

The following book chapter is extracted from:
Mitchell, Margaret and Casey, John (eds.) (2007),
Police Leadership and Management, Federation Press, Sydney.

For more information, see:

<http://www.federationpress.com.au/bookstore/book.asp?isbn=9781862876491>

©Margaret Mitchell / John Casey, or by the publisher Federation Press.
Copy available for legitimate personal research or other non-commercial purposes.
Contact the authors (john.casey@baruch.cuny.edu) or Federation Press for
permission for commercial use. All quotes or citations of the material must be
properly referenced.

COMMUNITY-POLICE CONSULTATION: WHAT IS IT AND WHAT IS IT INTENDED TO DO?

*Margaret Mitchell and John Casey*¹

This chapter describes the practices and purposes of police consultation with the community. While community consultation has been a central policy in Australian and New Zealand police organisations for the past two decades, both 'community' and 'consultation' are understood to mean very different things depending on the cultural, political and pragmatic contexts of police activity. More recently, the interaction of police with the community has also changed due to an agenda of heightened security. This chapter is intended to assist police managers to reflect on what community consultation is intended to do, and on their own consultation processes. This will go some way to ensuring that the purpose of the various consultation structures is clear and that the outcomes are worth the enormous expenditure of time that community consultation requires. We will start by considering some key terms and concepts and then examine the mechanisms of community consultation and its desired outcomes. The practice and products of community consultation are rarely evaluated objectively, although Victoria Police is an exception. The main findings of the Victoria Police evaluations are presented as are the results of an audit of consultation structures conducted in NSW Police.

The theory of consultation

Community consultation implies input from individuals, advocacy groups and community organisations, although many consultation structures in-

1 The authors acknowledge the contribution of Delaine Trofymowych to the early stages of this research. The ideas and analyses in this chapter have previously appeared in conference papers by Casey and Trofymowych (1999), Mitchell (2003) and Casey and Mitchell (2005).

clude participation by other government departments, such as social services, education, health and public safety, and local government (Casey & Mitchell 2007). The term consultation tends to be used interchangeably with *engagement, participation, and involvement*, and encompasses a broad range of consultative structures and activities (Tilley & Bullock 2003; Myhill 2006). Consultation with communities is related to other movements in police practice such as *community policing*, and the notion of a *police service* (rather than *force*) (Casey & Mitchell 2007). Consultation underpins other contemporary police models and practices such as *problem-solving, proactive, cooperative, partnership, participation, reassurance and local priority policing* each of which imply dialogue with and some level of support by the communities and citizens policed (Findlay 2004). Policing strategies that are based on closer interaction and consultation with the community are also the basis of what Bayley and Shearing (2001) have described as the *multilateralisation* of policing strategies through social and preventive responses to crime and disorder. The rise of police-community consultation has coincided with broader public sector reforms and the emergence of *New Public Management* and *governance* processes which focus on accountability to stakeholders (Davis & Weller 2001).

The degree to which communities are truly consulted and can participate in decisions about police deployment, focus and priorities is a topic we will return to throughout the chapter. The degree of involvement by the community, and by other government departments, can be thought of as a continuum, from a public relations exercise in which the police simply inform the community about current and future activities, to a full partnership in which there is joint governance of projects or programs (Arnstein 1969; Davis & Bishop 2001; Casey & Mitchell 2007). Recently, there has been a shift in our understanding of law and justice with responsibility for managing crime increasingly being taken on by other agencies and stakeholders (Ransley & Mazerolle, in this volume). A decade ago, Garland (1996; 1997) proposed that the responsibility for safety and security is a community and individual responsibility – what he termed the ‘responsibilisation’ of crime control and prevention. The idea that police are not solely responsible for law and order is also reflected in ubiquitous ‘whole of government’ approaches in which agencies work together to mutually solve social, crime and health problems (Bayley & Shearing 2001; Fleming & Rhodes 2004).

Fundamentally, community consultation is intended to maintain positive relations between the police and the community with which it works. Consultation became enshrined in legislation in the United Kingdom through the *Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984* (Pearse & Gudjonsson 1996), which created the legal responsibility for police to consult. This was confirmed more than a decade later through the 1998 *Crime and Disorder Act* which obliged local police authorities, in partnership with other agencies, to audit, evaluate and consult.

Since the late 1980s in Australia all jurisdictions have developed consultation structures, although there are no legislative requirements as there are in the UK. Consultative activities in Australian policing jurisdictions are based solely on internal management policies and guidelines. Maintaining good relations with the community and involving public opinion in police activities is seen as a central plank of greater openness which, in turn, is seen as an essential element of accountability and corruption resistance. Each royal commission into policing in Australia has recommended more consultation by police and involvement of external stakeholders, whether this is a particular group, such as Aboriginal communities, or consultation in general.

The commitment to consultation was re-affirmed in the recommendations of the Royal Commission into the New South Wales Police Service (Wood 1997) which emphasised the importance of the organisation being transparent in its activities, accountable in its service and not being isolated from the community. The Royal Commission specifically recommended that 'each patrol commander [now Local Area Commander] ... put into effect such form of Community Consultative groups or strategies for community feedback as best meet its needs', and 'that the effective establishment and use of community consultation be regarded as an important aspect in the ongoing assessment of the performance of patrol and regional commanders' (Wood 1997, p 368). Dixon (1999a) noted, however, that the Wood Royal Commission appeared to recreate the same flawed consultation structures that it had criticised in its review of the operations of past consultative committees.

Consultation in practice

Although there is a wide range of possible consultation techniques, including newly emerging processes such as citizen's juries, tele-voting and deliberative conferences police, almost all discourses on consultation quickly focus on the single technique of consultative committees. Community consultative committees – in all their possible manifestations such as *advisory groups, customer councils or local safety committees* – are the most common form of consultative structures (Ward 1995; Myhill et al 2003). New South Wales and Victoria provide good examples.

New South Wales

Mitchell and Urquhart (2002) conducted an audit of all means by which NSW Police was represented externally on committees, working parties and other consultation structures. This was conducted following the discovery that there was no corporate list of the plethora of public representation and consultation on which NSW Police officers served. Every Local Area Command and administrative unit in the organisation responded with detailed information. The request was deliberately kept simple and asked for the name of the consultation structure, the NSW Police officer who attended, who provides administrative support (ie who was responsible for the

agenda, minutes and outcomes of the meetings), what was its general purpose and any other comments.

Over 2500 separate consultation and meeting structures in which sworn officers, primarily, and some civilian staff, regularly participated were reported. Given that the survey documented *all* structures, a small number of statutory committees attended by senior officers dealing with whole-of-government and inter-agency matters were reported. There were also working parties and groups set up to deal, usually in the shorter term, although once set up there seemed to be an inertia which prevented the group being disbanded. These working parties and groups dealt with a particular emergent or critical crime or legislation issue, the deliberations on which required external input and/or cooperation.

By far the majority of the consultation structures reported were the many specific-focus committees dealing with local youth, mental health, domestic violence, Aboriginal matters, drug issues or school liaison, for example, or matters to do with transport, traffic, housing, rural crime matters, police input into community planning, relationships with gay and lesbian groups, or particular ethnic groups. Of these, the greatest number of committees and consultation exercises were concerned with mental health issues and matters concerning youth. Included also were meetings on programs of long standing such as Neighbourhood Watch, most of which were attended by one or more police representatives, and which could take place as frequently as bi-monthly.

Each geographical area also had its own structures dealing with the broad range of community crime and safety matters, including small businesses and representatives from the chamber of commerce. This was particularly the case in more remote areas of the State.

It was also found that, perhaps not surprisingly, a different person often attended to represent the police. This was explained by the fact of shift work, pressure of more urgent police work, the frequent changes in responsibility and location which characterises much of police work, illness, vacations and other reasons why a delegate or new representative would be sent. The occasions when this did not occur were when community consultation was part of the officer's job, such as the Aboriginal Community Liaison Officers, Youth Liaison Officers, and Crime Prevention Officers. Even here there was movement when new staff were appointed to these posts. This when added to the fluidity in representation from the community, the problems of discontinuity are obvious. Often, other than at high-level peak meetings attended by senior government officials and senior police commanders where resolutions and agreements could be reached, and committed to, the police representatives attending the meetings often did not have the necessary decision-making authority. Discontinuity and an inability to commit to decisions clearly hampered the productiveness of the consultation process.

Each meeting of such groups require research, review and preparation and often yielded recommendations and outcomes that needed to be acted

upon. Despite this there was no over-arching system to centrally manage problems and solutions as they emerged, to incorporate information about inter-agency projects and programs, to share good practice from other law enforcement agencies, or to provide consistent guidance on corporate issues. The first steps towards such an over-arching system was afforded by the implementation by NSW Police of the new Police and Community Teams (PACTs) in 2002 under the then Minister for Police, Michael Costa. The PACT process included a structure through which information could be centrally collected using a pro-forma communicated electronically through the NSW Police intranet. In the case of the PACT reports this information was available on the NSW Police website to be perused by interested parties both within and outside the organisation. There is an obvious benefit to this open informed communication for the public image of the police. Maintaining such a process, however, requires a substantial commitment both organisationally, and by individuals, and it is understood that the PACTs continue only in certain areas, and central reporting of the results of community consultation is no longer a requirement.

In the survey of consultation structures a degree of duplication of effort was also found, suggesting that rationalisation of the number of community consultation structures might be advisable. However, these structures were considered important to the participants and, in general, both community and police members felt that to amalgamate one process with another, or to disband it, would result in a loss of 'voice' by the community. It is evident that consultation with the community and the community's engagement with the police are both seen as an important component of civic engagement. It was also evident that NSW Police is fulfilling its commitment to consultation with the community and that, as a result, an enormous amount of police time was spent on these necessary consultative groups.

The large number of committees could have been further categorised to obtain an overall picture of consultation by NSW police. Casey and Mitchell (2007) have developed such a taxonomy characterising the differences between consultative committees according to the following dimensions:

- **Ownership/Control.** This describes the power in the consultation represented not only by who makes the decisions (following appropriate consultation) but also who initiates, chairs, hosts, and provides administrative support. In Australia, local governments have an increasing role in crime prevention and may initiate consultation between police and the wider community.
- **Coverage.** This describes the main focus of the committee in geographical terms, whether a local government area, a neighbourhood, a single shopping street or mall, or in terms of a subset of the community such as youth or an ethnic group.
- **Appointment/selection of members.** This describes how members are appointed whether by authorities or through a range of processes akin to an election or nomination.

- **Open versus closed participation.** This describes specifically who may attend and who has a voice and a vote at the meetings can be restricted to appointed/selected members or open to the public.
- **Relationship to other processes.** This describes how the committee interacts with other structures with common interests (eg Neighbourhood Watch with other crime prevention programs) or stands alone.
- **Focus or purpose of activities.** This describes what the committee is intended to do such as information exchange, development of local safety strategies, or the management of public safety and crime prevention programs.

Such taxonomies are useful to both managers and participants in fully understanding the function, purpose and potential outcomes of consultative committees in which they are involved and as a basis for their performance management.

*Victoria*²

Victoria is the Australian police jurisdiction that has made consultation most central to its operating philosophy. In 1998 Victoria Police embarked on a major strategic realignment known as Local Priority Policing, which sought to ensure that the local community became an active participant in shaping policing priorities (Victoria Police 1999). Victoria Police aligned operational boundaries to coincide with local government boundaries, gave local managers more control over specialist services, and created a range of processes to promote community input (Victoria Police 2003).

Each District Inspector was responsible for the establishment of a Local Safety Committee (LSC) as the key local-level component of the Local Priority Policing strategy. The LSCs were implemented against the background of the prior existence of the Police Community Involvement Program, first established in 1981; Neighbourhood Watch, established in 1983; and Police Community Consultation Committees (PCCCs), which were first launched in 1991 as the consultation mechanism for a range of crime prevention initiatives such as the Safer Cities and Shires program. There was also a wide array of previously established community safety committees and other community-based crime prevention programs that had been instituted by other public organisations such as local governments, social service agencies and non-government organisations.

The membership of LSCs comprises a range of appointed representatives from local government, from local offices of State-wide agencies and non-government organisations, and some community representatives. The committees were not intended as forums for grassroots community representation; instead they are seen more as 'management committees' for local

2 The following section on Victoria Police is based on cited evaluations and a series of confidential interviews with key stakeholders.

crime prevention and community safety activities (Victoria Police 2003, p 17). District Inspectors were given flexibility to implement the new committees according to local conditions and local experiences with previous consultation. As a result, in some Districts pre-existing consultation structures took on LSC responsibilities and a range of different linkages were created with existing PCCCs and Neighbourhood Watch.

In recent years, there have been four separate evaluations of police consultation and the community governance of community safety programs in Victoria:

1. an internal evaluation by Victoria Police of the LSCs (CMRD 2004);
2. an evaluation of PCCCs done by a consultant under contract to Crime Prevention Victoria;
3. a division of the Victoria Department of Justice (Martin Bonato and Associates 2003); and
4. two evaluations of the governance of local crime prevention structures done in partnership between Crime Prevention Victoria and local universities. (Totikidis, Armstrong & Francis 2005; Sutton, Dussuyer & Cherney 2003)

The combined findings of these four evaluations give a comprehensive picture of the operation of community consultation in Victoria.

The LSC and PCCC evaluations highlighted the considerable variation in how local structures operate and how they interact with other consultation mechanisms. As a result of these variations, the committees were able to respond to local conditions and generally garner positive reviews. The PCCCs were regarded as groundbreaking initiatives at the forefront of the shift to a community policing philosophy. The LSCs, established almost a decade later, were seen as being able to fulfil a commitment to extend the existing community consultation by building on the past experiences. The two reports found that both committee structures had significantly enhanced relationships with other government departments, local government and organisations within the community.

But both reports also indicate that, despite the successes, there is widespread concern about the functioning of consultation. The conclusion of the PCCC report was that many committees had not achieved sustained, effective consultation and information exchange with broad representation from local citizens. Many PCCCs had limited reach into the community due to lack of time and resources, and the skills and knowledge on how to approach the wider community were sometimes lacking on committees. The subsequent introduction of LSCs somewhat complicated the situation. The evaluation of PCCCs found that their role was 'severely challenged' as many of the stated aims and objectives of the two types of committees remain the same or similar, despite the theoretical division between the more grassroots focus of PCCCs and the interagency focus of the LSCs. At the time of the evaluations the PCCCs and the LSCs were operating through different units

within Victoria Police and there was only limited coordination between the two structures.

The evaluations found that the consultation structures were also hampered by structural difficulties as there were few mechanisms to link consultation with other operational processes. Victoria Polices' internal cultures, and current management processes such as COMPSTAT³, continued to tie reward and recognition more to reactive crime-fighting approaches than to preventive approaches and to the pursuing of cross-agency synergies. There continued to be operational staff, particularly District Inspectors who still had not embraced community consultation and/or did not have the skills or commitment to promote successful processes. Many senior police acknowledge the value of the interactions on committees and relationships built, but the impacts are generally not considered substantial in terms of their own operational targets.

The two evaluations done in partnership between Crime Prevention Victoria and universities also served to highlight the variations in structures that have been created at local levels to ensure consultation with and participation by a range of stakeholders in crime prevention. Somewhat curiously, one of the reports notes in the Introduction that LSCs were launched by the Police Minister and Chief Commissioner in 2000, but then makes almost no other mention or analysis of the role of Victoria Police or of the Local Priority Policing approach and the 'ownership' of the LSCs is attributed more to local councils than to Victoria Police (Totikidis, Armstrong & Francis 2005). While this is not inconsistent with the flexibility accorded to by Victoria Police to District Inspectors, it also probably reflects the intensity of 'turf wars' in local community safety projects. Leaving aside any debates about ownership, it can be concluded from these evaluations that consultation structures have been effective in generating networks of people, they have had significant input into local safety plans, and they are able to bring diverse resources together to successfully tackle local issues.

All the evaluations identified key elements for successful consultation. The most successful outcomes were observed where there were long established forum that responded to pressing issues, such as drug problems or youth violence. Where such triggers did not exist there appeared to be less incentive to maintain the structures. Success of community consultation was also dependent on the commitment and capacities of key 'local champions'; a clear direction and a sense of purpose; representative membership and continuing attendance; effective chairing of meetings; the availability of resources to support the committees work, and a strong sense of having achieved results individuals.

The reports highlighted the need for local flexibility in the design of consultative structures, and the need for a clear definition of purpose, principles, goals, objectives and performance measures. All the reports called for

3 The accountability process based on the New York Police Department model of the same name.

greater coordination between the diverse consultation processes, for the greater dissemination of information about consultative process and good practices, and for skills training for those involve with consultation. Finally, while the reports reaffirmed the primacy of consultation through committee structures, they also called for the use of a greater variety of consultation processes, such as surveys, focus groups, and online feedback.

Criticisms of the process of community consultation

Casey and Trofymowych (1999) have identified structural, operational and ideological criticisms of police-community consultation. Probably the most cutting criticism of the process is a concern about who is representing the community – which community, or community interests do the participants represent, and is this what those recommending that police consult with their communities intended? Those with the time and the inclination to participate in community consultation tend to be older and middle class. While their voice is as legitimate as any other member of the community, ('they may not be *the* community but it is *a* community', Squires 1998, p 171), the challenge is to reach the more marginalised, with whom the police need to engage but who are also the more difficult to engage (Hughes 1994; O'Malley 1997; Squires 1998; Jones & Newburn 2001). Self-evidently, in contemporary Australia where diversity defines the community, there is no one community and so the pursuit of consensus and consistent support for police programs and activities is elusive, as is a common view of the most serious or significant crimes, and the priorities for crime fighting. Consultation can be dominated by organisations such as local councils or business groups or self-selected influential sections of the population, who are likely to be biased towards majority and elite interests. While critics argue that effective responses to broader social needs cannot be achieved with this bias, others argue that the changing equilibria in social relations and service delivery are creating pluralist and multilateral approaches to the challenges of policing and public security (Bayley & Shearing 2001). And despite any elite biases, any well-organised consultative partners are capable of far more than relatively passive acceptance of the police line (Squires 1998). The uneven power relationships inherent in any consultation process can undermine community involvement. There is always the danger that instead of consulting, the police control the agendas, paying only lip-service to other inputs. Carson has said:

What currently passes for consultation and involvement is mere window dressing. Paraphrasing Beck (1994), can we really scrutinise our programs in crime prevention ... and say that the citizens who participate know that the decisions in question are truly open and not just being publicly legitimised? Are communal groups actively involved in decision-making, or are their views merely listened to and taken back, even if indeed to be 'taken into account', by a traditionally hierarchical decision-making structure? (Carson 2004b, p 204)

This need to control agendas is attributed to both the ideological imperative of maintaining existing power relationships and demonstrating police expertise in crime fighting and to the organisational imperative of determining priorities by other means which may not coincide with those that emerge from consultation. Hughes (1994) also sees the potential tokenism of consultation as serving only to break down community dissent and distract people from other possibly more conflictive agendas. He believes that this enhances the articulation of traditional, patriarchal values of security, property and privacy, while allowing issues such as sexual and racial harassment and domestic violence to slip from the agenda.

Finally, the pragmatic argument that 'it [community consultation] doesn't reduce crime' is reinforced by managerialist discourses about performance indicators and measurement, arguing that if a quantifiable reduction in crime cannot be attributed to a particular strategy it should not be continued (Bayley 1999; Murray 1999). Evaluations of community policing and consultation processes often find a short-term increase in reported crime usually attributed to the increased confidence that residents have in reporting crime to the local police now seen as more accessible (Collins 1996). The stress on crime fighting and social controls which reject consultation-related strategies, call for a return to 'traditional' reactive policing. Note that a wide range of policing philosophies lay claim to 'tradition'. Here, tradition refers to motorised, reactive policing, but others would argue that traditional policing is based on the Peelian notion of the 'beat police' and that 'the people are the police and the police are the people'. While this dialogue also takes place in external social debates over law and order policies, it is most often characterised as part of an internal clash between 'hard' or 'real' and 'soft' policing. Participation by officers in consultation activities is also often not fully compensated under overtime provisions or in performance and promotion criteria. Officers can also see consultation and community relations work as undervalued by their peers, being derided as the 'meet and greet cops'. In 1999, Sarre and Tomaino observed that:

what is conceptualized in theory, however, many not translate well into practice. Asking police to become problem-solvers and expecting them to be constantly engaged in widespread community consultation involves a fundamental challenge to police leadership and culture. Given the current culture, reward structure and community expectations, translating rhetoric into reality has proved to be a formidable task (p 103).

While progress continues to be slow, there is also widespread evidence of a substantial shift in how the police themselves view their relationship to the communities they serve. A recent example is the US Department of Justice project *Hiring in the Spirit of Service* (Scrivner 2006) which seeks to re-brand US police departments in order to attract new recruits who see service to the community as much an integral part of policing as adventure and law enforcement. While the main emphasis of the project is on recruitment it also works

with police departments to incorporate community-oriented competencies into staff appraisals and performance management processes.

Local intelligence gathering

In addition to being consulted, according to current heightened security initiatives, communities are also being watched. Perhaps the biggest challenge to consultation efforts over the next few years is how to reconcile these two operational imperatives. Evolving strategies of intelligence-based policing, combined with the current climate of heightened security alert, means that police seek to engage with the community not only to get their input into possible policy directions, but also as a valuable source of information and intelligence and, in the case of certain ethnic communities, as the objects of heightened scrutiny. In a recent interview with an Australian senior police commander (Mitchell 2006), it was his view that an important counter-terrorist strategy for front-line police was 'to get closer to the communities that we are policing ... especially to the multi-cultural groups in Australia'.

The current move to strengthen intelligence-driven policing seeks to combine the 'objective' data generated by centralised crime mapping with the community intelligence provided by local input, and the possible information flow from consultation processes can be a key to achieving this input (Maguire & John 2006). Most crimes are solved through information gathered in the community by cooperative citizens and informants (Findlay 2004; Dixon 2005). Augmenting the hard data generated in intelligence-led policing with the 'soft data' information provided by local community members renders the data more meaningful, and capable of being acted upon.

Since the terrorist attacks in New York, Madrid and London, rhetoric in policing is that front-line police officers are in a good position to be the 'eyes and ears', watching and listening for indicators of, or precursors to, potential terrorist activity. But how is this to be done? If front-line police are the 'eyes and ears', what is it that they are to watch and listen for? In addition, 'home-grown' terrorism has added a further layer of uncertainty about what should be considered a 'sign' of terrorism. Working closely with communities, while at the same time observing members of these communities as potential objects of suspicion, arguably produces dissonance on the part of frontline police. The suspicion cuts both ways. The Member of Parliament from the northern England area where the London suicide bombers lived acknowledged that the community was highly suspicious and mistrustful of the police (BBC News 2006).

Lyons (2002, p 530) argues that 'until we learn to police in ways that build trusting relationships with those communities where criminals or terrorists can more easily live lives insulated from observation - no amount of additional funding or legal authority, consistent with living in a free society, will increase the capacity of our police forces to gather the crime and terror-related information we need'. Lyons further argues that police lack

the skills and capability to work in 'genuinely reciprocal citizen partnerships'. with 'new' socially isolated or immigrant communities who do not traditionally partner with police. 'Community-police partnerships work best' declares Lyons, 'when they are structured to encourage information sharing, [and are] composed of citizens from those communities often least willing to assist police' (2002).

Conclusion

From the case studies on New South Wales and Victoria, it can be concluded that, despite any shortcomings, community consultation continues to have some success as a process that creates dialogue and interchange on local crime and disorder issues and serves to assist police in meeting local accountability and oversight imperatives. While the link to crime reduction of these outcomes may be hard to measure, they are an important value in themselves. As Casey and Tofymowych (1999) noted, consultation establishes legitimacy with key stakeholder communities such as business and community elites, local activists, and specific ethnic and racial communities, and it continues to be an integral part of the New Public Management and governance frameworks applied to policing.

Consultation processes continue to be essential for mobilising support for police (Squires 1998) and for responding to the consumerist rhetoric of an ethos of effective service and responsiveness to clients. Despite its flaws, consultation continues to reinforce the current agenda of *servicing* the community and provides the basis for intelligence-led and problem solving approaches to policing. Consultation is a lynch pin of both operational effectiveness and public accountability; it continues to enjoy widespread support, both from within policing and from external oversight bodies and it is an integral part of a wider public movement of public sector reform sector and citizen participation.

Consultation itself has become entrenched as part of operation philosophies over the past fifteen years; Terms like 'partnership' and 'community ownership' have become part of the stock in trade of many crime prevention policies (Carson 2004a, p 2). But are face-to-face committee meetings – the most common form of consultation – the best way to achieve that goal? In other words can 'local policing solutions for local crime problems' actually be achieved through a committee? Further analysis of the different structures – for example, as gained from the reviews of New South Wales and Victoria consultation structures – would be informative as to the value in organisational and strategic terms of the large expenditure of time involved in these activities. In both States there is still some frustration about whether the time spent in consultation is productive. While there is a clear and energetic commitment to consultation by managers and commanders, they continue to explore more efficient and effective ways to achieve its purposes. Efforts need to continue not only to find more efficient and effective ways to consult but also to address some ideological issues to ensure that consultation is not

seen as a 'soft' option that takes time from real policing. Whatever forms consultation take, each needs to demonstrate that it is capable of measuring the 'pulse' of public safety and crime concerns in its community.⁴

4 Practical advice on how to conduct community consultation can be found from the International Association for Public Participation (*IAP2 - Public Participation Toolbox 2000-2004*) or from Carson and Gelber (2001), *Ideas for Community Consultation*, Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, New South Wales.