

Beacon Council Scheme Round Five Crime and Disorder Partnerships Theme

Evidence on Current Practice, Best Practice and User Satisfaction

Background

This paper presents key findings on current practice, best practice and user satisfaction in the selected theme. This information has been taken from the Round Five theme reports completed by the central government policy leads in each theme in late Spring 2003. The full theme reports can be found at: www.local.odpm.gov.uk/research/beacon/beacon.htm

The user satisfaction data and analysis was completed by MORI in August 2003 and the full report on all themes is available at www.local.odpm.gov.uk/research/beacon5.pdf

The evidence base on theme research and user satisfaction is designed to assist the Independent Advisory Panel in creating the selection criteria for the scheme. It is also designed to assist local authorities in applying for the scheme and in improving services generally. The research evidence base on the Beacon Council Scheme is crucial in identifying current and best practice in service provision whilst taking into account the satisfaction of those that receive the services. This evidence base also enables local authorities to identify areas for improvement as well as potential areas for innovation in attempting to achieve continuous improvement in service provision.

The research evidence base can also demonstrate whether the scheme is achieving its long-term objective of improving services. Warwick University Business School has commenced work on a three to five year ODPM / IDeA funded project entitled *An Impact Evaluation of the Beacon Council Scheme* and this will yield further evidence shortly and greatly contribute to the future evidence base on service improvement.

Section A - Current Practice in Crime and Disorder Partnerships

The current levels of effectiveness of Crime and Disorder Partnerships (CDRPs) are not easily measured. A number of different but complementary studies have been made of the development of CDRPs; these are typically sample-based, and whilst they give an indication of the state of health of partnerships, they do not add up to a comprehensive picture. Crucially, it has proved difficult to link findings on the quality of partnership processes with the level of impact being achieved on crime and disorder locally (Audit Commission, 2002; Sizmur et al, forthcoming).

On the basis of the evidence available, a picture of widely varying performance emerges:

- only 9 out of 24 CDRPs were judged as providing a good service (and none as providing an excellent service) in best value inspections. However, 14 had promising or good prospects of improvement. (Audit Commission, 2002);
- 14 per cent of audit documents produced in 2002 were judged to be of a high quality, while 36 per cent were of medium quality and 50 per cent basic quality, (Sizmur et al, forthcoming);
- whilst some CDRPs has substantial resources at their disposal (for example, a multi-agency team of 40 personnel or a designated community safety budget of over £1 million), a minority of faced significant capacity issues that would make it difficult for them to improve performance; (Sizmur et al, forthcoming; LGA, 2001);
- there were a number of common areas of strength and weakness (Sizmur et al, forthcoming):

Strengths	Weaknesses
■ Representation and commitment from the local authority and police	■ Low level of engagement and commitment of other partners, (notably health, probation, education and the criminal

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Range of agencies ‘on board’ ■ Progress on linking across plans of different agencies ■ Increasing accountability through links to local government modernisation ■ Progress on community involvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> justice system) ■ Data sharing ■ Performance management ■ Planning for partnership development ■ Financial planning ■ Consultative links with ‘hard-to-reach’ groups
--	---

- the characteristic style of working in the first round of audits and strategies consisted of putting in place specific projects (or, simply stated, ‘doing extra things’), with an associated need for additional, external funding. There was little evidence of planning for the sustainable long-term impact made possible where partners realign existing functions and priorities, in other words ‘doing things differently’ (Sizmur et al, forthcoming).

The key success factors identified by research (HMIC 2000) have been incorporated into a self-assessment framework describing excellence and based on the EFQM Excellence Model. This framework is to become a vehicle for the development of partnerships, both informing their own development planning and the support provided by the Government Office for their region, as well as help determine and influence central policy.

The criteria are reproduced in part 6 of the report, and CDRPs rated themselves on these criteria as either ‘gap identified’, ‘working towards’, ‘some success’ or ‘doing well’. The framework has been piloted in one Government Office region, giving a picture of the level of development of all the CDRPs in that region. In this trial, no CDRP assessed itself as ‘doing well’ on all criteria. The highest scoring partnership in the region assessed itself as, on average, achieving ‘some success’ on all criteria.

Section B - Guidelines for Excellent Practice in Better Local Public Transport

The following are standards of good practice, which research has identified as success factors, that the Home Offices wishes to promote amongst CDRPs.

Leadership

<p>The partnership is well led with leaders of appropriate seniority who provide direction, motivation, and commitment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The leadership of the partnership is clearly identified and agreed • Leaders do not dominate proceedings but provide clear direction with support from partner colleagues • Leaders are committed to working in an open engaging manner recognising the role of participating agencies whilst understanding obstacles facing involvement • The chair of the partnership is re-elected on a regular basis • No single agency dominates proceedings in partnership meetings or the determination of priorities
<p>Partners have a clear understanding of the partnership's purpose, processes, structures for delivery and targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has an agreed mission statement • There is an agreed management structure which includes regularly timetabled partnership meetings • There is a coherent partnership structure with clear lines of responsibility from executive and management groups to action and delivery groups • Leaders have aligned the partnership's structure to support delivery of the Crime and Disorder Strategy • Partners understand the organisation's values, aims, and objectives • Procedures have been developed to facilitate effective partnership management, communication, and marketing
<p>There is a culture of participation and collaboration between partners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management and action groups are regularly attended by statutory and other relevant partners • Regular operational contact exists between statutory and other relevant partners • Leaders encourage and facilitate community involvement within the crime and disorder partnership • Innovative thinking and working is generated through the use of the crime and disorder partnership • Leaders are made aware of difficulties regarding participation and collaboration and work to overcome them
<p>There is clarity and transparency in the way the partnership makes decisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A formal decision making process exists through which tasks are allocated to action groups • Executive and management group meeting minutes are made available to all sections of the partnership and are reviewed • Action points are clearly documented in minutes
<p>Officers are valued and supported by partnership leaders in the delivery of crime reduction strategies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders actively communicate crime reduction priorities to all sections of their organisation • Leaders personally communicate the partnership's mission, vision, and strategy to staff • The partnership has identified and matched people's knowledge and competencies with its needs and strategy • The partnership has developed and used training and development plans to ensure staff match the needs of the partnership and its strategy • The partnership designs and implements individual, team and partnership learning opportunities • The partnership appraises and helps staff to improve their performance • Leaders actively communicate where crime reduction activity fits in with other priorities
<p>There are strong linkages with other local and regional partnerships and networks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders represent the CDRP on LSPs, YOTs, Chamber of Commerce, etc • Joint work has been undertaken with other local partnerships, e.g. New Deal for Communities, Single Regeneration Budget • Links have been made with other CDRPs, e.g. joint appointment of staff using pooled resources such as CAD / SCI

<p>Leaders adopt a responsive, pro-active, and accountable role in strategic partnership development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders seek to establish operational links with the business community • Key partners and partnership opportunities have been identified in line with the crime and disorder reduction strategy • Leaders have ensured a process for the development, deployment and updating of policy and strategy is developed and implemented • Leaders are aware of and responsive to national priorities
--

Audits and strategies

<p>The partnership identifies and uses appropriate multi-agency data sources to identify and review strategic priorities and baselines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership collects and researches up to date information and knowledge in support of the crime reduction strategy • The partnership collects data from a range of partner sources • Information is collected on a quarterly / monthly / weekly basis and analysed to inform action • The partnership has a dedicated audit and information team to analyse and interpret data
<p>The partnership has the necessary skills and equipment to analyse crime and disorder data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officers trained in crime analysis are involved in audit and ongoing problem solving activity • The partnership uses GIS mapping tools • Partnership action groups can draw on analysis for on-going problem solving and monitoring of progress
<p>Options for responses to problems are appraised drawing on national and local evidence based practice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has used Home Office toolkits • Evaluated activity is assessed in developing crime reduction responses • The audit included a review of current activity and approaches and will use this information to inform strategy development • Local partnerships share good practice through regular networking meetings • Strategic partner representatives have received training in what works • Task group representatives have received training in their specific area of work
<p>The partnership identifies and manages risks to the effective delivery of interventions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk analysis is undertaken for each response • When risks are identified they are managed and monitored • The crime and disorder partnership has considered exit strategies and issues of sustainability • Individual project monitoring regimes are commensurate with the level of risk identified
<p>The partnership has developed detailed SMART action plans for each strategic priority taking account of relevant local plans and targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action plans and targets are compatible with individual agency plans • Monitoring and evaluation methodology and procedures are established for each intervention • Targets have been established for each action plan intervention • Timescales have been set and are monitored for each priority • Partnership targets do not simply repeat individual agency targets • Targets beyond simple reduction in levels by a percentage have been considered • The relative impact of multiple actions has been considered in setting targets
<p>Partnership strategies have been formulated by all bodies required by the Crime and Disorder Act (responsible authorities, statutory consultees and invitees to participate).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders have ensured a process for identifying and implementing improvements to the delivery of the crime and disorder strategy • All named agencies and communities have been consulted on strategy priorities • All named agencies and communities have been involved in determining priorities • Strategies add value to the individual work of constituent agencies and are not simply a re-statement of action already taking place
<p>Strategic priorities are determined by evidence of local problems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priorities are based on crime and disorder problems highlighted by the audit • Evidence includes findings from local consultation including hard to reach groups • Qualitative as well as quantitative evidence is used to determine priorities

<p>Strategies acknowledge regional and national guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crime reduction Directors have been consulted in the development of strategies • Relevant national targets have been incorporated into strategies • Where strategies do not include national targets evidence is supplied as to why they have not been prioritised • Strategies of neighbouring partnerships have been consulted and possible benefits of cross partnership working have been considered

People and partners

<p>Partners understand the roles, structures and core activities of other partners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development activity focusing on partner's has been undertaken • Partners are aware of the crime reduction contributions partners can make • The partnership has utilised national good practice publications on involving partners
<p>All individuals involved in partnership working understand their role and responsibilities in delivering actions to achieve strategy targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action plans assign responsibility to individual partners in delivering interventions • The partnership strategy is communicated to all stakeholders • Terms of reference have been developed for the partnership • Partnership meetings at strategic and operational level are outcome focused • Partnership meetings are assessed and reviewed on a regular basis
<p>The partnership has consistent and appropriate involvement from the public, private and voluntary sector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is public, private, and voluntary sector representation on the partnership steering group • Key voluntary sector organisations are consulted in relation to specific interventions • Elected members are represented at different levels of the partnership • The police authority are represented on the partnership
<p>Partners have agreed and documented a plan for the necessary development of the partnership in order to deliver current local strategies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has produced a development plan • Partners have identified and agreed areas necessary for development • Development plan implementation is monitored
<p>The partnership regularly conducts and responds to a review of the multi-agency training needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-agency training needs analysis has been undertaken • An annual training programme has been agreed and funded • Training is delivered on a multi-agency basis
<p>Individuals at all levels of the partnership possess the knowledge and skills required to submit successful internal and external bids for funding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key individuals have been identified to submit bids on behalf of the partnership • Individuals undergo training to acquire skills necessary to submit bids for funding • The partnership is aware of and shares information on available sources of funding

Resources

<p>The partnership has agreed appropriate human and financial resources from partner's core budgets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dedicated officers from partner agencies work for the partnership • Agreed financial contributions are made to the partnership • Partnership human resource plans are aligned with the crime and disorder strategy, the organisational structure and the framework of key processes • The partnership uses people surveys and other forms of employee feedback to improve human resource strategies • Partner agencies contribution to partnership delivery is stated and recognised

<p>Partners have agreed pooled financial resources for dedicated crime and disorder reduction activity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners have contributed to a budget administered by the partnership • Operational groups within the CDRP have access to devolved budgets • Crime and disorder partners have contributed to the pool of people resources • Shared resource allocation and use is monitored on a quarterly basis • The partnership strategy is costed and funding allocated on a planned basis
<p>The partnership has agreed and prioritised interventions requiring external funding to deliver actions detailed within strategies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership is aware of external funding opportunities • Successful bids have been made for crime reduction funding • All bids for crime and disorder activity in the area are agreed and prioritised by the partnership • Gaps in locally available funding have been identified • A resourcing / fundraising strategy has been established • Development plan resource needs are identified
<p>The partnership has agreed a resource management strategy aligned to delivery of strategic priorities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action plan interventions are fully costed • The partnership has a policy for the purchasing of goods, services and equipment which ensures good value and quality • The partnership has ensured that resources available match what the organisation needs to achieve its purpose • Funding is available for rapid response to emerging priorities or issues identified through problem solving
<p>The partnership regularly reviews the effectiveness and benefits from human and financial resource expenditure and takes remedial action to ensure that the partnership secures value for money in its activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership undertakes cost benefit analysis on crime reduction interventions • Financial spend is regularly monitored along with other performance management information • Individual project spend is related to impact

Processes

<p>The partnership has agreed an appropriate response to Section 17 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners have received awareness training on Section 17 • The crime and disorder strategy compliments mainstream activities currently being provided • crime reduction is incorporated into officer's job descriptions • individual service departments have analysed the costs of crime to them • partners have identified how their core business can contribute to the partnership crime reduction strategy
<p>The partnership has a system to regularly review monitoring and evaluation data in order to ensure that levels of performance are sufficient to meet targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership action groups have been trained in performance management • Performance management is a standing agenda at partnership meetings
<p>The partnership regularly conducts and reviews consultation around experiences and perceptions of crime and disorder with communities (including hard to reach and vulnerable groups) in the partnership area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crime and disorder audits have utilised information from consultation exercises • stakeholders views on performance have been considered in the formulation of the strategy • Consultation exercises (resident questionnaires / focus groups) are periodically undertaken linked to specific crime reduction activity • Specialist knowledge has been utilised to access hard to reach groups
<p>The partnership has appropriate structures and protocols in place for the routine sharing and pooling of information between partners to ensure that partnership decisions and activity are driven by ongoing information use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A formal information sharing protocol has been agreed and signed by partners • The partnership has access to ongoing crime analysis information • GIS systems are used on an ongoing basis to direct crime reduction activity

<p>The partnership's information sharing protocol sets out how Information Technology is used to gather, analyse and share information between partners and communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has access to a shared database of crime analysis information • the partnership makes available training to maximise the benefit of specialist technology • the partnership has a formal process for communicating information to communities • the partnership has a website • Data sets previously beset by problems of poor quality and integrity have been improved through the use of technology
<p>The partnership has an agreed, clear and accountable framework for the delivery of the strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the partnership structure for the implementation of the strategy is reviewed and agreed
<p>The partnership routinely adopts problem solving approaches in the delivery of its strategy based upon; effective scanning and analysis of data and local knowledge, combined with properly resourced responses with agreed monitoring arrangements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the partnership collects multi-agency data at neighbourhood level • action groups are equipped with the knowledge, skills, and resources to adopt a problem solving approach • monitoring arrangements assess whether action groups are adopting problem solving approaches

People and partnership results

<p>Officers of the partnership feel their work is supported and valued.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officers have the opportunity to raise potential actions to be taken at the partnership steering group • There is an effective flow of communication between strategic level and operational partnership groups
<p>Officers feel that they have the appropriate skills and support to effectively manage partnership actions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has developed and used training and development plans to ensure staff match the needs of the partnership and its strategy • Partnership officers have been trained in partnership working • Seconded officers are selected according to their skills and knowledge
<p>Training and support for partnership members is regularly assessed, reviewed, and acted upon to ensure that personal development needs are being met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership designs and implements individual, team and partnership learning opportunities • The partnership undertakes staff training needs analysis
<p>Individual partners recognise the benefits of partnership action on their core work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners communicate the benefits of the partnership within their own organisations
<p>Individual partners recognise the additional benefits in achieving outcomes exceeding those that each partner could have achieved by working alone.</p>

Focus results

<p>Repeat victimisation figures and offender rates for offence and nuisance types prioritised in the strategy are regularly reviewed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figures are reviewed on a quarterly / monthly / weekly basis • Performance information is communicated to all sections of the partnership
<p>Crime and disorder levels in focus areas are regularly reviewed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figures are reviewed on a quarterly / monthly / weekly / daily basis • Crime and disorder levels are communicated to communities in focus areas
<p>Socio-demographic data for groups benefiting from interventions are regularly reviewed to ensure equality of access regardless of age, disability, gender, ethnic origin, sexuality or location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has access to neighbourhood level socio-demographic data • The partnership has access to data relating the number of people benefiting from interventions
<p>Groups involved in consultation are informed of the impact and outcomes of that consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has mechanisms for community consultation outcomes • Consultation exercises are evaluated and reviewed

Community results

<p>The partnership measures and reports communities' awareness of and satisfaction with the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the partnership assesses levels of satisfaction with services and service processes • all individual projects review public satisfaction where possible and appropriate • fear of crime is reviewed on an annual basis
<p>The partnership evaluates and feeds back the results of community consultation and involvement in relation to strategy development and delivery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the partnership publishes the results of all community consultation • regular public forums are held to inform communities • where possible consultation events offer participants opportunities for on-going involvement
<p>The partnership encourages, facilitates, and manages the active engagement of community members within action plan delivery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the partnership has community representatives • a volunteering strategy and plan has been drawn up • community volunteers receive training and support • the action planning process includes consideration of the role of community representatives and volunteers

Key performance results

<p>The partnership reviews progress against targets in strategies and BVPIs on at least a quarterly basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The crime and disorder partnership has benchmarked its performance and processes against other crime and disorder partnerships • All partnership members are aware of and trained in the performance management system • Accountability for performance is identified and agreed • Progress against targets is shared with other local partnerships, Government Office, and Home Office • Reasons for progress against targets or otherwise are analysed by the partnership
<p>The partnership has a system for assessing alternatives for failing or under performing interventions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All interventions have milestones or interim targets to aim for • The partnership can identify through monitoring procedures interventions which are not performing • The partnership appraises alternative options for interventions • The partnership has project management procedures to improve failing interventions
<p>The partnership has published an annual review of progress in implementation of strategies including achievements, outcomes and remedial action required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The review clearly states the partnership position in relation to strategy targets • The annual review includes identification of value for money • The annual review of progress is communicated to partnership members
<p>The partnership has processes in place for promoting the achievement of the partnership and partners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has developed a marketing strategy • The partnership has an agreed media protocol to ensure consistent messages are provided on partnership activity and crime and disorder issues

Section C - User Satisfaction in Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships

The main sources of data are the Best Value Pilot Surveys and Evaluation carried out on behalf of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), and the British Crime Survey commissioned by the Home Office.

Perceived effectiveness of local agencies in dealing with crime

The data in the two tables below are taken from the Best Value surveys and looks at the perceived effectiveness of local authorities in tackling crime and community safety. The

figures clearly show that crime prevention in inner London boroughs and metropolitan authorities is least well regarded.

Q How successful or unsuccessful would you say (name of council) is in dealing with crime and community safety?			
	1998	2000	2001
	%	%	%
<i>Base: All residents</i>	(2,500)	(2,515)	(2,568)
Very successful	3	3	3
Fairly successful	43	35	45
Neither/nor	14	17	17
Fairly unsuccessful	21	23	19
Very unsuccessful	10	13	6
Don't know/not stated	9	8	10
Successful	46	38	48
Unsuccessful	31	36	25
Net successful	+15	+2	+23

Source: ODPM (Best Value series, 1998-2001).

Q How successful or unsuccessful would you say (name of council) is in dealing with crime and community safety?							
	Overall	Inner London Borough	Outer London Borough	Mets	Unitary	County	District
<i>Base: All residents</i>	(2,568)	(100)	(133)	(426)	(248)	(1,313)	(348)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Very successful	3	2	9	2	1	3	2
Fairly successful	45	35	47	35	42	49	53
Neither/nor	17	19	17	13	21	18	15
Fairly unsuccessful	19	17	13	28	24	16	15
Very unsuccessful	6	13	3	9	5	4	5
Don't know/	10	14	12	12	7	9	8
Successful	48	37	56	37	43	52	55
Unsuccessful	25	30	30	37	29	20	20
Net successful	+23	+7	+26	0	+14	+32	+35

Source: ODPM (Best Value series, 1998-2001).

The Home Office's British Crime Survey tracks perceived changes in the level of crime. The latest figures available from 2001/02 show that proportion across England and Wales saying there will be more crime has remained consistent since 1999.

Q *How much would you say the crime rate has changed since two years ago. In this areas, would you say there is more crime or less crime?*

	1999	2000	2001	2001/02
<i>Base: All those who have been living in the area for more than 3 years (England & Wales).</i>	%	%	%	%
Lot more	20	20	19	21
Little more	30	30	30	29
Same	36	36	39	39
Little or lot less	14	14	11	10

Source: British Crime Surveys 2000-2002, Home Office.

Perceived impact of crime

As can be seen below, around three in five people regard crime as a problem, including one in five who say it is a *serious* problem. In particular, when looking at the figures by region, crime is a key issue in the West Midlands and Yorkshire.

Q *I am going to read out a list of things that can cause problems for people in their area. I would like you to tell me whether crime is a problem in this area?*

	Problem	Serious problem	Problem, but not serious	Not a problem	Don't know/not stated
<i>Base: All residents (2,568)</i>	%	%	%	%	%
Great Britain	59	19	40	38	3
Government Office Region					
East Midlands	56	19	37	40	4
Eastern	50	11	39	46	4
London	61	26	35	34	5
North East	59	20	39	39	2
North West	59	20	39	37	3
South East	56	13	43	42	3
South West	56	14	42	43	1
West Midlands	70	29	41	28	2
Yorkshire	70	25	45	27	3
Authority Type					
Inner London Boroughs	66	32	34	27	8
Outer London Boroughs	56	21	35	41	2
Mets	72	31	41	25	3
Unitary	69	17	52	29	2
County	52	13	39	45	2
District	53	15	38	44	2

Source: ODPM (2001 Best Value).

The British Crime Survey asks respondents to indicate to what extent their life is affected by the fear of crime/crime by choosing a number from a scale from one to ten, where 1 is no effect and 10 is total effect. Overall, few people nationally actually say that their own quality of life is affected by fear of crime, with fewer than one in ten people saying the impact of fear of crime/crime is *great*. Indeed, on this measure, recent years indicate positive changes in terms of public perceptions.

Impact of fear of crime/crime on the quality of life (1998–2001 British Crime Survey)

	1998 (fear of crime)	2000 (fear of crime)	2001 (fear of crime)	2001/2 (fear of crime)	2000 (crime)	2001 (crime)	2001/2 (crime)
<i>Base: All respondents (England & Wales).</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Minimal (scores 1 to 3)	50	56	60	63	67	71	71
Moderate (scores 4 to 7)	42	38	34	31	29	23	24
Great (scores 8 to 10)	8	6	6	6	4	5	5
<i>Mean</i>	<i>3.8</i>	<i>3.6</i>	<i>3.4</i>	<i>3.3</i>	<i>3.0</i>	<i>2.9</i>	<i>2.9</i>

Source: British Crime Surveys 1998-2002, Home Office.

The extent to which people nationally worry about certain crimes is detailed in the table below.

Q Most of us worry at some time or other about being the victim of crime. Using one of the phrases on this card, could you tell me how worried you are about the following:

	2000		2001		2001/02	
<i>Base: All respondents (England & Wales).</i>	Fairly worried %	Very worried %	Fairly worried %	Very worried %	Fairly worried %	Very worried %
Burglary	38	19	36	16	36	15
Muggings/robbery	27	17	26	15	26	15
Theft of a car*	36	21	34	18	34	17
Theft from a car*	37	16	35	16	34	15
Racially motivated assault	9	8	9	7	9	7
Rape (women only)	21	29	18	27	20	25
Physical attack	25	18	24	16	24	15
Insulted or pestered	23	9	23	9	22	9

* vehicle owners only

Source: British Crime Surveys 1999-2002, Home Office.

Perceived extent of crime

There is a wealth of national data from the British Crime Survey looking at perceived levels of crime and the stated proportion of crime reported to the police. The second table in this section outlines the varying degrees to which crime estimated by the British Crime Survey is recorded by the police. The latest figures available are from the survey in 2000/01 and the tables below detail the most recent findings.

Percentage of households/adults victim who were victims once or more, 1999 to 2000			
	1999	2000	2001/2
<i>Base: All respondents (England & Wales).¹</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Any BCS crime	31.1	27.6	27.8
Any BCS violence²	4.6	4	4
Vandalism	7.9	7.4	7.4
Burglary	4.3	3.4	3.5
All vehicle thefts	9.9	8.7	8.6
Theft from person	1.5	1.5	1.3
Bicycle theft	1.6	1.5	1.5
Other household theft	6.2	5.2	4.9
Other thefts of personal property	3.1	2.7	2.9
Common assault	3.2	3.1	2.5
Wounding	1	0.7	1
Robbery	0.6	0.4	0.6

Source: British Crime Surveys 1999-2002, Home Office.

¹ Risks for common assault, wounding, robbery, snatch theft, stealth theft and other theft of personal property, are based on adults. Risks for vandalism, burglary, vehicle thefts, bicycle thefts and other household thefts, are based on households.

² This rate is calculated treating a household crime as a personal crime. It is the estimated percentage of adults who have been a victim of at least one personal crime or have been a resident in a household that was a victim of at least one household victim.

Proportion of British Crime Survey incidents reported to the police, 1999-2000

	1999	2000	2001/2002
<i>Base: All</i>	%	%	%
Theft of vehicle	95	90	94
Burglary with loss	81	84	84
All burglary	62	66	61
Wounding	58	68	56
Bicycle theft	54	54	53
All vehicle related crime	50	50	52
Theft from vehicle	47	47	48
Robbery	31	54	45
Burglary (attempts and no loss)	49	54	44
All comparable crime	41	45	42
Attempted vehicle theft	39	33	40
All comparable violence	35	45	35
Theft from person	31	35	34
Vandalism	31	34	31
Common assault	29	39	26

Source: British Crime Surveys 1999-2002, Home Office.

The following data is useful for contextualising the importance of crime among the general public. The Best Value pilots carried out by MORI in 2000 shows that tackling crime is the principal area people would like more information about.

Q *Local councils would like to involve more people in their decisions about activities and services they provide. In which, if any, of the following services or issues would you personally like to have greater involvement? Please mention as many or as few as you like.*

	1998	2000
	%	%
<i>Base: All residents</i>	(c2,500)	(2,515)
Tackling crime	35	35
Meeting the needs of young people	30	27
Leisure services	27	25
Education services	26	22
Cleaning/Environmental services	20	20
How Councils spend their money	21	17
Social services	15	13
Council Housing	11	9
Other	1	2
None of these	26	27
Don't know	2	3

Source: ODPM (Best Value series, 1999-2000).

Suggested further reading:

The Home Office website lists all crimes per CDRP areas and shows how CDRPs are grouped into families for comparisons. For more information about this please visit <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs/1201data2.xls>.

Ronan Smyth
Local and Regional Government Research Unit (ODPM)
January 2004