

CoPaCC - comparing PCCs, sharing best practice

CoPaCC Thematic
“PCCs and Public Engagement”
March 2014

in association with
G4S Policing Support Services



Foreword

About the Authors

CoPaCC is an independent organisation, established in early 2013 to compare the work of Police and Crime Commissioners through objective, evidence-based analysis; to use those comparisons to identify best practice; and to share that best practice. Principal CoPaCC contributor to this report was CoPaCC's founder and Chief Executive, **Bernard Rix**. He has worked since 1990 as an independent advisor on policing. His clients have included: every UK police force; other UK bodies such as Home Office, Scottish Office, Ministry of Justice, Crown Prosecution Service, ACPO, Police Superintendents' Association for England and Wales, Police Federation of England and Wales; plus forces and agencies across Europe, Northern Africa and the Middle East. Several of his over sixty policing, criminal justice and community safety assignments have been of national significance. This work has – amongst other benefits – improved police investigation of burglary, cut court delays, given victims a better service, helped community relations, and enhanced police officer safety. Also working on the preparation of this report was **Jon Harvey**. Jon has worked as an advisor, facilitator, trainer and coach with the police service and wider criminal justice system since the late 1980s. He is an accomplished organisational development practitioner with particular expertise in the fields of executive and management development, change leadership, strategy formation, the improvement of public service governance and whole system approaches to delivering social outcomes. He is a psychologist, with a Diploma in Leadership Mentoring & Executive Coaching. He is also a Registered Practitioner of Programme Management.

Acknowledgements

CoPaCC's interviews for this Thematic were conducted under the Chatham House Rule. CoPaCC wishes to thank the many individuals and organisations who contributed on this basis, as well as the Offices of Police and Crime Commissioners who submitted, on an attributable basis, evidence for this Thematic.

CoPaCC also wishes to thank G4S Policing Support Services for their support for the development and publication of this "PCC Statutory Transparency" Thematic. G4S Policing Support Services supply police forces across the United Kingdom with a range of services covering both operational and organisational support functions.

Contents

1. Executive summary

2. Introduction, background and approach

2.1 Our definition of “public engagement”

2.2 Why PCCs’ public engagement is so important

2.3 Our approach to examining PCCs’ public engagement

3. Findings

3.1 Engagement planning

3.2 Approaches to engagement

3.3 Acting on engagement

3.4 Reviewing and learning from that engagement

4. Conclusions and next steps

Appendix (separate document)

A. OPCC submissions

1. Executive Summary

There are four key reasons why Police and Crime Commissioners' (PCCs') engagement with the public is important:

- **Practical:** public engagement is key to a PCC obtaining insight and feedback on where (and how) to focus, as well as to building trust and confidence between public and police
- **Ethical:** on taking office, PCCs make a "Declaration of Acceptance of Office", which includes a commitment to engage with the public
- **Effective:** partnership with the public can lead to enhanced community safety
- **Legal:** PCCs have a statutory obligation to consult the public on some areas of their work

In addition, a PCC may have **personal** reasons for good engagement with the public: for a PCC wishing to seek reelection, effective public engagement is clearly important in that PCC's building and maintaining an electoral majority.

This Thematic examines available evidence on PCCs' engagement with the public to date. It includes evidence submitted by seventeen Offices of Police and Crime Commissioners (OPCCs), plus insights provided through "Chatham House Rule"¹ interviews with a wide range of individuals and organisations.

We conclude that:

Many PCCs and OPCCs have much they can learn from others' "public engagement" good practice. This learning spans each of the following four areas:

- **Planning** - having a strategy and plan, with clear objectives, for public engagement;
- **Engaging** - putting that engagement strategy and plan into action;
- **Enhancing** - using that engagement to deliver benefit, working to "give a voice to the public" - and communicating that benefit back to the public;
- **Reviewing** - checking that the engagement has achieved the desired objectives and, where appropriate, amending future plans.

The available evidence suggests that PCCs and OPCCs are weaker on the Planning and Reviewing elements of the above cycle.

Many PCCs and OPCCs can also significantly improve their effectiveness in the "Engaging" and "Enhancing" elements of the public engagement cycle.

¹ See [\[link\]](#)

The “public engagement” work of several OPCCs indicates that such communication benefits from expert support and review. The high quality of a number of submissions from OPCCs suggests that some OPCCs have made good use of specialist communications and engagement staff and advisors. The maintenance of timely social media sites by OPCCs (in comparison with PCCs’ social media sites) also supports this conclusion.

Evidence suggests that it is important to maintain a separation, in the public eye, between the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Force itself. This is made more difficult by the regular media reference to “police chiefs” as a proxy for the term PCC. However, OPCCs themselves may be at risk of exacerbating that difficulty as a number of force media departments are subsumed within the OPCC under Stage 2 Transfers².

The CoPaCC “PCCs and Public Engagement” Awards 2014 will be announced later in March 2014. The Awards will be based on the findings from this Thematic and will draw from shortlisted OPCC submissions.

² see, for example, [\[link\]](#), for the background to Stage 2 Transfers

2. Introduction, background and approach

This CoPaCC Thematic examining “PCCs and public engagement” is the second in a series of six core CoPaCC Thematics comparing PCCs and sharing best practice. Our first Thematic, published in November 2013, examined PCCs’ transparency. Together with four more to be published later this year - covering innovation, commissioning, partnership and governance - these cover PCCs’ key areas of responsibility. We plan to revisit all six topics annually, to see how PCCs improve year on year in each area, and to identify further good and best practice as it emerges.

We include the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) in our analyses, as its responsibilities are similar to those of the Offices of the 41 Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs). This Thematic thus covers 41 Offices (OPCCs) of elected PCCs plus MOPAC. Throughout, we use the term OPCCs to represent all 42 entities.

This CoPaCC Thematic is structured as follows:

- the remainder of this **introduction**:
 - CoPaCC’s definition of “public engagement”;
 - why PCCs’ public engagement is so important
 - our approach to examining PCCs’ public engagement
- Section 3 provides our **findings**;
- Section 4 deals with **conclusions and next steps**.

2.1 Our definition of “public engagement”

In the absence of any standard definition³ of “public engagement” in the context of Police and Crime Commissioners, our thematic focused on examining the ways in which PCCs (and their Offices) sought to be available for, listen to, and act upon, views of the public about matters relevant to the PCCs’ work.

This Thematic does not focus on engagement with policing partners (such as local authorities or criminal justice agencies) - such partnership work will be covered in a future Thematic. Neither is it about police engagement with the public - the PCC and their Office is (or should be) separate from, and seen by the public as distinct from, the police. There may, for example, be instances where a member of the public wishes to comment to the PCC about the police but might be put off if they were seen as too close. For this and other reasons, PCC public engagement is distinct from police and public engagement⁴. Finally, it does not cover Police and Crime Panels’ (PCPs’) public engagement - though we note that several PCPs have recently announced work⁵ in this area.

³ There are definitions from other areas, for example see Wikipedia [\[link\]](#), Research Councils UK [\[link\]](#), the Welsh Audit Office [\[link\]](#) and the National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement [\[link\]](#)

⁴ See for example the NPIA’s “Community engagement in policing: lessons from the literature” [\[link\]](#) for an examination of police and public engagement

⁵ For example, Bedfordshire Police and Crime Panel [\[link\]](#) [\[link\]](#)

2.2 Why PCCs' public engagement is so important

There are four key reasons (acronym: PEEL) why Police and Crime Commissioners' (PCCs') engagement with the public is important:

- **Practical:** public engagement is key to a PCC obtaining insight and feedback on where (and how) to focus, as well as to building trust and confidence between public and police
- **Ethical:** on taking office, PCCs make a "Declaration of Acceptance of Office", which includes a commitment to engage with the public
- **Effective:** partnership with the public can lead to enhanced community safety
- **Legal:** PCCs have a statutory obligation to consult the public on some areas of their work

In addition, a PCC may have **personal** reasons for good engagement with the public: for a PCC wishing to seek reelection, effective public engagement is clearly important in that PCC's building and maintaining an electoral majority.

The Police Reform and Social Responsibility (PRSR) Act 2011 [\[link\]](#) provides the **legal** framework for PCCs. The following extract from the Merseyside OPCC submission to this Thematic (see Appendix A) suitably summarises this legal position.

The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 requires the Police and Crime Commissioners to obtain the views of the community, particularly the views of victims of crime, about their policing issues. In addition, the Commissioner is also required to obtain the views of local people and victims of crime before issuing the Police and Crime Plan and the police precept (the police part of local Council Tax).

Extract from Merseyside OPCC submission to this Thematic

The PCCs' "Declaration of Acceptance of Office" illustrates the **ethical** onus on PCCs to engage with the public. The absence of any statutory consequence for non-compliance makes this a matter for PCCs' conscience rather than for them to fear any legal consequence.

I [*Full Name*] of [*Place*] do hereby declare that I accept the office of Police and Crime Commissioner of [*Police Area*].

In making this declaration, I solemnly and sincerely promise that during my term of office:

I will serve the people of [*Police Area*] in the office of Police and Crime Commissioner.

I will act with integrity and diligence in my role and, to the best of my ability, will execute the duties of my office to ensure that the police are able to cut crime and protect the public

I will give a voice to the public, especially victims of crime, and work with other services to ensure the safety of the community and effective criminal justice.

I will take all steps within my power to ensure transparency of my decisions, so that I may be properly held to account to the public.

I will not interfere with the operational independence of police officers.

*PCCs' "Declaration of Acceptance of Office" (note CoPaCC emphasis in **bold**)*

2.3 Our approach to examining PCCs' public engagement

PCCs have been in post for just over a year. Their approaches to public engagement should, by now, be well established. This Thematic has sought a clearer initial understanding of PCCs' approaches, through:

- **interviews** with a cross-section of interested parties, conducted on a "Chatham House" basis;
- **desk research** - a brief examination of relevant wider material on public engagement;
- **invitations to provide evidence** - an invitation to OPCCs to contribute.

PCCs and their Offices were all invited to submit evidence [[link](#)] to this Thematic. This invite was delivered to all OPCCs through targeted use of social media (Twitter and Facebook). **Seventeen⁶ of the 42 OPCCs responded** - their submissions are provided in Appendix A. The seventeen were:

Avon & Somerset, Cambridgeshire, Cheshire, Cheshire, Cleveland, Cumbria, Devon & Cornwall, Dorset, Dyfed-Powys, Greater Manchester, Humberside, Leicestershire, Merseyside, Staffordshire, Surrey, Sussex, Warwickshire, West Mercia

This Thematic is intended as a first year, broad brush review - providing a preliminary comparison of PCCs' approaches so as to highlight aspects of good and best practice. We plan to return to this topic in more detail in future years.

⁶ An earlier version of this Thematic omitted Cumbria from this list

3. Findings

This section is structured as follows:

- engagement planning
- approaches to engagement
- acting on engagement
- reviewing and learning

3.1 Engagement planning

Our desk research found relatively few examples of OPCCs' public engagement plans or strategies. Having a public engagement plan and/or strategy clearly should be important for an OPCC, as it provides a defined and shared set of aims and approaches for that engagement.

Several of the PCCs that submitted evidence to this Thematic included details of their public engagement strategy (see Appendix A). Relevant submissions include those from Cleveland, Dorset, Dyfed-Powys, Merseyside and West Mercia. The following is an extract from the Dorset submission:

The OPCC Community Engagement Strategy provides a framework to deliver an effective and coordinated approach to community engagement for the benefit of all citizens and communities of Dorset. By listening to people's views Dorset's PCC can make well informed decisions to help meet community expectations and the community will be able to contribute to shaping and delivering a shared vision for Dorset. The OPCC Community Engagement Strategy details the five levels of community engagement that the PCC expects to achieve during his term of office.

Extract from Dorset OPCC submission to Thematic

Several PCCs and OPCCs acknowledge the importance of facilitating contact with all members of the public, not just those of statutory or personal interest to the PCC. For these PCCs and OPCCs, it's not simply a question of ticking boxes, it's ensuring that the PCC is approachable and accessible. An extract from Avon & Somerset and Cambridgeshire OPCC submissions illustrates this:

Especially important to the PCC is listening to the 'quiet voices': those who do not shout the loudest but often have the most to say.

Extract from Avon & Somerset OPCC submission to Thematic

Sir Graham Bright has said he wants to be the voice of the public, not the police... [he] sees effective engagement with the public as crucial to the success of the role and improving further trust in the police. In order to do this he has articulated his broad aspirations for engaging with the public both individually and collectively.

Extract from Cambridgeshire OPCC submission to Thematic

Several OPCCs identify aims and objectives for their public engagement, with a number setting out how they will use and monitor engagement. Here are two examples, from the Merseyside and Avon & Somerset OPCC submissions:

The OPCC Community Engagement Team will monitor all new community engagement initiatives. Recognised 'Good Practice' will be recorded and reported back to the Commissioner and OPCC management team for consideration to be used when appropriate in an internal Engagement 'Toolkit'. This will ensure a corporate approach, quality assurance and value for money for all engagement activity carried out jointly by the Police and OPCC.

Extract from Merseyside OPCC submission to Thematic

Contacts

Description: The PCC welcomes contact by email, letter or phone into the OPCC from residents, stakeholders and partners.

Objective: For the PCC to be available to answer or signpost residents' letters and emails. Monthly management information is used to identify trends.

Extract from Avon & Somerset OPCC submission to Thematic

3.2 Approaches to engagement

3.2.1 Target groupings

PCCs and OPCCs segment "Public engagement" in a variety of ways. This is reflected in the extracts below from Avon & Somerset and Dorset OPCCs :

...the PCC has a range of ways through which she engages with the public. As a suite of methods they provide a range of opportunities for members of the community to engage with their PCC.

Extract from Avon & Somerset OPCC submission to Thematic

The OPCC Community Engagement Strategy makes explicit that 'no-one is hard to reach, just 'more expensive to reach.' emphasising the importance of exerting more effort and creativity in reaching these groups.

Extract from Dorset OPCC submission to Thematic

The groups mentioned below appear in at least one of the OPCC submissions we received. Please note, this is not an exhaustive list:

Table 1: Target groupings

Victims	Public	Volunteers	Neighbourhood Watch
Scouts and Guides	Businesses	Councils	Older people
LGBT	People with a disability	Race groups	Faith groups
Staff Associations	Local communities	Ratepayers' representatives	BME
Young people	Children	Rural community	Travellers and Gypsies
Multi Cultural Networks	Women	Learning disability groups	Victim Focus Groups
Human Trafficking	Dementia Alliances	English as foreign language	Witnesses
Offenders	Taxpayers	Living in high crime areas	

It is worth noting that some OPCCs explicitly recognised that it was important not to exclude individuals simply because they do not fit within this segmentation. This is well illustrated by the comment of one of our interviewees that “people don’t fit in simple boxes”, and by an extract from the Humberside OPCC submission which contains a PCC quotation:

“At one of my Street Surgeries in a busy town centre, I observed a young man walk by twice; both times he looked at what was going on, as though he was plucking up courage to come over. On the third time of passing he came over and told me a story of something horrific which had happened to him. He needed help and I helped him find it. If I had held ‘appointment only’ surgeries in a building, that young man would never have come to see me”.

Extract from Humberside OPCC submission to Thematic

3.2.2 Mechanisms and tools

PCCs and OPCCs segment “Public engagement” in a variety of ways. The groups mentioned below appear in at least one of the OPCC submissions we received. Please note, this is not an exhaustive list.

Table 2: Public engagement mechanisms and tools

Outreach workers	Emails	Twitter	Facebook
Surgeries	Meetings	Roadshows	County Show presence
Speaking at conference	On-line surveys	Letters	Market research
Youth Ambassador	Focus Groups	Apps	Alert system
Press releases	Webcasts	Videos	Flickr
YouTube	AudioBoo	Telephone surveys	Control Room call-backs
Independent Advisory Groups	Safer Future Communities Network	Victims' Strategic Planning Group	Young People's Strategic Planning Group
Partnership seminars	Radio broadcasts	Newsletter	Engagement Officer
Older People Advocates	Youth Shadow Board	Youth Champions	Polish Advocates
Engagement Volunteers	Multi-lingual material	Website	Competitions
Case Management systems	Action Point logs	Web chats	Engagement toolkit
Youth Advisory Groups	Crime Summits	Grant Scheme	

It is worth noting that PCCs and OPCCs use different techniques to engage with the same groups. For example, PCCs' approaches to youth engagement include:

- a single, full-time Youth Commissioner;
- a Youth Ambassador;
- Youth Champions;
- a Young People's Strategic Planning Group;
- Youth Advisory Groups
- a Youth Shadow Board.

An extract from Leicestershire OPCC's submission illustrates one approach to youth engagement:

With training and support from the SHM Foundation, the Youth Commission were made up of a diverse cross-section of 14-25 year olds from Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland. Although they worked within necessary guidelines designed to protect young people, each group helped to decide the shape of their own 'Big Conversation' and what issues they examined. On 17th December 2013 members of the Youth Commission presented their findings from their 'Big Conversation' to the Police and Crime Commissioner, senior police officers and a diverse audience of 90 invited guests.

Extract from Humberside OPCC submission to Thematic

3.2.3 Case Study: Social media use

Most PCCs and OPCCs now use social media - primarily Twitter and Facebook - as a tool with which to engage the public. This is one of the few areas where there is some evidence available on how well PCCs are engaging with the public.

Most PCCs and OPCCs have Twitter accounts, with the majority having both “corporate” (OPCC) and “personal” (PCC) accounts. The majority have attracted over 1000 followers.

Table 3: Twitter Followers

	PCC Twitter	OPCC Twitter
5000 or more	0	1
1000 to 4999	20	33
100 to 999	11	7
99 or fewer	0	0
No Twitter account found	11	1
Total	42	42

Research conducted: 1st March 2014

Comparisons between follower numbers for PCC and OPCC accounts suggest that there is no nationally consistent approach for attracting (and, by extension, engaging with) the public.

Table 4: Twitter use

Examining both PCC and OPCC Twitter accounts

	Number
PCC Twitter Followers over 10% greater than OPCC Followers	10
PCC Twitter Followers within +/- 10% of OPCC Followers	6
PCC Twitter Followers over 10% less than OPCC Followers	15
Only one PCC/OPCC Twitter account	10
No Twitter account (note: Deputy PCC has Twitter account)	1
Total	42

Research conducted: 1st March 2014

OPCCs are generally better than PCCs at maintaining a current Twitter feed.

Table 5: Last Tweet

	PCC Twitter	OPCC Twitter
Within last 7 days	18	37
Between 7 and 28 days	1	4
Between one to three months	3	0
Between three to twelve months	2	0
More than twelve months ago	8	0
No Twitter account found	10	1
Total	42	42

Research conducted: 1st March 2014

Active public engagement with PCC and OPCC Facebook accounts (as represented by “Likes”) appears much less than via Twitter, with many PCCs and OPCCs not having a presence, and with fewer discernable followers/likes than for Twitter.

Table 6: Facebook Page Likes

	PCC Pages	OPCC Pages
1000 or more	1	2
From 500 to 999 inclusive	2	0
From 100 to 499 inclusive	12	16
Up to and including 99	5	10
No Facebook Page found	22	14
Totals	42	42

Research conducted: 2nd March 2014

Whilst most OPCCs are better at keeping their Facebook pages current than are PCCs, there are a small number of OPCCs for whom the latest Facebook content is over a year old.

Table 7: Facebook Page last updated

	PCC Page	OPCC Page
Within last 7 days	4	20
Between 7 and 28 days	2	4
Within one to three months	1	0
Within three to twelve months	3	1
More than twelve months ago	10	3
No Facebook Page found	22	14
Total	42	42

Research conducted: 2nd March 2014

3.3 Acting on engagement

A number of PCCs and OPCCs, in their submissions, provided evidence of how their public engagement had an impact. These ranged from engagement acting as inputs to strategic planning and decision-making, through to examples where the engagement had a limited impact - though one of great importance to the member of the public concerned. Here are two examples.

The public forum [for victims of domestic violence] resulted in actions to address the concerns made by victims which included:

- Witnesses providing evidence by video link in a location outside of the court.
- Establishing a more joined-up approach to providing support for victims, regardless of where/how they seek help initially, ensuring the help is tailored to the victim's needs.
- Looking to encourage increased third party reporting where applicable.
- Exploring how victims who fall below the threshold for more intensive intervention (this is called the Marac process. Marac stands for Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference) can best be supported and protected.

Extract from Greater Manchester OPCC submission to Thematic

“I was approached by a woman who had bladder cancer. She was picking up her grandchildren from school when she was caught short, a symptom of the disease. What was she to do? Abandon the children? Not an option. Wet herself? Not an option for such a respectable woman. The only option was to find somewhere to discretely relieve herself, which she did behind her car door. However, someone in a nearby house saw this happen, took her registration number and called the police. Two male officers came to see her at home and she was given a fixed penalty notice for urinating in a public place, the kind you would give to a drunk on a Friday night. She was distraught and asked me if I could intervene. A lot of people do not like to approach the police but see me as just Matthew, someone who can help. I am not an alternative appeals process but on this occasion I went to see the chief constable and the notice was quashed. The point of the story is that I see my role as changing the culture of the police. We lost accountability somewhere along the way”.

Extract from Humberside OPCC submission to Thematic

3.4 Reviewing and learning from that engagement

There has been relatively little to date in the public domain that expressly demonstrates how PCCs and OPCCs review and learn from their engagement. The evidence submitted to this Thematic and contained within Appendix A begins to address this deficit. Here are three examples.

The OPCC Community Engagement Team will monitor all new community engagement initiatives. Recognised ‘Good Practice’ will be recorded and reported back to the Commissioner and OPCC management team for consideration to be used when appropriate in an internal Engagement ‘Toolkit’. This will ensure a corporate approach, quality assurance and value for money for all engagement activity carried out jointly by the Police and OPCC.

Extract from Merseyside OPCC submission to Thematic

The OPCC make use of the following effective ways for engaging with the public: ... conducting an evaluation of engagement and consultation initiatives; being open to learning and considering other approaches and models to engagement.

Extract from Dyfed-Powys OPCC submission to Thematic

Issues discussed at each consultation event are logged. Any immediate operational concerns are raised with the Force and appropriate action taken. Consultation reports are produced on a quarterly basis, covering the results of all consultation undertaken. These reports form part of the PCCs Performance Scrutiny process, to ensure that strategic planning reflects the concerns raised by communities. An annual consultation report is produced, which also includes the results of any relevant consultation undertaken by partner agencies. This is input into the annual refresh of the Police and Crime Plan and this document is also used as part of the Force’s annual strategic planning process. Any issues raised through consultation which require specific work by the PCC Office are added to the action plans associated with each of the PCCs Police and Crime Plan priorities, and progress against these activities is monitored through regular meetings.

Extract from Cleveland OPCC submission to Thematic

4. Conclusions and next steps

Many PCCs and OPCCs have much they can learn from others’ “public engagement” good practice. This learning spans each of the following four areas:

- **Planning** - having a strategy and plan, with clear objectives, for public engagement;
- **Engaging** - putting that engagement strategy and plan into action;
- **Enhancing** - using that engagement to deliver benefit, working to “give a voice to the public” - and communicating that benefit back to the public;
- **Reviewing** - checking that the engagement has achieved the desired objectives and, where appropriate, amending future plans.

The available evidence suggests that PCCs and OPCCs are weaker on the Planning and Reviewing elements of the above cycle. This was certainly the view of many of the experts we consulted. Further, most of the evidence submitted to us by PCCs and OPCCs focuses on the two central elements of “Engaging” and “Enhancing”, with relatively little about “Planning” or “Reviewing”. Much of the submitted evidence is about process rather than objectives and outcomes. Put another way, not that much is said about what PCCs have learned in this area over their first year of office. It may be that the Plan and Review elements are undertaken away from the public eye. If this is so, PCCs and OPCCs might help build public confidence by being more open about their Planning and Review work and analysis.

Many PCCs and OPCCs can significantly improve their effectiveness in “Engaging” and “Enhancing”. Speaking at public meetings (even those that are well attended) is just one part of a PCC’s effective public engagement, as is clearly recognised in some of the evidence submitted to us by PCCs and OPCCs.

The “public engagement” work of several OPCCs indicates that such communication benefits from expert support and review. The high quality of a number of submissions from OPCCs suggests that some OPCCs have made good use of specialist communications and engagement staff and advisors. The maintenance of timely social media sites by OPCCs (in comparison with PCCs’ social media sites) also supports this conclusion.

Evidence (such as in Section 4.2.1) suggests that it is important to maintain a separation, in the public eye, between the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Force itself. This is made more difficult, for example, by the regular local media reference to “police chiefs” as a proxy for the term PCC. However, OPCCs themselves may risk exacerbating that difficulty as a number of force media departments are subsumed within OPCCs under Stage 2 Transfers⁷.

The CoPaCC “PCCs and Public Engagement” Awards 2014 will be announced later in

⁷ see, for example, [\[link\]](#), for the background to Stage 2 Transfers

March 2014. The Awards will be based on the findings from this Thematic and will draw from shortlisted OPCC submissions, which are listed in the Appendix to this Thematic.