and those without, and also provided some initial thoughts as to which neighbourhoods they thought would best suit the project based on initial investigations into the demography of the areas.

The consultancy extracted from the core 2001 Census Profiles key variables that related the demographics to indicators of potentially high crime areas. For example these included, those aged 16-24, ethnic background, unemployed people and data relating to tenure and accommodation type. Rates were produced for the data, and each variable was then ranked in turn, and a value of between one and forty two assigned (there being forty two neighbourhoods in the Merseyside Police Force area). The difference between the figures for each of the neighbourhood pairs (those with and without CSOs) was then calculated. These were totalled to produce an overall difference figure. The neighbourhood pair with the lowest overall difference was given a value of one, whilst the neighbourhood pair with the greatest overall difference was given a value of 24.
**Heswall and Bromborough**

The beat area of Heswall (experimental area) was made up of the wards of Heswall and Prenton (previously Greasby Frankby) and Irby (data not available). Data from the 2001 Census shows that the total population of beat area of Heswall was 42,190, with 17,628 households, with 8.1 per cent of the population aged between 16 and 24 and 3.2 per cent from an ethnic minority background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A2.5: Selected demographic details for wards comprising Heswall beat area within the Wirral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heswall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (18+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation index&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Males (18+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Females (18+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 18 – 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 25 – 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 45 – 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 or over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census neighbourhood statistics.

<sup>a</sup> The deprivation index score describes the Super Output Area (SOA) by combining information from seven domains and is the combined sum of the weighted, exponentially transformed domain rank of the domain score(0-100). The bigger the IMD 2004 score, the more deprived the SOA.

The beat area of Bromborough (control area) was made up of the wards of Bromborough, Bebington, Clatterbridge and Eastham. Data from the 2001 census show that the total population of beat area of Bromborough was 56,768, with 23,608 households. 9.5 per cent of the population was aged between 16 and 24 and 3.1 per cent were from an ethnic minority background.
Table A2.6: Selected demographic details for wards comprising Bromborough beat area within the Wirral

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bromborough</th>
<th>Bebington</th>
<th>Clatterbridge</th>
<th>Eastham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (18+)</td>
<td>10,763</td>
<td>10,408</td>
<td>13,416</td>
<td>10,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of households</td>
<td>6,189</td>
<td>5,599</td>
<td>6,751</td>
<td>5,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation indexa</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Males (18+)</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Females (18+)</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 18 – 24</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 25 – 44</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 45 – 64</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 or over</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-White</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census neighbourhood statistics.
a The deprivation index score describes the Super Output Area (SOA) by combining information from seven domains and is the combined sum of the weighted, exponentially transformed domain rank of the domain score(0-100). The bigger the IMD 2004 score, the more deprived the SOA.

Figure A2.3 compares the number of crimes in the areas. As can be seen, although the number of crimes in Bromborough was higher throughout the period the patterns were similar.
**Knowsley area**

At the time of the Census in April 2001, the resident population of the Knowsley local authority was 150,459 people. The average age of the population in Knowsley was 37 years. This compared with an average age for England and Wales of 38.6 years.

Knowsley is a deprived area, ranked three out of 354 local authorities. Of the people in Knowsley who were of working age (i.e. those aged 16 to 64 for men or 16 to 59 for women) the employment rate was 65.1 per cent during the summer of 2004 (June to August), compared with an average for Great Britain of 75 per cent. In Knowsley there were 60,553 households in 2001. The average size of households in Knowsley was 2.5 people compared with an average of 2.4 people for England and Wales.

**Halewood and Huyton**

The beat area of Halewood (experimental area) was made up of the wards of Halewood South, West and East. Data from the 2001 Census shows that the total population of beat area of Halewood was 20,623, with 8,220 households. 10.6 per cent of the population was aged between 16 and 24 and four per cent were from an ethnic minority background.

### Table A2.7: Selected demographic details for words comprising Halewood beat area within Knowsley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Halewood South</th>
<th>Halewood West</th>
<th>Halewood East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (18+)</td>
<td>4,277</td>
<td>4,462</td>
<td>7,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of households</td>
<td>2,377</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>4,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation indexa</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Males (18+)</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Females (18+)</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 18 – 24</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 25 – 44</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 45 – 64</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 or over</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-White</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census neighbourhood statistics.

a The deprivation index score describes the Super Output Area (SOA) by combining information from seven domains and is the combined sum of the weighted, exponentially transformed domain rank of the domain score(0-100). The bigger the IMD 2004 score, the more deprived the SOA.
The beat area of Huyton (control area) was made up of the wards of Longview, Page Moss, Swanside and Stockbridge. Data from the 2001 census shows that the total population of beat area of Halewood was 30,791, with 12,791 households. 11.0 per cent of the population was aged between 16 and 24 and 2.5% were from an ethnic minority background.

### Table A2.8: Selected demographic details for wards comprising Huyton beat area within Knowsley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Longview</th>
<th>Page Moss</th>
<th>Swanside</th>
<th>Stockbridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (18+)</td>
<td>4,171</td>
<td>5,362</td>
<td>6,009</td>
<td>3,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of households</td>
<td>2,457</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>3,065</td>
<td>2,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation indexa</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Males (18+)</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Females (18+)</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 18 – 24</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 25 – 44</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 45 – 64</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 or over</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-White</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census neighbourhood statistics.

a The deprivation index score describes the Super Output Area (SOA) by combining information from seven domains and is the combined sum of the weighted, exponentially transformed domain rank of the domain score (0-100). The bigger the IMD 2004 score, the more deprived the SOA.
Figure A2.4 compares the number of crimes in the areas. As can be seen, the patterns of crimes within the two wards were similar throughout the period.

Northumbria

A profile of CSOs in Northumbria and in case study areas
Table A2.1 provides a brief profile of the numbers of CSOs in Northumbria and the case study areas, when they were recruited and their gender and ethnicity.
Table A2.9: CSOs in Northumbria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of the area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Northumbria Police cover an area of more than 2,150 square miles of England’s border country, making it the seventh largest police area in England and Wales. The Northumbria Police area sits between Durham, Cumbria and the Scottish border and covers two distinct counties – Northumberland and Tyne and Wear. Its area therefore includes some of the UK’s most sparsely-populated rural areas as well as the densely populated urban conurbations of Tyneside and Wearside.  

Northumbria Police provide services for a resident population of approximately 1.4 million. This population tends to increase during the summer months with tourists and holiday-makers. Tyne and Wear is the metropolitan area which includes the two cities of Newcastle upon Tyne and Sunderland. The force has implemented a community policing and engagement style of policing in order to better serve all communities across Northumbria. Over 270 community beat managers are deployed to provide visibility and reassurance. The force has employed CSOs in key areas, supporting an intelligence-led and targeted approach to policing. |
Gateshead area
At the time of the Census in April 2001, the resident population of the Gateshead local authority was 191,151 people. The average age of the population in Gateshead was 39.7 years. This compared with an average age for England and Wales of 38.6 years.

Gateshead is a comparatively deprived area ranked 26 out of 354 local authorities. Of the people in Gateshead who were of working age (i.e. those aged from 16 to 64 for men or 16 to 59 for women) the employment rate was 71.4 per cent during the summer of 2004 (June to August), compared with an average for Great Britain of 75 per cent.

In Gateshead there were 84,267 households in 2001. The average size of households in Gateshead was 2.2 people compared with an average of 2.4 people for England and Wales.

Gateshead control and experimental areas
The beat areas within Northumbria are made up of parts of wards. This makes comparisons based on Census data difficult. Within Gateshead Chowden and High Fell was selected as an area with CSOs, because there was a well established CSO presence in the wards. The Dunston area was suggested by the force as a control area and was a good match demographically, although it covers a wider area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A2.10: Selected demographic details for wards comprising Gateshead (experimental) area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Fell (60%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (18+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation indexa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Males (18+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Females (18+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 18 – 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 25 – 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 45 – 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 or over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A small part of Lamesly ward also falls within the beat area.
Source: Census neighbourhood statistics.
a The deprivation index score describes the Super Output Area (SOA) by combining information from seven domains and is the combined sum of the weighted, exponentially transformed domain rank of the domain score(0-100). The bigger the IMD 2004 score, the more deprived the SOA.
Table A2.11: Selected demographic details for wards comprising Gateshead (control) area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whickham North (most)</th>
<th>Dunston (most)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (18+)</td>
<td>7,922</td>
<td>7,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of households</td>
<td>4,351</td>
<td>2,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation indexa</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Males (18+)</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Females (18+)</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 18 – 24</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 25 – 44</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 45 – 64</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 or over</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-White</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A small part of Whickham South also falls within the beat area.

Source: Census neighbourhood statistics

a The deprivation index score describes the Super Output Area (SOA) by combining information from seven domains and is the combined sum of the weighted, exponentially transformed domain rank of the domain score(0-100). The bigger the IMD 2004 score, the more deprived the SOA.

**North Tyneside area**

At the time of the Census in April 2001, the resident population of the North Tyneside local authority was 191,659 people. The average age of the population in North Tyneside was 40.1 years. This compared with an average age for England and Wales of 38.6 years.

North Tyneside is ranked 80 out of 354 local authorities on the indices of multiple deprivation¹. Of the people in North Tyneside who were of working age (i.e. those aged 16 to 64 for men or 16 to 59 for women) the employment rate was 72.5 per cent during the summer of 2004 (June to August), compared with an average for Great Britain of 75 per cent.

In North Tyneside there were 84,861 households in 2001. The average size of households in North Tyneside was 2.2 people compared with an average of 2.4 people for England and Wales.
**Foresthall control and experimental areas**

The beat areas within Northumbria are made up of parts of wards. This makes comparisons based using census data difficult. Within North Tyneside, Camperdown and Holystone was selected as an area with CSOs, because there was a well established CSO presence in the ward. The Valley area was suggested by the force as a control area and was a good match demographically. Although it is a neighbouring area it is divided from the experimental area by the A19 dual carriageway and separated by a substantial area of countryside. The control area is also a separate sector so it is extremely unlikely that PCSOs would ever patrol there or have any effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A2.12: Selected demographic details for wards comprising Foresthall (experimental) area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population (18+)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of households</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deprivation index</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Males (18+)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Females (18+)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% 18 – 24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% 25 – 44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% 45 – 64</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% 65 or over</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% White</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Non-White</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A very small part of Longbeton ward also falls within the beat area.*
### Table A2.13: Selected demographic details for wards comprising Foresthall (control) area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valley (almost all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (18+)</td>
<td>7,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of households</td>
<td>4,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation index*</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Males (18+)</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Females (18+)</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 18 – 24</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 25 – 44</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 45 – 64</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 or over</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-White</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Small parts of Collingwood and St Mary’s also falls within the beat area.
Source: census neighbourhood statistics.

---

a The deprivation index score describes the Super Output Area (SOA) by combining information from seven domains and is the combined sum of the weighted, exponentially transformed domain rank of the domain score(0-100). The bigger the IMD 2004 score, the more deprived the SOA.
## Appendix 3: Community Support Officer powers

### Table A3.1: Range of powers currently available for designation to Community Support Officers (January 2006):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date of commencement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power to issue penalty notices for disorder</td>
<td>Power of a constable in uniform to give a penalty notice under Chapter 1 of Part I of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 (fixed penalty notices in respect of offences of disorder) (See Table 2 for a list of offences for which CSOs can be designated with the power to issue penalty notices for disorder).</td>
<td>15.11.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to issue fixed penalty notices for truancy</td>
<td>Power of a constable to give a penalty notice under section 444A of the Education Act 1996 (penalty notice in respect of failure to secure regular attendance at school of registered pupil).</td>
<td>27.02.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to issue fixed penalty notices for cycling on a footpath</td>
<td>Power of a constable in uniform to give a person a fixed penalty notice under Section 54 of the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988 (fixed penalty notices in respect of an offence under Section 72 of the Highway Act 1835 (riding on a footway) committed by cycling).</td>
<td>2.12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to issue fixed penalty notices for dog fouling</td>
<td>Power of an authorised officer of a local authority to give a notice under section 4 of the Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996 (fixed penalty notices in respect of dog fouling).</td>
<td>2.12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to issue fixed penalty notices for graffiti and fly-posting</td>
<td>Power of an authorised officer of a local authority to give a notice under Section 43(1) of the Anti-social Behaviour Act 2003 (penalty notices in respect of graffiti or fly-posting).</td>
<td>31.03.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to issue fixed penalty notices for littering</td>
<td>Power of an authorised officer of a litter authority to give a notice under Section 88 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (fixed penalty notices in respect of litter).</td>
<td>2.12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to issue fixed penalty notices in respect of offences under dog control orders</td>
<td>Power of an authorised officer of a primary or secondary authority, within the meaning of Section 59 of the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005, to give a notice under that Section (fixed penalty notices in respect of offences under dog control orders).</td>
<td>Not yet commenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date of commencement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to require name and address</td>
<td>Power to require the name and address of a person whom a CSO has reason to believe has committed a relevant offence (fixed penalty offence – see Table 2) and failure to follow an instruction to disperse or an offence that causes injury, alarm or distress to another person or loss of or damage to another’s person’s property. Paragraph 1A enables chief constables to designate the power to require name and address without also designating the power of detention.</td>
<td>2.12.02 &amp; SOCAP amendment on 1.7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to detain</td>
<td>Power to detain a person whom a CSO has reason to believe has committed a relevant offence who fails to comply with a requirement to give name and address or who gives an answer which the CSO reasonably suspects to be false or inaccurate for up to 30 minutes or until the arrival of a police officer (or to accompany that person to a police station if he or she elects to do so on request). Under paragraph 3(2) of Schedule 8 to the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 a CO may only be designated with the power to detain if they have also been designated with the power to require name and address under paragraph 1A of the Police Reform Act 2002.</td>
<td>23.12.04 &amp; SOCAP amendment on 1.7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to enforce byelaws</td>
<td>The Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 provides that offences committed under relevant byelaws are relevant offences under paragraph 2(6) of Schedule 4 of the Police Reform Act 2002. A relevant byelaw is a byelaw from a list of byelaws that has been agreed between a chief constable and a relevant byelaw making body. As well as being able to require name and address for breach of a byelaw, CSOs can also enforce a byelaw by removing a person from a place if a constable would also have the power to enforce a byelaw in that way.</td>
<td>1.7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to deal with begging</td>
<td>The Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 makes offences under Sections 3 and 4 of the Vagrancy Act 1824 into relevant offences. It also gives CSOs a power to detain a person who they have required to stop committing an offence under Sections 3 and 4 of the Vagrancy Act and who has failed to comply with the requirement.</td>
<td>1.7.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3: Community Support Officer powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date of commencement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power to enforce certain licensing offences</td>
<td>The Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 establishes a set of relevant licensing offences. These offences are sale of alcohol to a person who is drunk, obtaining alcohol for a person who is drunk, sale of alcohol to children, purchase of alcohol by or on behalf of children, consumption of alcohol by children and sending a child to obtain alcohol. Where these offences apply specifically to clubs they are not relevant licensing offences. CSOs may require name and address but may not detain for those relevant licensing offences that are most likely to be committed by license holders.</td>
<td>1.1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to search detained persons for dangerous items or items that could be used to assist escape</td>
<td>The Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 allows CSOs to be designated with the same powers as a constable under Section 32 of PACE to search detained persons for anything that could be used to cause injury or to assist escape. A CSO must retain any item seized until the arrival of a police officer and comply with their instructions on what to do with the item.</td>
<td>1.1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to require name and address for anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>Power of a constable in uniform under Section 50 of the Police Reform Act 2002 to require a person whom he has reason to believe to have been acting, or to be acting, in an anti-social manner to give his name and address. Paragraph 3(2) of Schedule 4 enables a CSO designated under paragraph 3 of Schedule 4 to detain a person who fails to comply with a requirement to give name and address or who gives an answer which the CSO reasonably suspects to be false or inaccurate in the same way as he or she may under paragraph 2. Paragraph 3(10) of Schedule 8 to the Serious and Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 provides that paragraph 3(2) of Schedule 4 to the Police Reform Act 2002 has no effect unless a CSO has been designated with the power of detention under paragraph 2 of Schedule 4.</td>
<td>2.12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date of commencement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to require name and address for road traffic offences</td>
<td>The Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 allows CSOs to be designated with the power to require the name and address of a person or pedestrian who fails to follow the directions of a CSO or police officer.</td>
<td>1.7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to use reasonable force to prevent a detained person making off</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.12.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to disperse groups and remove persons under 16 to their place of residence</td>
<td>Powers which, by virtue of an authorisation under Section 30 of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003, are conferred on a constable in uniform be Section 30(3) to (6) of that Act (power to disperse groups and remove persons under 16 to their place of residence).</td>
<td>27.02.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to remove children in contravention of curfew notices to their place of residence</td>
<td>Power to remove a child to their place of residence if the CSO has reason to believe that the child is in contravention of a curfew notice under Sub-sections 15(1), (2) and (3) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.</td>
<td>20.01.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to use reasonable force to transfer control of detained persons</td>
<td>Paragraph 2(4A) of Schedule 4 to the Police Reform Act 2002 places a duty on CSOs to remain with a police officer when transferring a detained person to his or her custody until the police officer has the person under control. Paragraph 2(4B) places a CSO accompanying a detained person to a police station under a duty to remain at the police station until the detained person is under control. If a CSO is designated with paragraph 4ZB of Schedule 4 then he or she may use reasonable force in complying with duties under 2(4A) and 2(4B). If a CSO is designated with paragraph 4ZA then he or she may use reasonable force when exercising powers under paragraphs 2(3B), 7A(8) or 7C(2)(a).</td>
<td>1.7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date of commencement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to require persons drinking in designated places to surrender alcohol</td>
<td>Power to require a person whom a CSO reasonably believes is, or has been, consuming alcohol in a designated public place or intends to do so, to not consume that alcohol and to surrender any alcohol or container for alcohol. Power to dispose of alcohol surrendered.</td>
<td>2.12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to require persons aged under 18 to surrender alcohol</td>
<td>Power to require a person who he reasonably believes is aged under 18 or is or has been supplying alcohol to a person aged under 18 to surrender any alcohol in his possession and to give their name and address. Power to require such a person to surrender sealed containers of alcohol if the CSO has reason to believe that the person is or has been consuming or intends to consume alcohol. Power to dispose of alcohol surrendered.</td>
<td>2.12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to seize tobacco from a person aged under 16</td>
<td>Power to seize tobacco from a person aged under 16 and to dispose of that tobacco.</td>
<td>2.12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to search for alcohol and tobacco</td>
<td>Where a person has failed to comply with a requirement under paragraph 5 or 6 or has failed to allow a CSO to seize tobacco under paragraph 7 of Schedule 4 to the Police Reform Act 2002 and a CSO reasonably believes that the person is in possession of alcohol or tobacco then a CSO may search them for it and dispose of anything found. It is an offence to fail to consent to be searcher and CSOs can require name and address for this offence. As specified in paragraph 3(10) of the Serious and Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 a CSO may only detain a person for failure to give an adequate name and address if he or she has been designated with powers under paragraph 2 or Schedule 4 to the Police Reform Act 2002.</td>
<td>1.1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date of commencement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to seize drugs and require name and address for possession of drugs</td>
<td>The Serious and Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 allows CSOs to be designated with a power to seize unconcealed drugs or drugs found when searching for alcohol, tobacco or dangerous items. The CSO must retain the drugs until a constable instructs them what to do with it. If a CSO finds drugs in a person’s possession or has reason to believe that a person is in possession of drugs then the CSO may require that persons name and address. If designated with powers under paragraph 7C then the CSO may detain a person on failure to comply with this requirement.</td>
<td>1.1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to enter and search any premises for the purposes of saving life and limb or preventing serious damage to property</td>
<td>The power to enter and search any premises for the purposes of saving life and limb or preventing serious damage to property</td>
<td>2.12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited power to enter licensed premises</td>
<td>The Serious Organised Crime and Police Bill allows CSOs to be designated with a power to enter licensed premises under Section 180 of the Licensing Act 2003 for the purposes of investigating relevant licensing offences. They may not enter clubs and must enter all premises with a constable unless the premises are licensed for the sale of alcohol off the premises.</td>
<td>1.1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to seize vehicles used to cause alarm</td>
<td>Power to stop and search a vehicle which a CSO has reason to believe is being used in a manner which contravenes Sections 3 or 34 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 (careless and inconsiderate driving and prohibition of off-road driving) under Section 59 of the Police Reform Act 2002.</td>
<td>1.1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to remove abandoned vehicles</td>
<td>Power to remove abandoned vehicles under regulations made under Section 99 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</td>
<td>2.12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date of commencement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to stop vehicles for testing</td>
<td>Powers of a constable in uniform to stop vehicles for the purposes of testing under Section 67 of the Road Traffic Act 1988.</td>
<td>2.12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to stop cycles</td>
<td>Powers of a constable in uniform to stop a cycle under Section 163(2) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 when a CSO has reason to believe that a person has committed the offence of riding on a footpath.</td>
<td>2.12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to control traffic for purposes other than escorting a load of exceptional dimensions</td>
<td>The Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 allows CSOs to be given powers to direct traffic (for purposes other than escorting loads of exceptional dimensions) based on the powers constables have under Sections 35 and 37 of the Road Traffic Act 1988. It also gives CSOs the power to direct traffic for the purposes of conducting a traffic survey. CSOs designated under this paragraph must also be designated with powers under paragraph 3A of Schedule 4 to the Police Reform Act.</td>
<td>1.7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to direct traffic for the purposes of escorting abnormal loads</td>
<td>Power to direct traffic for the purposes of escorting abnormal loads.</td>
<td>2.12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to carry out road checks</td>
<td>Power to carry out a road check which has been authorised by a police officer and power to stop vehicles for the purposes of carrying out a road check. No power to authorise a road check – this must be done by a police officer.</td>
<td>2.12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to place signs</td>
<td>The Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 enables CSOs to be designated with the power of a constable under Section 67 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to place traffic signs.</td>
<td>1.7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to enforce cordoned areas</td>
<td>Power to enforce cordoned areas under Section 36 of the Terrorism Act 2000.</td>
<td>2.12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to stop and search in authorised areas</td>
<td>Powers under the Terrorism Act 2000 in authorised areas to stop and search vehicles and pedestrians when in the company and under the supervision of a constable.</td>
<td>2.12.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following power is listed under Section 38(8) of the Police Reform Act (2002):

**Table A3.2: Offences for which CSOs can be designated with the power to issue penalty notices for disorder**

- Sale of alcohol to a person under 18
- Purchase of alcohol for a person under 18
- Delivery of alcohol to a person under 18 or allowing such delivery
- Destroying or damaging property (under £500)
- Breach of fireworks curfew
- Possession of a category 4 firework
- Possession by a person under 18 of an adult firework
- Supply of excessively loud fireworks
- Wasting police time, giving false report
- Using public electronic communications network in order to cause annoyance, inconvenience or needless anxiety
- Knowingly giving false alarm to a person acting on behalf of a fire and rescue authority
- Causing harassment, alarm or distress
- Throwing fireworks
- Drunk and disorderly behaviour
- Consumption of alcohol by a person under 18 or allowing such consumption
- Trespassing on a railway
- Throwing stones at trains
- Drunk in a highway
- Drinking in a designated public area
Table A3.3: Sussex – Powers that have been designated to Community Support Officers at the time of fieldwork (March 2005)

At the time of fieldwork Sussex Police had designated the following powers to CSOs employed by Sussex Police Authority:

- Power to issue fixed penalty notices for cycling on a footpath and dog fouling
- Power to stop alcohol consumption in designated places
- Power to confiscate alcohol from under 18’s
- Power to confiscate tobacco from under 16’s
- Power to enter to save life or limb or prevent serious damage to property
- Power to stop and search vehicles in authorised areas
- Power to control traffic for purposes of escorting a load of exceptional dimensions
- Power to require name and address of person acting in an anti-social manner
- Power to deal with abandoned vehicles
- Power to stop vehicles for testing
- Power to seize vehicles used to cause alarm
- Power to carry out road checks
- Power to cordon areas

The following powers were designated after fieldwork had taken place:

- Power to stop cycles

---

Table A3.4: Northumbria – Powers that have been designated to Community Support Officers at the time of fieldwork (March 2005)

At the time of fieldwork Northumbria Police had designated the following powers to CSOs employed by Northumbria Police Authority:

- Power to issue some penalty notices for disorder
- Power to issue some penalty notices for cycling on footpath, dog fouling and littering
- Power to require name and address penalty notices
- Power to confiscate alcohol from under 18’s
- Power to confiscate tobacco from under 16’s
- Power to enter to save life or limb or prevent serious damage to property
- Power to require name and address of person acting in an anti-social manner
- Power to deal with abandoned vehicles
- Power to seize vehicles used to cause alarm
- Power to stop alcohol consumption in designated places
Table A3.5: Merseyside – Powers that have been designated to Community Support Officers at the time of fieldwork (March 2005)

At the time of fieldwork Merseyside Police had designated no powers to CSOs employed by Merseyside Police Authority. Since the fieldwork, Merseyside have reviewed their policy and are considering designating the following powers to CSOs employed by Merseyside Police Authority:

- Power to deal with abandoned vehicles
- Power to confiscate alcohol from under 18’s
- Power to confiscate tobacco from under 16’s
- Power to require name and address of person acting in an anti-social manner
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