



# EAST SUSSEX COMMUNITY SAFETY REVIEW

East Sussex Safer Communities Partnership

PHASE 4 – DETAILED SOLUTION DESIGN

**DRAFT REPORT June 2010 – Part 1 – Executive Summary**

# Community Safety Review Phase 4 – Executive Summary

- 1. Executive Summary**
- 2. Structures**
- 3. Performance Management**
- 4. Commissioning Framework**
- 5. Confidence, Communications and Community Engagement**
- 6. Anti-Social Behaviour**
- 7. Integrated Offender Management**
- 8. Risk Register**
- 9. Appendices**



# Executive Summary – Background and Process

## Background

Following the outcome of the consultation process and partners' agreement on the outline proposals developed through the earlier Review phases, Project Leads were appointed to develop detailed solution designs for all proposals and selected thematic delivery areas. A Coordinator was also appointed to support the developmental phase, reporting to the Review Steering Group (RSG).

## Process

A Project Leads Group (PLG) was established to aid coordination of developmental activity. The PLG comprises the Project Leads and the Coordinator.

During this 4<sup>th</sup> phase, it has become clear that funding for partnership activity will be reduced, although the full scale of the reduction will not be fully known until late 2010-early 2011. The need to identify delivery models that will not be dependent on continued partnership funds has been taken into account. In conjunction with the development of minimal cost options there has been an emphasis on establishing delivery models that are both effective and in line with established best practice.

The detailed solution design work has been based on evidence gathered during the earlier review phases and further detailed research into current delivery of partnership activity and best practice. This report includes the evidence which forms the basis for the delivery models that have been developed.

## Thematic Areas and Project Leads

<b>Structures</b>	Natalie Carron
<b>Performance Management &amp; Commissioning</b>	Marcus Gomm
<b>ASB</b>	Julia Pope
<b>CCCE</b>	Mary Denning
<b>IOM</b>	Leighe Rogers
<b>Coordinator</b>	Monica Adams-Acton

Although the earlier review work identified that a review of the DAAT structures was desirable in order to identify potential duplication and/or complementary activity, this was not included in this current phase. In light of the imminent and severe reductions in public sector funding streams, it is recommended that the next phase of the process include work to identify the potential for cost savings and more effective partnership delivery that might be achieved through closer integration of the CSP and DAAT structures.

# Executive Summary – Structures and CCCE

## Structures

The proposals for the strategic, tasking, coordination and delivery elements of the partnership structures have been further refined during this phase. Terms of reference, templates and guidance on roles and responsibilities for community safety members have been developed (Appendices 1-5, 7). There has been an emphasis on ensuring that representation across the structures is appropriate and promotes a transparent and inclusive planning and decision-making process.

In terms of coordination and administrative functions, work to date has focused on developing options for delivering coordination and administrative support to the district partnership structures. Two models have been developed and costed:

- Option 1: Reduce the number of coordinators to two, reduce their remit and co-locate with a county partner organisation, Police being the preferred host. Saves up to £265k.
- Option 2: Existing mainstreamed Community Safety roles co-located and delivering service across Districts and Partners.

A draft job description for the coordinator role has been developed (Appendix 22). A detailed solution design for central coordination and support for the thematic, commissioning and performance management activities across the partnership is an essential next step. Some of the functions currently carried out by the central Community Safety team will be undertaken by the Thematic Groups in the new structure, thus indicating further potential savings.

## Confidence, Communications and Community Engagement (CCCE)

This phase has involved a comprehensive mapping and gap analysis of existing communications and community engagement activity across the county. The CCCE steering group has identified the need for a simple but flexible framework of protocols and processes, geared to targeting local needs.

Four delivery options have been identified, each achieving savings against current estimated costs:

- Option 1: Maintain local delivery and current staffing levels, but with reduced operating budget and co-location of staff. Saves 43k
- Option 2: Merge CCCE function into CSSO role at district level, co-located centrally. Saves up to 86k
- Option 3: Centrally managed and delivered CCCE function (no local delivery). Saves up to 133k
- Option 4: Mainstream delivery only (no dedicated partnership CCCE function). Saves up to 192k

# Executive Summary – ASB, IOM, Commissioning & Performance Management

## Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB)

A steering group has been established, led by Sussex Police, to roll out a phased approach to a comprehensive and standardised ASB service across the county. This service will combine both prevention and enforcement activity, and will include an emphasis on victims of ASB.

Effective prevention and response to ASB requires a multi-agency approach, and the detailed solution design process will be phased to enable:

- Early implementation of consistent enforcement activity across the partnership area.
- Full scoping of the issues surrounding ASB in East Sussex and the impact on the community and local agencies.
- Joint planning with relevant partners engaged in ASB prevention and reduction interventions.

A victim risk assessment process has already been implemented across the county. The next stage will include a analysis of existing data and a comprehensive scoping of service provision.

## Integrated Offender Management (IOM)

The IOM approach, which builds on the success of the Priority Prolific Offender (PPO) scheme and the Drug Intervention Programme (DIP), is well advanced. A Reducing Re-offending Board has been established and is overseeing the delivery of a

case management system and support, disruption and enforcement methods to other offender cohorts. The delivery of the IOM approach to offenders serving less than 12 months will be implemented in June, and plans are well developed for the co-location of identified enforcement and probation officers in Hastings. The co-location of IOM staff in Eastbourne is awaiting the outcome of a bid to the Ministry of Justice for capital funds to establish the Eastbourne site.

Contingency plans are being developed in the event that funding is not secured, either for the capital works or the enhanced support services to offenders targeted through the IOM programme.

## Commissioning and Performance Management

A Commissioning framework has been developed (Appendix 26) which provides guidance and templates for determining and purchasing community safety services. It allows for a mixture of contracts and service level agreements between partner agencies. It provides a sound basis for planning and purchasing the full range of community safety services, and is flexible enough to serve as a framework for major contracts as well as small projects.

Most essential elements of a performance management framework have been drafted, to be further developed during the next phase. A detailed solution design for essential data analyst functions will be included in this work.

# Executive Summary – Next Steps and Key Risks

## Next steps

The earlier consultation revealed partners are in broad agreement with the outline proposals. It is important that partners now have an opportunity to consider the detailed delivery options and recommendations that have been developed and which are even more necessary now in light of the impending significant reductions in partnership resources. The borough and district councils will also want to consider the implications of these proposed changes to the level of service which they currently get via the partnership's resources, and to the level of funding support which they provide to the partnership, the level of funding support which they provide to the partnership.

The delivery options and recommendations have implications for staff currently employed across the partnerships, and this needs to be borne in mind in taking recommendations forward.

## Key risks

There is an extensive risk register included in this report,. However, the key risks at this point include:

- Partners acceptance of recommendations
- Funding reductions
- Continuing commitment of all partners to a joint approach to community safety across the county
- Sufficient partner resources to continue the intensive work required for full implementation of agreed actions.
- No identified plan for continued coordination of work required to achieve full implementation.
- Full implementation of the IOM service is subject to LAA reward funding.
- Outcome of Home Office approval of DIP Intensive application for Hastings and Rother.

# Project Status at 18 June 2010

KEY MILESTONES	Project Lead	Project Brief	Steering Group	PID	Detailed Design Solution	Partner Agreement	Needs Analysis	Commissioning Strategy	Funding Allocation	Commissioning	Implementation	DELIVERABLES
Structures / Perf. Mgt.	[Green arrow pointing right]						Detailed development of Performance Management framework and processes in next phase, including determination of analytical resources required.	Structure ToRs, Membership ✓▲ JAG best practice templates ✓▲ Coord/Admin workloads defined ✓▲ Delivery option for Coord/Admin ✓▲ Analyst delivery options ▲				
Commissioning	[Green arrow pointing right]						Individual commissioning strategies and plans for thematic delivery to be developed following determination of preferred delivery options.	Outline Commissioning Plan ✓▲ Commissioning Framework ✓▲				
Anti-Social Behaviour	[Green arrow pointing right]						Interim solution developed to counter inconsistency in database/intelligence sharing mechanisms.	Police ASB officers in post ✓▲ Victim Risk Assessment pilot ✓▲ Victim database standardised ✓▲ Standardised enforcement procedures ✓▲				
Confidence-Comms	[Green arrow pointing right]						Further development following determination of preferred delivery option. Initial consultation via involvement of partners in identifying delivery options, priorities and good practice. Most effective impact measures identified.	Mapping and gap identification ✓▲ Delivery priorities & key audiences ✓▲ Best practice options menu ✓▲ Consultation on options begun ✓▲ Impact measures developed ✓▲				
IOM	[Green arrow pointing right]						Contingency plan being developed for more limited delivery model.	Feasibility study & Bus. Case ▲ MOJ approval of Bid ▲ Reducing Reoffending Board ✓▲ Target groups, eval. framework ✓▲ Police/Probation staff identified ▲				
							RSG to consider ongoing oversight and coordination of next phases of work through to implementation of all agreed aspects.	Outline Programme Plan ✓▲ Exit strategy post June ▲				



# Recommendations

## Implementation and further work:

- The Review Steering Group (RSG) to continue to oversee further development of detailed solution design and work necessary to achieve full implementation of agreed changes. This group to continue to report to the ESSCSG.
- The Project Leads Group to be expanded to include senior officers from all Local Authorities and statutory partners, and that this group takes responsibility for coordinating and implementing agreed changes to staffing structures and co-location of partnership support staff. This group to continue to report to the RSG.
- To undertake a review of the DAAT structures to identify potential for closer integration and the most cost-effective structures and delivery of CSP and DAAT activity.
- To review central coordination, administrative and other support functions and develop costed delivery options that serve the new partnership structures and achieve further savings against current costs.

## Partnership Structures:

That:

- The best practice terms of reference be adopted for the:
  - East Sussex Safer Communities Steering Group
  - District Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs)
  - Resources and Performance Group (R&PG)
- The best practice templates be adopted for the
  - Thematic Groups
  - Joint Action Groups (JAGs)
- The Guidance on the Rights, Roles and Responsibilities of Community Safety Partnership members be adopted.
- The new structures be implemented on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2010.

## Commissioning and Performance Management:

- The commissioning framework be adopted for use across the range of partnership activity.
- Further development of performance management framework.





## Recommendations cont'd...

### **Partnership Co-ordination and administration:**

- Reduce responsibilities of coordinators to essential workload relating to JAG and District CSP work.
- Change coordinator title to Community Safety Support Officer (CSSO).
- CSSO role to co-locate with another County level function, Police being the preferred option.
- Two CSSOs to be employed to provide support and Communications function across all five Districts.
- CSSO to deal with their own administration.
- CSSO to take on the role of Communication officer
- Agree outline Job Description and develop Person Specifications

### **ASB:**

- Continue joint working with partners to deliver a phased approach to a comprehensive and standardised ASB service.



### **Confidence, Communications, Community Engagement (CCCE):**

- Focus available CCCE resources on communications activities that address local concerns.
- Prioritise community reassurance and engagement, including Neighbourhood Panels and “You Said...We Did” approaches.
- Continue to formally measure confidence levels through British Crime Survey and Place Survey and use evaluations in conjunction with these.
- Establish a permanent steering group (CCCEG) comprising senior officers from statutory partners.
- Adopt a simplified set of communications principles and protocols.
- Develop formal links between the CCCEG and other thematic groups

### **IOM:**

- Continue joint partner working to extend IOM interventions menu to wider group of offenders, from two hubs in Eastbourne and Hastings.

# Programme Plan – Key milestones and implementation timeline

## KEY

### Responsible body:

- ESSCSG
- Resources & Perf Sub Group
- Review Steering Group
- Project Leads Group
- ASB Project Group
- CCCE Theme Group
- Reducing Re-offending Bd.
- ◇ Implementation

