A Safe and Resilient Canada

**2009-2010 Evaluation of the
First Nations Policing Program**

**Evaluation Directorate
Public Safety Canada**

2010-09-10

Preface

In Spring 2009, Public Safety Canada was directed to undertake a comprehensive review of the First Nations Policing Program (FNPP). The purposes of the review were:

- to examine key elements of the FNPP, including service delivery models, funding mechanisms, and potential revisions to the policy framework.
- to develop recommendations pertaining to the sustainability, relevance, and effectiveness of the FNPP.

The comprehensive review consists of three elements, the first of which is an independent program evaluation. The evaluation, presented here, was undertaken by Public Safety Canada's Evaluation Directorate. It examines the relevance and performance of the program, as it is administered under the current First Nations Policing Policy.

The second element of the comprehensive review entails an extensive engagement exercise. Public Safety Canada officials therefore met with counterparts in provincial/territorial governments, representatives from police service providers, representatives from First Nation and Inuit communities, and a number of Aboriginal organizations.

The third element of the review is the development of policy options to guide the future direction of the FNPP.

The findings of the evaluation will help inform the development of these policy options. Given the ongoing work in this area, recommendations pertaining to the future of the Program may impact on the implementation of the management action plan.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Evaluation supports accountability to Parliament and Canadians by helping the Government of Canada to credibly report on the results achieved with resources invested in programs. Evaluation supports deputy heads in managing for results by informing them about whether their programs are producing the outcomes that they were designed to achieve, at an affordable cost; and, supports policy and program improvements by helping to identify lessons learned and best practices.

What we examined

The First Nations Policing Policy was approved in 1991 as the framework for the negotiation of culturally appropriate policing arrangements between the federal, provincial or territorial governments and First Nation and Inuit communities. The First Nations Policing Program (FNPP) is intended to provide First Nation and Inuit communities with access to police services that are professional, effective, culturally appropriate and accountable, without prejudice to the provinces or territories that are responsible for policing their respective jurisdictions.

Why it's important

The purpose of the First Nations Policing Program is to support the provision of police services in First Nation and Inuit communities, where it is presumed such services will contribute to the improvement of social order, public security and personal safety in First Nation communities, including that of women, children and other vulnerable groups. The FNPP is intended to enhance public safety in First Nation and Inuit communities; and that the FNPP is not intended to replace police services normally provided by the province or territory.

Prior to the First Nations Policing Program, there was recognition that some First Nation and Inuit communities were living in situations with inadequate police presence; poor response time; a lack of crime prevention activity; and, a lack of understanding of and sensitivity to Aboriginal culture by police officers. In 2009-10, Public Safety Canada spent $129,732,496 ($113,157,529 for contributions, $12,197,442 as part of Canada's *Economic Action Plan* for short-term infrastructure projects, and $4,377,525 for operating expenses) to support the provision of policing services to 419,728 persons.

What we found

The founding principles of the FNPP remain relevant today. First Nation and Inuit communities continue to have a need for police services that are professional, effective, culturally appropriate, and accountable to the communities they serve. The FNPP is aligned to the Government's policy initiative of "Keeping Canadians Safe".

The evaluators interviewed community representatives. More than 75% rated "the level of professionalism" and "enforcing the criminal code" as "good" or "very good" when asked to rate attributes related to the quality of policing. They were also more than 75% to rate "being approachable and easy to talk with" and "showing respect for members of the community" as "well" or "very well" when asked to rate attributes related to the quality of service.

Within the Aboriginal Policing Directorate (APD), emphasis has been placed on negotiating new and renewing agreements with First Nation and Inuit communities and the provinces or territories. However, as demonstrated in this report, cultural appropriateness, responsiveness and accountability to communities are areas that require attention.

We agree with APD's position that it should be up to the communities to define cultural appropriateness. In addition, we believe that any improvements with respect to cultural appropriateness, responsiveness, and accountability to communities will occur when community governance of police service providers is strengthened and when police services adopt models that include a greater involvement and engagement of the communities.

Strengthening community governance of police service providers is an integral component of making service providers accountable, responsive, and culturally appropriate. Communities should be encouraged to engage in regular dialogue with local police services and provide them with information about their culture, local community dynamics, and indigenous approaches to justice and problem solving. Communities should also be supported to strengthen their Community Consultative Groups and Police Management Boards abilities to oversee the performance of their police services against the objectives of the FNPP.

Based on key findings and conclusions contained in this report, the Evaluation Directorate recommends that the Assistant Deputy Minister, Community Safety and Partnerships Branch, ensure that the Aboriginal Policing Directorate address the following recommendations:

1. Assist in strengthening community governance of police service providers.

2. Ensure that future contribution agreements include performance objectives and reporting obligations that support APD's ability to measure the achievement of FNPP objectives.

3. Take measures to assess whether the objectives of the FNPP are achieved effectively and efficiently by the innovative service delivery approaches proposed by Program partners and stakeholders.

APD reviewed the three recommendations from the 2009-2010 evaluation of the First Nations Policing Program (FNPP). In the context of the comprehensive review of the FNPP, an examination of key elements of the FNPP, including service delivery models, funding mechanisms, and potential revisions to the FNPP policy framework, is underway. Recognizing that the work of the review is not yet complete, APD has outlined a response to the three recommendations by indicating planned actions, key deliverables and anticipated completion dates.

1. Introduction

This evaluation provides Canadians, Parliamentarians, Ministers, central agencies[1] and the Deputy Minister of Public Safety an evidence-based, neutral assessment of the value for money, (i.e., relevance and performance) of this federal government program.

2. Profile

2.1. Background

While policing is regulated concurrently by Parliament and provincial legislatures, policing is considered to be primarily the responsibility of Provinces. Provincial legislative authority regarding policing is found under Section 92(14) of *The Constitution Act*, which outlines provincial legislative jurisdiction with respect to the administration of justice. This section gives the provincial legislatures the authority to enact laws establishing police forces and regulating the appointment, supervision and discipline of members of these forces. Such provincial police forces have the authority to enforce not only provincial laws but also federal criminal laws. The federal legislative authority to establish through law police forces to enforce the *Criminal Code* and other federal statutes is an accessory of Parliament's power to enact substantive laws.

In 1991, the federal government introduced an Indian Policing Policy Framework for the negotiation of culturally appropriate policing arrangements between the federal, provincial or territorial governments, and First Nation or Inuit communities. The Framework consisted of a general statement of federal objectives, a statement of policy purpose, policy principles and funding parameters. The Indian Policing Program – now referred to as the First Nations Policing Program (FNPP) – was created as the funding vehicle of the Framework. The FNPP is a discretionary and non-statutory transfer payment program.

Some of the key principles of the First Nations Policing Policy include a recognition that First Nation and Inuit communities should have access to policing services which are responsive to their particular policing needs; communities should have input in determining the level and quality of the police services they are provided; the FNPP is intended to enhance public safety in First Nation and Inuit communities; and that the FNPP is not intended to replace police services normally provided by the province or territory .

The current terms and conditions of the FNPP describe the Program as providing First Nation and Inuit communities on reserve, Crown land or land set-aside for their use with access to police services that are:

- professional,

- effective,

---

[1] Central agencies are organizations that have a central coordinating role. These organizations work across government departments to provide advice to the prime minister and Cabinet and to ensure policy coherence and coordination on their behalf.

- culturally appropriate, and

- accountable to the communities they serve,

without prejudice to the provincial or territorial jurisdiction for policing.

In addition, there were two legacy programs for policing Aboriginal communities, in place prior to the creation of the FNPP:

Band Constable Program (BCP) agreements are funded at 100% by the federal government. These are bilateral agreements between a First Nation and the federal government. Band constables undertake such activities as:

- enforce Band by-laws and areas of local concerns not looked after by the RCMP or provincial police;

- refer to the RCMP or provincial police cases involving the *Criminal Code* or offences under other federal or provincial legislation.

The Aboriginal Community Constable Program (ACCP) provides for a limited number of designated peace officers (managed by the RCMP) to serve certain First Nation and other Aboriginal communities. ACCP agreements—negotiated by the province and Public Safety Canada—often assign specific peace officers to spend all of their time serving the community. The ACCP program is cost-shared at 46% by the federal government and 54% by the provincial or territorial government.

2.2. Delivery Approach

The FNPP works on the principles of tripartite partnerships with communities, provinces and territories. There are four types of agreements managed by the Program:

1. Self-Administered (SA) Agreements are negotiated among First Nation or Inuit communities, provincial or territorial governments, and the federal government. Under such agreements communities are responsible for managing their own police service, which is primarily staffed by officers of First Nation or Inuit descent.

2. First Nations Community Policing Services (FNCPS) Framework Agreements are bilateral agreements between the federal and provincial/territorial governments that allow for the future signing of individual Community Tripartite Agreements.

3. Community Tripartite Agreements (CTA) are a direct result of FNCPS Framework Agreements. Like SA agreements, CTAs are negotiated among First Nation or Inuit communities, provincial or territorial governments, and the federal government. Under a CTA arrangement, the First Nation or Inuit community has dedicated officers from an existing police service, typically the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP).

4. Bilateral Contribution Agreements are agreements between the federal government and an identified recipient for specific projects – such as research, training and development initiatives – that respect and advance the mandate of the FNPP.

Under the FNPP, the federal government pays 52% and the provincial or territorial government pays 48% of the cost of the First Nations policing service. Table 1 presents the number of agreements by province and territory.

Table 1, Numbers of Agreements

Province	CTA	Municipal CTA	SA	ACCP
Ontario	0	0	10	0
Quebec	0	0	22	0
British Columbia	47	1	1	0
Alberta	10	0	3	1
Saskatchewan	34	0	1	0
Manitoba	8	0	1	1
New Brunswick	3	1	0	0
Nova Scotia	7	1	0	0
Prince Edward Island	2	0	0	0
Newfoundland	4	0	0	0
Yukon	1	0	0	1
Northwest Territories	0	0	0	1
Nunavut	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	**116**	**3**	**38**	**4**

Source: December 31, 2009 APD database

Table 2 presents the number of communities and population covered by all FNPP agreements.

Table 2, Coverage by Agreement Types

Year	CTA		ACCP		SA		Total Population
	Communities	Population	Communities	Population	Communities	Population	
2009-2010	223	164,553	88	95,734	172	159,441	419,728
2008-2009	223	164,553	88	95,734	182	161,173	421,460
2007-2008	222	161,829	85	92,999	184	160,299	415,127
2006-2007	216	158,076	85	91,756	189	162,288	412,120
2005-2006	165	114,469	138	125,316	196	157,437	397,222
2004-2005	117	84,523	161	129,561	196	155,876	369,960
2003-2004	114	77,987	164	133,717	195	154,398	366,102
2002-2003	113	76,353	158	128,524	194	153,798	358,675
2001-2002	107	69,126	158	126,530	192	159,517	355,173

- For 2009-2010, December 31, 2009 was used for data
- All other fiscal years used March 31 of the end year

2.3.   Assessment of Funding Requirements

Within the funds available, the federal and provincial/territorial governments and First Nation or Inuit communities determine the number of police officers and civilian staff to be supported by government funding based on a business case prepared by the police services that include information on:

- the demographic characteristics of the population to be served (i.e., age and number of persons)

- the size and nature of the geographic area to be covered

- the police workload in the community based on crime statistics and crime prevention activities.

2.4.   Resources

In 2009-10, Public Safety Canada spent $129,732,496 ($113,157,529 for contributions, $12,197,442 as part of Canada's *Economic Action Plan* for short-term infrastructure projects, and $4,377,525 for operating expenses) to support the provision of policing services to 419,728 persons.

The First Nations Policing Program (FNPP) is managed by the Aboriginal Policing Directorate (APD) of the Community Safety and Partnerships Branch at Public Safety Canada staffed with 59 persons. Within the Aboriginal Policing Directorate, there are two functional groups: Operations (with people at headquarters and in the regions) and Policy Division, with people engaged in policy development, research, and analysis.

3.   About the Evaluation

3.1.   Objective

This evaluation supports:

- accountability to Parliament and Canadians by helping the government to credibly report on the results achieved with resources invested in this program;

- the Deputy Minister of Public Safety in managing for results by informing him about whether this program is producing the outcomes that it was designed to produce, at an affordable cost; and,

- policy and program improvements.

3.2.   Scope and Context of the Evaluation

The Evaluation Directorate of Public Safety Canada conducted this evaluation between July 2009 and August 2010. The timing of the evaluation serves to meet two requirements.

There is a Treasury Board *Policy on Evaluation* requirement that the evaluation be completed by 2010-2011. The second reason for the evaluation is to inform senior departmental managers and program managers who are conducting a Comprehensive Review of the FNPP.

The findings of this evaluation address the following issues:

Relevance

1. Continued Need for Program

2. Alignment with Government Priorities

3. Federal Role

Performance

1. Achievement of Expected Outcomes

2. Economy and Efficiency

3.3. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation team used five complementary evaluation methodologies designed in a manner to yield multiple lines of evidence in order to enhance construct validity for the findings.

Literature Review: A review and synthesis of literature was conducted. A complete bibliography of the documents reviewed is presented in Annex A.

Data Base Mining: Identification and use of data in existing sources. Chief among these were the Aboriginal Policing Information Management System, Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics and the Indian and Northern Affairs Canada Aboriginal Profiles.

Analysis of Program Cost Data: Analysis of the financial arrangements and costs for the FNPP and consideration of the cost-effectiveness of the several models in use.

Interviews of First Nations Community Representatives: A random sample of 100 First Nation and Inuit communities served by FNPP was sought. The populations of communities receiving support from the FNPP were identified and then listed by province. Samples were selected, proportional to the numbers in each province and cooperation was sought by means of advance telephone calls.

Each community for which a telephone interview could not be concluded was replaced by a random draw within the same province. A data sample of 62 respondents answered the evaluation questions (35 respondents from CTA communities and 27 respondents from SA communities). The interview guide is presented in Annex B.

Key Informant Interviews: Interviews were conducted with senior representatives of provinces, with representatives of national Aboriginal policing organizations, with senior officials in other federal departments with responsibilities for First Nations and with officers from the Aboriginal Policing Directorate (APD) of Public Safety Canada.

3.4. Limitations of the Methodology and Findings

All five methodologies are individually capable of providing trustworthy findings; as a set, they were designed to produce convergent validity through triangulation. The limitations noted below are those that occurred during the course of the study.

- The extent of non-response in the telephone interviews with First Nation communities means that the data sample represents the communities with the capacity to cooperate and not necessarily a representative subset of the communities served by FNPP.

- Lack of Performance Measurement Data. Basic performance information is not available. It was not possible to determine how much time individual police officers are physically present in each community; how much time individual police officers spend on community policing; the length of posting of individual police officers assigned to a specific community; or, the number of police officers who are Aboriginal.

3.5. Evaluation Protocols

Engagement and Collaboration

The evaluation enjoyed the cooperation of personnel of the Program and of the RCMP; representatives of both were asked for information at many points during the evaluation. Their contribution to the data requirements is gratefully acknowledged.

Approvals

The final draft evaluation report, including Program management response and action plan, was presented to the Public Safety Canada Departmental Evaluation Committee for consideration and for recommendation to the Deputy Minister of Public Safety for final approval.

4. Findings

4.1. Relevance

4.1.1 Ongoing Need

Several federal and provincial officials pointed out that the policing needs are greater now than they were when the FNPP was created. The population has grown significantly and the social and safety issues are more significant today, which necessitates more dollars for support. In discussing priorities for policing, the community representatives identified their community police service as having no lack of policing challenges to focus upon. Dealing more effectively with illegal drugs and alcohol abuse was considered by respondents in all policing arrangements as requiring the highest priority. Eighty percent of the community representatives did not think that the number of officers in their respective communities was adequate to meet the community's policing needs.

Community representatives were asked to characterize safety and security in their community. About two-thirds of the community representatives considered their community to be safe and secure (collapsing "very safe and secure" with "somewhat safe and secure"). There was a modest difference between responses from single and multi-community SA agreement respondents, with respondents in the former category giving the more positive ratings on safety and security.

The community representatives were also asked to consider how serious eleven types of criminal activities or social problems were in their community, assessing them on a scale from "very serious" to "not at all serious". Overall, the top-rated issues in terms of seriousness were drug abuse, alcohol abuse and poverty, cited as serious problems by 82%, 70% and 70% of the community representatives respectively. The items assessed as least serious were public disorder, gangs and sexual assaults, cited as such only by 20%, 22% and 26% of the community representatives respectively. Table 3 breaks down these responses by type of policing arrangement. There was much consensus among community representatives of all policing arrangements that drug and alcohol abuse, especially drug abuse, were serious problems in their communities. Roughly half the respondents in each policing arrangement considered domestic / family violence to be a serious problem and roughly 25% in each arrangement considered public disorder to be a serious problem. Generally, community representatives in SA policing arrangements were much less likely to characterize various crimes such as assaults, break and enter, vandalism and gang presence as serious problems in their community, but they were more likely than respondents in CTA communities to indicate that poverty was a serious problem.

Table 3, Assessing the Seriousness of Criminal and Social Issues

Criminal and Social Issues	CTA	SA
Drug Abuse	87%	75%
Alcohol Abuse	71%	67%
Domestic / Family Violence	54%	50%
Poverty	50%	83%
Burglary	54%	56%
Other Assaults	60%	33%
Vandalism	44%	42%
Youth Alienation	33%	42%
Sexual Assault	37%	17%
Public Disorder	21%	17%
Gangs	26%	8%

Community representatives were questioned about possible priorities for policing in their communities. They were asked to rate the priority of ten items (and suggest others not specified) such as "more police to enforce the law" and "dealing more effectively with violent crime". The items are specified in Table 4 below, where the % of respondents saying the issue is a 'high' priority is given by type of policing arrangement.

Overall, the top three "high" priority[2] issues given by a huge majority of respondents were "dealing with illegal drugs and alcohol abuse", "liaison with youth" and "visible presence in the community". Items garnering the least percentage of high priority rating were "police residing in the community", and "better collaboration between police and community authorities". Among the "other" open-ended comments advanced by respondents, about a fifth returned to the drugs issues and a handful referred equally to elders or presence, or cultural issues.

While dealing with drug issues and relating better to youth were pivotal challenges identified by all respondents, there was some variation among respondents' priority ratings that was associated with the type of policing arrangement. Those respondents under SA policing usually gave more "high priority" ratings to the ten issues than the respondents under CTA agreements.

---

[2] Given the small numbers "very high" and "high" priority ratings were merged.

Table 4, Assessing the "High" Priorities for Policing

Attributes	CTA	SA
Dealing Effectively with Illegal Drugs and Alcohol Abuse	75%	92%
More Work with Youth	75%	92%
More Police to Enforce the Law	65%	83%
More Police Visibility	65%	83%
More Aboriginal Officers	65%	83%
More Effective Response to Violent Crime	65%	75%
More Police Sensitive to Local Culture	60%	75%
More Crime Prevention	54%	92%
Better Collaboration Between Police and Community Authorities	50%	58%
More police residing here	43%	42%

In addition to the literature review conducted for this evaluation, we examined the literature review commissioned by the Ipperwash Inquiry (more than 15,000 pages of material from inquiries, commissions, studies, reports and evaluations of Aboriginal police relations in Canada, Australia, and the United States). The reviewers found consensus in three significant areas as to what "should" and, in some cases, what "seemed" to be working. The first area of consensus was the potential for community policing approaches to reduce crime and to improve relationships between police and the persons they are to serve. A second area of consensus was with regard to governance models. They found that Aboriginal persons must be given greater control over police services and in turn, must be more accountable for results. The third area of consensus was in relation to recruitment, training, and retention of police officers. They found that key dimensions of a successful approach include screening for racism, recruitment of more Aboriginal persons to police service, employee and family assistance programs, and cross-cultural training that utilizes Aboriginal officers.

4.1.2   Alignment with Federal Priorities

The 2009 Speech from the Throne reaffirmed the Government's priorities set out in the 2008 Speech from the Throne, including a commitment to take tough action against crime and to work with partners to improve the administration of justice.

Budget 2009 reflects the Government's commitment to deliver potent economic stimulus to encourage growth and restore confidence in the economy, including through the provision of funding for short-term infrastructure projects. Policing infrastructure in First Nation and Inuit communities was identified as part of Canada's *Economic Action Plan* outlined in the Budget.

In March, 2007, the Honourable Stockwell Day, then Minister of Public Safety, described RCMP First Nations Community Policing Service Agreements in the following terms: "These agreements demonstrate that Canada's New Government is taking action in collaboration with Provinces and Territories, as well as First Nations communities, to support Aboriginal policing and make our communities safer".[3]

The policy initiative of the Canadian government, "Keeping Canadians Safe", has been maintained over time. In the Speech from the Throne of November 2008, it was stated that "Canadians need to be assured that they are safe in their homes and communities" and that "Canadians look to governments to ensure that the justice system is working effectively and that Canadians are safe."

4.1.3   Role of the Federal Government

Up to the 1960s the policing of reserves was exclusively handled by the RCMP who did use 'native assistants' for local detachments and even as informal band constables to enforce band by-laws, but there was no set policy to guide these practices (Clairmont, 2000: 17). In the 1960s, the RCMP began the process of withdrawing from policing in Ontario and Quebec, and the provincial services (OPP and SQ, respectively) moved in. In the meantime, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) developed Circular 34 in 1965 to initiate a more formal Band Constable Program, where Aboriginal constables would serve as a supplement to the RCMP, OPP or SQ by enforcing band by-laws, band property and traffic control, or liquor offences (Armstrong, 1969: 1-6).

Through the 1960s, First Nation communities began to demand more involvement in policing their communities. INAC responded with Circular 55 in 1971 to outline the categories of Indian constables and to phase out the supernumerary constables by March 31, 1972 (Bergevin, 1971: 3). The RCMP, OPP and SQ all ran their versions of the special Indian constable programs:

- RCMP – 3B force – Indian Special Constable Program – community residents hired and exclusively directed by the RCMP with six or more weeks of training and the ability to carry a weapon and make arrests. This program was terminated in 1990, and constables received additional training and were integrated into full member status with the RCMP (FCPA 2001a: 105).

- OPP – Ontario Indian Special Constable Program (OICP) – as with the RCMP this 'second class' officer perspective was demeaning to many of the Aboriginal officers who served within it. On the other hand, the program avoided the RCMP problems by defining its role as a liaison with the OPP. It ultimately had 132 constables active in the

---

[3] 2007 News release 2007-03-01: Minister Day tables 80 RCMP First Nations Community Policing Service Agreements

program serving 65 communities (FCPA 2001a: 93). In July 1975, the federal government and the Government of Ontario entered into a cost-sharing arrangement to fund an Ontario Indian Constable Program – under this program, First Nations constables are not employees of the OPP, but are employees of First Nation councils (FCPA 2001a: 115).

- SQ – Amerindian Police Program (APP) – First Nations officers received more training than band constables and engaged in a wide range of police activities but were not considered full members of the SQ nor as peace officers by the province (Clairmont, 2000: 18).

By the 1970s, policing of First Nation communities would become a central issue to certain land claims, most notably for the James Bay Cree and Naskapi in Quebec, where autonomous police services were negotiated for and won. By the 1980s, more and more First Nation communities would take on policing roles as communities demanded more native staff, native control and more community-based policing (Clairmont, 2006: 17-19). Both the Head Report (1989) and the Indian Policing Policy Review Task Force Report (1990) highlighted the need for Aboriginal police members to be treated with equal respect and for more support to be given to Band Constable Programs, while enhancing communication between governments and policing services and First Nation communities. These recommendations, in part, led to the creation of the 1991 First Nations Policing Policy (Clairmont, 15-16; INAC, 1990: 14; 20).

Through the 1990s, after the FNPP was created, there was a rapid rise in the number of Aboriginal police officers. The rise of Aboriginal policing has also led to a rise in community expectations for greater service and involvement, as well as an expectation of greater transparency into all police actions and policies (Griffiths 2008). The push for greater efficiency and more stringent reporting requirements for police services is particularly challenging for small and medium-sized police services, and these include the bulk of the Self-Administered police services (Clairmont, 2006:10-11). First Nations populations are steadily increasing, which will only increase the workload of current services, while the rapid turnover rate and high vacancy rates in both SAs and CTAs highlight the need for more resources or risk permanent gaps in operating efficiency (Clatworthy, 2005: 48-49; Deukmedjian 2003, 2006; Sixdion, 2001:24-27).

The view of provincial respondents is that there is a very important role for the federal government to play in coordinating policing services with those of health, social services and other related functions - areas that impact on the need for policing in First Nation communities.

The majority of provincial governments and other federal departments/agencies suggest that coordination should be led at the national level but should be planned and managed primarily at the provincial level with participation from First Nations leadership.

The Public Safety Canada mandate is to keep Canadians safe from a range of risks such as natural disasters, crime and terrorism. Working with provincial/territorial governments and First Nation and Inuit communities, the FNPP provides funding for the provision of policing services to enhance safety and security in these communities.

4.2. Performance

4.2.1 Cultural Appropriateness

There has been a steady growth in cultural sensitivity and cultural appropriateness in police services in Canada since the 1990s, with particular attention being paid to Aboriginal peoples. The RCMP and the OPP for example have worked to enhance Aboriginal recruitment within their policing services, but First Nations officers continue to be in high demand to facilitate community liaison needs (Linden, 2007 Vol. 2: 197-230; Linden et al. 2002: 15). Between 1996 and 2001 the proportion of Aboriginal police officers increased from 3% to 4% of all officers (Taylor-Buts, 2004:15). Since 1990, the RCMP has had a national advisory council with Aboriginal leaders and has participated in Restorative Justice and Youth Justice Initiatives targeting Aboriginal populations at risk (Chatterjee, 2003: 352-358; Clairmont and Potts, 2006:34). In addition, the use of CTAs has further improved the lines of communication between the RCMP and the communities it serves (Watt, 2008: 8-9). The record of cultural sensitivity is even greater in First Nations police services. In a survey of First Nation police chiefs, Sixdion found that 70% of them used elders and community members in an advisory capacity (2001:33).

Many of the First Nation communities feel that their local police are "doing a good job" but they call for more community-based policing (Rigakos, 2008: 98; Statistics Canada, 2006: 14). There is also a need for a close working relationship between the police service and other service providers in Aboriginal communities, because many of the problems associated with alcoholism, drug use, domestic violence and poverty are intertwined and underpin other social problems seen in many First Nation communities (Guy 2008; Hylton 2006; Legge 2003; Rathwell 2003). Part of culturally sensitive policing involves acknowledging the legacy of colonialism and residential school attendance and focusing on crime prevention and community education (Clairmont, 2000). Fifty percent of community respondents rated sensitivity to local culture as "good".

Most stakeholders advised evaluators that the task of providing culturally relevant policing is very complicated because there is so much diversity among the First Nations. "Each First Nations is different and some communities want a more standard Euro-Canadian cultural practice while others are very traditional in their approach."

Public Safety Canada does not define cultural relevance *per se*, and is of the view that communities funded pursuant to an FNPP agreement are in the best position to do so. The FNPP does, however, emphasize the tripartite nature of policing, whereby communities have input into the process, as the basis for cultural relevance.

In addition, the First Nations Policing Policy recognizes the value of cultural and linguistic backgrounds as an element of effective and responsive policing in First Nation and Inuit communities. To that end, policing arrangements made under the FNPP typically have a clause that recognizes that policy principle. For instance, some CTAs state that the RCMP will make best efforts to ensure that members assigned to the community are Aboriginal and/or respectful of the culture and traditions of the First Nation.

APD officials observed that Aboriginal officers are proportionately more common among the SA agreements, but they also perceived that Aboriginal officers are common in the CTA-policed

Aboriginal communities. Provincial officials generally considered that, with respect to Aboriginal policing in their jurisdiction, the officers are thought to have the desired personal traits, training and cultural background. As evidence, they pointed to the number of Aboriginal police officers. At the same time, provincial officials also identified cultural training as "a continuing need", something that always needs work and resources.

The provincial officials and other stakeholders interviewed shared this criterion of cultural sensitivity. The consensus view was that the key was to respect the community being policed and pay attention to local ways. The key elements for culturally relevant policing were given as, first the background of the police officer, second, cultural awareness, and related training.

4.2.2 Responsiveness of Police Services

In the view of First Nation community respondents, there have been improvements in local police service though largely attributed to facets of policing (such as the fine efforts of the officers), rather than profound change in the character and structure of the policing service itself. Their answers included some clear patterns. Respondents representing communities policed under an SA arrangement clearly emphasized that the selected arrangement "seemed most likely to offer culturally appropriate policing" while those whose communities were policed under a CTA agreement were most likely to answer along the lines "It offered more effective policing".

Community representatives rated the following attribute of FNPP policing the highest: professionalism, enforcing the *Criminal Code* and working with other police services. The SAs also received higher ratings for keeping citizens safe and protecting property.

Sixty percent of the community representatives contended that all social groups were served equally well and none of the respondents indicated that socio-economic differentiation was associated with differential police service.

Asked to elaborate on why they indicated that not all community members received equal police service, the respondents gave a variety of answers but two factors were paramount, namely (a) the combination of manpower shortage and large geographical distances to be policed has meant that those in more distant or hard-to-reach places get poorer service such as several days for a response to their call for service; (b) the respondents simply said that their view was based on complaints from residents who insisted that they were not as well served by police whether in responding to their calls for service or following up on investigations. Only one respondent directly suggested that the police officers were biased in carrying out their duties.

Table 5 provides the percentage of community respondents that assessed their police services as good for selected aspect of service.

Table 5, Assessing the Quality of Policing as "Good" by Attribute

Attributes	CTA	SA
High level of Professionalism	93%	75%
Enforcing Criminal Code	87%	75%
Working with other Police Services	86%	67%
Enforcing Provincial Statutes	72%	58%
Independent from Inappropriate Influences	72%	50%
Keeping Citizens Safe	64%	67%
Protecting Property	50%	67%
Providing Crime Prevention Info	44%	50%
Being Visible	39%	50%
Preventing Crime	33%	33%
Enforcing band Bylaws	31%	33%
Prompt Response to calls for Service	28%	33%

Over 80% of community respondents indicated that the number of officers in their community was inadequate to the community's policing challenges. In elaborating on their views, many reasons were advanced by the interviewees. The four factors most identified were:

a) officers are overworked, their shifts too long, they are stressed out;

b) the growing population requires more officers; according to police stats we need more;

c) police response time is poor and /or the police have a wide area and several communities to cover;

d) the levels of crime and social problems (especially illicit drugs) require more officers and/or there is a need for 24/7 policing.

In addition to these most common causes, a few respondents held that the policing complement was inadequate since it prevented the police service from being more engaged in a community-based policing style; as one respondent observed, "police are portrayed as bad guys and more 'constructive policing" is needed; most youth are scared of RCMP".

The community representatives were asked to rate the local police service from "very good" to "very poor" on a variety of items listed in Table 6. Overall, the items with the highest percentage "good" were being approachable and easy to talk to; showing respect for community members; and, working with schools and local agencies. The first two items received a "good" rating from 80% of respondents, while the third item received a "good" rating from 63%.

The items receiving the lowest "good" ratings were youth liaison activities; presentations to groups in the community; and, achieving a good balance between law enforcement and community policing. These items received "good" ratings from 29%, 40% and 47% of respondents respectively.

Table 6, Assessing Service as "Good" by Aspects of Police-Community Relations

How Police are Doing at	CTA	SA
Being Approachable and Easy to talk with	97%	76%
Showing Respect for Members of the Community Members	87%	67%
Working with Local Agencies	76%	67%
Being Accountable to local policing Authorities (Boards/Consultation Groups)	54%	67%
Collaborating with Community leaders in Planning	55%	50%
Balancing Law Enforcement and Community Policing	50%	67%
Sensitive to Local Culture	50%	50%
Understanding Local Culture	44%	42%
Making Presentations to Local Groups	38%	58%
Youth Liaison Activities	38%	34%

4.2.3 Capacity of Community Consultative Groups and Police Management Boards

The majority of provincial government respondents indicated that the governance area was an aspect of First Nations policing that needed improvement. Some comments: We were told that the governance arrangements to facilitate community involvement could be improved with more

communication between police and chief and council to ensure key decisions on policing can be reached and understood by all. We were also told that the governance arrangements in the CTA depend on how effective the Community Consultative Group is and this takes a lot of work and continuous training in police management and in training the Officer in Charge in culturally relevant policing. When the policing is working well – police and community partnering well – the focus can shift to issues such as housing and employment which may lie at the root of social problems.

APD officials noted that there is significant variation in the adequacy of the accountability arrangements among the various Aboriginal communities. Most APD respondents commented that the governance arrangements work but there is variation by jurisdiction or that some communities are very effective and some are not and that it usually came down to community capacity. APD officials noted that they had been able to provide resources for training for Community Consultative Groups but this has been very limited in recent years. It was pointed out that some Community Consultative Groups are voluntary and some communities have none. They indicated that they need to have a dialogue with band councils and community service providers as well as provincial and territorial partners and agree on a formal accountability/governance model. The issue of funding would also need to be addressed.

The requirement for accountability to the community is not being achieved. Overall, only 52% of the community representatives reported that there was a local governance body in place for their police organization.

While police officers may get a range of training for their roles, most of the Community Consultative Groups did not receive training for their role, as Watt observed in his study of CTAs in BC communities.[4] Furthermore, Watt found that the RCMP and the community members were often confused about one or more parts of the CTA process and setting up Community Consultative Groups; this stems from the rapid turnover rate (40 to 50%) in both the police services and community member boards.[5]

The FNPP is designed to ensure that the communities being served by a police service funded pursuant to an agreement have the opportunity to advise on policing priorities and strategies. In terms of governance, SAs stipulate that an independent Police Governance Board (often called a police management board or a police commission) be established to represent the policing concerns and interests of the community. This provides a degree of police independence from political officials.

With the CTA model, the First Nations communities are expected to establish and maintain a Community Consultative Group. This group provides a forum for liaison and discussion between the band, the police, and the community. It also helps in the development of police objectives, priorities, strategies, and projects. Community Consultative Groups play a critical advisory role.

---

[4]   Watt, S. RCMP FNCPS Review: A review of the First Nation Community Police Service in British Columbia for Canada, the province of BC and the CTA Steering Committee. 2008, Page 27.

[5]   Watt, S. RCMP FNCPS Review: A review of the First Nation Community Police Service in British Columbia for Canada, the province of BC and the CTA Steering Committee. 2008, Pages 40-53.

The authority over the police service remains in the hands of the RCMP management hierarchy that ends with the Commissioner based in Ottawa.[6]

Those community representatives who indicated they did not have a police board or a police advisory committee, gave, in roughly equal proportion, basically one of three reasons:

(a) the community has been interested in principle in having a police services governance arrangement but for one reason or another (e.g., no resources, no volunteers) cannot get it off the ground;

(b) policing matters go through a local authority such as chief and council, band manager or director;

(c) the community feeling that directing the police is up to the federal government (e.g., "council has always taken the view that they are not the employers", "the federal government directs the RCMP").

4.2.4   Monitoring of Agreements

In the period under review, APD focused almost entirely on establishing new agreements and renegotiating existing ones. There are few performance measures in place to oversee existing agreements and monitor the achievement of program objectives, namely with respect to cultural appropriateness, focusing on the specific policing needs of communities and police services being accountable to the communities.

Monitoring activities may include community visits, attendance as observers at selected police board/community consultation groups meetings, meetings with relevant Chief of Police/Detachment Commander, regular contacts with funding partners, review of periodically operational reports prepared by the police service provider, review of media reports, reviews of complaints submitted to the police board/community consultation groups, and reviews of financial reports.

The police service providers provide operational reports. Evaluators were not informed of any performance targets and/or performance information/data that are aligned with FNPP objectives. The RCMP does not track the amount of time that officers assigned under the CTA spend in the community. Therefore, it cannot assure APD that officers spend their time in the communities to which they are assigned and for which they are funded. Although there are clauses inserted into each agreement to prevent 'stacking' of policing resources and overpayment, there has not been any tracking of the degree to which that stacking does occur (2007 RMAF:22).

The RCMP, for example, is frequently unable to deliver the personnel amounts to ensure that 80% of a CTA officer's time is spent in the community that he or she is assigned to (Canada,

---

[6]   The internal management of the RCMP First Nations Community Policing Service refers to its administration and the determination and application of professional police procedures. Responsibility for internal management will rest with the Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/pubs/abo-aut/fncps-spcpn-eng.htm

2005). Often the projected police officer assignment exists only on paper; Watt's study of the CTAs in British Columbia, for example, revealed that of the 91 RCMP positions on paper for 44 CTAs in 101 First Nations communities, only 82.5 were actively filled, while the other 8.5 were vacant or off-duty for other reasons (2008: 7).

4.2.5 Length of Agreements

A major, and consistent, criticism of the agreements is the counter-productive results of year-to-year funding of the agreements due to the ongoing comprehensive review of the Program. Provincial representatives contended that even five year renewals – let alone the current situation of one-year agreements – are inefficient. The minimum timeframe wanted was five years and most argued for at least ten years or, preferably, 20 years in line with the Provincial Police Service Agreements. The short-term renewal process was seen as being unnecessarily expensive and as detracting attention from issues more central to effectiveness.

4.2.6 Exploring Innovative Service Delivery Options

The literature review also indicated that there is concern that the FNPP has set up Aboriginal policing that perpetuates 'mainstream policing' because the training and certification of Aboriginal officers is determined by the policing authorities, and the role of policing has not changed, as it requires an adversarial approach (i.e., arrest) that may conflict with Aboriginal traditional modes of protecting society and administering justice.[7]

Evaluators found numerous instances where local and provincial police services have undertaken community policing initiatives. For example, the Surrey RCMP Detachment provides the following description of its community policing efforts:

"Community policing, as the name suggests, is deeply rooted in the belief that crime and public safety issues are a shared responsibility between police and the community. As such, communities play an integral role in any policing strategy and should be engaged as active partners in the delivery of police programs and services operating within the traditional policing model structure (e.g., from crime prevention and education to intelligence, investigation, enforcement and victim support)".

Policing, in partnership with the community, calls for community involvement in the identification of community problems and policing needs, as well as in the design and implementation of solutions. In a community policing model, the police strive to be more than mere 'reactive' agents of law enforcement. Rather, the emphasis is placed on positive police-community interaction to foster dialogue, build relationships and ultimately mobilize partnerships within the community that will result in a more collective and proactive response to local crime and safety issues.

At the heart of the community policing philosophy is consultation between the police service and community stakeholders—local residents and business owners, community non-profit

---

[7]   Kaloczi, K. K. 2004 The implications of self-government with respect to Aboriginal justice initiatives. Master's, Carleton University. Pages 61-62.

organizations, for example, City Council and other public sector agencies at all levels of government. In Surrey, this is achieved through a variety of mechanisms, including regular RCMP community consultative group meetings at the District level and Detachment participation on Integrated Service Teams and other community-based task forces or working group committees."[8]

Under the community policing model, police management needs to infuse community policing ideals throughout their organizations by making a number of critical changes in climate and culture, leadership, formal labour relations, decentralized decision-making and accountability, strategic planning, policing and procedures, organizational evaluations, and increased transparency.

The Community Support/Safety Officer and the Crime Prevention Officer are recent initiatives in policing in Western Europe (e.g., the MET, Amsterdam Stadtwacht) and in Canada (e.g., RCMP in Surrey BC and throughout New Brunswick) which have been instituted to enhance the existing community response in policing. Essentially these programs refer to civilians hired, trained and supervised by the police service to enable the latter to respond better to the needs and demands of local communities. Typically the "officers" are uniformed but not armed and their precise activities are tailored to the issues in the community in question ("one-size does not fit all"). Overall, these programs appear to have been successful in reducing crime (e.g., RCMP Moncton, Surrey) and in-house general evaluations have been positive. The RCMP reportedly is developing various CSO formats suitable for different milieus and incorporating formal training programs for such positions at the basic training centre in Regina. There are challenges such as overcoming potential negative imagery of civilian officers being "replacement or discount policing" and how to adjust overall police costs. But those issues are expected with initiatives that are at the leading edge of thinking on community-based policing. This direction, with the focus on community police (community based and governed) closely linked to a senior police service, would appear to be congruent with the imperatives for policing in Aboriginal communities.

Provincial representatives, Aboriginal leaders, and APD staff have identified having Aboriginal officers and community oversight through boards or committees as reflective of "culturally appropriate" policing. Some indicated that in addition to these structural indicators, additional performance indicators could include:

- A community plan developed in partnership by the police service and community representatives.

- Collaboration of the police service in other community service agencies – interagency activities- that create community efficiency and enable the community to deal better with conditions as they change.

---

8   http://www.surrey.rcmp.ca

- Direct engagement of the community and police service in crime prevention. A key way this has been achieved in Aboriginal communities has been through community justice committees.

4.2.7   Resource Limitations

Provincial and territorial officials view the current approach for the FNPP as appropriate, contingent upon a partnership with First Nations for policing in their communities. There was near-unanimity among provincial respondents that some range of agreement types is better nationally than having only one type of agreement and delivery option, even though administratively it is less efficient, and it can result in unevenness of service. Simply put, communities differ in important ways, so flexibility of options is required.

A few provincial authorities observed that limited resources were a cap on enhancement. One official commented that enhanced policing is wanted but the resources are not provided to achieve them sufficiently. "We have at least five responsible communities who want on-site policing but the budget freeze keeps it from happening". Another official stated that there has been enhancement but not as much as was wanted. Still another official agreed that "enhancement" has happened and elaborated as follows: "Yes, absolutely, but it is really replacement not enhancement".

While there are a variety of stakeholders involved in the delivery and receipt of the FNPP, there are common views of the current state of affairs in First Nations policing. There is a consistent call from band councils, provincial police services and the RCMP that there is a dire need for more First Nation police officers to be trained and hired, as they are consistently in demand across Canada. The fact that First Nations officers in SAs have lower salary and advancement opportunities are key challenges to address (Clairmont 2006; Gill et al. 2006, 2008; Linden 2007) while the shortage of police officers in general in the RCMP hampers the ability to deliver effective services (Auditor General 2005; Clark 2006a,b,c; Watt 2008). These limitations in personnel have led to reduce visibility of police positions and longer response times; the fact that many First Nation communities are remote and patrol areas can be vast add to this difficulty.

If we compare police officer ratio across Canada we do see a success in terms of providing more officers for First Nations communities; one APD study revealed that SA and CTA communities have a ratio of 4 officers per 1000 people as compared to the Canada average of 1.8 officers per 1000 people (2007:7). The need for more police officers in northern and First Nation communities is rationalized on the basis of higher crime rates there in general – on-reserve First Nation communities have over three times the crime rate of off-reserve First Nation communities; northern residents in general are three times more likely than provincial residents to experience violent victimization (Brzozowski 2006:10; Leseleuc and Brzozowski 2006: 15-18). One of the problems with case load indicators, as pointed out by the Cawsey Report (1991), is that reactive policing statistics are often used to note how many police officers are required. The 'Catch-22' situation occurs when an RCMP detachment carries out focused community policing and helps to greatly reduce crime – that community is then deemed to need fewer officers and so the detachment is given fewer and the intensive policing goes down and the crime rate rebounds (Cawsey, 1991: 2-17).

5.   Conclusions

The founding principles of the FNPP remain relevant today. First Nation and Inuit communities continue to have a need for police services that are professional, effective, culturally appropriate, and accountable to the communities they serve. The FNPP is aligned to the Government's policy initiative of "Keeping Canadians Safe".

The evaluators interviewed community representatives. More than 75% rated "the level of professionalism" and "enforcing the criminal code" as "good" or "very good" when asked to rate attributes related to the quality of policing. They were also more than 75% to rate "being approachable and easy to talk with" and "showing respect for members of the community" as "well" or "very well" when asked to rate attributes related to the quality of service.

Within APD, emphasis has been placed on negotiating new and renewing agreements with First Nation and Inuit communities and the provinces or territories. However, as demonstrated in this report, cultural appropriateness, responsiveness and accountability to communities are areas that require attention.

We agree with APD's position that it should be up to the communities to define cultural appropriateness. In addition, we believe that any improvements with respect to cultural appropriateness, responsiveness, and accountability to communities will occur when community governance of police service providers is strengthened and when police services adopt models that include a greater involvement and engagement of the communities.

Strengthening community governance of police service providers is an integral component of making service providers accountable, responsive, and culturally appropriate. Communities should be encouraged to engage in regular dialogue with local police services and provide them with information about their culture, local community dynamics, and indigenous approaches to justice and problem solving. Communities should also be supported to strengthen their Community Consultative Groups and Police Management Boards abilities to oversee the performance of their police services against the objectives of the FNPP.

6.   Recommendations

Based on key findings and conclusions contained in this report, the Evaluation Directorate recommends that the Assistant Deputy Minister, Community Safety and Partnerships Branch, ensure that the Aboriginal Policing Directorate address the following recommendations:

1. Assist in strengthening community governance of police service providers.

2. Ensure that future contribution agreements include performance objectives and reporting obligations that support APD's ability to measure the achievement of FNPP objectives.

3. Take measures to assess whether the objectives of the FNPP are achieved effectively and efficiently through innovative service delivery approaches proposed by Program partners and stakeholders.

7.   Management Responses and Action Plan

APD reviewed the three recommendations from the 2009-2010 evaluation of the FNPP. In the context of the comprehensive review of the FNPP, an examination of key elements of the FNPP, including service delivery models, funding mechanisms, and potential revisions to the FNPP policy framework, is underway. Recognizing that the work of the review is not yet complete, APD has outlined a response to the three recommendations.

The evaluation recommended that APD assist in strengthening community governance of police service providers. By December 2011, APD will develop a strategy aimed at identifying measures that will lead to the strengthening of community governance of police service providers. Discussions of the strategy will be undertaken with partners and stakeholders and an appropriate implementation plan will be developed.

The evaluation recommended that APD ensure that future contribution agreements include performance objectives and reporting obligations that support APD's ability to measure the achievement of FNPP objectives. Given the comprehensive review currently underway, it is anticipated that potential revisions to the performance measurement framework would be completed by April 2012.

The third recommendation directed APD to take measures to assess whether the objectives of the FNPP are achieved effectively and efficiently by innovative service delivery approaches proposed by Program partners and stakeholders. APD will ensure that by December 2011, appropriate Program authorities are in place that would enable the Directorate to assess whether innovative service delivery approaches that are proposed by Program partners and stakeholders meet FNPP objectives effectively and efficiently.

Annex A – Literature Review Bibliography

Aboriginal Policing Directorate Research Unit 2006 *Evaluation of the RCMP Inuit Policing Program and the Nunavut Community Constable Program*. Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.

Aboriginal Policing Directorate 2009 First Nations Policing Policy. vol. 2009. Public Safety Canada, Ottawa.

Armstrong, E. 1969 *Policing Services on Indian Reserves*. Social Affairs, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.

Baess, E. P. 2005 *Review of Pairing Police with Mental Health Outreach Services*. Integrated Mobile Crisis Response Team.

Barnes, C. 2007 *Citizens and the Police: Attitudes, Perceptions, and Race.* Master's, University of Regina.

Bayley, D. H. 2008 Police reform: Who done it? . *Policing & Society* 18(1):7-17.

Beattie, S. and A. Mole 2007 *Police Resources in Canada, 2007*. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.

Bergevin, J. B. 1971   Indian Bands' Policing Services, edited by DIAN, pp. 12. vol. File No. 1/18-1 Circular No. 55. Government of Canada, Ottawa.

Brzozowski, J.-A., A. Taylor-Butts and S. Johnson   2006   *Victimization and offending among the Aboriginal population in Canada*. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.

Auditor General of Canada 2005 *Ch. 1 - Royal Canadian Mounted Police - Contract Policing*. Office of the Auditor General of Canada.

Canada 2006   *General Social Survey on Victimization, Cycle 18: Personal Safety and Perceptions of the Criminal Justice System in the Territories 2004 (Revised).*

Canada 2007   *Audit of the First Nations Policing Program.* Public Works and Government Services Canada.

Canada 2007   First Nations Policing Policy, edited by Public Safety Canada. vol. 2009. Government of Canada, Ottawa.

Carrington, P. J. and J. L. Schulenberg 2003 *Police Discretion with Young Offenders*. Department of Justice Canada.

Chapman, I., D. Newhouse and D. McCaskill 2000 Management in Contemporary Aboriginal Organizations. *Aboriginal Organizations*:333-349.

Chatterjee, J. E., Liz   2003 Restorative Policing in Canada: The Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Community Justice Forums, and the Youth Criminal Justice Act. *Police Practice and Research* 4(4):347-359.

Clairmont, D. and J. Potts 2006 *For the Nonce: Policing and Aboriginal Occupations and Protests*.

Clairmont, D. 2000 *Case Studies of Effectiveness in First Nations Policing: Development of a Research Framework*. Atlantic Institute of Criminology, Dalhousie University.

Clairmont, D. 2002 *First Nations' Self-Administered Policing in Canada: Laying the Groundwork for a Nation-Wide Case Studies Approach*. The Aboriginal Policing Directorate.

Clairmont, D. 2006 *Aboriginal Policing in Canada: An Overview of Developments in First Nations*. Public Safety Canada.

Clark, S. 2006a *Policing in Nunavut: Report on a Public Consultation Process*. Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.

Clark, S. 2006b *Policing in the Northwest Territories: Report on a Public Consultation Process*. Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.

Clark, S. 2006c *Policing in the Yukon: Report on a Public Consultation Process*. Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.

Clark, S. 2007 *Implementation of the First Nations Policing Policy in the Territories: Analysis and Options*. Northwest Territories Department of Justice, Nunavut Department of Justice, Yukon Department of Justice.

Clatworthy, S. 2005 *Indian Registration, Membership and Population Change in First Nations Communities*. Four Directions Project Consultants.

Coaster, K. 2005 *Verdict of the Coroner's Jury for death of Kenneth Coaster*. Office of the Chief Coroner, Ontario.

Crowe-Salazar, N. 2007 Exploring the Experiences of an Elder, a Psychologist and a Psychiatrist: How can Traditional Practices and Healers Complement Existing Practices in Mental Health? *First Peoples Child & Family Review* 3(4):83-95.

de Leseleuc, S. and J.-A. Brzozowski 2006   *Victimization and Offending in Canada's Territories*. Statistics Canada.

Des Rosiers, N. 2003a The functions of an ombudsman: annotated bibliography. In *Annual Conference of the Forum of Canadian Ombudsman*, pp. 9, Ottawa, Ontario.

Deukmedjian, J. E. 2003 Reshaping Organizational Subjectivities in Canada's National Police Force: The Development of RCMP Alternative Dispute Resolution. *Policing & Society* 13(4):331-348.

Deukmedjian, J. E. 2006 From Community to Intelligence: Executive Realignment of RCMP Mission. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*.

Eby, D., J. Metcalfe, J. Richardson and D. Singhal 2004 Towards More Effective Oversight. In *City of Vancouver Peace and Justice Committee*, pp. 28. Pivot Legal Society, Vancouver.

Ede, A., R. Homel and T. Prenzler   2002   Reducing Complaints Against Police and Preventing Misconduct: A Diagnostic Study Using Hot Spot Analysis. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 35(1):27-42.

Ekos Research Associates Inc.2005 *First Nations Syndicated Study: First Wave Survey Final Report*.

Ekos Research Associates Inc.2005 *First Nations Syndicated Study: Second Wave Survey Final Report*.

Fife-Schaw, C.   2006 Levels of Measurement. In *Research Methods in Psychology*, edited by G. M. Breakwell, S. Hammond and C. Fife-Schaw, pp. 50-63. Sage Publications.

Francisco, J. and C. Chenier   2007   *A comparison of large urban, small urban and rural crime rates, 2005*. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.

Gannon, M. 2006 *Crime Statistics in Canada, 2005*. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.

General, S. 1974 *The Task Force on Policing in Ontario*. Solicitor General.

Gill, R.   2006 *Review of the RCMP Aboriginal Community Constable Program*. Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.

Gill, R., D. Clairmont, D. Redmond and J. Legault   2008   *Socio-Demographic Survey of Police Officers Serving in Aboriginal Communities*. Alderson-Gill & Associates Consulting Inc.

Greene, J. R.   2007   Make Police Oversight Independent and Transparent. *Criminology and Public Policy* 6(4):747-754.

Griffiths, C.   2008   Measuring what can't be measured. In *First Nations Chiefs of Police Association Annual General Assembly*, pp. 8, Habour Towers Hotel and Suites, Victoria, B.C.

Guy, J.   2008 Inquest into death of Tracia Owen, edited by P. C. o. Manitoba, pp. 72. Government of Manitoba, Winnipeg.

H. S. Resources 2004 *Challenge, Choice, & Change: A Report on Evidence-Based Practice in the Provision of Policing Services to Aboriginal Peoples*. Ipperwash Inquiry Commission.

Hawdon, J. and J. Ryan 2003 Satisfaction With Police: An Empirical Test of Community Policing Assertions. *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 14(1):55-74.

Herrington, V. and A. Millie   2006 Applying Reassurance Policing: Is it "Business as Usual"? *Policing & Society* 16(2):146-163.

Hinds, L. and K. Murphy 2007 Public Satisfaction With Police: Using Procedural Justice to Improve Police Legitimacy. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 40(1):27-42.

Hoffman, R. and L. Putnam 2004 *"Not just another call...police response to people with mental illnesses in Ontario"*. Centre for Addiction and Mental Health.

Hylton, J. H. 2006 *Canadian Innovations in the Provision of Policing Services to Aboriginal Peoples*. Ipperwash Inquiry.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada 1990 *Principles and Conclusions of the 1990 Indian Policing Policy Review*. Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada 1990 *Indian Policing Policy Review: Task Force Report*. Department of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada 1990 *Procedure for Special Constable Appointment (Band Constables - Circular 55)*. Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.

Kaloczi, K. K. 2004 *The implications of self-government with respect to Aboriginal justice initiatives.* Master's, Carleton.

Legge, D. 2003 *Verdict of the Coroner's Jury in death of Maurice Linklater*. Office of the Chief Coroner, Ontario.

Linden, R., D. Clairmont and C. Murphy 2002 *Aboriginal Policing in Manitoba: A Report to the Aboriginal Justice Implementation Committee*. Public Safety Canada.

Linden, S. B.   2007 *Ipperwash Inquiry*. Ministry of the Attorney General. Lithopoulos, Savvas and Rigakos, George S., - Neo-liberalism, community, and police regionalization in Canada. A critical empirical analysis, In Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, Volume 27, Issue No. 2, 2004

Lithopoulos, S. 2007 *International Comparison of Indigenous Policing Models*. Public Safety Canada.

Lithopoulos, S. 2009 *Manitoba BCP Risk Matrix Analysis*. Research and Evaluation Unit, Aboriginal Policing Directorate.

Matthews, R. and R. Cote 2005 Understanding Aboriginal Policing in a Social Capital Context. In *Social Capital as a Public Policy Tool*, pp. 34. Policy Research Initiative, Government of Canada, Ottawa.

McCallum, A. L. 2009 *Inquest into the deaths of Ricardo Wesley and Jamie Goodwin*. Office of the Chief Coroner.

McKim, E. 1998 Policing in Canada Today, pp. 4. Public Affairs and Information Directorate, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Ottawa.

Melchers, R. 2001 *What Can (and Can't) Statistics Tell Us About Crime and Criminal Justice?* Office of the Auditor General of Canada.

Moore, M. H. 2002 The limits of social science guiding policy. *Criminology and Public Policy* 2(1):33-42.

Murphy, C. J. and D. Clairmont 1996 *First Nations Police Officers Survey*. Atlantic Insitute of Criminology, Dalhousie University.

Murphy, S. A. and E. N. Drodge 2004 The four I's of police leadership: A case study heuristic. *International Journal of Police Science & Management* 6(1):1-15.

Neugebauer, R 2000 First Nations Peoples and Law Enforcement: Community Perspectives on Police Response. In *Criminal Injustice: Racism in the Criminal Justice System*, edited by R. Neugebauer, pp. 109-128. Canadian Scholar's Press Inc., Toronto.

Neugebauer, R.1999 First Nations Peoples and Law Enforcement: Community Perspectives on Police Response. In *Interrogating Social Justice: Politics, Culture and Identity*, edited by M. Corsianos and K. A. Train, pp. 247-269. Canadian Scholars' Press Inc., Toronto.

O'Donnell, V. 2006 *Selected findings of the Aboriginal Children's Survey 2006: Family and Community*. Statistics Canada.

Perry, B. 2006 Nobody Trusts Them! Under- and Over-Policing Native American Communities. *Critical Criminology* 14:411-444.

Prairie Research Associates 2005 *Evaluation of the Band Constable Program*. Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.

Prairie Research Associates 2005 *Final Summary Report on Community Case Studies Regarding the Effectiveness and Sustainability of First Nations Policing Services*. Prairie Research Associates, Inc.

Prairie Research Associates 2006 *Evaluations of the First Nations Policing Policy Vol. I and II*. Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.

Public Safety   2009 Police Survey Types, pp. 9. Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada, Ottawa.

Rathwell, C. K. 2003 *Verdict of Coroner's Jury in death of Benjamin Mitten*. Office of the Chief Coroner, Ontario.

Rigakos, G. S. 2008 *Future of Policing: Tiered Policing Study in Saskatchewan*. Carleton University.

Royal Canadian Mounted Police 1998RCMP First Nations Community Policing Service, edited by C. a. A. P. S. D. Community, pp. 6. Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Ottawa.

Royal Canadian Mounted Police 2007*Rebuilding the Trust: Task Force on Governance and Cultural Change in the RCMP*. Task Force on Governance and Cultural Change in the RCMP.

Royal Canadian Mounted Police 2007*Royal Canadian Mounted Police Departmental Performance Report for the period ending March 31, 2007.*

Royal Canadian Mounted Police 2009Aboriginal Peoples of Canada Adaptations Regulations (Firearms), pp. Fact Sheet. vol. 2009. Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Ottawa.

Taylor-Butts, A. 2004 Private Security and Public Policing in Canada, 2001. *Juristat* 24(7):16.

Watt, S. 2008 *RCMP FNCPS Review: A review of the First Nation Community Police Service in British Columbia for Canada, the province of BC and the CTA Steering Committee*.

White, J. P. and P. S. Maxim 2007 *Community Well-Being: A Comparable Communities Analysis*. Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.

Annex B – Community Interview Guide

A. Current Policing Arrangement

1.   What is the current primary policing arrangement at your community?

   a.   RCMP services under a Community Tripartite Agreement (CTA)

   b.   Regular RCMP services with no special arrangement

   c.   Both regular RCMP services and a CTA

   d.   A Self-Administered community police service

   e.   A Self-Administered multi-community police service

   f.   RCMP policing under the Aboriginal Community Constable Policing program (ACCP)

   g.   Other (please describe) _____

   h.   Not sure

1a.   How long has the current approach to policing been used in the community?

1b.   What was the type of policing that you used to have?

   i.   RCMP services under a Community Tripartite Agreement (CTA)

   j.   Regular RCMP services with no special arrangement

   k.   Both regular RCMP services and a CTA

   l.   A Self-Administered community police service

   m.   A Self-Administered multi-community police service

   n.   RCMP policing under the Aboriginal Community Constable Policing program (ACCP)

   o.   Other (please describe) _____

   p.   Not sure

2.   Does your community contribute directly to the cost of this primary police service? Yes/No

2a.   If so, roughly how much per year does the community contribute to the following costs? (None;   <$1,000; $1,001-$10,000; $10,001-$25,000; $25,001-$50,000;   >$50,000)

       a.   The cost of paying police officers

       b.   The cost of police-related housing, living expenses

       c.   The cost of policing-related equipment/supplies

       d.   Other

3.   Over and above these formal policing arrangements, does your community have any additional security personnel, such as…?

       a.   Additional police officers paid for by the community

       b.   Special constables or peacekeepers with limited policing authority

       c.   Other (please describe) _____

3a.   If so, roughly how much per year does the community pay for each of them?

4.   How many police officers of the following types are hired full-time or part-time in your community?

	Full Time	Part Time
a. Officers with full policing authority paid for by federal/provincial/territorial governments	____	____
b. Officers with full policing authority paid for by the community	____	____
c. Special constables or peacekeepers with limited authority	____	____
d. Other (please describe) _____	____	____

4a.   Has the number of officers serving in the community grown, stayed the same, or declined in the past ten years?

4b.   How many of the police officers serving in the community are Aboriginal?

4c.   Are any of the officers serving in the community originally from this community? Yes/No

       If yes, how many?_____

4d.   How many of the officers serving in your community also reside in the community?

5.   Do the people that you represent all live in a single community, or do they live in more than one location?

B. Quality of Police Services

(For the following questions, we would like your overall assessment of policing quality for your community, even if it is divided into several locations.)

6.   Do you think the number of police officers in the community is adequate to the challenges of policing in your community?

        Yes/No

6a.   If no, why? _____

6b.   If no, how many more officers do you think are needed?

7.   Please assess the quality of policing services in your community by rating the following characteristics as either very good, good, neither good nor poor, poor or very poor.

      a)   Enforcing the Criminal Code

      b)   Enforcing Provincial/territorial statutes

      c)   Enforcing community by-laws

      d)   Keeping citizens safe

      e)   Protecting property in the community

      f)   Preventing crime

      g)   Responding quickly to calls for service

      h)   Being visible in the community

      i)   Providing people with information to help prevent crime

      j)   Maintaining independence from inappropriate political influence

      k)   Serving with a high level of professionalism

      l)   Working with other police services in the area

8.   Would you say all members of your community, regardless of what area or part of the community they live in, are equally well served by the police?

                Yes/No

8a.   If no, why do you think that is the case?

9.   Are there particular population groups in your community that you think are not as well served by the police as other groups?

10.   Please assess the quality of the relationship between the police service and the community by indicating whether you think the police do very well, well, neither well nor poorly, poorly or very poorly in the following areas:

        a)   Being approachable and easy to talk to

        b)   Collaborating with community leaders to plan police services

        c)   Showing respect for community members

        d)   Working with schools, social service and health officials, elders

        e)   Making presentations to groups in the community

        f)   Youth liaison activities

        g)   Demonstrating an understanding of local culture

        h)   Serving in a way that is sensitive to local culture

        i)   Being accountable to community policing authorities

        j)   Achieving a good balance between law enforcement and community policing

11.   Overall, how satisfied is your community with the police service it receives?

12.   How would you characterize safety and security in your community?

13.   How serious a problem would you say the following types of crime are in your community today?

        1. Domestic/family violence

        2. Alcohol abuse

        3. Drug abuse

        4. Sexual assault

5. Physical violence (assault)

6. Poverty

7. Break-enter, theft

8. Vandalism

9. Alienation of youth

10. Public disorder

11. Gangs

12. Other (please specify) _____

C. Effectiveness of the Policing Arrangement

14.   Thinking about policing in the community before you had your current arrangement (CTA, self-administered), how would you say the quality of policing then compared with policing today?

15.   How would you say the police services provided to your community compare in quality to the services provided in similar non-Aboriginal communities you are familiar with?

16.   Thinking about areas that police could focus on, how would you rate the following areas as priorities for the police in your community? Are these areas a very high priority, a high priority, a moderate priority, a low priority or a very low priority?

1. More police to enforce the law

2. Better collaboration between police and community policing authorities

3. More police visibility in the community

4. More work with youth in the community

5. More Aboriginal officers

6. More work on crime prevention

7. Police residing in the community

8. Policing that is more sensitive to local culture

9. Dealing more effectively with violent crime

10. Dealing more effectively with illegal drugs and alcohol abuse

11. Other (please specify): _____

17.   Does your current policing arrangement help in addressing these priorities, as compared to before this arrangement was in place? Would you say…

   1. The current policing arrangement makes it easier to address these priorities?

   2. The current policing arrangement makes it harder to address these priorities?

   3. The current policing arrangement has no effect on the ability to address these priorities?

18.   Would you say a majority of residents in your community support the current policing arrangement?

18a. Thinking about aspects of policing that may have helped to improve service in your community, please indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements?

   1. The current policing arrangement has improved law enforcement

   2. The current policing arrangement has brought more of a community policing approach

   3. The current policing arrangement has allowed our community to decide on policing priorities

   4. The officers themselves are doing a great job

   5. The current policing arrangement has brought policing that is more sensitive to local culture

   6. Police officers are now living in the community more than before

   7. The current policing arrangement has improved community relations with the police

   8. There are more Aboriginal officers now than before

19.   This question concerns local police governance. You may have a police governance board, a police management board or a community consultative group in place to govern police services. We would like to know how effective this body is in overseeing the planning and delivery of police services in the community.

   Please indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements:

   1. The local board/committee has meaningful input into policing priorities and approaches.

2. The police seek out the views of the board/committee.

3. The police act on the guidance provided by the board/committee.

4. When there are problems in policing, the board/committee is active in identifying solutions.

5. The board/committee and the police work well together to resolve such problems when they arise.

6. The board/committee produces periodic reports/evaluations for the police.

7. The police respond to the recommendations in these reports.

8. The police usually act on the recommendations.

9. The board/committee has the right people in place to represent the community

10. The board/committee has people with the necessary skills to perform its duties effectively.

11. The board/committee has the resources necessary to deal with the problems that arise in the police service.

12. The board/committee keeps the community well-informed about what is happening with local policing.

20. At the beginning of the interview I asked if your police service operates under a Community Tripartite Agreement, a Self-Administered agreement, or some other arrangement. (Q1) You said _____ .

Could you tell me why your community chose this arrangement?

21. Do you have any comments you would like to add about policing services in your community?

_____

_____

Thank-you very much for sharing your views.