

Committee(s): Police Committee	Date: 18 th May 2017
Subject: Review of Community Engagement	Public
Report of: Commissioner of Police Pol 20-17	For Information
Report authors: Superintendent Helen Isaac (Head of Communities and Partnerships) & Teresa La Thangue (Director of Corporate Communications)	

Summary

A review of community engagement has been carried out across the Force, considering the ways we engage with different audiences and any gaps and improvements we can make. Feeding into this and in line with our Force Communications Strategy, a comprehensive 'Digital Futures' review has been undertaken, considering our current use of social media and ways to expand our reach into different audiences using both current and new platforms. Governance to support our progress against the national Digital Policing Programme will commence in Force this summer, with improving digital contact and engagement with the public, one of three key strands of this work.

A full review of the Everbridge community messaging platform has been undertaken by the Safer Communities Team with a list of priority actions now in progress, including a survey of current users undertaken to assess their requirements. The results of this survey are summarised within this report. Options to improve our reach and returns from community surveys are currently being considered to reduce the impact of 'survey fatigue' that has made obtaining the views of our community challenging in recent months.

This review acknowledges the importance of face to face engagement to many in our communities and found there is considerable activity taking place across the spectrum of service providers, both in the Force and the City of London Corporation (CoL). As a result of this review a new Community Engagement Working Group has been set up, with representatives from the Force and the CoL, to reduce duplication of effort and ensure our engagement is consistent and joined up and meets the needs of those we serve.

Recommendation

It is recommended that Members note this report and its contents.

Main Report

1 Background and approach

- 1.1 In 2016 the Police Committee asked for a review of the Force's engagement to be carried out. Working with the Safer Communities Project team under the One Safe City Programme the following objectives were set and a review commenced, starting with an innovations workshop with software, data and media company Bloomberg who are shortly to move into new premises in the City. As key contacts who receive our messages and who are engaged by various levels of the Force prior to their move, they were keen to provide feedback and give us the benefit of their experience and ideas.
- 1.2 Objectives of the review were set as:
- To understand current community engagement activity and mediums across the Force
 - To find and address gaps in our current engagement activity, considering our many and varied audiences
 - To implement processes and governance around our engagement to improve consistency and inter-department working and drive innovation and improvement
 - To make best use of digital technology and innovations for engagement in line with the national digital policing vision and the Force communications strategy
- 1.3 The review considered feedback and areas of improvement from recent Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) inspections around our engagement activities. It also considered the national policing context and the direction being set for Forces to work towards. The national Digital Policing Programme is relevant to this review; this includes three strands of work, one of which aims to improve digital contact and engagement with the public.
- 1.4 The Force recently signed off its Communications Strategy which was presented in draft format to your November 2016 Committee and after feedback received, was re-circulated to Members in February 2017 via the Town Clerk's Office. This review has been aligned with priorities contained within the Strategy.
- 1.5 This report has been written jointly between Superintendent Helen Isaac, Head of Communities and Partnerships and Teresa La Thangue, Director of the Force's Corporate Communications Department, with input from key members of staff involved in community engagement from across the Force and the City of London Corporation (CoL), including the Safer Communities Project under the One Safe City Programme.

2. Current position and identified gaps

2.1 Current community engagement

- 2.1.1 During the course of the review, interviews were held with a number of key staff around the Force and CoL to understand how we currently engage. In line with the Force's Communications Strategy principle to explore and exploit

the best engagement tools and emerging technologies, a comprehensive 'Digital Futures' review of our current digital engagement has been carried out by the Force's Digital Communications Manager and feeds into this report.

- 2.1.2 This review has found that the value of all types of engagement is clearly understood in both organisations and there is already work taking place across departments to improve collaborative communications and make improvements.
- 2.1.3 In the Force there are four areas in particular where engagement with the community is a key daily part of business; Corporate Communications, Communities and Partnerships, the Counter Terrorist Security Advisor's (CTSAs) office and in the Economic Crime Directorate (ECD).

2.2 Social Media

- 2.2.1 Social media is a two-way channel and lends itself to engaging with followers and building community relations on our digital platforms. The social media landscape has significantly shifted, with new channels and ways of using these channels changing a user's behaviour. Social media is recognised within the Force as a primary means of communication. The speed, ease and cost-effectiveness have demonstrated that important messages can be communicated to large audiences. Enthusiasm for using the platforms has steadily increased from frontline officers to senior commanders and staff.
- 2.2.2 We use a number of Twitter accounts to provide real-time updates in quick, concise messages and media. Facebook remains the most dominant social media platform in terms of active users, and we have pages for City of London Police (CoLP) and Action Fraud respectively. We also use YouTube to promote video campaigns and utilise CCTV to drive appeals and/or advice messages.
- 2.2.3 Paid advertising for social media enables us to serve posts to engage with particular users. For a platform such as Facebook, which has a raft of demographic data about each user, it means we can target our messages to very specific groups. More importantly, it enables us to communicate with users who do not follow us on social media and therefore aren't exposed to our regular posts. As an example of the value of doing this, in an October 2016 ECD campaign on 'boiler room' fraud awareness, a video promoting the campaign was run through paid advertising on Facebook and resulted in a 25% engagement rate. The usual engagement rate for an organic (non-paid) post is around 2% on Twitter and 5% on Facebook.

The table below details the recognised social media canon of City of London Police.

Table 1: City of London Police social media canon

	Purpose and audience	Frontline	ECD	Face
Twitter	Timely, concise updates for universal audience. Alerts function in event of crisis.	@CityPolice @CityCycleCop @CityHorses @CityDogs @CityPoliceLGBT	@CityPoliceFraud @ActionFraudUK @CityPolicePIPCU @CityPoliceIFED	@CityPoliceBD (Bill Duffy) @CityPoliceGM (Glenn Maleary) @CityPoliceDCS (Dave Clark)
Facebook	Feature posts of news and updates with	City of London Police central channel.	Action Fraud central channel.	None.
YouTube	Video-sharing for universal audience. Can embed into Facebook, Twitter, email etc.	City of London Police central channel.	Action Fraud central channel.	None, but officers may appear presenting to camera in City channel.
LinkedIn	Corporate news for a professional and stakeholder audience.	City of London Police central channel.	NLFF/Action Fraud updates go via City of London Police page. Separate Academy page for practitioners.	None.

2.3 Twitter

2.3.1 Today, Twitter is considered a vital means of corporate communication. Police Twitter accounts across the country are seen as the official voice of a Force, and are relied upon as the single point of truth and information. They are the social media equivalent of the information in a press release or on the Force’s official website.

2.3.2 @CityPolice is the recognised account that represents the Force on Twitter. It is also the most-followed with more than 75,000 followers. It is run by Corporate Communications with input from 18 trained officers. Beyond the main account, we have a devolved presence of four departmental accounts and one ‘face’ account for Square Mile policing. There are also four departmental accounts and three ‘face’ accounts for ECD.

2.3.3 ‘Face’ accounts are run by individual senior officers, such as T/Commander Dave Clark; they offer thought leadership and add a human touch to compliment the departmental and main accounts. Departmental accounts are run by a selection of officers or staff within each department to give a perspective of the day-to-day activity, with input from Corporate Communications as necessary.

2.3.4 Twitter is a fast-moving social media platform that relies on regular updates. A large pool of tweeters guarantees there is almost always daily content. The @CityPoliceHorses and @CityPoliceDogs accounts have demonstrated that they are an excellent way to grab people’s attention and highlight what could otherwise be seen as uninteresting police work as something exciting. They have a strong following from horse and dog enthusiasts alike along with the City population and other stakeholders. They consistently rank as having the highest levels of engagement rates in our monthly reports.

2.3.5 The review has identified that there are opportunities around our use of Twitter, where a greater number of devolved accounts away from the Force’s

main Twitter account would provide a greater choice for our community to follow based on their location, interests, lifestyle etc. Devolved accounts are usually created for departments that work with the public and/or have a clear public interest, such as geographic neighbourhood teams, Special Constables or recruitment, or dedicated divisions such as Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) or football/event policing. The Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) have devolved their contact centre to a separate account to trial crime reporting over Twitter.

- 2.3.6 When asked about current gaps in communication with residents it was felt by the residential team within Communities and Partnerships that devolved Twitter and Facebook accounts for the team would provide a good opportunity for officers familiar to the residential community to have direct engagement and a two way dialogue on specific subjects with residents. This is to be trialled to assess how popular this is with residents and whether they feel it adds value to our engagement with them.
- 2.3.7 As a Force we will develop our use of Twitter by replying to more comments on posts and will develop open conversations around specific themes, taking account of criticism as consistently as we embrace praise and developing a two way engagement process to increase our accountability and transparency as a police Force. Digital engagement activity and decisions on our evolving digital engagement will be directed through a new governance Board for CoLP digital policing commencing this summer and led by Commander Gyford.
- 2.3.8 Our overall approach to social media will be more fluid and put the end user's benefits first, including measuring success in different ways. Rather than measure solely by follower/like counts, we will work to establish what our audiences are receptive to and what works for the end user, also examining social media's relationship with our website and how effective our supporting pages perform when shared on Facebook and Twitter.

2.4 Other Platforms

- 2.4.1 There are many more social media channels beyond Facebook and Twitter. Some specialise in niche interests or styles and would be unsuitable for a police Force to use, while others are significantly growing in popularity. Different audiences use different social media platforms. The table below provides a snapshot of just some of the many audiences the Force needs to consider when starting on and developing social media channels.

Table 2: Audience types and channels

Audience types	Why?	Best existing channels/platforms	Opportunities for the future
City commuters	Our largest group to communicate with. Their network is likely made up of similar groups.	Any with a public-facing interest. The main accounts on each channel should be their first port of call for information and advice about City activity. Devolved accounts can offer the ‘buffet’ for users to follow based on preference (e.g. @CityCycleCop for cycle commuters).	Work with home county forces to evolve Twitter and Facebook following from their ‘home’ force. Innovate with new channels to grab commuter attention. Continue to explore devolution of accounts.
City residents (plus taxi drivers and SMEs)	Active around the City all day, they’re most likely to encounter officer interaction in their line of work.	Twitter is the primary platform for up-to-the-minute information.	Similar platforms that offer timely information such as Snapchat. Platforms that promote positive policing and increase visibility such as Instagram.
City visitors (tourists etc)	May be unaware of City customs, risks or dangers when touring and of CoLP presence.	Twitter and Facebook provide in-built translation services.	Paid social media can identify users who are visiting. Platforms that promote positive policing and increase visibility such as Instagram.
‘Police family’ and professional associates	Contacts help disseminate messages, particularly nearby home office forces. For ECD national campaigns, pickup of our messages is crucial. Demonstrates partnership working.	Twitter has a large number of blue-light accounts.	Work with home county forces to evolve Twitter and Facebook following from their ‘home’ force. For more corporate-focused messages LinkedIn (and the private groups that can be created) is a more suitable platform.
Young People	For frontline, stay-safe messages for school pupils, university students and postgraduate professionals. For ECD, to communicate key messages that may impact on them, such as cyber & fraud warnings.	Facebook still has the highest reach of any social network. YouTube is still popular among young audiences.	Paid social on Facebook and YouTube, with youth-orientated marketing material, can target key demographics that wouldn’t normally follow police accounts. Other social media such as Instagram and Snapchat are proving extremely popular among younger audiences.
Older and/or vulnerable people	For frontline, missing persons and safeguarding messages. For ECD, awareness and prevention messages that can help prevent fraud by exploitation (e.g. investment fraud).	Facebook still has the highest reach of any social network. The average age of Facebook users has risen since its creation as more senior users have joined to keep in touch with family.	We can continue to push our messages via paid social to reach out to vulnerable people or those that care for them.

- 2.4.2 Instagram, a photo and video-sharing social media platform, has now overtaken Twitter in terms of number of active users. At least 35 other UK police forces use the channel or have a presence; we are one of the few remaining forces in the country who do not have any Instagram presence.
- 2.4.3 An Instagram account for the City of London Police, run by Corporate Communications with contributions fed in from officers, has the potential to be markedly different from our Twitter and Facebook outputs. We can use the channel to document positive policing and help promote the best public events and engagements that the Square Mile has to offer.
- 2.4.4 As table 3 below shows, there are many new and emerging social media platforms we have yet to explore, all with their own advantages and disadvantages. Some of these secondary social media platforms serve a different purpose to the ‘big three’ of Facebook, Twitter and YouTube; the aim will not be to build a large following within the channel, but rather use them as a vehicle to deliver content via our established channels (Facebook and Twitter) on an ad-hoc basis. The successful use of these platforms depends on the demographic and audience we are trying to target (as in table 2) with our messages.

Table 3: Social media platforms we are yet to explore

Platform/summary	Advantages	Disadvantages
Instagram (see above)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More active users now than on Twitter. • Huge success enjoyed by other forces building a community on the platform. • Excellent for documenting positive policing and story-telling. • Integration with Facebook for paid campaigns. • Can now upload video and multiple images in a single post. 	Engagement works differently on Instagram compared to Twitter or Facebook; the image is the driver of the message and users cannot click through to a website in a post’s supporting text. However, on corporate Instagram channels users are encouraged to visit links in the account’s bio for more information, which can be useful for campaigns, and click-throughs can be enabled on paid posts.
Flickr , a platform to host high-quality images and album.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proved useful for HO forces for documenting galleries or for providing a suite of ID-sought stills. • Can be embedded into website. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to build following. • Expectation of professional-standard photography.
Snapchat , a peer-to-peer instant messaging service that allows multi-media messaging.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young audience. • Used by some HO forces. • Quick, simple messaging just like Twitter. • ‘Featured’ section provide animated digest of news stories. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very informal style required that may work against us. • ‘Featured’ section given to select outlets only. • Would have to register as an individual account.
SoundCloud , an audio-only platform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Useful for supporting press releases and campaigns with 	Monthly subscription for full range of features.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • additional comment. • Can be used to feed media with quote/Q&A. • Can be embedded into social media posts and website pages. 	
Tumblr , a social media blogging platform that relies on visual media.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can convey complex documents with different strands, such as an annual report. • Can be used as a temporary website backup in event of a crash. 	Very off-beat, informal style across the platform.
Medium , a blogging platform that is universal to all.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upmarket style encourages sensible discussion that could suit police blogging. • Can be used to follow up on campaigns, press releases or crisis comms with thought leadership. • Will have our expertise and unique style of policing valued. 	Still a developing platform.
Facebook Messenger and Skype bot , instant messenger services with pre-programmed responses to automatically reply to user interaction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once set up, runs by itself. • Daily/weekly news delivery capability to increase our messages. • Works on existing channels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set-up can be difficult; need to second-guess how users interact • Need to emphasise not for crime reporting.
Facebook Live and Periscope , live-broadcast video streaming embedded into Facebook and Twitter channels respectively.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exciting way to capture events in the City. • Not much work needed to set up/run; works on existing channels. 	Live streaming comes with risk of unforeseen events being broadcast to all our followers; events for live broadcast should be carefully selected.

2.5 Everbridge Community Messaging Platform

2.5.1 The Force primarily uses the Everbridge Community Messaging Platform as a critical messaging tool, rather than for general communications. It has been used for sending out other materials such as surveys, crime prevention advice and crime updates. However, a small survey of those who had unsubscribed from the service in 2015 revealed that the main reason for unsubscribing was that users had not wished to receive anything other than critical messages which had the potential to affect their business. They had become frustrated by the volume of general community messages being sent over the platform when these were of little interest or relevance to them and the sometimes poor quality of messages. Another issue highlighted to us has been some subscribers not receiving messages, something which has since been rectified as this was an issue identified as brought about during implementation of the platform.

- 2.5.2 With the growing number of social media platforms and other engagement methods available and considering the feedback we've had from some users, engagement via Everbridge is not about the number or frequency of messages, but about the criticality, timeliness and quality. The Safer Communities Project (under the One Safe City Programme) recently sought feedback from a varied sample of users and this was consistent with the 2015 survey, citing the importance of the quality and timeliness of our messaging over the quantity of messages sent via this platform.
- 2.5.3 We send messages using the platform via text and/or email depending on user preference and this compliments our use of Twitter and other communications platforms. Whilst some people prefer to receive messages via Twitter, not all organisations allow staff access to social media sites from their work devices, so a text or e-mail provides another way of providing important messages in a way that is accessible to most people. Twitter messages are also limited by the number of characters that can be used which restricts the information we can provide. When views were sought by the Safer Communities team from some security personnel, the text message format was largely preferred because it provides them with a quick and easy way to receive critical messages, whether they are in the office or out and about.
- 2.5.4 As a result of a comprehensive review by Safer Communities of the implementation and use of Everbridge, a number of priority actions were identified. The team undertook to:
- Survey all Everbridge users (summary of results at 2.5.6) to understand the requirements of users and provide the type of messages they want to receive
 - Ensure all groups within the system are sent messages and identify and resolve issues with the system implementation
 - Simplify the message sending process and provide simple guidance and training for staff on message content and quality
 - Provide clarity for corporate partners and other users on the type of contracts available, what these will provide and any costs involved
 - Set up the social media connector in Everbridge so that messaging and Twitter, for example, are aligned
 - Explore opportunities for further savings on the cost of the contract
 - Bring all instances of Everbridge use across the CoL and CoLP into a single environment, subject to agreement and financial incentive
 - Identify and adopt accountability and responsibility for the system
- 2.5.5 The Safer Communities Project has extensively reviewed the set up and use of Everbridge to ensure we use the platform to its best effect and that it delivers messages our users want to receive. In April 2017, this resulted in a simple survey being sent to all users to gain an understanding of their requirements of this tool. The information from this survey will now be analysed in more detail and used to inform our future set up and use of Everbridge.

2.5.6 A total of 937 responses were received from the 6409 users sent the survey, a response rate of just below 15%. A summary of the results is shown below;

Q1 Are you a business, resident, work in the City or a visitor?

547 responses were from businesses, 331 from people who work in the City, 45 from residents and 14 from visitors.

Q2 Type of business?

Out of 513 replies for this question, 352 (66%) were from large enterprises, 170 (32%) were from SMEs and 15 (3%) were from sole traders/small businesses.

Q3 Industry type?

533 respondents replied to this question with the majority of 231 (43%) from the finance industry. The next highest category was 'other' with 93 (17%).

Q4 What types of communication do you expect to receive from this tool?

Out of 884 responses, 448 (51%) expect to receive critical and other police information such as major incidents, road closures and crime incidents. 317 (36%) expect to receive critical, other police information and awareness communications such as crime prevention, events and campaigns. 119 (13%) expect to receive critical information on major incidents only.

Q5 What in your view is a critical message?

Out of 884 responses where more than one option could be selected, most agreed that an actual (83%) or emerging (89%) threat to life or natural disaster is a critical message, 75% agreed an alert such as a suspect vehicle or package meets the criteria and a smaller number at 28%, feel a road closure qualifies.

Q6 What do you expect from a critical message?

From 884 replies where more than one option could be selected, 815 (92%) wanted to be enabled to act to protect themselves and others and 754 (85%) wanted to be informed of issues.

Q7 What level of detail do you expect?

Most users want detail of the time, location, nature of incident, impact and advice with slightly less than half, 425 (48%) wanting links to further information.

Q8 Do you expect messages sent to be specific to your location?

Most users 549 (62%) expect to see critical messages from outside their location, with 335 (38%) expecting only those related to their location.

Q9 If only critical messaging was sent out using this system, where would you go for other City of London Police updates?

Out of 858 replies for this question where multiple options could be selected, 604 (70%) of people would use our website, 446 (52%) social media and (440) 51% email updates. Only 44 (5%) would choose a paper based option.

Q10 Which City of London Police social media accounts do you follow?

50% of 858 respondents for this question do not follow any of our social media accounts. 302 (35%) follow our Twitter, 131 (15%) Facebook, (95) 11% LinkedIn and 49 (6%) YouTube. Reasons given for not following our social media are varied, but themes running through the responses include; our alerts are sufficient to meet needs, businesses restrict access to social media, users don't access any kind of social media through personal choice or a lack of time and also due to the amount of other information considered irrelevant to users that is present on social media.

Q11 What topics are most important to you?

93% of 857 respondents agreed that counter terrorism is very important with the next highest group at 54% agreeing the crime prevention is very important.

- 2.5.7 With work on some of the actions in 2.5.4 on-going, a briefing note setting out the background, issues and long term recommendations was completed by Safer Communities and has recently been approved by senior One Safe City Board members.
- 2.5.8 A date of June 2018 has been agreed for a procurement process to commence, scoping requirements across the CoLP and CoL to replace all current messaging contracts across both organisations. This process will consider the engagement requirements and gaps at that time, against the ever-changing opportunities afforded by social media and other engagement tools. Contracts have been aligned to the Everbridge end date of February 2019 to allow a procurement process to consider and encompass, where possible, the requirements of a number of departments.

2.6 Traditional Methods of Engagement

The importance of knowing our communities

- 2.6.1 During this review, the importance of having an accurate, detailed and up to date community profile was clear. This is a document often requested by the HMIC prior to inspections as it helps to inform activity both in the CoLP and CoL. Our community profile is in the process of being updated at present, something which has become more challenging the further we move in time from the 2011 Census which normally provides much of the data.
- 2.6.2 Having raised this as an issue with the Safer Communities Project, the team has since identified several new sources of information for inclusion in the updated version. It has also been agreed that this document will be reviewed annually as a joint exercise between the CoLP and CoL to provide an

essential central source of information on our communities for both organisations.

- 2.6.3 During the review we were interested in understanding the different groups across our communities, which are many and varied and also how widespread the use of social media and digital forms of contact are. It can be easy to assume that most people have regular access to a computer and a smart-phone and are well-versed in the use of these to access engagement, but this is not always the case, which is why traditional forms of engagement such as surgeries and meetings remain an important part of our service provision.
- 2.6.4 As an illustration of the importance of this in the City, reference was made to a 2015 study carried out by Goldsmiths University, exploring social isolation and loneliness.¹ This involved a study of 104 residents aged between 48 and 86 years of age from the Middlesex Street and Golden Lane housing estates, the Guinness Trust Mansell Street Estate and the Barbican.
- 2.6.5 On considering computer skills the study found that a significant minority of residents interviewed had access to a laptop or desk-top computer, with the majority having little or no computer skills beyond simple word processing. Many did not know that facilities such as Skype are available to maintain contact with family and friends. Anecdotal evidence of some residents continuing to use public phone boxes to make calls due to not having a home phone line, let alone a smart phone, was also heard from community officers.

Face to face engagement

- 2.6.6. We maintain our dedicated residential community officers and PCSOs where some other forces have been unable to do so, due to the budgetary challenges of recent years. These officers have policed our residential communities and estates for many years and have a wealth of knowledge, being familiar and trusted faces to many.
- 2.6.7 When interviewed for this review the residential officers stated that face to face contact forms a central part of their engagement activities because they understand not all residents want to, or indeed are able to communicate digitally. Through daily patrolling of residential areas, sometimes alone and sometimes with the dedicated guard from Parkguard, officers regularly come into contact with residents and they also attend drop-in surgeries held by the Corporation. Regular events such as the Memory Club for people with Alzheimer's on Golden Lane (includes residents from the Barbican and Tudor Rose Court), the Tuesday Club for retired professionals, the Tudor Rose coffee morning and the Bengali Women's Group at Mansell Street to name but a few, provide officers with invaluable contact with residents and allow a personal, bespoke style of engagement to take place. Sessions for residents with an input on the counter terrorism threat and advice, fraud prevention

¹ The Voices of Older People: Exploring Social Isolation and Loneliness in the City of London – Roger Green and T. Stacey, Goldsmiths University 2015

advice, community engagement and other topics will also be taking place this summer, starting with the Barbican on 11th July.

- 2.6.8 Personal engagement with businesses and other sectors is also of fundamental importance in the City. We have business forums across the City, made up of large businesses and SMEs and we regularly provide input at these based on the requirements of each area. A forums lead meeting has recently been commenced, allowing messages to be sent through the lead for each area and shared with other businesses.
- 2.6.9 The Economic Crime Directorate engages face to face extensively, with the intention of reducing vulnerability to fraud, ensuring the community is well informed, has the latest advice on protection and is aware of any existing and emerging threats. The Counter Terrorist Security Advisors also use personal engagement, with both areas using breakfast briefings, lunch and learn sessions, presentations, individual meetings with premises and inputs at forum meetings and at the Crime Prevention Association to do this, as examples of just some of the personal engagement activities taking place.
- 2.6.10 A new multi-faith forum is being explored, with initial meetings held to discuss the appetite for this with the City Sikhs Network, City Hindus Network and Square Mile Muslims and others to follow. It is envisaged that this group would act as a critical friend and be a conduit for messaging and information following an incident, and so far the idea has been received with enthusiasm. The Independent Advisory Group (IAG), the new youth IAG and the Community Scrutiny Group also provide personal engagement opportunities, and act as critical friends.
- 2.6.11 Our schools and youth officer and other community officers engage extensively with children and young people in the City, running junior and senior cadets, the Youth IAG, a community boxing club and the Drugs and Alcohol Resistance Education (DARE) programme in our schools. These are just some of the on-going engagement activities, along with provision of training and workshops on subjects such as sexting, legal highs, Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) awareness and digital/ online safeguarding.
- 2.6.12 In addition to the training for children and young people, training is also provided by several parts of the Force through personal engagement; by Prevent officers delivering WRAP² training in educational and health establishments and via inputs for residents and businesses; through Project Griffin training every month for security personnel; through new REAct³ training for key security officers and via postal awareness sessions for post room staff in businesses.

² WRAP- Workshop to Raise Awareness of PREVENT - which is the strand of the HMGs CONTEST strategy in countering Terrorism

³ REAct - Recognise, React, Engage training in disruptive effects for security personnel

2.7 Surveys

- 2.7.1 One of the ways we have sought to engage and seek community views and preferences over the years is through the use of surveys. However in recent months we have increasingly experienced 'survey fatigue' with a low number of replies received for our counter terrorism and post event questionnaires. As seeking public views and using these to shape our service delivery is key, Corporate Communications have researched options for improving our survey reach and results and these will be considered by the Force's Strategic Management Board for a decision on the way forward in the near future.

2.8 Newsletter

- 2.8.1 Our previous newsletter, sent out via the Everbridge platform, was counter terrorism specific and the Force has recently widened this to include other subject matter, with an update called 'Skyline' now going out via Mailchimp to a growing circulation list every fortnight. There is a link on the Force website to sign up to receive this and information on Skyline is about to be published in the City Residents' Magazine. All areas of the Force have an opportunity to contribute to this and ideas for the content of Skyline forms part of the standing agenda at the newly formed Community Engagement Working Group.

3. Inter-Department Working

3.1 Gaps and issues identified

- 3.1.1 During interviews with staff in the Force and the CoL for this review, themes arose concerning duplication of effort and wanting to improve interdepartmental working on engagement activities between areas and across the two organisations. Staff also supported the idea of a central database of contacts and engagement information being created for access by all those involved in community engagement.

3.2 Community Engagement Working Group

- 3.2.1 As a result of staff feedback, a new Community Engagement Working Group has been formed with the overarching aim within the terms of reference agreed as;

'To share information and coordinate engagement activity, both across the City of London Police and with the City of London Corporation, preventing duplication, encouraging innovation and ensuring activities are shared and consistent and meet the needs of the many varied City of London communities.'

- 3.2.2 The inaugural meeting took place on 26th April 2017 and was chaired by the Communities and Partnerships Superintendent, with twenty attendees from across the Force and CoL who regularly engage with the community. Information on roles and up and coming events and ideas were shared and it

was agreed that whilst this forum embeds it will be a monthly meeting chaired by the Communities and Partnerships Inspector, with an email circulation group formed to ensure communication and information sharing is on-going between meetings.

3.3 Customer Relationship Management (CRM)

- 3.3.1 Through the Safer Communities Project, work is taking place with the CRM manager in the CoL to consider options for a single shared database of community contacts and engagement information. This is on-going and a small pilot of what a CRM database could contain has been successful, but decisions have yet to be made around the final scope and content of this.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 This review of engagement has encouraged the Force to think about our different audiences, their needs and the way we currently engage. It has led to a comprehensive review of our digital engagement being carried out, for progression by our new digital policing governance Board, commencing this summer, to drive progress against the national Digital Policing Programme.
- 4.2 What was clear throughout this review is the value that staff from both the Force and the CoL place on our engagement across City communities and their will to improve shared working practises and provide a professional service. It is clear also, that whatever digital platforms and future technologies we embrace, we must continue to assess the needs and profile of our many and varied audiences and offer services via a range of engagements, including the personal face to face contact we know is important to many.
- 4.3 An update on the continuing work from this engagement review, the Force's developments in digital contact and progress from the Community Engagement Working Group will be contained in future quarterly engagement reports to your Committee.

Contact(s)

Helen Isaac
Superintendent
Communities and Partnerships
Tel: 020 7601 2401
e-mail: helen.isaac@cityoflondon.police.uk

Teresa La Thangue
Corporate Communications Director
Tel: 020 7601 2290
e-mail: Teresa.La-Thangue@cityoflondon.police.uk