



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

**The Prince George Community Social Development Board:
A Case Study of Municipal Inter-Agency Crime Prevention**

Brigitte Koch

053567

Submitted to the Department of Criminology, University of Ottawa,
in partial fulfilment of requirements for the degree of Master of
Arts, 1991.



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-75075-8

Canada



UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

ABSTRACT

This research examines the planning and organization of municipal inter-agency crime prevention through a case study of Prince George's Community Social Development Board. This program is based on the "French Model" which promotes local inter-agency crime prevention. A committee of key members in the community combat crime in both the short and long-term.

The focus of the Board is on social development: it attempts to tackle the social causes of crime such as poverty, an unresponsive education system, a growing underclass created by blocked opportunities, the disintegration of communities and families, inadequate parenting, and drug and alcohol abuse.

This Board was initiated by a RCMP officer in Prince George who handed the project to the Mayor once it was approved by City Council. The first meeting of the Board was in June 1990.

The methodology for the study includes an analysis of available documentation, including letters, memorandums and reports; interviews in Prince George with the ten members of the Community Social Development Board and the RCMP officer who initiated the Board and; observation of one Board meeting (May 1, 1991).

The ten members of the Board are persons in senior positions in the following organizations: the City of Prince George (the Mayor and Director of Development Services), the Native Friendship Centre, Employment and Immigration Canada, the Health Unit, RCMP,

the regional crown prosecutor, a provincial court judge, the school district, and the Ministry of Social Services and Housing for British Columbia.

Results of the interviews show that although the Board did have some benefits, it did not have clear objectives, it lacked leadership and it desperately needed a full-time executive director. The level of trust and cooperation varied amongst members. As well, the role of the police in initiating crime prevention councils is addressed since this Board was initiated by an RCMP officer.

In conclusion, municipal inter-agency crime prevention is a promising strategy to lower crime, and deserves to be given a second chance. The study shows that the problems faced by Prince George are not unique, and that it is possible for police to initiate municipal inter-agency programs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research is designed to provide insight to those interested in crime prevention and the role of the police, and those interested in setting up an inter-agency committee or Board. I hope this research will be useful to communities across Canada interested in tackling the situations that breed crime.

In conducting this research many thanks are due to several people. First of all, I would like to thank Irvin Waller, my supervisor of this research for having opened the doors to a whole new world through his encouragement, support, confidence and enthusiasm.

Secondly, I would like to thank the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for assisting me financially in my research. Particular thanks are due to Dean Jones, Sgt Lew Penny and Sgt Sam Landry from Crime Prevention/Victims' Services Branch, Ottawa, for their insights on crime prevention and policing. Thanks also for having made it possible for me to attend the International Crime Prevention Conference in October, 1990 and the Police Oriented Workshop Management Program in May 1991.

Thirdly, I would like to thank Richard Weiler for his guidance and all members of the Community Social Development Board including RCMP Inspector Harrower for their cooperation and time with the interviews. A particular thanks to David McDonald for helping me with arranging the interviews and to RCMP Superintendent Wilcox for having given me the opportunity to experience life as a patrol officer on the Ride Along Program. That will definitely be

unforgettable.

Last but not least I would like to thank Peter Von Maydell, my parents and my brother Tom for all their support and confidence.

**THE PRINCE GEORGE COMMUNITY SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD:
A CASE STUDY OF MUNICIPAL INTER-AGENCY CRIME PREVENTION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	iii
List Of Tables	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Review Of The Literature On Municipal Inter- Agency Crime Prevention	9
Social Situations That Generate Crime	9
The Organization Of Municipal Inter-Agency Crime Prevention	11
The "French Model"	15
The Urban Safety And Crime Prevention Program	17
The Role Of The Police In Community Policing And Crime Prevention	19
Summary	22
Chapter 3: The Study Of Prince George's Community Social Development Board	23
Methodology	23
Prince George: Description Of The City	26
The Community Social Development Board	31
Analysis Of The History And Development Of The Community Social Development Board	32
Results Of The Interviews	41
Commentary	52
Summary	54
Chapter 4: Major Issues In The Implementation Of The Community Social Development Board	56
Mandate And Objective	56
Leadership	60
Territoriality	61
The Absence Of A Full-Time Executive Director	62
The Transfer Of The Initiator	63
Summary	65
Chapter 5: Conclusion	66
Bibliography	68

List of Tables

1: Selected Demographic Variables For The City Of Prince George And The Province Of British Columbia	29
2: Actual Offenses Reported To The Police For Prince George And For British Columbia By Type Of Offense And Year	30
3: A Summary Of Findings For The Community Social Development Board And The Crime Prevention Council Of Ottawa	59

Appendices

I: Interview Questions	76
II: Letter Requesting Interviews In Prince George	79
III: <u>Terms Of Reference</u> , Community Social Development Board	80
IV: <u>Short-term Action Plan</u> , Community Social Development Board	82
V: Proposal For Research Projects	85
VI: Profile Of Qualifications For Executive Director	87

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In 1988, the General Social Survey found that 42% of elderly persons and 42% of women in urban areas felt unsafe walking in their own neighbourhood at night (Sacco and Johnson, 1990: 62). Overall, one quarter of Canadians 15 years and over indicated that they felt unsafe in their own neighbourhoods at night (Sacco and Johnson, 1990: 49).

In the past twenty five years, the number of offenses reported to the police has more than quadrupled from 572,105 in 1963 to 2,392,419 in 1988 (Normandeau and Leighton, 1990: 17). The number of police personnel more than doubled in this same time period from 33,269 to 72,297 (Normandeau and Leighton, 1990: 17). The number of offenses recorded per police officer increased from 20.9 in 1963 to 30.1 in 1973, to 42.9 in 1983, and 44.9 in 1988 (Normandeau and Leighton, 1990: 17).

Expenditures on policing, the courts and corrections also show the magnitude of the crime problem. In 1989-90, 4.68 billion dollars were spent on policing (Statistics Canada, 1991: 1). An additional 2.6 billion dollars were spent on courts and corrections (Statistics Canada, 1991: 1). Less than one percent of the total criminal justice system budget is spent on prevention (Ministry of Justice and Attorney General Of Canada, 1990: 1-3).

The statistics for fear, crime, and the cost of policing

suggest that our resources must be better spent if we wish to reduce crime and fear in urban communities. As research demonstrates, increasing the length of prison sentences or the number of patrol cars are not viable solutions (Currie, 1985; Kelling, 1974)

In the United States, penal policies were toughened in New York, Texas and California by increasing the use and length of imprisonment in an attempt to lower crime rates. However, rates of serious crime went up (Correctional Association of New York cited in Currie, 1985: 33-34). A study by the Correctional Association of New York in 1982 concluded "The state's new policies have been staggeringly expensive, have threatened a crisis of safety and manageability in the prison system, and have failed to reduce the rate of crime or even stop its increase" (Correctional Association of New York cited in Currie, 1985: 33). This illustrates that increasing jail sentences is not effective in lowering crime rates.

A study in Kansas City showed that the number of patrol cars does not affect crime rates or the level of fear (Kelling, 1974: iii). The study divided an area of the city into three regions. The first region doubled the number of patrol cars. The second remained the same (control group) and in the third region, police entered only in response to calls from the public (Kelling, 1974: iii).

After one year, the crime rates and level of fear did not change in any of the regions (Kelling, 1974: iii). This indicates that the number of police cars did not affect crime rates or levels of fear. Therefore, resources ordinarily allocated to preventive

patrol can safely be devoted to other, more productive strategies (Kelling, 1974: 14). One such strategy is community policing. This strategy has not yet proven to be effective in reducing crime but it has reduced levels of fear in certain neighbourhoods (Greene and Mastrofski, 1988).

The preceding studies show that adding more of the same (e.g., harsher punishments, more prisons or patrol cars) is not sufficient to lower crime or fear. In the early 1970's, crime prevention emerged as an alternative to reactive, offender-oriented approaches (Rosenbaum, 1988: 324). The notion of preventing crime made sense as a solution since it limited the need to increase resources within the criminal justice system and the costs associated with a criminal act.

In Confronting Crime: An American Challenge, Currie (1985: 229) provides an analogy between hospitals and prisons to explain how neither is the source of prevention. He states,

Just as we have come slowly to recognize that the hospital and the physician's office are not the only - nor even the most important - sources of physical health, we need to acknowledge the fundamental fact that most of the prevention of crime takes place outside the courts and prisons.

Based on Currie's analogy, crime problems must be dealt with before they reach the court room. As in the medical field, the causes must be examined before developing solutions.

In the field of crime prevention, there have been some success stories such as the Seattle Neighbourhood Watch Program (Seattle Law And Justice Planning Office, 1975; Cirel et al., 1977) and the

Perry Preschool Project (MacKillop and Clarke, 1989; Berrueta-Clement et al., 1984). However, Rosenbaum's (1988: 340-375) review of the literature suggests that crime prevention initiatives are generally limited in their ability to lower crime. His review examined citizen crime prevention strategies such as target hardening approaches, neighbourhood protection behaviours which include citizen patrols, neighbourhood watch, crime prevention through environmental design and a social problems approach, and finally, community policing.

One promising strategy, which Rosenbaum (1988) did not discuss is tackling the situations that generate crime through municipal inter-agency crime prevention. One model of this approach is the "French Model" which was recently adapted by a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) in Prince George, British Columbia. The City of Prince George implemented the "Community Social Development Board" whose overall objective is "to develop a comprehensive community social development strategy".

For the purpose of this study the term 'crime' will include "street crimes" such as assaults, break and enters, theft, and damage to property. Environmental or white collar crimes are excluded. The term 'prevention' will mean "any activity, by an individual or a group, public or private, that precludes the incidence of one or more criminal acts" (Brantingham and Faust, 1976: 284).

The prevention of crime can focus on opportunity reduction or social development. Opportunity reduction is synonymous with

efforts to remove or reduce the opportunity to commit crimes (Rosenbaum, 1988: 328). Programs include Neighbourhood Watch, Block Parents and target hardening methods such as installing better locks or leaving on lights. A few of these programs have been successful in low-to-moderate crime areas (Rosenbaum, 1988: 380).

Social development focuses on social causes of crime, such as blocked opportunities, lack of proper parenting skills, insufficient affordable housing, and lack of job skills (Canadian Council On Social Development, 1988: 4). Results of social development programs are often not seen for years. The Perry Preschool Program in the United States based on Head Start is the most recognized. The Perry Preschool Project targeted socially disadvantaged children at the age of 3 or 4 years (MacKillop and Clarke, 1989: 5; Berrueta-Clement et al., 1984: 1). At the age of nineteen those who participated in the daycare program were less likely to commit crimes and were more likely to display higher educational achievement and employment (MacKillop and Clarke, 1989: 5; Berrueta-Clement et al., 1984: 1-2).

Opportunity reduction and social development can further be divided into three levels; primary, secondary, and tertiary. These levels are similar to, but not identical to the definitions of the "Public Health Model". For example, Wharf (1989: 43) defines primary prevention as "<attempting> to ensure that problems do not arise"; secondary prevention as "requiring early identification and intervention" with existing problems; and tertiary prevention as "concerned with developing effective programs so that problems do

not reoccur". Brantingham and Faust (1976), however use the following definitions:

Primary crime prevention "identifies conditions of the physical and social environment that provide opportunities for or precipitate criminal acts" (Brantingham and Faust, 1976: 290). This form of prevention looks at society generally rather than focusing on specific problem situations or people. Examples of primary prevention include: showing less violence on television, providing parenting courses in secondary schools, and focusing on the design of a building or city. This latter example is known as Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (for more information refer to Newman, 1972; Brantingham and Brantingham, 1990).

Secondary crime prevention "engages in early identification of potential offenders and seeks to intervene in their lives in such a way that they never commit criminal violation" (Brantingham and Faust, 1976: 290). Some examples of secondary crime prevention are Neighbourhood Watch, Head Start, Big Brothers, Block Watch, and Operation Go Home.

Tertiary crime prevention "deals with actual offenders and involves intervention in their lives in such a fashion that they will not commit further offenses" (Brantingham and Faust, 1976: 290). This includes incapacitation, rehabilitation, and treatment programs.

This study examines the planning and organization of municipal inter-agency crime prevention in Prince George's Community Social Development Board. This Board was examined for two reasons.

First, it is an attempt to tackle the situations that generate crime by bringing together agencies whose policies can affect crime. The Board recognizes that adding more of the same (police, courts, corrections) is not sufficient in lowering the incidence of crime. It also assumes that criminal activity can be explained in part by early childhood experiences.

Second, this Board is the result of initiatives and recommendations from the RCMP detachment in Prince George and was recommended as a model program by RCMP Commanding Officer Donald Wilson.

Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature on municipal inter-agency crime prevention by: (1) Distinguishing occasional offenders who commit one or two crimes in their lifetime from persistent offenders who constitute a small percentage of offenders, but account for a disproportionate percentage of the offenses. (2) Reviewing the social generators of crime since social development, the focus of the Community Social Development Board, examines these factors. (3) Providing an overview of how municipal inter-agency crime prevention can be organized by indicating which organizations should be included in this approach. Recommendations from the United Nations for the organization of local councils are also provided, along with a commentary on challenges within the inter-agency approach. (4) Describing the "French Model" since the Community Social Development Board adopted this approach to crime prevention. (5) Describing the Urban Safety and Crime Prevention Program since it could play a vital future role for municipalities

interested in municipal inter-agency crime prevention. Finally, the role of the police in community policing and preventing crime is discussed.

The third chapter describes the methodology used in this study. This project includes an examination of various documents such as reports, minutes, letters and memorandums; interviews with the ten members of the Community Social Development Board and the one member of the RCMP who initiated the Board (but is no longer a member); and, the observation of one Board meeting on May 1, 1991. Results of the research are then provided.

The fourth chapter examines major issues such as the Board's mandate and objectives, leadership, territoriality, the absence of a facilitator, and the police role in crime prevention and community policing.

Finally, a conclusion is presented.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

ON MUNICIPAL INTER-AGENCY CRIME PREVENTION

This chapter examines the literature on prevention by reviewing the social situations that may generate crime, the organization of municipal inter-agency crime prevention, the "French Model", the Urban Safety and Crime Prevention Program, and the role of the police in preventing crime with a focus on factors that supported initiatives taken by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in Prince George.

Social Situations That Generate Crime

Because the overall objective of the Community Social Development Board (CSDB) is "to develop a comprehensive community social development strategy", literature related to social development needs to be reviewed.

As stated in the definition of social development, the focus is on social causes of crime. Literature on the causes of crime tends to focus on the "persistent" offender, as opposed to the "occasional" offender. Those people who commit one or two delinquent acts in their lifetime, typically during adolescence, are often referred to as occasional or infrequent offenders (Canadian Council On Social Development, 1989: 15). Individuals persistently involved in serious offenses, differ from those not

so involved in many ways (Farrington, 1989: 9; Canadian Council On Social Development, 1989: 15). These differences are considered by some as sources of the causes of crime. Persistent offenders account for approximately 6% of the proportion of offenders, yet commit over 50% of all criminal convictions (Farrington, 1989: 7; Wolfgang et al., 1972: 248).

Although adolescent males are more likely to commit crimes in general (Wooton, 1959 cited in Rutter and Giller, 1983: 161; Cloward and Ohlin, 1960: 33; Farrington, 1989: 7), persistent offenders tend to be less intelligent at school (Farrington, 1989: 8; Hirschi and Hindelang 1977 cited in Rutter and Giller, 1983: 164; Wolfgang et al., 1972: 246); have criminal parents (Farrington, 1989: 9; McCord, 1979 cited in Rutter and Giller, 1983: 180); have inconsistent and uncaring parents (McCord, 1979 cited in Rutter and Giller, 1983: 180; Farrington, 1989: 459; Dishion, 1990: 148-149); are faced with blocked opportunities (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960: 55-56; Robins and Lewis, 1966 cited in Rutter and Giller, 1983: 182), little community support (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960: 173; Currie, 1985: 178; Wilson, 1989: 48-49) and low social class or social-economic status (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960: 33; Wolfgang et al., 1972: 245).

Rutter and Giller (1983: 162) caution that the association between social status and crime to a large extent "is a consequence of the problems that may accompany low status, rather than low social status per se.". Other factors such as unemployment, income, poverty, and drug and/or alcohol use are also cited as causes of

crime within the literature (Wilson, 1983a: 83, Currie, 1985: 111; Canadian Council on Social Development, 1989: 29, 32).

In order to reduce the likelihood of persistent offending, these factors must be dealt with in crime prevention through social development.

The Organization Of Municipal Inter-Agency Crime Prevention

Waller (1989c: 21) states that for social development programs to work effectively, long-term inter-agency cooperation is required. The concept of inter-agency cooperation is not new. Different agencies have been working together to resolve issues for some time, especially in the field of child abuse and spousal violence (Waller, 1989a: 22).

Because the causes of crime are varied and fall into the control of many agencies (e.g, education, employment, and health), it makes sense that the respective agencies work together in trying to alleviate the situations that breed crime. Without inter-agency cooperation, efforts to reduce crime are minimized. As Jensen (1990: 21) states, inter-agency cooperation "comprises the optimal utilization of each other's expertise and professionalism".

The agencies that need to work together include local government, employment, education, social services, housing, health, and representatives from the criminal justice system such as police, judges, and crown prosecutors. Depending on where the committee is set-up, one might want to include a member of a particular ethnic group, such as a native or a black person.

Local governments have an interest in reducing crime for two reasons. The first is because municipalities are responsible for two-thirds of policing costs in Canada (Statistics Canada, 1990 cited in Waller, 1990a: 3). If crime is reduced, then policing costs to the municipalities can be limited.

Second, crime rates affect one's quality of life. This affects economic prosperity in a municipality. If crime rates are low, industries may be more likely to build in a municipality.

Local governments are important players in the fight against crime because they have the power to influence municipal policies.

A representative from Employment and Immigration Canada is beneficial to an inter-agency committee interested in reducing crime because of his/her involvement in job creation initiatives, job preparation, and training and placement for disadvantaged youth (Canadian Council on Social Development, 1989: 13).

Schools, the only institutions that have contact with virtually all children (Canadian Council on Social Development, 1988), can provide special programs for youths with learning disabilities or for those having problems at school as well as social/psychological support. This could affect self-esteem and future employment (Canadian Council on Social Development, 1989: 13).

Social services have a vital role in crime prevention because they provide "a range of personal, social and physical-support services offered to individuals and families ... <they deal mostly> with children and families with emotional and social difficulties"

(Canadian Council on Social Development, 1989: 12).

Some-one responsible for housing is required since subsidized housing is generally directed to those with limited income. Social housing developments tend to be highly concentrated and lacking in services such as daycare and recreational needs (Canadian Council on Social Development, 1989: 12-13).

Those involved in public and community health programs are often involved in the identification of both physical and mental difficulties, the prevention of mental and physical illness and the promotion of health (Canadian Council on Social Development, 1989: 13). Epp (1986: 4, cited in Wharf, 1989: 42) states that the unemployed, welfare recipients, single women supporting children and minorities such as natives and immigrants all have a higher chance of experiencing poor health than others. The children of these families are also more likely to become persistent offenders (based on the generators of crime provided earlier). Health officers also work directly with persons suffering from drug and/or alcohol problems.

It is important that police, crown prosecutors and judges be represented on committees tackling the situations that breed crime. Police confirm through their own personal experiences of making arrests what longitudinal studies have reported (Waller, 1989a: 20). They play a valuable role in sharing their experiences and providing information on the problems that they encounter while on duty (Dewar, 1990: 174).

Crown prosecutors and judges are important members since they

are involved in prosecuting and sentencing. An understanding of the community, its agencies and of the consequences of conviction enables them to make more effective choices when dealing with those in conflict with the law.

Finally, when the proportion of a certain ethnic group is high in a community and/or among those arrested, it is useful to have a representative of this group to help others in understanding the hardships they may face (Weiler, 1989: 2). This would affect the types of programs that are put in place.

The unification of these agencies at the local level would fulfil two of the recommendations made by the United Nations in August 1990 concerning the organization for crime prevention councils (United Nations, 1990: A/CONF.144/L.3). These two recommendations suggest that councils be set up at the local level and that they include the above-mentioned agencies. Other recommendations made at this time include:

- * adopting a long-range approach to crime while still being responsive to immediate needs;
- * governments and other sectors of society facilitate the development of local and national prevention programs;
- * elected officials exert political leadership and assume responsibility to prevent urban crime (United Nations, 1990: A/CONF.144/L.3).

These recommendations, based on The Agenda For Safer Cities, were taken into account in establishing the Community Social Development Board.

One of the challenges faced by inter-agency committees is

territoriality or 'turf protection'. During initial encounters, there is often a lack of trust among people. They are wary of what others really want from their agency. At first this cannot be avoided as members have to learn to trust one another. However, after time has passed it is possible that the feelings of territoriality might be diminished. To a great extent this depends on the members themselves, and on the structure of the committee. One point that cannot be forgotten is that without the cooperation of other agencies, the likelihood of reducing crime effectively is minimized.

The "French Model"

Unlike Canada or the United States, France deals with increasing crime rates by making inter-agency crime prevention a permanent part of national and local methods of coping with crime (Waller, 1989b: 6).

The establishment of a national crime prevention council brings together ministries and private organizations under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister. This council focuses on both crime prevention through opportunity reduction and social development (Waller, 1989b: 6).

Since 1983, over 650 local councils have been set up to respond more effectively to the problems of crime. These local councils consist of locally elected officials, ministries such as social services, housing, education, employment, and justice. The representatives from the ministries are persons with power who are

able to make decisions and/or control resources (Waller, 1989c: 19). They work together to ensure that the root causes of crime are attacked by implementing programs that might have an effect on crime (Waller, 1989c: 19). There is a senior city official who prepares meetings and ensures that decisions are implemented (Waller, 1989b: 13). Other representatives from private organizations and experts are involved in a consultative capacity (Waller, 1989b: 13).

The municipal councils tend to operate by first getting a report on crime in the municipality from the police. This is discussed by the council until some collegial consensus is reached on the extent and nature of the crime problem in the community (Waller, 1989a: 23). The city manager then presents an inventory of all the programs in the community that might have some relevance to the amount of crime (Waller, 1989a: 23). A needs analysis is then completed to identify where changes in present programs or new projects need to be initiated (Waller, 1989a: 23).

The local councils are powerful political structures that use local resources to focus on the root causes of crime. This ensures accountability of community agencies for coping with crime (Waller, 1989c: 18).

Initially <agencies> may not see any close relationship between their programs and crime. However, over time, they usually discover many ways through which they may cooperate with other members of the council to achieve their own departmental objectives as well as to have an impact on crime. This cooperative effort results in joint ownership of the activities. Further, most of these crime prevention activities are achieved through cooperation and realignment of priorities rather than through the infusion of new monies (Waller, 1989b: 15).

The "French Model" corresponds with proposals currently being put forth in Ontario by the consultation paper entitled, Investing In Children (Ministry of Community and Social Services, 1988, cited in Lee, 1989: 9) for community based social planning. This report states that a social planning council must:

- * establish visible and active leadership;
- * convene key sectoral representatives;
- * do an inventory of local resources;
- * compare local resources with ideal range of services;
- * identify gaps, boundary issues and new service issues;
- * develop a plan that identifies priorities; and
- * identify resources to respond to identified priorities (Ministry of Community and Social Services, 1988, cited in Lee, 1989: 9).

This indicates that the strategies utilized in France are also seen to be promising for Canada. One point to remember is that the political structures in France differ from Canada's. As well the Canadian government is not committed to crime prevention as are the French.

The Urban Safety And Crime Prevention Program

Unlike other industrialized countries such as France, England, the Netherlands and each of the Scandinavian countries, Canada does not have a national crime prevention council (House of Commons, 1990: 27:6).

In January 1990, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities adopted the Agenda For Safer Cities and set up the 'Urban Safety

and Crime Prevention Program'. The National Policy adopted in June 1990 states their main objective is to "give municipal leaders the tools to establish comprehensive crime prevention programs to sustain the safety of Canadian communities into the next century" (Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 1990b: 3). Their strategies include (i) the promotion of models for "Safer Cities", (ii) the production of "How To" manuals, (iii) the establishment of a resource and consultation service, (iv) the development of recommendations for national and international action, (v) the promotion of the importance of prevention and, (vi) an evaluation of the program (Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 1990c: ii).

Although the Urban Safety and Crime Prevention Program did not provide these tools to Prince George, it hopes to have them implemented by 1993 for other Canadian municipalities (Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 1990c: 9). By 1999 the program hopes to have achieved significant decreases in levels of crime and improved levels of urban safety with a strategy to sustain such results into the 21st century (Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 1990c: 9). The cost to run this program is 1.2 million dollars for a total of three years (Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 1990c: 19).

In Canada there are only a few municipalities that have set up committees to tackle the situations that breed crime. Examples include; Regina, Halifax, Victoria, Montréal, Ottawa, Surrey, Kelowna, and Prince George. This research examines Prince George's "Community Social Development Board".

The Role Of The Police In Community Policing and Crime Prevention:

Since this Board was initiated by an RCMP officer it is also important to understand some of the trends in policing that might have influenced RCMP Inspector Harrower in initiating the Community Social Development Board.

The notion that "... the police are the public and the public are the police; the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full-time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen, in the interests of community welfare and existence" (Sir Robert Peel's Principles of Policing cited in Normandeau and Leighton, 1990: 140) is according to RCMP Commissioner Inkster (1990: 250) the essence of community policing today.

Community policing, which is a new approach in many progressive urban police forces, is a term that varies both within the literature and between police forces.

Although the RCMP do not have one standard definition of community policing, the Operational Manual for British Columbia defines community policing as follows:

Community Policing - a style of policing that incorporates crime prevention, control and response strategies. It is directed toward identified crime/policing problems and involves citizen/community participation, whenever/wherever possible. This policing style is sensitized to the needs of the individual community, and ultimately places an increased responsibility on our personnel to work together with the community to control/reduce crime (RCMP, 1991b: "E"-130).

The definition of community policing has two major tenets: problem solving and citizen involvement (Interview with Brown cited

in Webber, 1991: 117).

The citizen involvement aspect, often termed "partnership", acknowledges that the police cannot solve crimes alone and must share power (RCMP 1990b: 4; Koller, 1990: 2; Wilson, 1990: 87; Inkster, 1990: 254; Stephens, 1990: 227). In developing partnerships police should involve those affected by the problems in order to generate solutions designed to resolve them and to lower crime levels. Examples of how some police departments are trying to respond to a particular community's needs include mini-stations (see Liaison, 1989; Brewin, 1989) and problem-oriented policing which emphasizes the analysis of a group of similar incidents and the derivation of solutions that draw upon a wide variety of public and private resources (see Murphy and Muir, 1985: 212-221; Spelman and Eck, 1987: 1; Goldstein, 1990).

Problem oriented police take the initiative in working with other agencies on community problems when those problems touch on police responsibilities. This allows for a more efficient use of a department's resources (Spelman and Eck, 1987: 2; Interview with Brown cited in Webber, 1990: 117). This type of policing includes inter-agency cooperation.

The need to emphasize more flexible and community-specific policing policies has increasingly been recognized by large centralized police organizations like the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. In 1990, the Solicitor General of Canada (Normandeau and Leighton, 1990: 43-46) recommended that community policing include:

1. A problem-oriented policing strategy developed to address crime and its underlying causes.

2. Broader police responses to underlying causes of problems, particularly crime prevention activities.
3. The recognition of inter-agency cooperation.
4. The exchange of information on a reciprocal basis with community members.
5. The provision of accountability to the community.

The RCMP recognize that the community can no longer be regarded as a passive recipient of police services (RCMP, 1990a: 1).

Reduced resources and a more aware, activist and culturally diverse public, among other things, are leading police forces to examine the types of services they are providing, and to reorganize their delivery of those services (RCMP, 1990a: 1)

The Commissioner's Directional Statement in 1990, stated that the RCMP must relinquish their role as conservators of the status quo in order to "operate on the leading edge of social change in a proactive, problem-solving way ... the key to this new role is partnership with others" (RCMP, 1990b: 4). He continues by saying that through community policing, the RCMP must join with other agencies in order to make the most of their collective resources, expertise and vision for the future (RCMP, 1990b: 4).

This 'new' philosophy within the RCMP supports the visions held by the initiator of the Community Social Development Board for reducing crime and limiting the cost of policing for municipalities and Canada as a whole.

Summary

This chapter reviews the literature on municipal inter-agency crime prevention by examining the social situations that generate crime - the factors targeted by crime prevention through social development. It also examines the organization of municipal inter-agency crime prevention which explains who should ideally be part of a municipal inter-agency crime prevention council and the challenges within this approach. The "French Model" is described since the Prince George Community Social Development Board adopted this approach. In addition, the role of the Urban Safety and Crime Prevention Program is addressed since their objective is to give municipal leaders the tools to establish comprehensive crime prevention programs. Finally, the role of the police in community policing and crime prevention is reviewed since the Board was initiated by an RCMP officer. The "new" philosophy of policing encourages problem solving and citizen involvement which were both utilized in the development of the Community Social Development Board.

CHAPTER 3

THE STUDY OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COMMUNITY SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD

This chapter describes the methodology utilized in this study. It then describes the city of Prince George by stating its location, describing its demographic breakdown and crime trends. The history of the development of the Board is given chronologically, and results of the interviews are discussed.

Methodology

Three methods were used to examine the Community Social Development Board as an example of municipal inter-agency crime prevention: examining documents, conducting interviews and participant observation.

1. Documents:

The documents examined include the minutes from all the twelve meetings held between June 25, 1990 (the inaugural meeting) until May 1, 1991, and the minutes from City Council for March 5, 1990 since this was the date when the Community Social Development Board was approved. These minutes, unfortunately, provided very little information. Other documents such as memorandums, letters, and reports relevant to the Board were also examined to explain its evolution and how it differs from others across Canada. These

documents were provided by the City Of Prince George and The Canadian Council On Social Development (CCSD). The CCSD had contact with the City of Prince George in the development of the Board and had kept relevant correspondence and reports.

2. Interviews:

Eleven people were formally interviewed using the set of questions provided in Appendix I. Ten of these people are presently participants of the Community Social Development Board and were interviewed in Prince George. The other person is an RCMP member who initiated the development of the Board. He was interviewed in Vancouver. His input was important since he played a major role in establishing the Board.

All but two of the interviews were held in the offices of the individuals. One was held in the conference room of the person's workplace and the other was held in the conference room at City Hall.

Nine of the eleven interviews were taped and then transcribed. The other two interviews required note-taking since there were malfunctions with the tape recorder.

Prior to the interviews, a letter was facsimiled to David McDonald, the Director of Development Services, City of Prince George, from my thesis director of the University of Ottawa, Criminology Department, Irvin Waller, requesting interviews in Prince George with Board participants (Appendix II). Copies of this letter were enclosed with material provided to each member of the

Community Social Development Board before a meeting on March 13, 1991. At this meeting, David McDonald announced the intent of the research and asked whether members would be available for interviews the week of April 22, 1991. Many of the members were unavailable during this week but were all available the week of April 29 to May 3, 1991. Thus, interviews were scheduled by telephone the first two weeks of April and were conducted between April 29 and May 3, 1991 in Prince George. The interview in Vancouver was held May 7, 1991.

Interviews varied from 45 minutes to two hours. Questions were prepared beforehand and were fashioned in an open-ended manner (refer to Appendix I). Questions for the RCMP members in Prince George and Vancouver varied somewhat from the other interviews. This was due to their role on the board and in the community. Confidentiality of the interviews was assured in the letter requesting the participation of Board members.

In addition to these interviews, several discussions were held with Richard Weiler, Director of the Canadian Council on Social Development, and with three members of the Crime Prevention/Victims' Services Branch of RCMP headquarters.

Participation at the International Crime Prevention Conference in October 1990, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Oriented Workshop Management Program in May 1991, and the second meeting of the Advisory Forum To The Urban Safety And Crime Prevention Program - June 1991 also benefitted the research by providing insight into the issues of crime prevention.

3. Participant Observation:

On May 1, 1991 a meeting of the Community Social Development Board was attended. The intent was to observe the relationship between the Board members, and the manner in which the meetings were conducted. The meeting was held from 7 - 8:30 pm in a conference room on the second floor of City Hall.

The meetings held by the Community Social Development Board are closed to the public in order to encourage members to talk freely about sensitive issues that might otherwise be scrutinized by the media. However, access was provided since attendance was part of the research design.

Although only one meeting was attended, it did provide an idea of how members get along and the function of group dynamics in the Board. Six persons interviewed after this meeting had told me that the meeting was fairly typical of other meetings except that one member was unusually quiet. Whether this person was quiet due to my presence is unknown.

Prince George: Description Of The City

1. Location:

Prince George is located 779 kilometres north of Vancouver and 90 kilometres from the geographic centre of British Columbia. The city is situated at the junction of two major highways - one running east/west and the other north/south - as well as the British Columbia Railway and the Canadian National Railway (British

Columbia Ministry of Municipal Affairs, Recreation and Culture, 1990). It is the major distribution point for northern and central British Columbia, and the western United States (British Columbia Ministry of Municipal Affairs, Recreation and Culture, 1990).

This community is transient; many people stay in Prince George for short periods of time, especially during the summer. Beginning in May, many young people come to plant trees around Prince George (Interview with David McDonald). They work outside the city from Monday to Friday and return to the city on weekends. The consequence is that on Friday and Saturday nights the bars in the downtown core are full, causing several problems at closing time. Many assaults occur, as well as damage to vehicles, thefts, and break and enters (Interview with David McDonald).

2. Demographic Breakdown:

As Table 1 illustrates, Prince George is typical of British Columbia in terms of mobility, education, and number of lone parent families. Prince George has a much younger population than British Columbia and fewer people receiving government transfer payments as a major source of income. However, the unemployment rates in Prince George are higher than for British Columbia.

One explanation for this higher unemployment rate and lower dependence on government transfer payments could be derived from the unstable nature of the forest industry which is the economic base of Prince George (British Columbia Ministry of Municipal Affairs, Recreation and Culture, 1990). The forest sector employs

the largest percentage of the labour force - about 18 percent (British Columbia Ministry of Municipal Affairs, Recreation and Culture, 1990). Other major industries in Prince George include mining, manufacturing, petroleum and chemical products (British Columbia Ministry of Municipal Affairs, Recreation and Culture, 1990).

3. Crime Trends:

Each detachment in the RCMP keeps statistics on the number of offenses that have occurred. The most common offenses in Prince George include assaults, break and enters, thefts, property damage, and alcohol related offenses (Royal Canadian Mounted Police Operational Statistics, 1987-1990).

As Table 2 indicates, the rate of crime in Prince George is generally higher than for British Columbia as a whole. According to a few police officers from Prince George, crime patterns change as the night progresses. When bars close, the major problem is assaults. Shortly afterwards the problems are related to theft from motor vehicles or property damage, and at around 4 or 5 AM, the problem switches to Break and Enters. Most of these crimes are believed to be a consequence of alcohol. Although the information in Table 2 is not crossed by time of day, it does show that these crimes are high compared to those of British Columbia.

Police officers in Prince George also state that crimes change based on the season or day of the week. According to these police

Table 1

Selected Demographic Variables For The City of Prince George and
The Province of British Columbia

Variables	Prince George (rate per 1000)*	British Columbia (rate per 1000)**
Population <15 yrs	266	105
Males 15-24 yrs	89.5	77
Females 15-24 yrs	89.5	75
Population 15-24 yrs	179	152
Population 15+ Receiving Government Transfer Payments As Major Source Of Income	88	117
Population 15+ With Less Than Grade 9 Education	84.5	89
Unemployment Rate 15-24 yrs	245	200
Unemployment Rate 25+ yrs	144	114
Person 5+ yrs Who Moved In Past Five Years	452	452
Total Lone Parent Families	38	33.5

Source: Statistics Canada. (1986). Census of Population Canada
Profile Series - Part I (pages 1-5), and Part II (pages 1-9).

* Based on 1986 population of Prince George (67,621)

** Based on 1986 population of British Columbia (2,883,367).

Table 2

Actual Offenses Reported To The Police For Prince George And For
British Columbia By Type Of Offence And Year

Type Of Offence	Prince George		British Columbia	
	Year		Year	
	1988 (rate per 1000)	1989 (rate per 1000)	1988 (rate per 1000)	1989 (rate per 1000)
Total Assaults	17	19	12	12
B&E Residence	16	14	-	10
Other B&E	10	8	-	8
Total Break & Enters	26	22	19	18
Auto Theft	3	3	-	3
Other Motor Vehicle	5	4	-	2
Total Motor Vehicle Theft	8	7	4	5
Theft From Motor Vehicle	43	40	-	24
Other Theft	45	40	-	27
Total Theft	88	80	53	51
Property Damage <1000	47	30	-	26
Intoxicated Persons Detained	32	38	-	-
Liquor Act	13	12	-	7
Impaired Operation Of A Motor Vehicle	7	9	-	-

(Source: Royal Canadian Mounted Police Operational Statistics Reporting System, 1988-1989; Statistics Canada, Centre For Justice Statistics. Canadian Crime Statistics: 1988 (Table 2, pages 27-28), Canadian Crime Statistics: 1989 (Table 2, pages 81-88).

"-": numbers not available

officers, most of the offenses in Table 2 occur in the downtown core, where there are no residential homes.

The Community Social Development Board

The Community Social Development Board consists of ten members from the community, each holding senior positions within one of the agencies which have the capacity to tackle situations that breed crime in Prince George. The agencies represented include:

- * The City of Prince George (Mayor, and Director of Development Services);
- * Employment and Immigration Canada (Manager, Canadian Job Strategies Operations);
- * Northern Interior Health Unit (Manager);
- * Indian Friendship Centres (Director);
- * The Regional Crown Prosecutor;
- * RCMP (Superintendent);
- * School District #57 (Superintendent);
- * Ministry of Social Services and Housing (Manager); and
- * Provincial Court Judge.

All members have "alternates" available to attend meeting in their place to ensure continuity of participation in the Board's activities.

The chairman of the Board is a political figure, the Mayor of Prince George. Through his position he was able to attract others to the board and affect the commitment of the members. The City of Prince George provides funding for the Board.

The intent of the Community Social Development Board is to

focus mainly on social development using a problem-solving approach (Appendix III). The Board hopes to act as a coordinator of local resources and mobilize the community to do necessary research or work (Backhouse, 1990: 4). The Terms of Reference and Short-Term Action Plan of the Community Social Development Board are provided in Appendix III and IV.

This Board is similar to the "French model" since its members hold senior positions, the crown prosecutor and judge are present, it is chaired by the mayor, and it focuses on social development. It differs from the "French Model" because the sphere of influence of mayors in Canada differs from those in France due to the different political structures.

Between June 25, 1990 and May 1, 1991 inclusive, the Board met twelve times. Meetings last from one and a half hours to three hours. At first the Board met every two weeks but due to scheduling problems, meetings now tend to be every six weeks. Originally the meetings were held during working hours but this has changed to Wednesday evenings at 7 p.m. in order to better accommodate the members.

This Board was initiated by a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police detachment in Prince George.

Analysis Of The History And Development Of The Community Social Development Board

This section provides a chronological review of the development of the Community Social Development Board. The

information for this section comes from documents and interviews.

1. Inception Of The Community Social Development Board:

In 1987, RCMP Inspector Harrower was transferred to Prince George. He recognized that there were inadequate police resources to handle the crime problem in Prince George. Response-type police operations were not seen as effective in slowing the crime increases and in dealing with problems faced by both the community and the police (Interview with Harrower, 1991). There was also a need for both the City and police to affect crime occurrences and to have some input into prevention operations (Interview with Harrower, 1991).

In January 1989, the RCMP Deputy Commissioner of Operations, sent a memorandum to all divisions across Canada formalizing the concept of community policing (Jensen, 1989). Although this project was underway before the memorandum was distributed, the memorandum provided support for the development of the CSDB by encouraging community policing efforts (Interview). The present RCMP member of the Board states, "I see this Board as part of community policing because we are trying to get down to the street level, to the grass root problems which ultimately will involve the community" (Interview, 1991).

In February and March of 1989, negotiations between the Prince George Police Liaison Committee, which consisted of three members (Inspector Harrower, David McDonald, and another RCMP officer from the crime prevention unit of the Prince George detachment), and the

Mayor began concerning the establishment of a group involving the police and community members.

One letter from the RCMP to the mayor states,

" It has become painfully obvious that no amount of improved efficiency by the police or in the courts can solve our community crime problems. We believe that in order to improve the quality of life within our City, particularly as it relates to citizen perceptions, and to slow the increasing costs of police services, we should adopt a multi-faceted crime prevention approach. The establishment of an all powerful co-ordinating group, headed by Your Worship, is a first step" (Harrower, 1989: 1).

In March 1989 work began on several reports authorized by the Prince George City Council. These reports included, "The Mayor's Task Force on Downtown Concerns", "The Mayor's Committee on Youth", and "The City Centre Concept Committee". In addition, the RCMP had been working on the concept of Community Based Policing.

In July of 1989, the RCMP detachment in Prince George received a memorandum from RCMP Deputy Commissioner of British Columbia, Donald Wilson, in response to the directive dated 89.01.25 formalizing community policing. This memorandum (Wilson, 1989: 2) encouraged the establishment of new committees to address policing concerns, thus supporting the steps taken in Prince George.

In October 1989, the Mayor of Prince George attended the "European and North-American Conference on Urban Safety and Crime Prevention" in Montreal where he met Irvin Waller, Professor of Criminology at the University of Ottawa, and Richard Weiler, Director of The Canadian Council On Social Development (Community Social Development Board, Minutes from June 25, 1990).

He spoke with them about issues concerning Prince George and believed that his community could benefit considerably from the philosophy and approach to crime prevention and social development discussed at that time. After the conference, Richard Weiler wrote to the Mayor, re-affirming suggestions made to him at the conference in regards to the role of the Board (i.e., developing comprehensive crime prevention strategies), and membership (representatives from social planning groups, district social and community services offices, public health, education, social housing, police, and given the extensive native population, the Director of the Native Friendship centre [Weiler, 1989]).

The four reports initiated in March 1989 were completed in November 1989. They all reflected a common theme - that there was a need for coordination of and communication amongst the agencies involved in the social development of the community (Prince George Police Liaison Committee, 1990: 2). As a result, the Police Liaison Committee felt that a need existed for the "coordination of and communication amongst the agencies involved in the social development of our community" (Prince George Police Liaison Committee, 1990: 2).

David McDonald states that "It was considered by the police ... that some kind of a coordinative agency effort should be mounted that could bear the name of something akin to community policing" (Interview, 1991). The name "Community Social Development Board" was chosen since "it sounded like it had a little bit of everything for everybody in it. It sounded relatively neutral and

broad-based" (Interview with McDonald, 1991).

Although the RCMP took the initiative in establishing this Board, "they wanted to maintain an arms length - at least visibly. They did not want to be seen as too close or have the experiment obviously driven by the police. They wanted to be on board but they did not want to be seen as driving it" (Interview with McDonald, 1991). Harrower states,

if the Board were seen to be RCMP initiated, crime prevention would be seen to be the issue when in fact it is only one issue. The Board must go beyond this. Police problems tend to be the main concern because everything becomes a police issue in the end ... (Interview, 1991).

The Police Liaison Committee sent a proposal to City Council in March 1990, advocating the establishment of a Community Social Development Board, responsible primarily to the City "to develop both short-term and long-term strategies directed at crime prevention, with a principal focus on social development issues and opportunities" (Prince George Police Liaison Committee, 1990: 1). The proposal stated,

In order to build a solid, cooperative environment, two key ingredients are necessary. First, the Board should be given an extremely high profile through the appointment of His Worship Mayor John Backhouse as its Chairman. Second, all of the members should have the ability, as much as possible, to influence the agency which they represent to the course of action determined by the Board as being in the best interest of our community. The members should thus have the authority and mandate to recommend the development or redirection of programs within the organization that they represent (Prince George Police Liaison Committee, 1990: 4).

The Police Liaison Committee felt that a partnership with local government, the Police, community organizations, and social services, could "have an impact on the social development of the community and reduce the rates of urban crime and violence while improving the social climate and livability of the city" (Prince George Police Liaison Committee, 1990: 2).

The Police Liaison Committee felt that crime and violence were related to facets of community life such as inadequate housing, education and job training, care facilities for the disadvantaged, chronic high unemployment, family violence and drug and alcohol abuse (Prince George Police Liaison Committee, 1990: 2). The issue of whether drug and alcohol use was a cause or effect was not raised by the committee.

The committee thought if a Board which included agencies with the mandate and authority to address the above-mentioned issues were formed, a degree of community coordination could be achieved (Prince George Police Liaison Committee, 1990: 2).

Three recommendations were provided by the Police Liaison Committee to City Council. They were:

1. THAT a Community Social Development Board be established in accordance with this report, with a primary role to develop strategies for social development which will lead to more effective crime prevention in our community over the long term. The Board:

- (a) will focus on assessing the community's overall needs in dealing with existing or potential social and related problems;

- (b) will be involved in developing comprehensive program strategies, including law enforcement, crime prevention, social development and behaviour modification programs, suited to the community

profile and nature of specific social and related problems; and

(c) will attempt to develop comprehensive strategies which call on the response of those organizations represented on the Board, others in the community and the community citizenry, seeking to encourage and support collaborative, cooperative inter-agency planning and action.

2. THAT the City make provision in its 1990 Annual Operating Budget for necessary start-up staffing costs, to include a half-time secretarial position and a full-time executive director beginning September 1, 1990, the decision to hire to be deferred pending establishment of the Board and its specific terms of reference and a report back to Council by the Board with recommendations.

3. THAT the proposed actions to reinforce the Board's mandate as set out in this report be approved AND THAT the Administration be directed to advise the newly constituted Board and existing Committees accordingly (Prince George Police Liaison Committee, 1990: 1).

This proposal was accepted by City Council on March 5, 1990 at which point the mayor "took it and ran with it as an individual project" (Interview with Backhouse, 1991). Up until this point, the initiative for developing the Community Social Development Board was the result of the Police Liaison Committee and a few very committed members of the RCMP detachment in Prince George. They had done the groundwork and now it was up to the Mayor to get the Board implemented. The Police Liaison Committee stepped back and let the Mayor take control which ended the police role in developing the Board.

This was the intention of the Police Liaison Committee since they did not want the Board to be perceived by the community as police driven. "If it was to be truly community based, <the RCMP>

would have to be an equal among many, not necessarily the driving force" (Interview with McDonald, 1991).

2. Organizing The Community Social Development Board:

Between March and June 1990, the Mayor contacted various agencies and individuals requesting that they represent their agency on the Board (Interview with McDonald, 1991).

The mayor was considered to be the best person, as the prospective chairman of the Board to go and make the initial contacts ... anybody less than the Mayor was not seen to be effective in enticing the people to commit of their time, especially busy people. The object was to get the chief executive officers or people of that level ... (Interview with McDonald, 1991).

The process of contacting prospective members consisted of the mayor visiting every individual. Nobody came to City Hall (Interview with Backhouse, 1991). The mayor provided them with documentation and a rough draft of the Terms Of Reference. The Mayor,

explained it to them in a very superficial way. It was not intended to be superficial but in retrospect it was superficial. It was very difficult to explain in detail what we were going to do because in many ways I did not quite know what we were going to do. I used my office and power of persuasion ... (Interview with Backhouse, 1991).

After the meetings with prospective members, letters were sent out thanking them for meeting with the Mayor. One of the controlling factors in this exercise was not to have a Board that was too large (Interview with McDonald, 1991).

In April 1990, Weiler wrote a letter to George Paul, the city manager of Prince George, with the following recommendations:

1. THAT members have an appreciation of the international and national trends towards developing such community-based coordinated efforts, e.g., The French Model. It is also important to stress the increasing emphasis countries are placing on "Crime Prevention Through Social Development" efforts in developing effective crime prevention activity.

2. THAT the initial meeting of the Board allow people to share its history, discuss its potential value/impact on the community, and ensure that members are comfortable with the mandate and proposed action plan for the first six months, etc.

3. THAT the initial meeting include an outside speaker to give some perspective to the Board concept which includes a general discussion on: responsibilities and roles of the Board as a group and individual responsibilities/accountability; accountability to, and relationship with other related organizations, e.g., city council committees, school boards, etc., and accountability to and involvement with the community.

Consideration of an initial action agenda should ensue. The items should be "do-able" and should require inter-organizational coordination and collaboration, especially among many of the Board members. They should be matters which the community has noted as priority concerns (e.g., the development of "downtown" or youth-based programs for "street kids").

Discussions on selecting an executive director should be made and it should be noted that public relations should not be made until after the Board has established itself (Weiler, 1990: 1-2).

The first meeting of the Community Social Development Board was held June 25, 1990 based on the above recommendations from Richard Weiler.

3. Implementation Of The Community Social Development Board:

During the past year of the Board's existence, it has executed the Terms of Reference (Appendix III) and the Short-Term Action Plan (Appendix IV); it reviewed recommendations from the Task Forces' reports from 1989 and it has recently established a Short-Term Work Program (Appendix V) which consists of two projects - a crime profile and an assessment of community services - identified in December 1990 during a facilitation session with Anne Jeffrey & Associates. During the year, the Board also invited a few guest speakers to discuss topics of concern to the members (i.e., investing in youth, and the absence of a mental health care officer in Prince George [minutes of the Community Social Development Board, August 15, 1991 and October 25, 1991 respectively]).

Results Of The Interviews

1. The Perceived Role Of The Agencies:

The perceived role of each member's agency in the Board varied. Some were very clear in their ability to tackle the situations that generate crime, whereas others were less clear. Members tended to know the general causes of crime described in chapter 2, but some did not know what their agency could do specifically to tackle some of the crime problems. These members did not understand that problems within their agency have an effect on others. In all fairness to the agencies, the goals and objectives of the Board were general, making it difficult to know

exactly what role to play.

The Mayor saw himself as the political representative and chairman. He understood that through the power of his office and his persuasion he could attract agencies/members to give their time to "making Prince George a better place to live" (Interview, 1991). What specifically needs to be done to make Prince George a better place to live was not clear.

The Director of Development Services is responsible for the social planning budget, hence his involvement in the Board (Interview, 1991). If a social planning officer were part of the city's administration, s/he would have been a more suitable candidate (Interview, 1991).

The Director of the Native Friendship Centre is a member because it is estimated that 10% of Prince George is of native ancestry (Interview, 1991). "The mayor felt we constituted a sizable portion of the population and therefore we should be represented on the Community Social Development Board". The Director explained the native situation as follows,

when you are talking about community policing and getting at the root of the problem rather than incarcerating people, we are unfortunately talking about mostly native people because we are the highest people in poverty, rate of suicide, lowest educated and so on. In the public's eye we are a lot of the problem in the downtown core ... the only way to combat that problem is to work cooperatively with the community, hence my involvement in the Board (Interview, 1991).

The Crown Counsel Office had a very clear understanding of its role. They are,

an organization that potentially has a very large

impact upon the criminal justice system, crime management and crime matters ... it was important that we have a voice both for input and to gain input from others on the Board. To a large extent for the benefit of the community (Interview, 1991).

The judge felt that his role differed from others since he was not in a position to control financial resources (Interview, 1991). His role was to provide input (Interview, 1991). He made no indication that he or his agency could gain from the input of others. Other members felt that having a judge as a member of the Board was very significant since s/he could learn much about the community (Interviews, 1991). Having judges understand the problems within a community is desired by many agencies (refer to Waller, 1989a: 22).

The RCMP representative stated that "we are dealing with some very complex, social, psychological problems", and that "traditionally, the police chief's role on the Board is to bring crime statistics and say 'here are the problems - what are we going to do about them?'" (Interview, 1991).

The connection between Employment and Immigration and the Board was straight forward: "Employment is a very critical part of any community in terms of their social development and planning" (Interview, 1991).

The Ministry of Social Services and Housing is responsible for welfare, persons with mental handicaps, and family and children services, particularly protective services. Although not said directly in the interview, the Ministry of Social Services and Housing can play a major role in parenting and family services.

Children in protective services would be prime targets for targeted social development programs for reducing persistent offending.

"The school faces the effects of crime and some of the social factors that lead up to crime and build to it" (Interview, 1991). The school recognizes that "it will be cheaper to provide services for parents and children than one year in jail for any of those kids. Economically, it makes sense ..." (Interview, 1991).

The health unit recognizes the connection between those in trouble with the police, those from disadvantaged homes and those who overdose on drugs or alcohol, but their exact role was unclear. This could be due to the fact that this representative has retired from the health unit but is still on the Board until a replacement is found for her, or because she has a secondary role of informing this Board about the Healthy Communities Committee of which she is also a member.

2. Understanding Of The Board And Its Ability To Tackle Crime:

Many members did not know how or why the Board was established. They knew the aim of the Board was to make Prince George a better place but how this was going to be accomplished was not clear. This lack of understanding lowered the credibility of the Board and diminished its sense of purpose (Interviews, 1991). This could be due to the fact that not all members read the material, that the Terms of Reference and Short-Term Action Plan were not clear, or because members were not fully briefed before joining the Board. The Mayor states that if he were to start the

Board over again, he "would have spent a little more time in preparing the individual members who I invited. I ... overestimated the individuals' understanding" (Interview, 1991).

Two members had an understanding of the term "social development" based on prior experiences in this domain (Interviews, 1991). Others did not know specifically what was meant by "social development" (Interviews, 1991) which could explain a lack of understanding of the Boards overall objective which is "to develop a comprehensive community social development strategy" (Appendix III). One half of the Board members did not have a vision of how the Board could tackle situations that generate crime (Interviews, 1991).

3. Obstacles Faced By The Board And Their Effects:

All members of the Board stated that the major obstacle was its slow progress. Others reported the inability to hire a full-time executive director, a lack of confidence in front of "outsiders", being unsure of how to address certain individuals, and finally, that both the Mayor's secretary, and the Director of Development Services, were 'obligated' to do a lot of work.

In November 1990 the Board made an attempt to hire both a full-time executive director and a part-time secretary for a three year contract through the City of Prince George.

The process to hire the executive director demonstrated reluctance on the part of the Board to make a decision. Three persons were selected to be interviewed (based on criteria in

Appendix VI) by the Director of Development Services and by the Director of Human Resources, City of Prince George. After being interviewed by these two people they were later interviewed by the members of the Board. They were rated based on open ended questions to which candidates had a half hour to prepare answers. These questions covered areas such as education/experience of the candidate, knowledge/abilities, and personal suitability (Community Social Development Board, 1990).

When this process was completed, the Board could not agree on one suitable candidate. One member states that "there was a certain measure of anxiety about 'come on let's make a decision'" (Interview, 1991). Another member felt that after the interviews, the Board was discouraged because when questions were posed about the Board, members would be uncertain on how to answer (Interview, 1991). It made members feel unsure of the Board's direction. As a result of these interviews, a facilitation exercise with Anne Jeffrey & Associates was scheduled for December in order to try give some direction to the Board (Interview, 1991).

Until the Anne Jeffrey session in December 1990, the Board had difficulties in setting goals and objectives (Interview, 1991). Members felt as if they were not going anywhere (Interview, 1991). One member states,

there was some obligation to keep coming because the mayor had come up here and asked each of us personally to be a member. We have stayed longer than we would ordinarily stay. <Because of the Anne Jeffrey session> people are willing to stay for quite some time (Interview, 1991).

As a result of the Anne Jeffrey session, the Board has decided to obtain a crime profile of Prince George, and an inventory and assessment of agencies related to crime prevention/social development in the city (Appendix V). Once these projects are completed the Board will have to decide where to go from there.

All members agreed that the process to get to the above-mentioned projects was very slow. One member said, "the whole process was very slow and in fact very painful - painful in that we kept questioning ourselves: do we know where we are going? Are we going to achieve anything? Are we wasting our time?" (Interview, 1991). This caused much frustration for those who would have liked the Board to have moved a little quicker.

The lack of focus and momentum affected the level of confidence in the Board and might have contributed to the hesitancy in hiring an executive director. A lack of confidence was expressed as a weakness of the Board by a few members, and was observed at the meeting held May 1, 1991. At the meeting an outside agency was invited to discuss the possibility of doing the crime profile project (Appendix V). This 'agency' was not well organized or focused since he started talking about doing crime profiles for other cities across Canada, and discussing how this could lead to interesting results. All the Board wanted was a crime profile on Prince George. He did not focus on the objectives of the project. As one member stated afterwards, "I am not so sure that the conversation at the meeting went as profitably as I would have liked. I would have liked a better focus. Our proposal for the

project is clearer to me than the discussion left me with" (Interview, 1991).

Only one member of the Board spoke up in an attempt to 're-focus' the guest and explain the expectations of the Board. Other members knew what they wanted but did not express their views. This could be because they do not want to "take control" or because the Mayor selected this person and they did not want to challenge his decision to "hire" him.

During the interviews, one person mentioned some members were unsure how to address the Mayor and/or the judge. This could be simply resolved if one agency spoke up and asked how they should be addressed. However, nobody has done this.

4. Benefits Of The Community Social Development Board:

Most members stated the slow progression of the Board showed a high level of commitment in the individual players since nobody quit the Board. It also gave members a chance to learn to trust each other which allowed barriers to be broken (Interviews, 1991).

Many indirect benefits have resulted from the Board. These include: networking of the agencies, avoiding 'red tape' and possible territoriality conflicts, as well as the union of two agencies to jointly work on a program for single mothers. The closing of two bars has had an effect on police resources. However, this was not a result of Board initiatives. This section recounts how members have described these benefits.

The major difference that the Board has made to date is in

relation to the networking of the agencies. One member said,

the benefit to me, in my position, is just in terms of the networking with the people on that Board ... in the establishment of programs that we are doing here I have resource people that I can contact in the community ... it has been advantageous in that respect (Interview, 1991).

Another member states,

the Board has broadened my personal perspective on the element of crime on the social problems of the downtown area. As a consequence it has enlightened my staff on social problems that exist (Interview, 1991).

The Board has also been a useful forum for reducing territoriality and getting to know each other (Interview, 1991). Because of the Board, members can discuss matters informally without going through the 'bureaucratic red tape'. For example, one member stated that he "had heard something that impacts a piece of a program that we run.... Rather than go through an official thing <we were able to discuss it after a Board meeting> in a very low key way, without it ever becoming a big issue. It was completely dealt with to mine and his satisfaction. That is really important" (Interview, 1991).

A third benefit of the Board is that two agencies have got together to work on an initiative targeted to "single women parents who do not have grade twelve ..." (Interview, 1991). One member was describing the program to Board members when another agency stated that the program was of interest to his ministry as well. The agencies met at a later date and are now jointly doing the project. This has avoided a duplication of programs and has saved costs for the community.

As for the crime rate in Prince George, the RCMP Superintendent stated that the closure of two drinking spots in the downtown core has "lessened some of the policing problems we faced down there" (Interview, 1991). This however is a result of the 'Downtown Revitalization Project', not the Community Social Development Board (Interview, 1991).

All members felt that 'visible' effects of the Board, such as a reduction in crime rates, would not be seen until ten or fifteen years down the road (Interviews, 1991). The issue of how these reductions are going to be measured has not been discussed within the Board (Interview, 1991). One member stated that this could not be determined until the Board knew exactly what were the crime problems - they would know the answer to this after the crime profile was completed (Interview, 1991).

5. Future Goals Of The Board:

In August or September 1991, the Board will once again attempt to hire a full-time executive director and part-time secretary.

The two projects that resulted from the Anne Jeffrey session will, once completed, allow Board members to say "hey, we did accomplish something" and will be the foundation for whatever direction the Board decides to take (Interview, 1991). Members expect that eventually the Board will be a "governing body with different working committees" that will "make recommendations to city council" (Interviews, 1991).

As for the effects of the Board, it was thought that,

results will not be seen for at least ten years ...
 When you start trying to develop programs aimed at the
 alcoholic, at the low-income people ... you are not
 going to see results until way down the road
 (Interview, 1991).

Other members of the Board felt there would be a more effective use of police resources and that the Board would have "a direct and immediate effect on the RCMP, and consequently an economic effect for the city and the Ministry of Social Services and Housing" (Interviews, 1991). Most members felt that "there is never going to be any direct link to the Board as the only operative factor on the result. It may have been a factor, but not a sole factor, or sole generator of improvement" (Interview, 1991).

6. The Community Social Development Board's Uniqueness:

Two of the ten members felt that the Community Social Development Board was very similar to the 'Healthy Communities Committee' since they both focused on broad issues such as the quality of life. Most of the other boards/committees in which members participated had a very specific issue to focus upon.

This Board is unique in that its membership consists of "the top people from important ministries in Prince George" that have an influence over the circumstances that generate crime (Interview, 1991). One member describes the Board as follows,

to some extent, they say that knowledge is power,
 but control of resources is power too. The Board
 in terms of dollars and resources - human, capital
 and buildings - controls a big smack of all those
 kinds of resources in this community. That allows
 for a big impact ... (Interview, 1991).

7. Needs Of The Community Social Development Board:

One member of the Board summarized the needs as follows,

- they need the basic research;
- they need their short-term work program fine-lined;
- they need some staff to give them some help;
- they need to determine precisely what it is they want to do;
- they need to go public with it and be convincing to the public in terms of what they want to do;
- they need to maintain a certain amount of momentum for at least the time frame of which they want to have a director on board which is about a three year period; and ...
- the police need to find a more effective means of focusing on crime prevention instead of enforcement themselves. They have to put their money where their mouth is (Interview, 1991).

In addition the Board needs to set dated objectives: it needs to set objectives for one year from now, five years, ten years and so on. This will involve selecting indicators such as reductions of certain crimes, economic growth and/or the average level of educational attainment of residents. One question that should be posed is "who will pay for this?".

Commentary

Shortly after the inaugural meeting, RCMP Inspector Harrower was transferred to Vancouver. The 'new' RCMP representative had a different view of crime prevention than Inspector Harrower: Inspector Harrower felt that in order to improve the quality of life and lower policing costs (and crime), agencies had to work together at tackling the situations that generate crime. In other words, the causes of crime had to be dealt with by all agencies whose policies could affect these circumstances.

The 'new' RCMP representative feels that the police role is law enforcement. His approach to crime prevention is much more short-term and reactive. He would, it seems, be much more likely to deal with 'policing problems' immediately within his own agency, rather than confront other agencies with the problems and their causes and ask for cooperation in trying to reduce the likelihood of the problem continuing.

In order to lower crime rates or increase the quality of life both these approaches is required. Not just police forces, but all agencies must look at both short term and long term methods for prevention. Long term methods must look at the causes of the problem.

In addition to Inspector Harrower's departure, three members have retired. One member who recently retired in May 1991 was called the "driving force of the Board" (Interview, 1991). He had a clear vision of where the Board should be going and what needed to be done. Both he and Harrower had been involved in the initiation and development of the Community Social Development Board. His absence will likely slow down the momentum of the Board since his role which included preparing drafts on proposed projects for the Board.

Every time that a member leaves or joins the Board, there is a re-adjustment. Board members must once again learn to trust one another. As Brian Wharf (1979: 16) says "newcomers <must> prove themselves and develop a reputation of being open, trustworthy and fair". With a high turnover of staff, power imbalances might form

based on length of time in the Board or length of time in Prince George. This could consequently affect power struggles between agencies. The presence of an executive director would greatly help the Board in overcoming these potential problems since s/he represents the Board, as opposed to a particular agency.

One final comment that should be made relates to the interviews and their analysis. Members knew the research was in the field of criminology. Whether this affected responses is unknown. Members might have felt obligated to direct their answers in relation to crime as opposed to more general social issues such as housing, poverty or social services. One should also be aware that the interviews occurred at one point in time. If interviews were held at a different date, the research results might have been different.

Summary

This chapter provides a description of the methodology, of Prince George, and it provides the results of the study.

The methodology includes a review of documents, interviews, and the observation of one Board meeting. The description of Prince George shows that it is an isolated community with a very young population compared to British Columbia as a whole. As well, Prince George has a higher crime rate than British Columbia.

The results provide a chronological breakdown of the history and development of the Community Social Development Board. It also addresses the perceived role of each agency illustrating that few

agencies saw a direct link between their agency and crime. In addition, some members did not know how the Board was formed, which lowered its credibility.

A review of the Board's benefits shows that networking improved between some agencies, a possible "conflict" was avoided, and two agencies joined together for a program. Future goals of the board were also examined.

The Community Social Development Board was perceived to be unique because it had a very broad focus (the quality of life) and it consisted of persons in senior positions. The needs of the Board summarized what had to be done for the Board to succeed in lowering crime and tackling the situations that generate crime.

Finally a commentary was provided on changes that had occurred in the structure of the Board since the inaugural meeting.

CHAPTER 4

MAJOR ISSUES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMUNITY SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD

The study of Prince George shows how the Community Social Development Board was developed. Although the group was formed, its overall performance is disappointing. The results, however, do not change the belief that municipal inter-agency crime prevention is a promising alternative to lower crime. It is concluded, that the potential success of the CSDB has been limited due to five major factors.

The first factor relates to the mandate and objectives of the Board; the second factor to leadership, the third to territoriality, the fourth to the absence of a full-time executive director, and the fifth, to the transfer of the initiator of the Community Social Development Board.

1. Mandate And Objective:

Brian Wharf (1979: 18) states, "the mandate of an organization refers to the authority and resources conferred on it to achieve its objectives". Based on this definition, one would conclude that the mandate for the CSDB comes from the Prince George City Council since they approved the proposals put forth by the Police Liaison Committee on March 5, 1990 and agreed to provide staffing costs for a half-time secretary and full-time executive director (Council

Minutes, March 5, 1990: page 10-11 [6.J.]).

The overall objective of the Board, as stated in the Terms of Reference (Appendix III) is "to develop a comprehensive community social development strategy". The Terms of Reference define 'social development' in a lengthy and superficial way. To paraphrase the definition, social development examines the social causes of crime and fear, and tries to mitigate those factors in individuals. Based on this definition, one can conclude that it is important for the Board to know the social causes of crime and how they can influence those aspects that lead to crime and fear.

According to Hastings and Jamieson (1987: 36), "objectives are narrow and specific statements of the targets of an organization. They define what an organization hopes to achieve through its activities". Goals are defined as "broad or general statements which indicate the overall aim and philosophy of an organization" (Hastings and Jamieson, 1987: 36). Based on these definitions the objectives of the Board are unclear, although the goal has been stated. Furthermore, the Board does not state what it hopes to accomplish through its activities. These findings are similar to those of a process evaluation done by Hastings and Jamieson (1987) for the Crime Prevention Council of Ottawa. A comparison of findings between the two studies is provided in Table 3. This table shows that they both had poor planning activities and had adopted a reactive approach. Differences between the two Boards include membership and source of revenue.

The formation of clear objectives would enhance the Board's

focus which could strengthen their confidence level and how others perceive their role(s). As a result, the likelihood of the program succeeding could improve. The 'new' objectives should be dated (i.e., when results should be measurable) and should include both a process evaluation and impact evaluations. The evaluations could be useful to determine priorities and how to address them, showing whether changes have occurred as a result of the program, strengths and weaknesses within the program, and, in showing the overall impact potential for future funding. Others interested in setting up similar committees could also benefit from this information instead of 're-inventing the wheel'.

2. Leadership:

Throughout the literature on local crime prevention councils, leadership is considered a vital component (Waller, 1990b: 201; Farrell, 1990: 223; Stephens, 1990: 227; Ministry of Community and Social Services, 1988 cited in Lee, 1989: 9; Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 1990a: 5). The Agenda For Safer Cities states, "elected officials at all levels must exert political leadership and assume responsibility to prevent urban crime".

In Prince George, Inspector Harrower influenced the Mayor to exert political leadership at the municipal level. The Mayor has demonstrated leadership by being open to the concept of the CSDB, by getting other persons to join it and by chairing it.

It seems, however, that his leadership has diminished and that the Board is no longer a priority. The Mayor is not clarifying what

Table 3

A Summary Of Findings For The Community Social Development Board
And The Crime Prevention Council Of Ottawa

Issue	Prince George	Ottawa
Distinction Between Goals & Objectives	NO	NO
Planning Of Activities	POOR	POOR
Strategy	REACTIVE	REACTIVE
Administers Crime Prevention Programs	NO, BUT WAS RECOMMENDED BY P.L.C.	YES, WITH VARYING SUCCESS
Staff Person	NOT YET	ONE
Leadership From The Mayor	AT THE BEGINNING	NO
Membership	* APPOINTED BY MAYOR * SENIOR LEVELS OF ORGANIZATION	ANYONE
Source Of Funding	CITY	* CITY, * POLICE, * SOLICITOR GENERAL

Source: Hastings and Jamieson, 1987: 32-53

Definition:

"Reactive" - Approach is to respond to particular events or crises

the Board hopes to achieve (i.e., crime reduction), and he is not taking the initiative to get things done. It seems as if the Mayor forgot why the Board was implemented. Leadership for the group (although not political) was demonstrated by the Director of Development Services who has recently retired. This leaves the Board with little leadership. The "ideal remedy" for this situation would be to get Inspector Harrower back to Prince George to remind the Mayor why he was so enthusiastic with the idea of a municipal inter-agency crime prevention council in the first instance. This is unlikely to happen, making the predictability of the outcome of the Board uncertain. The Board could disintegrate within the next year.

3. Territoriality:

Although not considered an obstacle by members in this Board, the trust of members can be a constricting factor in inter-agency committees. At the first meeting of the Board, one member was concerned with the amount of time it would take before members felt at ease and could trust one another (Community Social Development Board, Minutes June 25, 1990). This is an issue that is of concern for many individuals/agencies working in an inter-agency environment. The response made by Richard Weiler from the Canadian Council On Social Development, a guest at the inaugural meeting, was that trust had to be built - the Board should work on one or two important issues that are "do-able" demonstrating that the board has a purpose. This enables trust to develop through success

and choosing initial issues for consideration (Community Social Development Board, Minutes June 25, 1990).

At the first couple of meetings,

"people were a little bit reticent about saying very much and committing to much ... everybody was a bit on edge and a bit guarded in their responses, <now> nobody feels threatened, we have reached the point where people can jokingly make off remarks about things going on that ... when we were just starting out may seem to be a bit offensive ..." (Interview, 1991).

The author feels that members generally trust one another but to varying degrees. Although the majority of persons felt that territoriality did not exist on the Board one member did state "inevitably there are certain amounts of territoriality" (Interview, 1991). The author agrees with this statement. During the interviews, some members stated that they were members of the Board because of the input they could provide. In return, they did not feel the Board could do anything for their agency. Whether this indicates a lack of trust to count on others, territoriality, or the unwillingness to cooperate and solve problems together (problem-solving) is unknown. What is known is that some agencies are not using the Board as a tool in resolving some of "their" problems. For example, one member stated "Other than providing statistics, I do not see the Board as a group of people I should be going to say 'I need your help to solve this problem'. I have other avenues for that" (Interview, 1991). This view of not using the Board to resolve "agency" problems was expressed by two others.

The view of the author is that these three agencies want to

see quick results, which are what some have referred to as "band-aid solutions", instead of examining the social causes of the problem and developing a long-term approach to mitigate these factors.

Where 'territoriality' does exist, it could be partially the result of the lack of understanding of the Boards direction and purpose.

4. The Absence Of A Full-Time Executive Director:

In the "French model", there is one person responsible for preparing meeting and ensuring that decisions are implemented. This is a crucial element needed in the Community Social Development Board. The absence of an executive facilitator resulted in one member of the Board doing most of the work, such as preparing drafts for the Boards approval. Although another member thought this was part of his job, the work done was all voluntary.

If the Board would have had a full-time executive director, many of the obstacles could have been avoided. S/he could have focused the group more quickly, as did Anne Jeffrey & Associates, which could have improved the momentum of the Board.

The executive director would be seen as an organizer and internal spokesperson for the group. When members felt uneasy about a particular issue, s/he could address it without pointing a finger to any particular agency. The executive director would be kept abreast of programs in the community and would be considered something akin to a social planner. Having such as person would

increase group confidence, provide a sense of direction, ensure that plans/projects are accomplished, and ultimately lead the group to success.

5. The Transfer of The Initiator:

Inspector Harrower is committed to crime reduction. As a police officer, he saw the problems in Prince George. He made connections between the people he was confronted with and the social situations they faced. Without directives from any of his superiors in the RCMP, he took the initiative to do something about the crime problem in Prince George (which resulted in high policing costs for the municipality). Without him, the Community Social Development Board would not have been realized.

He adopted a problem-solving approach in an attempt to solve community crime problems. He understood that due to the vertical nature of many bureaucracies the likelihood of reducing crime problems without the cooperation of others was minimal. Unless inter-agency cooperation was put into place, the circumstances that breed crime could not be effectively tackled. For this reason, he initiated a municipal inter-agency crime prevention committee to examine both long and short-term strategies aimed at tackling the situations that generate crime.

Inspector Harrower had a clear idea of the tasks of the Board. The Board, in his view, would work together to ensure that the root causes of crime were attacked through the implementation of programs for youth at risk. He wanted an executive director to be

hired before the Board was implemented and he wanted the Board to initiate and manage programs for youth at risk.

Once the program was handed to the Mayor, it was the Mayor's decision on how to run the Board. He wanted the Board to make decisions together which could explain why an executive director was not hired beforehand. Both the Mayor and Harrower wanted the goal of this Board to be crime reduction (which would ultimately lead to a better quality of life). When Harrower was transferred, his replacement did not have the same visions as his predecessor. This factor, based on speculation, affected the outcome of the Board. It is possible that if Inspector Harrower had remained, the Board would have already had a crime profile, and that it would be at least initiating or managing one program.

This is an issue the RCMP will have to deal with since they determine who is to be transferred and when. If the RCMP want to reduce crime and encourage community policing, they will have to realize the significance of this promising approach and will have to let its members spend more than three years in a community to run programs effectively.

Summary

This chapter addresses five issues that have stopped the Board from moving ahead. These include factors such as a lack of clear objectives, leadership, willingness to use the Board as a tool to solve problems and the absence of an executive director. The transfer of the initiator of the Board, Inspector Harrower also had

negative consequences for the Board and is a issue the RCMP will have to consider if they want to adopt a long-term approach to reducing crime.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the planning and organization of municipal inter-agency crime prevention by taking the Prince George Community Social Development Board as a case example.

Despite traditional attempts to lower crime, crime rates have stayed at high levels. In Prince George, the crime rates are higher than those for British Columbia.

The literature shows that there are several social factors linked to persistent offending. These factors include poverty, an unresponsive education system, a growing underclass created by blocked opportunities, the disintegration of communities and families, and drug and alcohol abuse. All these factors cannot be tackled by one agency alone due to the vertical nature of organizations. Agencies must work together at eliminating the circumstances that breed crime.

The results of the study on the Community Social Development Board are similar to those of the Crime Prevention Council of Ottawa. Both did not have clear objectives and had accomplished little. This however, does not mean that municipal inter-agency crime prevention has failed. It remains a promising alternative to lower crime. Five major factors have stopped the Board from moving ahead. These include a lack of clear objectives, little leadership,

territoriality, the absence of an executive director, and the transfer of the initiator. Models like the one in Prince George need support both politically and financially to succeed.

The study shows that police can play a catalyst role in starting municipal inter-agency crime prevention. They can influence the City into paying more attention to the crime problems. In addition, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police will need to re-examine their policies on mobility within the force to ensure that crime reduction strategies work.

The study also shows that the results of the Community Social Development Board are similar to the Crime Prevention Council Of Ottawa. More process evaluations need to be done in the area of municipal inter-agency crime prevention councils, so that planning can be done more effectively in the future.

Future research could look at general issues such as comparisons between municipal inter-agency committees and social planning councils. In addition specific issues such as maintaining leadership or building clear objectives could also be examined.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anne Jeffrey & Associates. (1990) Community Social Development Board: Work Session, December 11, 1990, Unpublished.
- Backhouse, John. (1990) Speech made on Friday October 12, 1990 at City Hall in Prince George, British Columbia: 3-4 PM, Unpublished.
- Berrueta-Clement, J., et al. (1984) Changed Lives: The Effects Of The Perry Preschool Program On Youths Through Age 19, Michigan: The High/Scope Press.
- Bielert, M. (1989) Letter written to His Worship John E. Backhouse dated February 22, 1989. Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Unpublished.
- Brantingham, P., and Faust, F. (1976) "A conceptual model of crime prevention". Crime And Delinquency, 22: 284-296.
- Brantingham P., and Brantingham, P., (1990) "Situational crime prevention". Canadian Journal Of Criminology, 32(1): 17-40.
- Brewin, G. (1989) "The Victoria Community Police Stations And The Citizens Of Victoria United In Preventing Crime". Notes from the European and North American Conference on Urban Safety And Crime Prevention. Montreal 1989.
- British Columbia Ministry of Municipal Affairs, Recreation and Culture. (1990) Prince George. Economic renewals programs.
- Canadian Council On Social Development. (1988) Crime Prevention Through Social Development: National Workshop Report. Ottawa.
- Canadian Council on Social Development. (1989) Crime Prevention Through Social Development: A Discussion Paper for Social Policy Makers and Practitioners. Ottawa.
- Canadian Council on Social Development. (1990) Safer Communities: An Emerging Canadian Experience, Ottawa.
- Canadian Urban Victimization Survey. (1983) Victims of Crime. Ottawa: Solicitor General Canada, Bulletin #1.
- Canadian Youth Foundation. (no date) Canada's Youth "Ready For Today": A Comprehensive Survey Of 15-24 Year Olds. Ottawa.
- Cirel, P., et. al., (1977) Community Crime Prevention Program: Seattle, Washington. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

- City Centre Concept Committee. (1989) Report of the City Centre Concept Committee on a Proposed Prince George City Centre Strategy. Prince George Region Development Corporation.
- City Centre Concept Committee. (1990) Report of the City Centre Concept Committee on a Prince George City Centre Strategy. Prince George Region Development Corporation.
- City of Prince George. (1988a) Strategic Focus, Unpublished.
- City of Prince George. (1988b) Mission Statement, Unpublished.
- City of Prince George. (1989a) The Mayor's Task Force on Downtown Concerns: Report to City Council.
- City of Prince George. (1989b) Youth Matters: Mayor's Committee on Youth Report to the City of Prince George.
- Cloward, R., and Ohlin, L. (1960) Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs. New York: The Free Press.
- Community Social Development Board. (1990) Terms of Reference. Prince George, British Columbia, Unpublished.
- Cooper, H. S. (1981) "The evolution of Canadian police". In McGrath, W. and Mitchell, M. (eds.), The Police Function in Canada. Toronto: Methuen, 77-180.
- Currie, Elliott. (1985) Confronting Crime: An American Challenge. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Dewar, M. (1990) "Community organizations and crime prevention". In Loree, D., and Walker, R. 1991. Community Crime Prevention: Shaping The Future. Ottawa: Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 171-177.
- Dishion, T. (1990) "The peer context of troublesome child and adolescent behaviour". In Leone, P. 1990. Understanding Troubled and Troubling Youth. London: Sage Publications, Inc, 128-153.
- Elliott, D., and Huizinga, D. (1983) "Social class and delinquent behaviour in a National Youth Panel". Criminology: 21(2): 149-177.
- European and North-American Conference on Urban Safety and Crime Prevention. (1989) Package from the Conference, Unpublished.
- Farrell, J. (1990) "Leadership: A police perspective". In Loree, D., and Walker, R. 1991. Community Crime Prevention: Shaping The Future. Ottawa: Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 220-223.

- Farrington, David. (1989) "Implications of longitudinal studies for social prevention". Canadian Journal of Criminology: 31(4), 453-463.
- Federation of Canadian Municipalities. (1990a) Agenda For Safer Cities: Final Declaration of the European and North American Conference on Urban Safety And Crime Prevention. Ottawa.
- Federation of Canadian Municipalities. (1990b) National Policy: Urban Safety and Crime Prevention. Ottawa.
- Federation of Canadian Municipalities. (1990c) Proposal For A Urban Safety and Crime Prevention Program. Ottawa.
- Greene, J., and Mastrofski, S. (eds.) (1988) Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality. New-York: Praeger Publishers.
- Goldstein, Herman. (1977) Policing a Free Society. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Co.
- Goldstein, Herman. (1990) Problem-Oriented Policing. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.
- Harrower, M. (March 17, 1989) Letter written to His Worship John E. Backhouse dated March 17, 1989. Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Unpublished.
- Harrower, M. (March 28, 1989) Letter written to His Worship John E. Backhouse dated March 28, 1989. Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Unpublished.
- Hastings, R., and Jamieson, W. (1987) The Crime Prevention Council Of Ottawa: A Process Evaluation. Unpublished.
- Horn, J. (1990) "The future of crime prevention: inter-agency issues". In Loree, D., and Walker, R. 1991. Community Crime Prevention: Shaping the Future. Ottawa: Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 115-136.
- House of Commons. (1990) Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General. Issue No. 27, Tuesday April 3, 1990.
- Inkster, N. (1990) "Policing in '90s and beyond". In Loree, D., and Walker, R. 1991. Community Crime Prevention: Shaping the Future. Ottawa: Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 248-256.
- Jensen, H. (January 25, 1989) Memorandum regarding "Community Based Policing". Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Deputy Commissioner Operations, Unpublished.

- Jensen, L. (1990) "Provincial, national and international dimensions". In Loree, D., and Walker, R. 1991. Community Crime Prevention: Shaping the Future. Ottawa: Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 9-27.
- Kelling, G., Pate, T., Dieckman, D., and Brown, C. (1974) The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment: A Technical Report. Police Foundation.
- Kelling, G. (1981) "Conclusions". The New-York Foot Patrol Experiment. Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.
- Kelling, G., and Moore, M. (1988) "From political to reform to community: the evolving strategy of police" in Greene, J., and Mastrofski, S. (eds.) (1988). Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality. New-York: Praeger Publishers, 3 - 26.
- Kelly, W. and N. Kelly. (1976) Policing in Canada. Toronto: MacMillan of Canada Ltd.
- Kinsey, R., Lea, J., and Young, J. (1986) Losing the Fight Against Crime. New York: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Koller, Katherine. (1990) Working The Beat: The Edmonton Neighbourhood Foot Patrol. Edmonton Police Service.
- Lee Consultants. (1989) Community Based Planning: A Concept In Search Of A Context. Prepared for The Organizing Committee Of The Community Planning Conference.
- MacKillop, B., and Clarke, M. (1989) Safer Tomorrows Begin Today. Canadian Council on Children and Youth, Ottawa.
- Manning, P. (1984) "Community policing". American Journal Of Police. 3(2): 205 - 227.
- Mastrofski, S. (1988) "Community policing as reform: a cautionary tale". In Greene, J., and Mastrofski, S. (eds.) 1988. Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality. New-York: Praeger Publishers, 47 - 67.
- McCord, J. (1978) "A thirty year follow-up of treatment effects". American Psychologist: 33 (3), 284-289.
- McDonald, David. (1990a) Letter written to Richard Weiler dated August 24, 1990. City of Prince George, Unpublished.
- McDonald, David. (1990b) Letter written to Ms. Lise Brisson-Noreau On October 22, 1990. City of Prince George, Unpublished.
- McGrath, W. and Mitchell, M. (eds.) (1981) The Police Function in Canada. Toronto: Methuen, 77-180.

Ministry of Justice and Attorney General of Canada. (1990) Letter written from Kim Campbell to Mr. MacLellan, M.P., Unpublished.

Murphy, C., and Muir, G. (1985) Community-Based Policing: A Review Of The Critical Issues. Ottawa: User Report, Solicitor General Canada.

Murphy, Chris. (1988) "The development, impact, and implications of community policing in Canada". In Greene, J., and Mastrofski, S. (eds.) (1988). Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality. New-York: Praeger Publishers.

Newman, O. (1972) Defensible Space: Crime Prevention Through Urban Design. New York: MacMillan Company.

Normandeau, A., and Leighton, B. (1990) A Vision Of The Future Of Policing In Canada: Police Challenge 2000. Ottawa: Solicitor General Canada.

Ontario Police Services Act. 1990.

Police Liaison Committee. (1990) Proposal For The Establishment Of A Community Social Development Board In The City Of Prince George. Paper submitted to Prince George City Council.

Radzinowicz, L. (1956) A History of English Criminal Law and its Administration from 1750. London: Stevens and Sons Ltd.

Rattner, A., and McKie, C. (1990) "The ecology of crime and its implications for prevention: An Ontario study". Canadian Journal Of Criminology: 31(1), 155-171.

Roberts, I. (no date) Community Based Policing Report. Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Prince George, Unpublished.

Robins L., et al. (1975) "Arrests and delinquency in two generations: a study of black urban families and their children". Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry: 16, 125-140.

Robins L., and Lewis, R. (1966) "The role of the antisocial family in school completion and delinquency: a three-generation study". Sociology Quarterly: 7, 500-514.

Rosenbaum, D. (1988) "Community Crime Prevention: A review and synthesis of the literature". Justice Quarterly, 5, 323-395.

Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act. 1986.

Royal Canadian Mounted Police. (1987-1990) Operational Statistics Reporting System, Unpublished.

- Royal Canadian Mounted Police. (1990a) Strategic Action Plan: Implementation Of Community. Ottawa.
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police. (1990b) Commissioner's Directional Statement, 1990. Ottawa.
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police. (1991a) Commissioner's Directional Statement, 1991. Ottawa.
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police. (1991b) Operations Manual. "E" Division, Unpublished.
- Rutter, M., and Giller, H. (1983) Juvenile Delinquency: Trends And Perspectives. Markham: Penguin Books.
- Sacco, V. and Johnson, H. (1990) Patterns of Criminal Victimization in Canada. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey Analysis Series.
- Seattle Law And Justice Planning Office. (1975) Burglary Reduction Program. Final Report prepared for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Seattle, Washington.
- Social Planning Council Of Metropolitan Toronto. (1989) Report From The National Consultation Of Voluntary Social Planning Organizations. Toronto.
- Spelman, W., and Eck, J. (1987) "Problem Oriented Policing". National Institute of Justice: Research In Brief. United States Department of Justice.
- Statistics Canada. (1986) Census of Population Canada Profile Series - Part I and II.
- Statistics Canada. (1989) Canadian Crime Statistics: 1988. Canadian Centre For Justice Statistics. Ministry of Supply and Services: Ottawa, Table 2.
- Statistics Canada. (1990) Canadian Crime Statistics: 1989. Canadian Centre For Justice Statistics. Ministry of Supply and Services: Ottawa, Table 2.
- Statistics Canada. (April 1991) Juristat Service Bulletin. Ottawa: Canadian Centre For Justice Statistics: 11(7).
- Stein, A., and Friedrich, L. (1975) "Impact of television on children and youth". In Hetherington, E. (ed.), Review Of Child Development Research. 5, 183-256.

- Stephens, D. (1990) "A network for future leadership and cooperation". In Loree, D., and Walker, R. 1991. Community Crime Prevention: Shaping the Future. Ottawa: Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 224-232.
- Trojanowicz, R. (1983) "An evaluation of a neighbourhood Foot Patrol Program". Journal Of Police Science And Administration: 11(4), 410 - 419.
- United Nations. (1990) Eighth United Nations Congress On The Prevention Of Crime And The Treatment Of Offenders. Agenda Item 3: A/CONF.144/L.3.
- Waller, I., and Weiler, D. (1984) Crime Prevention Through Social Development: An Overview With Sources. Ottawa
- Waller, Irvin. (1989a) Crime Prevention In A Community Policing Context: Working With Citizens And Community Agencies. Draft Manual Prepared For Barry Leighton, Solicitor General Of Canada.
- Waller, Irvin. (1989b) Current Trends In European Crime Prevention: Implications For Canada. Department of Justice Canada.
- Waller, Irvin. (1989c) Making Canada Safer From Crime: Pragmatic Action And Law Reform. Report prepared for Judge Allen Linden, Law Reform Commission of Canada.
- Waller, Irvin. (1990a) "Overview of crime and justice in Canada". Paper submitted to the Department of Justice for inclusion into The Prevention Of Crime And The Treatment Of Offenders: A Source Book Of Canadian Experiences. Department of Justice.
- Waller, Irvin. (1990b) "Making communities safer from crime: A Question of leadership". In Loree, D., and Walker, R. 1991. Community Crime Prevention: Shaping the Future. Ottawa: Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 201-219.
- Weatheritt, Mollie. (1986) Innovations In Policing. Beckenham: Croom Helm.
- Weatheritt, Mollie. (1988) "Community policing: rhetoric or reality?" In Greene, J., and Mastrofski, S. (eds.) (1988). Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality. New-York: Praeger Publishers.
- Webber, A., (1991) "Crime and management: an interview with NYC police commissioner Lee P. Brown". Harvard Business Review, May-June 1991: 110-129.
- Weiler, R. (1989) Letter written to Mr. John Backhouse on October 31, 1989. Canadian Council on Social Development, Unpublished.

- Weiler, R. (1990) Memorandum to George Paul on April 18, 1990. Canadian Council On Social Development, Unpublished.
- Wharf, Brian (ed). (1979) Community Work In Canada. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 9-24.
- Wharf, Brian. (1989) "Implementating Achieving Health for All". Canadian Review Of Social Policy, 24, 42-48.
- Wilson, D. (July 31, 1989) Memorandum regarding "Community Based Policing - Community Law Enforcement Consultative Groups". Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Commanding Officer, "E" Division, Unpublished.
- Wilson, D. 1990. "Police and crime prevention: changing roles and relationships". In Loree, D., and Walker, R. 1991. Community Crime Prevention: Shaping the Future. Ottawa: Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 85-91.
- Wilson, J. and Kelling, G. (1982) "Broken windows: the police and neighbourhood safety". The Atlantic Monthly. (March). 29 -38.
- Wilson, J. (1983a) "Thinking about crime: the debate over deterrence". The Atlantic Monthly (September), 72-88.
- Wilson, J. (1983b) "Raising kids". The Atlantic Monthly (October), 45-56.
- Wilson, J., and Kelling, G. (1989) "Making neighbourhoods safe". The Atlantic Monthly (February), 46-52.
- Wolfgang, M.E., et al. (1972) Delinquency in A Birth Cohort. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

OTHER SOURCES:

Minutes of Community Social Development Board

Date: June 25, 1990
 July 04, 1990
 July 24, 1990
 August 15, 1990
 August 29, 1990
 October 03, 1990
 October 25, 1990
 November 07, 1990
 December 11, 1990
 January 23, 1991
 March 13, 1991
 May 01, 1991

Minutes from Prince George City Council - March 5, 1991.

APPENDIX I: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

INTERVIEWS**GENERAL**

As I mentioned in my letter to you, our interview will be strictly confidential. Would you mind if I tape our conversation for my own use, it's easier than writing notes while you are talking?

As I have discussed with you, I am interested in knowing the evolution of the Community Social Development Board and the role the RCMP has played in establishing this program.

1. Could you begin by telling me about your agency's role or function in the community and with the Board
2. Could you tell me some of the obstacles you have had to overcome in this program [how was this done?] Do you foresee future obstacles and how would you suggest to overcome them?
3. Could you tell me how this program has affected the quality of life in Prince George
 - a) How do you think the people of Prince George/your agency view this program? Have you received any feedback?
 - b) Do you feel it has made a difference in crime levels, fear of crime, or violence? Do you believe it will? Could you explain why/how or why not?
4. Quite often, after starting a program, you realize what could have been done differently, If you had to start over again, would you do anything differently?
5. Could you tell me what you feel is the role of the RCMP in the community and with the Board
6. What difference do you feel the Board has made to the community
7. Do you sit on any other Committees? Could you tell me how they are both similar and different from the Community Social Development Board ...

THANK-YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORTS. I GREATLY APPRECIATE THIS. WOULD YOU MIND IF I CONTACTED YOU AGAIN, SHOULD I HAVE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS ONCE I PUT ALL MY INFORMATION TOGETHER?

INTERVIEW - RCMP

As I mentioned in my letter to you, our interview will be strictly confidential. Would you mind if I tape our conversation for my own use, it's easier than writing notes while you are talking?

As I have discussed with you, I am interested in knowing the evolution of the Community Social Development Board and the role the RCMP has played in establishing this program.

1. Could you begin by telling me about your agency's role or function in the community and with the Board
2. Could you tell me some of the obstacles you have had to overcome in this program ... [how was this done?] Do you foresee future obstacles and how would you suggest to overcome them?
3. Could you tell me how this program has affected the quality of life in Prince George
 - a) How do you think the people of Prince George/other RCMP view this program? Have you received any feedback?
 - b) Do you feel it has made a difference in crime levels, fear of crime, or violence? Do you believe it will? Could you explain why/how or why not?
4. Quite often, after starting a program, you realize what could have been done differently, If you had to start over again, would you do anything differently?
5. Could you tell me what you feel the roles are of the other agencies in the community and with the Board
6. What difference do you feel the Board has made to the community
7. Do you sit on any other Committees? Could you tell me how they are both similar and different from the Community Social Development Board ...

THANK-YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORTS. I GREATLY APPRECIATE THIS. WOULD YOU MIND IF I CONTACTED YOU AGAIN, SHOULD I HAVE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS ONCE I PUT ALL MY INFORMATION TOGETHER?

INTERVIEW - VANCOUVER

As I have discussed with you over the phone, I am interested in documenting how the Community Social Development Board got established and the role that the RCMP played in this process. Our interview will be kept strictly confidential. Would you mind if I tape our conversation for my own use, it's easier than writing notes while you are talking.

1. Maybe you could begin by telling me the role of the Police Liaison Committee generally and in preparing the proposal for the Community Social Development Board ... What were the concerns of the RCMP and the City Council?
2. Could you tell me some of the obstacles you have had to overcome (within RCMP/ community / personally - how were they resolved) ...
3. How do you feel this Committee could affect the quality of life/crime levels in Prince George ...
4. Quite often, after starting a program, you realize what could have been done differently, If you had to start over again, would you do anything differently?
5. Could you tell me how the Community Social Development Board is both similar and different to other committees in which you have participated?

THANK-YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORTS. I GREATLY APPRECIATE THIS. WOULD YOU MIND IF I CONTACTED YOU AGAIN, SHOULD I HAVE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS ONCE I PUT ALL MY INFORMATION TOGETHER?

APPENDIX II: LETTER REQUESTING INTERVIEWS IN PRINCE GEORGE



UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

FACULTÉ DES SCIENCES SOCIALES
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

March 6, 1991

David McDonald
Director of Development Services and
Member of the Community Social Development Board
City Hall
1100 Patricia Blvd.
Prince George, British Columbia
V2L 3V9

Dear David McDonald;

RE: IMPLICATIONS OF PRINCE GEORGE FOR CRIME PREVENTION IN CANADA

Brigitte Koch, a graduate student in Criminology, plans to visit Prince George April 22, 1991 to April 26, 1991 and would like to meet with the members of the Board.

Her research will examine the formation of the Community Social Development Board, and the role the RCMP has played in this process. This Board was chosen because of its inter-agency approach to preventing crime and because it adapted the French model.

The research will enable other interested communities across Canada to implement similar boards and learn from the experiences in Prince George. The information will be beneficial to police departments, mayors, and other agencies interested in preventing crime and improving the quality of life in Canada.

Brigitte would like to interview each of the board members, and find out their views of the Board and what they feel are its strengths and weaknesses. Confidentiality of the interview will be maintained. The interview would last approximately one to one and a half hours.

Brigitte will be contacting you around the end of March by telephone to arrange a time that will be convenient for you.

Thank-you for your co-operation.

Yours Sincerely,

Irvin Waller.
Full Professor

CRIMINOLOGIE/CRIMINOLOGY

**APPENDIX III: TERMS OF REFERENCE,
COMMUNITY SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD**



CITY OF PRINCE GEORGE
BRITISH COLUMBIA
INCORPORATED A.D. 1914

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

1100 PATRICIA BOULEVARD, PRINCE GEORGE, B.C. V2L 3V9
TELEPHONE (604) 564 5151

August 15, 1990

TERMS OF REFERENCE

COMMUNITY SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD

"Social development" means the pursuit of a higher standard of community social well-being, the focus being on the improvement of individual opportunity for all and the mitigation of those aspects of individual social behaviour giving rise to community crime and violence, or the fear of it, and the consequent deterioration in our overall quality of life.

THE BOARD'S OVERALL OBJECTIVE:

"To develop a comprehensive community social development strategy."

THE BOARD'S BASIC ACTIVITIES:

In pursuing its overall objective, the Board will engage in the following basic activities:

1. To develop and maintain an appreciation of the community's overall social requirements.
2. To initiate appropriate community consultations and reviews in areas of perceived social need requiring a coordinated inter-agency response.
3. To encourage and, where appropriate, assume responsibility for developing and implementing supportive, collaborative inter-agency coordination and service delivery efforts.

THE BOARD'S APPROACH:

In carrying out its activities, the Board:

- o will seek to improve communications among the major agencies delivering social services, as well as the coordination of specified activities, from planning through implementation and the monitoring and evaluation of results;
- o will identify and seek to resolve major social issues, leading to an overall strategy for program improvement which will be results oriented;
- o will pursue activities which call on the collective interest, support and commitment of its members, as well as the interests of other community organizations;
- o will progressively clarify and refine its emerging role, expectations, authority and accountability and the scope and limitations on its capacity to initiate or direct change.

THE BOARD'S STRATEGY ROLE:

1. To develop short- and long-term strategies for social development which will lead to improved opportunities generally for the economically and socially disadvantaged, foster a healthier community, and enhance our continuing efforts in community crime prevention.
2. To develop strategies which will integrate existing program efforts and future initiatives relating to behaviour modification, social development, crime prevention and law enforcement, all of which will be suited to our community profile.
3. To develop strategies which will call for responses from the Board's member organizations, other government and non-government organizations, and the citizenry at large, which will assist in promoting inter-agency planning and action.

The Board will develop a short-term action plan which will list its program of activities and objectives for the coming six months to a year. The plan will include methods for achieving objectives, will provide for the measurement of progress, and will include the monitoring and evaluation of results. Periodic reports will be prepared. The action plan will be updated as the Board's work program evolves.

APPENDIX IV: SHORT-TERM ACTION PLAN,
COMMUNITY SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD

August 15, 1990

SHORT-TERM ACTION PLAN
(August, 1990 - April, 1991)

COMMUNITY SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD

In pursuing its basic objective, carrying out its basic activities, and developing its strategy, the Board:

1. Will maintain a liaison with the City's Health Advisory Committee in its Canadian Healthy Communities Project.
2. Will develop a liaison with the City's Housing Committee in a joint effort to review and assess our low-income rental housing stock and gain a better understanding of the structure, funding and accessibility of Federal/Provincial social housing programs.
3. Will review all those matters arising out of the Reports of the Mayor's Committee on Youth and the Mayor's Task Force on Downtown Concerns referred by resolution of Council to the Board for consideration.
4. Will consider organizing a community conference or forum (in October, 1990), to which all community social service delivery agencies will be invited, and where the Board's role will be introduced and community input sought in respect to the identification and strategic means of resolving major community social issues.

Additionally, the Board will consider the advancement of its Strategy objectives, set out in its Terms of Reference, as follows:

For Strategy Statement 1:

To explore means of improving access by individuals to programs offering counselling and assistance in gaining employment, job (re-) training, acquiring better life skills, pursuing lifestyle changes, enhancing living and health standards, and getting off the welfare cycle.

For Strategy Statement 2:

To prepare a community socio-economic profile and analysis based on existing data from Census sources and statistics maintained by the Board's member organizations.

To prepare an inventory, by agency, of existing programs of a social, economic and crime prevention nature.

For Strategy Statement 3:

To prepare an inventory and assessment of the role of all involved social service delivery agencies and to assess existing inter-agency dynamics.

To liaise with the City's Health Advisory Committee in carrying out its proposed community attitude survey, to be funded by the B.C. Health Care Research Foundation.

Other Potential Work Program Activities:

1. To assess the social condition of specific problem areas within the city, most notably the downtown, selected inner-city neighbourhoods, or a defined local area, the assessment to include correlation analyses of various socio-economic, health, educational, and crime statistics and indices, the scope of agency program activities and the potential for inter-agency coordination and joint action.
2. To review the Board's own research capabilities and to set tasks for the Board's member agencies, sub-committees of the Board which may be struck and the Board's own staff when recruited.
3. To investigate sources of funding to pursue research, using our own staff resources or qualified consultants, including a possible "demonstration project grant" based on the uniqueness of the Board's efforts and the potential application of the model to other communities.

APPENDIX V: PROPOSALS FOR RESEARCH PROJECTS

RESEARCH PROJECT NO. 1

Short Title

Social Service Programs and Crime Prevention in Prince George: An Inventory and Assessment.

Outline of Project

The aim of this project is to establish a data base of social programs and delivery agencies in Prince George oriented toward crime prevention through social development.

The project will:

- (1) establish a detailed inventory of social service programs and delivery agencies in the community which have a direct or indirect impact on crime prevention, presented within the context of all community social service programs and any existing similar inventories, all of which should be listed with brief annotated descriptions;
- (2) establish, in specific terms, the legislative mandate or constitutional objects (as applicable), principal activities, clientele and caseload served (by numbers and category including waiting lists), funding sources, and annual operating budget (incl. major components) for each program and agency listed in (1) and identify any recent significant changes in any of the foregoing elements which have an impact on the program or agency's effectiveness;
- (3) consult with the principal administrative officer(s) responsible for each program or agency in (1) and:
 - (a) prepare a comprehensive, but concise, operating narrative description of the general purposes, functions and activities of each, and
 - (b) provide a separate statement, in similar form, giving a general evaluation of the program or agency's performance in meeting its objectives;
- (4) identify specific perceived gaps or overlaps in services provided or clientele served respecting each program or agency in (1), as well as with respect to other similar programs or agencies, with a brief commentary on the perceived causes and possible remedies to improve the levels of service and benefit; and
- (5) identify, in specific terms if possible, the perceived short- and long-term effect of each program or agency on crime prevention through social development.

RESEARCH PROJECT NO. 2

Short Title

Crime Profile and Crime Prevention in Prince George.

Outline of Project

The aim of this project is to establish a crime profile of Prince George as a basis for developing effective crime prevention measures through social development, to identify and assess existing crime prevention efforts, and to propose new or improved initiatives.

The project will:

- (1) carry out an inventory and analysis of RCMP-generated crime statistics over the past 10 years, by type of offence, aggregate same on a local-area and community-wide basis, and correlate with other published or computerized demographic, social, economic, educational and public health indicators, using existing Federal (Census), Provincial and local government data sources;
- (2) define key problem areas, by type of offence, and principal "at-risk" populations, by type, origin and profile of offenders and victims, correlating with primary socio-economic and other relevant indicators which are characteristic of or affect each group;
- (3) identify all crime prevention measures and programs instituted and administered in recent years on a local-area and community-wide basis, including community-based policing efforts, and, in consultation with the principal administrative officer(s) responsible, evaluate the performance of each in meeting stated objectives;
- (4) propose possible new or improved community-based initiatives directed toward crime prevention, in the short and long term, together with an evaluative methodology, with reference to specific types of offences, offenders, victims, "at-risk" populations, existing programs, and specific local or community-wide problem areas.

APPENDIX VI: PROFILE OF QUALIFICATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

DRAFT

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
COMMUNITY SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Job Summary

Reporting to the Community Social Development Board through the City's Director of Development Services, the Executive Director is responsible for assisting the Board to:

Assess the community's overall needs in dealing with existing or potential social and related problems; develop comprehensive program strategies (including law enforcement, crime prevention, social development and behaviour modification programs) suited to the community profile and the nature of specific social and related problems; and, in developing comprehensive strategies, encourage and support collaborative, cooperative inter-agency planning and action.

PROFILE OF QUALIFICATIONS

for
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, COMMUNITY SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD

PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

1. Master's Degree in related field. e.g. Social or Municipal Planning, Social Work, Criminology, Education, Political Science, Sociology.
2. Ten (10) years experience in planning, coordinating and delivering programs and/or services at the Community level.
- * Equivalent combinations of education and experience will be considered.
3. Ability to assist the Community Social Development Board to identify issues for its consideration. Ability to provide support to the Board and follow-up on recommendations made to it.

KNOWLEDGE REQUIRED

1. Experience with or knowledge of a broad range of social development systems, e.g. Social Services, Social Housing, Income Security, Education, Community Health, Criminal Justice.
2. Knowledge of the organizational behaviour, programs and services of community agencies engaged in social development activities.
3. Knowledge of planning processes and ability to analyze information related to criminal justice and social development interests, e.g. ability to interpret population, economic, social, health, education and crime statistics, and identify appropriate program responses.

IMPORTANT QUALITIES

1. Ability to maintain keen awareness and advise the Community Social Development Board of community issues. Ability to initiate and carry out productive consultations with various community representatives.
2. Ability to initiate and/or develop program action plans.
3. Ability to communicate effectively, both orally and in writing.
4. Ability to establish and maintain co-operative working relationships with a variety of individuals ranging from Board members to agency officials, senior administrators, and community representatives.
5. Ability to work with Board members in a mature and supportive manner.
6. Commitment to attainment of the Community Social Development Board's objectives.

COMPENSATION

- SALARY - \$43,000.00 TO \$50,000.00 PER YEAR.
- BENEFITS - Comprehensive benefits package - i.e. those offered to City of Prince George Management/Exempt staff.
- LENGTH OF TERM - Minimum contractual term of up to three (3) years, renewable.

Prepared By: K. Soltis in consultation
with D. McDonald
and R. Weiler

Date Prepared: June 27, 1990