Perspectives on Crime Prevention and Quality Management

Hannover, January 2005

Beccaria-Project

Quality Management in Crime Prevention

Conference organised by The Federal Council for Prevention of Lower Saxony/Lower Saxony Ministery of Justice.

Paper presented by Mr Lars Rand Jensen,

Chief Constable, Odense, Denmark,

Chairman of the national SSP Committee under the Danish

Crime Prevention Council

Introduction

Establishing standards for developing the quality of crime prevention in Europe requires an examination of both the concept of crime prevention, itself, and of the basis for the further development of crime prevention initiatives as well as the ordinary constituent elements of prevention activities.

Perspectives on Crime Prevention

Prevention of crime forms an integral part of a variety of initiatives taken by all sectors of modern society. Consequently, crime prevention is related to all activities which aim at preventing, controlling, reducing and countering the incidence of crime. Primarily, this means that crime prevention is fundamentally related to policing, crime control and social order.

Crime prevention aspects are related as well to policing measures on crime control (or policy on crime), consisting of preventive, proactive and reactive elements as to the entire social order in society, especially within the areas of care and order as the fundamental conditions for a good social life.

At present these concepts are referred to, e.g. in the EUCPN Draft Work Programme, as freedom, security and justice. They are also, however, related to education, housing and ways of life etc. Crime prevention should be viewed in this broad context, and this is the context in which methods should be progressed in order to promote further development of quality in individual crime prevention projects.

This presents difficulties because we lack actual comparative methods of determining factors that are to be compared in individual countries, in projects, among countries and as a background for a common European quality development.

Some steps have been taken, however, towards improved comparability through common project descriptions, common evaluation standards, development through quality awards, as well as through a great number of attempts on benchmarking and the like.

Much has still to be done, however, for instance making a distinction between prevention and proactive initiatives. This also applies to descriptions of networks and setting out standards for evaluating networks, clarification of whether networks include public agencies alone or whether they include community involvement. There is, further, a tendency towards benchmarking <u>effectiveness</u> and not <u>effect</u>. Within the EU the Council of Ministers as well as the Commission, the EUCPN and working groups have launched activities directed towards formulating the basis for improved comparative statistics, developing standards of <u>crime proofing</u>, i.e. making legislation better equipped to prevent crime from being committed by way of evasion, distortion of competition etc., as well as towards securing consumer goods and tools so as to impede criminal acts. Both elements aim at reducing the steady increase in <u>crime potential</u>. Systematic work is also in progress on <u>monitoring</u> crime prevention elements in Member States' policies on crime.

In short, endeavours are directed towards developing comparability of countries' individual projects and initiatives in order to measure an activity that reduces criminogenic effects and ensures the effect of individual crime prevention measures.

In many countries, including the EU, work is being carried out within the fields of educational and social policies. In these policy areas there is a tendency to apply prevention concepts from the worlds of medicine, social policy and education and to rashly transfer prevention methods to the field of crime prevention.

It is highly uncertain whether prevention concepts can be transferred from the medical, social and educational sciences to crime prevention. As stated above, crime prevention finds itself in a different context. Crime prevention, for instance, sees a much greater connection to the control systems of society (police and the criminal justice system) and a connection to people's immediate desire for situational gratification of their needs, irrespective of whether the means are legal or not, or simply an expression of unacceptable behaviour. It is, for instance, a question whether there is a need to counter alcohol and drug abuse or a need for health promoting interventions to regulate the legal substance use in daily life and in larger segments of the society.

It is urgently required to arrive at a more precise formulation of the concept of crime prevention as well as to establish the effects of individual prevention hypotheses.

<u>The Role of the Police</u>

The functions of the police and their potential for preventing and reducing crime are natural components of the concept of crime prevention. This applies to the delivery of core policing functions as well as to providing support to and cooperating with other agencies and with the population in the widest sense, including those groups that are not organised and are characterised by a certain degree of criminal activity, abuse and unacceptable behaviour. Such groups may also comprise subcultures and groups which are socially innovative.

The role of the police might be summarised in the following description of the problems and opportunities facing the police within the area of crime prevention:

The <u>growth</u> of crime and disorder in continental Europe, UK and other Western industrial societies is <u>not</u> <u>inevitable</u>. There is no doubt that these topics are breeding at present: growing public debate and divisions both as to their causes and as to the ways to <u>counter</u> and <u>prevent</u> them in the fields of crime control, order and care in society by support from the police.

<u>Potential</u> for crime and disorder comes from many quarters: from mass unemployment to mass consumer values; from family breakdown to drug abuse; from homelessness to failures in urban planning and housing policy. And this potential seems strongest where these and other associated factors meet and compound each other in environments of multiple disadvantage and added to it, in many countries and in various ways, the different kinds of multiethnic problems.

As potential for crime and disorder turns often into harsh fact (such as riots of diverse causes in many large cities) there is growing recognition that much current policing policy and practice is inadequate to check these rising threats to peace and order. The police themselves come under mounting pressure to rethink and remodel their strategies, priorities, organisational structures and use of resources. And as

the limitations of their professional resources become increasingly apparent, they increasingly perceive needs to develop - in Sir Kenneth Newman's words (former Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police in England) "a co-ordinated strategy" against crime contributed to by government, police, social agencies and communities. And to this might be added: based on knowledge and research, and again comparative research.

Policy and practice along similar lines are now developing for almost identical reasons in all Western societies. These range from the work of the national Crime Prevention Councils in the Nordic countries and other co-ordinating structures elsewhere to the very comprehensive recommendations for social/economic/legal policies against delinquency recommended by the "Commission des Maires" to the Prime Minister of France followed all ready by the Decree of 1983 and before that the recommendation of the Peyrefitte Committee followed by the Decree of 28 February 1978. So there is a long story behind this thinking.

These views have most recently been laid down in the strategy plan ("Crime Prevention – Policing 2002-2005") of the National Police Directorate of Norway.

Visions or strategy plans such as these are based more or less explicitly upon a description of three policing models set out in 1982 by the above Sir Kenneth Newman:

> the "crime control model" versus the "due process model"
> the "legalistic model" versus the "service model"
> the "reactive model" versus the "proactive model"

The three models are based upon a wide variety of Anglo-Saxon research from the 1960s and 1970s.

They are also the basis for the formulation of the role of the police at local level which we have sought to apply in Denmark in recent years.

Community and/or Neighbourhood Policing

In Denmark we have stated our community policing strategy on the basis of the following assumptions regarding the elements comprised by the concepts:

1) Area-based policing,

2) Multi-agency partnership,

3) Community-based crime prevention,

4) Police-public contact strategies,

5) Area-based foot patrols,

6) Community involvement and consultation.

These are the six community policing models which have been described by, *inter alia*, Trevor Bennet in 1994. To these I wish to add some specific working methods, which are, at any rate, important for consideration in the Nordic countries:

7) Problem-oriented policing

8) Cross-sectoral and interdisciplinary preventive work and inter-agency cooperation

9) Community involvement.

The Nordic Crime Prevention Model

Crime Prevention

Since 1971 all the Nordic countries have established national Crime Prevention Councils, most recently

in Finland with the creation of the Crime Prevention Delegation, and with the establishment of an agency in Iceland under the Ministry of Justice and Ecclesiastical Affairs.

A common denominator for the national Crime Prevention Councils is an overall effort to develop and promote all types of crime prevention activity based on solid research with special attention directed towards local initiatives. The objective is to establish interagency and cross-disciplinary initiatives with the police service as an important and also equal partner in cooperation. Special efforts have been directed towards involving individual members of the public, for instance parents, in the activities.

A number of constant components are common to the Nordic views on crime prevention:

There exists a perception that the criminal justice system exerts only a restricted influence on the crime rate. Therefore, equal importance is attached to delinquency prevention and crime prevention.

The incorporation of elements of social policy, not least targeted at reducing marginalisation and social isolation, receives high priority.

Elements of social as well as cultural policies are incorporated especially to establish networks, so that all children and young persons may lead as good an everyday life as possible. "A good life" is a concept which is key to all the Nordic countries, especially in relation to children and young persons.

Throughout basic general education deliberate efforts are directed towards identifying methods that may contribute towards the shaping of norms and social skills which are also presumed to have a lasting crime prevention impact.

The great number of situational initiatives attempt to deliberately involve the general public and all types of organisation and group both regarding an improved quality of everyday life of children, young persons, and the elderly and regarding various forms of technical safeguarding, neighbourhood watch, and Operation Marking schemes. It is a distinctive feature that in the Nordic countries the police will be involved in initiatives within all the areas referred to. This is a result of a systematic endeavour to involve the police as an equal partner in those areas.

Special importance is attached to the involvement of the local community, its professionals and its residents in co-ordinated cooperation both as far as social and cultural policies and as far as situationally determined activities are concerned. Cross-sectoral and interdisciplinary working methods receive high priority, and at local level it is endeavoured to establish decentralised types of organisation which can promote these endeavours. Every attempt is made to coordinate public-sector and private initiatives.

Inherent in the shaping of crime preventive strategies in all the countries is the fact that it should be based on scientific research - both in the search for causes and patterns as well as in the assessment of the efficiency and effect of crime prevention initiatives. The crime prevention policies defined by central government, which are predominantly reactive, are deliberately complemented by a government-supported general crime prevention doctrine, defined by the respective national Crime Prevention Councils and their initiatives and guidelines. As the framework of this presentation does not allow going into further detail on this issue, I have, as an illustration, distributed a handout which describes these factors by way of examples from Denmark.

Crime Prevention in Denmark

Along the lines set out above we have in Denmark supplemented the reactive delinquency prevention policies, i.e. threat of punishment, defined by central government with a general crime prevention doctrine defined by the Danish Crime Prevention Council, established in 1971.

It follows from this that there is a close connection between crime prevention activities of the Danish Crime Prevention Council, the Danish police districts, the local authorities and the various private organisations. The connection may initially be described as a fairly close and uniform network structure.

The structure has been developed over a period of 30 years and is characterised by the fundamental values of cooperation, cross-sectoral and interdisciplinary co-ordination, mutual understanding, a tolerant understanding of people and training of professionals at all levels. The network is, moreover,

based on a careful balance between demands for co-ordination and demands for autonomy.

The network was introduced by the national level (top-bottom) but operates bottom-up in the daily work, i.e. with the national authorities and the Danish Crime Prevention Council as fora for compiling the experience gained at local level.

The network model has been developed with full respect for all official and professional competencies; it rests on negotiated agreements and it is based locally on the so-called SSP network.

The Crime Prevention Council and the SSP Network in Denmark

"SSP" stands for a form of interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral cooperation involving schools and after-school programmes (**S**), the social services and health care services (**S**) and the police (**P**).

The National SSP Committee under the Danish Crime Prevention Council was set up in 1975. The objective of the SSP committee is to guide and assist local authorities in establishing SSP cooperation in the communities. In 1996 the Committee expressed the declaration of intent for SSP cooperation in the following way: The central aim of SSP cooperation is

> to build up local networks that
> have a crime prevention effect on the daily lives of children and young people.

The National SSP Committee works primarily with planning initiatives that may reinforce interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral co-operation locally. The Committee encourages all municipalities to establish formalised SSP cooperation and offers advice and guidance to local authorities and the police on how the work may be planned and on which initiatives should be taken.

More than 95% of the Danish municipalities have now established SSP committees in accordance with the guidelines laid down by the Crime Prevention Council.

The term "formal cooperation" is not legally binding. SSP cooperation will be based on municipalities'

decisions to implement interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral activities.

Denmark's local government system precludes central demand that municipalities shall establish interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral cooperation. This would only be possible if the Danish Parliament (*the Folketing*) should pass legislation to that effect.

<u>Legislation Governing SSP Cooperation</u>

Danish legislation obliges the basic educational system, the social services and the police to carry out crime prevention work in its broadest sense.

This obligation is not expressly stated in the Primary Education Act. However, the objectives in the Act state that the individual pupil should acquire all-round personal development. This aim is very difficult to achieve if the young person is involved in alcohol and drug abuse or crime.

Legislation on the social services obliges staff to supervise the conditions under which children and young people live. This includes the possibility of supporting them in creating the best possible conditions for growing up.

Legislation covering the social services, health care and education ensures that the population can maintain a certain standard of living and receive free treatment under the National Health Service and free education in Danish primary schools. Legislation concerning housing regulations, including planning and urban redevelopment programmes, ensures healthy housing standards. All these factors form a long-term part of the endeavour towards reducing crime.

The duties of the police are laid down in sections 1 to 3 of the Danish Police Act of 1 July 2004, under which the police must do whatever is necessary to prevent crime.

It should be added that provisions in section 115b of the Danish Administration of Justice Act enable the laws concerning professional confidentiality to be derogated from to a limited extent in connection

with SSP work.

SSP cooperation shall build up, use and maintain local networks that have a crime preventive influence on the daily lives of children and young people. The networks are also to be used to detect, at an early stage, danger signals and new tendencies in the development of crime. Moreover, they are able to monitor the development in the conditions of life for children and young people.

Another aim is to identify local prevention options on an interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral basis as well as at professional level in specific fields such as schools, social services, police, institutions, housing and recreational and cultural areas. Projects and specific efforts are directed towards attempting to prevent young people and groups of young people from engaging in inappropriate social behaviour, including criminal behaviour. And to prevent this type of behaviour from spreading.

Quality Development of SSP Cooperation

The Crime Prevention Council is working on a project in which the country's municipalities will be offered the assistance of consultants to develop plans of action for SSP cooperation. Eleven ad-hoc consultants have been trained, and they will support municipalities in the process of finalising their plans of action. Agreements have been made with 23 municipalities, large as well as small, across the country.

A member of staff from the Council will establish contacts with new local authorities and manage the corps of ad-hoc consultants.

As support to the ad-hoc consultants, "model plans of action" will be worked out for small, medium-sized and large municipalities.

Activities Relating to Young Persons over 18 ("SSP +")

Another focus area of the Crime Prevention Council is work with the over-18 age group. It has been necessary to involve new partners in the cooperation scheme so that, in particular, young people with social problems may be given improved prospects for the future.

For many years the Council has recommended - and contributed towards - organising crime prevention initiatives for both pre-school and post-school age groups, so the idea of working with a target group of over I8-year-olds was not a new one.

It is, however, essential to discuss how traditional SSP cooperation can be developed to include other educational institutions than primary schools. The background for this is the circumstance that many state and county institutions (business schools, upper secondary schools, vocational colleges, production schools and others) have come forward with specific problems and have wished to be included in the existing SSP cooperation in their neighbourhoods.

Many local authorities have followed the Council's recommendations on involving new partners in the cooperation scheme. The results show that groups are chiefly set up with representatives from public services, educational institutions etc., all of which have in common the fact that they usually work with individual cases, counselling or education.

A typical group can comprise representatives from:

Social Services
Child and Youth Welfare Service
Cultural Affairs Service
Prison and Probation Service
Police
Integration Groups
Outreach Youth Education Programmes
Youth Schools
Youth Guidance Service
Production Schools

SSP co-ordinators

Consultants working with drug abuse

Psychological advisors

not necessarily all off them, but put together on ad-hoc demands.

The SSP+ work can be characterised by the term "prevention of recidivism", as many of the target groups or individuals have, in one way or the other, been involved in criminal activities.

In short, in Denmark this currently means:

- Action against marginalisation and social isolation of children and young persons not comprehended by ordinary prevention activities.

- Handling socially unstable children and young persons who at an early age fall outside the ordinary offers of help provided under special systems.

- Development of working methods and organisation of the work with young persons who socially are severely unstable and marginalised in relation to social initiatives in the broadest sense and who are in a situation where they are not within reach of even sophisticated prevention programmes of a socio-educational nature but rather need real treatment.

- Concretisation of cooperation relationships to be developed in regard to socially unstable young persons of 18 to 24 years of age.

The Concept of "Network" in Crime Prevention

As stated above, the concept of crime prevention should generally be viewed in a wider context. In Denmark, it is often characterised by cross-sectoral and interdisciplinary views and practices; it is marked by rather floating forms of cooperation involving a large number of interests and interested parties and we have, consequently, developed a working method along the following guidelines:

If we were to form a general view of "a turbulent surrounding world" or "a complex and rapidly changing situation" against the background of such vague concepts as values, attitudes, view of human nature whilst at the same time taking decisions on institutions, communities of interest, "actors" and legal principles, it might be helpful to consider the totality as a network or a networking organisation. Such a consideration would mean that a problem might be formulated as a "network-reminder" as follows:

Which degree of <u>co-ordination</u> is desirable and achievable?

Which degree of <u>freedom/autonomy</u> is desirable and achievable?

Which common interests and <u>principles</u> form the basis of the network?

Which <u>competencies</u> and <u>legal principles</u> regulate the interaction between the separate constituent parts of the network?

Which <u>fora/organisation</u> will co-ordinate the network and will ensure the appropriate autonomy for the separate constituents of the network?

Which <u>communities of interests</u> can be identified?

How are <u>common interests</u> and <u>principles</u> to be defined?

<u>Who</u> is/are to define common interests and principles?

How will common interests and principles be <u>safeguarded</u>?

Such, or similar, considerations will provide other approaches to a fundamental debate on cooperation. Hence, the following concrete questions may be posed as a basis for debate:

What <u>basic values</u> are involved (e.g. democracy, human rights, market economy, social dimension, equality, environmental awareness, professional attitudes)?

Which <u>actors</u> exist in the field of cooperation?

Which degree of <u>co-ordination</u> is desirable?

Which degree <u>of autonomy</u> is desirable?

Which are the common <u>interests</u>?

Which <u>competencies</u> and <u>legal principles</u>?

Which <u>institutions</u>, <u>agencies</u>, <u>businesses</u>, spheres of authority?

Which <u>communities of interests</u> (professional, cultural, religious, financial)?

How, and by whom, are the various values, actors, interests and communities of interests to be <u>defined</u>?

How will the various defined values, interests and communities of interests be <u>upheld and safeguarded</u>?

How will the <u>balance be struck</u> between the numerous various interests and what <u>strategies</u> should be promoted?

<u>Problem-oriented Prioritisation</u>

As crime prevention is so multi-facetted, an option might be to divide prevention initiatives into areas, for instance according to types of crime such as violence, acquisitive offences, economic crime, cross-border crime, organised crime etc. and then list potential prevention activities within the concept of <u>crime</u> <u>control</u>. Alternatively, distinctions might be made according to types of victim: young persons, the elderly, women, minorities, events etc. A second alternative might be to list the types of offender either to be induced to refrain from their actions or to be prevented from committing crimes.

In addition, priorities might be established for both types of victim and offender under the concept of <u>social order</u> or <u>security in society</u>, or a further step could be taken so as to focus on institutions, housing areas, businesses or the like.

Mention may be made of an example from Denmark, where we have attempted to prioritise "safer cities". Under an umbrella-project we have implemented 12 well-documented projects during the years 2000 to 2004, following which we have attempted to extract the sustainable and transferable crime prevention <u>effects</u>. Ms Merete Watt Boolsen, sociologist and associate professor at the University of Copenhagen, Denmark, Department of Political Science, has been responsible for the work and the evaluation of the umbrella project.

This is the first time in Denmark that so many projects have been reviewed concurrently, systematically and with the application of sociological and crime prevention methodologies.

The objectives of the umbrella project are/were to "*implement, follow up and evaluate the subsidised projects with a view to identifying those crime prevention elements which are applicable to other projects /other areas*".

It must be said forthwith: 12 projects constitute, of course, a flimsy basis for firm evaluations and conclusions. There is no reason to say otherwise! However, when the findings are considered in their entirety and when it appears that circumstances, conditions etc. repeat themselves in very diverse sub-projects under very diverse conditions (and are, moreover, supported by findings in other countries), then there are grounds for setting down perspectives which can be translated into concrete recommendations and guidelines.

Anyone who wishes to know the contents of the projects, their results and the crime prevention evaluation would be referred to the first part of the report on the umbrella project, which describes the approach towards "*implementing, following up and evaluating the subsidised projects…*". The report describes the general approach and sets out the processes, experience and crime prevention evaluations of the individual sub-projects.

Anyone who is interested in the latter part of the objective of the umbrella project, i.e. "*identifying those crime prevention elements which are applicable to other projects /other areas*" would be referred to the report on C*rime prevention geometry: how to raise wolves, look after ducks and fit up caverns.* This report sets out a crime prevention philosophy which concludes in a number of practical and concrete guidelines on:

       (1) how to work with crime prevention projects;
       (2) how to prioritise interventions;
       (3) how to implement good practice;
       (4) how to proceed, practically and concretely.

The conclusions were the following:

The crime prevention evaluation of the "Safer Cities" projects indicates that the projects that have a comparatively larger positive effect (compared to other projects)

- are sub-projects of composite projects, i.e. in being *well-integrated into a larger system* where there already exists a "project framework" or a "project philosophy" which can be developed;

- are anchored in different *networks* (governmental as well as non-governmental) which are of relevance and importance to the projects and on the basis of which they can actively progress. The SSP cooperation scheme is singled out as and important network;

- involve more than one practitioner having the same role in the projects, i.e. there are "*colleagues*";

- have developed short *chains* of command within the system (i.e. responsibility and competence are closely connected);

- operate in a *preventive and inter-disciplinary* way at a professional level;

- are *methodologically* grounded in a professional project culture.

The first four points concern, in the widest sense, various aspects of the <u>organisational structures</u> of the crime prevention projects and the two last ones deal with <u>practitioner competence</u>.

The findings of the above mentioned umbrella project correspond with experience gained in various fields of evaluated projects over thirty years of crime prevention in Denmark under the crime council.

Rather than benchmarking, these views represent an attempt at prioritising a defined, complex area and extrapolating the crime prevention effects. Or, as suggested by the EUCPN within this field:

"There is currently <u>little methodological consistency </u>in the collation of good practice in crime prevention within the EUCPN.

The EUCPN is of the opinion that the Commission's proposal to have one EU-wide standard methodology is very ambitious. In the past the EUCPN has tended to concentrate on small-scale projects. In future there should be a much broader scope that includes, among others, good practice in national <u>crime prevention strategies</u>, <u>policy-making</u>, <u>organisational structures</u>, <u>crime resistant product design</u> and development and <u>national crime proofing of legislation</u>, as well as <u>individual projects</u>

This diversity of good practice suggests that one EU wide methodology would be unattainable. The aim of the EUCPN should be a diversity of methodologies, held together by common structural principles. These would range from rigorous academic descriptions and evaluations to peer evaluations and formats for narrative reports. Each of these and others can describe good practice and each is appropriate to the different forms it can take."

<u>Development of the Concept of Quality Management</u>

The reflections above attempt to set out some approaches to the concepts which should form the basis of the way in which in Europe we develop the quality in crime prevention activities which are often in request and are considered necessary by many. Otherwise the term crime prevention would become a broad and quite undefined catchword.

<u>How, then, do we develop a comprehensive professional approach which can be evaluated as to its effect and can form a comprehensive basis for further development of quality</u>?

The answer would, to me, contain two basic requirements: One is to define ways in which we jointly arrive at some generally accepted <u>comparative methods</u> as a basis for <u>common European evaluation standards</u>. The other is to define ways in which to ensure the existence an <u>institutional framework</u> for taking on this work and in relation to this, it should be determined where will these efforts be conjoined.

This and other conferences prove that tremendous and profound effort is being made in order to take forward the development of quality management as well at national as at European and international

levels. Thus, for instance, as will appear from Recommendation 1531 (2001) of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the Council has considered the establishment of a "European observatory".

In my opinion such work should be based in a "unit" at an esteemed European university. Work on this topic was actually carried out from the 1970s into the 1990s by a fairly informal international interest group, which had accidentally chosen the name of Cranfield Conferences.

With much support from Cambridge University this informal interest group, consisting of a wide range of international partners, took steps towards realising an institutional framework for a unit at the Institute of Criminology at Cambridge University. I had the pleasure then of being the author of setting out the views of the group in concrete form as a proposal, the main elements of which were established at the Institute of Criminology, Cambridge, and funded by international trust. I would like to take this opportunity to reintroduce the proposal, which received a certain acclaim at the time but afterwards waned for a while:

"Proposal. As new professional and inter-disciplinary and cross-sectoral approaches to crime control and prevention emerge in Western societies, so the need for an international structure with a comparative aspect to act as a common resource (base) for them becomes ever more plain. This need has been clearly identified by policy makers, practitioners and analysts from governmental, legal, police, social agency, community and academic backgrounds who have come together to discuss crime problems of common concern, and to analyse working models of policy and practice of common interest, in the series of Cranfield Conferences on European Strategies against crime.

These conferences have acted as springboards for fresh policy initiatives, new practical projects and original evaluative studies. They have been usefully complemented and reinforced by other "Cranfield" activities ranging from a postgraduate "problem centred" research programme developed in partnership between academics and public service professionals, to seminars, workshops and publications on professional and inter-agency strategies for care and order in society.

A pattern of inter-dependent activities on similar lines recommends itself for an international structure for advanced police and crime preventive thinking and studies in social policies related to the above mentioned fields of interest. The purpose of this structure would be:

<u>to create</u> a forum for inter-disciplinary/cross-sectoral and trans-national thinking and action in this sphere through a programme which links conferences, seminars and workshops developed in association with governmental, professional and academic institutions in Western societies;

<u>to develop</u> research programmes in which academics and professionals from relevant disciplines can work in partnership to analyse crime and public order problems in key environments and to assess professional and inter-disciplinary strategies to counter or contain them. This research would aim to develop local, national and international perspectives and would be undertaken by "some kind" of permanent staff, by professional researchers on a contract basis, and by professionals from the public services within postgraduate research programmes;

<u>to act</u> as an information and advice service for new preventive strategies; to provide consultancy services; to develop a series of publications from national and cross-national research and evaluation studies;

<u>to lialise</u> with other institutions - governmental, professional, academic and research - in this sphere to create springboards for fresh practical initiatives and research studies. (Given the personal links and "network" already established with relevant institutions and professionals in Europe, as well as with European organizations, liaison of this kind could be e.g. the Council of Europe, the EUCPN, the Standing Conference of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe and other institutions within the framework of the European Community and the different programmes, e.g. the Beccari programme.)

<u>by the formation of a "Unit"</u>. The "Unit" e.g. research fellows and assistants would be financed by funds or programmes and sponsored by the above-mentioned institutions should be located at and work from an independent, major broadly recognised European university".

I shall add today to <u>promote</u> solid comparative research to secure the development of <u>quality management in crime prevention</u>.

Ideas equivalent to these have been expressed by Dr. Joachim Jäger, Polizeiführungsakademie, Münster-Hiltrup, in a recent book *Effizienz von Kriminalprävention - Erfahrungen im Ostseeraum* (Schmidt-Römhild, Lübeck 2004) and presented at a conference under the umbrella topic of professionalization of practitioners in crime prevention.

<div align="center">

Lars Rand Jensen

Chief Constable

</div>