comment

Colin Cramphorn , of the RUC responds to CJM 40, Managerialism.

The theme for CJM 40 was particularly timely, and therefore welcome, for those of us working at the front end of the criminal justice system in policing. For us the drift towards managerialism has been slow, rather like confronting an advancing glacier, but none the less inexorable for that. Many of us have long been alert to the dangers inherent in this process and have commented upon them in the context of a variety of specific developments over recent years. So far as I am concerned, the 'Community Safety' debate, which eventually led to the implementation of the Crime and Disorder Act, provided the framework for such comment.

My modest contribution sought to highlight two things. Firstly, the inherent risks contained within the infrastructure eventually established by the Act, which deploys a managerial approach, leading to a risk of bureaucratisation and remoteness from the communities that the crime and disorder plans are intended to sustain. Without the engagement of these communities in 'their' crime and disorder plans the practitioners will struggle to deliver them. Secondly, the audit and evaluation framework for such plans, which will be quick to judge and, one suspects, to condemn. It does not acknowledge the fact that in similar programmes elsewhere, results only begin to become clear after extended periods. The note of caution that I have thereby sought to deliver is to beware of managerialism, establishing such programmes in the wrong context and evaluating them in the wrong time frame. Those who rebuff such notes of caution deploy the full weight of the rationalist heritage within the social sciences, deploying the predominant empiricism of their disciplines, and, thereby, the intellectual legacy of Berkeley, Hume and Locke. For example, when the then newly appointed head of the Home Office research and statistics unit, Paul Wiles, addressed the AGM of the Centre for Crime and Justice Studies in November 1999, he took 'evidenced based policy' as his theme. He was dismissive of members' subsequent challenges to his theme, especially concerning the interpretation of the 'evidence' in order to translate it into policy. His position contrasts markedly with the recent House of Lords Select Committee report - *Science and Society* - which calls for a new agenda for science in the public domain and challenges not just science, but the political culture, which presumes to trade on science's traditional authority and thereby succeeds only in corroding public assent. As the special adviser to the House of Lords inquiry, Brian Wynne, has commented, *"Many public reactions to science are actually reactions to a science-led policy culture which assumes issues are solely or primarily scientific and thus excludes other legitimate public concerns from attention."* What value 'evidence based policy', when the 'evidence' is carefully selected to support the political objective?

I find myself applauding the editorial thrust of CJM 40 as a whole and Barry Loveday for his specific contribution. In particular I welcome his emphasis upon the inherent tensions managerialism creates in the area of integrity and ethical standards. However, he is wrong to dismiss senior police managers *en masse* as failing to meet this challenge. There has been considerable attention paid to these ethical dilemmas, much of which long pre-dates HM Inspectorate of Constabulary's report *Police Integrity: Securing and Maintaining Public Confidence* (Home Office, June 1999), which he understandably focuses on.

For example, senior police managers have been active participants in the Royal Society for Arts, Manufactures and Commerce (RSA) multi-disciplinary *Forum for Ethics in the Workplace*, since it was established in 1997. In the spring 1998 series of seminars, conducted under the auspices of the forum, the then Chief Constable of South Yorkshire Police, Richard Wells, presented a paper in which he stated; *"It will be the task of leaders of the service to hold the qualitative ground against the league table monolith of Treasury thinking and practice."* And this is, of course, exactly what the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) has been attempting to do, within the bounds of constitutional propriety.

More recently, on 9 September 1999, Superintendent Jo Hampson of Thames Valley Police presented the RSA forum with her reflections on a period of secondment to New South Wales, confronting the aftermath of the serious corruption scandal in that state's police service. She summed up with the comment; *"To use an Australianism, if we are 'fair dinkum' about working with integrity, if we are really serious about ethics, then we have to start with our culture, our work practices, our systems and policies."*

Of course if those working practices, systems and policies are dictated by the current culture of managerialism, the inherent tensions and the risks therein will play themselves out with inevitable consequences. Once again ACPO has been alert to these risks and has sought to address them with the work of its task force on corruption, now being taken forward by its professional standards group.

Alongside the RSA Forum has been the work of the Police Ethics Network (PEN), originally founded in London in 1996 and now based at the University of Surrey, with satellite centres at Teeside University and Glamorgan University. With the help and support of the Comino Foundation it held a seminar in Nov/Dec 1998 entitled *Ethics on Duty: Fitting the Bill.* (Reported in the Journal of the Police Ethics Network, Issue No: 2, March 1999). Just under half those at the seminar were middle and senior police managers. Most recently, on 7 March 2000, the RSA hosted a seminar which sought to identify means to translate ethical awareness into better behaviour, with particular reference to the Human Rights Act, and in the context of the growing number of public/private partnerships. The majority of attendees at that seminar were senior police managers.

There has, therefore, been no failure amongst police managers to recognise the unintended dangers and difficulties, which the current culture of managerialism, as epitomised by 'the league table monolith of Treasury thinking and practice', presents. The most senior officers of the service continue to espouse to government these dangers and shortcomings. For example the President of ACPO, Sir John Evans, Chief Constable of

Devon and Cornwall, writing in the most recent edition of *Policing Today*, states *"Indeed we must resist the temptation of moving from an idea to a solution without thoughtful consideration and consultation on the journey. It should be taken as read that we fully accept the right of Government to set the overall strategy for the Service and give a clear direction in WHAT we do but the dangers inherent in a shift to centralism is the involvement in HOW we do it."*

A clearer statement of concern is hard to imagine, given the constitutional relationships within the tri-partite arrangements for the delivery of policing within all three jurisdictions in the UK.

Senior police managers are addressing the misgivings surrounding inappropriate and u n r e c o n s t r u c t e d managerialism, as identified in CJM 40. That effort is not necessarily welcomed, nor does it always carry the day, but the service should not be condemned for failing to recognise the issues, when it has done more than most to flag them up to policy makers and to address the consequences within its own activities.

◼

Colin Cramphorn is Deputy Chief Constable, Royal Ulster Constabulary.

References:
Cramphorn, C., 'Community Safety - A New Framework for Local Action or Old Wine into New Bottles?', *Police Research & Management*, Vol:2, No:1
Cramphorn, C. (1999), *Working Together for Safer Communities* - Report of the Community Safety Conference, Community Safety Centre, Belfast: Northern Ireland Office.
Evans, J (2000), in *Policing Today*, Vol: 6, No. 2.
Wells, R., (1999), 'Ethics in Policing', *RSA on Work and Leadership*, Aldershot: Gower.
Wynne, B. (2000), 'Retrieving a Human Agenda for Science' - *RSA Journal 2/4*.

We have learned lots of lessons over the years but there are some key issues. Mentoring is a structured relationship, unlike befriending or counselling, with the mentor helping the young person to work towards, and achieve, goals identified at the outset. For it to work, the mentoring needs to have a clear purpose, with the focus being on helping young people to re-engage with education or training, or helping them gain employment. At DYP the young people themselves have identified accessing further education or getting a job as being the best way to prevent them slipping into a career of crime (Webb 2000). This is why we emphasise the importance of the educational components of the programme and urge other projects to think carefully about how they can ensure that mentors have a framework in which to work. There are, however, pitfalls in relying, as we do at DYP, on the goodwill and commitment of volunteers. Sometimes partnerships don't work out, young people don't meet with their mentor or mentors disappear. By its very nature, mentoring can be hard to define and sometimes difficult to manage. Mentoring schemes need to be adequately staffed and managed so that volunteers receive the support and training they need. We have to be realistic about what can and can't be achieved by mentoring. We also have to acknowledge the 'hidden' successes that come from damage limitation. For some young people, involvement with a mentor may prevent their personal situation deteriorating.

Retaining the basic principles of our model of mentoring, DYP has continued to grow and develop new and innovative strands. Significant amongst these is DYP II. This is a programme for eleven to fourteen year olds, which works with local secondary schools to prevent exclusion and truancy.

We have also developed a peer mentor programme so that young people who have been involved with the project can themselves act as peer group mentors, effectively challenging some of the negative peer pressure that youngsters experience.

Clearly DYP has continued to evolve in a flexible and innovative way in responding to the challenge of working with youth at risk. Experience and expertise accrued through DYP's development stands it in good stead to continue to be a leading model of good practice.

◼

Jane O'Sullivan is Project Manager of the 15-18s Programme at Dalston Youth Project.

Reference:
Webb, Janice (2000) *Dalston Youth Project Programme 7 Final Evaluation*, Janice Webb Research.