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Executive Summary

The Community Safety & Crime Prevention Council of Waterloo Region (CS&CPC), Waterloo Regional Police Service (WRPS), participants in a federally funded neighbourhood crime prevention project known as ‘Safe & Sound’ (1999-2003), and other partners came together to discuss and share their ideas for decreasing crime and victimization through a coordinated approach. The result of their discussions is the Integrated Model for Crime Prevention (Integrated Model) contained in this document.

This Integrated Model is a prototype for neighbourhood crime prevention work. The foundation of the model is the collaboration and commitment of neighbourhood services, law enforcement, human service providers, policy makers, and citizens. This model has the ability to empower these community partners and gives them an effective framework to work within. Neighbourhood-based and neighbourhood-driven prevention models have shown to effectively contribute to crime prevention and community safety locally, nationally and globally. When all these community partners work together, developing and sustaining a prevention agenda becomes possible.

The Integrated Model is a comprehensive look at the prevention, intervention, post-intervention, recovery, and renewal phases throughout the cycle of crime. It identifies how neighbourhood services, law enforcement, human service providers, policy makers, and citizens can each play a vital role. The model describes the interplay and commitment of community partners in creating and sustaining crime prevention methods.

There are a number of ways such community partnerships can unfold, be sustained, and be effective. This document will examine the 3 C’s of partnership: cooperation, coordination, and collaboration. Furthermore, it details the benefits and importance of our community putting more focus on prevention efforts, both within and between services, to complement enforcement and recovery.

This model is built on the understanding that enforcement alone is not sufficient to secure our safety, and calls for a shift from traditional police-centric problem solving to working in a community mobilization approach similar to efforts by the Waterloo Regional Police Service. Community mobilization, in this context, refers to actions and initiatives that police officers take to motivate and/or support citizens in effectively dealing with the root causes of crime and insecurity in their neighbourhoods in partnership with other services.

To ensure that these mobilization efforts are integrated with other crime prevention approaches, the Integrated Model attempts to answer the question:

“Who leads what & when?”
A Connected Community is a Safer Community

There is strength in working together with multiple partners to accomplish long-term crime prevention goals. Many partners come together through the efforts of the Community Safety & Crime Prevention Council of Waterloo Region (CS&CPC). As a coalition focused on decreasing the root causes of crime, the CS&CPC and its partners share three strategic approaches:

- **Facilitating and Supporting Problem Solving**
- **Region Wide Partnership Building**
- **Public Education**

This report spans all three strategies. It is an integrated approach to crime prevention through the shared actions of formal and informal services and law enforcement to work with organizations and individuals. We hope this model can serve as a prototype for neighbourhood-based crime prevention work.

**History**

Several events established a fertile ground for the development of this **Integrated Model**:

- In 1999, a three-year crime prevention pilot project called “Safe and Sound” was launched in four neighbourhoods in Waterloo Region. The goal was to work with residents and community partners to build safer, stronger neighbourhoods. The pilot project was funded by the National Crime Prevention Strategy and administered by the CS&CPC. The project was grounded on a neighbourhood capacity building approach through the provision of facilitation, financial and human resources. Neighbourhood capacity building is a long term process by which residents strengthen their skills and influence to improve their quality of life.

- In 2000, the Safe & Sound Advisory Committee was told by participating neighbourhood residents that it was not clear as to which community partners should be involved in identifying and solving neighbourhood issues. This lack of clarity caused confusion and in some instances duplicated efforts. The challenge to develop the **Integrated Model** began.

- In 2000, the Waterloo Region Police Service (W.R.P.S.) established a Community Mobilization Division. By motivating and/or supporting citizens to effectively deal with the root causes of crime and insecurity in their neighbourhoods, police encourage community members to deal with conflicts long before they become violations of the law. This increases community safety and reduces calls to police for service.
• In 2000, the CS&CPC, together with the Waterloo Region Police Service and Safe & Sound neighbourhood residents, reaffirmed its vision and mission to:

“mobilize the efforts of our community in preventing crime, increasing safety and fostering the well-being of everyone” in creating “a safe and crime-free community in which to work, live and grow”.

The values of the CS&CPC further emphasize the strength of working together and the unique contributions of citizens to enhance community vitality: “We are stronger working together.”

• In 2002, W.R.P.S., CS&CPC, and residents from neighbourhoods across Waterloo Region came together to develop a model for seamless and integrated crime prevention actions in neighbourhoods. This report is the outcome of their deliberations and agreements.

“Vision without action is merely a dream.
Action without vision just passes time.
Vision with action can change the world.”

~ Joel Barker
Who Should Familiarize Themselves
With the Integrated Model and Why?

- Neighbourhood Residents
  - To appreciate the potential benefits of mobilizing for crime prevention and safer communities
  - To understand their own capacities to respond to crime in neighbourhoods
  - To share the task of building safe communities
  - To have a framework to work within

- Service Providers
  - To broaden their scope
  - To make more effective decisions re: resource allocation, staffing, planning etc.
  - To understand their role in the prevention-enforcement continuum
  - To share the task of building safe communities
  - To have a framework to work within

- Law Enforcement
  - To support police in working with people and communities
  - To share the task of building safe communities
  - To have a framework to work within

- Policy Makers
  - To shift funding towards a greater emphasis for grassroots prevention initiatives
  - To assist in setting priorities
  - To share the task of building safe communities
  - To have a framework to work within

In the last two decades, many organizations, including government, have utilized informal neighbourhood “infra-structures” to deliver their services (neighbourhood-based). In these approaches, residents contribute to the delivery of services in their neighbourhoods. Residents also have a right to actively participate in directing these services (neighbourhood-driven). Most neighbourhood centres provide a diversity of services that offer a unique opportunity for prevention success. This neighbourhood-driven and neighbourhood-based prevention/intervention is often done at a fraction of the cost of formal services.

Positive outcomes are only sustained, however, if service providers and informal supports collaborate. The goal is to enhance - not replace - everyday actions that build healthy, safe, and strong communities.

Further, working collaboratively helps avoid duplication, confusion, and/or “learned helplessness”.
The illustration above shows the traditional investment (purple circle) and the investments with the greatest potential savings (red and green circles). Current investment in most communities across all services tends to be concentrated in the areas of intervention, enforcement, recovery, and to some extent, renewal. By comparison, prevention tends to be relegated to the status of “service luxury.”

One of the challenges for this integrated model of crime prevention will be in how far we can collectively persuade our community to increase prevention resources within and between services. The savings in human and financial terms through a shared prevention agenda will only be realized through an ongoing commitment to think and plan long-term.

“Every dollar spent on crime prevention saves $5-7 in corrections. How can we not put our full support behind crime prevention initiatives?”

~ Horner Commission, March 1993
The Three C’s of Partnership:  
*Cooperation, Coordination, Collaboration*

**Cooperation** is for the purpose of information sharing. Resources and authority are separate and stay contained within each organization.

**Coordination** requires joint planning and division of roles. Some resources and rewards are mutually acknowledged.

**Collaboration** is a durable relationship bringing separate organizations together to share resources, communication channels and services.

“We do not have the power to change the winds, but we can turn the sails.”

~ unknown

In successful partnerships, egos, power differences and agendas are “checked at the door” in recognition of the unique opportunity to resolve issues through working together. Individual partners benefit by: learning from others, harnessing collective wisdom, helping to enhance and support each partner’s place in the community. The three C’s of partnership is an ongoing process in which responsibilities, roles, risks and rewards are shared. Partnerships are better able to address the complexity of social issues, since no one person or organization has the answer or the resources to do it alone. Furthermore, sound problem-solving approaches need the knowledge and experience of all stakeholders. These and other values/beliefs were affirmed during the discussions in the development of this integrated model and are summarized in Appendix 1.

“People acknowledge that when they are involved in making decisions affecting their future, they develop a sense of ownership and commitment to carrying out those decisions.”

~ John Burbridge, ‘Beyond Prince and Merchant’
In many neighbourhoods there are three types of prevention/intervention approaches at work. The large size of the yellow circle acknowledges that most of the work on a daily basis is done by residents. Interventions and prevention efforts by law enforcement and social services will have more positive impacts if they connect with these more informal supports or capacities from the start.

- The large yellow circle reflects the daily informal activities of residents that make neighbourhoods safer (for examples of activities visit www.violencefree.net).

- The green circle reflects the work of social services, which are best understood as actions that contribute to crime prevention through dealing with the root causes of crime (i.e. efforts to keep children in school, reduction of economic stressors, financial assistance, day care/pre-school etc.).

- The blue circle reflects law enforcement approaches that commonly start when neighbourhoods show an increase in crime or fear of crime. This may include an increase in calls to police for service from the same neighbourhood or regular calls to the same address within one neighbourhood.

The overlapping areas represent two or more sectors involved in the same issue. The degree of collaboration needs to be negotiated and agreed upon if the impact is to be positive. Representatives of these sectors need to agree on “Who leads what & when?”
Area 1: Law Enforcement & Residents

In Area 1, law enforcement and informal supports (residents, neighbourhood groups) come together. An Intervention is likely to be initiated when police ask residents to support their community mobilization efforts or vice versa. Residents’ readiness to support these efforts will depend on our shared success in educating the public of their role in building healthy and safe communities, including the public’s appreciation of crime prevention through social development. Secondary and primary prevention might be resident initiated and driven (i.e. inviting police to recreational events to strengthen police-youth relationships).

Example:

In 2000, some youth started to use narcotics in a rural community in Waterloo Region. Concerned parents recognized the problem and formed a community based group to address the issue. Initially the group was interested in helping fellow concerned parents through weekly support meetings; however the group has since grown and now considers two elements necessary to its purpose – SUPPORT and EDUCATION – by utilizing a preventative approach to drugs and drug use.

This group became a pilot project in partnership with the Waterloo Regional Police Services Community Mobilization program. An assigned police officer provided weekly facilitation and liaison skills, as well as resources to the group for the first year. Since the group’s establishment, the Community Mobilization program continues to be involved on a monthly basis to meet with local youth, present drug awareness education in the community, meet with the group’s Executive and acts as a resource for concerned parents. The group was and continues to be independent and operate on its own, creating solutions unique to its community. Its success has led to expansion of its support and services to other communities throughout Waterloo region.

Area 2: Law Enforcement & Social Services

In Area 2 area law enforcement and social services come together to increase service readiness to respond to complex neighbourhood situations.

Example:

In 1997, crime rates and the fear of crime were on the rise in an urban neighbourhood in Waterloo Region. Family & Children Services of Waterloo Region, Waterloo Regional Police Services Community Mobilization program and other social service/agency representatives were quick to respond to this neighbourhood with different initiatives. Programs were developed for families. In addition, resources, leadership/mentoring opportunities were made available and neighbourhood meetings were held. A neighbourhood association was formed so that the community could creatively plan neighbourhood events and responsibly reduce the effects of conflict. The residents became stronger as a result of the agency support thus increasing their resolve to provide their community with positive options for the future.
The residents applied to Waterloo Regional Housing for the use of a townhouse unit as a community centre and to the House of Friendship for a community centre coordinator. Both proposals were accepted and a community centre was established. The neighbourhood benefited from the community space even though conflicts and struggles were still present. The neighbourhood association also applied for support from the Safe & Sound Project and benefited from the involvement of the neighbourhood crime prevention project.

The continued presence of the community centre has made a difference in the neighbourhood; people are helped who need help, the community is friendlier, the fear of crime has decreased, the media coverage is more positive and there is a sense of encouragement.

**AREA 3: Social Services & Residents**

In **Area 3** social services and informal supports (residents, families, community based resources, neighbourhood groups) decide on shared actions with prevention/intervention goals. If these efforts are the result of a crisis they tend to be service initiated. Actions are more resident driven if they have a longer-term prevention focus.

*Example:*

An independent, non-profit agency works with families in Waterloo Region who experience complex needs and situations that require support from both social services and informal groups. It is a process of bringing people together to help others by building a support system of family members, friends and community resources in an effort to find solutions to their complex needs. The non-profit matches a dedicated resource facilitator with each family and together they create a Child and Family Team which also includes any person the family sees as helpful. The team works together to build a personalized, strength-based, goal-oriented plan which is the family’s solution to the needs they are experiencing. The family’s plan is also community-based, involves community partnerships / ownership and requires collaboration of and between resources for the process to be successful. Most of the families involved with the non-profit are connected in one way or another to social services because their support is necessary and essential to the family.

The non-profit works hard to maintain community and social service partnerships to connect the family with informal resources and community supports. To date it has worked with public and separate school boards, Family and Children’s Services of Waterloo Region, kidsLINK, Lutherwood, Canadian Mental Health Association, as well as other professional services. Families’ needs are given attention so the root causes of crime are reduced. Families create their own action plans for sustainability and crisis response. This non-profit has had the privilege to work with over 100 families in Waterloo Region building a sense of well-being.
Purple Triangle – ALL INVOLVED

The purple triangle, comprised of all three circles, is the area where the greatest number of players is involved and where healthy partnerships are most critical. Depending on the situation, the leadership for these efforts will vary and may change over time. For example, immediate safety efforts need strong police presence and leadership. Resident leadership is required to strengthen and sustain the capacity of residents for safe communities and resource development over the long term.

Example:

In 2000, the fear of crime was increasing in another urban neighbourhood in Waterloo Region. As noted above, the leadership roles may vary at any given time. The story of this urban neighbourhood is a positive example of “who leads what when” in the ‘purple triangle’ where sectors/partners overlap.

The Waterloo Regional Police Services led when its Community Mobilization program worked with the residents to address safety and crime related issues. The Community Safety & Crime Prevention Council led when this neighbourhood became one of the sites for the Safe & Sound pilot project which worked to build strong neighbourhood relations so people could experience a safe neighbourhood. Following Safe & Sound the “Neighbourhood Conflict Resolution Services (NCCRS)”, a collaborative project with a local community centre and Community Justice Initiatives was created. The project led the community with mediation services for the residents, mediator training, and communication / conflict awareness workshops for staff and residents. A ripple effect has occurred as a result of the two projects and the conflict resolution skills demonstrated by dedicated staff.

Presently the partnership that is leading is the community centre and Waterloo Regional Housing. They respond to the community needs by offering creative changes for community centre programs (i.e. – a program designed to introduce new immigrant families to the community and their neighbours), making the community centre accessible (i.e. a ramp to the sidewalk) to all community residents and providing facilitation skills to residents to initiate a tenants’ association. At this point the residents have strengthened their lead for a safer sustainable community and they are experiencing a sense of safety and caring; the community centre has become an integral part of the neighbourhood. According to community centre staff the residents are more responsive and responsible for creating changes in their complex, they treat each other and community centre staff with greater respect, and they care for the neighbourhood differently; there is a general sense of well-being.
What is Crime Prevention?

**Primary Prevention (Universal)**

Primary prevention efforts try to ensure the health of the community as a whole by attempting to stop adverse conditions from developing in the first place. Programs which address parenting, family support, adequate housing, etc. could all be considered primary prevention if they are universally accessible and offered before any difficulties are identified. Primary prevention can be the most cost-effective method of dealing with a problem because it can reduce costs in many different areas over the long term.

**Secondary Prevention (Selected)**

Secondary prevention attempts to stop a crime from occurring after certain “warning signs” have appeared. An example might be programs which focus on a specific problem or problem group. Anti-social or delinquent behaviour (e.g. disrespect for school staff; spray painting slogans on buildings etc) can often be stopped through early intervention in problem situations before they become more serious and lead to a life of crime or victimization.

Primary and secondary efforts tend incorporate the community’s collective capacity to act upon need(s).

**Tertiary Prevention (Indicated)**

The efforts of the judicial system generally fall into the category of tertiary prevention. Sentencing a person to prison ensures that he/she will not commit a crime while serving his/her sentence. This is crime prevention after the fact because the person is known to the community and has been accused and found guilty of breaking the law. While these measures ensure (for a time) that an offender cannot commit another offence, they cannot reverse the effects of the original crime.*

* from “The Root Causes of Crime”,
  CS&CPC Statement on the Root Causes of Crime approved in 1996

“This is the time for all of us to consider what threads are weaving our tomorrow.”

~ Dyyani Ywahoo, Voice of Our Ancestors
In the Integrated Model for Crime Prevention, activities of intervention, recovery, renewal and prevention flow into one another in crime prevention efforts at the neighbourhood level. While one approach may be more visible than another at any one time, the cycle of change is altered when we focus our efforts in one area only to the exclusion of others.

Interventions such as law enforcement commonly start as the result of a specific need or problem. Such situations might be urgent and require intervention, or they might be emerging and lead to a request for intervention. The key time to begin to plan for future service collaboration and to boost informal efforts is after the immediate crisis intervention phase. Recovery and renewal are part of the healing process. Healing includes learning from what has caused the harm in the first place and ensuring that similar situations will not arise in the future, thus leading to prevention.

“Without a sense of caring, there can be no sense of community.”

~ Anthony J. D’Angelo

These four quadrants of change flow into one another. In order to affect smooth leadership transitions, key stakeholders need to be involved early in the process. Communities that have crime prevention partnerships already in place find it easier to mobilize these collective efforts than communities that do not.
The shading of the arrows indicates where neighbourhood residents (yellow), social service organizations (green) and law enforcement (blue) have the highest level of investment and involvement. The darker shades represent a high level of involvement and are most likely to be where the leadership role lies. Lighter shades represent a reduced level of investment and involvement. As the efforts of one partner decrease, the efforts of another partner will increase.

The illustration acknowledges that by far the largest number of activities that maintain or restore neighbourhood vitality are led by neighbourhood residents. Citizens’ efforts create strong and sustainable neighbourhoods while service efforts tend to be short lived and problem focused.

The Integrated Model embraces a holistic understanding of community problems and solutions. The model is based on a shared understanding that crime is a complex social issue with roots in economic, social, cultural, family and individual conditions that can be known and are open to change. The model’s use has shown there is greater success when partnerships are present and citizens become engaged with creating solutions for their neighbourhood. Committing ourselves to a holistic approach, progressively moving from community based toward community driven action, will increase the commitment of community residents and grassroots organizations.

“Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed individuals can change the world; indeed it is the only thing that ever has.”

~ Margaret Mead
Appendix 1
Community Mobilization - What is it?

Community mobilization is an action and/or initiative that police officers take to motivate and support citizens in effectively dealing with the roots of crime and insecurity in their neighbourhoods.

The goal is to increase community safety and to reduce service calls to police by encouraging and supporting community members to deal with conflicts long before they become violations of the law.

Some key features include:

- The importance of partnerships between the police and neighbourhood residents; realizing the right and the responsibility of residents to be involved in determining solutions to neighbourhood problems and/or opportunities.

- Stabilizing the neighbourhood through law enforcement efforts aimed at removing the criminal elements that often create fear of crime and victimization and feelings of insecurity.

- Identifying the causes of a problem, crime or conflict, in order to foster solutions that are sustained efforts and not merely efforts that displace or postpone the issue.

- Neighbourhood residents’ ultimate control over the mobilization process because when people have more control over the conditions of life in their neighbourhoods we can expect sustained crime reduction and prevention.

Community mobilization effectiveness can be evaluated both in terms of the reduction of threats to safety as well as the degree to which residents report a sense of their own capacities to determine their quality of life. Actions and initiatives tend to involve increased cooperation, coordination, and collaboration with a wide-variety of other agencies and organizations.

Community Mobilization Principles

- All members of the community share the responsibility for safety and security.

- All communities have individuals and organizations that are able and committed to increase safety and security.

- Threats to community safety often originate with systemic barriers that limit people’s positive life choices. All communities benefit from a range of social services and government efforts that attempt to remove systemic barriers and strengthen citizen capacities.

- In addition to enforcement, police have the mandate and the skills to identify and work with community individuals and organizations.
Community Mobilization Objectives

- Use targeted law enforcement to stabilize and reduce high risk situations in neighbourhoods.
- Mobilize residents’ strength and capacity to reduce and prevent crime in their own neighbourhoods.
- Support bonds of mutual assistance, friendship and peace in communities.
- Link communities to agencies and organizations of interest.
- Participate in effective partnerships against crime and anti-social behaviour with other agencies and organizations.

How Does Waterloo Region Police Service’s Community Mobilization Model Compare with Other Prevention Models?

Community Mobilization is a major shift for the Waterloo Regional Police Service (W.R.P.S) and their partners in the social service world because of the emphasis on community partnership and sustainability. The idea of police concerning themselves with broader social and community issues is a step away from traditional reactive policing and enforcement. In the spectrum of prevention efforts, community mobilization falls under tertiary prevention because most interventions requiring police involvement are the result of short-term urgent and recently emergent issues.

If an officer believes that there is a need for community mobilization within a neighbourhood, his/her efforts will be greatly enhanced by approaching others with knowledge about the neighbourhood for advice/help/support in mobilizing the community and sustaining efforts that will lead to decreased crime and/or fear of crime.

Community Mobilization in Practice

A community mobilization initiative connects individuals with social supports. When officers are trained and equipped to refer troubled individuals, families or neighbourhoods to a social agency or service for assistance, it is most likely that a situation can be prevented from re-occurring. For example, repeat calls to an address where a youth gets into frequent disputes with his/her parent(s) might prompt an officer to call the school counsellor’s office and/or encourage the youth and parent(s) to attend a family support program at a local neighbourhood centre.

A community mobilization project unfolds when an entire neighbourhood is affected by anti-social behaviours at more than one address. In such situations a wide range of initiatives are required over a long period of time. For example, police might work with neighbourhood residents and other service providers over several months to resolve an underlying problem that is responsible for crime and fear of crime.
The following are hypothetical examples where police officers may use community mobilization strategies. These examples help show how W.R.P.S. Community Mobilization might be applied in the field and how it cooperates, coordinates and collaborates with informal neighbourhood supports and necessary social service providers. These examples do not imply procedural guidelines because, in reality, officers sometimes may not have any options or discretion beyond enforcement.

**Case #1 - Victim of Severe Bullying at School**

**Situation:**
A police officer responds to a residence where the parents are very concerned about the severe bullying of their teenage daughter. The victim is scared and upset. The stress is making her physically sick every day before school. She wants the bullying to stop so she can concentrate on her studies and enjoy attending classes once again. The ‘bully’ is easily identified and the nature of bullying is approaching criminal harassment.

**Community Mobilization Response:**
The officer has some legal options at his/her disposal, but these are limited. Before intervening, the officer consults with the WRPS’ Community Resources Branch and contacts other experts in the community for anti-bullying material, advice, support and resources. Community partners such as Public Health, Family and Children Services or counselling agencies might suggest programmes and opportunities with the goal of resolving the issue (i.e. victim-offender reconciliation). After the police have spoken with the ‘bully’, the police may find out that s/he believes that nobody cares; that s/he is a loner, but loves sports. The police officer may consult with the local neighbourhood association which offers to enlist the young person to help with its programs (i.e. sports), under the supervision of an adult leader.

It is the shared goal of all involved to permanently stop the bullying so that the victim can return to school. The number one priority is not to make arrests or lay charges, but the ‘bully’ needs to be made aware that he/she can be held criminally responsible for bullying behaviour. The law enforcement component of Community Mobilization can be invoked at any time.

**Case #2 – Youth Loitering at a Park**

**Situation:**
A police officer is inundated with calls over several weeks regarding youth hanging around a neighbourhood park. Residents believe that the youth are responsible for graffiti, property damage, drug use, and intimidation. There are no specific ways to identify the exact individuals, as many youth use the park, and most of them are law-abiding citizens.

**Community Mobilization Response:**
The officer will contact a network within the neighbourhood (i.e., a neighbourhood association, community group) to discuss the situation. Are these youngsters from the neighbourhood? Are they
mostly “hanging out” or have they engaged in criminal activities? What solutions do the
neighbourhood association or community group suggest? In the absence of such a network the
officer connects with the CS&CPC’s community engagement co-ordinators. The community
engagement co-ordinators work with the police officer to make contact with groups in the proximity
of the neighbourhood and other service providers.

These groups could solicit ideas and solutions from neighbourhood residents. Once the community
is mobilized, it could develop a strategy that incorporates enforcement, intervention and prevention.
Drug awareness programs might be implemented with drug enforcement efforts. Options may be
explored to increase alternatives for youth with input from the youth in the park. An increased
police presence in the park can help with immediate safety and security concerns. Long-term
strategies might include cooperation from local schools, the municipality or the establishment of a
community group or neighbourhood association.

Case #3 – Drivers Speeding in a Residential Neighbourhood

Situation:
A local mall becomes a weekly gathering spot for car enthusiasts. Most of the vehicle owners take
advantage of their time together to admire each other’s cars and discuss issues related to repairs
and maintenance. However, several of the car enthusiasts take advantage of weekly gatherings to
challenge each other to street races. Neighbours are worried about the safety of their children. The
street racers drive well above the speed limit and frequently fail to properly stop at several of the
intersections used by the children.

Community Mobilization Response:
Police officers meet with the neighbours to find out more about their concerns. Neighbours ask that
the police informally connect with the car enthusiasts at the mall. Police officers follow through on
this request and make it clear that street racing will not be tolerated. Police learn that several of the
car enthusiasts are uncomfortable with the street races. They too are concerned about safety. The
street racers recognize that if they continue to drive recklessly they will be “evicted” from the mall.
Police begin to patrol the area around the mall more often and issue fines for speeding and
disregarding stop signs.
Appendix 2

WHAT DO WE VALUE/BELIEVE IN?

1. **Capacity:** Residents have expertise and understanding of their neighbourhoods and need to have a significant role in decision making.

2. **Diversity:** All human beings are worth our efforts.

3. **Creativity:** What is a good solution for one person or neighbourhood will not be right for all (there are no cookie cutter solutions).

4. **Equity:** Successful neighbourhood work is based on a level playing field between residents and all parties involved.

5. **Partnership:** Communities are assisted and not directed. Responsibility is shared.

6. **Prevention:** It is better to prevent crime than to react to it.

7. **Safety:** All neighbourhoods should be safe.

WHAT ARE OUR APPLIED VALUES?

1. **Commitment.** Consistent services are critical to the well being of neighbourhoods.

2. **Labels hurt.** Stereotyping neighbourhoods is unfair and can cause long-term damage to their quality of life.

3. **Partnership efforts** should be started at the earliest possible time.

4. **Adequate resources.** Prevention for community safety needs to be adequately and responsibly resourced, both within organizations and at the neighbourhood level.

5. **Shared opportunities.** Opportunities for mutual learning and honest exchanges of experiences are a critical part of any community mobilization work.

6. **Role clarification** is an important part of the process. At all times we need to answer the question: ‘Who leads what and when?’

7. **Supports to neighbourhoods** must complement the work already going on in these neighbourhoods.

8. **Remove barriers.** Large service organizations need to become aware of barriers that inhibit and prevent safe and healthy neighbourhood development and be committed to breaking down these barriers.

RECOMMENDATION FOR ENDORSEMENT

Based on the Integrated Model for Crime Prevention, we invite residents, neighbourhood associations, human services, municipalities and police to commit to the values and approaches defined herein, as a way to collectively reduce victimization, crime and fear of crime in Waterloo Region. We further recommend that practical applications of this community engagement approach feature significantly in training and resource allocation discussions. We finally recommend that a commitment to this mode be made public as a starting point for future integrated efforts.