Delivering Safer Communities: A guide to effective partnership working

Guidance for Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships and Community Safety Partnerships
Foreword

We all want to be and feel as safe as possible from the impact of crime in our communities. Over the past ten years, there have been radical shifts both in the levels of crime and the approaches taken to tackle it. Overall crime has fallen dramatically by around a third since 1997, and the chances of becoming a victim of crime have reached historically low levels. Collectively, we have learnt an enormous amount about what works in tackling crime.

Partnership working has been a key factor in this transformation. Almost a decade ago, the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 put partnership working on a statutory footing in England and Wales for the first time. Partnerships have matured over this time and inter-agency working has become second nature to many who work to improve the safety of our communities. The combined dedication and ambition of thousands of practitioners in many different agencies has been a key factor in the significant and lasting progress that has been made in the fight against crime.

Despite these improvements, major challenges remain and there are still some communities which are experiencing high levels of crime and anti-social behaviour. There is more to do to reduce re-offending, tackle the misuse of drugs and alcohol, improve the life chances of young people and ensure that we continue to detect and punish crime appropriately. Fear of crime continues to limit people's quality of life and harm communities.

This is why I was pleased that the Home Office launched the new Crime Strategy in July 2007. It recognises that the rate of crime reduction is slowing and new approaches are needed. It sets out a road-map for finding new ways of working and innovative solutions in the fight against crime. Partnerships will be absolutely central to the successful delivery of this strategy.

While some partnerships have achieved excellent outcomes for their communities, in other areas they remain more virtual than real. Through a review of the partnership provisions in the Crime and Disorder Act and extensive stakeholder consultation, we have identified what works well and have developed the Hallmarks of Effective Partnerships. In changing the legislation to more closely reflect these Hallmarks, we aim to consolidate effective practice and ensure that all partnerships deliver to a common standard.

Beyond these minimum statutory requirements, partnerships have the flexibility to deliver in their own way. This guidance provides suggested practice and case studies to support partnerships as they find ways to implement the regulations and embed the Hallmarks within their day-to-day work. This guidance embodies the new relationship between Government and delivery partners. Providing front line professionals with increased flexibility to respond to local issues is a sign of the growing confidence we have in the ability and capacity of local agencies to deliver. It also reflects our belief that an effective partnership is one that is visible to the local community and held to account for the decisions it makes.

High performing, responsive and accountable partnerships are part of our vision of communities where local people are engaged in tackling crime and anti-social behaviour and where they can see and feel the difference that local agencies are making to their communities. I look forward to working towards this together.

Vernon Coaker MP
Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Crime Reduction
Executive Summary

Changing Landscape

Partnership working has contributed to a sustained fall in crime over the past ten years. However, the landscape in which Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) in England and Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) in Wales deliver has changed considerably since legislation was first introduced in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. Working with stakeholders, we carried out a formal review of the partnership provisions of that Act. The suggested improvements were reflected in the Police and Justice Act 2006 and in subsequent regulations, which came into force on 1 August 2007 in England and in November 2007 in Wales.

Hallmarks of Effective Partnerships

These new statutory requirements form part of the Hallmarks of Effective Partnerships, which have been informed and influenced by our stakeholders. These represent the key aspects of partnership working that underpin effective delivery through partnerships. Partnerships can use them to check their own effectiveness and to identify areas for improvement. The six Hallmarks of Effective Partnerships are:

- Empowered and Effective Leadership;
- Visible and Constructive Accountability;
- Intelligence-led Business Processes;
- Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures;
- Engaged Communities; and
- Appropriate Skills and Knowledge.

Each Hallmark comprises two elements:

- New statutory elements for partnership working; and
- Suggested practice to achieve increased effective partnership, using the statutory requirements as a foundation.

Guidance for Partnerships

Beyond the statutory requirements, partnerships have the flexibility to deliver in their own way. The guidance provides suggested practice and case studies to support partnerships as they find ways to implement the regulations and embed the Hallmarks in their work. Partnerships are also encouraged to use an implementation checklist to assist in their own implementation of the statutory requirements and Hallmarks. Throughout each section, we emphasise the importance of appropriate skills and knowledge, so that partners are aware of the need to ensure that those who work for them have the capacity and capability to support delivery.
The guidance is structured around the key aspects of partnership business:

**Lead and guide**

This section covers:
- which agencies need to be represented and by whom to ensure that there is strong leadership across the partnership;
- governance within the partnership;
- county-level structures in two-tier areas and how they relate to other partnerships such as Local Strategic Partnerships;
- establishing protocols for sharing information and other processes; and
- accountability to local communities through *face the people* sessions.

**Assess**

This section covers:
- sharing information for analysis, including the new duty to share certain sets of depersonalised information;
- the importance of involving community concerns and priorities as part of the strategic assessment;
- links to the National Intelligence Model;
- conducting annual strategic assessments to identify local issues; and
- identifying county-wide priorities and opportunities for cross-border working across partnerships.

**Plan**

This section covers:
- preparation of the three year partnership plan, which is to be refreshed annually (in line with requirements for Local Area Agreements in England);
- the importance of performance frameworks;
- consideration of resources for delivering within the partnership; and
- publication of a summary of the plan for the community to support improved visibility and accountability, highlighting links to other requirements, such as the publication of the Local Policing Summary.

**Deliver**

This section covers:
- setting up structures to deliver priorities identified through the plan;
- problem-solving processes within delivery to ensure the implementation of effective solutions to identified priorities;
- the importance of performance frameworks to monitor delivery; and
- evaluating individual projects and the delivery of the partnership plan.
We expect partnerships to follow the advice set out in the guidance. It is grounded in effective practice, rather than being statutory guidance, and various stakeholder organisations have contributed to its development. We will update the guidance online on a regular basis, refreshing case studies as further good practice emerges. This will ensure that we keep the guidance current and relevant to provide effective support to partnerships.

The guidance and the Hallmarks will support increased effectiveness among partnerships and enable them to be high performing, responsive and accountable to their communities.
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Introduction

1. Supporting and Enabling Partnerships

1.1 Delivering Safer Communities

The last ten years have witnessed a sea change in the approach that local bodies have adopted to delivering safer communities. Police, local government and a range of other agencies have come together to tackle the crime and disorder problems in their locality. However, as challenges change, so must our approach for dealing with them. This guidance is intended to help Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships/Community Safety Partnerships to continue to deliver for their communities. It is part of a wider body of work that the Home Office has in train, including the new three year crime strategy, ‘Cutting Crime – A New Partnership 2008-11’, the new Public Service Agreement goals for community safety and the Government’s desire to help partnerships to be better able to tailor their arrangements according to local circumstances.

1.2 Improving Public Services

Developing joined-up approaches to public service delivery has been at the heart of the Government approach to developing sustainable and lasting improvements in delivering outcomes. In a number of cases, this has required a range of agencies to work together in partnership, for example Safer Schools Partnerships which focus on crime and anti-social behaviour in educational environments. The various partnerships introduced by the Government have brought together different agencies to tackle shared problems and to address the issues that face our communities in a way that supports improved delivery of public services, including crime and community safety. The Government has worked to weave partnership working into the fabric of service delivery in communities and to enable agencies to recognise and then realise the benefits that working together brings.

However, there is more to do to support partnership effectiveness across the range of services provided in communities and for the Home Office, this means improving the delivery of services to tackle crime and disorder and to reduce the fear of crime. From speaking to our delivery partners, we know they want to increase their effectiveness and improve their performance in delivering outcomes to communities. Communities want to see strong local services and to see the differences that public agencies, working together, make to their lives. Because of this, we are committed to a broad range of policies that will support changes in the way in which partners work together to address issues concerning local communities.

1 In this guidance, when we say ‘crime and disorder’ or ‘community safety’, we mean matters including crime and disorder, anti-social behaviour, substance misuse and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment

2 In this guidance, when we say ‘community safety partnership’ or ‘partnership’, we refer to Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) in England and Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) in Wales. For other partnerships, we will refer to them in full throughout
11.3 Improving community safety partnerships

In community safety, it has become ever more evident that a range of organisations and agencies working together deliver more effective and long lasting solutions than any one agency working alone. We recognise that all of us have a role to play in tackling crime if we are to meet the challenges that our communities face. Part of the role of Government will be to remove some of the central direction that had been necessary until local community safety partnerships matured. In place of nationwide mandates from Government, the onus will be on our partnerships to understand the full breadth of crime and community safety issues in their area and be able to demonstrate effective action to address them. However, partnerships will also be expected to improve their skills and processes to perform better and in doing so, rise to the increased challenges posed by this greater flexibility and to the needs of their communities.

We are committed to ensuring that partnerships are the most effective vehicle for securing improvements in the delivery of crime reduction in our communities. However, challenges remain, particularly in how we can bring up the performance of all partnerships to the levels achieved by the best. It is this challenge that this guidance is intended to address. We have set out, after consultation with our delivery partners, the key aspects of partnership working which underpin effective partnerships. These are presented as **Hallmarks of Effective Partnership** working and we expect that, through using them, partnerships will rise to the challenges ahead and play their part in delivering greater reductions in crime.
II. Introducing the Hallmarks of Effective Partnerships

II.1 Improving Effectiveness – the Hallmarks of Effective Partnerships

During the time that partnership working on crime and community safety issues has been in place, we, and our delivery partners, have learnt what characterises effective partnerships by appraising the way in which high-performing partnerships conduct their business. It is the desire to improve performance across all partnerships to a higher level that lies at the root of these Hallmarks and this guidance.

We are introducing the Hallmarks because we want:

- to ensure that all partnerships are functioning to an acceptable level of performance;
- to embed an intelligence-led way of doing partnership business;
- to enable communities to see the difference that effective partnerships can have in their area;
- to ensure that local communities are involved in shaping local priorities;
- to support the development of skills and knowledge across all partnerships; and
- to increase partnership accountability in addressing crime and disorder matters.

The Hallmarks of Effective Partnerships are intended to summarise the core elements of effective partnership working. They provide a way for partnerships to check if they are delivering effectively or if there are areas where they should target improvements. They flow from the views of our stakeholders, our own work in supporting improvements in partnership performance at local level and from the Government’s broader reform agenda.

This guidance outlines six Hallmarks of effective practice. These are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hallmark 1</th>
<th>Empowered and Effective Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hallmark 2</td>
<td>Intelligence-led Business Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallmark 3</td>
<td>Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallmark 4</td>
<td>Engaged Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallmark 5</td>
<td>Visible and Constructive Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallmark 6</td>
<td>Appropriate Skills and Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each Hallmark then comprises two elements:

- New statutory requirements for partnership working; and
- Suggested practice to achieve increased effective partnership working, using the statutory requirements as a foundation.

The suggested relationship between the statutory requirements and the Hallmarks is shown below.
12.2 New Statutory Requirements

The five responsible authorities – the police, police authorities, local authorities, fire and rescue authorities, Local Health Boards in Wales and Primary Care Trusts in England – set out in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and subsequent legislation are under a duty to formulate and implement a strategy to tackle crime and disorder in their areas. The new statutory requirements included in this guidance describe the processes these responsible authorities must have in place as they develop these strategies. We expect other partners (see Appendix G for details) to follow the spirit of the requirements and to work with, and support, the responsible authorities as they deliver the statutory requirements and the Hallmarks of Effective Practice.

We recognise that legislation on its own will not achieve the further improvements in partnership effectiveness. The legislation set out our expectations of the processes that all partnerships need to have in place to ensure that all areas achieve a common level of performance.

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 represented a solid start upon which to build partnerships to tackle crime and disorder. However, the landscape in which these partnerships deliver has changed considerably over time and, to identify what changes might be made to the legislation, a formal review of the provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act was carried out during 2004-5. This involved over 450 stakeholders and found that the existing legislation did not fully reflect the changing expectations of effective delivery.

One of the key findings of the review was that three year audits and strategies were resource intensive and were often seen as a distraction from delivery. Many partnerships were already reviewing and revising their three year strategies on an annual basis to reflect shifting patterns in their local areas. For this reason, the review team recommended more regular strategic assessments and the adoption of intelligence-led business processes. To support this, it recommended strengthening section 115 of the Crime and Disorder Act (data sharing) by placing a duty on partners to share certain depersonalised datasets. In order to become more visible and accountable to their communities, it also concluded that partnerships should engage with their communities on a regular and ongoing basis, reporting to them instead of to the Secretary of State. In order to bring these changes about, a key recommendation of the review was that there should be a set of national standards for partnerships.

3 For details of the review of the Crime and Disorder Act, please see Appendix F
At regional events during Summer 2006, we consulted stakeholders on the findings of the review and the content of national standards. To reflect the changing role of partners and partnerships, legislative changes were brought in by the Police and Justice Act 2006 and subsequent regulations, which came into force on 1 August 2007 for England and in November 2007 in Wales. This included the repeal of two main partnership duties:

- The duty to produce three yearly audits and strategies – the 2005-08 audit and strategy will be the last in the current format; and
- The duty to report annually to the Secretary of State on a partnership’s work and progress.

By introducing the new statutory requirements, the intention is to:

- Improve partnership performance across England and Wales;
- Provide clarity around what the responsible authorities are expected to do under partnership arrangements; and
- Reflect the changes in the delivery and performance management landscape since the introduction of partnerships in 1998.

What partnerships will need to do in accordance with the new legislation under each of these elements is set out in the following chapters of this guidance. We believe that every partnership is capable of delivering what is required through these statutory requirements and they represent minimum standards of partnership performance. However, the Hallmarks build on them to describe what partnerships can achieve if they aim for increased effectiveness. We will highlight the statutory requirements in each chapter, so that partners can see easily how they relate to the Hallmarks and understand how they can build upon them to achieve the Hallmarks.

Where you see this symbol, this refers to the statutory requirements so that partnerships can identify clearly what they are required to do under new legislation.

These new statutory requirements will apply in England from 1 August 2007 and in Wales from November 2007. This guidance covers both England and Wales. Where there are differences in delivery, issues specific to either England or Wales are highlighted.
I3. Building on strong foundations – using this guidance to build effective partnerships

I3.1 Using the Hallmarks – to support partnerships

This guidance seeks to provide practical advice for partnerships to support the implementation of the statutory requirements and of the Hallmarks to help them embed effective delivery processes and in doing so, secure better outcomes for their local communities.

When partners have read this guidance, we want them to:

✓ Know what the statutory requirements are;
✓ Understand how these requirements impact the day-to-day work that partnerships do;
✓ Put these requirements in the context of the wider delivery and performance management landscapes;
✓ Improve performance and partnership working through the Hallmarks;
✓ Actively manage performance and ensure successful delivery of projects;
✓ Find practical ways of overcoming obstacles and performance barriers;
✓ Learn about what other partnerships are doing and share good practice through case study examples;
✓ Understand the wider delivery landscape and be able to find additional information where necessary; and
✓ Be able to quickly refer to other resources, tools and guidance where appropriate.

I3.2 Using the Hallmarks – the guidance structure

The new legislation explains that partnerships will need to produce a plan setting out how they intend to tackle crime and disorder/community safety challenges in their area. We have used the process that a partnership would use to develop and deliver this plan as the structure of this guidance. We believe that this will help partnerships understand the way in which achieving the Hallmarks can underpin and inform all their work. Partners can use the Hallmarks to identify if there are any improvement needs at every stage of their work and to target their improvement accordingly.

There are four main sections to this guidance. They are:

• **Lead and Guide** - which sets out the role of the partnership;
• **Assess** - which sets out the way in which the partnership identifies its priorities to produce a strategic assessment;
• **Plan for action** - which sets out what partnerships will do to produce a partnership plan; and
• **Deliver** - which sets out what partnerships will do to deliver the plan and evaluate its effectiveness.
Within these sections, the guidance:

- Starts by explaining the purposes behind the section and why we believe that partnerships will want to achieve the Hallmark;
- Explains the statutory requirements;
- Includes examples of suggested practice to support delivery of the Hallmark;
- Identifies potential barriers and solutions; and
- Signposts partnerships towards other useful resources.

This structure is illustrated below:

**I3.3 Using the Hallmarks – the Case Studies**

We have framed much of the suggested practice based on the knowledge and experience of partnerships and using case studies provided by a broad range of partnerships. These case studies represent the practical solutions that we believe will support partnerships implement the Hallmarks. Therefore, although we do not require partnerships to meet the Hallmarks as we do the statutory requirements, we do expect partnerships to consider the suggested practice and the way that they can use them in their own partnerships.

Please see Appendix L for a complete index of case studies.
I4. Effective Performance Management

I4.1 Embedding Performance Management across Partnerships

Effective Performance Management is at the heart of an effective partnership

This guidance and the Hallmarks around which it is based are designed to help partnerships to work as effective as possible. In the very broadest sense, managing the performance of the partnership is the key to both being effective and knowing that the partnership is effective.

What do we mean by “performance”?

Partnership performance in its simplest form just means how well the partnership carries out and delivers the things for which they have responsibility. “Performance” does not mean “performance indicators” (i.e. numbers and statistics), although this can be a common assumption – for example when people equate simple crime statistics with partnership performance. Performance indicators help us examine what performance actually is, and may not cover all of the areas for which the partnership is responsible, unless they have been put in place specifically.

What do we mean by “performance management”?

Performance management is the practice of reviewing current performance and the factors that might affect future performance, and taking decisions in response to that information so that the appropriate actions can be taken in order to make that future performance better than it might otherwise be.

All performance management is dependent on:

- Performance measurement – the collection of data about performance, and the processing of this into usable information (e.g. as performance indicators); and
- Performance monitoring – analysing the information in order to make judgements about the level of performance (e.g. is performance getting better or worse?; is it worse or better than what we would expect?).

Successful performance management builds on the output of performance measurement and monitoring: decisions and actions are taken based upon the insights into performance that are given through these two steps. Performance management is therefore important because fundamentally it is about how resources are used.

The principles of performance management in this broadest sense are therefore implicit throughout this guidance, not least in the overall strategic actions of the partnership (assess, plan for action, deliver) around which the guide is set out. The Hallmarks describe the three broadest enablers of effective performance management:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People &amp; Relationships</th>
<th>Hallmark 1</th>
<th>Empowered and Effective Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hallmark 4</td>
<td>Engaged Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hallmark 5</td>
<td>Visible and constructive accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hallmark 6</td>
<td>Appropriate Skills and Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>Hallmark 2</td>
<td>Intelligence led Business Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures &amp; Processes</td>
<td>Hallmark 3</td>
<td>Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Frameworks

When people refer to a “performance framework” they most commonly mean the array of performance measurements and associated analysis/assessments that are gathered together in a structured way to support the performance management process (although this can be more properly described as a performance assessment framework to distinguish it from the wider performance management framework (which would refer to the whole process of managing performance, not just the analytical products).

Such frameworks should be reviewed (or established) as part of the process of agreeing strategic priorities and setting out strategic objectives, as at this point the partnership will need to understand how it can measure progress towards those objectives. The performance framework then provides a reference tool for the monitoring of progress.

Performance Assessment Frameworks

In the past, there has been a range of mechanisms for assessing crime and community safety. There is now a need to simplify this landscape and we have committed to working in partnership to do this.

APACS stands for ‘Assessments of Policing and Community Safety’ and is the name of the performance management framework that will replace a number of the assessment systems and performance management regimes currently in use. APACS will provide the Home Office and partners with the capability to monitor and assess performance in policing and community safety. Principally, it will replace the Policing Performance Assessment Framework (PPAF), which brought together a number of police performance indicators and qualitative judgements that the Home Office and HMIC had previously published separately.

The Home Office and its partners are now committed to refining the approach to managing the performance of the police, working alone or in partnership with others, on crime and community safety to ensure continued improvements. In developing APACS, we intend to simplify current Home Office arrangements and align the framework with those used by other partners (e.g. local authorities). In England, this will be aligned with the National Indicator Set for local authorities. We will work with Welsh stakeholders to ensure that the framework reflects the Welsh delivery landscape. APACS is to be introduced in April 2008 and the first assessments will be published in 2009, reporting on financial year 2008-09. This framework will:

- simplify national and local performance arrangements;
- align the performance management of crime, drugs and policing by combining existing performance assessment arrangements for these areas in the Home Office;
- join up with the wider performance management frameworks of community safety partners; and
- broaden the scope of performance management to take account of important community safety work which has not been included in previous performance frameworks.

Why national performance assessment frameworks are useful for local partnerships

These national frameworks provide a common language for the discussion of performance issues between central government and local partnerships; they are also designed to support effective accountability. However, they also provide a useful resource for local partnerships in managing their own performance. At the most basic level, they could provide structure and (some) content for a local performance framework, although only if this would adequately support local objectives. More fundamentally, national frameworks provide a valuable source of information on how – on key performance measures - any given partnership compares with others.
iQuanta - crime data

Comparative analysis of key crime and community safety performance indicators reported by all areas is made available to all practitioners through the iQuanta website.

iQuanta supports the comparison of performance in three main ways:

- Comparison with peers (similar areas elsewhere);
- Comparison across time; and
- Progress towards targets/direction of travel.

It acts as a one-stop shop for a wide range of performance information including:

- Crime numbers and rates;
- Detections and sanction detections; and
- Offences brought to justice.

As well as this important resource, the website also includes a variety of other analytical resources and information, and provides several thousand users at local, regional and national level with a “common language” for discussion of performance issues. Information from iQuanta should therefore form a useful part of any partnership’s performance framework, as a supplement to more detailed local information and analysis.

iQuanta will be updated to reflect the performance measures included in APACS once they have been agreed.

Peer comparison – most similar groups

Most similar partnership groups (MSGs) are designed to underpin analysis of performance in a relative sense. The expected performance of an individual partnership is the average of the group of similar partnerships. So any variation in actual results from that average (for better or worse) is more likely to be down to the actions of the partnership. The individual partnership areas in a given MSG are not identical to the partnership in question, but the average of their characteristics (which are linked to demands on service) is very nearly identical.

Using MSGs, it is proven that a similar area, with similar demands, can reach a specific level of performance relative to peers. The “most similar” concept provides the most sophisticated peer comparison available in the crime reduction arena at the moment. It is therefore not likely to be realistic to argue that a given level of performance relative to peers is unachievable, but only how long it should take to get there. Importantly, when using such peer groups, a partnership could be expected to be significantly above average in areas of key priority. However, partnerships should not expect the same level of achievement in all performance areas, as there will always be a resource balance to be considered.

More information on most similar groupings can be found in the Help section of the iQuanta website, which explains how the groups are created, why each police force and partnership has a unique group and provides other information.
I4.2 Using the Hallmarks to support Effective Performance Management across Partnerships

We expect that partnerships will want to use their performance against the statutory requirements and the Hallmarks of Effective Partnerships as part of their own performance regime. These can provide a valuable way of identifying the quality of the partnership working to sit alongside the quantitative data that they will use to measure their performance against their targets. We emphasise the importance of performance frameworks throughout this guidance. Partnerships will want to have their own performance framework to measure and monitor their progress against their objectives. We are exploring the possibility of introducing a self-evaluation process that would support partnerships as they monitor their own progress towards the Hallmarks.

Just as we expect partnerships to use the Hallmarks as part of their performance management framework, the Home Office will also use the Hallmarks as part of the work we do to review partnership performance. In particular, when we conduct Partnership Support Programmes - intensive work undertaken with partnerships that have performance issues – we will use the statutory requirements and the Hallmarks as part of the diagnostic work to review quality of processes and outcomes. The Government Offices and Welsh Assembly Government will also use them as part of their work in supporting partnerships.
Lead and Guide

Strategic leadership, although vital to any high performing organisation, becomes ever more crucial where a range of different agencies need to work together. Effective processes, clear accountability and robust performance management provide important foundations for the rest of the work partnerships undertake to improve local community safety.
Lead and Guide

Strategic leadership, although vital to any high performing organisation, becomes ever more crucial where a range of different agencies need to work together. Effective processes, clear accountability and robust performance management provide important foundations for the rest of the work partnerships undertake to improve local community safety.

This chapter explains the new statutory requirements that will help to ensure a minimum standard of effective leadership from all the responsible authorities. It contains some suggestions to support partnership embed further effective and empowered leadership. Many partnerships will already meet the statutory requirements highlighted in this chapter and might want to take this opportunity to review their leadership structures and processes in light of some of the suggested practice. Additionally, partnerships may want to review how they engage with other partnerships, for example the Local Strategic Partnership, Local Criminal Justice Board, Regional Reducing Re-offending Board, or other community safety partnerships.

At the end of this chapter you should be able to:

- Understand the new statutory requirements relating to governance, information sharing protocols, designated liaison officers and reporting back to your community;
- Develop local governance structures, including chairing arrangements;
- Develop the relevant local protocols, particularly an information-sharing protocol;
- Agree a local performance management framework;
- Understand requirements to report back to the community on performance;
- Consider how best to work across multiple partnerships, especially in two-tier areas;
- Understand how the partnership can demonstrate Empowered and Effective Leadership and other relevant Hallmarks; and
- Understand the skills and knowledge that will support leadership.
L1. The right people around the table

The leadership of the partnership is crucial to the success in tackling the issues of the community. They develop a strategic vision for the partnership, enabling a diverse range of agencies and bodies to work together effectively to achieve common goals. Then, strategic leaders identify the partnership’s focus and priorities, outlining the steps to meeting these priorities and committing the necessary resources. The leadership also have a role in evaluating performance, holding each other to account, and supporting problem solving within the partnership. In this section, we set out the statutory requirements and suggested practice that will support partnerships as they seek to embed strong leadership.

L1.1 Statutory Requirements – District / Unitary area

This section explains what is now required within the governance structure of each partnership. Although the legislation makes reference to a ‘strategy group’, this will not necessarily require establishing a new body. Various groups could meet these criteria, or be adapted to meet them. These may be called a ‘governing body’, ‘responsible authority group’, ‘executive group’ or ‘strategic partnership group’.

- This group is ultimately responsible for preparing and implementing a strategic assessment and partnership plan.
- Other staff may be commissioned to undertake some of the research or analysis, but the strategy group is responsible for signing it off and committing to the implementation of the plan. They are responsible for formulating and implementing a strategy to tackle crime and disorder.
- Each of the five responsible authorities must be represented on the group.
- This is important since each has a part of the picture and a unique role to play. Together, the partners can pool their combined knowledge to better identify the key issues within the community and understand clearly how to tackle them.
- At least one of the representatives from each of the five responsible authorities must hold a senior position within their home organisation.
- It is important that those within the partnership have an appropriate level of seniority within their home organisations to commit resources to joint projects and make decisions.
- Where there is an elected member responsible for community safety on the council for the district/unitary area, they must also be a member of this group.

Elected members have a key role to play in partnerships and can ensure local services are responsive to the needs of their constituents. They are also able to play a key role in accessing funding for initiatives.
The group can decide the frequency of its meetings and can invite others to their meetings. While the ultimate responsibility for the strategic assessment and partnership plan falls to the responsible authorities, other partners have important perspectives, information and resources to bring to the partnership table. The responsible authorities should consider inviting the cooperating bodies and invitees to participate (set out in Appendix G) to attend their meetings and contribute to the work of the partnership.

There must be arrangements for appointing a chair, agreeing the period for which the chair can serve and the grounds on which the chair can be changed within this period.

Leadership and authority should be earned rather than asserted and the responsibility given to the person with the skills and time to fulfil it most effectively. The chair does not have to be a member of one of the responsible authorities. The requirements are to ensure that leadership is accountable.

At least once a year, the group needs to consider whether the partnership has the requisite skills and knowledge to meet the statutory requirements.

As part of their lead role within the partnership, the strategy group has to ensure that the right people with the right skills are contributing to the work of the partnership. This does not need to involve a comprehensive skills audit, but they have to ensure that the partnership has an appropriate level of capability. Conducting an annual review enables the partnership as an organisation the opportunity to identify key strengths and weaknesses within the partnership.

ENGLAND

L1.2 Statutory Requirements – County area

In two-tier areas, the Local Area Agreement is negotiated at county level. For this reason, district priorities should be co-ordinated to feed into this process. There are also opportunities for co-ordinated community safety activities between partnerships. As community safety issues do not always respect district borders and may be organised better at county level. Each county council area (i.e. excluding unitary council areas) must have a county-level group to help coordinate the work of the partnerships within the area. This is referred to in the legislation as a ‘County Strategy Group’ but the following requirements may be met by an existing structure by another name, possibly a sub-group of the Local Strategic Partnership.

This group is responsible for preparing a community safety agreement for the county. This document can identify priorities that can be fed into the Local Area Agreement for the area. In addition, this agreement should set out how the partnerships within the county will cooperate to deliver their priorities. This could include identifying where back office functions could be shared or where practitioners could work more closely on specific thematic or geographical areas.

This group must include chairs of each of the district strategy groups.

Since the community safety agreement will feed into the Local Area Agreement, through which community safety partnership funding is allocated, it is important that each partnership has a voice at county level.

The county council elected member responsible for community safety, where applicable, must be a member of this group.

As at district/unitary level, the county council elected member can ensure that the community’s considerations are taken into account in deciding county-wide priorities and can be a key player in securing funding for the community safety projects.

Representatives from each of the Police Forces, Police Authorities and Fire and Rescue Authorities in the county and a representative jointly appointed by the Primary Care Trusts in the county must sit on the group.

This requirement could be met by one of the partnership chairs, where they have an appropriate level of seniority within their home organisations to commit resources and make decisions.
There must be arrangements for appointing a chair, agreeing the period for which the chair can serve and the grounds on which the chair can be changed within this period. Leadership and authority should be earned rather than asserted and the responsibility given to the person with the skills and time to fulfil it most effectively. The chair does not have to be a member of one of the responsible authorities. The requirements are to ensure that leadership is accountable.

The group can decide the frequency of its meetings and can invite others to their meetings. While the ultimate responsibility for the community safety agreement falls to the responsible authorities, other partners have important perspectives, information, requirements and resources. The responsible authorities should consider inviting the co-operating bodies and invitees to participate (set out in Appendix G) to attend their meetings and contribute to the work of Community Safety Partnerships, particularly where engagement from these bodies is more appropriate at county than district level.

**L1.3 Suggested Practice - Making the Structures Work**

The legislation sets out how the essentials of governance at district/unitary and county level can be delivered. However, establishing leadership structures and links with other bodies can be mapped out locally. We recommend developing terms of reference for any new groups outlining, among other issues, the meeting structure. In deciding the meeting frequency for the district/unitary group or the county group, needs should be balanced with availability. Groups may also wish to consider:

- Aligning with availability of performance information (e.g. quarterly);
- Aligning with other meetings, such as Local Strategic Partnership or Local Criminal Justice Board meeting cycles, or even sharing venues with these meetings;
- Aligning with the work of Children and Young People’s Strategic Partnerships;
- Strengthening links with Safer Schools Partnerships to improve young people’s safety; and
- Aligning with the business planning process of the partnership, for example the core functions of commissioning and agreeing the strategic assessment and partnership plan.

In terms of who should attend the group, we recommend considering the following people:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Authority</th>
<th>District/Unitary Group</th>
<th>County Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Force</td>
<td>Senior police commander for the district/unitary (e.g. BCU Commander)</td>
<td>Senior police commander for the county area (e.g. Assistant Chief Constable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>Elected Member with Community Safety portfolio (where applicable) District/Unitary Council Chief Executive Community Safety Manager</td>
<td>County Council Elected Member with Community Safety portfolio (where applicable) County Council Chief Executive or Deputy Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Authority</td>
<td>Police Authority Member</td>
<td>Police Authority Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Authority</td>
<td>Middle/Brigade Manager</td>
<td>Brigade Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Care Trust (England)</td>
<td>Director of Public Health</td>
<td>Chief Executive or Director of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Health Board (Wales)</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where the home organisation covers many partnership areas and it is not practical for one senior representative to be part of all the community safety partnerships at district/unitary level, this responsibility could be delegated to other representatives. However, this is best done alongside the need to consider the ability to delegate or allocate resources. For the local police authority, which does not have direct control over the police force’s resource deployment, the level of membership should be senior enough to negotiate or influence the police use of budget and resources in the area and to consider the county-wide allocation of resources.

In two-tier areas, the respective roles and responsibilities of the district and county groups should be agreed by all parties, but should reflect the following:

- The district level partnership should have a lead role given their accountability for delivery of community safety priorities;
- The county group should act as an effective co-ordinating body, ensuring that there is a strong voice for district level priorities and interests on other partnerships such as Local Criminal Justice Boards and Local Strategic Partnerships. This is particularly important when agreeing the targets and priorities that could be included within the Local Area Agreement and how these reflect the priorities that the district level community safety partnerships have within their own partnership plans. The county group can develop an overview that can support the effective identification of countywide priorities that could be contained within the Local Area Agreement; and
- District community safety partnerships may want to maintain their own links with such partnerships to ensure that they play an active role in delivering joint priorities and in developing cross-cutting work.

L1.4 Suggested Practice - Linking with other Structures

We expect the partnership to maintain strong effective links with other local structures and partnerships, e.g. those established to support delivery of Neighbourhood Policing. The following show examples of the linkages we expect to see.

**ENGLAND**

**Local Strategic Partnerships**

As part of its wider aim to improve community sustainability, the Local Strategic Partnership has Safer and Stronger Communities as one of its five themes. The Local Strategic Partnership will play an overarching role in determining the strategic vision of an area, to which the community safety partnerships in the area will contribute. This does not alter the tripartite relationship in policing between the Home Office, Chief Officers and the police authorities, but it does emphasise that all local partners have a role to play in being accountable to their local communities for the delivery of community safety priorities.

To ensure that community safety priorities are adequately reflected in the local Sustainable Communities Strategy and Local Area Agreement, the links between district community safety partnerships, the county strategy group (where applicable) and Local Strategic Partnership need to be clearly defined. In two-tier areas, we suggest that the county strategy group forms a sub-group of the county Local Strategic Partnership given its role in identifying community safety priorities and coordinating across many community safety partnerships. In unitary areas, the partnership strategy group could form a sub-group of the Local Strategic Partnership.
Local Service Boards

Like the Local Strategic Partnership in England, the Local Service Board will also have a stake in community safety. Local Service Boards are Wales’s new model for engaging the whole of the Welsh public service in a new way of working, by defining shared outcomes, integrating services, and responding more effectively to citizens’ needs. The aim is to improve local services for citizens by pooling resources and removing bureaucracy or other obstacles. Local Service Boards are local leadership teams that pull together all the partners to agree joint actions to achieve better outcomes for citizens. They will agree, and ensure delivery of, a set of priority joint actions, which will be expressed as Local Service Agreements. The Local Service Agreement will be designed to bring together national priorities, together with the local priorities identified through the community strategy process, into a joint delivery programme agreed by all the partners.

Currently, there are six Local Service Boards development projects in place, and the aim is to have a Local Service Agreement, encapsulating a limited number of key priorities requiring delivery across service boundaries, in place in these areas by April 2008. All areas are working on moving from the existing community strategy/local strategic partnership model to a Local Service Board approach and the timeline is to have a Local Service Agreement in place in every Local Service Board in Wales by 2010.

The roles and responsibilities between the partnership and Local Service Board will need to be agreed and clearly set out to ensure that priorities, resources and approaches are aligned. Ensuring that these structures are clear will help the partnership align priorities, approaches and corresponding resources and funding.

Drug Action Teams

In November 2003, the government recommended the merger of Drug Action Teams with community safety partnerships in unitary areas and, where possible in two-tier areas. Guidance on this can be found at: http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/integration.htm.

The Police and Justice Act 2006 expanded the remit of community safety partnerships to include alcohol and other substances as well as drugs. With shared responsibility for tackling the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances in England, we recommend merging, or working very closely with Drug Action Teams (DATs), if you have not done so already. This can help to align priorities, approaches and funding and may even deliver efficiency savings by sharing support resources and reducing duplication of efforts and intervention work. In two-tier areas, these links are more appropriate at the county level, as DATs operate at this level.

As DATs are co-operating bodies, we expect them, and partners within the DATs, to work within the spirit and principles of the statutory requirements and Hallmarks and to support their community safety partners as they work towards them. The responsible authorities who are members of the DATs can also ensure that the DAT works to support the implementation of the Hallmarks.

The following case study shows the way in which closer working can be achieved through merging the DAT and community safety partnership.
Empowered and Effective Leadership and Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures: Merging the DAAT and County Community Safety Support Teams in East Sussex

During 2006-7 the East Sussex DAAT and county community safety support teams were merged by their host organisation, East Sussex County Council, to become the East Sussex Safer Communities Team. This merger was established to support more effective approaches to addressing substance misuse and crime and disorder across the county.

What they did

The two teams merged and a dedicated support team was introduced to support the linkages between the district community safety partnerships and the county council. The new team was introduced to act as the principal point of contact for each of these groups and comprised a team leader heading up a small group of individuals ranging from managers to administrative staff.

What it involved

The county council were keen to minimise duplication when the merger took place and therefore amalgamated the community safety co-ordinator and DAAT manager posts into a single post. This individual was tasked with heading up the newly merged team.

A change of management plan was drawn up and agreed, setting out the process and timescales of the restructure. This principally involved:

• Further consultation with staff about proposed structure;
• Completion of redundancy process with the previous Community Safety Co-ordinator;
• Review of job descriptions;
• Re-grading of posts where appropriate;
• Completing the appointment of new staff; and
• Agreeing induction, training and team building requirements.

Around 16 hours of Director/Assistant Director time was required to set up the initial process followed by around one month’s work by the team manager and personnel to complete the re-structure of the team.

What impact it had

The main benefits included the harmonisation of the DAAT and Community Safety business planning process through the Safer Communities Plan and the successful establishment and maintenance of the County Safer Communities Steering Group.

Financial efficiency targets established prior to the merger process were also met and partnership performance in all areas improved due to improved focus on performance outputs.

What they learned

The group learnt a number of lessons in undertaking this process, namely:

• Produce and agree a comprehensive change management plan once any alterations to the team have been agreed. This will help to ensure a smooth and orderly transition;
• Establish a clear timetable of activity. This will help staff to understand more about the steps in the process and why they are taking place; and
• A risk and issue log should also be produced to ensure that significant threats to the process are identified as early as possible and steps can be taken to reduce the impact.

Consultation with partners and staff at an early stage about proposed and actual changes was important in making sure that there was buy in to the process and stakeholders understood the reasons for the changes.
L1.5 Suggested Practice – Linking with criminal justice/offender management

In addition to clear and direct links with the Local Strategic Partnership, we recommend that the community safety partnership establish a clear relationship with the Local Criminal Justice Board, most usefully through the county level strategy group in two-tier areas. Community safety partnerships and Local Criminal Justice Boards play crucial roles in preventing and reducing crime and are part of the wider management of offenders. They both have an important task to provide reassurance to communities and increase communities’ confidence in the criminal justice system. Successfully rehabilitating and resettling offenders in the community will also have a significant impact on partnerships’ crime reduction work and the Local Criminal Justice Board’s work to improve public confidence in the criminal justice system. In particular, good working relationships would help to address overlaps in:

- **Membership on the groups** – the same members may sit on multiple groups and represent similar interests;
- **Responsibility for delivering on Prolific and other Priority Offender (PPO) and Persistent Young Offender (PYO) schemes**;
- **Similar requirements to engage with the community to identify local needs** – which would benefit from a joined up and coordinated approach;
- **Shared involvement in PSA2: Reassurance and Public Confidence until April 2008 and future shared involvement in Safer Communities PSA**; and
- **Links with the work of Youth Offending Teams on youth justice issues**.

For more on working with Local Criminal Justice Boards, partnerships can refer to the guidance ‘CDRPs(CSPs) and LCJBs: How to work together’ – details of which are given in the further resources section.

Partnerships already work closely with many local agencies and voluntary groups to achieve a community-based multi-agency approach to crime reduction. They may consider developing these existing partnerships or building new partnerships to incorporate reducing re-offending as an important aspect of crime reduction.

Working more closely with Probation Trusts to reduce re-offending will support the delivery of crime reduction priorities, and therefore community safety outcomes. Currently, Probation Trusts have specific responsibility for managing offenders but much of the resource and services needed to address re-offending are not within their control, for example accommodation provision. Partnerships are in a good position to bring together and co-ordinate the actions of a range of partner agencies that all have a critical role to play in providing mainstream services focused on offenders’ needs.

With changes to the local delivery landscape arising from the Offender Management Act 2007 (see Appendix E), partnerships may wish to consider joint commissioning of services with Probation Trusts to reduce re-offending, for example through the co-location of resources or the identification and bringing together of existing resources.

Partners in the Local Strategic Partnership/Local Service Board also include the agencies that hold the key to reducing offending and re-offending. Strong links between all these partnerships will support improvements in joined up working across community safety and criminal justice agencies and influence the allocation of resources accordingly.

Regional Reducing Re-offending Boards act as fora to bring together regional and local agencies from the public, private and voluntary and community sectors that can help make a difference to reducing re-offending and protecting the public. Their purpose is to develop and deliver the regional reducing re-offending strategies and action plans to tackle re-offending in each region. They can also influence the
prioritisation of resources to reduce re-offending and can support the work of community safety partnerships.

The following case study shows the way in which community safety partnerships have developed closer working arrangements with offender management structures.

**Empowered and Effective Leadership and Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures: Hounslow CDRP – working with NOMS/ROMS**

Hounslow Community Safety Partnership (HCSP) is currently working with the Office of the Regional Offender Manager (ROM) for London, which is developing and implementing a Local Delivery Programme made up of a series of projects linked to individual prisons. The projects aim to reduce re-offending in London by improving the co-ordination of resettlement support to offenders on release from custody. The working relationships that have developed through the HMP Wormwood Scrubs and HMP Latchmere House projects between Hounslow CDRP and the prisons have resulted in better planned service delivery.

**What it involved**

There are currently 16 London boroughs engaging with three London prisons. The 16 were identified as those receiving the most released prisoners from the prisons involved, and we approached the Chief Executives and Council Leaders to explain the aims of the projects and ask for their support.

HCSP oversees the project, with the council’s community safety team providing the strategic and operational framework for the Local Delivery Project alongside the local PPO Scheme and DIP. In particular, HCSP has set up a strategic Resettlement Leads group to oversee the strategic delivery of the Local Delivery project.

At a practitioner level in Hounslow, the sharing of information about prisoners and joint intervention-planning takes place at monthly case conferences, which fit into the case conference schedule for PPO and DIP cases. These involve relevant partnership agencies in the community, and discussion is based around information from the prison indicating the resettlement needs of the prisoners due for release, which is shared with the informed consent of the prisoner. In addition, relevant community-based practitioners go into the prison to meet the prisoners prior to release and contribute to internal case conferences.

**What impact did it have?**

An outcome monitoring framework with indicators across all pathways to measure the impact of the local delivery projects was introduced in April 2007. It is too early to be able to identify longer-term outcomes, but several CDRPs have been able to point to positive initial outcomes, such as stable accommodation on release and at four weeks.

**Key lesson:**

There is much to be gained through strong links between PPO Schemes, DIP, and wider work to reduce re-offending, to avoid duplication and maximise the added value of operational groups in terms of co-ordinating a response to the needs individual offenders.

**Future Plans**

Representatives from the office of the London ROM will be attending the next Hounslow CDRP meeting as part of a programme of meetings with all London CDRPs, to present the London Reducing Re-offending Action Plan 2007-09 and help them consider how they can address re-offending further through their Local Area Agreements.
L1.6 Suggested Practice - Effective Chair Arrangements

The chair for either the district/unitary or county group has a key leadership function. This definition could be captured in Terms of Reference. While areas should decide this role locally, we suggest that part of the chair’s role could be to ensure that:

- The partnership reaches clear decisions;
- There are clear responsibilities for each member of the partnership, evaluating delivery against these and securing developmental support where required;
- There are clear lines of accountability within the partnership and back to partner agencies;
- The partnership meets the statutory requirements and can further demonstrate the Hallmarks of an Effective Partnership;
- There are strong and effective links at all levels with the county strategy group (where applicable), and other local partnerships;
- The partnership priorities are fed into Local Area Agreements/Local Service Agreements;
- The partnership actively manages performance, understanding current performance, setting delivery targets and evaluating results; and
- The partnership engages appropriately with the community, for example, via links made by local Neighbourhood Policing teams, understanding local priorities, involving the community in delivery and communicating its activities and decisions in an accessible manner.

The chair may also fulfil the role of spokesperson for the partnership. In addition, you will need to agree a process for electing the chair. The most important consideration is the knowledge and skills of the individual, who will ideally have senior management experience. Some options to consider in defining this process locally might include:

- **Electing a chair for a set term** (e.g. two years) can help to provide continuity of leadership, allowing the individual to become established in the role and to deliver results. The clear benefit of this approach is that it is likely to result in the most appropriately skilled and motivated individual becoming chair;

- **Nominating the elected member** with responsibility for community safety to serve as chair. Where this individual has the necessary skills, this can help to embed the principle of democratically accountable political leadership across the local partnership landscape, providing visible leadership in a way to which the public can relate. It may also help to secure resources and support for the partnership; and

- **Chairing on a rota system** (e.g. 6-12 months). Where each of the responsible bodies rotate chairmanship, this can help secure the commitment and accountability of all responsible authorities and/or members of the partnership. However, to ensure consistency of leadership, the group will need to develop a strong vision and clear plan.

L1.7 Suggested Practice - Clear Roles and Responsibilities

Everybody works better together when they understand what their responsibilities are and the role that they are expected to play in the partnership. It has already been outlined that there is added benefit in securing the active involvement of co-operating bodies and invitees in the partnership and that representation from the responsible authorities must be senior enough to commit resources and make decisions on behalf of their home organisation. Where partnering and cooperating bodies sit on the partnership and county strategy group, these representatives would also benefit from the ability to make key decisions and commit resources.
While there is not space here to outline all the different contributions that could be made by the different agencies involved in partnerships, an example is given below in relation to Primary Care Trusts (in England) and Local Health Boards (in Wales).

Primary Care Trusts and Local Health Boards have an important role not only in reducing crime, including violent crime, domestic violence, theft and burglaries, but also in tackling the misuse of alcohol, drugs and other substances. Some crimes are closely linked to alcohol or drug use but even when this is not the case, Primary Care Trusts and Local Health Boards may work with others in the partnership, for example to support the victims of domestic violence. Even when no crime is committed, Primary Care Trusts and Local Health Boards arrange for the provision of health advice or treatment for people who put themselves or others at risk through their use of drugs or alcohol. They may also work with other local partners to help prevent problems occurring in the first place, for example by alerting the police to licensed premises where a lot of alcohol-related injuries occur.

Particular roles and responsibilities of the Primary Care Trust/Local Health Board representative on the partnership might, therefore, include:

- **Sharing information about the scale of substance misuse, violent crime or domestic violence;**
- **Suggesting how agencies could work together to combat these issues, for example through considering the licensing of local premises or the provision of accommodation or jobs to substance misusers; and**
- **Monitoring the effect of interventions on the uptake of health services as an indication of the effect on un-reported community safety issues.**

**L1.8 Suggested Practice - Role of the Elected Member**

Where there is an elected member within a leadership structure, the role and responsibilities of this person is a local decision. The democratic legitimacy of the elected member naturally gives them a leading role in partnership working. This member also sits on the Local Strategic Partnership, helping to create a clear link between the two partnerships. We suggest that the other members of the group discuss with the relevant elected member what the most appropriate role is. In doing so, they may wish to consider the elected member's role in:

- **Helping the partnership to secure funds and resources to address community concerns;**
- **Raising community concerns and supporting community engagement;**
- **Attending meetings to ensure that recommendations and decisions of the partnership are fed into the Local Strategic Partnership;**
- **Keeping the partnerships informed of the wider picture on local priorities and targets, including progress on these, developed at the Local Strategic Partnership level;**
- **Ensuring the priorities of the partnership are reflected in the work of the local authority;**
- **Encouraging open discussion and transparent decision-making within the partnership;**
- **Providing a steer in reaching difficult decisions on those issues that involve competing public interests or may prove contentious in an area;**
- **Bedding community safety issues in the policy and decision-making processes of the local authority and championing Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998; and**
- **Ensuring that other executive members are fully briefed on key programmes under the community safety agenda and how that will affect other portfolio areas.**
Appropriate Skills and Knowledge: Safer Blaenau Gwent:

Developing local training products

The purpose was to increase awareness of Section 17 amongst all elected members, local authority staff and partner agencies, by developing a handbook outlining the key concepts of Section 17. The handbook was developed within the local authority in order to raise awareness of Section 17 and make the transition to streamlining Section 17 more effective within the local authority. The development of the handbook not only increased awareness amongst key representatives of their responsibilities but also encouraged more effective joint working.

What they did

The groundwork was laid for the Section 17 handbook in 2004 when awareness-raising sessions, induction presentations and accredited training that were rolled out across the local authority. These sessions increased awareness of the principles of Section 17 and created a need for additional resources for individuals to support the mainstreaming of Section 17 into their work. The Section 17 handbook was developed to support this need by:

- Outlining the key factors that underpin Section 17;
- Identifying key responsibilities in terms of outputs; and
- Including contact details for each department within the local authority who had responsibility for delivering on Section 17.

What it involved

Initially 250 members and staff completed the Home Office accredited “An Introduction to Crime and Disorder Reduction” training. These created the foundation for the development of the Section 17 handbook.
handbook to continue to support individuals implement what they had learned in the training.

From a practical perspective, the process of developing the handbook required one officer’s time to secure corporate buy-in to the handbook and prepare the document for publication. The development of the product was incorporated into part of the officer’s core outputs.

What impact it had

- Overall there has been an increase in awareness and the mainstreaming of Section 17 has been more effective as individuals understand what is expected of them and what their role is in supporting the delivery of Section 17;
- Relations internally and with other partnership agencies, especially the police have improved;
- There has been interest from another community safety partnerships in adopting the process and the guide handbook; and
- The awareness raising of section 17 has led and is continuing to lead to the review, development and implementation of new ways of working to deliver on core responsibilities (e.g. graffiti/fly tipping/litter removal working policy).

Lessons learned

The group learnt a number of lessons in undertaking this process, namely:

- Secure the buy-in from across the council – there are benefits from adopting a corporate approach to mainstreaming;
- Place emphasis on the 'Invest to Save' ethos and giving practical examples – as it helps the departments see the potential savings;
- Make sure the document remains ‘live’ – staff move in and out of an organisation, re-structuring occurs, legislation is updated as it is important to make the documents flexible;
- Provide alternative products to increase accessibility to the document (hard copies, intranet, CD-Rom); and
- Ensure that the content of the handbook reflects the discussions held across the partnership – allowing the departments to shape the content – as this will help secure ownership.

Appropriate Skills and Knowledge: North East:
ISCAN - Internal Review of Services and Skills

In order to support the introduction of minimum standards and effective practice hallmarks through the ISCAN programme (the Intelligence-led delivery of Safety Communities Across the North East) an extensive learning needs analysis (LNA) was carried out using a literature review, focus groups, observations, examination of current training and a questionnaire to partnerships. This review process, which was conducted by Government Office North East, explored the overall knowledge and skills base within all the CDRPs in the North East region. The review focused on the following areas:

- The local delivery landscape;
- Performance and programme management knowledge;
- Business planning ;
- Legal awareness;
- People management skills;
- Technology and information knowledge; and
- Research skills.
The information collected by the review process gave Government Office North East an insight into the gaps and strengths within partnerships.

To enable all CDRPs to improve performance, the Government Office North East has used the information identified as a means of assessing the development needs of partners to effectively function within an intelligence-led business environment. This will result in bespoke training events. While the process of supporting skills awareness and capacity building will vary, we recommend that partnerships should consider the following steps:

• Determine the skills and knowledge required for the CDRP to deliver effectively – particularly in regards to effective partnership working;
• Examine what skills and experience currently exists within the CDRP – incorporating learning from previous experience and from other similar CDRPs;
• Match the skills to the requirement;
• Identify any gaps that need to be addressed in order to achieve effective delivery – focusing on improving outcomes; and
• Identify actions to build capacity internally – including processes to monitor and review the impact.

Where gaps are identified, improving the skills and knowledge of partnership staff might be reflected as a strategic objective in the partnership plan. Strategies to address this might include:

• Ensuring that skills transfer is an integral part of any commissioning process;
• Seconding experts from individual partners to help build capacity; and
• Pooling support services across responsible authorities, cooperating bodies and partnering bodies, such as joint training and job-shadowing to ensure skills within the partnership are reviewed and used to maximum benefit.

L1.10 Potential Barriers and Solutions

In determining governance arrangements, partners may encounter some barriers. We have outlined below are some common challenges and suggested solutions to these.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Barrier</th>
<th>Suggested Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Varying commitment across individual partners due to different constraints on time, resources and budgets in home organisations | • Understand how the partnership work helps to deliver individual home agency targets to improve buy-in.  
• Request that partners support specific initiatives that will simultaneously benefit their home organisations to build commitment.  
• Request that partners support robust research to demonstrate the value of shared governance arrangements and partnership delivery, and to identify up-to-date effective practice. |
| Senior level representatives do not have time to attend the meetings | • Ensure that the partnership has a clear remit to reinforce the importance of attending.  
• Where members may sit on other district and/or county groups (including other community safety partnerships), rationalise the number of partnerships locally, to reduce duplication in membership.  
• Provide regular information or briefings between meetings in order to reduce meeting times and frequency.  
• Delegate functions, such as operational management, to a sub-group, to free senior time.  
• Where delegates attend meetings, ensure that they also have decision-making abilities. |
Lack of clarity around the governance structure

- Agree clear Terms of Reference that set out the roles and responsibilities of each group.
- Produce a visual representation of the governance structure, showing key meetings and membership. Distribute this to staff involved in delivering community safety initiatives.

**L1.11 Additional Resources**

You may find the additional resources helpful in reviewing your governance arrangements.

- Centre for Public Scrutiny  [www.cfps.org.uk](http://www.cfps.org.uk)
- Pmp Partner  [http://pmpartner.editme.com](http://pmpartner.editme.com)

**L1 Implementation Checklist**

**Empowered and Effective Leadership**

- Do you have an effective governance structure that is able to provide strategic leadership for your partnership?
- Does it involve senior representatives from all the responsible authorities?
- Are other bodies and agencies represented as appropriate?
- Do you have a clear process for agreeing and reviewing the chair?
- Does the elected member with responsibility for community safety sit on this body?
- Do you have a clear meeting structure?

At county level (in two-tier areas):

- Do you have a group with representation from the responsible authorities at county level and the chairs of all the community safety partnerships?

**Intelligence-led Business Processes**

- Does the strategy group understand their core responsibilities for preparing and implementing the strategic assessment and partnership plan?

At county level (in two-tier areas):

- Does this group feed community safety priorities into the Local Area Agreement negotiations?

**Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures**

At county level (in two-tier areas):

- Does the county strategy group actively encourage cross-border working within the county?

**Appropriate Skills and Knowledge**

- Is there a clear understanding amongst all partners of the purpose and aims of the partnership?
- Is there clarity over the roles and responsibilities of those who make up the partnership?
- Is there clarity over membership of the partnership, are there any identifiable gaps, and how frequently is membership reviewed?
L2. Governing Partnership Processes

Information sharing is the cornerstone of delivering shared understanding of issues and arriving at shared solutions. Effective delivery relies on good decision making and those decisions should be based on good information. The right information enables partners to carry out evidence-based, targeted community safety interventions and to evaluate their impact. The improved outcomes of an intelligence-led, problem solving approach to community safety can only be achieved when partners have access to relevant, robust and up-to-date information from a broad range of sources. Much of this information will be depersonalised datasets but, in some cases, it is also necessary to share personal information, notably where decisions about particular individuals are being made.

However, information sharing between key agencies has often been sporadic and, in some instances, many partners have been reluctant to share both personal and depersonalised information, despite the power to do so under Section 115 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. The use and exchange of personalised data identifying particular individuals is rightly controlled and it is important that the processes for sharing all information are robust. Therefore, the first step in ensuring effective information sharing involves establishing an information-sharing protocol and nominating designated liaison officers to facilitate the sharing of information.

Similarly, for other processes that are vital for the effective functioning of a partnership, for example performance management, protocols can provide clarity and a shared understanding of how the partnership will function. This section considers how you might go about preparing these protocols. The new duty to share certain sets of depersonalised data is considered in more detail in the next chapter (Assess).

L2.1 Statutory Requirements

- The strategy group will prepare an information-sharing protocol.

It is important that strategic leaders appreciate the importance of information sharing and give the necessary approval to the processes that need to take place. This must cover the sharing of information under the new duty to share depersonalised datasets and any additional information, including personal data, which the partnership needs to share.

- This protocol will be signed by all responsible authorities and will govern the sharing of information between the responsible authorities.
It can also be signed by other agencies and bodies and we strongly recommend that those other agencies covered by Section 115 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 are also invited to sign and comply with the protocol.

Each responsible authority must nominate a designated liaison officer whose role will be to facilitate the sharing of information with other partners.

Having one person whose role includes sharing information with partners should allow other agencies to know who to approach first for information. These designated liaison officers should also be a source of expertise, allowing good quality decisions about information sharing to be made.

L2.2 Suggested Practice - Preparing the Information-sharing Protocol

The first step in ensuring that information sharing is robust and legitimate is the preparation of an information sharing protocol. Because the protocol is essentially an agreement between local partners, it should be prepared locally to reflect local circumstances. However, we recommend that you include the following sections:

- Signatories;
- Processes for disclosure and storage of different kinds of information (non-personal, depersonalised, personal, sensitive);
- Data sets covered, including the depersonalised datasets covered by the new duty to share, set out in Appendix J, and discussed in A1;
- Names of designated liaison officers for the responsible authorities; and
- Review dates for the protocol.

In preparing your information protocol, you may want to consult the Management of Police Information Code of Practice. This is what governs information sharing by the police with other agencies and can, therefore, facilitate the clarification of processes within the rest of the partnership.

L2.3 Suggested Practice – Sharing Personal Information

It is often appropriate and necessary for partnerships to share data that can identify a living individual ('personal data') for the purposes of reducing crime and disorder. Section 115 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 provides a legal basis for data sharing with relevant authorities where it is necessary for fulfilling duties contained in the Act. This means that there are a wide range of activities in which the sharing of personal information is not only useful but legally permissible, particularly where decisions regarding particular interventions with individuals are being discussed. These are considered more fully on the Crime Reduction Website at http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/toolkits/ui0307.htm.

Your processes for deciding when to share information and how those who receive the information should retain it should be compliant with:

- The Data Protection Act 1998 – this legislation aims to make sure that when personal information is shared, this happens in a fair and transparent manner. It provides a legal framework for good practice in handling personal information and should not be seen as prohibitive of the sharing of all personal data; and
- Guidance and advice from the Information Commissioner's Office – this is the UK's independent public body set up to promote access to official information and protect personal information. The new ‘Framework code of practice for sharing personal information' from the Information Commissioner's Office will be available on their website in October 2007.

4 The Section 115 responsible authorities are: police, police authority, local authority (including district, county, London borough, parish council, community council, county borough council), registered social landlord, local probation board, local health board (in Wales), primary care trust, strategic health authority, fire and rescue authority.
WALES

In Wales, the process should also be compliant with the Wales Accord on the Sharing of Patient Information (WASPI) – this is intended to enable service-providing and other organisations directly concerned with the well being of an individual to share information between them in a lawful and intelligent way.

L2.4 Suggested Practice - Role of the Designated Liaison Officer

The legal requirement is to have a named person within each responsible authority who can facilitate information sharing with other agencies. For this to be a meaningful role, each partnership should agree a clear role for the designated liaison officers. This might include:

- Acting as the single point of contact for information requests between the partnership and relevant organisations;
- Understanding the relevant legislation and being able to champion information sharing within their own organisations;
- Working with other designated liaison officers to establish the best ways to share information; and
- Acting as the first point of call for any technical problems with sharing the information that may arise.

Partnerships should decide locally whether the existing Data Protection Officers are appropriate for this role. In two-tier areas in particular, one person may fulfil the role of designated liaison officer across multiple community safety partnerships. In small partnerships, it may be that the key representative on the partnership also acts as the designated liaison officer.

L2.5 Suggested Practice - Appropriate skills and knowledge for the designated liaison officer

To fulfil the role of designated liaison officers, individuals may require additional training and support. This should be considered as part of the strategy group’s consideration of appropriate skills and knowledge within the partnership. This training and support may focus around the key competencies as outlined by the National Occupational Standards.

L2.6 Suggested Practice - Preparation of additional protocols

For the roles and responsibilities within the partnership to be clear, the strategy group could prepare additional protocols and written agreements. While these are dependent on local decision, they could include:

- Terms of reference for the strategy group, county group and any relevant sub-groups;
- Process-specific protocols to outline shared responsibilities and respective service level agreements particularly for processes that depend on multiple partners (for example, Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements, Prolific and Other Priority Offenders, Drugs Intervention Programme, the Youth Justice Board model for youth offending or protocols for sharing information when working with children and young people); and
- Agreements outlining shared support, such as training and business support.

This case study demonstrates how sharing information on anti-social behaviour within a shared service level agreement led to the more active involvement of an additional partner.
Demonstrating Intelligence-led Business Processes and Appropriate Skills and Knowledge: Coventry Consortium of Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) & Coventry CDRP:
Effective engagement on ASB between Housing Consortium and CDRP

Upon transfer of the housing stock from Coventry City Council to Whitefriars Housing Group Ltd, Coventry CDRP agreed a service level agreement (SLA) to continue the relationship between Whitefriars Housing and CDRP partners. Links were also established with additional Coventry RSLs and the Consortium was formed. The relationship proved to be so successful that the Consortium now supports a comprehensive range of targeted initiatives to tackle crime & anti-social behaviour.

What they did

Initially, the Consortium obtained a two-year grant from the Housing Corporation to support all housing associations in Coventry to achieve a more integrated and practical approach to tackling anti-social behaviour, to develop key indicators to assist in managing anti-social behaviour and to ensure better working links with the Coventry CDRP.

What it involved

Funding was obtained from the Safer Stronger Communities Fund to further develop the partnership links with the Consortium and its members. A needs assessment was undertaken focusing on how anti-social behaviour was perceived by Consortium members and their tenants. The outcomes of the assessment offered the Consortium the opportunity to introduce training and systems to support members to manage anti-social behaviour cases more effectively and to ensure best practice was applied consistently. To further facilitate partnership working, the Consortium established a Steering Group which included a member of the CDRP.

What impact it had

The approach has resulted in a more effective working relationship between the Consortium and the CDRP. This was influenced initially by the Consortium making its intelligence and expertise available to the CDRP to support the process of addressing anti-social behaviour. The success of this relationship resulted in the Consortium taking a more active role in supporting a comprehensive range of crime reduction initiatives in conjunction. The Consortium project was evaluated throughout the two year period and the Consortium is now self-financed by members.

Lessons learned

• Be aware of how important registered social landlords can be in supporting partners in tackling crime and anti-social behaviour. Although the Consortium’s role initially involved sharing intelligence and expertise, their role quickly developed beyond this to support and deliver a range of programmes devised by the CDRP;
• Ensure that appropriate plans and governance structures are in place so that the group can continue to develop; and
• Conduct a needs assessment, involving all stakeholders, prior to beginning any new initiative so that everyone is aware of the scope of the proposed project.
L2.7 Potential Barriers and Suggested Solutions

In setting up information-sharing protocols and sharing personal information, partnerships may encounter some potential barriers. Below are some common challenges and suggested solutions to these:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Barrier</th>
<th>Suggested Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unwillingness to share information</td>
<td>• Agree clear processes for sharing information to ensure it is secure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure that the legislation set out in the Data Protection Act is clearly understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Liaise with the Information Commissioner’s Office to seek formal advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Refer to existing legislation, guidance and case studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following case study from West Sussex offers a good example of the way in which partners can join other agencies to deliver their business.

**Demonstrating Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures:**

**West Sussex County – Successful and supportive County/District relationships**

The purpose of this project was to develop a strong, flexible and successful model of partnership working (the West Sussex Strategic Community Safety Partnership – WSSCSP) that brings together principal local authorities, the police, YOT, the DAT and other key stakeholders within a single, voluntary framework. The framework is now being used to monitor and report on the Safer and Stronger Communities element of the LAA.

**What they did**

West Sussex has developed a framework to support and strengthen multi-agency working to deliver more effective community safety across the county. By establishing a framework that offers clear strategic direction and pooled budgets, services are set up and delivered on a county-wide basis. This approach has resulted in a number of cross-cutting themes being addressed in a holistic multi-agency manner including domestic violence, environmental safety, education and anti-social behaviour. There has also been the development of web-based performance management system enabling seven CDRPs in West Sussex to view and access up-to-date information on LAA Safer Communities schemes.

**What it involved**

The process of building successful working relationships involved many people from many different organisations that work with the County Council to develop the forum at the strategic level and at the organisational level. In order to ensure that the WSSCSP retains its focus by regularly reviewing and revising the approaches and frameworks established.

**What impact it had**

There has been a 20% reduction in repeat attendance at Accident and Emergency minor injuries unit due to domestic violence and the county team has been awarded the Sussex Health and Social Care ‘Team of the Year’ in the NHS South East Coast Best Health Awards 2006.

The partnership has also provided safer school partnership officers who interact with young people to prevent, deter and reduce anti-social behaviour in educational settings in order to reduce the incidents of young people becoming victim or perpetrators of crime.
The web-based performance management system devised to support CDRPs in the area is now being used as the quarterly Government Office South East performance reporting system.

**Lessons learned**

The group learned a number of lessons in undertaking this process:

- The importance of strategic partnership working and supporting delivery through CDRPs and associated sub-groups;
- The ethos of WSSCSP includes subsidiarity, existence by consent, the county council taking a facilitative and enabling role, the recognition of commonality as well as difference;
- Leaders and positive engagement are vital;
- The model supports stronger and weaker partnerships alike;
- Joining up resources and activity at the most appropriate level creates action; and
- The importance of good quality data and the sharing of information.

The following case study shows how an effective structure can support good information sharing processes. The case study also highlights the importance of information sharing in delivering positive outcomes.

**Intelligence led Business Processes and Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures: Safer Southwark Partnership – The Partnership Operations Group (POG)**

The Safer Southwark Partnership (SSP) is the Community Safety arm of the South Alliance, the Local Strategic Partnership in the area. In 2005, Safer Southwark Partnership set up the Partnership Operations Group (POG), as part of their wider governance structure, to better co-ordinate a partnership approach to tackling local crime, disorder, substance misuse and anti-social behaviour issues. This group co-ordinates tasking across over 18 different agencies and reports to the SSP Performance Group, which closely monitors performance. In the years following the establishment of the POG, crime has fallen in the area and performance has improved significantly across a range of measures. In particular the borough has seen a dramatic reduction in violent crime, such as common assault, actual bodily harm, grievous bodily harm and domestic violence. All of which have formed the focus of the POG.

**What they did**

2005 saw the introduction of a new three year strategy with a challenging set of performance targets. Like most of crime and disorder reduction partnerships, Southwark has developed a range of services to respond to the priorities outlined in their strategy. However, the partnership recognised that to meet the new targets there had to be appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure strategic targets can be delivered by those on front line. This was particularly important in areas such as violent crime, domestic violence and alcohol related disorder where the recorded levels of crime were showing signs of increasing.

In order to support this process, a review was conducted which focused on the partnerships ability to ensure appropriate strategic direction, performance management frameworks and the targeting of operational resources. The POG was developed as a result of this review to provide a framework to task and hold to account a range of partnership resources based on data and intelligence profiling. The POG meets fortnightly to agree operational tasking for Southwark. This tasking has a strong forward-planning remit and is supported by analysis and profiling of a range of partnership data, prepared by members of a joint funded partnership analytical team.
What it involved

The first POG took place in May 2005. The level of intelligence at the initial meetings tended to be broad overviews and it took approximately three months to establish a thorough intelligence profile for the meetings.

The POG is an intelligence-led business process, driven by analysis conducted within the community desk (a jointly resourced team of analysts and researchers). This accounts for approximately three days work from this team during a 14 day cycle. The analysis conducted concentrates on key aspect of the ten indicators for PSA 1 as well as domestic violence which is recognised by the partnership as a key causal factor in influencing involvement in other types of crime and anti-social behaviour.

The composition of POG is multi-agency in focus and includes individuals from across the responsible authorities, co-operating bodies and invitees to participate in order to ensure that a holistic approach is taken to tackling crime.

What impact it had

The introduction of the new structure has been has facilitated the following:

• A fall in comparator crime by 7% in Southwark as measured by the British Crime Survey;
• During 2006-07 Southwark experienced month-on-month reductions in wounding (ABH and GBH) offences, compared to the previous year and a achieving a 22% reduction in wounding;
• Within their CDRP most similar grouping, SSP have significantly improved their position from sixth out of 15 and above the family average in 2006-7 compared to 2005-6;
• Clearer identification of trends and patterns within Southwark which can be acted upon succinctly;
• 6% reduction in DV in June, compared to the previous June. This was the 3rd lowest month for DV in the borough for the past 15 months; and
• In addition, the focus on repeat offenders has meant that the sanctioned detection rate for domestic violence for 2006-7 was 38%.
Lessons learned

Key lessons learned from this process include:

- Strong leadership is essential. Through strong leadership they engaged and inspired partners to strive for constant improvement at the POG and created enthusiasm to tackle long standing issues;
- Those who attend the POG need to be at a senior enough level to be able to commit resources and make operational decisions that can be delivered within their own agency/division. Financial resources are not enough and the individual must also have a good level of operational knowledge to appropriate decision making;
- Equal buy-in and commitment from all partners is critical – in order to tackle crime and anti social behaviour in a sustainable fashion, the co-operation and input of all partners is necessary;
- Other partnerships wanting to implement a POG in their own area will need to have the analytical capacity and capability in place to deliver the intelligence product necessary to the group’s functioning and success; and
- Strong executive member support it important as it ensures that the key issues that emerge are incorporated into the broader council priorities.

L2 Implementation Checklist

Intelligence-led Business Processes

✓ Do you have an information sharing protocol?
✓ Have the responsible authorities signed it and do they comply with it?
✓ Are there other parties who could to sign up to, and comply with, the protocol?
✓ Do you share personal data when necessary and appropriate to do so?

Empowered and Effective Leadership

✓ Does each responsible authority have a designated liaison officer?
✓ Do these personnel understand the legislation relating to information sharing and are they equipped to solve any information sharing related problems facing your partnership?
✓ Do you need any additional protocols to govern processes where there has been confusion or disagreement in the past?

Appropriate Skills and Knowledge

✓ Does the person facilitating the sharing of information understand the objectives of the partnership and what can be shared and by whom?
✓ Do all the partners understand the importance of sharing information?
L3. Visibility and Accountability

An effective partnership should be visible and accountable to its community for the decisions and actions it takes on their behalf. Strong communities are ones where people are informed about what is being done to address their concerns.

An important aspect of securing better performance is the outward and visible performance management of the partnership’s challenges and achievements that enables the community to know that the partnership is dealing with their issues. All partners should be aware of their responsibilities within the partnership and have appropriate systems in place to provide information to the community. Ensuring that the partnership engages with, involves and regularly offers feedback to, the community is crucial in supporting increased feelings of public confidence and reassurance amongst the community.

L3.1 Statutory Requirements

This section sets out what is now required of partnership as part of their work engaging with their communities. An important part of visible accountability is the ability of the community to meet with the key decision-makers in the partnerships. A statutory requirement to hold public meetings has been introduced, but we have purposely not prescribed their format. However, we intend these to be face the people meetings, included as part of the work in delivering the Respect agenda. A face the people session is where senior representatives of community safety partnerships meet the public to hear their issues and let them know about action that they have taken or will take to tackle them. The events will vary a great deal from place to place, from drop in sessions, to public meetings, to action-focused sessions tackling a particular issue. However, we recognise that partners hold many public meetings and we expect that they can use those meetings to serve a similar purpose.

To ensure that communities are involved with the process of supporting delivery, the regulations outline the following:

📅 The strategy group must hold one or more public meetings during each year

The partnership can decide the frequency of these meetings, but they must be held at least once a year.
That the public meetings be attended by individuals who hold a senior position within each responsible authority.

The partnership must hold public meetings, attended by senior representatives from each of the responsible authorities. It is an important aspect of visible accountability that the community can raise their concerns with senior representatives.

The strategy group shall take steps as it considers appropriate to bring to the attention of persons who live or work in the area, or who might otherwise be interested, information about what was discussed at such meetings and where the meetings are to be held

It is important that the communities are able to access the information on what partners are doing to address crime and anti-social behaviour. If local communities are to be informed about, and actively engage in addressing the problems in their areas, they must be better informed about the delivery of priorities. Providing this form of information to the community is also important as it supports the process of ensuring that individuals can be active participants in supporting the partnership achieve local priorities.

**ENGLAND**

**Engaging Communities**

The interaction between partnerships and their communities is an important theme running through all the new statutory requirements and the Hallmarks. This is a significant change from the previous legislation, where partnerships were required only to consult their communities as part of their work to produce a strategy. Now, partnerships are required specifically to consult and seek the participation of their communities in their work. This matches the new role under the new Best Value duty to ‘consult and involve’, set out in the Local Government White Paper, ‘Strong and Prosperous Communities’.

These new statutory requirements are included in the relevant sections of the guidance, but they are set out here to emphasise the role that the leadership of the partnership have in ensuring that there is a sense of genuine empowerment in their communities in relation to crime and disorder. There is room for local flexibility in how this is done, so that we allow for local innovation or existing arrangements.

**New Statutory Requirements**

- The partnership will consult its communities about crime and disorder issues in their area and also about what priorities the partnership should tackle (see A1).
- The partnership also has to consult communities who may be affected by the priorities that will be included in the strategy and plan (see A1).
- In doing so, the partnership will take into account any existing consultation undertaken by partnership members (see A1).
- The partnership will hold one or more public meetings throughout the year (explained in more detail in this section).
- The partnership will also have to consider the way in which its communities can help in supporting the delivery of the priorities in the partnership plan (see D1).
- The strategic assessment will contain the priorities that the community have identified that the partnership should tackle (see A2).
- The partnership have to publish a summary of the partnership plan in a way that reaches all the community, as far as is reasonable (see P2).
L3.2 Suggested Practice - Making the Structures Work

To engage effectively with communities, partnerships could consider the following:

Holding Regular Meetings:
In addition to holding the types of meetings set out in the statutory requirements, partnerships can hold many other meetings. They provide an opportunity to listen to community concerns, inform communities about action taken in response to local priorities and engage the community in action to tackle local problems. These meetings provide only a minimum level of community engagement and must be positioned within a wider culture of effective public-facing services.

While how these meeting operate is dependent on local flexibility, partnerships are encouraged to consider the following issues:

- **Location** – venues should be accessible to diverse community members. The partnership may consider locations such as community centres, public parks, schools and shopping centres and varying locations to meet needs;
- **Format** – these meetings may take place as public forums, drop-in sessions, surgeries or be aligned to local campaigns (e.g. 100 Days Clean-Up, Week of Action or Citizens’ Jury);
- **Need** – the partnership may consider holding more regular events in areas where there is greater need, such as more concern around local issues or higher crime rates; and
- **Knowledge** – in order to respond to community concerns, the partnership should ensure that it is clear on the community safety priorities, performance against these and other key targets, potential risks, work that has been delivered and future planned initiatives.

The process of regularly holding public meetings also supports the process of delivering the Respect programme. The Respect programme is a comprehensive approach to tackling and preventing anti-social behaviour. The process of encouraging more open dialogue between communities and agencies that have been established to protect the public, reduce crime and anti-social behaviour sits at the heart of the Respect programme and is an important part of promoting open and accountable leadership.

Feeding Back Information to the Community

It is important that the communities are able to access the information on what partners are doing to address crime and anti-social behaviour. If local communities are to have an informed view and actively engage in partnership working, they need to be better informed about how the partners will deliver the identified priorities.

Providing this form of information to the community is also important as it supports the process of ensuring that the partnership is accountable and transparent to the public including individuals who comprise ‘hard to reach’ and ‘hard to hear’ communities.

The following case study shows one way in which a partnership engaged with its community.
Building Partnership Working and Engaged Communities:
Respect Weeks of Action in Liverpool

Liverpool has piloted the ‘Respect weeks of action’ initiative in Tuebrook and Stoneycroft Ward, where crime and anti-social behaviour have been identified by the local community as a particular concern. The initiative required developing a programme of activities to reduce the levels of crime and anti-social behaviour. The initiative also seeks to further develop community engagement and partnership collaboration to sustain this.

What they did

A variety of initiatives were launched in the areas in order to support the process of reducing and preventing crime and anti-social behaviour. These included enforcement (targeting known offenders, locations and organisations), diversionary (supporting young people) advice (encouraging health, employment and enterprise agencies to set up programmes in the local community), education (supporting the local schools) and prevention (introducing a series of volunteer programmes and employment programmes) in an intensive period.

What it involved

Before the start of the project, a series of key officers scoped the needs of the community. This initiative was supported and implemented by a multi-agency group and linked with project leaders from other initiatives such as the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund to encourage as broad a series of programmes as possible. There are now discussions regarding the possibility of rolling out this model across other areas of Liverpool.

What impact it had

Analysis indicated that there was a substantial reduction in the PSA1 indicator in the area within the first month of the week of action. The morale of both staff who were employed on the initiative and the residents of Tuebrook and Stoneycroft had increased significantly. Partners involved also experienced the opportunity to work together in close co-operation within one community to support both intervention and preventative techniques.

Lessons learned

• Ensure that you have the appropriate people around the table – this will broaden not only the variety of services that the initiative can include but also ensure that there is a continuity of approach; and

• Conduct a scoping exercise before you begin the initiative – this should also focus on reviewing the nature of service provisions in the area and identifying whether there are other initiatives taking place in the location being targeted. This knowledge can assist in building links between all key partners and reduce service provision.

L3.3 Suggested Practice - Linking with other Structures

In order to support economies of scale and coordinate responses, partners should consider the possibility of working with key agencies with an established process on community engagement. For example, there is a statutory requirement on police authorities to produce local policing summaries. These are intended to be concise, insightful, publications geared specifically at reaching and engaging with local communities. For further details of these summaries, please refer to P2 (Plan – Publish Summary).
Effective community engagement is crucial to the successful delivery of Neighbourhood Policing (see Appendix B for further details). Through PACT (Police and Communities Together) community engagement processes, Neighbourhood Policing involves the community and partners together to identify priorities. With neighbourhood teams having an ongoing dialogue with the communities that they serve, this can be an additional approach when considering engagement and feedback. Neighbourhood Policing aims to provide the community with:

- **Access** – to policing or community safety services through a named point of contact; and
- **Influence** – over community safety priorities in their neighbourhood.

This helps build much needed reassurance and confidence that local priorities and concerns are being addressed with the involvement of the community. Communities should be involved in the identification of priorities and this process should not just be led by the partner agencies.

### L3.4 Potential Barriers and Suggested Solutions

In managing performance and reporting to the public, the partnership may encounter some potential barriers. We have outlined below some common challenges and suggested solutions to these:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Barrier</th>
<th>Suggested Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Performance reports that are not fit-for-purpose       | • Identify the key performance objectives. These might include targets and other local priorities identified through the strategic assessment.  
• Determine the key indicators that will enable the partnership to evaluate performance. In many cases, these may be existing measures through performance frameworks.  
• Analyse information in a way that supports key objectives.  
• Dedicated analyst support from partner agencies to support the review of cross partnership data. |
| Limited or non-representative attendance at public meetings | • Consider varying the premises of meetings to target specific groups – for example the best place to engage young people will not be the same as the elderly.  
• Review the frequency of meetings and whether the agenda is inclusive of partner agencies.  
• Target communications – for example, school bulletins may be a better way to reach young people than publishing dates and times on the partnership website  
• Consider varying the meeting times, varying approaches to include under-represented groups, and not relying on traditional public meeting approaches.  
• Consider using other forms of engagement besides meetings, e.g. neighbourhood panels, e-briefings, “piggy-backing” on other events at which a representative section of the public is likely to be present.  
• Use web-based information to reduce the focus on meetings. |
L3.5 Additional Resources

- Respect home page www.respect.gov.uk
- National Standards for Community Engagement, produced by Communities Scotland www.communi tiesscotland.gov.uk
- Cabinet Office – Office of the Third Sector
- Neighbourhood Policing – www.neighbourhoodpolicing.co.uk
- Audit Commission – Know your Communities toolkit http://www.userfocus.audit-commission.gov.uk/KycHome.aspx

L3 Implementation Checklist

Visible and Constructive Accountability

✓ Have you ensured that the information collected from community engagement is included in the partnership plan?
✓ Do you have appropriate structures and documents in place to ensure that all community members, including hard to reach and hard to hear communities, can be involved in any community meetings being scheduled?
✓ Are the community aware of the community focused meetings being scheduled?
✓ Are you taking steps to ensure that the community will receive regular feedback and update on the progress of the community?
✓ Are all your partners aware of the existing processes and approaches adopted within agencies to engage and feedback to communities?

Appropriate Skills and Knowledge

✓ Do you know the make-up of the communities you represent, including the groups and organisations within it?
✓ Do you have adequate processes in place for listening to all sections of the community, including minority and hard-to-reach groups?
Assess

Intelligence-led or evidence-led decision making means understanding what needs to be done and how to do it. Intelligence-led decision making lies at the heart of effective delivery. Every partnership works within a defined budget and, with a full range of community safety issues to address, must prioritise their efforts to reduce crime and disorder. In this context, routine strategic analysis of all the available information is important when identifying the most pressing priorities, based on the most important risks to community safety. We want every partnership to pursue an intelligence-led, problem-solving and outcome orientated approach to community safety.
Assess

Effective partnership planning will be heavily dependent on the quality of the analysis that takes place. This is in turn reliant on effective and timely information sharing between partners. In addition, it is important to have a good understanding of the needs and concerns of your local community and to explore lessons learned from previous projects and interventions. Analysis of all this information allows partnerships to set strategic priorities, plan for delivery, allocate resources and deliver real benefits to their communities. In two-tier areas, it is important that this information is co-ordinated at county level to deliver economies of scale.

At the end of this chapter you should be able to:

✓ Understand what you are required to do by law to prepare a strategic assessment;
✓ Know which datasets you are required by law to share on a quarterly basis;
✓ Be able to identify additional datasets of use to the partnership;
✓ Develop a local process to effectively identify, collate and analyse information from the community;
✓ Identify key priorities and prepare a strategic assessment;
✓ Escalate priorities to the county strategy group (where applicable);
✓ Prepare a Community Safety Agreement across your county (where applicable);
✓ Feed community safety priorities into your Local Area Agreement in England;
✓ Understand how the partnership can demonstrate Intelligence-led Business Processes and other relevant Hallmarks; and
✓ Understand the skills and knowledge that will support effective analysis and problem solving.
A1. Getting the information you need

For the partnership to be able to identify priorities and deliver community safety, they must have access to information. Some of this information will come from partners, both the responsible authorities and others, while other intelligence and information must be gathered from the community. Routine profiling of all this information is important to help you to best allocate your resources. At a minimum, an annual assessment of this information is required. Routine profiling also provides a good opportunity to assess the effectiveness of information sharing arrangements and ensure the relevance and necessity of information being shared. The section on partnership protocols in the previous chapter sets out the requirement to have an information-sharing protocol and demonstrates why this is important. This section builds outlines which datasets partners are required by law to disclose, what other information sources are available, and how to make the most of community consultation.

A1.1 Statutory Requirements

Certain sets of depersonalised information must be shared on a quarterly basis. Information sharing within partnerships has often been sporadic even though it is permitted under section 115 of the Crime and Disorder Act. The introduction of a new duty to share certain sets of depersonalised data is designed to increase the effectiveness of partnerships by ensuring that they have the necessary multi-agency data for identifying priorities, mapping trends and patterns in crime and disorder, and managing their performance.

The Police and Justice Act 2006 introduces a new duty on certain agencies to disclose certain sets of depersonalised information at least quarterly in electronic form to the other section 115 relevant authorities. The relevant datasets are included in a separate statutory instrument and are set out in Appendix J. The purpose of sharing this information is to enable the profiling of crime and disorder trends and patterns within the area. For this reason, in most cases, it is the record level data that is specified rather than aggregate data or statistics.

This duty only applies when the authority holds the information so it does not require the collection of any additional information. In each case, the duty applies to information relating to the partnership area as defined by the district or unitary authority area. Analysis can then take place across a number of different datasets on at least a quarterly basis.

5 The Section 115 responsible authorities are: police, police authority, local authority (including district, county, London borough, parish council, community council, county borough council), registered social landlord, local probation board, local health board (in Wales), primary care trust, strategic health authority, fire and rescue authority.
In order to satisfy the new requirements, information covered by the new duty relating to each quarter (for example July – September) must be shared by the end of the following quarter (for example, by the end of December). This means that the relevant authorities could share all the information once per quarter; on a monthly basis; or more regularly. In England, the first quarter for which information must be shared is July 2007 – September 2007. This information must be disclosed by the end of December 2007. In Wales, the duty will only apply once the duty to share information has been commenced alongside the other statutory requirements for Wales.

The Police and Justice Act 2006 specifically excludes any personal data from this duty to disclose. This means information which can identify a living individual, either by itself or in combination with other information held, or likely to be held, by the relevant authority. Where an incident is recorded as a domestic incident, for example, sharing precise location information may, in some circumstances, be sufficient to identify a living individual. In such instances, the duty does not apply. Subject to complying with other legal obligations such as the common law of confidentiality for information from ambulance callouts, the authority may still choose to disclose this information to the other Section 115 relevant authorities, who should treat it as personal data (see L2). Alternatively, the authority may choose to share less specific location information so that the dataset contains exclusively depersonalised information. In the case of ambulance callouts, this should be the outward part of the postcode only.6

The following information needs to be considered when preparing a strategic assessment:

- Information from the responsible authorities;
- Information from wider partners;
- Information from the overview and scrutiny committee considering crime and disorder matters, where it exists7;
- Information provided by the community; and
- The previous partnership plan.

For the strategic assessment to be a document that best reflects the most up-to-date needs of the community, it is important that information from a wide range of partners is considered. This should include, but not be limited to, the information shared on a quarterly basis under the new duty to share (see above). It is not sufficient for it to be based purely on information from one source, for example police crime records.

In undertaking any community consultation, the partnership must have regard to the results of any other consultation activities undertaken by the responsible authorities.

All the responsible authorities have requirements to consult their communities. For example, local authorities and fire and rescue authorities have a duty to consult as best value authorities. Some of these exercises will result in information about the community safety issues that the community are most concerned about. This information should be considered alongside information gathered by other agencies and bodies before any further engagement activity is undertaken.

In preparing the strategic assessment, the partnership will seek:

- Views from the community on the levels and patterns of crime, disorder and substance misuse; and
- Views from the community on matters that need to be prioritised by the partnership.

6 The outward part of the postcode is the part before the space e.g. BN14 in BN14 8DF or M1 in M1 1AA. For more information please see: http://www.govtalk.gov.uk/gdsc/html/frames/Postcode.htm.

7 Sections 19-20 of the Police and Justice Act 2006 introduced a requirement for overview and scrutiny committees to consider crime and disorder but the provisions have yet to come into force.
In seeking these views, the partnership will ensure they are sought from:

- People who appear to represent the interests of as many different groups or persons within the area as is reasonable; and
- Those likely to be most affected by the priorities.

The purpose of community consultation in this instance is to gather additional information for the strategic assessment. In doing so, partnership should make sure it consults any parts of the community whose views are under represented and also target those most likely to be affected by their priorities. This could include, for example, young people or victim support groups.

### A1.2 Suggested Practice – Sharing Minimum Datasets

To undertake the daily business of your partnership, and particularly to produce the strategic assessment, you need to have the right information available. The new duty to share depersonalised datasets sets out the minimum required of partners. While it is only necessary to share the datasets specified in Appendix J on a quarterly basis, there are clear operational benefits to sharing all or some of the information more frequently. Most notably, it will allow the partnership to respond more quickly to new trends and patterns in crime as they occur.

To satisfy the duty to share information, it has to be shared with the other Section 115 relevant authorities in electronic form. Partnerships will need to decide locally on the best way to satisfy this requirement. In many cases, this could be through disclosure to a central hub to which all relevant authorities have access. Alternatively, the requirement could be met by the disclosure of the information to each relevant authority individually.

The format of the data will also need to be agreed locally and will depend largely on the format in which it is recorded. Where possible, using geo-coded location data allows for better analysis across a number of datasets and sharing the information in open text-delineated form means it can be more easily analysed. Local partners will need to agree how best to cleanse and analyse the data.

### A1.3 Suggested Practice – Sharing Additional Datasets

There are additional sources of information that may be useful for determining local priorities, managing performance and building a richer picture of the area both throughout the year and for preparing the strategic assessment. In some instances, it may be useful to share additional fields of the datasets covered by the duty to share, for example:

- Demographic information (age, gender, ethnic group) of victims, offenders or suspects; and
- Information about the type of dwelling in which a deliberate fire took place.

Which data you choose to collate will depend on the locality and the particular priorities of the partnership. Some additional datasets are listed below:

- Census information and other socio-demographic information;
- Any supplementary incident datasets distinguished by the relevant qualifier, for example, youth-related, alcohol-related;
- Data collected on patients receiving treatment in Accident and Emergency departments, walk-in centres or other treatment centres for assault, suspected abuse, gun or knife wounds, and other crime and disorder related incidents;
Information collected by the British Transport Police about incidents in the area;
Offender management, including risk assessment information, through OASys (Offender Assessment System);
Data from the National Offender Management Service and their providers;
Alcohol misuse and attendance treatment programmes through organisations including Drug Action Teams;
Children and Family Services information (e.g. truancy and additional information held on domestic violence, numbers of young people not in education or employment, bullying in schools);
Youth Offending Team data and Department of Children, Schools and Families data;
Trading standards data;
Data held by the local authority on crime against the local environment;
Data held by voluntary organisations, including data that can be used to identify non-reported incidents;
Regional and national issues manifested locally (e.g. information about local problems that could be linked to serious and organised crime); and
Any other information shared routinely or for specific purposes within the partnership.

The following case study demonstrates how information from the fire service helped the Dudley partnership to identify their priorities.

**Intelligence-led business processes:**
Using information from the Fire Services to determine local priorities in Dudley CSP

Dudley Borough Fire Service on behalf of the CSP recognised that there was a problem with derelict and void properties. The Fire Service led on designing a new reporting mechanism for this, involving a multi-agency approach. This has resulted in a reduction in criminal damage, arson and anti-social behaviour.

**What they did**

A newly designed Fire Service driven reporting mechanism was created for identifying and managing void and derelict properties, within the housing, commercial and industrial sectors was created. Properties were identified by referrals from operational crews, in the course of their duties, by analysing fire-related data on a weekly basis. The Commercial or Industrial sectors of the Council also identified derelict or void properties. These were visited by Fire Service personnel, who then supplied the council with a report outlining and detailing risk based concerns with each property. Council employees visited identified properties, to decide upon relevant action and departmental responsibility.

**What it involved**

It took four months to establish processes, protocols and legal implications fully but several properties are now being managed effectively, demonstrating that the partnership and owners have clearly had a positive impact in the area in which they are located. The scheme involves personnel from the fire service, police, West Midlands arson task force, community safety team, housing service, legal and property, and environmental protection.
What impact it had

This process has supported economic regeneration and community cohesion using a multi-agency approach to address the lack of cohesion within the area and to halt the rising trend of anti-social behaviour. A three-month downward trend has been established, with the prospect of achieving similar figures in the future and meeting LAA targets. A better understanding of risks within the local area has been established between agencies involved. Agencies are better able to manage their time, efforts and resources by prioritising and planning their work more effectively, based on intelligence provided by the fire service. Both fire crews and police crews do not have to attend so many incidents and therefore can spend more ‘customer contact time’. More time can be allocated to prevention based activity across the Borough, including education, schools initiatives, and the conducting of Home Fire Safety Checks. With the reduction of incidents, the knock on effects include fuel savings, more efficient usage of time, and better contact with our core audience.

Lessons learned

• The need to be clear about what you are trying to achieve – which entailed agencies having to fully understand their own operational requirements and practical implications of the legislation involved;
• Data should be easily shared - agencies need information to be in a totally compatible format, and include addresses and grid references that all agencies can use; and
• Expect delays - the process relies on speedy action from agencies, but when dealing with issues of land ownership, responsibility etc, delays must be expected.

A1.4 Suggested Practice – Community Consultation

As well as information provided by agencies within the area, your priorities must also be informed by local people’s views. In the next round of Public Service Agreements (PSAs) for the period 2008-2011, the proposed Community Safety PSA is likely to include a target to increase public confidence in agencies. Partners are likely to be measured on how well they respond to those issues that matter most to their local communities. In order to drive down the fear of crime and be responsive to your local community, you need to find out what their concerns are.

This should be an ongoing process throughout the year. When preparing the strategic assessment, the partnership can then consider what information has already been gathered from the community and target any further consultation activities to fill any gaps. ‘Community’ does not only mean geographic community. It is also important to consult other communities, such as communities of faith, ethnicity, age, condition. In drawing together the information that has already been collected, partners should be considering whether there are any groups within the area whose views are under represented. The partnership should then take steps to address those groups who are not involved in existing arrangements.

A number of mechanisms already exist for identifying community concerns and we suggest that partnerships draw on these where appropriate:

• Information gathered from the community through day-to-day engagement of the partners (e.g. from Neighbourhood Policing teams);
• Information gathered through specific community engagement activities being undertaken by the responsible authorities, co-operating bodies and others to fulfil their requirements;
• Information from national surveys pertaining to the area (e.g. results of Tellus2 surveys concerning the views of young people, see the Ofsted Website http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/)
• Information gathered by Drug Action Teams and Youth Offending Teams;
• Information gathered through previous partnership projects (e.g. Weeks of Action);
• Views gathered through any public meetings (e.g. face the people sessions); and
• Issues raised with or identified by the overview and scrutiny committee considering crime and disorder, where there is one.

As well as gathering information, community consultation can also be used to test hypotheses behind changes in performance and gain initial feedback on potential priorities after you have prepared your strategic assessment.

When conducting community consultation activities, some important factors to consider include:
• Making clear why you are consulting;
• Explaining how the information will be used;
• Promoting opportunities for the public to be involved in community safety;
• Ensuring that there are clear mechanisms to take actions based on community views;
• Providing feedback on the action taken; and
• Feeding back any information gathered that is relevant to other individual partners so that appropriate actions can be taken.

A1.5 Suggested Practice – Evaluation of Previous Activities

While it can be easier to base your analysis only on new information, there is often a lot to be gained by reflecting on previous activities. As part of the strategic assessment, the partnership must include information on the previous year’s partnership plan. In evaluating the progress on the previous plan, we suggest that the partnership consider both:
• Outputs – review of planned activities that were delivered, the timeliness of these projects, their cost effectiveness and any lessons learned; and
• Outcomes – review of the impact that delivered activities had on previous priorities, including any tangible performance improvements;

We have included further information on how to conduct evaluation in section D3 (Deliver – Evaluate Effectiveness). As part of reviewing and refreshing your priorities for the coming year, it is also important that you consider whether the same issues are still as important as they were this time last year.

A1.6 Potential Barriers and Suggested Solutions

In gathering the information you need, you may encounter some potential barriers. Below are some common challenges and suggested solutions to these:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Barrier</th>
<th>Suggested Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data accuracy needs improvement</td>
<td>• Constructively challenge individual organisations on their data collection to improve quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discuss how and when the information will be used to ensure it is in the necessary format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agree a common means of recording information to be shared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gaps in information
- Contact Designated Liaison Officer in relevant organisation to establish processes for obtaining information, where it is already collected.
- Consider ways to collect information during following year.

Engaging with hard-to-reach groups
- Target consultation efforts to meet the needs of diverse groups
- Consider how to work with organisations in the community, including voluntary organisations, to target hard-to-reach groups.

Limited resources for community engagement
- Use existing community engagement mechanisms.
- Consider how the partnership engagement may help to fulfil the individual community engagement requirements of responsible authorities, partnering bodies, co-operating bodies and others.
- Co-ordinate the approach to community engagement accordingly.

Lack of capacity
- Consider utilising staff and other resources from within individual organisations.
- Consider closer joint working with neighbouring partnerships.

**A1.7 Additional Resources**

You may find these additional resources helpful when gathering together the information you need.

*Audit Commission - Compiling neighbourhood profiles – a guide for local agencies*


*Strategic Assessment template and toolkit - Crime Reduction website (forthcoming Autumn 2007)*

*Ofsted - Tellus2 Survey. http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/portal/site/Internet/menuitem.455968b0530071c4828a0d8308e08a0c/?vgnextoid=69e46c472b6b1110VgnVCM1000003507640aRCRD*

**A1 Implementation Checklist**

*Intelligence-led Business Processes*
- Do you share all the datasets in Appendix J on a quarterly basis in electronic form?
- Do you have all the additional information from other partners that you need to build a profile of your community and the community safety needs?

*Community Engagement*
- Does all the information gathered through community consultation feed into your priority-setting activities?
- Are you targeting your community consultation activities to diverse groups within the community and those most likely to be affected by your priorities?

*Appropriate Skills and Knowledge*
- Do you understand the new requirements and what they mean for the partnership?
A2. Determine Priorities

To allocate resources in the most effective way, partnerships should analyse the information available and decide where their priorities lie. This may involve analysis by geographical area to identify those neighbourhoods and wards which are subject to a disproportionate amount of crime; it may include an analysis of the kinds of crime that your area is experiencing to know what prevention and intervention methods to employ; you may want to analyse the profile of victims to see which groups are most frequently victims of crime, or offenders, to see how best to deter them; and you may consider evaluating previous projects to see which bore most fruit for your communities.

Once a year, you are required to undertake a strategic assessment of a wide range of information to set the course of the partnership for the coming year. However, some of the principles included in this chapter could usefully be repeated throughout the year, outwith this annual assessment. A six-monthly refresh will allow partnerships to reassess their priorities in the light of new information or emerging trends.

A2.1 Statutory Requirements

Each year, the partnership shall prepare a strategic assessment to assist in producing or revising the partnership plan.

The legislation requires the strategy group to do this on behalf of the responsible authorities. Your governing body should commission the assessment and commit to taking forward the priorities identified through the process. The purpose of the strategic assessment is to help you identify which crime and disorder priorities to focus on in the coming year.

The strategic assessment must include:

- Analysis of the level and patterns of crime, disorder and substance misuse;
- Changes in the levels and patterns of crime, disorder and substance misuse since the last strategic assessment;
- Analysis of why these changes have occurred; and
- Assessment of the extent to which last year’s plan was implemented.

The strategic assessment should help you to understand what is happening in your area and why. It is an internal document for the partnership, to inform the partnership plan, and does not need to be published.

In preparing the strategic assessment, the partnership will reflect views from the community on matters that need to be prioritised.

In addition to collecting the views of the community, they need to be fed into the strategic assessment to inform the identification of priorities.
A2.2 Suggested Practice – Preparing a strategic assessment

The purpose of the strategic assessment is to assist the partnership in identifying the major issues within the local area, allocating their resources and prioritising their activities. It should be a succinct document that can be of use to all those involved in the partnership. Separate guidance for those preparing the strategic assessment will be available in the form of a toolkit from the Home Office and published on the Crime Reduction website.

Although all that is required of partnerships is set out above, we suggest that the aspects outlined below are likely to form the generic elements of a partnership strategic assessment. However, the format of the strategic assessment is for local decision.

- **Aim and Scope of the Report** - including the timeframe to which it relates;
- **Methods** - including what information has been collected from which sources and what methodology has been used to analyse them;
- **General Picture** - set out the levels and patterns of crime, disorder and substance misuse including changes since the last strategic assessment and considers why these changes might have occurred;
- **Performance** - Consider performance against last year’s priorities and the extent to which the previous plan was implemented;
- **Major areas of concern** - Set out your priorities based on an analysis of the current information you have;
- **Description of current topic areas** - Include more information on the suggested priorities including relevant partnership information;
- **Summary of predictions for next year** - This could include emerging trends, seasonal trends, and scanning of the political, economic, social, technological, environmental, legal and organisational (PESTELO) factors potentially affecting delivery;
- **Summary of recommendations** - Set out a list of suggested partnership priority topics for the coming year. This section can also feed into Local Area Agreement negotiations; and
- **Review date** - Partnerships are able to review the strategic assessment throughout the annual cycle should they choose to do so, in line with the analysis of new information.

The police are required to produce an annual strategic assessment locally (see Appendix H for details of the National Intelligence Model). Police and partnerships may choose to produce a joint police and partnership strategic assessment where it is possible to meet the statutory requirements and the NIM requirements in one document. Equally, there are opportunities to draw on similar data sources but produce two separate documents.

In two-tier areas it is possible to produce a strategic assessment at county level as long as the following criteria are met:

- The strategy group at district level agree this approach since they are ultimately responsible for the preparation of the strategic assessment; and
- The document meets all the statutory requirements for each community safety partnership area individually. Unless any partnerships have merged, this will equate to each district council area. Where partnerships have merged, this will mean the merged area. For each area, the crime, disorder and substance misuse trends and patterns and community concerns need to be analysed separately.

The following case study from Dudley shows how they approached the development of their strategic assessment.
### 1. Executive Summary

**Purpose of the document**

The Executive Summary is high-level, contains only key points and is directed at stakeholders. It also briefly explains the purpose of the document.

**Brief overview of methodology**

The Summary of key findings contains only high-level findings, headline figures and recommendations. It does not contain in-depth statistics or detailed actions.

**Key Priorities**

### 2. Summary of Key Findings

**Key findings**

Key findings: Within the borough, separately the analysis of Dudley North and Dudley South highlights hotspot areas that can be targeted in the reduction of DA. Geographical incident analysis highlights the areas of Brierley Hill (Dudley North) and Hawsbury (Dudley South) as a hotspot area as a whole.

**Recommendation**

Development and implement a Borough Domestic Abuse Strategy which will provide development of a Marketing Strategy, provision of appropriate services for victims and provision of appropriate services for offenders.

### 3. Introduction

**Aim of the Strategic Assessment**

The introduction sets out the aim of the document and explains the purpose of the Assessment (e.g. why it was carried out). This is also an opportunity to give an overview of the partnership area for those less familiar. The methodology may be part of the introduction or a separate section. It sets out:

- The type of data used
- How the data was collected
- How the data was analysed
- Limitations in the analysis

The methodology needs to outline both the data and community intelligence.

**Purpose**

- Facilitate the review and development of current Control Strategies through the identification and evaluation of priority areas, key threats.
- Assess previously identified threats and auxiliary areas for intelligence gathering including emerging threats and future priorities outside current Control Strategies.
- Identify factors that may pose a threat to the achievement of the mission.
- Identify intelligence and information requirements and offer recommendations for prevention, enforcement and reassurance.

### 4. Analysis of All Crime

**Analysis across all crime types**

A prioritised area thematic or geographic. A separate analysis would be included for each priority area identified. This would aim to:

- Detailed profiling of crime levels in the partnership area.
- Show fluctuations based on seasonality, geography, defendant, offence type, etc.
- Analysis across all crime types gives an overview of the crime levels in the partnership area. The current situation may provide crime levels over time in the area. More detailed profiling of crime levels may show fluctuations based on seasonality, geography, defendant, offence type, etc. This analysis would begin to highlight priorities.

**Dudley CSP’s analysis of all crime in the area, included:**

- Crime levels over time
- Optimisation chart showing the levels of control exerted over crime
- Performance by offence type and crime category
- Seasonality profile showing vulnerable months
- Geographical profile showing hotspots
- Defendant profile, broken down by socio-demographics and offence type

### 5. Analysis of Priorities (multiple)

**Dudley CSP’s priority areas were thematic:**

- Vehicle Crime
- Violent Crime
- Domestic Abuse
- Criminal Damage
- Anti-Social Behaviour
- and Substance Misuse

**For each of these priorities, Dudley CSP provided analysis on:**

- Levels over time
- Seasonality profile, showing vulnerable months
- Geographical profile showing hotspots
- Crime analysis showing factors such as victim profile, offender profile, repeat locations, repeat victimisation, repeat offending, weapons used, alcohol and drugs related offences, and youth offences
- Current activities being undertaken to tackle problems
- Threats and emerging situations
- Predictors and influences
- Summary of key findings

**Recommendations**

### 6. Conclusion

**Summary of main findings**

The aim of the conclusion is to sum up key findings and review recommendations. The conclusion should also provide details on what the planned next steps are in taking forward the recommendations (e.g. developing the Partnership Plan).
A2.3 Suggested Practice – How to determine your priorities

Preparing your strategic assessment is about deciding on your priorities based on the information you have about your area. This is also part of having an ongoing intelligence-led business processes. You can approach prioritisation by understanding what poses the greatest threat or risk to the safety of your local community. Using a risk management based approach to prioritisation can help you to balance the demands of the political environment, performance targets and local community needs.

Partnerships are expected to take a collaborative approach in ensuring that key priorities, vulnerable neighbourhoods and key individuals are properly identified and resources applied appropriately and effectively in order to bring about improvements and reductions in crime, improve cohesion and reduce offending. Partnerships should ensure that they can identify and target the key individuals and key places that cause most disruption to others.

A small number of problematic localities or individuals can have a disproportionate effect on crime and that by tackling these, they have a significant positive impact in reducing overall crime and addressing the important issues to communities.

In addition, partnerships could pre-emptively intervene with both young people at risk or those who are vulnerable to being involved in offending behaviour and can also offer comprehensive support for those returning from prison etc and that plans should be agreed and implemented across all agencies. These plans should be robust enough to include both short-term and long-term considerations.

In developing the analysis of the level and pattern of crime, disorder and substance misuse, we recommend that the partnership consider:

- Using relative targets and peer comparison – Most Similar Groups (MSGs) are designed to give a peer comparison for relative performance on police recorded crime so that a partnership can evaluate whether performance is at the level expected when compared to areas that face similar circumstances;
- Addressing local inequities and gaps in performance – in particular communities and/or neighbourhoods – through local analysis of partnership data;
- Considering changes in these patterns by comparing different periods of data. Analysis of why the changes may have occurred will involve identifying and testing a set of hypotheses. Often these hypotheses can easily be tested using existing data sources and it may also be beneficial to consult the community regarding their views on the reasons for changes; and
- Considering how regional and national issues (e.g. human trafficking, drug trafficking) may be manifesting as local community safety issues (e.g. prostitution, increased substance misuse) will also help to identify reasons for changes in levels and patterns.

You can access useful tools and information sources for obtaining peer comparisons, comparing different periods of data and testing hypotheses through iQuanta. A weblink to iQuanta is included in Appendix A. However, this tool is based on police recorded crime and is only available at community safety partnership level. Therefore, further analysis of additional datasets within the partnership will be required to create a more detailed picture.
A2.4 Suggested Practice - Using the problem-analysis triangle (PAT)

It is possible to get a clearer understanding of the community safety priorities within your area by considering the different aspects of the crimes that are occurring. Introduced through Routine Activity Theory (one of the main theories of environmental criminology), the problem-analysis triangle (PAT), is a useful way to think about a problem, as well as guiding the response. Routine Activity Theory suggests that in order for a crime to happen, three things need to be present at the same time and in the same space:

- A suitable target (either human or object);
- Lack of a suitable guardian to stop the crime from happening; and
- A likely and motivated offender.

As presented below, the inner triangle (victim/offender/location) provides a helpful way to think about the problem (or suitable target), while the outer triangle (handler/guardian/manager) helps to guide the appropriate response.

[Diagram of the problem-analysis triangle]

Additional information on the PAT is available on the Crime Reduction website http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk.

A2.5 Suggested Practice – Analytical Skills and Knowledge

Some partnerships are concerned about the resources and technical skills required to produce a strategic assessment, both in terms of analysing quantitative data and consulting with the community. Only the key aspects of the strategic assessment are statutory requirements, as support and time will be necessary to further develop skills and knowledge in this area.

In some areas it may be beneficial to pool analytical capacity across more than one partnership and undertake some of the work jointly. Where this occurs, the analysis of crime, disorder and substance misuse still needs to take place for each community safety partnership area individually.

Further information on the skills and competencies required for analysing data can be found through the National Occupational Standards.

The following case study shows how information was analysed to develop strategic priorities in Birmingham Community Safety Partnership.
Intelligence led Business Processes: 
Birmingham CSP - Analysing intelligence to determine priorities

Birmingham CSP is structured to support information sharing and the intelligent analysis of data. Through their Information and Intelligence Team, the CSP has developed a Composite Index of community safety, based on the Victim/Offender/Location problem-analysis triangle, which enables them to effectively determine local strategic priorities, as well as guide their delivery responses.

What they did

Birmingham CSP developed a local structure to support intelligence-led business processes. The Information and Intelligence Team, which bridges the strategic leadership and ongoing local delivery (as shown below), is responsible for:

- Updating and maintaining COSMOS (multi-agency web-based product on www.cosmos-bcsp.com);
- Performance management and analysis, including regular performance management information, briefings to the CDRP boards, police commanders and constituency directors, overview and scrutiny panel and a tactical assessments for the city tasking and co-ordination process;
- The annual strategic assessment; and
- Bespoke intelligence products commissioned through a formal request process to ensuring the work is directly related to the aims and objectives of the partnership with a tangible outcome.

The structure of the partnership, and specific responsibilities of this team are illustrated below:

A key part of the team’s responsibility is the production of the strategic assessment for the city and then for each of the ten constituencies. To inform the assessment, the team developed the Composite Index. As demonstrated below, each of the core themes for community safety is analysed geographically, to create a layered picture. This enables the partnership to identify strategic priorities and shape delivery accordingly.
In brief, the Composite Index is developed by:

1. Identifying specific issues within each of the core themes, based on a wide range of quantitative and qualitative data;
2. Analysing each of these issues using the victim/offender/location problem-analysis triangle;
3. For example, hate crime was identified as a key issue under the violence and vulnerability theme. The team asked:
   - Where victims of hate crime reside (victim)?
   - Where offenders who commit hate crime reside (offender)?
   - Where does hate crime take place (location)?
4. To improve the understanding, this analysis was not restricted to existing administrative boundaries; and
5. Agreeing the strategic priorities and guiding delivery accordingly.

What it involved

The Birmingham CSP process for developing the strategic assessment is roughly a 4-month project, within which the index forms a significant part. As it relies heavily on data from multi-agency sources, much of this time was spent in sourcing the data and formatting/cleansing/etc. The time it takes varies according to the number of variables that are included. The assessments are made available on www.birmingham-csp.org.uk.

What impact it had

Through the Composite Index, Birmingham CSP was able to identify a “gap” in community safety in the area. In order to improve the overall performance on this indicator, the partnership aimed to reduce this gap. While this gap still exists, significant improvements have been delivered and it is reduced in comparison to years prior to the Composite Index.

In addition to performance improvements, this practice has also had wider benefits, including:

- A shift in focus from a silo mentality – both in terms of a geographic focus up to and now beyond administrative boundaries as well as understanding the intra-relationship of different community safety themes and priorities;
- Joining up LAA blocks – by demonstrating that the communities most affected by community safety are largely similar to other areas of the strategic partnership and LAA; and
- Improvements in data sharing – by highlighting existing gaps in the process and encouraging the development of new data sets with agencies keen that their data can be included.

Lessons learned

Key lessons learned from this process include:

- The need for analytical capacity and technical skills – e.g. the analyst needs to decide which denominator to use to normalise data or if volume/clustering is more appropriate; and
- Importance of prioritisation – the Composite Index will never contain every set of data desired and some core priority themes will be weaker than others.
A2.6 Potential Barriers and Suggested Solutions

In determining priorities and producing the strategic assessment, the partnership may encounter some barriers. Below are some common challenges and suggested solutions to these:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Barriers</th>
<th>Suggested Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The necessary analytical skills are not available in-house</td>
<td>• Consider commissioning analytical support from a partnering organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Co-ordinate across multiple partnerships to share analytical resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Where support is commissioned, ensure that there is a clear process in place for transferring skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple strategic assessments place burdens on analytical capacity of partners</td>
<td>• Align processes for information gathering and development of strategic assessments across organisations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A2.7 Additional Resources

- Strategic Assessment Toolkit – Crime Reduction website (forthcoming)
- Together We Can: Improving Community Involvement in Community Safety www.togetherwecan.direct.gov.uk
- ‘National Standards for Community Engagement, produced by Communities Scotland www.communityscotland.gov.uk
- Community Engagement in Policing Guide, a resource for a range of practitioners: www.communityengagement.policing.uk

A2 Implementation Checklist

Intelligence-led Business Processes

✓ Have you produced a strategic assessment for this year?
✓ Have you embedded problem-solving and evaluation processes within your business planning?
✓ Are you clear of the priorities for your area, based on what the community thinks and what your information says?
✓ Have you made sufficient links with other strategic assessments in your area?
✓ Have you ensured that that you have worked together as a partnership to identify those most vulnerable and at risk?

Appropriate Skills and Knowledge

✓ Do you know what you are required to do to produce a strategic assessment and what it means for your organisation?
✓ Is there the analytical capacity/capability across the partnership to support the strategic assessment?
A3. Partnership-Working in Two-Tier Areas

Community safety partnerships do not exist in isolation. They are part of a multi-layered delivery landscape. What is more, crime does not respect boundaries and it is of paramount importance for all partnerships to work with their neighbours. In two-tier areas in England, this is even more important. Increasingly, funding for partnerships is to be accessed through Local Area Agreements. These are negotiated at county level in two-tier areas by Local Strategic Partnerships with Government Offices for the Regions. Community safety partnerships in unitary areas should feed into the Local Area Agreement discussions at unitary level.

So far, the ‘Assess’ chapter has outlined how the partnership can identify which of the community’s priorities it plans to address in the coming year. This is important information that should influence the negotiation of funding at the county level. In addition, there will often be benefits to the local community if you work more closely with other partnerships within your area or at county level. This section sets out how you might go about doing this.

A3.1 Statutory Requirements

The strategic assessment must outline the priorities to escalate to the county level.
In order for partnership priorities to be reflected in the Local Area Agreement and in any plans to tackle community safety at the county level, the partnership need to identify those priorities that should be escalated.

The county strategy group will prepare a community safety agreement based on the individual strategic assessments of partnerships within the county.

The county group, the purpose and structure of which is discussed in L1, hold the responsibility for coordinating the strategic assessments into a county-wide document.

The community safety agreement will identify:

- Ways of co-ordinating across the county to address priorities; and
- How the responsible authorities might otherwise contribute to reducing crime, disorder and substance misuse through closer joint working across the county.

Some crimes can be tackled more effectively through joint working between partnerships. For example, if each partnership has a domestic violence action group, all of which are liaising with the same Primary Care Trust or health service provider, it can be beneficial to amalgamate these groups into one which works across the county. This can free up both human and financial resources to support the delivery of this work in other ways or the delivery of other projects.
**A3.2 Suggested Practice – Identifying County-Wide Priorities**

It is important that the views and concerns of local communities are escalated to inform discussions about funding within the county. In addition, while concerns are expressed locally, they may be best addressed through activity co-ordinated at the county level. The partnership’s role in ensuring this happens is to identify priorities for the county level agreement. This can be done in a number of ways but we suggest considering some of the following issues:

- Tackling more serious crimes that would benefit from a county-wide approach;
- Using delivery mechanisms at the county-level to address priorities (e.g. Drug Action Teams and Domestic Violence Fora);
- Making use of economies of scale in tackling priorities that are likely high volume across other districts in order to deliver better value for money; and
- Accessing opportunities for county-level funding.

Partnerships may benefit from designing a protocol in order to ensure that there is agreement within the partnership about which priorities to escalate. This could also include a risk assessment to ensure that any issues not escalated are fully considered.

When producing the county-wide community safety agreement, the county strategy group must draw on the strategic assessments of the partnerships within the county. We believe that the following would be useful to consider in producing this agreement:

- Making use of links with other local partnerships, (e.g. Local Criminal Justice Boards, Local Strategic Partnerships or Children and Young People’s Partnerships) to agree and deliver priorities;
- Aiming to improve cost efficiency by making use of economies of scale and existing delivery mechanisms in co-ordinating approaches;
- Looking for opportunities to work across regions and across borders, not just within the county structure;
- Considering how to work with any unitary partnerships in the area;
- Ensuring priorities are reflected in the strategic plans for each individual agency; and
- Forming multi-agency working groups around specific priorities at county level and encouraging community safety partnerships within the county to coordinate their activities where relevant.

Each locality needs to establish how community priorities will impact on the Local Area Agreement. As set out in L1, there should be a clear relationship between the Local Strategic Partnership responsible for the Local Area Agreement and the county strategy group. There also needs to be agreement on how funding will be used at a county level to tackle joint priorities across the county. As suggested elsewhere, it might make sense for the county strategy group to be a sub-group of the Local Strategic Partnership.

The following case study shows how the Isles of Scilly and Cornwall worked together to ensure that intelligence-led business processes are embedded throughout the county.
Intelligence-led Business Process:
Producing a strategic assessment that works at both county and CDRP-level - Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly Community Safety Partnership

What they did
The Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly Community Safety Partnership produces a county-level strategic assessment every 6 months, encompassing the individual strategic assessments for each of the county’s six CDRPs. This gives both a county and a district view of crime and disorder in a single document. The strategic assessment is fully embedded within the county’s partnerships, informs their strategic planning and is used to direct their resources to best effect. The process is supported by Project Amethyst, a geographic information system (GIS)-based information sharing ‘one-stop-shop’ developed to collect, map and share local data and partnership information.

What it involved
Project Amethyst was initially established with support from the Home Office and Government Office for the South West, and is now funded by the Safer and Stronger Communities Fund (SSCF) and the police through the LAA. The development and production of the strategic assessment is undertaken by the three person Amethyst team, which sits within the County Council. This team consists of a manager, an analyst and a support officer, who, in order to resolve any data-sharing issues, are employed by the police. An estimated two months’ effort is required for the production of each strategic assessment.

What impact it had
The Amethyst system provides a problem-solving analytical capability across Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly, allowing patterns of crime and the underlying causes to be identified. The approach has led to more informed decision-making, effective targeting of resources and cohesive partnership working.

The Amethyst system provides a central hub for the collection of data from both partner and external agency sources and produces ‘problem solved’ analysis on that data down to a very low level (postcode and Lower Layer Super Output Area). From this information, strategic assessments have been produced on a six-monthly basis since 2004, with refinements based on the experience of previous years.

Lessons learned
The first assessment combined partner data from the police, Youth Offending Team, DAAT and local authority with socio-demographic data, in line with the Safer and Stronger Communities block of the LAA. The second strategic assessment took the problem-solving analysis to a more detailed estate level, and the third saw the introduction of the identification of priorities for problem-solving. The forthcoming fourth strategic assessment will provide an LAA overview alongside individual CDRP information.
A3.3 Potential Barriers and Suggested Solutions

In co-ordinating at the county level, the partnership and the county level group may encounter some barriers. Below are some common challenges and suggested solutions to these:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Barriers</th>
<th>Suggested Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Engaging multiple partnerships in larger counties. | • Vary the premises of county strategy group meetings, particularly in larger geographical areas in order to improve engagement.  
• Ensure that there are clear objectives and actions from meetings. |
| Ensuring the right balance between local, district-level priorities and shared county-level priorities | • Ensure agreement across district-level partnerships on the shared, county-level priorities.  
• Include a reflection of district-level priorities in the community safety agreement, particularly those priorities that may have a significant impact in a district despite not being common across others. |

A3 Implementation Checklist

Intelligence-led Business Processes

✓ Do you have a process for ensuring that district level priorities are fed into the Local Area Agreement?
✓ Does your county community safety agreement include ways in which the community safety partnerships will work together to make better use of their joint resources?

Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures

✓ Have you made sufficient links to other partnerships (e.g. Local Criminal Justice Boards, Regional Reducing Re-offending Boards)?
✓ Are your delivery mechanisms aligned across the county to ensure joined-up delivery of cross-border priorities?
✓ Have you put in place actions to prevent re-offending and identified pre-emptive intervention of those most vulnerable and at risk?

Visible and Constructive Accountability

✓ Are there effective performance management arrangements in place?

Appropriate Skills and Knowledge

✓ If you are in the county strategy group, do you know what you are required to do in order to support delivery in two-tier areas?
✓ If you are in a two-tier area, can you identify areas, themes or issues for cross-partnership working?
Plan for Action

Effective planning lies at the heart of work undertaken to tackle the problems in communities. The partnership plan is the basis for the partnership to ensure delivery of services that meet the needs of its communities. The partnership plan should also enable individual partnership members to understand their respective roles in supporting delivery across a range of services.
Plan for Action

The plan builds on the strategic assessment. The strategic assessment (see A2) sets out the analysis of crime and disorder and helps identify the priorities upon which the partnership will focus its efforts. The partnership plan takes these forward and identifies the ways in which they will be delivered.

The plan should be designed around a robust performance management framework to ensure that the plan is a ‘living’ document that partners can use to review and monitor progress against their targets. A well structured partnership plan can also offer new opportunities to engage and interact with the communities that partners serve. Aspects of the plan can be shared with communities in order to keep them informed of priorities, progress and the people involved in the partnership.

At the end of this chapter, you should be able to:

✓ Understand the statutory requirements relating to a partnership plan;
✓ Develop your local objectives and strategies to address the priorities identified through the strategic assessment;
✓ Identify the resources available to you and how best to use them;
✓ Understand the importance of a performance framework to support delivery;
✓ Inform your communities of the plan by publishing a summary in an accessible manner;
✓ Understand how to demonstrate Intelligence-led Business Processes and Engaged Communities and other relevant Hallmarks; and
✓ Understand the skills and knowledge that support effective planning.
P1. Prepare the Plan

The plan produced by partnerships follows on from the strategic assessment (see A2). It should enable the partnership to set out the priorities identified through the strategic assessment and should include their strategy to address these priorities. It is important that the plan sets out the contribution of all partners in delivering against these priorities and the resources that will be used to support delivery.

The first plan will be for the period 2008 to 2011. However, because we know that priorities can change as circumstances change, we have introduced a requirement for partnerships to revise the plan to enable them to reflect any change in priorities. The first of these will be due during 2009.

The partnership plan serves a number of purposes. It sets out the partnership's expectations of partners, what it will deliver in the next three years; the resources available for doing so; and how performance will be measured. The partnership plan is also a key document through which the partnership communicates to local people.

P1.1 Statutory Requirements

- **This plan has to be a three year plan**
The partnership has to produce a plan that covers the next three years. This allows them to develop plans to tackle their short, medium and long-term priorities and to align with other planning cycles, notably in England, the Local Area Agreement planning process.

- **The plan must be revised annually**
The priorities of the partnership will not always remain the same. In revising the plan annually, partnerships can reflect any new priorities emerging from their strategic assessments.

- **The plan has to include a strategy for tackling crime and disorder in the area**
Partnerships are required by existing legislation in the Crime and Disorder Act to produce this strategy. The plan should contain a strategy for tackling the identified crime and disorder in their area.

- **The plan will contain the priorities identified through the strategic assessment**
The plan takes forward the priorities that have been identified in the strategic assessment, including the community priorities.
The plan has to contain information about the role of each partner in supporting delivery of the priorities and how this will be resourced

Working together to deliver priorities is the activity that binds the partnership together. However, the plan will contain details of the way in which partners will contribute to agreed priorities and how these will be resourced.

The plan should contain information about the way in which performance against priorities will be measured

Establishing a robust performance management framework is a vital aspect of any effective partnership and is essential for successful and sustainable delivery. The plan must contain details of how the partnership will address the performance management of their work.

The plan will also contain information about the way in which the partnership will engage with their communities

Partnerships are required to carry out community consultation as part of their strategic assessment. This demonstrates to the community that their views are taken seriously.

P1.2 Developing the Plan – linking with other plans

In developing their plan, we expect partnerships to identify areas where there are crosscutting issues, where they can work with other partnerships or agencies on areas of common interest. These may include:

- Offender management and working with probation, for example through links with the Regional Reducing Re-offending Action Plan and the Youth Offending Team;
- Working with the Local Strategic Partnership or Local Services Board on priorities that impact on crime and disorder;
- Working with Local Criminal Justice Boards on links between criminal justice and crime reduction;
- Linking with the local policing plan through the police authority;
- Linking with the Drug Action Teams annual treatment plan; and
- Linking with the work of the Youth Offending Team on youth justice matters.

The partnership will also wish to consider how they link with the work of the county strategy group and their community safety agreement. After the county strategy group have identified cross-county priorities through the community safety agreement, they may wish to see these priorities reflected in the partnership plan, which would then reflect the joint working that the partnership could undertake in other areas.

P1.3 Suggested practice - Developing the Plan

This section outlines some of the features that partners can consider when preparing their partnership plan. We are not prescribing the style of plan or the specific contents, over and above the statutory requirements shown above. This enables the partnership to tackle and present their own local problems in a way that works for them and their communities. You may find it helpful to incorporate the following in the plan:

Vision Statement

This can be a clear definition of what the partnership intends to achieve over an extended period and the potential impact of the achievements on the community. The statement could also include how the partnership intends to conduct itself in ensuring that the achievements are delivered and the key partnership values, e.g. transparency, integrity and diversity that will drive and govern the manner in which the partnership will do business.
**Reason for priorities – evidence from the Strategic Assessment**

The partnership will use the information received from the strategic assessment to identify the objectives and priorities within the local area. This can be seen as a form of business plan, setting out the business of the partnership.

Wherever possible, the objectives set should be driven by what can be what are referred to as **SMART** principles:

- **Specific** – Objectives should specify what they want to achieve;
- **Measurable** – You should be able to measure if you are meeting the objectives;
- **Achievable** – Are the objectives you set, achievable and attainable?;
- **Realistic** – Can you realistically achieve the objectives with the resources available?; and
- **Timely** – When do you want to achieve these objectives?

By adopting this approach, the aim of the objectives can be understood clearly and the process of who is accountable for what can be established plainly. The objectives can also include the potential outcomes of the objectives and why the course of action identified is the best way of moving forward.

**Detail of Projects**

Partnerships may find it helpful to include details of their projects within the plan. Details of each project or initiative introduced to deliver the priorities can be included within the plan. These could outline clearly the aims of the projects, actions, how they will be delivered, which partners will have ownership for the delivery and the delivery dates.

**Risk Registers/Risk Log**

This document would outline the risks and issues that can influence or impact on successful delivery of individual projects or the partnership’s ability to ensure that they can deliver. The document can include the severity of the risks, the likelihood that the risk will happen, actions relating to the risks identified and which partners have responsibility for managing and monitoring the risks identified.

**Community Engagement section**

The decisions made by the partnership will affect their communities and because of this, it is particularly important that partners adopt the most effective means of ensuring that their concerns, views and perceptions are taken into account. Engaging with the community not only offers a means of collecting valuable information that can be used to support the strategic assessment but communities also hold information that can act as a possible solution to overcome any barriers or challenges.

To ensure that partners can engage effectively, the partnership can consider developing a document outlining how this will be achieved and identifying responsibility for ensuring achievement of these actions.

The following case study shows the way in which one partnership approached the creation of a new plan.
Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures:
Milton Keynes CSP reviewed their structure and performance.

Milton Keynes experienced a substantial increase in the volume of recorded crime in spring 2006. The pattern continued into the summer of 2006 and impacted on the partnerships ability to deliver on key performance targets. In order to address this, the partnership worked with a Partnership Support Programme Team from the Police and Partnership Standards Unit to being to review the structure and performance of the partnership. The majority of the recommendations incorporated in the ‘Health Check’ report were adopted. The partnership has now seen a decrease in the number of reported crimes in the area.

What they did

After experiencing an increase in the amount of recorded crime during the Spring and Summer of 2007 the partnership accepted the invitation of the Home Office to conduct a ‘Health Check’/PSP (Partnership Support Programme) currently developed and run by the Police and Partnership Standards Unit at the Home Office) to fundamentally review the partnership structures and processes with a view to improving performance. The ‘Health Check’/PSP monitored several aspects of the partnership and delivered recommendations on how to improve the performance of the partnership. Communities a brief overview of their work and thus raise their profile.

What was involved?

Following the diagnostic phase of the ‘Health Check’/PSP and the delivery of a comprehensive report containing key recommendations the partnership undertook the following work:

1. Refocus of the partnership plan
The plan has been re-aligned to assure that delivery is the main focus. This is underpinned by the development of the Joint Agency Tasking and Coordination Group (JATC); the development of a performance group and the employment of an Action Plan Project Manager; whose main responsibilities are ensuring that the objectives outlined in the plan are being embedded within the partnership and that delivery is the key focus.

2. The Joint Agency Tasking and Co-ordination Group
This group comprises all key partners that are brought together once a fortnight to review local intelligence to highlight patterns and respond appropriately. This group was established prior to the ‘Health Check’ commencing but has been strengthened further since the ‘Health Check’ has occurred.

3. The Performance Group
The partnership established this group to focus purely on monitoring the relationship between the partnership delivery groups and performance outputs. Regular meetings reflect on how well each delivery group is doing against the targets established; if performance is weak or the delivery groups are experiencing particular challenges the representatives of this group can introduce a series of actions to address and improve performance.
What impact did it have?

- BCS crime has fallen 15% since the involvement of the PSP/‘Health Check’ process;
- The re-alignment of the partnership plan has meant that the partnership is more focused as a team on delivery and performance;
- The development of both the JATC and the Performance Group make it easier for the group to track and monitor performance and also to implement appropriate steps to address any major challenges; and
- The PSP/Health Check experience offered the partnership the opportunity to review and refresh the focus of all partners.

Lessons Learned

- The PSP/Health Check process should not be viewed as another ‘audit’, rather as a means of working with experts to improve performance and therefore partners should not be fearful. The more up front and honest the partnership can be with the PSP team the more they will get back in terms of support;
- The PSP process facilitates internal discussions within the partnership which acts as a catalyst to improving performance; and
- A new approach to working always produces challenges and this should be viewed as a normal part of the process of supporting change.

P1.4 Suggested practice - Resourcing the plan

This section outlines considerations to support partners make appropriate decisions on both financial resources (e.g. funding) and human resources (e.g. people and their skills and knowledge) in order to improve performance.

To address the priorities in the partnership plan, it is important to understand what resources are available. Understanding the availability of resources helps to ensure that the partnership plan is realistic and achievable. Likewise, it encourages the partnership to look for ways to improve value for money by delivering solutions in the most cost-effective ways. To ensure that the resources are used as effectively as possible partners may wish to consider adopting one of the following approaches:

- Including the financial information within each section of the partnership plan, i.e. stating how resources are to be used to support the objectives outlined in the business case and also ensuring that any risks attached to the use of resources will be managed and by whom; and
- Develop and produce a separate financial information section within the plan that relates purely to resource, both financial and personnel, management.

Each partnership will have their own preferences and the minimum standards do not specify how partnerships should go about documenting, monitoring and evaluating the impact of resource usage. To ensure that partnerships achieve maximum benefit from their resources, they may wish to consider the following questions:

- How will the partnership ensure that there are appropriate financial resources to deliver on the objectives outlined in the partnership plan?
- What mechanisms or measures will the partnership put in place to ensure that the financial resources are being used effectively?
How will the partnership ensure that the partners tasked with ensuring either strategic or operational delivery are appropriately skilled to meet the objectives outlined in the partnership plan?

The next two sections consider these questions in more detail by setting out the areas that partners could consider when ensuring that the resources are used as effectively as possible.

**P1.5. Suggested practice - Securing funding**

An important part of preparing a partnership plan is to estimate what resources the partnership is likely to require to deliver on the priorities identified. We recognise that existing resources may be tight and suggest the partnership may wish to consider the following:

- Mainstreaming activities where appropriate – through Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act, responsible authorities have a requirement to do all that they reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in their area;
- By delivering on common objectives, the partnership may bring together resources from across responsible authorities;
- Considering funding through the Local Area Agreement – by ensuring that local community safety priorities are reflected in the Local Area Agreement, the partnership may access funds through the Local Strategic Partnership;
- Putting existing resources and delivery mechanisms to the best use – understanding what is being done already and building on this rather than initiating additional projects; and
- Accessing external sources of funding – a number of additional sources of funding exist for specific projects commissioned through the partnership, both through Government Office and central government and initiative-specific funds; and
- In Wales, there are specific Welsh Assembly Government funding streams available to partnerships.

**P1.6. Reviewing Resources**

The partnership is required to have arrangements to ensure that they assess the economy, efficiency and effectiveness (the three E’s of Best Value) of the money that they spend carrying out their business. We see this as part of a broader approach to ensure that there is an awareness of the need to consider the cost effectiveness and cost benefit of their work.

This should be a major consideration in the planning and budgeting processes at all levels in the partnership. It can be considered and documented as part of the justification for all schemes, decisions made and projects. Partnerships may decide to include a section on cost benefit in any project proposal. Similarly, any review process and/or each planning round proposal could identify how any decisions made will have met the requirements.

Regular reports produced as part of the performance management framework could also incorporate information on cost benefit or cost effectiveness. This report should concentrate on identifying those initiatives already under way or planned for futures that are likely to secure significant gains in efficiency, effectiveness or economy.
P1.7. Potential Barriers and suggested solutions

In preparing the partnership plan, the partnership may encounter some barriers. We outline below some common challenges and suggested solutions to these:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Barriers</th>
<th>Suggested Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Difficulty reaching consensus across the partners on the vision, objectives and strategies | • Hold a workshop or an away day specifically to develop the partnership plan.  
• Identify factors for consideration in the wider landscape and availability of resources in advance.  
• Ensure that all partners are well briefed on these aspects, in addition to the priorities agreed through the strategic assessment, in advance of the workshop.  
• Consider using an external facilitator (possibly from Government Office/Welsh Assembly Government or one of the responsible authorities) to assist this process.  
• Give the chair decision-making power where consensus cannot be reached. |
| Planning becomes onerous and “planning for planning’s sake”                       | • Be succinct and direct in plans.  
• Stay focused on key outcomes.  
• Ensure that actions can be addressed.  
• Have a word limit and agree the structure of the plan in advance  
• Avoid becoming too detailed around specific projects – these can each have individual action plans.  
• Review the plan (and progress against it) regularly to ensure that it is effectively used as a management tool. |
| Lack of internal capacity and/or objective distance to effectively review existing skills and knowledge | • Bring in a form of external challenge, for example input from:  
- Government Office staff;  
- Human resource or training specialists from member organisations; Colleagues working in similar partnerships; or  
- Expert advice from the IDEa and Local Government Association. |

P1.8. Additional resources

Ourpartnership.org.uk pmpartner (IDeA) http://pmpartner.editme.com/  
Local Area Agreement website http://www.communities.gov.uk/localgovernment/performanceframework/partnerships/localareaagreements/  
Audit Commission: Value for Money Toolkit (to be launched October 2007), will be available from the Audit Commission Website: http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/.  
Safer Stronger Communities Fund - Taking the agreements forward http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/publications.asp?did=1545  
Safer Stronger Communities Fund - Indicators of Strong Communities http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/publications.asp?did=1567
P1 Implementation Checklist

Empowered and Effective Leadership
✓ Have you ensured that there are actions ascribed to relevant partners?
✓ Have you considered ownership of any individual action plans?

Intelligence-led Business Processes
✓ Have you ensured that your plan contains links to the priorities identified through the strategic assessment?
✓ Does your plan contain details of how you will measure performance against priorities?
✓ Have you ensured that the decisions made have been influenced by the priorities that you have identified and also the ability to deliver?

Effective and Responsive Delivery Structure
✓ Have you considered how you will resource the delivery of your priorities?
✓ Have you maximised the opportunities for the joint delivery of actions?

Engaged Communities
✓ Have you ensured that aspects of the partnership plan can be shared with the community?
✓ Have you identified the correct medium for sharing information with the community, including those who are hard to reach and hard to hear?

Appropriate Skills and Knowledge
✓ Have you ensured that there are people within the partnership who can review the economy, efficiency and effectiveness of the partnership’s work?
P2. Publish Summary

Publishing a summary of the partnership plan is a good way to strengthen community engagement through ensuring that the community have access to good quality information about what is happening in their local area. It helps raise the profile of the partnership in the community and support increased confidence in the partnership.

Publishing a summary of the plan will demonstrate visible and constructive accountability and support community engagement. It will enable the communities to be better informed and actively engaged in crime and disorder matters. The community will understand the priority issues being addressed by the partnership and will have a better idea about how they can access, engage and influence local partnerships. It also supports greater transparency in decision making, with communities able to see the way in which their opinions have shaped partnership priorities.

P2.1 Statutory Requirements – Publishing the plan

The partnership have to publish a summary of the partnership plan in a format of their choice, but in a way that makes it available to diverse groups in their communities. We know that some agencies within a partnership are already under existing duties to publish summaries of their own plans, but an effective partnership will still want to be open about their own plans. However, the partnership should publish a summary in a way that is accessible to diverse communities as part of their need to be visible and accountable, but we are not specifying the format of the summary plan.

P2.2 Suggested practice – Contents of the summary

We have not prescribed the content of the summary, as we believe that partnerships will want to tailor the contents to the needs of their communities. However, partnerships may wish to consider including:

- Details of their priorities and how they reflect the priorities identified through community consultation;
- Who is involved in the partnership;
- Ways in which the community could be involved;
- Details of performance against previous priorities; and
- Contact details for the partnership.
**P2.3 Suggested practice – Publishing the summary**

Although how the partnership publishes the summary is based on local discretion, the partnership should attempt to ensure that this is widely available in the community. This might involve different types of publication methods, including:

- Publishing the summary on the internet – this might include the partnership website (where applicable) and/or the individual local websites for each of the responsible authorities and other partnership members;
- Publishing the summary on intranet sites – improving the awareness of staff in the partner agencies;
- Distributing flyers through existing channels – such as community centres, Neighbourhood Watch programmes, local health centres, council services, etc;
- Distributing information through voluntary organisations – including targeting information at particular groups served by these organisations (e.g. the elderly, or victims of particular types of crimes); and
- Consider publishing the information in publications produced by partnership members i.e. council publications that are sent out to individuals who live within the council boundaries.

We recognise that numerous documents may not be the best way to disseminate similar information. Where possible, we suggest that partnerships consider how the summary of the plan can be linked to other local documents available to the public. In order to ensure economies of scale and reduce duplication of effort across services, partners can review the manner in which additional agencies inform the community and identify possible means of sharing resources. The partnership may also wish to make a copy of the full partnership plan available to the public. If so, this should be in addition to the summary as it will be less accessible to many audiences.

**P2.4 Suggested Practice - Appropriate formats**

Police authorities are already required by statute to publish local policing summaries. In some areas, these are published at partnership level and may provide a suitable vehicle for the summary of the partnership plan, if that is what is agreed locally. In any event, partnerships may wish to consider the ten hallmarks of a good local policing summary in their own publications. These are as follows:

1. Uses the format to engage;
2. Includes local and relevant information;
3. Provides a balanced and objective view of performance;
4. Includes creative material to capture attention;
5. Uses clear branding – makes it clear who it’s from and what it’s for;
6. Adopts a user-friendly layout;
7. Uses targeted language and avoids jargon;
8. Encourages community involvement;
9. Is developed in collaboration with partners where possible; and
10. Makes every effort to reach every household.

Partnerships should consider how they could use these for their own publications. They may also want to consider how to meet the diverse needs of their communities, for example, other languages and formats accessible to those with impaired vision.
The following case study shows the way in which one police authority approached the publication of police summaries and highlighted the work of the partnerships at the same time.

**Visible and constructive accountability:**

**Policing summaries in Leicestershire - Communicating plans to the public**

Leicestershire Police used the local policing summary they produced to highlight the purpose and work of the partnerships in their county. The summary ensured that the communities were informed about what was going on in their local areas in relation to community safety as well as the bigger picture of a county-wide perspective. This also helped ease burdens on the partnerships’ resources as they did not have to produce individual summaries for their communities.

**What they did**

Local policing summaries were produced for each of the community safety partnerships in the County of Leicestershire which included the districts and unitary councils within the constabulary boundaries. Each document had a general overview on what the police had been doing across the county and what they would be doing over the next year. The partnerships had their own page which was dedicated to local initiatives and the targets for the year ahead. The summary also contained contact details for the individual inspectors for each area of the local policing units so that the public would know who to contact in their area. These helped the partnerships of Leicestershire and Rutland to disseminate to their communities a brief overview of their work and thus raise their profile.

**P2.5 Additional Resources**

Home Office - Citizen Focus: A Practical Guide to Local Policing Summaries

Local Policing Summaries: Good Practice Guide to Maximise Impact

**P2 Implementation Checklist**

**Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures**

✔ Have you considered the most effective way to publish the summary plan?
✔ Are you making the best use of other avenues of publication?
✔ Are you making use of the Hallmarks of a good local policing summary?

**Engaged Communities**

✔ Have you ensured that it can be accessed by diverse communities?

**Appropriate Skills and Knowledge**

✔ Do you know that the messages of the partnership are reaching the intended audience?
Deliver

Successful delivery of the partnership’s priorities is a crucial aspect of the way in which an effective partnership operates. An effective partnership should be able to sustain a high quality of delivery and demonstrate that they have a clear strategy for improvement. They will consider the way in which they deliver their activities to tackle crime and disorder, the quality and outcomes of the implementation of their plans, the way in which they have engaged with their communities and how they will support and challenge performance across the partnership.
Deliver

Successful delivery of the partnership’s priorities is a crucial aspect of the way in which an effective partnership operates. An effective partnership should be able to sustain a high quality of delivery and demonstrate that they have a clear strategy for continued improvement. An effective partnership will consider the way in which they deliver their activities to tackle crime and disorder, the quality and outcomes of implementing their plans, the way in which they have engaged with their communities and how they will support and challenge performance across the partnership. There should be a process for monitoring progress and planning for improvement and a mechanism for reporting on that progress to their stakeholders. Evaluation forms a key component of this process: without an understanding of the impact of any intervention, partnerships will be limited in their ability to repeat their successes or improve delivery of outcomes.

This chapter sets out ways in which you might further improve your delivery processes. We want your efforts to be visibly successful to ensure that communities and partners alike understand and value the benefits of partnership working. We want partnerships to have robust delivery mechanisms to embed successful implementation of their plans. This section sets out how you might go about structuring your resources to aid implementation, how to adopt a problem-solving approach to community safety, and how to evaluate the impact of your work.

At the end of this chapter you should be able to:

✓ Consider how best to structure delivery locally;
✓ Develop and agree a local approach to problem-solving and tasking and coordination to implement agreed priorities;
✓ Develop a performance management framework to monitor and challenge progress;
✓ Evaluate overall effectiveness of delivery work and learn from emerging good practice;
✓ Understand how to demonstrate Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures and other relevant Hallmarks; and
✓ Understand the skills and knowledge that will underpin this.
D1. Implementation

The implementation of the partnership plan forms an important aspect of the business of the partnership. The success of the implementation phase provides the visible signs of effectiveness to the community and to other partners. Partnerships should work to find creative solutions to their issues and to involve the community in the implementation wherever possible.

Once a partnership has identified priorities and established a plan outlining how these priorities will be delivered, they should structure their resources so that there are appropriate process and people in place to deliver effectively.

The statutory requirements have been devised in a manner to ensure that local flexibilities are protected; this will ensure that partnerships continue to be responsive to the communities that they represent. However, there is much to be learned from existing approaches and examples of effective practice. This section sets out some of these for your consideration in implementing your partnership plan.

D1.1 Statutory Requirements

- The strategy group is responsible for the implementation of the partnership plan. The core responsibilities of the partnership include the implementation or delivery of the partnership plan as well as its formulation.
- The partnership plan must set out the extent to which people living or working in the area might assist the partnership in reducing crime, disorder and substance misuse.

As part of a partnership’s community engagement activities, there are often ways in which the community can be involved in delivering community safety. Making the most of these can lead to more empowered communities and sustain and embed delivery.

D1.2 Suggested Practice – the relationship between the strategy group and delivery

The process of moving from planning to delivery can be fraught with difficulty. However, the partnership plan should act as a compass to guide the partnership begin the process of establishing appropriate processes to ensure effective delivery.
This section will outline some of the key questions that partners should consider in order to ensure that the move from plan to deliver is as smooth as possible.

- Is the partnership ensuring that there are appropriate processes and structures in place to address the priorities outlined in the partnership plan?
- What steps are the partnership taking to ensure that resources are being deployed where they will be needed most?

**D1.3 Suggested Practice – Tackling diverse problems**

Drawing on the resources available within the partnership can offer real opportunities to address the key issues facing the communities that the partnerships represent. Techniques for successfully managing delivery include:

- Working closely with private sector and voluntary organisations – e.g. involving pub landlords in projects to tackle alcohol-related crimes;
- Commissioning services from the voluntary sector – e.g. involving youth outreach groups in projects to tackle substance misuse in youths;
- Using existing mechanisms – e.g. involving Neighbourhood Wardens in attempts to tackle fly-tipping on local council estates;
- Involving the community in problem-solving – e.g. identifying community champions to help mediate concerns in local council estates;
- Working to support families and improve parenting;
- Focusing actions around specific campaigns – e.g. Weeks of Action programmes to address anti-social behaviour; and
- Commissioning Services or working in partnership with Regional Offender Managers, through Probation Trusts.

The following case studies sets out how Preston Community Safety Partnership adopted a partnership approach to preventing alcohol-related crime.

**Engaged Communities and Intelligence-led Business Processes:**

**Preston CSP – Preventing alcohol-related crime**

In order to combat alcohol-related crime, as well as aid Public Health objectives, Preston Community Safety Partnership appointed a secondee from Lancashire Police to the role of Alcohol Project Manager. The project manager worked alongside public health officials to engage local businesses and successfully reduce the opportunity for alcohol-related crime and harm in the area.

**What they did**

Recognising the cross-cutting impacts of alcohol misuse on both crime and disorder and public health, the project manager produced an alcohol-related crime prevention strategy. Building on the positive relationship that had been established with pub and club operators in Preston, the Preston partnership aimed to use this relationship with alcohol retailers to improve BCS comparator crime whilst complementing public health objectives and statutory obligations under the new Licensing Act.
The prevention strategy involved a number of initiatives, including the Pubnet scheme, which engaged all major retailers of alcohol within the city by sharing relevant information about performance and risks. In addition, the partnership used local data to identify key “hotspot premises” and worked with businesses to develop individual action plans to improve working practices at these premises. These actions continue to be implemented and monitored.

**What it involved**

In order to implement the strategy, the partnership used the existing services and structures of the relevant responsible authorities. The secondment of the project manager for a period of nine months was funded through the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund.

**What impact it had**

The prevention strategy has resulted in improved performance on the BCS Comparator crime, which have been sustained over time.

Additional benefits include:

- Improved information sharing – analytical data from accident and emergency departments on assaults in licensed premises is now being used to complement current analytical data gathered by the police, improving problem-solving; and
- Improved partnership working – between the police and health services in Preston through a recognition of the common benefits of tackling this problem with a joint approach.

**Lessons learned**

Key lessons learned from this process include:

- The value of information from multiple sources when problem-solving – pairing police and public health data has resulted in more comprehensive understanding of a complex problem; and
- The importance of building common aims and objectives – when securing buy in and commitment from multiple partners.

**D1.4 Suggested Practice: Appropriate processes and structures to support delivery**

To support the delivery process, the partnership could consider how the opportunities for joint working can be managed in order to deliver effectively. In particular, the partnership could consider developing the following:

**Action Groups:** These may consist of personnel from many different partner agencies that have been tasked to address particular issues (thematic) across a number of neighbourhoods or formed to address a number of issues in one neighbourhood (geographic). In practice, the distinction between the two approaches is more flexible with the respective groups addressing combinations of both.

The group could focus on supporting delivery of initiatives and incorporate business processes to capture community information and monitor outcomes as part of their core business. This information can be extremely valuable from a strategic perspective as the intelligence from this group can support the process of monitoring the progress of particular initiatives and be used as a means of detecting new challenges.
The work of partnership action groups could be co-ordinated with the work of existing police tasking and co-ordination meetings and local action groups set up by neighbourhood policing teams. Effective co-ordination prevents duplication of effort by different groups and helps to manage resources efficiently.

Neighbourhood Policing Teams offer an ideal opportunity through a joint approach with the partnership to deliver partnership priorities and solutions to address crime, disorder and substance misuse by:

- Interventions – joint action with communities and partners to solve problems; and
- Answers – sustainable solutions to problems and feedback on results.

Because Neighbourhood Policing Teams focus on the needs of the community and the issues that affect neighbourhoods by involving them in identifying priorities and solutions, partnerships should consider how they can be used effectively within their delivery structure.

The following case study sets out how action groups were established in Wrexham and Flintshire.

**Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures and Empowered and Effective Leadership:**

*Wrexham and Flintshire CSP – Joint Action Groups (JAGs)*

Wrexham and Flintshire Joint Action Groups (JAGs) were established in 2004 to support the operational side of the CSP. They comprise of stakeholders and partners from a wide variety of agencies who meet to address key targets relating to crime and disorder and also to share intelligence to support the identification of any new crime trends.

**What they did**

The JAGs comprise multi-agency representatives who have been tasked by the partnership to ensure that:

- Appropriate approaches and initiatives are in place to achieve the targets established by the strategic board; and
- Any new trends regarding crime and disorder have been identified and appropriate steps taken to reduce impact.

**What it involved**

The JAG members met regularly in order to monitor progress and also identify key trends. Composition of the group is dependent on the nature of the issues being discussed. The team was supported by regular up-to-date performance and crime information which provided the basis for discussions. The decisions and actions required as a result of the meetings were delegated to the agencies best placed to support them.

**What impact it had**

The joint action groups enabled the establishment of a performance-focused culture. Regular performance and crime trends information has meant that the JAG members can be more responsive to local problems. By focusing on the intelligence that they had access to, members could identify clearly patterns and trends that needed to be addressed before they became too problematic.
There are more opportunities for cross agency working as JAG members have become more aware of the overlaps between each of their respective agendas, which supports partnership working ethos. As all members have become more aware of each other they have begun to increase the knowledge they have of where to go to access information regarding a particular issue. Members are now aware of what they have responsibilities for and which other members are accountable for it.

Lessons learned

The group learnt a number of lessons in undertaking this process.

- The importance of getting all partners involved in the process as it offers more effective buy-in.
- Good representation - the appropriate level of seniority and rank to offer both financial and personnel resources both financial and personnel is important; without this it is very difficult to task a particular agency to deliver.
- Having a good chair was identified as another key lesson learnt, as a good chair will ensure that members are kept focused on the issue at hand and not allow one group/partnership agency to dominate the proceedings.

Tasking and Co-ordinating Group: Co-ordination can be facilitated by introducing a tasking and co-ordination group (T&CG) to manage delivery. The T&CG is a decision making group with control over resource allocation and responsibility to ensure that delivery is always relevant to the partnership plan. They can hold to account those responsible for taking action, resolve problems, and ensure progress.

Some partnerships already use a T&CG to co-ordinate their problem solving work. A T&CG could work by co-ordinating a range of action groups. Alternatively, the T&CG could co-ordinate problem solving activity directly instead of separate action groups. However, problem solving could still be co-ordinated with the work of existing police tasking and co-ordination meetings and local action groups set up by neighbourhood policing teams.

In a partnership where the T&CG is effectively co-ordinating problem solving activity, it may become overly bureaucratic to also hold a police tasking and co-ordination meeting. Before running joint tasking and co-ordination processes, the local police commander could ensure that the partnership process meets the needs of the local police area and the specific demands on that organisation. If the police in an area decide to close their police tasking and co-ordination meeting, they should satisfy themselves that they are involved fully with the partnership process. Furthermore, the police must ensure that the partnership process satisfies any requirements the police have to meet under the NIM minimum standards for tasking and co-ordination as laid out in ACPO (2005) Guidance on the National Intelligence Model.

The regulations do not prescribe what constitutes an action group(s) or their composition, but partnerships may find it useful to consider the following:

- **Functions and responsibilities of the group**

  Members of the group could make decisions about day-to-day resource allocation and could be responsible for ensuring that delivery is relevant to the partnership plan. They could hold people to account for taking action, resolve problems, and ensure progress.

- **Membership, roles and level of representation**

  Experience suggests that members should be those who can directly assist in the resolution of issues being discussed. They should also be able to commit resources to specific problems and make decisions about what needs to be done. An example might be the manager of the local council housing department. They
can decide which of their staff are able to carry out specific actions to assist in one, or a number of problem solving initiatives being discussed at the meeting. At the next meeting, that manager would then provide an update on progress against agreed tasks.

- **Frequency and nature of meetings**

Again, experience suggests that meetings should be regular enough to ensure that problem solving activity stays focused on the partnership plan. This can also form part of the wider approach to performance management adopted by the partnership. They could also be at appropriate intervals to allow time for some activity to take place, but ensure that too much time does not elapse before reporting on progress for the agreed tasks. T&CG Meetings are guided by a tactical assessment that uses information shared within the partnership to update current problems in relation to the partnership plan and identify emerging ones.

Action groups may mobilise around particular issues or responses and disassemble when the project has been completed. Likewise, as a key part of being responsive, the nature and constitution of the action groups should be reviewed regularly and modified to meet changing requirements and needs.

In the following diagram, we depict how a partnership may structure its delivery, including roles and responsibilities at different levels. This is a suggested structure only and we recognise that effective delivery structures will depend on local characteristics.
D1.7 Suggested Practice – Engaging the Community

The community can play an important role in helping to resolve issues and tensions as well as in identifying priorities. In this, they can be viewed as an additional resource to assist the partnership achieve their objectives. By involving the community in the solutions to problems, the partnership can improve:

- The sustainability of the response – particularly where potential offenders can be involved as a means of preventing crime and disorder;
- Public confidence and reassurance – by ensuring the public are aware of the true nature and level of issues in their community, and the action being taken to resolve these issues;
- Visibility and accountability – by being transparent and open about processes and reasons for actions; and
- Future community participation – by increasing awareness and building interest and buy-in to the work that the partnership is doing in the area.

Neighbourhood Policing teams offer an ideal opportunity to engage with the community. There are many examples on the Neighbourhood Policing website (www.neighbourhoodpolicing.co.uk). One of the key aims of Neighbourhood Policing teams is to engage with local communities to tackle local priorities and as such, partnerships can use this as a valuable approach in their broader work.

The following two case studies highlight how to work with the community to solve community safety issues.

**Demonstrating Engaged Communities:**

**Barking & Dagenham – “Focus Weeks” in the Gascoigne Estate**

Barking & Dagenham CDRP wanted to tackle the problems that residents were experiencing on a council estate that experienced crime and anti-social behaviour. By undertaking a programme of community consultation and awareness-raising events the partnership were able to improve relations with residents and also highlighted to them the services that were available.

**What they did**

The four broad-based focus weeks took place over four months in early 2007. Wide-ranging engagement activities included community mediation, ‘fun days’, youth diversionary projects, and reparation activities organised through Community Payback. The partnership ensured that a broad range of agencies participated in the events, including health checks carried out through the PCT, and housing advice surgeries. All of the engagement took place against a backdrop of high-visibility action on environmental and maintenance issues on the estate, with the Police contributing high-visibility patrols and proactive enforcement actions.

**What it involved**

The first focus week was planned and delivered within 6 weeks from start to finish, with other weeks’ planning activities starting relatively shortly after the last week had completed. The Community Safety section of the Council co-ordinated the process. Although the majority of services involved were already working on the estate as part of their core work, the focus was placed on tailoring the agencies’ response to the needs of the community in order to raise awareness of the services that were available. During the weeks themselves, daily briefings ensured that the active focus was sustained.

**What impact it had**

The community mediation was particularly effective. Approximately 25 people took part, and organisation was quick, with readily available key contacts. The team mapped the perceptions that each
group had of one another and of facilities and activities on the estate. Through the resulting shift in perceptions, the young people demonstrated understanding of the issues for older people and the older people began to see young people as approachable and less threatening.

Improved communication with residents and a better baseline for cleanliness and envirocrime issues have helped to sustain the improvements to the estate. Returning for successive ‘focus weeks’ have also strengthened the community’s sense that the partnership is committed to longer-term improvement.

**Lessons learned**

- Ensure that you have appropriate intelligence prior to establishing an initiative. Initial intelligence of problems on the estate was difficult to collate from all agencies. However, it is important to start with the information available and demonstrate that ‘something is happening’ while you capitalise on increasing community confidence to improve your intelligence picture;
- Build the operational partnership base slowly and over time – work with those that will come on board initially, without holding everything up whilst you assemble the ‘dream team’;
- A programme of events helps to make the product more effective – diversity of approach is the hallmark of effective community engagement and by using a broad-based set of focus weeks you can target broadly, and refine as you go along;
- Get your ‘authorisers’ on board – strategic buy-in is crucial at the outset, whilst operational engagement can be built gradually; and
- Use short timescales – use the energy created by a pressurised deadline to galvanise partners into action and encourage them to find the right ‘working balance’.

**Demonstrating Engaged Communities:**
**Sparkplug Projects in North Somerset CDRP**

**What they did**

North Somerset CDRP successfully bid for £8000 funding from Government Office South West which was match funded by the Partnership. With a total budget of only £16,000 North Somerset was able to fund 9 separate initiatives, each one conceived and run by members of the community. Each of these initiatives became known as Sparkplug projects. They were successfully run under the project management oversight of the partnership’s Community Development Worker (a full-time post).

**What it involved**

As grassroots projects, they successfully engaged the community in solving problems. Each had genuine community ownership and was well-respected in their individual areas. In addition to demonstrating what can be achieved by community efforts, these projects helped build more effective links between the CDRP and the community. The Community Development Worker was not only able to support individuals turn their ideas into real initiatives, but was also able to help new community groups establish themselves as part of the process.

**What impact it had**

All of the Sparkplugs are continuing to contribute to their local communities. The success of the initiative has raised the profile of community engagement in the area.
D1.8 Potential Barriers and Suggested Solutions

In setting up a problem-solving approach to doing business, partnerships may encounter some potential barriers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Barriers</th>
<th>Suggested Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not all partners are equally committed to delivering through the action groups</td>
<td>• Use action groups as an opportunity to build the skills and knowledge of practitioners by pairing persons with complementary experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery structures become bureaucratic and lose focus on delivery</td>
<td>• Stay focused on key outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review processes annually as part of review of partnership plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure robust performance management framework reviews decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns from individual partners relating to joint tasking and co-ordination</td>
<td>• Ensure performance management regimes within agencies take account of work delivered in partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Emphasise that delivery of Local Area Agreement priorities binds on all agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D1.9 Additional Resources

ACPO Practice Advice on Tasking and co-ordination
http://www.acpo.police.uk/asp/policies/Data/TaskingandCo-ordination_inter_11.09.06.pdf

D1 Implementation Checklist

**Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures:**
✓ Do you have action groups structured around your key priorities?
✓ Are these groups delivering what is required to meet the objectives set out in the partnership plan?

**Intelligence-led Business Processes:**
✓ Is there a clear process for allocating tasks and resources to delivery groups and bodies?

**Engaged Communities:**
✓ Are you actively seeking ways to involve diverse groups within your community in problem solving initiatives?

**Appropriate Skills and Knowledge:**
✓ Are you familiar with the planning processes and the links to other areas of partner business?
D2 Solving Problems

Partnerships have to deal with many different and difficult issues as they address the priorities of the community. To be responsive to emerging crime and disorder issues and changing priorities within the community, partnerships should adopt an active problem-solving approach. In this way, they can engage agencies and the community itself to tackle community safety issues by identifying the root cause of such problems, finding a sustainable solution that removes the cause. This section includes advice on how to ensure that the partnership activity is based on up-to-date intelligence and information throughout the year and also considers how to manage internal conflict and performance issues.

D2.1 Statutory Requirements

There are no statutory requirements concerned with the way in which partnerships tackle their crime and disorder issues. This recognises that partnerships will benefit from the flexibility to address problems in a way that makes sense locally.

D2.2 Suggested Practice - Using an intelligence-led problem-solving approach

The partnership strategic assessment process is supported by the quarterly (or more frequent) exchange of certain depersonalised information as required by the new information sharing regulations. This information is not only of use to the strategic assessment production process. It can also be used to ensure that problem solving throughout the year is intelligence-led. This means using the shared information, along with other information such as open source (publicly accessible) information and/or personal information specific to certain problems, to produce a tactical assessment.

Tactical assessments could consider the specific problems that relate to the agreed priorities including any significant changes and predictions for the next period. It could also consider the progress made on current problem solving activity. Additionally it could consider any new problems that require a response from the partnership.

The tactical assessment could be structured around the following components:

- **Priority Locations:** hotspots and locations representing long term concentrated need;
- **Crime or Incident Series:** identifiable and linked crimes and incidents;
- **Subjects:** such as lifestyle criminals, Prolific and other Priority Offenders, victims and witnesses; and
- **High Risk Issues:** such as repeat victimisation or signal crimes.
The T&CG (as set out in D1.4) can use the tactical assessment to decide the priority of problems being dealt with, allocate resources and check that activity being carried out is relevant to current issues and to the priorities agreed by the strategy group.

The response to individual problems can also be intelligence-led by ensuring that detailed analysis of shared information occurs before a response to the problem is planned and executed. This could be in the form of a problem profile, like those used by the police as part of the National Intelligence Model. Problem solving that takes place within the partnership will have to be carefully co-ordinated with problem solving work that takes place under the lead of individual partnership organisations, such as the police. Coordination will ensure there is less duplication of effort, more efficient use of resources, and should lead to better information sharing. The co-ordination of problem solving can be achieved through the tasking and co-ordination meeting.

Intelligence-led analysis can also be part of a problem-solving model. There are a number of problem solving models a partnership may use. We outline two of these in Section 2.3: SARA and PROCTOR. An essential part of problem solving is the review or assessment of results and lessons learned. For assessment to be successful, each problem being dealt with should have a clear owner who is held to account for actions in relation to the problem. Clear and accessible records of problem-solving activity and its results should also be kept.

The following case study demonstrates how the Safer Southwark partnership adopted a problem-solving approach to street drinking.

**Intelligence-led Business Processes, Empowered and Effective Leadership, Visible and Constructive Accountability and Engaged Communities:**

Safer Southwark Partnership – Camberwell Street Drinking Initiative (CSDI)

CSDI was a multi-agency partnership approach to address a long-standing issue in the community. The team used a problem-solving approach to engage wider partners and develop a sustainable solution. The initiative was formally evaluated and learning points were used to revise the partnership delivery structures, resulting in ACTION groups – problem-solving structures at the neighbourhood level – in Southwark.

**What they did**

There was a 40-year history of problematic street drinking in the area, where perpetrators were drawn in to a number of substance misuse treatment centres and facilities in the area. The problem had dramatically worsened since 2000, where large groups of drinkers congregated in busy areas throughout the day, seven days a week. The drinkers’ presence reduced the quality of life for people living, working or travelling through the area.

A “call for action” came from the community and local businesses who wanted the problem tackled once and for all.

The Project Lead used an intelligence-led, problem-solving approach, employing the SARA model:
What it involved

Six months were invested in setting up the process, from April 2004 to October 2004, which entailed:
• Identifying and funding appropriate problem solving and co-ordination role;
• Intelligence gathering and monitoring of perpetrators;
• Community Consultation;
• Setting up local partnership framework and agreements;
• Research into best practice; and
• Identifying suitable funding sources.

The practice ran for 24 months, from October 2004 to October 2006.

What impact it had

The initiative resulted in tangible performance improvements:
• An 89% reduction in the numbers of street drinkers and no concentrations of street drinking groups in target areas; and
• Two thirds reduction in complaints from community and local business regarding anti-social behaviour by street drinkers.

By learning from and through the process, the Camberwell Street Drinking Intervention has provided Safer Southwark Partnership with a working model to be used to address other localised issues. This has resulted in the ACTION (Area Co-Coordinated Teams In Our Neighbourhood) framework. An ACTION process has since been developed for each of the eight community council areas in the borough.
Lessons learned

- Leadership – the strong leadership of the Project Lead was instrumental in driving this initiative, from engaging the support of senior managers to driving along the strategic and operations forums as dynamic and action based meetings;
- Problem solving process – anti-social behaviour on the streets often attracts knee-jerk reactions. These are usually fuelled by fear, prejudice and lack of understanding. Knee-jerk reactions can be characterised by displacement activities – exclusion ASBOs or street drinking bans. In working through the problem-solving process in Camberwell a measured and long-term solution to the street drinking problem has been developed;
- Action plan – the plan provided direction, ownership and co-ordination of the initiative. It provided a strategic partnership response to the issue and was and still is useful in steering the partners and keeping all partners accountable and responsible for specific actions;
- Ownership of the issue – being able to accurately identify the problem helped to encourage joint ownership, enabling wider agencies, particularly the service providers, to become aware of the impact of their service on the local community; and
- Sustainability – the foresight and ability to recognise that a long-term strategy is required to address street population issues. There is recognition that street drinking will never be eradicated in Camberwell, even through displacement, so what was developed was a long-term strategy to manage the issue. By providing appropriate outreach and by linking in clients to services in their own localities, it will be possible not to eradicate but certainly to ameliorate the street drinking issue in the area.

D2.3 Suggested Practice – SARA and PROCTOR

While it can also be applied more widely, the SARA model provides a good framework for identifying, understanding and responding to problems on an ongoing basis. Applying the SARA process can ensure that a crime problem is effectively identified and tackled, avoiding any waste of time and resources if only part of the actual problem is identified. SARA is also commonly used within the police service, so an understanding of the process may help partner organisations to work with the police to tackle local problems. The four stages are:

- Scanning – spotting problems using knowledge, basic data and electronic maps;
- Analysis – using hunches and information technology to dig deeper into problems’ characteristics and underlying causes;
- Response – devising a solution, working with the community, wherever possible; and
- Assessment – looking back to see if the solution worked and what lessons can be learned.

PROCTOR (PROblem, Cause, Tactic or Treatment, Output and Result) is an acronym devised to enhance the SARA model by emphasising the importance of analysis throughout the problem solving process, not just in the second phase. Likewise, it reinforces the need to distinguish between outputs and results.

The following case study sets out how a Humberside partnership adopted the SARA process to improve community engagement.
Intelligence-led Business Processes, Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures and Engaged Communities:
Humberside Association of Neighbourhood Watch Groups (HANWaG) – Community Problem Solving Kit

Humberside communities felt that the partner agencies were not listening to them and the partnerships were frustrated at what they saw as inadequate information from the communities to support action. In order to overcome this issue HANWaG developed the Community Problem Solving Kit to help communities identify their problems, so that partners would know exactly where to focus their attentions, and improve the quality of community intelligence.

What they did

HANWaG adapted ‘SARA’ and developed the Community Problem Solving Kit (CPSK) to improve the quality of community intelligence. In developing the toolkit it was recognised that the process had to be uncomplicated, flexible, deal with wide-ranging community issues (both high and low levels of crime), have a strong participative/visual impact and be community focused. Information gathered had to be a coherent, structured, focused, living and tangible. This was done by developing a four-step problem solving process that would be flexible enough to feed in community information.

The process was used within the community to identify the key priorities and collect valuable intelligence enabling HANWaG both to access valuable information and overcome the challenges offered by community members.

What it involved

The toolkit took approximately six months to design and develop. The process of conducting the activity with the community takes approximately two hours and is conducted once a year.

What impact it had

The community was consulted only once, reducing consultation fatigued. The approach makes the community part of the problem solving process by encouraging them to agree on priorities and potential approaches to address those problems. This increases the confidence of community members.

The manner in which the community intelligence was collected meant that links between the data collected as part of the consultation process could be easily transferred to NIM and IT systems. This made it easier for partners to access and use the information.

Lessons learned

• Some communities are fearful of repercussions - it can be difficult to get them to convey information. This can be overcome by encouraging individuals to adopt a problem-solving approach to the challenges.
• Keep members focused on the task at hand in order to prevent the consultation degenerating into an unconstructive ‘moans and groans’ session – be creative in approaching individuals to discuss the issues that face them.
D2.4 Suggested Practice – Managing Performance

The partnership is responsible for managing performance. The partnership should meet regularly enough to carry out this function. They may delegate the day-to-day function of holding owners of problem solving initiatives to account to the T&CG, but will still need to retain a strategic overview. The partnership should manage their own performance as part of evaluation of the impact of interventions. This should form part of their regular meeting structure and may benefit from the use of risk registers, aligned with the partnership plan. As part of evaluating the impact of interventions (see below), there will be occasions on which the partnership members may need to challenge one another about their commitment of resources to a particular project or priority.

D2.5 Potential Barriers and Suggested Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Barriers</th>
<th>Suggested Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources to carry out scanning, analysis and response</td>
<td>• Consider broadening existing police or local authority mechanisms to encompass other partners’ information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider a more joined up approach to tasking and co-ordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of problem-solving training to maximise impact and benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D2.6 Additional Resources

Additional information on both of these models is available on the Crime Reduction website. In addition, the website also provides:
- Report on the results of a questionnaire on problem-solving in crime reduction;
- A subsequent good practice checklist for problem-solving; and
- Additional reading on problem solving techniques.

The Centre for Problem-Oriented Policing website includes information about problem solving:
http://www.popcenter.org/

D2 Implementation Checklist

Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures:
✓ Are you able to respond flexibly to emerging issues within the community?

Intelligence-led Business Processes:
✓ Do you have a process for weighing up emerging issues with existing priorities?

Empowered and Effective Leadership:
✓ Within the strategy group, are you able to constructively challenge each other in order improve performance?

Appropriate Skills and Knowledge:
✓ Do you understand the various problem solving models and how they can be applied to the business of the partnership?
✓ Do you understand the relationship between the partnership delivery structure and the NIM approach?
D3 Evaluating Impact

For partnerships to be able to deliver on their priorities, it is important to understand what works well and what works less well, particularly in different localities and communities. Evaluating the outcomes of the approaches used to address priorities will not only offer partners a clear indication of impact but allow them to identify what has worked well. This form of information is invaluable to empowering partnerships to make evidence-based decisions. As such, evaluation should be part and parcel of partnership core business.

Evaluation that is built into the work that partnerships deliver should be less onerous for practitioners to undertake and have greater utility to the partnership. This approach also makes it easier for the results of the evaluation to be fed into the review of the partnership plan. Embedding evaluation within the work of the partnership requires the evaluation of both individual projects and the partnership plan. This will help to improve the effectiveness of the work that the partnership does, it builds knowledge, skills and organisational memory, and can help the partnership to become more accountable to the local community.

D3.1 Statutory Requirements

- The strategic assessment must include an assessment of the extent to which last year’s plan was implemented.

Evaluation of the implementation of partnership plans needs to be considered throughout the year, but will be required when preparing the strategic assessment. Evidence of the success of the implementation of the previous year’s partnership plan will need to be feed into the strategic assessment. Any evaluation of particular projects or initiatives will form an important and robust part of this evidence. The partnership will need to consider what further evaluation work could to be carried out during the year in order to inform future strategic assessments.

- The strategy group must have in place arrangements for assessing the value for money of partnership activities.

Many of the agencies within the partnership already have a duty to consider value for money (economy, efficiency and effectiveness) within their own organisations. This regulation extends this duty to projects and initiatives carried out in partnership. These arrangements should look at the cost of the intervention as well as the effectiveness in achieving the goals in order to assess the value for money the work presented—see P1 (Plan for Action – Prepare the Plan) for further details)
D3.2 Suggested Practice – Why Evaluate?

The word ‘evaluation’ can be used to cover many different but related activities such as reviewing, accountability reporting, measuring impact, cost analysis. We suggest that there are two main activities that partnerships should be considering as evaluation;

- Measuring whether or not an individual project or programme has met its goals or objectives and how efficiently the partnership was able to achieve these; and
- Reviewing the overall partnership plan, which will include taking into account the results of the individual projects and programmes along with other data.

There are many reasons why evaluation is important including:

- Results of evaluations help partnerships decide how to deploy limited resources to have the maximum impact and can help decide when to stop projects;
- It facilitates the sharing of knowledge and skills between partner organisations and with other partnerships;
- Evaluated work has better outcomes than work that is not evaluated regardless of anything else a partnership may do; and
- Evaluation can involve local people and publishing the results can build visible and constructive accountability.

D3.3 Suggested Practice – Evaluating the partnership plan

In evaluating their plan, the partnership will gather evidence from a number of different sources. This might include;

- Reviews of the plans throughout the year such as risk registers, action plans or meeting minutes demonstrating the progress of delivery against priorities;
- Results of evaluations from individual projects or programmes;
- Data produced by crime or other analysts;
- Results from any community engagement activities; and
- Opinions of key stakeholders and partnership member organisations.

In considering the evidence from all these sources and comparing it to the main objectives of the plan, it may be necessary to make judgments about the relative importance of evidence from different sources. This will depend on what initial objectives were set. To ensure accountability to the public, the results of this process can be recorded and made available.

D3.4 Suggested Practice – Evaluating Projects

As well as evaluating the overall partnership plan, the partnership will benefit from the evaluation of individual projects throughout the year. It is unlikely that the partnership will want or need to evaluate every project that it undertakes, but it is important that the evaluations that are undertaken make a meaningful contribution to the following year’s strategic assessment. In deciding which initiatives to evaluate, you may want to consider:

- The scope of the work;
- The cost of the work;
- The lack of existing knowledge of the effectiveness of the approach;
The level of public interest in the work;

- The balance of outcomes gained verses effort to evaluate; and

- The novelty of the approach being adopted.

Generally speaking, the more of the above that feature in a project, the more reason there will be for a partnership to evaluate it. Occasionally, with particularly sensitive or difficult pieces of work, partnerships may also need to factor into their decision making the possibility of adverse or unexpected consequences of the work or a disproportionate impact of the work on one group of people versus another, particularly in relation to race or ethnicity. We would strongly recommend that projects be evaluated if they have a very large budget, a stipulation in a grant or a funding arrangement that requires an evaluation or a report back to funding bodies. Evaluation is also vital where projects involve a novel or unusual approach, particularly where the existing evidence base may be poor or the theory of change unproven.

D3.5 Suggested Practice - How to evaluate

When evaluating a particular project, we recommend that you consider:

- **Outputs** – what the project delivered, the activities undertaken (for example number of community engagement events delivered in a week of action); and

- **Outcomes** – the impact that the delivery had on the target business (for example reduction of a certain crime type in a particular area).

Measuring the outputs enables the partnership to change their project management practices according to lessons learned. Clearly defining the problem will help you to clarify what to measure. The evaluation simply needs to have measurement tools in place to track these elements. Outcomes of a project involve the impact that the project had. This might include on performance indicators, but may also include some indirect benefits. The project will have been chosen because of a priority identified through the strategic assessment, which is the starting point against which to measure outcomes.

When evaluating, some initial questions may include:

- Did the project meet the objectives defined? If no, what were some of the reasons for the change?
- Did the project produce the agreed deliverables? If not, what were the reasons?
- Did the project deliver these outputs on time, including meeting any key milestones that were agreed? If not, what were the reasons for the delays?
- Did the project team engage effectively with stakeholders to ensure successful delivery? If not, how could this be improved?
- What was the total cost of the project? How was this cost met?
- Was the anticipated amount of resource used? Were additional resources required?
- What tangible impact did the project have on quantitative performance? Was this the anticipated impact?

There are three broad approaches to evaluations that would be beneficial to a partnership:

- **Impact evaluation** - This shows whether or not a project has met it objectives in terms of changing or reducing the problem identified. Also known as Outcome Evaluation and often referred to by the short hand of ‘what works?’;

- **Process Evaluation** – to help to answer the question ‘how did it work?’ This may involve consideration of who was involved and how the project was rolled out; and
- **Economic evaluation** – to help to answer the question ‘was it worth it?’ This may involve consideration of costs of the project against the savings brought. Resources such as people, buildings and time as well as money can be considered.

Undertaking these different types of evaluation will help to answer the overall question: ‘what works best in what circumstances?’ which complements the problem-oriented approach to crime reduction.

### D3.6 Suggested Practice - Who should do the evaluation

Many partnerships have the impression that evaluation has to be carried out by external evaluators and will be expensive in both time and money to conduct. However, many very good evaluations have been conducted by practitioners working on their own projects (for example the previous winners and shortlist of the Tilley Awards). The key to good newsletters, making presentations at conferences or workshops, or through informal networking is not who did the work, but whether the evaluation method meets the following criteria:

- Is clearly and fully shown (transparent);
- Measured what it claimed to measure (valid);
- Conclusions made only from the data presented (independent); and
- Others doing the evaluation would have produced the same results (replicable).

The following case studies from Hounslow Community Safety Partnerships and the Safer Middlesbrough Partnership highlight how influential conducting evaluation can be to supporting core business.

---

**Intelligence-led Business Processes and Engaged Communities:**

**Hounslow CSP** - A problem-solving project designed to tackle anti-social and criminal behaviour in alleyways had built in evaluation processes from the start.

Residents had high fear of crime regarding an alley area in their community. By collecting community information and also crime information about the area the CSP were able to identify the level of fear the residents experience, the reason why and also levels of crime and anti-social behaviour. The CSP used this information to tailor a project to address the crime, anti-social behaviour and fear of crime in the alley area. An evaluation of the project was conducted to identify the impact of the intervention.

**What they did**

Before the project began the local police consulted the residents on areas within their region that they perceived as problematic. The community information collected was used to support the development of interventions. The impact of the interventions was monitored to track the impact overtime.

**What it involved**

Along with community information, crime statistics for the area and environmental problems were reviewed to give a detailed view of the needs of the community. The findings of this process highlighted area within the residential district (the alleys) as the location of a wide range of criminal and anti-social behaviour.

The community information also highlighted that residents were under reporting incidents of crime and disorder in their area which made it difficult for the police to identify patterns of crime developing in particular locations. A series of projects were developed to address the criminal and anti-social behaviour in the alley areas.
The overall initiative was named the Reclaim Project and four specific objectives were agreed upon (1) community cohesion, (2) police intervention; (3) clean up the area and (4) reclaim the alley area for the residents.

These objectives were used as the key areas to monitor the success of the project. A review of the crime statistics and community views was conducted after the interventions were rolled out. The CSP also compared the crime statistics of this area with similar areas in the region to identify the nature of the impact.

**What impact it had**

The Reclaim Project achieved strong quantifiable results against targets. In particular the evaluation of the project highlighted:

- A 74% reduction in burglary in twelve months;
- A 76% decrease in problems of anti-social behaviour in six months and
- A 40% increase in public feelings of safety in the alleys in six months.

There was also an increase in the proportion of residents who lived close to the alleys reporting that they felt very safe or safe in their area after the project took place.

**Lessons Learned**

- Establishing clear objectives makes it easier to monitor progress and impact; and
- Making sure that the process of evaluating the project is part of the process will make it easier to track the outcome of the project.

**Intelligence-led business processes:**

Safer Middlesbrough Partnership (SMP) includes an economic impact section to their evaluation processes to identify the financial impact of the interventions.

The Safer Middlesbrough Partnership have recently established an intelligence-led business model that incorporates an evaluation model that includes the economic impact of the interventions that the partnership puts in place. The economic element focuses on the cost savings that each intervention or project conducted has had for the partnership. The partnership has also established a library of evaluations conducted to build up the corporate memory for future problem solving work.

When using internal staff resources to evaluate the projects or programmes, the partnership will want to ensure that there is sufficient time built in to the project for the staff to be able to complete the work. When staff members are under pressure to deliver pieces of work, it is often the evaluation that receives less attention, often resulting in a poor or undelivered evaluation. External evaluators can be drawn from partnership organisations, specialist research or evaluation companies or freelance consultants. The Social Research Association has produced some useful guidance on contracting researchers which can be applied to obtaining external evaluators.

Whoever does the evaluation, it is important that those commissioning it (often the strategy group) understand the purpose of evaluation and are able to construct clear and simple terms of reference for any evaluation undertaken.
D3.7 Suggested Practice - Using evaluation throughout the partnership process

There are four main ways in which your partnership can use the evaluations it undertakes;

- **Delivering the partnership plan** - Evaluation identifies what works best in which circumstances;
- **Monitoring the progress of the work** - Evaluations can help to highlight what adjustments need to be made to work being undertaken and any unintended consequences;
- **Conducting the strategic assessment** - The key findings of the evaluation, including the success factors, barriers and learning points, can inform the next year’s strategic assessment; and
- **Contributing to Appropriate Skills and Knowledge** - It is not only your own partnership that can benefit from the evaluations you undertake, other partnerships have an interest in your work (as you will have in theirs). It is vital that partnerships try to share the results of the evaluations as widely as possible. This may be through submission to the Effective Practice database (see the Additional Resources section below), writing for journals or working through peer groups.

D3.8 Additional Resources

There are a number of sources for advice and support with evaluation. In addition to those listed below, the Government Offices and the Welsh Assembly Government have researchers who have experience in evaluation and can provide advice and guidance. The Police and Partnerships Standards Unit in the Home Office are developing programmes to support partnerships in evaluation.


UK Evaluation Society [www.evaluation.org.uk](http://www.evaluation.org.uk)

Charities Evaluation Services [http://www.ces-vol.org.uk](http://www.ces-vol.org.uk)

National Community Safety Network [www.ncsn.org.uk](http://www.ncsn.org.uk)

Passport to Evaluation [http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/passport_to_evaluation.htm](http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/passport_to_evaluation.htm)


Partnerships may also be able to learn from the police experience of using the National Intelligence Model. Within the National Intelligence Model, there is a technique for evaluation called results analysis, which can be used to evaluate the outcome of problem solving activity. It involves looking at both intended and unintended consequences and assessing whether the problem has been reduced or merely displaced. More information on this subject can be found in ACPO (2006) Practice Advice on Tasking and Co-ordination, which can be viewed at the following address:


Once you have evaluated a project, you may want to consider submitting it for inclusion on the following websites, which are also good sources of effective practice:

The Effective Practice Database (currently called the Ideas Exchange until early 2008) housed on the Crime Reduction Website, contains examples of projects from across the country as a resource for practitioners and partnerships developing their plans. Any projects or programme that have been undertaken by partnership and which have an evaluation report can be entered onto the Database.

[http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/iex](http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/iex)
D3.9 Potential Barriers and Suggested Solutions

In preparing and/or revising the partnership plan, the strategy group and/or county strategy group may encounter some barriers. Below are some common challenges and suggested solutions to these:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Barriers</th>
<th>Suggested Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Evaluation process is viewed negatively by project teams who feel they are being tested | • Engage members of the team in the evaluation process to improve openness and transparency.  
• Ensure consensus has been met on the results Embed evaluation as a regular discipline at all levels (including senior) to demonstrate its importance. |
| Lack of resources to carry out evaluation                                          | • Carefully choose which projects to evaluate on the basis of the above criteria.   
• Embed simple evaluation processes within project specifications.                 |

D3 Implementation Checklist

Intelligence-led Business Processes:
✓ Do you have a process for deciding which projects to evaluate?
✓ Have you embedded the need to evaluate within these projects?
✓ Have you made resources available to carry out evaluation?
✓ Are lessons learnt included within your strategic assessment?

Appropriate Knowledge and Skills:
✓ Do you have a process for learning from previous evaluations?
✓ Do you understand what makes a good evaluation?

Visible and Constructive Accountability:
✓ Does the strategy group consider 'Value for Money' when commissioning and evaluating projects?
✓ Do you have a clear idea how effectively your previous partnership plan has been implemented?
✓ Do you share the results of your evaluations with others?
Appendices

A: List of additional resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Crime Reduction website</td>
<td>Home Office website aimed at practitioners to help them achieve and sustain reductions in crime and disorder. Interactive resource where practitioners, policy-makers and others can find guidance of good practice and share ideas and solutions.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas Exchange</td>
<td>Crime Reduction website</td>
<td>An Effective Practice Database housed on the Crime Reduction Website, containing examples of projects from across the country as a resource for practitioners and partnerships developing their plans.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/iex">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/iex</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Community Safety Network (NCSN)</td>
<td>National Community Safety Network website</td>
<td>Website for the NCSN, a practitioner-led organisation supporting those involved in promoting community safety/crime reduction throughout the UK. Provides news, information, research, best practice, web links and job vacancies.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.community-safety.net">www.community-safety.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal.net</td>
<td>Renewal.net website</td>
<td>Online guide to neighbourhood renewal, including how-to-guides, case studies, project summaries, toolkits, events, discussion forums and useful links.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.renewal.net">www.renewal.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA)</td>
<td>IDeA: Safer and Stronger Communities</td>
<td>IDeA Knowledge works for local government improvement by providing news and examples of good practice from councils across England and Wales. This section of the website provides community safety information.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pageId=448290">http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pageId=448290</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA) - Performance Management in Partnership</td>
<td>Performance Management in Partnership website</td>
<td>IDeA-sponsored community of practice space for Performance Management in Partnership, with links to resources, tools and guidance which can help in performance management in partnership.</td>
<td><a href="http://pmpartner.editme.com/">http://pmpartner.editme.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Association (LGA)</td>
<td>LGA: Community Safety</td>
<td>The LGA promotes the interests of local governments in England and Wales. This section of the website provides information on community safety.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lga.gov.uk/OurWork.asp?section=59&amp;root=870">http://www.lga.gov.uk/OurWork.asp?section=59&amp;root=870</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Watch</td>
<td>Part of the Crime Reduction website, this is the official Neighbourhood Watch website containing news, information, documents and useful links relating to the Neighbourhood Watch programme.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neighbourhoodwatch.gov.uk">www.neighbourhoodwatch.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Drug Action Teams (DAT)</td>
<td>Information to help partnerships, Drug Action Teams (DATs) and CDRPs/CSPs carry out their work, including news and events, information on the drug strategy, guidance, newsletters and useful links.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.drugs.gov.uk/dat/">www.drugs.gov.uk/dat/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Drug Intervention Programmes (DIP)</td>
<td>Information on the Drugs Intervention Programme (DIP) including the drugs strategy, news and events, guidance, case studies and publications.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.drugs.gov.uk/drug-interventions-programme/">www.drugs.gov.uk/drug-interventions-programme/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</td>
<td>Together We Can</td>
<td>Website for the government campaign to bring government and the people closer together. The site aims to provide sources of help including organisations, sources of funding, and advice.</td>
<td><a href="http://togetherwecan.direct.gov.uk">http://togetherwecan.direct.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</td>
<td>Cleaner Greener Safer Communities</td>
<td>Campaign to create quality spaces in which people want to live and can be proud of, which others will respect. Contains information on working in partnership, powers and tools available.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cleanersafergreener.gov.uk">www.cleanersafergreener.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</td>
<td>Arson Control Forum</td>
<td>The Arson Control Forum was created in April 2001 as a Government-led national body seeking to reduce arson-related deaths, injuries and damage. It brings together stakeholders such as the fire and rescue service, local authorities, the police service, insurance companies and government departments.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/fire/arsonreduction/arsoncontrolforum/">http://www.communities.gov.uk/fire/arsonreduction/arsoncontrolforum/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Justice (MoJ)</td>
<td>Community Justice</td>
<td>Part of the Government's agenda to tackle anti-social behaviour and the crime associated with it, bringing courts and the criminal justice system closer to the communities they serve. Contains news, media publications and useful links.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.communityjustice.gov.uk">www.communityjustice.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Justice (MoJ) – National Offender Management Service (NOMS)</td>
<td>Regional Reducing Re-offending Delivery Plan</td>
<td>The nine regions in England, and Wales, have all developed strategies to take forward work on the pathways, with appropriate regional partners leading work on each of the strands through their Regional Reducing Re-offending Partnership Boards.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ministryofjustice.gov.uk/category/regions">http://www.ministryofjustice.gov.uk/ category/regions</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF)</td>
<td>Respect Task Force</td>
<td>Central government, local agencies and citizens working together to tackle anti-social behaviour. Contains handbook, resources and good practice.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.respect.gov.uk">www.respect.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Transport (DfT)</td>
<td>Withinreach</td>
<td>DfT sponsored programme providing training and advice concerning accessibility planning. Contains guidance, toolkits, news, and useful links.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.within-reach.org.uk">www.within-reach.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Justice (MoJ) – National Offender Management Service (NOMS)</td>
<td>Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA)</td>
<td>General information on Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA), including links to MAPPA guidance and reports.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.noms.justice.gov.uk/protecting-the-public/Supervision/mappa">www.noms.justice.gov.uk/protecting-the-public/Supervision/mappa</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Police Improvement Agency (NPIA)</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Policing Programme</td>
<td>Information on the Neighbourhood Policing Programme, including guidance, practical advice, FAQs and useful links.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neighbourhoodpolicing.co.uk">www.neighbourhoodpolicing.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Association (LGA)</td>
<td>Reducing Offending and Re-offending Programme with the National Offender Management Service (NOMS)</td>
<td>Joint project between the LGA and NOMS that seeks to identify the potential benefits to local government and communities from closer working with correctional services, both probation and prisons and develop new relationships between correctional services and local government. Includes information on Community Payback.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.lga.gov.uk/ProjectAHome.asp?lsection=59&amp;ccat=946">https://www.lga.gov.uk/ProjectAHome.asp?lsection=59&amp;ccat=946</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Renewal Unit</td>
<td>Responsible for overseeing the Government’s comprehensive neighbourhood renewal strategy. Includes information on cross-sector regeneration programmes (New Deal for Communities, Neighbourhood Management, Neighbourhood Wardens, and business involvement in regeneration).</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=3">www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=3</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</td>
<td>New Deal for Communities (NDC)</td>
<td>Key programme in tackling multi-deprivation in the most deprived neighbourhoods. Contains information on areas where grants have been approved, how-to-guides, information on the Streetgames programme and contact lists.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=617">www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=617</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG) - Neighbourhood Renewal Unit</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Management</td>
<td>The Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder programme is a process involving communities working with local agencies to improve services at neighbourhood level. Neighbourhood management aims to tackle quality of life (“liveability”) issues in communities through better management of the local environment; increasing community safety; improving housing stock; working with young people; and encouraging employment opportunities.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=577">http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=577</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Travelwise Association and Living Streets</td>
<td>Walk to School Campaign</td>
<td>A campaign that asks parents, pupils and teachers to think about their journey to and from school, and how making this journey on foot can mitigate against reduced physical activity among children, increased childhood obesity, urban congestion and air pollution.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.walktoschool.org.uk/">http://www.walktoschool.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA)</td>
<td>Public space legislation resource</td>
<td>Providing a quick and easy point of reference for practitioners who want to find out what legislation is on the statute book in relation to all elements of open space management.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pageId=78105">http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pageId=78105</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Commission and Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA)</td>
<td>Library of local performance indicators: Community safety</td>
<td>An electronic library providing a source of ‘ready made’ performance indicators that you can adopt on a voluntary basis. All the indicators included in the electronic library have standard definitions to enable comparison where appropriate.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.local-pi-library.gov.uk/1">http://www.local-pi-library.gov.uk/1</a> LIBRARY-ALL_PK%3A%23APAFM%3ANUID%3D502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Office</td>
<td>Office of the Third Sector</td>
<td>Information about working with the third sector, including VCS development and community participation initiatives.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/third_sector/index.asp">www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/third_sector/index.asp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Non-Governmental Websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim Support</td>
<td>Victim Support website</td>
<td>Victim Support is the independent charity which helps people cope with the effects of crime providing free and confidential support and information to help victims deal with their experiences.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.victimsupport.org.uk/">http://www.victimsupport.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Concern</td>
<td>Crime Concern website</td>
<td>Crime Concern is a national crime prevention charity offering crime prevention and offender justice services. Crime Concern works largely, but not exclusively, with young people, providing routes away from crime and anti-social behaviour and back into full-time education and employment.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.crimeconcern.org.uk/">http://www.crimeconcern.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimestoppers</td>
<td>Crimestoppers website</td>
<td>Crimestoppers is an independent UK-wide charity working to stop crime. The charity operates across the UK to help identify, prevent, solve and reduce crime.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.crimestoppers-uk.org/">http://www.crimestoppers-uk.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College London – Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science</td>
<td>Jill Dando Institute website</td>
<td>The UCL Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science is the first in the world devoted specifically to reducing crime, through teaching, research, public policy analysis and by the dissemination of evidence-based information on crime reduction.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.jdi.ucl.ac.uk/">http://www.jdi.ucl.ac.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACRO</td>
<td>NACRO website</td>
<td>NACRO is an independent voluntary organisation working to prevent crime. Nacro has six main areas of work: resettlement, housing, education and employment, activities for young people, community and family schemes and finding better ways to reduce crime.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nacro.org.uk/">http://www.nacro.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The London Drug and Alcohol Network (LDAN) and Alcohol Concern</td>
<td>Local Alcohol Strategy Toolkit</td>
<td>A toolkit designed to help local policy makers and strategists in developing local responses to alcohol problems. It sets out a process for the work, and gives guidance on each step of the way.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.localalcoholstrategies.org.uk/">http://www.localalcoholstrategies.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Public Scrutiny (CPS)</td>
<td>Centre for Public Scrutiny (CPS) website</td>
<td>The Centre for Public Scrutiny was created to promote the value of scrutiny in modern and effective government – not only to hold executives to account but also to create a constructive dialogue between the public and its elected representatives – to improve the quality of public services.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cfps.org.uk/">http://www.cfps.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Research Association (SRA)</td>
<td>SRA website</td>
<td>The Social Research Association plays a unique role as an organisation open to social research practitioners and trainees from all sectors, as well as others with an interest in social research.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.the-sra.org.uk/">http://www.the-sra.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charities Evaluation Services</td>
<td>Charities Evaluation Services website</td>
<td>Charities Evaluation Services is the UK’s leading provider of information and advice on quality and evaluation systems for the voluntary sector.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ces-vol.org.uk/">http://www.ces-vol.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office – Drug Action Teams (DAT)</td>
<td>Audit Annex B</td>
<td>Suggestions on data sources that partnerships might consider during the strategic assessment process to ensure that the drugs element is based on an accurate assessment of the extent and nature of local misuse of drugs.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.drugs.gov.uk/publication-search/drug-strategy/audit-annex-b.pdf">www.drugs.gov.uk/publication-search/drug-strategy/audit-annex-b.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office – Drug Action Teams (DAT)</td>
<td>Audit Annex B</td>
<td>Suggestions on data sources that partnerships might consider during the strategic assessment process to ensure that the drugs element is based on an accurate assessment of the extent and nature of local misuse of drugs.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.drugs.gov.uk/publication-search/drug-strategy/audit-annex-b.pdf">www.drugs.gov.uk/publication-search/drug-strategy/audit-annex-b.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>iQuanta</td>
<td>iQuanta is an internet-based analysis tool developed by the Police and Crime Standards Directorate to turn statistical data routinely collected by the Home Office into useful outputs for understanding and improving policing performance at partnership level and above. Access to iQuanta is provided to police forces, police authorities and members of partnerships.</td>
<td><a href="https://iquanta.net/Default.aspx?tabid=27">https://iquanta.net/Default.aspx?tabid=27</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>National Plan for Domestic Violence</td>
<td>A national action plan that sets out the progress made so far in tackling domestic violence and outlines future proposals to further improve support to victims and bring more perpetrators to justice.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/domesticviolence/domesticviolence51.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/domesticviolence/domesticviolence51.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>National Community Safety Plan</td>
<td>The NCSP sets out the Government’s community safety priorities for 2006-2009. It outlines a new approach to community safety and aims to manage a coherent community safety programme across Government, providing people working in the field with a clear view of overall priorities.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/communitysafety01.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/communitysafety01.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Related Guidance and useful websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Crime &amp; Disorder Reduction Partnerships and Drug Action Team Integration/ Closer Working</td>
<td>This guidance issued in November 2003 outlines what measures CDRPs and DATs should take to integrate or work more closely together</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/integration.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/integration.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>What Crime &amp; Disorder Activities Fall Within the Remit of the Crime &amp; Disorder Act 1998</td>
<td>This weblink discusses what can date should be shared for crime &amp; disorder purposes.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/toolkits/ud0507.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/toolkits/ud0507.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>The use of geographic information systems by crime analysts in England and Wales, HO Report 03/07</td>
<td>This report presents findings from a survey to assess the extent to which GIS is used by crime analysts.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdf/07/rds000307.pdf">http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdf/07/rds000307.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Toolkit for community safety audit</td>
<td>This toolkit on the Crime Reduction Website gives guidance on how to conduct a crime &amp; disorder audit</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/toolkits/p031801.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/toolkits/p031801.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Crime Reduction Website - Routine Activity Theory</td>
<td>This website explains the theory behind RAT</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/rat.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/rat.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Crime Reduction website - SARA model</td>
<td>This page on the CRW explains the SARA problem solving model with links for further information</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/sara.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/sara.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Crime Reduction website - PROCTOR model</td>
<td>This page on the CRW explains the PROCTOR problem solving model with links for further information</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/skills/skill05.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/skills/skill05.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Crime Reduction Website - Passport to evaluation</td>
<td>This was devised by the Home Office. It looks at the basic techniques used to evaluate crime reduction projects.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/passport_to_evaluation.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/passport_to_evaluation.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Crime Reduction Website - Tilley Awards</td>
<td>The Tilley Award, funded by the Home Office, was set up in 1999 to encourage and recognise excellence in crime reduction using problem-oriented principles.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/tilley/tilleyawards2007.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/tilley/tilleyawards2007.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Child Matters</td>
<td>Information sharing guidance for children's practitioners</td>
<td>This website provides useful guidance on info sharing for those professionals dealing with children.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/directoryservices/informationsharing/">http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/directoryservices/informationsharing/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Related Guidance and useful websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Justice – National Offender Management Service</td>
<td>Civic Society Alliance Toolkit - Local Solutions to Reduce Re-offending by Adult and Young Offenders</td>
<td>A toolkit, showing how local authorities and local partners can develop a Civic Society Alliance to reduce re-offending</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lga.gov.uk/civicalliancetoolkit">www.lga.gov.uk/civicalliancetoolkit</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Police Improvement Agency (NPIA) - Neighbourhood Policing Programme</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Policing Partnership Guide</td>
<td>Information for community safety partners on the Neighbourhood Policing Programme, including advantages of joint working and case studies.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neighbourhoodpolicing.co.uk/publication.asp">www.neighbourhoodpolicing.co.uk/publication.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Association (LGA)</td>
<td>Neighbourhood by neighbourhood: local action to reduce re-offending</td>
<td>Report that outlines how local organisations with local knowledge are best placed to work with the prison and probation services to reduce re-offending.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lga.gov.uk/Publication.asp?lsection=59&amp;catid=5X1F07_7A7D3D42&amp;state=946">www.lga.gov.uk/Publication.asp?lsection=59&amp;catid=5X1F07_7A7D3D42&amp;state=946</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Association (LGA)</td>
<td>Checklist for local authorities in domestic violence partnership working</td>
<td>Appropriately prioritising work to tackle domestic violence is crucial - this checklist aims to help local authorities, within partnerships, work effectively to do this.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lga.gov.uk/Publication.asp?section=59&amp;catid=5X1F0DF_7A7D3DF7&amp;state=967">www.lga.gov.uk/Publication.asp?section=59&amp;catid=5X1F0DF_7A7D3DF7&amp;state=967</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA)</td>
<td>Joint working in waste: final report</td>
<td>Findings and recommendations from the project, which examined how joint working between authorities on waste management can achieve improved performance and drive efficiency.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.idea.gov.uk/ask/aia/4821781">http://www.idea.gov.uk/ask/aia/4821781</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</td>
<td>NDC How-to-guides</td>
<td>Guidance on applying for NDC finance, developing delivery plans, gathering baseline information and evaluating outcomes and milestones.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=619">www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=619</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Commission</td>
<td>Know your Communities toolkit</td>
<td>This website has a self assessment on how well councils know their communities.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.userfocus.audit-commission.gov.uk/KycHome.aspx">http://www.userfocus.audit-commission.gov.uk/KycHome.aspx</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Commission</td>
<td>Compiling neighbourhood profiles - a guide for local agencies</td>
<td>The purpose of this guide is to assist local agencies in: creating neighbourhood profiles under stage three of the five-stage framework for neighbourhood management of crime and anti-social behaviour; and reviewing current neighbourhood level activity and resource use to determine how to obtain better value for money (VFM).</td>
<td><a href="http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/neighbourhoodcrime/profiling.asp">http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/neighbourhoodcrime/profiling.asp</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office – Office for Criminal Justice Reform (OCJR)</td>
<td>CDRPs (CSPs) and LCJBs: How to work together</td>
<td>Guidance written for practitioners working in partnerships and LCJBs, highlighting those areas where both these local partnerships have common interests and suggesting ways in which they might work together.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/partnerinfo/07.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/partnerinfo/07.htm</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Commissioner’s Office (ICO)</td>
<td>Information Commissioner’s Office (ICO)</td>
<td>The Information Commissioner’s Office is the UK’s independent authority set up to promote access to official information and to protect personal information by promoting good practice, ruling on eligible complaints, providing information to individuals and organisations, and taking appropriate action when the law is broken. The ICO enforces and oversees the Data Protection Act, the Freedom of Information Act, the Environmental Information Regulations, and the Privacy and Electronic Communications Regulations.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ico.gov.uk/">http://www.ico.gov.uk/</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Related Guidance and useful websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NHS Wales</td>
<td>The Wales Accord for the Sharing of Personal Information (WASPI)</td>
<td>The purpose of this Accord is to enable service-providing and other organisations directly concerned with the well being of an individual to share information between them in a lawful and intelligent way.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wales.nhs.uk/sites3/home.cfm?orgid=702">http://www.wales.nhs.uk/sites3/home.cfm?orgid=702</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities Scotland</td>
<td>National Standards for Community Engagement</td>
<td>The Communities Scotland website has a section on community engagement which contains standards for CE.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.communitiesscotland.gov.uk">www.communitiesscotland.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofsted</td>
<td>Tellus 2 surveys</td>
<td>This website offers information on Tellus2 surveys which can help to garner the views of young people.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/">http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</td>
<td>Local Area Agreements</td>
<td>The CLG website has information on LAAs.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/localgovernment/performancetargetsandpartnerships/localareaagreements/">http://www.communities.gov.uk/localgovernment/performancetargetsandpartnerships/localareaagreements/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</td>
<td>Safer Stronger Communities Fund - Taking the agreements forward</td>
<td>This guidance explains the Safer Strong Communities Fund and how it feeds into LAAs</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/publications.asp?did=1545">http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/publications.asp?did=1545</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</td>
<td>Safer Stronger Communities Fund - Indicators of Strong Communities</td>
<td>This document gives the indicators for strong communities.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/publications.asp?did=1567">http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/publications.asp?did=1567</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## White Papers and Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
B: Neighbourhood Policing

The purpose of Neighbourhood Policing is to deliver the right people, at the right places and in the right numbers, in order to create neighbourhoods that are safe and feel safe. The Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) leads the Neighbourhood Policing Programme. The programme was established to support the achievement of dedicated Neighbourhood Teams in all areas of England and Wales by 2008 and the target of 16,000 Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) by April 2007.

Neighbourhood Policing aims to provide communities with:

- Access – to policing or community safety services through a named point of contact;
- Influence – over community safety priorities in their neighbourhood;
- Interventions – joint action with communities and partners to solve problems; and
- Answers – sustainable solutions to problems and feedback on results.

Whilst ‘neighbourhood’ generally describes a geographic area, there is no universal definition shared by all community safety partners. Communities themselves also have widely differing views of what constitutes their neighbourhood. For the purposes of neighbourhood policing, a neighbourhood is defined through local agreement between communities, local authorities, police and partner organisations.

As each Neighbourhood Team is dedicated to a locally agreed geographic area, the size and composition will vary according to local need and resources. There is not a ‘one size fits all’ model to neighbourhood policing and partnerships will need to take into account the differing local circumstances that may exist across a partnership area.

In operational terms neighbourhood policing can be understood as:

- An organisational strategy that allows the police, its partners and the public to work closely together to solve problems of crime and disorder, and improve neighbourhood conditions and feelings of security;
- A mainstream policing activity and integrated with other policing services;
- Requiring evidence based deployment of neighbourhood teams against identified need;
- Establishes dedicated, identifiable, accessible, knowledgeable and responsive neighbourhood policing teams which provide all citizens with a named point of access;
- Reflects local conditions and is flexible, responsive and adaptable;
- Allows the police service to work directly with the local community to identify the problems that are most important to them, thereby giving people direct influence over local policing priorities;
- Establishes a regime for engaging other agencies and the public in problem solving mechanisms;
- Uses the National Intelligence Model as the basis for deployment;
- Requires an effective engagement, communication and feedback strategy, and a clear explanation of where accountability lies; and
- Should be subject to rigorous performance management including clear performance monitoring against a local plan and commitments made to neighbourhoods.
Police and partners need to work with communities not only to make neighbourhoods free from crime and disorder, but also to make people feel safe in them. However, community safety is not just a policing issue. Community safety issues can significantly influence the public's perception of the quality of public service provision for example, dealing with abandoned vehicles, graffiti, or tackling nuisance neighbours can have a huge impact on the way the public judge the quality of public services. Working with communities to identify and resolve the problems that have the greatest impact on them can bring significant improvements to the sense of community wellbeing and the perception of the quality of local services.

Not all crime is local. There are links between national and international threats and events and the impact that these can have on local communities, for example, people trafficking, prostitution, terrorism and serious and organised crime. Appropriate delivery structures and processes should be in place at all levels of delivery within the police and partner agencies to ensure that there is sufficient capacity to impact upon these broader issues effectively.

The National Reassurance Policing Programme (NRPP) introduced a form of Neighbourhood Policing across 16 sites in England between 2003 – 2005. The programme involved local communities in identifying crime and disorder issues in their neighbourhoods, which they then tackled together with the police and other public service providers and partners.

The evaluation of the NRPP (published in January 2006) found the results of the programme to be consistently positive. The evidence showed that improvements in key outcomes such as levels of crime, perceptions of anti-social behaviour, and feelings of safety after dark and public confidence in the police were directly attributable to the NRPP approach. The programme also delivered significant improvements in trust amongst communities themselves.

When properly implemented, Neighbourhood Policing works to cut crime and anti-social behaviour and to increase public confidence. The three critical elements were found to be:

- The presence of visible, accessible and locally known authority figures in neighbourhoods, in particular police officers and PCSOs;
- Community involvement in the process of identifying priorities and taking action to deal with them; and
- Targeted policing activity and problem solving to tackle crimes and disorder that matter most to local people.

Communities notice the difference when the police work directly on the problems prioritised by local people. Involving individuals and communities in collaborative problem solving together with police and partners has a significant impact on perceptions of safety.

Evidence shows that communities want local Neighbourhood Policing to tackle the issues that matter most to them. Community engagement, which lies at the heart of the approach, brings highly localised problems to the attention of the police. Neighbourhood Policing enables communities to determine the priorities for action. When Neighbourhood Teams tackle these in partnership with communities and other local services neighbourhoods feel safer and are safer for those living and working in them.
The 42 Local Criminal Justice Boards (LCJBs) in England and Wales were established non-statutorily in 2003 and are based on police force/criminal justice areas. Membership comprises chief officers of the police, crown prosecution, court, prison, probation and youth offending services.

LCJBs are responsible for joining up the Criminal Justice System (CJS) at the local CJS area level and are increasingly involved in managing the change across the CJS. They focus on improving the effectiveness of the CJS by bringing more offences to justice, reducing ineffective trials, improving the experience of victims and witnesses, driving delivery of the timeliness target in the Persistent Young Offenders (PYO) pledge, delivering the Prolific and other Priority Offender (PPO) CJS Premium Service, improving enforcement and increasing public confidence in the CJS.

There are many overlaps between the agendas of community safety partnerships and LCJBs. They can work together to reinforce each other’s area of work. Key areas of common interest are:

- Public confidence;
- Support and services for victims; and
- Management of offenders, including re-offending.

Other areas will be determined by local priorities.

The creation of the county strategy group (see L1 for further details) can support and facilitate closer joint working between community safety partnerships and LCJBs. It can enable the LCJB to make meaningful links with community safety partnerships that will influence district level partnerships at operational level, but to retain their strategic oversight to ensure efficient local delivery of the CJS.
The National Offender Management Service (NOMS) was created in 2004 with the aim of reducing re-offending and protecting the public. NOMS, based within the Ministry of Justice, comprises of a number of organisations including the prison and probation services, and is putting a system in place to deliver end-to-end management of offenders.

The organisation’s key responsibilities are delivering a reduction in re-offending; protecting the public and the management of offenders. The management of offenders is devolved to nine regional offices in England and one office in Wales. The English regional offices are led by Regional Offender Managers. The Wales office is led by a Director of Offender Management.

These leaders are experts in the offending-related problems of their local area and are responsible for:

- commissioning services for their region;
- developing a regional reducing re-offending delivery plan; and
- co-ordinating regional and local partnerships.

The cross-government National Reducing Re-offending Delivery Plan (NRRDP), launched in November 2005, outlines the Government commitment on improving offenders’ access to mainstream services across the seven pathways as identified by the Social Exclusion Unit’s report on ‘Reducing Re-offending by ex-Prisoners’ (2002):

- Accommodation;
- Employment and Skills;
- Children and Families;
- Finance, Benefit and Debt;
- Attitudes, Thinking and Behaviour;
- Drugs and Alcohol; and
- Health.

The nine regions in England, and Wales, have all developed strategies to take forward work on the pathways, with appropriate regional partners leading work on each of the strands through their Regional Reducing Re-offending Partnership Boards.

As the NRRDP was only designed to cover a period of 18 months, NOMS and partners have begun the process of developing a new three year strategic plan to take into account the new cross government PSA targets on drugs, alcohol and social exclusion. The plan will also need to promote the wider engagement of partners; support the continued delivery of offender management and the NOMS reform programme; and link to the CJS and wider government strategies. Key to its success will be its ability to drive effective local delivery.
E: Changes in the Local Delivery Landscape – The Offender Management Act 2007

The Offender Management Act (2007) aims to improve the delivery of probation services to reduce re-offending and better protect the public. It will do so by enabling the establishment of probation trusts (replacing probation boards) and supporting the development of the commissioning of probation services in greater partnership with providers in the voluntary, charitable and private sectors.

Commissioning will take place at national, regional, and local levels. The national commissioning and partnership framework will set out NOMS’ priorities for England and Wales. The national priorities will find expression in the regional commissioning and partnership plans, which will also reflect the Regional Reducing Re-offending Plans developed by the Regional Reducing Re-offending Partnership Boards. These commissioning plans will be developed in full consultation with regional and local providers, and sentencers.

Regional commissioners (Regional Offender Managers), acting on behalf of the Secretary of State, will contract with lead providers for the delivery of services in a probation area. The lead provider will concentrate on the delivery of offender management, while sub-contracting much of their interventions work to other providers based on what is most effective, and who is best placed to deliver, in their local community (known as local commissioning).

Providing their performance meets the requirements, the lead provider in a probation area will be the public sector probation trust. Due to their local knowledge and relationships, Probation Trusts, as NOMS’ lead providers, have a critical role to play and will provide assistance in ensuring that access to mainstream local services are improved for offenders through both joint commissioning and partnership arrangements. The Act creates a variety of opportunities to strengthen further the relationship between community safety partnerships and NOMS in tackling re-offending:

- Supporting Regional Offender Managers commission services to improve public protection and reducing re-offending at local level, for example through joint commissioning;
- Building effective partnerships with local agencies, voluntary groups and other local partnerships such as Local Criminal Justice Boards to tackle the social exclusion faced by offenders; and
- Aligning resources to support securing effective services to tackle re-offending. This will require making the necessary links between reducing crime and reducing re-offending.
**F: Crime and Disorder Act Review**

The Government announced a review of the partnership provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, as amended by the Police Reform Act 2002, in the police reform White Paper – Building Communities, Beating Crime – in November 2004. The review was conducted jointly by the representative bodies of all the agencies with responsible authority status on partnerships, and included input via regional workshops from well over 400 practitioners and other stakeholders. Representatives of other key central Government departments were also involved.

The partnership landscape had changed substantially since partnerships were first created in 1998, with the introduction of Local Area Agreements and the changing role of local government presenting new challenges for partnerships. Changes in the Criminal Justice System and the delivery of the police reform agenda also affected how partnerships did business. The review, therefore, was a timely piece of work that would help ensure all partnerships were in a good position to adapt to a changing delivery landscape and take on any new challenges.

The overall objective of the review was to strengthen the visibility, responsiveness, accountability, membership and role of local partnerships. The aim is to make them the most effective possible vehicle for tackling crime, anti-social behaviour and substance misuse.

The Home Office, the Local Government Association, the Association of Chief Police Officers and the Association of Police Authorities worked together on the review between November 2004 and January 2005. Over 450 key stakeholders and practitioners were consulted through four regional seminars and many contributed through e-questionnaires and submissions.

The report of the review findings was published in January 2006 (http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/partnerships60.htm) and led to the legislative changes in the Police and Justice Act 2006.

The Government Offices and the Home Office jointly arranged ten stakeholder consultation events around the country, followed by another two events arranged with the Welsh Assembly Government in Wales. These events sought views and information on the implementation of the review findings and, specifically, what should be included in new legislation for partnerships.
G: Composition of Partnerships

Responsible authorities have a statutory duty to work with other local agencies and organisations to develop and implement strategies to tackle crime and disorder including anti-social and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment as well as the misuse of drugs in their area. (s6, Crime and Disorder Act 1998 as amended by s97 and s98 Police Reform Act 2002 and s1, Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005).

These statutory partnerships are known as Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) or Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) in Wales.

The responsible authorities set out in s 5 Crime and Disorder Act 1998 are:

- police;
- police authorities;
- local authorities;
- fire and rescue authorities;
- local health boards (LHBs) in Wales; and
- primary care trusts (PCTs) in England (added on 30 April 2004).

Responsible authorities are under a statutory duty to ensure that the key agencies come together to work in partnership in a CDRP/CSP. They are required to work in co-operation with probation boards parish councils, NHS Trusts, NHS Foundation Trusts, proprietors of independent schools and governing bodies of an institution within the further education sector and to work closely with Drug Action Teams in two-tier local authority areas and have developed integrated working arrangements in unitary authority areas. They are also expected to invite a range of local private, voluntary, other public and community groups including the public to become involved in the strategy process.

While the term ‘partnership’ is applied to all those who sit round the table, legally, the responsible authorities are the only bodies or agencies under the duty to meet the new regulatory requirements.

From 31 July 2007, Registered Social Landlords (in England) will be co-operating bodies with the responsible authorities of community safety partnerships and the Environment Agency in England will become an invitee to participate with the responsible authorities in their functions on the partnership. The Welsh Assembly Government will be considering changing the status of Registered Social Landlords and the Environment Agency in Wales later in the year.
H: Partnerships and the National Intelligence Model

The National Intelligence Model (NIM) is the intelligence-led business process that is statutory for all police forces in England and Wales to use.

Partnerships may find it sensible to adopt aspects of the NIM model as a framework for partnership working to facilitate a joint approach with their police partners. This appendix outlines how a partnership may adopt aspects of NIM to structure their business and meet the Hallmarks set out in this Guidance.

The use of NIM ensures that activity to reduce crime, disorder, anti-social behaviour and substance misuse is delivered in a targeted manner through the collection and analysis of information, which is used to guide activity. The model involves identifying, understanding and addressing underlying problems and trends through the use of analysis, and is then used to prioritise issues, based on risk, and allocate resources to deal with them.

The NIM process is introduced in the following diagram and further explained in sections 1.1 – 1.11.

1.1 Knowledge Assets

The four assets are the building blocks that are the foundation of the model. Within the partnership, it is important that all staff involved in agreeing priorities and carrying out activity to deal with them have the professional knowledge to work effectively and to understand the processes within which they work, including an understanding of the role and use of intelligence.

1.2 System Assets

Within the partnership, it is important that there are systems in place to ensure the lawful sharing of information and the secure storage and use of information once it has been shared, according to the new Information Sharing Regulations.

1.3 Source Assets

Within the partnership, it is important that the staff responsible for producing the strategic assessment and partnership plan are aware of the different types of information available to them, how they are collected, evaluated, and used.

1.4 People Assets

Within the partnership, it is important that all staff involved in agreeing priorities and carrying out activity to deal with them know their roles and responsibilities in relation to NIM. It is also important that staff are properly trained to carry out these roles and responsibilities.

More information on all the roles and responsibilities required to make NIM work can be found in ACPO(2007) Practice Advice on Resources and the People Assets of NIM.
1.5 Information sources

The first stage of the NIM process is to ensure that appropriate information sources are available. The minimum standards contribute to performance in this area by creating a duty to share certain types of information (G2) and by describing the kinds of information that should be used within a strategic assessment (A1). The minimum standards also describe the need for community consultation and the possible process to be used (G3).

1.6 Intelligence/Information Recording

The NIM sets out standards for the recording on information so that is available for use to help make strategic and tactical decisions. This element of NIM is unlikely to apply to partnerships adopting its use. The majority of information used by the partnership will be recorded and collected by the member organisations. If the partnership do begin to record and collect their own information there should be appropriate management processes in place.

1.7 Research, Development and Analysis

This element of the NIM is core to the success of an intelligence-led business process. It is at this stage in the process where a wide variety of information is brought together and given meaning. Critical links and associations between bits of information are made and inferences are drawn. This work is carried out in an intelligence unit. Within a partnership, an intelligence unit could be made up of a combination of researchers, to develop information, and analysts. For analysts and/or researchers to carry out their jobs effectively they must have easy access to the information that the partnership has collected. They must also have access to open source, or public access information.

The Hallmarks contribute to performance in this area by outlining the analytical contribution to strategic assessments (A2).

More information about the work of analysts can be found in ACPO (forthcoming) Practice Advice for Analysis. Although a document aimed for analysts working for the police, it has been designed to be equally applicable to analysts working within a partnership environment.

1.8 Intelligence Products

Within NIM there are four intelligence products. The following table shows the four intelligence products and how they could be used within a partnership environment.
**Strategic assessment**

- Drives the business of the strategy group meeting.
- Aids and supports strategic business planning and resource allocation.
- Informs the strategy group of the issues likely to affect the partnership in the coming year and recommends which should be a priority.
- Assists the agreement of partnership priorities.

**Tactical assessment**

- Drives the business of the partnership tasking and co-ordination group (where the partnership has set one up).
- Assists and supports tactical planning and resource allocation to resolve problems.
- Informs the tasking and co-ordination group of the current problems that link to the priority areas and makes proposals for continued prevention/reduction activity.
- Ensures tactical activity is aligned to the agreed partnership priorities.

**Subject profile**

Establishes a greater understanding of either a person or group of people (whether suspects, victims or witnesses) in relation to an identified problem and a record of activity for tactical opportunities to resolve the problem. For example a profile of a family causing anti-social behaviour and the activity taken to prevent and reduce their behaviour and its impact on the community.

**Problem profile**

Establishes a greater understanding of an identified problem and a record of activity for tactical opportunities to resolve the problem. For example a profile of youths drinking on a playground and the activity taken to reduce and prevent their behaviour and its impact on the community.

The Hallmarks contribute to performance in this area by making it a statutory obligation for each partnership to produce a strategic assessment (A2).

### 1.9 Tasking and Co-ordination

It is the tasking and co-ordination process that provides partnership leaders with a decision-making mechanism by which they can manage the business of the partnership strategically and tactically.

Within a partnership, the strategy group will carry out strategic tasking and co-ordination. The strategy group are responsible for setting the priorities that the partnership will work to and making individuals responsible for delivery in each area. The strategy group are ultimately responsible for the performance of the partnership, especially in the areas identified as priorities.

Partnerships could also set up a tasking and co-ordination group to manage the tactical delivery of priorities. The tasking and co-ordination group could be informed by a tactical assessment. (See D1 for further details of this)
The minimum standards contribute to performance in this area by setting out the governance arrangements for the strategy group (G1). This guidance also provides advice on how tasking and co-ordination groups can manage tactical delivery (D1).

Further information about how to set up and run tasking and co-ordination meetings can be found in ACPO (2006) Practice Advice on Tasking and Co-ordination.

1.10 Tactical Resolution

This element refers to the actual activity that takes place to resolve problems. Within a partnership activity to resolve problems may be undertaken by a wide range of people. Partnerships can use problem solving creatively and to use a wide range of resources ensuring that prevention, further information collection, enforcement and community reassurance are key pillars to any planned activity.

Problems will range in scope and scale. A large problem may be broken down into smaller problems or projects. Regardless of the scale or scope of a problem or project each should be clearly owned by a named individual who should be held accountable for the progress of the problem or project through the tasking and co-ordination process.

Some problems will be supported by a problem profile and one or more subject profiles. Others will be supported with some simple problem solving analysis using SARA or PROCTOR. In all cases there must be clear records of the planned activity and use of resources and the outcome of all activity. Without clear records it is difficult to co-ordinate activity across the partnership or to measure the success of outcomes.

This guidance also provides advice on addressing problems (D2).

1.11 Operational Review

Operational review is an essential element of any intelligence-led business processes. It ensures that lessons are learnt from activity that has taken place and that they are retained for future use to improve outcomes. A review should be a genuine assessment of the successes and failures of activity.

This guidance provides advice on how effectiveness can be evaluated in (D3).

More information on operational review and results analysis can be found in all of ACPO NIM products.
Local Strategic Partnerships are non-statutory, multi-agency partnerships. They bring together at a local level the different parts of the public, private, community and voluntary sectors; allowing different initiatives and services to support one another so that they can work together more effectively. Local Strategic Partnerships are not single organisations, but a “family” of partnerships and/or themed sub-groups. How individual Local Strategic Partnerships are structured is down to local determination.

Local Area Agreements

Local Area Agreements set out the priorities for a local area agreed between central government and a local area (the local authority and Local Strategic Partnership) and other key partners at the local level. Local Area Agreements simplify some central funding, help join up public services more effectively and allow greater flexibility for local solutions to local circumstances.

Local Area Agreements are structured around four blocks (or policy fields): children and young people, safer and stronger communities, healthier communities and older people, and economic development and enterprise.

Local Area Agreements are subject to an annual refresh, which should coincide with the new strategic assessments which partnerships will now carry out. The three year cycle of a Local Area Agreement should also coincide with that of partnership plans for community safety partnerships. The priorities decided on by your partnership should therefore inform those which go into the Local Area Agreement. The process for doing so will vary according to each area, so partnerships should make themselves aware of local arrangements. The local government white paper, “Strong and Prosperous Communities” states that in agreeing the Local Area Agreement, partners should have regard to key local plans, which will include the strategic assessments and partnership plans produced by community safety partnerships.

In two-tier areas, the responsibility for Local Area Agreements sits at the county level. Under the proposals set out in the White paper, county authorities will be under a duty to consult and involve districts when drawing up their Local Area Agreements. This links in with the requirement under the legislation for district level community safety partnerships to identify priorities for inclusion in the county-wide Local Area Agreement. The county strategy group as set out in the legislation will be the key means of linking the work of district level community safety partnerships into county-wide Local Area Agreements.
Diagrams - England

This diagram shows an example of structures and processes in **two-tier areas**. There is obviously flexibility within these arrangements, but it demonstrates how the structures should enable district level priorities to both feed into and be informed by the Local Area Agreement (LAA). It also demonstrates how the county-level group can facilitate closer working between district community safety partnerships.

The below diagram shows an example of structures and processes in a unitary area. There is obviously flexibility within these arrangements but it demonstrates how the structures should enable priorities to both feed into and be informed by the Local Area Agreement (LAA).
J: Information Sharing Regulations

Details of the information sets that must be shared on at least a quarterly basis are given below. In each case, the duty applies to information relating to the partnership area as defined by the district or unitary authority area. This duty only applies when the authority holds the information so it does not require the collection of any additional information. The purpose of sharing this information is to enable the profiling of crime and disorder trends and patterns within the area. For this reason, in most cases, it is the record level data that is specified rather than aggregate data or statistics. Analysis can then take place across a number of different datasets on at least a quarterly basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Datasets (for the area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police force</td>
<td>1. Records on anti-social behaviour, transport and public safety/welfare <strong>incidents</strong> recorded according to the National Incident Category List. Whatever information is recorded about the time, date, location and category of each incident must be disclosed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>Crime records</strong> recorded according to the Notifiable Offences list. Whatever information is recorded about the time, date, location and sub-category of each crime must be disclosed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and rescue authority</td>
<td>3. Records on <strong>deliberate fires</strong>, whether it was a deliberate primary fire (not in a vehicle), a deliberate secondary fire (not in a vehicle) or a deliberate fire in a vehicle. In addition, records on <strong>incidents of violence against employees</strong> and records of fires attended in dwellings where <strong>no smoke alarm</strong> was fitted. For all these records, whatever information is recorded about the time, date and location of the fire must be shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Records on <strong>malicious false alarms</strong>. Whatever information is recorded about the time and date of each call and the purported location of those alarms must be shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>5. Records on <strong>road traffic collisions</strong>. Whatever information is recorded about the time, date, location and the number of adults and children killed, seriously injured and slightly injured in each road traffic collision must be shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Records on <strong>fixed term and permanent school exclusions</strong>. Whatever information is held about the age and gender of the pupil, the name and address of the school from which they were excluded and the reasons for their exclusion must be shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. <strong>Records of racial incidents</strong>. Whatever information is held about the time, date and location of each incident must be shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Records of <strong>anti-social behaviour incidents</strong> identified by the authority or reported by the public. Whatever information is held about the category, time, date and location of each incident must be shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Datasets (for the area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Primary Care Trust (lying entirely or partly in the area) | 9. Records on various categories of hospital admissions. The relevant admissions are those relating to the following blocks within the International Classification of Diseases:  
   a) assault (X85-Y09);  
   b) mental and behavioural disorders due to psychoactive substance use (F10-F19);  
   c) toxic effect of alcohol (T51); and  
   d) other entries where there is evidence of alcohol involvement determined by blood alcohol level (Y90) or evidence of alcohol involvement determined by level of intoxication (Y91). For each record, whatever information is held about the date of the admission, the sub-category of the admission and the outward part of the postcode (the first part of the postcode, before the space which separates it from the second part) of the patient’s address must be shared.  
10. Records of admissions to hospital in respect of domestic abuse. Whatever information is held about the date of the admission and the outward part of the postcode of the patient’s address must be shared.  
12. Records of ambulance call outs to crime and disorder incidents. Whatever information is held about the category, time, date and location of each ambulance call out must be shared. |
K: Worked Example

How the new business process might work:

**Leadership** established at district and county level.

**Information-sharing Protocol** agreed and signed by all responsible authorities and other agencies.

**Information Shared**, both depersonalised information sets included in new legislation, information gathered from community and additional information.

**Community consulted** about their priorities.

**Strategic Assessment** conducted to identify crime issues.

**Priorities** identified, for e.g. street crime, and escalated to county-level group in two-tier areas – passed to Local Strategic Partnership for possible inclusion in Local Area Agreement.

**Partnership Plan** produced to outline how to deliver on priorities in coming year and three years, e.g. accessing funding through Local Area Agreement (Safer and Stronger Communities and other blocks).

**Summary of Partnership Plan** published, outlining steps that will be taken to deliver on priorities and consult communities.

**Delivery Structure** considered, e.g. setting up an action group to deal with street crime, or city centre issues.
Further Analysis of individual priorities, using depersonalised and personal information shared between partners, to further define the problem and establish baselines e.g. the street crime, action group may identify that students walking along a particular street in the evening are one group of victims and that the majority of offenders are already known within the criminal justice system.

Tactical Options considered e.g. the street crime, action group may consider running an information campaign through the local university, focusing on rehabilitation of offenders once they are released from prison, or improving street-lighting. The solutions are chosen will depend on the precise problems identified through analysis, but should consider the role that can be played by other agencies, including those from the criminal justice system.

Governance within the action group agreed e.g. deciding responsibility for actions, a meeting structure, 6 monthly and annual targets and how to report to relevant partners.

Evaluation of initiatives on an ongoing basis to ensure real improvements e.g. reductions in street crime, and ensuring crime is not simply being displaced elsewhere.

Leadership within partnership to monitor progress on reductions in street crime, e.g. considering number of street crime incidents at quarterly meetings, involving representatives of the criminal justice agencies at meetings.

Strategic Assessment following year to reassess priorities e.g. to identify whether street crime should still be a priority.

Refresh Partnership Plan outlining what will be done to address new priorities, e.g. whether more will be done to address street crime.

Publish Summary of Plan in order to report back to community on progress e.g. reductions in street crime.
L: Index of Case Studies

This table will help you identify where relevant case studies are for each of the Hallmarks of an Effective Partnership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hallmark</th>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empowered &amp; Effective Leadership</strong></td>
<td>East Sussex - Merging the DAAT and County Community Safety Support Teams</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hounslow CDRP – working with NOMS / ROMS</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wrexham and Flintshire CSP – Joint Action Groups (JAGs)</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safer Southwark Partnership – Camberwell Street Drinking Initiative</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intelligence-led Business Processes</strong></td>
<td>Safer Southwark Partnership – The Partnership Operations Group (POG)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coventry Consortium of Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) &amp; Coventry CDRP</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dudley CSP - Using information from the Fire Services</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birmingham CSP - Analysing intelligence to determine priorities</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly Community Safety Partnership - Producing a strategic assessment that works at both county and CDRP-level</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preston CSP – Preventing alcohol-related crime</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safer Southwark Partnership – Camberwell Street Drinking Initiative</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humberside Association of Neighbourhood Watch Groups - Community Problem Solving Kit</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hounslow CSP - A problem-solving project with built in evaluation processes</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safer Middlesbrough Partnership (SMP)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective &amp; Responsive Delivery Structures</strong></td>
<td>Hounslow CDRP – working with NOMS / ROMS</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Sussex County – Successful and supportive County/District relationships</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safer Southwark Partnership – The Partnership Operations Group (POG)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wrexham and Flintshire CSP – Joint Action Groups</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humberside Association of Neighbourhood Watch Groups – Community Problem Solving Kit</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallmark</td>
<td>Case Study</td>
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<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engaged Communities</strong></td>
<td>Liverpool - Respect Weeks of Action</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preston CSP – Preventing alcohol-related crime</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td>99</td>
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hounslow CSP - A problem-solving project with built in evaluation processes</td>
<td>104</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Policing summaries in Leicestershire - Communicating plans to the public</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safer Southwark Partnership – Camberwell Street Drinking Initiative</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriate Skills and Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Safer Blaenau Gwent – Developing local training products</td>
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Appendices

A: List of additional resources

Strategy Regulations
Information Sharing Regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Community Safety Websites</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Crime Reduction website</td>
<td>Home Office website aimed at practitioners to help them achieve and sustain reductions in crime and disorder. Interactive resource where practitioners, policy-makers and others can find guidance of good practice and share ideas and solutions.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas Exchange</td>
<td>Crime Reduction website</td>
<td>An Effective Practice Database housed on the Crime Reduction Website, containing examples of projects from across the country as a resource for practitioners and partnerships developing their plans.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/ies">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/ies</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Community Safety Network (NCSN)</td>
<td>National Community Safety Network website</td>
<td>Website for the NCSN, a practitioner-led organisation supporting those involved in promoting community safety/crime reduction throughout the UK. Provides news, information, research, best practice, web links and job vacancies.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.community-safety.net">www.community-safety.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal.net</td>
<td>Renewal.net website</td>
<td>Online guide to neighbourhood renewal, including how-to-guides, case studies, project summaries, toolkits, events, discussion forums and useful links.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.renewal.net">www.renewal.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA)</td>
<td>IDeA: Safer and Stronger Communities</td>
<td>IDeA Knowledge works for local government improvement by providing news and examples of good practice from councils across England and Wales. This section of the website provides community safety information.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pageId=448290">http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pageId=448290</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA) - Performance Management in Partnership</td>
<td>Performance Management in Partnership website</td>
<td>IDeA-sponsored community of practice space for Performance Management in Partnership, with links to resources, tools and guidance which can help in performance management in partnership.</td>
<td><a href="http://pmpartner.editme.com/">http://pmpartner.editme.com/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specific Initiative Websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Watch</td>
<td>Part of the Crime Reduction website, this is the official Neighbourhood Watch website containing news, information, documents and useful links relating to the Neighbourhood Watch programme.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neighbourhoodwatch.gov.uk.com">www.neighbourhoodwatch.gov.uk.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Drug Action Teams (DAT)</td>
<td>Information to help partnerships, Drug Action Teams (DATs) and CDRPs/CSPs carry out their work, including news and events, information on the drug strategy, guidance, newsletters and useful links.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.drugs.gov.uk/dat/">www.drugs.gov.uk/dat/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Drug Intervention Programmes (DIP)</td>
<td>Information on the Drugs Intervention Programme (DIP) including the drugs strategy, news and events, guidance, case studies and publications.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/ip/intronationalprogrammes/dip/">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/ip/intronationalprogrammes/dip/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</td>
<td>Together We Can mini-site</td>
<td>Section of the Crime Reduction website that provides information on domestic violence.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/df/d001.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/df/d001.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</td>
<td>Cleaner Greener Safer Communities</td>
<td>Campaign to create quality spaces in which people want to live and can be proud of, which others will respect. Contains information on working in partnership, powers and tools available and innovative approaches and good practice.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cleanersafergreener.gov.uk">www.cleanersafergreener.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</td>
<td>Arson Control Forum</td>
<td>The Arson Control Forum was created in April 2001 as a Government-led national body seeking to reduce arson-related deaths, injuries and damage. It brings together stakeholders such as the fire and rescue service, local authorities, the police service, insurance companies and government departments.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/fire/arsonreduction/arsoncontrolforum/">http://www.communities.gov.uk/fire/arsonreduction/arsoncontrolforum/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Justice (MoJ)</td>
<td>Community Justice</td>
<td>Part of the Government’s agenda to tackle anti-social behaviour and the crime associated with it, bringing courts and the criminal justice system closer to the communities they serve. Contains news, media publications and useful links.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.communityjustice.gov.uk">www.communityjustice.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Justice (MoJ) – National Offender Management Service (NOMS)</td>
<td>Regional Reducing Re-offending Delivery Plan</td>
<td>The nine regions in England, and Wales, have all developed strategies to take forward work on the pathways, with appropriate regional partners leading work on each of the strands through their Regional Reducing Re-offending Partnership Boards.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.justice.gov.uk/govt-website/strategy/reducing-reoffender-delivery-plan/reducing-reoffending-delivery?view=Standard&amp;pubId=3810988">http://www.justice.gov.uk/govt-website/strategy/reducing-reoffender-delivery-plan/reducing-reoffending-delivery?view=Standard&amp;pubId=3810988</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF)</td>
<td>Respect Task Force</td>
<td>Central government, local agencies and citizens working together to tackle anti-social behaviour. Contains handbook, resources and good practice.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.respect.gov.uk">www.respect.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Transport (DfT)</td>
<td>Withintreach</td>
<td>DfT sponsored programme providing training and advice concerning accessibility planning. Contains guidance, toolkits, news, and useful links.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.within-reach.org.uk">www.within-reach.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Specific Initiative Websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Police Improvement Agency (NPIA)</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Policing Programme</td>
<td>Information on the Neighbourhood Policing Programme, including guidance, practical advice, FAQs and useful links.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neighbourhoodpolicing.co.uk">www.neighbourhoodpolicing.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Association (LGA)</td>
<td>Reducing Offending and Re-offending Programme with the National Offender Management Service (NOMS)</td>
<td>Joint project between the LGA and NOMS that seeks to identify the potential benefits to local government and communities from closer working with correctional services, both probation and prisons and develop new relationships between correctional services and local government. Includes information on Community Payback.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lga.gov.uk/ProjectAsmu.aspx?election=5&amp;cset=946">http://www.lga.gov.uk/ProjectAsmu.aspx?election=5&amp;cset=946</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Renewal Unit</td>
<td>Responsible for overseeing the Government’s comprehensive neighbourhood renewal strategy. Includes information on cross-sector regeneration programmes (New Deal for Communities, Neighbourhood Management, Neighbourhood Wardens, and business involvement in regeneration).</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=3">www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=3</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</td>
<td>New Deal for Communities (NDC)</td>
<td>Key programme in tackling multi-deprivation in the most deprived neighbourhoods. Contains information on areas where grants have been approved, how-to-guides, information on the Streetgames programme and contact lists.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=617">www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=617</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG) - Neighbourhood Renewal Unit</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Management</td>
<td>The Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder programme is a process involving communities working with local agencies to improve services at neighbourhood level. Neighbourhood management aims to tackle quality of life (“liveability”) issues in communities through better management of the local environment; increasing community safety; improving housing stock; working with young people; and encouraging employment opportunities.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=577">http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=577</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Travelwise Association and Living Streets</td>
<td>Walk to School Campaign</td>
<td>A campaign that asks parents, pupils and teachers to think about their journey to and from school, and how making this journey on foot can mitigate against reduced physical activity among children, increased childhood obesity, urban congestion and air pollution.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.walktoschool.org.uk/">http://www.walktoschool.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA)</td>
<td>Public space legislation resource</td>
<td>Providing a quick and easy point of reference for practitioners who want to find out what legislation is on the statute book in relation to all elements of open space management.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pageId=78105">http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pageId=78105</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Commission and Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA)</td>
<td>Library of local performance indicators: Community safety</td>
<td>An electronic library providing a source of ‘ready made’ performance indicators that you can adopt on a voluntary basis. All the indicators included in the electronic library have standard definitions to enable comparison where appropriate.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.local-pi-library.gov.uk/1LIBRARY/ALL_PI/ASSPAME-NUID=502">http://www.local-pi-library.gov.uk/1LIBRARY/ALL_PI/ASSPAME-NUID=502</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Office</td>
<td>Office of the Third Sector</td>
<td>Information about working with the third sector, including VCS development and community participation initiatives.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/third_sector/index.asp">www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/third_sector/index.asp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Non-Governmental Websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim Support</td>
<td>Victim Support website</td>
<td>Victim Support is the independent charity which helps people cope with the effects of crime providing free and confidential support and information to help victims deal with their experiences.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.victimsupport.org.uk/">http://www.victimsupport.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Concern</td>
<td>Crime Concern website</td>
<td>Crime Concern is a national crime prevention charity offering crime prevention and offender justice services. Crime Concern works largely, but not exclusively, with young people, providing routes away from crime and anti-social behaviour and back into full-time education and employment.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.crimeconcern.org.uk/">http://www.crimeconcern.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimestoppers</td>
<td>Crimestoppers website</td>
<td>Crimestoppers is an independent UK-wide charity working to stop crime. The charity operates across the UK to help identify, prevent, solve and reduce crime.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.crimestoppers-uk.org/">http://www.crimestoppers-uk.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College London – Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science</td>
<td>Jill Dando Institute website</td>
<td>The UCL Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science is the first in the world devoted specifically to reducing crime, through teaching, research, public policy analysis and by the dissemination of evidence-based information on crime reduction.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.jdi.ucl.ac.uk/">http://www.jdi.ucl.ac.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACRO</td>
<td>NACRO website</td>
<td>NACRO is an independent voluntary organisation working to prevent crime. Nacro has six main areas of work: resettlement, housing, education and employment, activities for young people, community and family schemes and finding better ways to reduce crime.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nacro.org.uk/">http://www.nacro.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The London Drug and Alcohol Network (LDAN) and Alcohol Concern</td>
<td>Local Alcohol Strategy Toolkit</td>
<td>A toolkit designed to help local policy makers and strategists in developing local responses to alcohol problems. It sets out a process for the work, and gives guidance on each step of the way.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.localalcoholstrategies.org.uk/">http://www.localalcoholstrategies.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS)</td>
<td>Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS) website</td>
<td>The Centre for Public Scrutiny was created to promote the value of scrutiny in modern and effective government – not only to hold executives to account but also to create a constructive dialogue between the public and its elected representatives – to improve the quality of public services.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cfps.org.uk/">http://www.cfps.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Research Association (SRA)</td>
<td>SRA website</td>
<td>The Social Research Association plays a unique role as an organisation open to social research practitioners and trainees from all sectors, as well as others with an interest in social research.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.the-sra.org.uk/">http://www.the-sra.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charities Evaluation Services</td>
<td>Charities Evaluation Services website</td>
<td>Charities Evaluation Services is the UK’s leading provider of information and advice on quality and evaluation systems for the voluntary sector.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ces-rol.org.uk/">http://www.ces-rol.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office – Drug Action Teams (DAT)</td>
<td>Audit Annex B</td>
<td>Suggestions on data sources that partnerships might consider during the strategic assessment process to ensure that the drugs element is based on an accurate assessment of the extent and nature of local misuse of drugs.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.drugs.gov.uk/publication-search/drug-strategy/audit-annex-b.pdf">www.drugs.gov.uk/publication-search/drug-strategy/audit-annex-b.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office – Drug Action Teams (DAT)</td>
<td>Audit Annex B</td>
<td>Suggestions on data sources that partnerships might consider during the strategic assessment process to ensure that the drugs element is based on an accurate assessment of the extent and nature of local misuse of drugs.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.drugs.gov.uk/publication-search/drug-strategy/audit-annex-b.pdf">www.drugs.gov.uk/publication-search/drug-strategy/audit-annex-b.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>iQuanta</td>
<td>iQuanta is an internet-based analysis tool developed by the Police and Crime Standards Directorate to turn statistical data routinely collected by the Home Office into useful outputs for understanding and improving policing performance at partnership level and above. Access to iQuanta is provided to police forces, police authorities and members of partnerships.</td>
<td><a href="https://iquanta.net/Default.aspx?tabid=27">https://iquanta.net/Default.aspx?tabid=27</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>National Plan for Domestic Violence</td>
<td>A national action plan that sets out the progress made so far in tackling domestic violence and outlines future proposals to further improve support to victims and bring more perpetrators to justice.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/domesticviolence/domesticviolence51.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/domesticviolence/domesticviolence51.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>National Community Safety Plan</td>
<td>The NCSF sets out the Government’s community safety priorities for 2006-2009. It outlines a new approach to community safety and aims to manage a coherent community safety programme across Government, providing people working in the field with a clear view of overall priorities.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/communitysafety01.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/communitysafety01.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Related Guidance and useful websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Crime &amp; Disorder Reduction Partnerships and Drug Action Team Integration/ Closer Working</td>
<td>This guidance issued in November 2003 outlines what measures CDRPs and DATs should take to integrate or work more closely together.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/integration.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/integration.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>What Crime &amp; Disorder Activities Fall Within the Remit of the Crime &amp; Disorder Act1998</td>
<td>This weblink discusses what can date should be shared for crime &amp; disorder purposes.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/toolkits/g0007.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/toolkits/g0007.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>The use of geographic information systems by crime analysts in England and Wales, HO Report 03/07</td>
<td>This report presents findings from a survey to assess the extent to which GIS is used by crime analysts.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rdi/pdf/07/rdi000307.pdf">http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rdi/pdf/07/rdi000307.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Toolkit for community safety audit</td>
<td>This toolkit on the Crime Reduction Website gives guidance on how to conduct a crime &amp; disorder audit.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/toolkits/p031801.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/toolkits/p031801.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Routine Activity Theory</td>
<td>This website explains the theory behind RAT.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/rat.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/rat.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Crime Reduction website - SARA model</td>
<td>This page on the CRW explains the SARA problem solving model with links for further information.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/sara.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/sara.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Crime Reduction website - PROCTOR model</td>
<td>This page on the CRW explains the PROCTOR problem solving model with links for further information.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/skills/skill05.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/skills/skill05.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Crime Reduction Website - Passport to evaluation</td>
<td>This was devised by the Home Office. It looks at the basic techniques used to evaluate crime reduction projects.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/passport_to_evaluation.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/passport_to_evaluation.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Crime Reduction Website - Tilley Awards</td>
<td>The Tilley Award, funded by the Home Office, was set up in 1999 to encourage and recognise excellence in crime reduction using problem-oriented principles.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/tilly/tilleyaward2007.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/tilly/tilleyaward2007.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Transport (DfT)</td>
<td>Accessibility Planning: Guidance</td>
<td>Guidance for local authorities on dealing with accessibility planning as part of their Local Transport Plans.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dft.gov.uk/per/regionall/bp/accessibility/guidance/gap/">www.dft.gov.uk/per/regionall/bp/accessibility/guidance/gap/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF)</td>
<td>The RESPECT Handbook: A Guide for Local Services</td>
<td>Identifies the key principles that underpin the programme and the key features of service delivery to help meet the programme’s goals. Designed to help local implementation.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.respect.gov.uk/members/article.aspx?id=9764">www.respect.gov.uk/members/article.aspx?id=9764</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Child Matters</td>
<td>Information sharing guidance for children's practitioners</td>
<td>This website provides useful guidance on info sharing for those professionals dealing with children.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/directoryservices/informationsharing/">http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/directoryservices/informationsharing/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Justice – National Offender Management Service</td>
<td>Civic Society Alliance Toolkit - Local Solutions to Reduce Re-offending by Adult and Young Offenders</td>
<td>A toolkit, showing how local authorities and local partners can develop a Civic Society Alliance to reduce re-offending</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lgc.gov.uk">www.lgc.gov.uk/civillacke toolkit</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Police Improvement Agency (NPIA) - Neighbourhood Policing Programme</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Policing Partnership Guide</td>
<td>Information for community safety partners on the Neighbourhood Policing Programme, including advantages of joint working and case studies.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neighbourhoodpolicing.co.uk/publication.asp">www.neighbourhoodpolicing.co.uk/publication.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Association (LGA)</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Policing by neighbourhood: local action to reduce re-offending</td>
<td>Report that outlines how local organisations with local knowledge are best placed to work with the prison and probation services to reduce re-offending</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lga.gov.uk/Publication.asp?lsection=59&amp;catid=38873&amp;zst=946">http://www.lga.gov.uk/Publication.asp?lsection=59&amp;catid=38873&amp;zst=946</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Association (LGA)</td>
<td>Checklist for local authorities in domestic violence partnership working</td>
<td>Appropriately prioritising work to tackle domestic violence is crucial - this checklist aims to help local authorities, within partnerships, work effectively to do this.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lga.gov.uk/Publication.aspx?lsection=59&amp;catid=5385&amp;zst=967">http://www.lga.gov.uk/Publication.aspx?lsection=59&amp;catid=5385&amp;zst=967</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA)</td>
<td>Joint working in waste: final report</td>
<td>Findings and recommendations from the project, which examined how joint working between authorities on waste management can achieve improved performance and drive efficiency.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.idea.gov.uk/uk/uk/4837783">http://www.idea.gov.uk/uk/uk/4837783</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</td>
<td>NDC How-to-guides</td>
<td>Guidance on applying for NDC finance, developing delivery plans, gathering baseline information and evaluating outcomes and milestones.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=619">www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=619</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Related Guidance and useful websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO)</strong></td>
<td>Practice Advice on Resources and the People Assets of NIM (2007)</td>
<td>Guidance on the roles of staff that work within intelligence units within the National Intelligence Model business process.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.acpo.police.uk/asp/policies/Data/resources_people_assets_nim_17x08x07.pdf">http://www.acpo.police.uk/asp/policies/Data/resources_people_assets_nim_17x08x07.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO)</strong></td>
<td>Practice Advice on Analysis (forthcoming)</td>
<td>Guidance on how and why analysis should be completed within the National Intelligence model.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.acpo.police.uk/">http://www.acpo.police.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit Commission</strong></td>
<td>Know your Communities toolkit</td>
<td>This website has a self-assessment on how well councils know their communities.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.userfocus.audit-commission.gov.uk/KycHome.aspx">http://www.userfocus.audit-commission.gov.uk/KycHome.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit Commission</strong></td>
<td>Compiling neighbourhood profiles - a guide for local agencies</td>
<td>The purpose of this guide is to assist local agencies in: creating neighbourhood profiles under stage three of the five-stage framework for neighbourhood management of crime and anti-social behaviour; and reviewing current neighbourhood level activity and resource use to determine how to obtain better value for money (VFM).</td>
<td><a href="http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/neighbourhoodcrime/profiling.asp">http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/neighbourhoodcrime/profiling.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home Office – Office for Criminal Justice Reform (OCJR)</strong></td>
<td>CDRPs (CSPs) and LCJBs: How to work together</td>
<td>Guidance written for practitioners working in partnerships and LCJBs, highlighting those areas where both these local partnerships have common interests and suggesting ways in which they might work together.</td>
<td><a href="http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/partnerinfofor7.htm">http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/partnerinfofor7.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Commissioner’s Office (ICO)</strong></td>
<td>Information Commissioner’s Office (ICO)</td>
<td>The Information Commissioner’s Office is the UK’s independent authority set up to promote access to official information and to protect personal information by promoting good practice, ruling on eligible complaints, providing information to individuals and organisations, and taking appropriate action when the law is broken. The ICO enforces and oversees the Data Protection Act, the Freedom of Information Act, the Environmental Information Regulations, and the Privacy and Electronic Communications Regulations.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ico.gov.uk/">http://www.ico.gov.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Related Guidance and useful websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NHS Wales</td>
<td>The Wales Accord for the Sharing of Personal Information (WASPI)</td>
<td>The purpose of this Accord is to enable service-providing and other organisations directly concerned with the well being of an individual to share information between them in a lawful and intelligent way.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wales.nhs.uk/sites3/home.cfm?orgid=702">http://www.wales.nhs.uk/sites3/home.cfm?orgid=702</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities Scotland</td>
<td>National Standards for Community Engagement</td>
<td>The Communities Scotland website has a section on community engagement which contains standards for CE.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.communitiesscotland.gov.uk">www.communitiesscotland.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofsted</td>
<td>Tellus 2 surveys</td>
<td>This website offers information on Tellus2 surveys which can help to garner the views of young people.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/portal/siz/Internet/">http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/portal/siz/Internet/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</td>
<td>Local Area Agreements</td>
<td>The CLG website has information on LAAs.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/localgovernment/performaceframeworkpartnerships/localareaagreements/">http://www.communities.gov.uk/localgovernment/performaceframeworkpartnerships/localareaagreements/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</td>
<td>Safer Stronger Communities Fund - Taking the agreements forward</td>
<td>This guidance explains the Safer Strong Communities Fund and how it feeds into LAAs</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/publications.asp?did=1545">http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/publications.asp?did=1545</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</td>
<td>Safer Stronger Communities Fund - Indicators of Strong Communities</td>
<td>This document gives the indicators for strong communities.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/publications.asp?did=1567">http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/publications.asp?did=1567</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**B: Neighbourhood Policing**

The purpose of Neighbourhood Policing is to deliver the right people, at the right places and in the right numbers, in order to create neighbourhoods that are safe and feel safe. The Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) leads the Neighbourhood Policing Programme. The programme was established to support the achievement of dedicated Neighbourhood Teams in all areas of England and Wales by 2008 and the target of 16,000 Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) by April 2007.

Neighbourhood Policing aims to provide communities with:

- Access – to policing or community safety services through a named point of contact;
- Influence – over community safety priorities in their neighbourhood;
- Interventions – joint action with communities and partners to solve problems; and
- Answers – sustainable solutions to problems and feedback on results.

Whilst ‘neighbourhood’ generally describes a geographic area, there is no universal definition shared by all community safety partners. Communities themselves also have widely differing views of what constitutes their neighbourhood. For the purposes of neighbourhood policing, a neighbourhood is defined through local agreement between communities, local authorities, police and partner organisations.

As each Neighbourhood Team is dedicated to a locally agreed geographic area, the size and composition will vary according to local need and resources. There is not a ‘one size fits all’ model to neighbourhood policing and partnerships will need to take into account the differing local circumstances that may exist across a partnership area.

In operational terms neighbourhood policing can be understood as:

- An organisational strategy that allows the police, its partners and the public to work closely together to solve problems of crime and disorder, and improve neighbourhood conditions and feelings of security;
- A mainstream policing activity and integrated with other policing services;
- Requiring evidence based deployment of neighbourhood teams against identified need;
- Establishes dedicated, identifiable, accessible, knowledgeable and responsive neighbourhood policing teams which provide all citizens with a named point of access;
- Reflects local conditions and is flexible, responsive and adaptable;
- Allows the police service to work directly with the local community to identify the problems that are most important to them, thereby giving people direct influence over local policing priorities;
- Establishes a regime for engaging other agencies and the public in problem solving mechanisms;
- Uses the National Intelligence Model as the basis for deployment;
- Requires an effective engagement, communication and feedback strategy, and a clear explanation of where accountability lies; and
- Should be subject to rigorous performance management including clear performance monitoring against a local plan and commitments made to neighbourhoods.
Police and partners need to work with communities not only to make neighbourhoods free from crime and disorder, but also to make people feel safe in them. However, community safety is not just a policing issue. Community safety issues can significantly influence the public’s perception of the quality of public service provision for example, dealing with abandoned vehicles, graffiti, or tackling nuisance neighbours can have a huge impact on the way the public judge the quality of public services. Working with communities to identify and resolve the problems that have the greatest impact on them can bring significant improvements to the sense of community wellbeing and the perception of the quality of local services.

Not all crime is local. There are links between national and international threats and events and the impact that these can have on local communities, for example, people trafficking, prostitution, terrorism and serious and organised crime. Appropriate delivery structures and processes should be in place at all levels of delivery within the police and partner agencies to ensure that there is sufficient capacity to impact upon these broader issues effectively.

The National Reassurance Policing Programme (NRPP) introduced a form of Neighbourhood Policing across 16 sites in England between 2003 – 2005. The programme involved local communities in identifying crime and disorder issues in their neighbourhoods, which they then tackled together with the police and other public service providers and partners.

The evaluation of the NRPP (published in January 2006) found the results of the programme to be consistently positive. The evidence showed that improvements in key outcomes such as levels of crime, perceptions of anti-social behaviour, and feelings of safety after dark and public confidence in the police were directly attributable to the NRPP approach. The programme also delivered significant improvements in trust amongst communities themselves.

When properly implemented, Neighbourhood Policing works to cut crime and anti-social behaviour and to increase public confidence. The three critical elements were found to be:

- The presence of visible, accessible and locally known authority figures in neighbourhoods, in particular police officers and PCSOs;
- Community involvement in the process of identifying priorities and taking action to deal with them; and
- Targeted policing activity and problem solving to tackle crimes and disorder that matter most to local people.

Communities notice the difference when the police work directly on the problems prioritised by local people. Involving individuals and communities in collaborative problem solving together with police and partners has a significant impact on perceptions of safety.

Evidence shows that communities want local Neighbourhood Policing to tackle the issues that matter most to them. Community engagement, which lies at the heart of the approach, brings highly localised problems to the attention of the police. Neighbourhood Policing enables communities to determine the priorities for action. When Neighbourhood Teams tackle these in partnership with communities and other local services neighbourhoods feel safer and are safer for those living and working in them.
The 42 Local Criminal Justice Boards (LCJBs) in England and Wales were established non-statutorily in 2003 and are based on police force/criminal justice areas. Membership comprises chief officers of the police, crown prosecution, court, prison, probation and youth offending services.

LCJBs are responsible for joining up the Criminal Justice System (CJS) at the local CJS area level and are increasingly involved in managing the change across the CJS. They focus on improving the effectiveness of the CJS by bringing more offences to justice, reducing ineffective trials, improving the experience of victims and witnesses, driving delivery of the timeliness target in the Persistent Young Offenders (PYO) pledge, delivering the Prolific and other Priority Offender (PPO) CJS Premium Service, improving enforcement and increasing public confidence in the CJS.

There are many overlaps between the agendas of community safety partnerships and LCJBs. They can work together to reinforce each other’s area of work. Key areas of common interest are:

- Public confidence;
- Support and services for victims; and
- Management of offenders, including re-offending.

Other areas will be determined by local priorities.

The creation of the county strategy group (see L1 for further details) can support and facilitate closer joint working between community safety partnerships and LCJBs. It can enable the LCJB to make meaningful links with community safety partnerships that will influence district level partnerships at operational level, but to retain their strategic oversight to ensure efficient local delivery of the CJS.
The National Offender Management Service (NOMS) was created in 2004 with the aim of reducing re-offending and protecting the public. NOMS, based within the Ministry of Justice, comprises of a number of organisations including the prison and probation services, and is putting a system in place to deliver end-to-end management of offenders.

The organisation’s key responsibilities are delivering a reduction in re-offending; protecting the public and the management of offenders. The management of offenders is devolved to nine regional offices in England and one office in Wales. The English regional offices are led by Regional Offender Managers. The Wales office is led by a Director of Offender Management.

These leaders are experts in the offending-related problems of their local area and are responsible for:

- commissioning services for their region;
- developing a regional reducing re-offending delivery plan; and
- co-ordinating regional and local partnerships.

The cross-government National Reducing Re-offending Delivery Plan (NRRDP), launched in November 2005, outlines the Government commitment on improving offenders’ access to mainstream services across the seven pathways as identified by the Social Exclusion Unit’s report on ‘Reducing Re-offending by ex-Prisoners’ (2002):

- Accommodation;
- Employment and Skills;
- Children and Families;
- Finance, Benefit and Debt;
- Attitudes, Thinking and Behaviour;
- Drugs and Alcohol; and
- Health.

The nine regions in England, and Wales, have all developed strategies to take forward work on the pathways, with appropriate regional partners leading work on each of the strands through their Regional Reducing Re-offending Partnership Boards.

As the NRRDP was only designed to cover a period of 18 months, NOMS and partners have begun the process of developing a new three year strategic plan to take into account the new cross government PSA targets on drugs, alcohol and social exclusion. The plan will also need to promote the wider engagement of partners; support the continued delivery of offender management and the NOMS reform programme; and link to the CJS and wider government strategies. Key to its success will be its ability to drive effective local delivery.
E: Changes in the Local Delivery Landscape – The Offender Management Act 2007

The Offender Management Act (2007) aims to improve the delivery of probation services to reduce re-offending and better protect the public. It will do so by enabling the establishment of probation trusts (replacing probation boards) and supporting the development of the commissioning of probation services in greater partnership with providers in the voluntary, charitable and private sectors.

Commissioning will take place at national, regional, and local levels. The national commissioning and partnership framework will set out NOMS’ priorities for England and Wales. The national priorities will find expression in the regional commissioning and partnership plans, which will also reflect the Regional Reducing Re-offending Plans developed by the Regional Reducing Re-offending Partnership Boards. These commissioning plans will be developed in full consultation with regional and local providers, and sentencers.

Regional commissioners (Regional Offender Managers), acting on behalf of the Secretary of State, will contract with lead providers for the delivery of services in a probation area. The lead provider will concentrate on the delivery of offender management, while sub-contracting much of their interventions work to other providers based on what is most effective, and who is best placed to deliver, in their local community (known as local commissioning).

Providing their performance meets the requirements, the lead provider in a probation area will be the public sector probation trust. Due to their local knowledge and relationships, Probation Trusts, as NOMS’ lead providers, have a critical role to play and will provide assistance in ensuring that access to mainstream local services are improved for offenders through both joint commissioning and partnership arrangements. The Act creates a variety of opportunities to strengthen further the relationship between community safety partnerships and NOMS in tackling re-offending:

- Supporting Regional Offender Managers commission services to improve public protection and reducing re-offending at local level, for example through joint commissioning;
- Building effective partnerships with local agencies, voluntary groups and other local partnerships such as Local Criminal Justice Boards to tackle the social exclusion faced by offenders; and
- Aligning resources to support securing effective services to tackle re-offending. This will require making the necessary links between reducing crime and reducing re-offending.
**F: Crime and Disorder Act Review**

The Government announced a review of the partnership provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, as amended by the Police Reform Act 2002, in the police reform White Paper – Building Communities, Beating Crime – in November 2004. The review was conducted jointly by the representative bodies of all the agencies with responsible authority status on partnerships, and included input via regional workshops from well over 400 practitioners and other stakeholders. Representatives of other key central Government departments were also involved.

The partnership landscape had changed substantially since partnerships were first created in 1998, with the introduction of Local Area Agreements and the changing role of local government presenting new challenges for partnerships. Changes in the Criminal Justice System and the delivery of the police reform agenda also affected how partnerships did business. The review, therefore, was a timely piece of work that would help ensure all partnerships were in a good position to adapt to a changing delivery landscape and take on any new challenges.

The overall objective of the review was to strengthen the visibility, responsiveness, accountability, membership and role of local partnerships. The aim is to make them the most effective possible vehicle for tackling crime, anti-social behaviour and substance misuse.

The Home Office, the Local Government Association, the Association of Chief Police Officers and the Association of Police Authorities worked together on the review between November 2004 and January 2005. Over 450 key stakeholders and practitioners were consulted through four regional seminars and many contributed through e-questionnaires and submissions.

The report of the review findings was published in January 2006 (http://crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/partnerships60.htm) and led to the legislative changes in the Police and Justice Act 2006.

The Government Offices and the Home Office jointly arranged ten stakeholder consultation events around the country, followed by another two events arranged with the Welsh Assembly Government in Wales. These events sought views and information on the implementation of the review findings and, specifically, what should be included in new legislation for partnerships.
G: Composition of Partnerships

Responsible authorities have a statutory duty to work with other local agencies and organisations to develop and implement strategies to tackle crime and disorder including anti-social and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment as well as the misuse of drugs in their area. (s6, Crime and Disorder Act 1998 as amended by s97 and s98 Police Reform Act 2002 and s1, Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005).

These statutory partnerships are known as Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) or Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) in Wales.

The responsible authorities set out in s 5 Crime and Disorder Act 1998 are:

• police;
• police authorities;
• local authorities;
• fire and rescue authorities;
• local health boards (LHBs) in Wales; and
• primary care trusts (PCTs) in England (added on 30 April 2004).

Responsible authorities are under a statutory duty to ensure that the key agencies come together to work in partnership in a CDRP/CSP. They are required to work in co-operation with probation boards parish councils, NHS Trusts, NHS Foundation Trusts, proprietors of independent schools and governing bodies of an institution within the further education sector and to work closely with Drug Action Teams in two-tier local authority areas and have developed integrated working arrangements in unitary authority areas. They are also expected to invite a range of local private, voluntary, other public and community groups including the public to become involved in the strategy process.

While the term ‘partnership’ is applied to all those who sit round the table, legally, the responsible authorities are the only bodies or agencies under the duty to meet the new regulatory requirements.

From 31 July 2007, Registered Social Landlords (in England) will be co-operating bodies with the responsible authorities of community safety partnerships and the Environment Agency in England will become an invitee to participate with the responsible authorities in their functions on the partnership. The Welsh Assembly Government will be considering changing the status of Registered Social Landlords and the Environment Agency in Wales later in the year.
H: Partnerships and the National Intelligence Model

The National Intelligence Model (NIM) is the intelligence-led business process that is statutory for all police forces in England and Wales to use.

Partnerships may find it sensible to adopt aspects of the NIM model as a framework for partnership working to facilitate a joint approach with their police partners. This appendix outlines how a partnership may adopt aspects of NIM to structure their business and meet the Hallmarks set out in this Guidance.

The use of NIM ensures that activity to reduce crime, disorder, anti-social behaviour and substance misuse is delivered in a targeted manner through the collection and analysis of information, which is used to guide activity. The model involves identifying, understanding and addressing underlying problems and trends through the use of analysis, and is then used to prioritise issues, based on risk, and allocate resources to deal with them.

The NIM process is introduced in the following diagram and further explained in sections 1.1 – 1.11.

1.1 Knowledge Assets

The four assets are the building blocks that are the foundation of the model. Within the partnership, it is important that all staff involved in agreeing priorities and carrying out activity to deal with them have the professional knowledge to work effectively and to understand the processes within which they work, including an understanding of the role and use of intelligence.

1.2 System Assets

Within the partnership, it is important that there are systems in place to ensure the lawful sharing of information and the secure storage and use of information once it has been shared, according to the new Information Sharing Regulations.

1.3 Source Assets

Within the partnership, it is important that the staff responsible for producing the strategic assessment and partnership plan are aware of the different types of information available to them, how they are collected, evaluated, and used.

1.4 People Assets

Within the partnership, it is important that all staff involved in agreeing priorities and carrying out activity to deal with them know their roles and responsibilities in relation to NIM. It is also important that staff are properly trained to carry out these roles and responsibilities.

More information on all the roles and responsibilities required to make NIM work can be found in ACPO(2007) Practice Advice on Resources and the People Assets of NIM.
1.5 Information sources
The first stage of the NIM process is to ensure that appropriate information sources are available. The minimum standards contribute to performance in this area by creating a duty to share certain types of information (G2) and by describing the kinds of information that should be used within a strategic assessment (A1). The minimum standards also describe the need for community consultation and the possible process to be used (G3).

1.6 Intelligence/Information Recording
The NIM sets out standards for the recording on information so that is available for use to help make strategic and tactical decisions. This element of NIM is unlikely to apply to partnerships adopting its use. The majority of information used by the partnership will be recorded and collected by the member organisations. If the partnership do begin to record and collect their own information there should be appropriate management processes in place.

1.7 Research, Development and Analysis
This element of the NIM is core to the success of an intelligence-led business process. It is at this stage in the process where a wide variety of information is brought together and given meaning. Critical links and associations between bits of information are made and inferences are drawn. This work is carried out in an intelligence unit. Within a partnership, an intelligence unit could be made up of a combination of researchers, to develop information, and analysts. For analysts and/or researchers to carry out their jobs effectively they must have easy access to the information that the partnership has collected. They must also have access to open source, or public access information.

The Hallmarks contribute to performance in this area by outlining the analytical contribution to strategic assessments (A2).

More information about the work of analysts can be found in ACPO (forthcoming) Practice Advice for Analysis. Although a document aimed for analysts working for the police, it has been designed to be equally applicable to analysts working within a partnership environment.

1.8 Intelligence Products
Within NIM there are four intelligence products. The following table shows the four intelligence products and how they could be used within a partnership environment.
Strategic assessment

Drives the business of the strategy group meeting.
Aids and supports strategic business planning and resource allocation.
Informs the strategy group of the issues likely to affect the partnership in the coming year and recommends which should be a priority.
Assists the agreement of partnership priorities.

Tactical assessment

Drives the business of the partnership tasking and co-ordination group (where the partnership has set one up).
Assists and supports tactical planning and resource allocation to resolve problems.
Informs the tasking and co-ordination group of the current problems that link to the priority areas and makes proposals for continued prevention/reduction activity.
Ensures tactical activity is aligned to the agreed partnership priorities.

Subject profile

Establishes a greater understanding of either a person or group of people (whether suspects, victims or witnesses) in relation to an identified problem and a record of activity for tactical opportunities to resolve the problem. For example a profile of a family causing anti-social behaviour and the activity taken to prevent and reduce their behaviour and its impact on the community.

Problem profile

Establishes a greater understanding of an identified problem and a record of activity for tactical opportunities to resolve the problem. For example a profile of a problem of youths drinking on a playground and the activity taken to reduce and prevent their behaviour and its impact on the community.

The Hallmarks contribute to performance in this area by making it a statutory obligation for each partnership to produce a strategic assessment (A2).

1.9 Tasking and Co-ordination

It is the tasking and co-ordination process that provides partnership leaders with a decision-making mechanism by which they can manage the business of the partnership strategically and tactically.

Within a partnership, the strategy group will carry out strategic tasking and co-ordination. The strategy group are responsible for setting the priorities that the partnership will work to and making individuals responsible for delivery in each area. The strategy group are ultimately responsible for the performance of the partnership, especially in the areas identified as priorities.

Partnerships could also set up a tasking and co-ordination group to manage the tactical delivery of priorities. The tasking and co-ordination group could be informed by a tactical assessment. (See D1 for further details of this)
The minimum standards contribute to performance in this area by setting out the governance arrangements for the strategy group (G1). This guidance also provides advice on how tasking and co-ordination groups can manage tactical delivery (D1).

Further information about how to set up and run tasking and co-ordination meetings can be found in ACPO (2006) Practice Advice on Tasking and Co-ordination.

1.10 Tactical Resolution

This element refers to the actual activity that takes place to resolve problems. Within a partnership activity to resolve problems may be undertaken by a wide range of people. Partnerships can use problem solving creatively and to use a wide range of resources ensuring that prevention, further information collection, enforcement and community reassurance are key pillars to any planned activity.

Problems will range in scope and scale. A large problem may be broken down into smaller problems or projects. Regardless of the scale or scope of a problem or project each should be clearly owned by a named individual who should be held accountable for the progress of the problem or project through the tasking and co-ordination process.

Some problems will be supported by a problem profile and one or more subject profiles. Others will be supported with some simple problem solving analysis using SARA or PROCTOR. In all cases there must be clear records of the planned activity and use of resources and the outcome of all activity. Without clear records it is difficult to co-ordinate activity across the partnership or to measure the success of outcomes.

This guidance also provides advice on addressing problems (D2).

1.11 Operational Review

Operational review is an essential element of any intelligence-led business processes. It ensures that lessons are learnt from activity that has taken place and that they are retained for future use to improve outcomes. A review should be a genuine assessment of the successes and failures of activity.

This guidance provides advice on how effectiveness can be evaluated in (D3).

More information on operational review and results analysis can be found in all of ACPO NIM products.
I: Local Strategic Partnerships and Local Area Agreements

ENGLAND

Local Strategic Partnerships are non-statutory, multi-agency partnerships. They bring together at a local level the different parts of the public, private, community and voluntary sectors; allowing different initiatives and services to support one another so that they can work together more effectively. Local Strategic Partnerships are not single organisations, but a “family” of partnerships and/or themed sub-groups. How individual Local Strategic Partnerships are structured is down to local determination.

Local Area Agreements

Local Area Agreements set out the priorities for a local area agreed between central government and a local area (the local authority and Local Strategic Partnership) and other key partners at the local level. Local Area Agreements simplify some central funding, help join up public services more effectively and allow greater flexibility for local solutions to local circumstances.

Local Area Agreements are structured around four blocks (or policy fields): children and young people, safer and stronger communities, healthier communities and older people, and economic development and enterprise.

Local Area Agreements are subject to an annual refresh, which should coincide with the new strategic assessments which partnerships will now carry out. The three year cycle of a Local Area Agreement should also coincide with that of partnership plans for community safety partnerships. The priorities decided on by your partnership should therefore inform those which go into the Local Area Agreement. The process for doing so will vary according to each area, so partnerships should make themselves aware of local arrangements. The local government white paper, “Strong and Prosperous Communities” states that in agreeing the Local Area Agreement, partners should have regard to key local plans, which will include the strategic assessments and partnership plans produced by community safety partnerships.

In two-tier areas, the responsibility for Local Area Agreements sits at the county level. Under the proposals set out in the White paper, county authorities will be under a duty to consult and involve districts when drawing up their Local Area Agreements. This links in with the requirement under the legislation for district level community safety partnerships to identify priorities for inclusion in the county-wide Local Area Agreement. The county strategy group as set out in the legislation will be the key means of linking the work of district level community safety partnerships into county-wide Local Area Agreements.
Diagrams - England

This diagram shows an example of structures and processes in **two-tier areas**. There is obviously flexibility within these arrangements, but it demonstrates how the structures should enable district level priorities to both feed into and be informed by the Local Area Agreement (LAA). It also demonstrates how the county-level group can facilitate closer working between district community safety partnerships.

The below diagram shows an example of structures and processes in a unitary area. There is obviously flexibility within these arrangements but it demonstrates how the structures should enable priorities to both feed into and be informed by the Local Area Agreement (LAA).
J: Information Sharing Regulations

Details of the information sets that must be shared on at least a quarterly basis are given below. In each case, the duty applies to information relating to the partnership area as defined by the district or unitary authority area. This duty only applies when the authority holds the information so it does not require the collection of any additional information. The purpose of sharing this information is to enable the profiling of crime and disorder trends and patterns within the area. For this reason, in most cases, it is the record level data that is specified rather than aggregate data or statistics. Analysis can then take place across a number of different datasets on at least a quarterly basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Datasets (for the area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police force</td>
<td>1. Records on anti-social behaviour, transport and public safety/welfare <strong>incidents</strong> recorded according to the National Incident Category List. Whatever information is recorded about the time, date, location and category of each incident must be disclosed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>Crime records</strong> recorded according to the Notifiable Offences list. Whatever information is recorded about the time, date, location and sub-category of each crime must be disclosed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and rescue authority</td>
<td>3. Records on <strong>deliberate fires</strong>, whether it was a deliberate primary fire (not in a vehicle), a deliberate secondary fire (not in a vehicle) or a deliberate fire in a vehicle. In addition, records on <strong>incidents of violence against employees</strong> and records of fires attended in dwellings where <strong>no smoke alarm</strong> was fitted. For all these records, whatever information is recorded about the time, date and location of the fire must be shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Records on <strong>malicious false alarms</strong>. Whatever information is recorded about the time and date of each call and the purported location of those alarms must be shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>5. Records on <strong>road traffic collisions</strong>. Whatever information is recorded about the time, date, location and the number of adults and children killed, seriously injured and slightly injured in each road traffic collision must be shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Records on <strong>fixed term and permanent school exclusions</strong>. Whatever information is held about the age and gender of the pupil, the name and address of the school from which they were excluded and the reasons for their exclusion must be shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Records of <strong>racial incidents</strong>. Whatever information is held about the time, date and location of each incident must be shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Records of <strong>anti-social behaviour incidents</strong> identified by the authority or reported by the public. Whatever information is held about the category, time, date and location of each incident must be shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Datasets (for the area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Primary Care Trust (lying entirely or partly in the area) | 9. Records on various categories of hospital admissions. The relevant admissions are those relating to the following blocks within the International Classification of Diseases:  
  a) assault (X85-Y09);  
  b) mental and behavioural disorders due to psychoactive substance use (F10-F19);  
  c) toxic effect of alcohol (T51); and  
  d) other entries where there is evidence of alcohol involvement determined by blood alcohol level (Y90) or evidence of alcohol involvement determined by level of intoxication (Y91). For each record, whatever information is held about the date of the admission, the sub-category of the admission and the outward part of the postcode (the first part of the postcode, before the space which separates it from the second part) of the patient's address must be shared.  
  10. Records of admissions to hospital in respect of domestic abuse. Whatever information is held about the date of the admission and the outward part of the postcode of the patient's address must be shared.  
  12. Records of ambulance call outs to crime and disorder incidents. Whatever information is held about the category, time, date and location of each ambulance call out must be shared. |
K: Worked Example

How the new business process might work:

Leadership established at district and county level.

Information-sharing Protocol agreed and signed by all responsible authorities and other agencies.

Information Shared, both depersonalised information sets included in new legislation, information gathered from community and additional information.

Community consulted about their priorities.

Strategic Assessment conducted to identify crime issues.

Priorities identified, for e.g. street crime, and escalated to county-level group in two-tier areas – passed to Local Strategic Partnership for possible inclusion in Local Area Agreement.

Partnership Plan produced to outline how to deliver on priorities in coming year and three years, e.g. accessing funding through Local Area Agreement (Safer and Stronger Communities and other blocks).

Summary of Partnership Plan published, outlining steps that will be taken to deliver on priorities and consult communities.

Delivery Structure considered, e.g. setting up an action group to deal with street crime, or city centre issues.
Further Analysis of individual priorities, using depersonalised and personal information shared between partners, to further define the problem and establish baselines e.g. the street crime, action group may identify that students walking along a particular street in the evening are one group of victims and that the majority of offenders are already known within the criminal justice system.

Tactical Options considered e.g. the street crime, action group may consider running an information campaign through the local university, focusing on rehabilitation of offenders once they are released from prison, or improving street-lighting. The solutions are chosen will depend on the precise problems identified through analysis, but should consider the role that can be played by other agencies, including those from the criminal justice system.

Governance within the action group agreed e.g. deciding responsibility for actions, a meeting structure, 6 monthly and annual targets and how to report to relevant partners.

Evaluation of initiatives on an ongoing basis to ensure real improvements e.g. reductions in street crime, and ensuring crime is not simply being displaced elsewhere.

Leadership within partnership to monitor progress on reductions in street crime, e.g. considering number of street crime incidents at quarterly meetings, involving representatives of the criminal justice agencies at meetings.

Strategic Assessment following year to reassess priorities e.g. to identify whether street crime should still be a priority.

Refresh Partnership Plan outlining what will be done to address new priorities, e.g. whether more will be done to address street crime.

Publish Summary of Plan in order to report back to community on progress e.g. reductions in street crime.
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