

BEACON COUNCIL SCHEME

COMMUNITY SAFETY

ROUND 5

2003

Contents

	<u>Paragraph</u>
1. Executive Summary	
Policy Context	1.1
Definition	1.2
Current Practice	1.5
Obstacles to excellent practice	1.8
Outcomes	1.9
Guidelines for excellent practice	1.10
2. Policy Context	2.1
3. Definition	3.1
4. Current practice	4.1
5. Obstacles to excellent practice	5.1
6. Outcomes	6.1
7. Guidelines for excellent practice	7.1
8. Document bibliography	
Annex A	Wider bibliography for partnerships
Annex B	Wider bibliography of drug-related activity

Alan Brown
Home Office
Crime Reduction Delivery Team
Allington Towers
19 Allington Street
London SW1
020 7035 5210
alan.brown@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

1. Executive Summary

Policy context

1.1 The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 recognises that tackling crime is not a matter for the police alone. It promotes the adoption of multi-agency cross cutting approaches to deliver sustainable reductions in crime and promote safer, more secure communities. This is achieved through the statutory requirement to establish Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships or Community Safety Partnerships. There are 376 in England and Wales at local authority level, mainly district.

Definition

1.2 The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 requires police, local authorities, fire and police authorities to carry out an audit of crime and disorder in their area, consult on the results and formulate and implement a strategy to tackle the local and national priorities. Strategies published every three years.

1.3 The partnership) is required to co-operate with other local public bodies such as health, probation and education and invite the participation of other public, private, voluntary and community groups and the community itself.

1.4 Local authorities are also required under the Act to have due regard to crime and disorder issues in the exercise of it's varies functions.

Current practice

1.5 Various research studies give varying perspectives in the working of CDRPs. These have revealed a very mixed picture. Whilst most CDRPs could evidence some achievements in most areas, there were few, if any, that excelled. Some had substantial capacity problems.

1.6 There were some common weaknesses, particularly in the poor engagement of certain partners, problematic data exchange, dependence on unsustainable add-on interventions, lack of performance management, self-development, and financial planning, and limited links with 'hard-to-reach' groups.

1.7 Areas of common strength were the commitment from the local authority and police, progress towards linking across the plans of different agencies, increasing political accountability and progress on community involvement.

Obstacles to excellent practice

1.8 A key barrier to excellence lies in overcoming agency cultures and resultant silo working. Capacity issues hamper progress for some CDRPs, and the pool of suitable personnel is small. CDRPs in local authority areas that are not coterminous with major partners experience particular difficulty in engagement and data sharing.

Outcomes

1.9 Whilst all CDRPs have published strategies for reducing crime and disorder, it is not currently possible to assess the impact of these in isolation from other factors, particularly police performance. BVPIs provide a limited perspective in outcomes. The Home Office has developed family groups that assist comparison of CDRPs on a more like-for-like basis.

1.10 Guidelines for excellent practice

Summary of key aspects

The partnership is well led with leaders of appropriate seniority who provide direction, motivation, and commitment.

Partners have a clear understanding of the partnership's purpose, processes, structures for delivery and targets.

There is a culture of participation and collaboration between partners.

Officers are valued and supported by partnership leaders

Linkages with other local and regional partnerships and networks.

Identifies and uses appropriate multi-agency data sources to identify and review strategic priorities and baselines.

The partnership has the necessary skills and equipment to analyse crime and disorder data.

The partnership has developed detailed SMART action plans for each strategic priority taking account of relevant local plans and targets.

Partners understand the roles, structures and core activities of other partners.

Regularly conducts and responds to a review of the multi-agency training needs.

Agreed appropriate human and financial resources from partner's core budgets.

Agreed a resource management strategy aligned to delivery of strategic priorities.

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.

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.

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.

Has an agreed, clear and accountable framework for the delivery of the strategy.

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.

Training and support for partnership members is regularly assessed, reviewed, and acted upon to ensure that personal development needs are being met.

Individual partners recognise the benefits of partnership action on their core work.

The partnership measures and reports communities' awareness of and satisfaction with the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership.

The partnership encourages, facilitates, and manages the active engagement of community members within action plan delivery.

The partnership has a system for assessing alternatives for failing or under performing interventions.

2. Policy Context

2.1 Statutory Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) came into being as a result of the Crime and Disorder Act (1998). This was the first time that every area in England and Wales was covered by such a partnership, and the first time that aspects of partnership working were made part of a statutory framework.

2.2 The rationale behind the Act is that the focused and coordinated activities of a range of appropriate partners are more effective and more efficient than relying on each agency to tackle its own priorities in its own ways. By drawing in a range of agencies, crime and disorder problems can be examined and addressed from several perspectives.

2.3 This gives flexibility in how problems are tackled and allows a range of complementary initiatives to be put in place. Under the Act (sections 5 and 6), the police and local authority, in partnership with other agencies, are required every three years to:

- carry out an audit of crime and disorder in their local area;
- consult locally on the basis of the audit;
- prioritise among the issues identified;
- formulate a strategy for addressing these issues;
- keep this strategy under review.

2.4 The first crime and disorder reduction strategies were published in April 1999. These covered the period up to the end of March 2002, with the second generation of strategies published in April 2002.

2.5 To facilitate problem identification and problem solving, the Act provides enabling legislation under Section 115 for agencies to disclose to the police and other bodies data relevant to the prevention, detection and reduction of crime.

2.7 Another important aspect of the Act is set out in Section 17, which requires local authorities, police authorities and certain other bodies to consider crime and disorder reduction while exercising all their duties and to do all that they reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in their area.

2.8 Since the establishment of CDRPs, the role of Government Offices in the regions and in Wales in relation to crime and disorder and the drugs strategy has increased. A Crime Reduction Director (now known as Home Office Director) was appointed to each of the nine English regions and to the National Assembly for Wales. These Directors took on responsibility for:

- ensuring partnerships in the region receive training, support and guidance;
- managing allocation of funding;
- monitoring the performance of CDRPs against their strategies (in conjunction with relevant inspectorates);
- working with CDRP partners to achieve results.
- Working with Drug Action Teams on delivery of the national Drugs Strategy

2.9 The regional Crime Reduction Teams should be the first and main point of contact between partnerships and the Home Office.

2.10 The 1998 Act was amended by the Police Reform Act 2002 to require the responsible authorities to consider the misuse of drugs in determination of their

strategy. CDRPs and DATs have areas of overlapping interest and common areas of membership and geographical areas, although all CDRPs and DATs are not coterminous. The Home Office has promoted the merger of these two groups to achieve improved delivery and more effective partnership working. This has been subject to a consultation exercise and the merger exercise is subject to ongoing consideration.

3. Definition

3.1 Partnerships perform an important public service by addressing issues that are a major influence on how citizens view their neighbourhood (Audit Commission, 2002). Reflecting the broader concerns of the community, they can have a wider remit than a focus on crime and disorder issues (for example, some cover fire and road safety). However, as far as statutory responsibilities are concerned, these cover primarily the audit and strategy process described in part 1.

3.2 The published audit and strategy documents provide key evidence concerning the multi-agency problem-solving work of the partnership. In keeping with the level of experience of the partnerships, these strategies have varied considerably in terms of their scope and their focus. Although statutorily required for all local authority area under the Crime and Disorder Act, 1998, a number of partnerships were already in existence, and in a few areas there has been a long history of partnership.

3.3 However, the majority of CDRPs only came into being following the legislation. The scope of CDRP membership is wide. In addition to the statutory partners, a range of over thirty different types of organisation have been identified as potential partners, the vast majority of which are represented on at least 10% of CDRPs (source: 'ePartnerships' survey of all 376 CDRPs carried out by the Home Office in early 2002).

4. Current Practice

4.1 The current levels of effectiveness of 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).

4.2 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Representation and commitment from the local authority and police ▪ 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"> ▪ Low level of engagement and commitment of other partners, (notably health, probation, education and the criminal 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).

4.3 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.

4.4 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.

5. Obstacles to Excellent Practice

5.1 Various reports have confirmed that the greatest, and most over-arching, obstacle to effective partnership working is the intransigence of agency cultures, resulting in lack of engagement of key partners and in narrow, uncoordinated 'silo' working (Audit Commission, 2002; Sizmur et al, forthcoming). This is reflected in failure to 'mainstream' community safety issues into the objectives and regular functions of the partner agencies and in failure to share data between agencies, another significant obstacle to progress. Silo working has, however, been successfully overcome in a range of CDRPs. There are some indications that areas geared up for area-based delivery of services are in a stronger position in this respect.

5.2 Effective problem solving is a weakness in many CDRPs (Philips et al, 2002), and common obstacles to progress are lack of data from certain agencies (or inadequate and inaccurate data when it is available), and absence of trained and qualified personnel with the time available to undertake detailed analyses of the information – an issue of capacity. There are indications that suitable personnel are in short supply, and there is a high turnover in some areas, leading to instability in the partnership. Lack of capacity is also likely to be an explanatory factor in the widespread absence of effective performance monitoring and management, which in turn invites implementation failure.

5.3 CDRP personnel have, in the past, consistently pointed to the complexity and uncertainty of central funding as a barrier to success. However, this obstacle should now be greatly reduced following the move by the Home Office towards formula-based funding of crime and disorder initiatives. Nevertheless, excellent partnerships should be looking for ways to maximise the effective use of agency service budgets and resources, and for sustainable, longer-term solutions alongside short-term, intensive 'quick fixes'.

5.4 Non-coterminosity (in some CDRP areas) presents a significant obstacle in engaging partners working within differing geographic boundaries and hinders sharing and merging data.

6. Outcomes

6.1 Strategies for crime and disorder reduction have been produced covering all CDRP areas. For the reasons given in part 3 of this report, determining the impact on crime and disorder and on people's perceptions of their area, that can be attributed to these strategies is highly problematic. In coterminous areas, the impact of the partnership is for most purposes inextricably linked with the impact of the police Basic Command Unit.

6.2 Crime problems can also be displaced from one area to another, so the success of a CDRP is to an extent governed by the company it keeps: those partnerships neighbouring areas where there has been a high level of success may find they have inherited problems from across the border and over which they have limited control.

6.3 Nevertheless, basic monitoring information is available to interested parties, including members of the public, in the form of performance indicators. National Best Value PIs have been set for Community Safety. Approximately half of these apply to local authorities. However, only a minority relate directly to crime and disorder issues(<http://www.local-regions.odpm.gov.uk/bestvalue/indicators/pi2003-04/index.htm>), and these can give a narrow picture. For example, CDRPs are strongly encouraged to use a range of data sources beyond police recorded crime figures when analysing trends in their area, but some BVPIs reflect only the police figures. Currently, there is no national indicator that allows public perceptions to be measured at the local authority level.

6.4 In addition to the national indicators, councils are encouraged to adopt local PIs. According to a survey carried out in 2001 by the Local Government Association, 39 per cent of local authorities had developed local Best Value PIs for community

safety, while 12 per cent had no plans to do so. 52 per cent had developed other local indicators for community safety (LGA, 2001).

6.5 As an aid to bench-marking the performance of CDRPs, the Home Office has allocated each area to one of 13 'families' that have similar characteristics on a range of socio-demographic variables (Leigh et al, 2000). This allows CDRPs themselves and others monitoring their performance to make more realistic comparisons. Using the CDRP family and the police force area as dual points of comparison, Sizmur et al (forthcoming) found that out of a sample of 40 CDRP areas, half were attributed with a positive local effect, while just over a quarter were attributed with a negative effect. However, they stopped short of attributing these effects directly to the impact of the partnerships, for the reasons already explored.

7. Guidelines for Excellent Practice

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

Leadership

The partnership is well led with leaders of appropriate seniority who provide direction, motivation, and commitment.

- 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

Partners have a clear understanding of the partnership's purpose, processes, structures for delivery and targets.

- 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

There is a culture of participation and collaboration between partners.

- 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

There is clarity and transparency in the way the partnership makes decisions.

- 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

Officers are valued and supported by partnership leaders in the delivery of crime reduction strategies.

- 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

There are strong linkages with other local and regional partnerships and networks.

- 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

Leaders adopt a responsive, pro-active, and accountable role in strategic partnership development.

- 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

The partnership identifies and uses appropriate multi-agency data sources to identify and review strategic priorities and baselines.

- 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

The partnership has the necessary skills and equipment to analyse crime and disorder data.

- 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

Options for responses to problems are appraised drawing on national and local evidence based practice.

- 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

The partnership identifies and manages risks to the effective delivery of interventions.

- 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

The partnership has developed detailed SMART action plans for each strategic priority taking account of relevant local plans and targets.

- 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

Partnership strategies have been formulated by all bodies required by the Crime and Disorder Act (responsible authorities, statutory consultees and invitees to participate).

- 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

Strategic priorities are determined by evidence of local problems.

- 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

Strategies acknowledge regional and national guidance.

- 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

Partners understand the roles, structures and core activities of other partners.

- 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

The partnership has agreed and prioritised interventions requiring external funding to deliver actions detailed within strategies.

- 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

The partnership has agreed a resource management strategy aligned to delivery of strategic priorities.

- 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

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.

- 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

The partnership has agreed an appropriate response to Section 17 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998.

- 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

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.

- Partnership action groups have been trained in performance management
- Performance management is a standing agenda at partnership meetings

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.

- 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

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.

- 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

The partnership's information sharing protocol sets out how Information Technology is used to gather, analyse and share information between partners and communities.

- 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

The partnership has an agreed, clear and accountable framework for the delivery of the strategy.

- the partnership structure for the implementation of the strategy is reviewed and agreed

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.

- 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

Officers of the partnership feel their work is supported and valued.

- 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

Officers feel that they have the appropriate skills and support to effectively manage partnership actions.

- 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

Training and support for partnership members is regularly assessed, reviewed, and acted upon to ensure that personal development needs are being met.

- The partnership designs and implements individual, team and partnership learning opportunities
- The partnership undertakes staff training needs analysis

Individual partners recognise the benefits of partnership action on their core work.

- Partners communicate the benefits of the partnership within their own organisations

Individual partners recognise the additional benefits in achieving outcomes exceeding those that each partner could have achieved by working alone.

Focus results

Repeat victimisation figures and offender rates for offence and nuisance types prioritised in the strategy are regularly reviewed.

- Figures are reviewed on a quarterly / monthly / weekly basis
- Performance information is communicated to all sections of the partnership

Crime and disorder levels in focus areas are regularly reviewed.

- Figures are reviewed on a quarterly / monthly / weekly / daily basis
- Crime and disorder levels are communicated to communities in focus areas

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.

- The partnership has access to neighbourhood level socio-demographic data
- The partnership has access to data relating the number of people benefiting from interventions

Groups involved in consultation are informed of the impact and outcomes of that consultation.

- The partnership has mechanisms for community consultation outcomes
- Consultation exercises are evaluated and reviewed

Community results

The partnership measures and reports communities' awareness of and satisfaction with the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership.

- 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

The partnership evaluates and feeds back the results of community consultation and involvement in relation to strategy development and delivery.

- 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

The partnership encourages, facilitates, and manages the active engagement of community members within action plan delivery.

- 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

The partnership reviews progress against targets in strategies and BVPIs on at least a quarterly basis.

- 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

References

- Audit Commission** (2002) *Community Safety Partnerships*. London: Audit Commission.
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC)** (2000) *Calling Time on Crime*. London: HMIC.
- Leigh, A., Arnott, J., Clarke, G. and See, L.** (2000) *Family values: Grouping similar policing and crime reduction areas for comparative purposes*. Briefing Note 3/00. London: Home Office.
- Local Government Association (LGA)** (2001) *Partners Against Crime: A survey of local authority approaches to community safety*. London: LGA Publications.
- Phillips, C., Jacobson, J., Prime, R., Carter, M. and Considine, M.** (2002) *Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships: Round one progress*. Police Research Series paper 151. London: Home Office.
- Sizmur, S., Clery, L. and Ingram, S.** (forthcoming) *The Effectiveness of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships: The position at the end of round 1*. Police Research Series paper. London: Home Office.

ANNEX A – Detailed bibliography of partnership research

ANNEX B - Detailed bibliography of drug-related activity