



**LEICESTERSHIRE SAFER COMMUNITIES STRATEGY BOARD**

**Thursday, 8 September 2016 at 10.00 am**

**Guthlaxton Committee Room, County Hall, Glenfield**

**Agenda**

1. Introductions
2. Minutes of previous meeting. (Pages 3 - 10)
3. Matters arising
4. Declarations of interest
5. PCC Update.  
*An update from the Police and Crime Commissioner Lord Bach.*
6. Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service. (Pages 11 - 12)
7. LSCSB Performance Update - Quarter 1. (Pages 13 - 18)
8. ASB Case Management Review. (Pages 19 - 46)
9. Domestic Abuse. (Pages 47 - 52)
10. Prevent and Hate Update.  
*A verbal update will be provided by Gurjit Samra-Rai – Community Safety Team Manager, Leicestershire County Council.*
11. United Against Violence and Abuse (UAVA) Update. (Pages 53 - 54)
12. Twenty Twenty.  
*A presentation will be provided by Mike Hughes, Executive Director, Twenty Twenty.*
13. Other business



14. Dates of future meetings.

Future meetings of Leicestershire Safer Communities Strategy Board will take place at 10:00am on the following dates:

8 December 2016;  
23 February 2017;  
2 June 2017;  
4 September 2017;  
1 December 2017.

Minutes of a meeting of the Leicestershire Safer Communities Strategy Board held at County Hall, Glenfield on Wednesday, 8 June 2016.

Present

Cllr. Pam Posnett	Leicestershire County Council
Cllr. Lee Breckon	Community Safety Partnership Strategy Group Chair – Blaby District Council
Cllr Jonathan Morgan	Community Safety Partnership Strategy Group Chair – Charnwood Borough Council
Cllr Rosita Page	Community Safety Partnership Strategy Group Chair - Harborough
Cllr. Chris Boothby	Community Safety Partnership Strategy Group Chair - Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
Cllr. Malise Graham	Community Safety Partnership Strategy Group Chair - Melton Borough Council
Cllr. Trevor Pendleton	Community Safety Partnership Strategy Group Chair - N. W. Leicestershire District Council
Jane Moore	Head of Supporting Leicestershire Families and Safer Communities
Mina Bhavsar	Head of Adult Safeguarding ( LLR CCG Hosted Safeguarding team) representing Ket Chudasama ; Ast Director of Corporate Affairs (WLCCG)
Bob Bearne	Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire and Rutland Community Rehabilitation Company
Debra Cunningham	Senior Public Health Manager
Supt Mark Newcombe	Leicestershire Police

Officers

Gurjit Samra-Rai	Leicestershire County Council
Chris Thomas	Leicestershire County Council
Rik Basra	Leicestershire County Council
Julie Robinson	Charnwood Borough Council
Sarah Pennelli	Blaby District Council
Bill Cullen	Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
Ann Marie Hawkins	Harborough District Council
Chris Brown	North West Leicestershire District Council

David Lingard

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council

Others

Lord Willy Bach

Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire

Mick Fletcher

Integrated Offender Management

Apologies for absence

Cllr. Kevin Loydall

Community Safety Partnership Strategy Group  
Chair – Oadby and Wigston Borough Council

Cllr. Tony Mathias

Rutland County Council

78. Appointment of Chairman.

It was proposed, seconded, and AGREED that Mr. J. T. Orson CC JP be elected Chairman of the Board for 2016/17.

79. Election of Vice-Chairman.

It was proposed, seconded, and AGREED that Mr. T. J. Pendleton CC be elected Vice-Chairman of the Board for 2016/17.

Mr. T. J. Pendleton CC in the Chair.

80. Introductions

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and all those present introduced themselves.

The new Police and Crime Commissioner Lord Willy Bach was given the opportunity to address the Board. Lord Bach stated that he was in favour of Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) and announced his intention to meet the Chairs of CSPs and the Chief Executives of the associated District Councils as soon as possible. Lord Bach stated that he intended to listen to partners and that his Police and Crime Plan would be informed by attending meetings such as Leicestershire Safer Communities Strategy Board.

81. Minutes of previous meeting.

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2016 were taken as read and confirmed as a correct record.

## 82. Matters arising

### Victim First update. (minute 74)

Councillor Page informed that she had arranged to visit the offices of Victim First and that there was an open invite for other members of the Board to visit as well.

### Matters arising (minute 66)

Gurjit Samra-Rai stated that a report on Sentinel would be brought to a future meeting of the Board when there was some tangible information to update on.

## 83. Declarations of interest

The Chairman invited members who wished to do so to declare any interests in respect of items on the agenda for the meeting.

No declarations were made.

## 84. Safer Communities Performance - End of Year.

The Board considered a report from James Fox, presented by Rick Basra, regarding Safer Communities' Performance for the 2015/16 year. A copy of the report is filed with these minutes.

With regard to Appendix 1 - Safer Communities Dashboard 2015/16 it was noted that the figures for the number of referrals to domestic abuse support services (adults) had been estimated as the precise figures were not available. It was suggested that it would be helpful if the Safer Communities Dashboard included the national figures for each performance measure so that benchmarking could be carried out. Officers agreed to give consideration to how this could be included in the report in future.

With regard to Appendix 2 – Domestic Abuse & Sexual Violence Support Service summary figures it was clarified that the top line of Table 1 labelled 'Helpline calls received' concerned new referrals to the service, so these were different people to those referred to in the bottom line of Table 1 labelled 'Face to face contacts with existing service users'.

In response to a query regarding the validity of Hate Crime data it was acknowledged that Hate Crime was underreported and further work needed to be carried out to improve the accuracy of the data. Sentinel was being looked at with regards to the way Hate Crime was recorded, and a campaign was being undertaken to raise awareness of the importance of reporting Hate Crime.

RESOLVED:

(a) That the 2015/16 End of Year performance information be noted;

(b) That proposals be brought to a future meeting of the Board regarding monitoring performance trends and in particular hate incidents.

#### 85. Volume & Harm - police priority areas for 2016/17.

The Board received a presentation from Supt Mark Newcombe on the Cambridge Harm Index and a change of emphasis by the Police towards prioritising those offences which cause the most harm rather than offences with the highest volume. A copy of the presentation slides is filed with these minutes.

Arising from the presentation the following points were noted:

Leicestershire Police were not going to stop investigating any particular types of crime. Supt Newcombe emphasised that the Cambridge Harm Index was a tool to assist and augment the decision making process and prioritisation decisions would not be solely dictated by the Harm Index. It was noted that Anti-Social Behaviour was a type of offence where if the Harm Index was strictly followed then it would not be prioritised due to the level of sentencing the offence received. Nevertheless, it was still intended to allocate resources to tackle Anti-social behaviour.

Prosecuting and convicting offenders still remained an option to deter people from committing criminal offences, however intervention work was being carried out earlier to decrease the likelihood of an offence being committed.

It was emphasised that Hate Crime and ASB were two separate types of offences.

RESOLVED:

(a) That the presentation on Volume and Harm be noted.

(b) That a further update be provided on progress of the Harm model of policing at the meeting of the Board in 6 months time.

#### 86. Domestic Homicide Reviews.

The Board received a report from James Fox, presented by Chris Thomas, the purpose of which was to outline progress on current Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHRs) and proposed developments of the process for carrying out DHRs in Leicestershire. A copy of the report is filed with these minutes.

It was noted that there were two DHRs underway in Leicestershire; one in the Charnwood Borough and one in Hinckley and Bosworth District.

It was noted that with the exception of Charnwood, contributions to the pooled budget were awaited from CSP's for 2016/17. Leicestershire & Rutland Safeguarding Business Office had requested that the total funding contribution increase to £42,089 and discussion took place regarding whether this was agreeable. Some Board members were of the view that other partners such as providers of probation services and Clinical Commissioning Groups should contribute to the pooled budget, though it was noted that the responsibility for carrying out DHRs lay with CSPs. The Board felt that it needed to be established what were the costs to each organisation when Domestic Homicide took place, and it would be useful to have a report on the benefits and risks. It was agreed that the Senior Officers Group would carry out this work.

RESOLVED:

- a) That the update on Domestic Homicide Reviews in Leicestershire be noted;
- b) That the allocation to the safeguarding Board Business Office be increased to £42,089 for 2016/17;
- c) A more detailed review be undertaken, considering:
  - Revised costs for the management of the process and cost of each review;
  - Basing the budget on a lower average number of cases;
  - Revised contributions across partners;
  - Improving the timeliness of reviews;
  - The process for action plan monitoring and follow up of impact of reviews.

#### 87. Reoffending Update - Young People.

The Board considered a report from Chris Thomas the purpose of which was to provide a summary of Youth Offending Service performance. A copy of the report is filed with these minutes.

It was noted that as part of the restructure of Neighbourhood Policing there had been a change in approach from Neighbourhood Police Officers who were engaging with youths rather than just moving them on and this approach was commended by the Board.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

#### 88. Integrated Offender Management.

The Board received a presentation from Bob Bearne and Detective Inspector Mick Fletcher which gave an introduction to Integrated Offender Management (IOM) and the IOM Performance Report 2015/16. A copy of the relevant paperwork which was tabled at the meeting is filed with these minutes.

It was noted that IOM was a co-located team comprised of staff from the Police, Probation Services and Substance Misuse workers. Mick Fletcher had been promoted within Leicestershire Police and was therefore moving out of offender management.

In response to a question it was explained that Smart Tagging was voluntary and tracked an offender 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, enabling the police to know the offender's whereabouts at any point in time. It was useful as a rehabilitation tool because it helped Young Offenders to stay away from criminal groups and gave them an excuse to stay indoors. It also meant that the police could check whether an offender was in the vicinity of an offence that had been committed and save arresting them unnecessarily. Leicestershire would be taking part in a national trial of statutory GPS Tagging.

It was noted that a lack of accommodation was a major contributory factor towards offending and questioned what was being done about this problem. Bob Bearne stated that there was a large amount of work being done on this issue however the amount of accommodation available was limited and offenders were not always popular tenants. The Reducing Reoffending Board and MAPPA (Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangement) were tasked with assisting offenders with their accommodation needs. It was highlighted that in addition to providing accommodation a support package needed to be provided as well.

RESOLVED:

That the presentation on Integrated Offender Management be noted.

89. Substance Misuse.

The Board considered a report from Debra Cunningham which gave an update on the work being undertaken to tackle substance misuse in Leicestershire. A copy of the report is filed with these minutes.

Concern was raised by a Member of the Board that the substance misuse work was in a silo and did not involve partners such as District Councils and other community organisations. It was felt that there could be greater information sharing particularly in relation to providing District Councils with the details of people receiving substance misuse treatment. It was suggested that this information sharing could take place at Joint Action Groups. Debra Cunningham acknowledged that since the substance misuse work had moved within the Public Health department there had been less partnership working. However, she stated that once Turning Point had begun providing the specialist substance misuse services on 1 July it would be looked at how partnership working could be enhanced. Debra Cunningham stated that with regard to information sharing Data Protection was an issue which had to be overcome but she believed that this problem could be resolved.

Members of the Board stated that the quality of reporting to Community Safety Partnerships had been mixed; in some cases satisfactory and in some cases not so. Debra Cunningham explained that reporting had previously been provided on a quarterly basis by the former DAAT (Drug + Alcohol Action Team) but unfortunately as responsibility for the work had moved into the Public Health department there was no longer the capacity to do this.

In response to a question it was confirmed that tackling the use of Legal Highs was a priority for Turning Point, however the difficulty was that users of Legal Highs did not see themselves as having a substance misuse problem so innovative ways needed to be used to encourage users of Legal Highs to engage with Turning Point.

RESOLVED:

(a) That the report and in particular the key issues for partners be noted.

(b) That it be recommended that the Senior Officer Group review current arrangements for 'responsible authority' partner contributions to licensing statements and applications, and the reporting arrangements to Community Safety Partnerships.

90. Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE).

The Board considered a report from Victor Cook (Strategic Lead CSE and Complex Abuse), presented by Jane Moore, which provided an update on the work of the Children Board's Joint CSE, Trafficking and Missing Subgroup. A copy of the report is filed with these minutes.

Jane Moore asked all Board attendees to encourage their organisations to be aware of the CEASE (Commitment to Eradicate Abuse and Sexual Exploitation) campaign.



## RESOLVED:

- (a) That the report and progress to date be noted.
- (b) That the approach to continue to increase and widen partner involvement in the agenda be noted.
- (c) That the proposals to strengthen local governance arrangements be noted.

91. Other business

It was noted that James Fox had moved onto a new role within Leicestershire County Council so would no longer be attending Board meetings. James was thanked for his contribution to the Board since it was established.

92. Date of the next meeting

The Board noted that the next meeting was due to take place on 8 September 2016 at 10:00am.

10.00 am - 12.15 pm  
08 June 2016

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

## **LEICESTERSHIRE SAFER COMMUNITIES STRATEGY BOARD**

**8TH SEPTEMBER 2016**

### **LSCSB UPDATE: LEICESTERSHIRE FIRE & RESCUE SERVICE (LFRS)**

#### **Background**

1. In February 2016, LFRS agreed a revised set of proposals for its emergency response function as part of its Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) 2016-20. The Plan reflected the need for the Service to rebalance its finances according to difficult financial circumstances.
2. The proposals were to:
  - a) Upgrade on-call fire engines at Market Harborough & Lutterworth Stations to wholetime day crewed and on-call at night fire engines
  - b) Replace second on-call fire engine at Coalville and Melton Stations with Tactical Response Vehicles (TRVs).
  - c) Replace second on-call fire engine at Market Harborough with a Tactical Response Vehicle.
  - d) Introduce day crewing plus at Wigston Station
  - e) Replace second fire engine at Loughborough Station with a Tactical Response Vehicle
  - f) Replace second on-call fire engine at Oakham Station with a Tactical Response Vehicle
3. The Plan also reflected the need to work more in partnership with other agencies on procurement and delivery, in all areas of its work in prevention, regulatory inspection and emergency response.

#### **Notable developments and challenges**

##### **Past Year**

4. In 2015/16 we carried out 5,086 Home Fire Safety Checks and partners carried out another 472.
5. In 2015/16 we carried out 540 Fire Safety Audits which resulted in 250 informal notifications and 59 formal enforcement notices were served.

6. In 2015/16 in addition we engaged the public in 1,969 events mostly aimed at fire and road safety such as our schools' programme.
7. Expansion of the Emergency First Responder trial as a consequence of the introduction of TRVs to other parts of the Service's area.

### **Coming Year**

8. IRMP Actions (all of which will have some knock on effect on capacity for community safety work);
9. Ongoing development of road safety project 'VF4' to incorporate virtual reality;
10. Launch of tri-blue light service prevention project, the 'Braunstone Blues';
11. We are currently undertaking a re-structure within our Community Safety team, which once embedded, will result in the expansion of partnership collaboration and ways of working.

### **Key issues for partnership working or affecting partners**

12. Effecting Entry – Leicestershire Police no longer attend incidents where East Midlands Ambulance Service require entry into a building and this has had a knock on effect for LFRS. For the period Apr-July 2016 158 such incidents were attended and this compares to only 67 incidents for the same time period last year.
13. Identifying Vulnerable People – broadening Home Fire Safety Checks to incorporate wellbeing and facilitating the exchange of data to identify vulnerable people at an early stage
14. Derelict Building Fires – Ongoing issue over the past 12 months of repeated deliberate fires in derelict buildings in and around Leicester: Frog Island, former Corah building and Forest Business Park off Parker Drive.

### **Issues in local areas**

15. As mentioned within Key Issues above, there is a rise in the number of deliberate building fires predominantly confined to the Western side of the City (Frog Island & Parker Drive) that is having a significant impact on both resources and our Community Safety Plan. We have devised an initiative to inform local businesses on arson prevention measures.

### **Recommendations for the Board**

16. For the LSCSB to note the contents of the report

### **Report Author**

**Paul Weston – Leicestershire Fire and Rescue**

**Tel:** 0116 2872241

**Email:** paul.weston@lfrs.org



## **LEICESTERSHIRE SAFER COMMUNITIES STRATEGY BOARD**

**8TH SEPTEMBER 2016**

### **SAFER COMMUNITIES PERFORMANCE 2016/17 Q1**

#### **Introduction**

1. The purpose of this report is to update the Board regarding Safer Communities performance.
2. The 2016/17 Q1 Safer Communities dashboard is shown at Appendix 1.
3. The dashboard shows performance of each outcome with measures to August 2016. Following feedback from the June LSCSB meeting it also includes rolling 12 months trend data. Where collated comparative data is also included showing most similar group (MSG) ranking and more locally charts showing how districts compare with each other.

#### **Overall Performance Summary**

4. Where performance information is available the majority of performance indicators have continued the improving trend outlined in the 2015/16 year-end report. The significant increase to Q4 2015/16 with regard to dwelling house burglary's and vehicle crime has stabilised. Hate crime however continues to fall short of target.
5. Performance with regard to each priority is outlined below.

#### **Ongoing Reductions in Crime**

6. Reported crimes in Leicestershire County in 2015/16 showed a slight increase on the previous year with a 3% increase. The upward trend has however stabilised in Q1 and will require ongoing monitoring. It is to be noted the dashboard shows a favourable reduction. This is however slightly misleading. Q1 data uses revised 2015 population data which supersedes 2011 data used for the previous dashboard calculation.
7. The number of reported sexual offences during 2015/16 had shown an increase. The trend however appears to have stabilised, there were 142 reports in Q4 2015/16, Q1 has seen this figure fall to 117 an 18% reduction on

the previous quarter. Similarly reported rape had been on the increase last year. This trend has also levelled off. Most recently there were 59 reports in Q4 2015/16 with exactly the same number in Q1 of this year; reassuringly the ongoing overall statistical trend is downward.

### **Reducing Re-offending**

8. As previously advised updated statistics on Integrated Offender Management (IOM) re-offending for the County as a whole is now not produced. IOM data monitors the LLR wide overall reoffending rate amongst a representative cohort of offenders (163), Q4 2015/16 reported a 40% reduction in re-offending, Q1 shows a slight improvement to 41% reduction.
9. The data in relation to the number of First Time Entrants to the Youth Justice system has not been updated since the last yearend report. The 2015/16 yearend report specified 68 (37%) fewer first time entrants to the CJS than the previous year. This was building on the lowest numbers recorded in 2014/15 since the baseline year in 2005.
10. Similarly the data pertinent to young people's re-offending has also not been updated since the yearend report with an update due for release Sept. As previously reported 2015/16 data trends were extremely positive with reoffending rates reducing after a significant increase in young people's re-offending in 2014/15. The rate to December 2015 was 0.62 offences per offender compared to 1.0 for the same period the previous year.

### **Repeat Victimisation and Vulnerable Victims**

11. MARAC (Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference) referrals in the county have shown a steady increase throughout 2014/15, as previously reported the Domestic Violence Delivery Group is considering the capacity of the MARAC and options for addressing the increasing demand. Repeat referral rates to MARAC increased slightly from 27% in Q4 2015/16 to 28% in Q1 2016/17, which is the minimum SafeLives recommended threshold for repeat MARAC referrals.
12. Final figures for referrals to domestic abuse support services for 2015/16 are not yet available. It is estimated that referrals were around 1,400 based upon the incomplete data we do have.
13. In summary all outcome measures are on track for the county, though numbers are based upon a small number of returns (around 30), as it is early in the service.
14. With regard to outputs there are a few points to note:
  - (a) An increase in callers to the new helpline from Leicestershire County compared to the previous helpline.
  - (b) Increase in demand for support overall

(c) More telephone contacts than expected and less face to face contacts than expected with existing service users.

15. Demand and capacity with regard to the helpline is affecting other elements of service, including the levels of telephone and face to face contacts. The joint commissioners of the service (JCAB) are working with UAVA on solutions to this.

### **Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) & Satisfaction**

16. The Community Based Survey (CBS) data shows that the proportion of people reporting they have been affected by anti-social behaviour in the past year remains stable at a low of just over 5%.
17. The CBS also shows proportion reporting they feel the police and local authorities are addressing local crime and disorder remains high although very slightly reduced from 92.7% (Q4 2015/16) to 91% in Q1.

### **Preventing terrorism and radicalisation**

18. Reports of Hate Incidents continue to show a sustained reduction. The Hate and Prevent Delivery Group will oversee a multi-agency action plan, the aim is to ensure an effective response to reported hate incidents, promote confidence in communities and encourage reporting.

### **Recommendations**

19. The Board notes 2016/17 Q1 performance information;

### **Officers to Contact**

Rik Basra  
Community Safety Coordinator  
Tel: 0116 3050619  
E-mail: [rik.basra@leics.gov.uk](mailto:rik.basra@leics.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank



# Appendix 3 - Safer Communities Performance Dashboard Quarter 1, 2016/17

Outcomes	Overall Progress RAG	Supporting Indicators	Previous Year (2015-16)	Latest Data Rolling 12 months	Current Direction of Travel	Progress	Nearest Neighbour Comparison	County Comparison	District Comparison
Ongoing reductions in crime	A	Total Crime rate (per 1,000 population)	47.21	46.14	→	G	3/9	Top	
		Domestic Burglary rate (per 1,000 population)	3.53	3.51	→	A	5/9	Average	
		Vehicle Crime rate (per 1,000 population)	7.07	6.52	↑	A	5/9	Average	
		Violence with Injury rate (per 1,000 population)	2.95	3.00	→	G	3/9	Top	
Reduce offending and re-offending	G	% Reduction in offending by IOM & PPO Offenders	40% (2014-15)	41% (2015-16)	→	G	-	-	
		Rate of re-offending by young offenders (local data)	1.25 (2014-15)	0.62 (Apr-Dec 2015)	↑	G	-	-	
		Number of first time entrants to the criminal justice system aged 10 - 17	190	124 (2015/16 Q1 - 28)	↑	G	Top		
Protect and support the most vulnerable in communities	G	% of domestic violence cases reviewed at MARAC that are repeat incidents (Leicestershire inc. Rutland)	27% (Jan2015-Dec2015)	28% (Apr2015-Mar2016)	→	G	-	-	
		Number of referrals to domestic abuse support services (adults). From December 2015 includes sexual violence referrals.	1264 (2014-15)	2003* (2015-16)	↑	G	-	-	
Continue to reduce anti-social behaviour	G	% of people stating that they have been a victim of anti-social behaviour in the past year	5.4%	5.2%	→	G	-	-	
		% of people stating that they feel that the police and other local public services are successfully dealing with ASB and crime in their local area	92.7%	91.0%	→	G	-	-	
Prevent people from being drawn into terrorism with a focus on working in partnership to reduce the risk of radicalisation	A	Reported hate incidents (per 1,000 population)	0.58	0.56	↓	R	-	-	

\* The figure provided includes an estimated number (227) of supports for HBBC stand-alone DA services based on 2013-15 performance. Figures provided relate to 2015/16, not a 12 month rolling figure. Figures exclude callers to the domestic abuse helpline and children referred for specialist domestic abuse support

This page is intentionally left blank

## **LEICESTERSHIRE SAFER COMMUNITIES STRATEGY BOARD**

**8<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2016**

### **THE ASB CASE MANAGEMENT REVIEW**

#### **Introduction**

1. The purpose of this report is to introduce and outline the ASB Case Management Review.

#### **Background**

2. A light touch review has been commissioned by the SPB Executive. It was felt that recent developments in the 'world of ASB' including major legislative updates, organisational and infrastructure changes, funding and resource challenges, all had the potential to affect service delivery.
3. The review examined the consistency of service delivery; it was not a detailed inspection of individual arrangements but instead looked at common threats, risks and opportunities across the sub-region. The process involved interviews with practitioners and service users, completion of self-inspection templates and examination of supporting bureaucracy.

#### **Findings**

4. The Review Report, attached at Appendix 1, outlines the findings of the review; however there is a caveat that the observations did not apply universally. There was some excellent practice, there were however also identified areas for development.
5. In very broad terms the review findings fall into two development areas:
  - a. Standards: There were a number of opportunities to add consistency to service delivery through agreed minimum standards for example around the timescales, method and documentation of victim updates.
  - b. Training/Knowledge: individuals using the case management system require tiered training according to their function. The training inputs should be proactively user led and fulfil operational needs rather than being based on provider capacity and provision.
6. A summary of the main areas within the report:
  - a. Taking a report of ASB: where the report of ASB was not taken directly by an ASB practitioner there were opportunities to mitigate potential

delays in risk assessment, e.g. using supporting scripts or induction training for call takers.

- b. Lack of supporting literature: cost was often cited as a barrier, although not a complete solution digital version of information material for victims was a low cost, accessible, easily updateable, multi-language option.
- c. Keeping victims apprised of case progress: The victim care package on the Sentinel case management system was underused, with little in the way of supervisory footprint. There may be value in adopting elements of the victims' code for updating victims of ASB cases in order to instil standards.
- d. The incremental approach: this was supported by practitioners but there appeared to be a skewed implementation of it following the roll-out of the ASB Crime and Policing Act. Non-judicial disposals appeared to be favoured with patchy uptake of legal elements of the ASB toolkit. Anecdotally, cost, lack of resources, confidence and training all feature as possible barriers.
- e. The ASB toolkit: documentation and associated procedures for use of the toolkit were developed piecemeal across the sub-region. This requires standardisation and made more accessible to users.
- f. Information Sharing: arrangements to share information externally rightly receive a great deal of attention. Conversely internal information sharing between community safety practitioners such as housing, environmental health etc. appears more ad hoc. There appeared a similar issue with non-statutory partners who deal with ASB such as Registered Social Landlords; agreed protocols for information sharing would address these issues in both cases.
- g. Sentinel (the IT system used to case manage ASB): It would be fair to say the system has a poor image/reputation amongst many practitioners, much of it based on historical issues, poor user experience/skill levels and lack of familiarity. Much of this can be addressed through appropriate training and a robust practitioner led process for system development.

## **Solutions**

7. Some of the potential solutions have already been discussed; in no particular order they may also include:
  - a. Revamped sub regionally agreed ASB toolkit and documentation,
  - b. Mentoring/partnership between districts, peer support,
  - c. Explore commissioning shared services such as legal advice and provision for civil elements of the ASB toolkit,
  - d. More effective practitioner support forums,
  - e. Joint working groups,
  - f. Using systems to their full potential,
  - g. Revamped protocols where necessary,
  - h. Training and system user support.

The list is by no means exhaustive.

**Next Steps**

8. A practitioner led programme of work is required to explore the issues contained in the report. The ASB Delivery Group provides a logical forum with necessary expertise to assess feasibility and drive the necessary changes required; indeed many of the suggested actions are already in progress through the group.

**Recommendations**

9. That the Board note the contents of the report

**Officer to Contact**

Rik Basra, Community Safety Coordinator,  
Leicestershire County Council  
0116 305 0619, [rik.basra@leics.gov.uk](mailto:rik.basra@leics.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

Leicestershire County Council

# LLR ASB Case Management Review

Examining the consistency of ASB case management across the sub-region

Rik Basra  
June 2016

# LLR ASB Case Management Review

## Executive Summary

### 1. Background and Methodology:

1.1 The management of anti- social behaviour (ASB) across a multi-agency environment brings many challenges. In recent times additional factors have come to bear, each with the potential to impact service delivery, these include:

- An ongoing trend of reducing reports of ASB nationally and locally
- Major legislative updates, including a revamped ASB practitioner ‘toolkit’
- Organisational and infrastructure changes amongst partners
- Austerity and the ongoing savings agenda
- The impact of inter and intra-agency conventions and working practices
- Statistical ASB trends and service user feedback

In this context a review was commissioned to evaluate the consistency of ASB case management across the sub-region, examining common threats/risks and opportunities.

### 2. Summary of Findings

2.1 ASB practitioners are undeniably knowledgeable, passionate and committed in their role. However, the review has highlighted potential areas for development.

Headlines are listed below with a more detailed commentary and examples within the body of the main report; the observations by no means apply universally, some elements bear more relevance to a locality than others and the report should be read with this in mind.

2.2 *Local arrangements for taking reports and a potential procedural delay in risk assessment:*

An early risk assessment triggers enhanced supervision and bespoke case management. The most expeditious and effective risk assessments are those undertaken directly by practitioners. In many cases however there was an inherent delay in the risk assessment process, chiefly as consequence of locally adopted reporting arrangements such as the use of call centres. Investigation regarding the merits of such arrangements was not within the scope of this review; however effective strategies to mitigate the risk are readily available yet surprisingly remain largely un-adopted. Solutions include the use of supporting scripts to instil consistency and induction training to attain a level of awareness regarding relevant questioning amongst generalist call-takers.



More involved solutions take in the direct imputing of reports as well as technical solutions to map across data to Sentinel from call taking databases. Whereas the latter are aspirational solutions necessitating development the former are very much low cost readily deployable solutions which would significantly improve reports and better support victims/callers.

### 2.3 *The victims reporting experience, a potential gap:*

Written material serves to reinforce verbal advice and sets 'customer' expectations, generally victims/callers for service received little in the way of supporting literature. Understandably cost was cited as justification for the lack of provision; the option for digital versions is a partial solution, accepting of course that not all sections of the community will be able to access information in this format. Accessibility will improve as the proportion of the population comfortable with technology inevitably grows over time. Electronic support literature has the advantage of being more cost effective to produce, allows easier update and distribution and given emerging communities multiple language versions can be produced at relatively low cost.

### 2.4 *Keeping victims apprised of case progress:*

Unsurprisingly practitioners agreed that victims should be kept informed of case progress. In reality however there was little in the way of a coherent set of standards for doing so. The victim care package on Sentinel provides a technical aid to practitioners but appears largely unused a situation that highlights a secondary issue regarding adequate supervision of cases. A concerted effort to raise awareness regarding the care package together with accompanying supervisory oversight and compliance checking is a ready solution in an area that profoundly impacts victim satisfaction.

Additionally, there may also be value in adopting some of the principles within the 'victim's code'. The 'code' is mandatory for criminal justice (CJ) partners; there would be value in a similar vein to incorporate sub-regionally agreed obligatory timeframes for victim updates at key points in the life of a case. There may also be scope to provide a technical solution, 'intelligent triggers' to support compliance in the form of flags to remind case workers of overdue contacts as well as supervisory alerts.

### 2.5 *The Incremental Approach but only up to a point:*

Practitioners outlined a clear commitment to the principles underpinning the Incremental Approach; however a closer examination of outcomes revealed a skewed implementation across the sub-region. There was a strong use of non-legal interventions, however with some notable exceptions there appeared to be a reluctance to proactively utilise legal remedies. This has clear implications for the consistency of decision making, outcomes for victims and sanctions for perpetrators

across the sub-region. The reason for the failure was difficult to discern, the tactics may of course have been entirely appropriate, it may be due to a lack of confidence, problematic implementation of the ASB toolkit, lack of resources, cost or indeed a combination of factors.

Further training and logistical support are obvious solutions but these are not resolutions in themselves. Across the sub-region there was feedback from practitioners that they felt isolated and in effect left to interpret and implement the ASB toolkit locally. It seems at the very least inefficient that a major piece of legislation has been implemented piecemeal when it actually affects all. The reconfigured ASB Delivery Group provides a timely and opportune forum for practitioners to address this and other important issues. The aim should be to mutually support practitioners to utilise the incremental approach fully based on the circumstances of the case rather than other considerations.

#### 2.6 *Problems with local ASB toolkit process design and implementation:*

Developing the above theme, the ASB Crime and Policing Act 2014 brought about a wholesale update of the ASB toolkit. Unlike previous legislative rollouts, deployment was very much left to local design and implementation. 'Responsible bodies' were left to create their own bureaucracy and processes, in many cases the resultant lag in administrative support has stifled utilisation of the full range of options present in the ASB toolkit. Anecdotally there have been instances of practitioners hunting for documentation or having to design process from scratch which may have delayed or even stifled use of a particular power.

With hindsight it would have made sense to undertake a collective design process in partnership with the production of a single version of common documentation. That said this process can still be undertaken retrospectively to help remedy the situation. The latest update of Sentinel V2.8 will introduce folders and a document/template library and there is no reason why a full suite of documentation cannot be collated, agreed and put on the system for all to use.

#### 2.7 *The threat from internal silo working:*

A major driver for a single case management system was the desire to gain greater local visibility of circumstances relevant to an individual or locality. However, ASB is cross-cutting and can be dealt with by many specialists including internal experts and/or departments. Case primacy can depend on how internal services are configured, community safety, environmental health, housing, street cleansing etc. Such cases have the potential to bypass scrutiny by community safety specialists. Partners need to ensure a way is found to ensure relevant cases recorded and managed on disparate internal systems and by specialists are highlighted to

community safety practitioners and vice versa, giving case managers the best information upon which to base decision making and actions.

- 2.8 That said, in general, community safety practitioners appeared comfortable with their current internal information sharing arrangements; some partners benefited from technical support with search engines such as ‘Genie’ (Police) or ‘Enterprise’ (Leicester City Council ) to aid data aggregation. Others, particularly those dealing with lower incident numbers, relied on ad-hoc arrangements with internal colleagues. Such arrangements may be entirely proportionate, however, accepting incident numbers and resources there may be value as a minimum in formalising internal protocols to ensure information is not missed or ignored. It seems risky to say the least to rely on ad-hoc arrangements with colleagues who may be absent or simply fail to disclose at a critical point in the life of a case.
- 2.9 *The threat from non-participant stakeholders:*  
Taking the above principle further, the ASB Crime and Policing Act 2014 brought in some supplementary powers and responsibilities for a number of additional stakeholders. Perhaps the most notable of these being registered social landlords (RSL’s) a sector that has seen recent wholesale growth. However, with one or two notable exceptions, ASB dealt with by RSLs runs the danger of remaining largely hidden unless the relevant RSL wishes otherwise. There are some RSLs attending JAGs although even in these cases there appears to be little in the way of formalised protocols to escalate, appraise and advise on cases. This does not mean of course that appropriate cases are not being disclosed; however there is no defensible process to hold such key stakeholders to account. Given the growth in this sector this issue requires attention.
- 2.10 *Sentinel, a partnership system, requiring proactive commitment and support:*  
The original driver for the introduction of a single cross-partner case management system was to engender greater incident visibility, in-turn supporting more informed responsive evidence based decision making. Sentinel was the system ‘chosen’ to undertake this vital role. The circumstances of system selection is not within the scope of this review or indeed relevant.
- 2.11 User Feedback reveals a number of issues; some based in fact, some anecdotal, each however if left unaddressed have equal potential to undermine the credibility of the system:
- i) *Image/reputation:* some users held the view that Sentinel was functionally a poor system, however when asked many were unable or unwilling to

elaborate or spoke of historical issues that had been remedied in subsequent versions of the system.

ii) There was amongst some an unsubstantiated supposition that Sentinel would either be imminently replaced or abandoned, in part this belief may have been fuelled by the relatively recent loss of the Sentinel Coordinator.

iii) Further feedback included a sense of frustration with some users feeling they were unable to influence system development and/or a belief that this would be inordinately slow.

iv) Steps need to be taken to recover system reputation with a transparent accessible process to address legitimate issues/concerns/gaps in knowledge; there needs to be an effective means not only to communicate developments in usability but also to proactively address negative anecdotal rhetoric.

v) Feedback: Potential solutions must offer the opportunity for users to easily post concerns (anonymously if required) mirrored by a timely transparent response for all to see. This may take the form of:

- An ongoing programme of user training and development
- Identified local system administrators to act as system champions and source for advice and direction
- A 'suggestion box' and/or a 'question and answer section' or blog on the system for users to 'air' issues
- A 'how to' section on the system to take users through typical functions and tasks or indeed refresh knowledge regarding seldom used or more advanced tasks such as 'back-end' searches.

There are help files on the system but these may benefit from re-launch, update and/or revamp.

**2.12 System administration and functionality:** Sentinel is not a fully automated system and from time to time physical intervention is required to ensure smooth running, examples include:

- System administration, ensuring smooth running such as addressing user password issues or access levels etc.
- System governance and coordination; garner partnership agreement for system configuration changes and address conflicts and competing agendas.
- Managing the deployment/implementation of system changes
- Coordination of system snagging and development

- Providing a single point to address knowledge gaps, training and development amongst system users

Historically the Partnership collectively funded a Sentinel administrator to undertake the above; the post-holder built up considerable expertise and the scope of responsibilities expanded over time.

- 2.13 The loss of a Sentinel administrator resulted in the loss of coordination. The reasons for the lack of succession planning for the role is not within the scope of this review, however, in the medium to long term processes and procedures must be developed to supplant the administrative responsibilities detailed above.

There are a number of possible options; an obvious solution could make use of enhanced Sentinel users to undertake the administrator role locally and this is currently being worked through by the ASB Delivery Group.

- 2.14 *System Development:* Sentinel is subject to ongoing development, such requests can emanate from a number of sources; it is absolutely vital that practitioners have an input and help decision makers filter and prioritise proposed enhancements such as the proposal to include/update intelligent triggers on the system. Previously this scrutiny occurred within the 'Sentinel User Group' (SUG) a now obsolete entity.

Moving to the present; practitioners now attend The ASB Delivery Group, this provides the most pragmatic solution to reinstate the SUG function and incorporate it as a standing item within the ASB Delivery Group meeting agenda.

- 2.15 *Training and System Use:* User confidence and competence showed extreme variance and unsurprisingly the demand for further training was universally advocated amongst users. However, past approaches to this important area reveals a rather incoherent picture. To add clarity and aid prioritisation a logical next step would be to undertake a training needs analysis to properly scope the training requirement. Failure to do so runs the danger of undertaking inputs that fail to address the true training requirement.

Anecdotally practitioner feedback outlines a plea that training should be based on user function rather than a 'one size fits all' approach. A suggested training continuum as a minimum should cover:

- Basic User - training must be task focused with attention to basic system functionality, giving training on advanced functionality is wasted and more likely to confuse.
- Enhanced User – additionally covering administration and interrogation of the system.

- System user support; readily accessible, up to date step by step “How to” help files designed to support occasional users who may wish to refresh knowledge.
  - The above may be supported by ‘you tube’ style screencasts covering system functions.
- 2.16 Practitioner feedback suggested a feeling that system development was developer led and to some degree past incremental system development had focussed on acceptance of offered enhancements rather than the development of user led requirements. Whether a perception or a reality this is of course unacceptable, the system clearly needs to service practitioners and a transparent practitioner led development process is vital.

### Next Steps & Recommendations:

3. A multi-faceted approach is required to deal with the issues outlined, in addition to some of the possible solutions referenced above utilising a combination of the following tactics may also help:

3.1 *Mentoring:*

Some local authorities have more experience in certain areas, they may have already undertaken particular tactics, for example undertaking applications for a civil injunction or a closure order. Having built up this expertise it would make sense to share it in a reciprocal arrangement with less experienced colleagues in other authorities.

3.2 *Formalised Partnership:*

Acting as mentor to any number of partners may appear too onerous especially for smaller teams, there may be scope as has already happened in some localities for a less burdensome formalised partnership arrangement.

3.3 *More effective meetings/practitioner forum's:*

ASB practitioners attend meetings regularly, interacting with fellow specialists; the ASB Delivery Group is an example. Examination of past agendas reveals what appeared a skewed focus on planning for future campaigns and work-streams. There is real scope to better utilise these gatherings to focus on problem solving, acting as a forum to share issues and solutions amongst peers. This change in focus is beginning to happen, such practise is identifying issues and engendering solutions or resource provision for mutual support.

3.4 *Joint commissioning and purchasing of services:*

Contracting legal services is an obvious example; greater workloads and buying power potentially may result in better rates together with an opportunity to pool and enhance expertise amongst lawyers and in-turn outcomes. It is accepted that there are political as well as practical considerations but even in these circumstances there may be scope to partner with any number of other LA's with real benefits to those less well resourced.

3.5 *Joint working groups:*

Guarding against 'reinventing the wheel' to work together to solution issues that communally impact all. For example, it seems at the very least inefficient to design and draw-up individual documentation for a bureaucracy that is common to all.

3.6 *Utilising joint infrastructure more effectively:*

For example Sentinel is a common system and achieving a common standard would be more easily achieved if practitioners realised its full potential. For example, there may be scope to utilise it as a common repository for documentation and stationary and promote a single version of the ASB documentation. Sentinel developments should soon incorporate a folder structure which can be utilised for the purposes described.

3.7 *Better use of what we already have:*

The victim care package is an example; there seems little value in having a wish list of system enhancements for Sentinel, undertaking (and paying) for development to then fail to support deployment with an effective training/awareness programme and communication plan.

3.8 *Revamped and updated protocols:*

This does not necessarily require a rewrite of all procedures and associated documentation but at the very least a revisit to ensure they remain relevant and are cognisant of the revised toolkit. The Incremental Approach and JAG Terms of Reference are two obvious examples.

3.9 *Training and system user support:*

Undertaking a training needs analysis to better understand the user requirement is needed followed by rollout of tiered training reinforced by user development support materials.

## 4. Conclusion:

- 4.1 The recommendations are not exhaustive but intended as a starting point to prompt discussion, engender strategic decision making and support tactical delivery across a

range of key business processes. The ASB Delivery Group is the obvious coordinating body for work-streams with larger pieces of work assigned to working groups.

- 4.2 Many of the remedial work-streams require collaborative working and clearly the potential benefits to some partners will be greater than others. Ultimately there will be collective benefits for all but perhaps more importantly a better service for victims.



## The LLR ASB Case Management Review.

### 1. Background & Purpose...

Anti-social behaviour (ASB) can profoundly impact quality of life for many and disproportionately effects the most vulnerable; in response our ongoing efforts to mitigate its effects are unrelenting. There have however been a number of recent developments in the 'world of ASB' which have the potential to directly or indirectly impact service delivery.

These changes/developments are continuously evolving but most notably include...

- *Major legislative updates:* most recently the ASB Crime and Policing Act 2014: this introduced wholesale changes to the 'toolkit' available to ASB practitioners. Unlike previous more prescriptive legislative rollouts the current ethos has been to permit local implementation. The design, embedding of new processes and procedures has implications, not least consistency across the sub-region and partners.
- *Organisational and infrastructure changes:* these include key partners and service providers, Leicestershire Police, CPS, and victim services amongst many undertaking reorganisation. The catalyst may be a bid to gain efficiencies or commission new services, either way the resultant change in equilibrium has implications, staff churn and potential loss of expertise for example pose significant challenges.
- *Austerity and the savings agenda:* diminishing budgets have the real potential to impact service provision and directly affect the capacity to effectively case manage ASB. Issues can take many forms including reductions and/or redeployment of staff or reduced or realigned resources and capability for example with regards to enforcement and the ability to finance and therefore offer positive requirements.
- *Statistical trends and victim/service user feedback:* Statistically speaking reported ASB has shown a sustained downward trend, this may of course be due to positive remedial action and/or changing behaviours. Assurance is required regarding the factors contributing to the reductions such as a shift in recording practice or at the very least some reassurance that the reductions are not contrived.
- *Inter and Intra-agency conventions:* there are of course many inter-agency matters affecting ASB case management...data sharing, the governance and operation of the Sentinel case management system etc. Intra-agency issues are often overlooked, internal organisational structures and dynamics can define who deals with the ASB and indeed which system is used to record it. The protocols in place (or lack of them) for aggregating this data are a potential threat in the context of case and risk management.

In response to these multi-faceted issues a review has been commissioned. It aims to identify examine and assess sub-regional practice in regards to ASB case management.

## 2. A Caveat...

The delivery of services will inevitably differ across partners, justification invariably being based on a requirement to cater for particular local circumstances and needs or indeed the availability of resources and infrastructure.

Accepting this context the review is not intended as a detailed critical inspection of specific local practice and procedure. Indeed some of the observations contained in this report may not wholly apply to the reader's organisation; this is unavoidable without bespoke site specific analysis. Rather this review is an assessment of overarching principles utilised in ASB case management and aims to...

- Identify common threats, risks and opportunities across key business areas across the sub-region.
- Provide some assurance that service delivery achieves an acceptable level of consistency across the sub-region and where it does not highlight the issues.
- Highlight areas requiring further work and form a basis for stakeholder scoping and discussion.

## 3. Methodology...

Information/evidence was gathered across broad themes using a number of methods...

- Site visits and face to face discussions with practitioners.
- Completion of a self-assessment by service providers, this took the form of a pro-forma template with an outline of key themes
- Observations/interviews with users and practitioners
- Assessment of current practice, procedure, protocols, documentation and infrastructure arrangements.

To aid transparency and encourage candour there was an undertaking that practices undertaken by specific individuals/localities would not be identified in the report without prior agreement...

## 4. Summary of Findings...

Findings have been placed into broad themes it is accepted however that most issues are cross-cutting and will not sit in isolation...

## 5. Managing the Report of ASB:

Preventative strategies accepted ASB case management begins from the initial call for service from a victim, witness or other interested party. Actions undertaken at this critical juncture can profoundly impact effective and timely case resolution and ultimately victim satisfaction with the service received.

Ideally a person making contact regarding an issue should be able to...

- Make a seamless report with an unambiguous pathway, minimising the need for repetition and delay.
- Be dealt with by trained staff able to obtain necessary relevant information to assess vulnerability and support decision making based on threat risk and potential harm.
- Receive early assessment and decision making regarding case supervision, information sharing with other specialists and referral if required.
- Service providers should possess the capability to flex and respond with an ability to escalate and work to relevant timescales based on case urgency?
- Victims/callers should be left with clear unambiguous expectations regarding management of their case... necessary information together with confirmatory documentation should be passed to the victim/caller at an early stage and timely updates given.

## 6. First Contact

Reports can of course be received in a number of ways... personal visit, phone call, information via third-parties or agencies, on-line report or even text... The availability of reporting method varies from organisation to organisation. Certainly in the past increasing the availability of reporting methods was seen as desirable, however this trend has reversed and in any case in general terms only larger organisations/departments have the resources and infrastructure to service such an approach.

In most cases there has been a rationalisation of reporting channels mainly in favour of initial contact via telephone reporting. Convenience and cost effectiveness are drivers for such an approach but there are consequential issues which require ongoing consideration...

- ASB practitioners taking reports directly provide the ideal scenario, taking reports 'first hand' builds in quality, provides the best opportunity to assess needs and minimises information seepage. From a victim/caller perspective the need to repeat potentially upsetting circumstances is reduced and practitioners can impart first-hand advice and outline next steps or indeed early notification of closure if appropriate. Having expounded the benefits, there is in reality obvious difficulties not least availability and access to practitioners set in the context of public demand for seamless expedient reporting.

- Call centres provide another channel with generalist call takers taking initial reports for onward resolution by specialists. In principle there is nothing wrong with such an approach, however such arrangements bring additional challenges and steps may be required to mitigate these, most obviously...
  - A need to upskill or raise awareness amongst generalist call takers to ensure they ask callers appropriate questions and make necessary decisions in response to information gleaned.
  - To some degree this can (and in some cases is) mitigated by the use of supporting scripts with call takers going through a set of questions to add consistency and assess victim needs, vulnerability and risk.
  - Induction/training for staff dealing with ASB calls...assessing the level of training given to call takers was not within the scope of the review but logical areas for consideration could include...
    - Training content
    - Training frequency
    - Provisions for new staff to address staff churn
    - Briefing arrangements to support any temporary personnel
- It is preferable that reports taken by generalist call takers once logged and recorded are passed to those able to progress enquiries with minimal delay, practitioner feedback suggested this was the case but it was not possible to test this in reality.

Direct skeleton record input by call takers either directly inputting to Sentinel or via an interface would minimise delay... obstacles to such an approach include additional staff training and the cost and development time required to design a technical solution to allow call taker data to map across onto Sentinel. There was a widely held view amongst local authority ASB specialists that relatively speaking a short delay in data transmission was not an issue, and that calls for service to them were not intrinsically 'urgent'. They held the view that ASB victims always had the option to use the police emergency number if an immediate response was required.

The merits of such a view are debatable however it is perhaps more relevant that callers (whether their enquiry is urgent or not) are given a realistic timeframe within which they should receive further contact; this was not always the case. Locally set contact standards would 'sets the scene' for victims/callers, conversely ambiguity fuels dissatisfaction which is difficult to recover.

## 7. Information Visibility

A key driver for the introduction of Sentinel was at least in part motivated by a desire to gain local cross-agency visibility of ASB and in so doing reduce hidden occurrences and mitigate risk. Practically speaking however there are issues which at least in part frustrate this aspiration.

Reports of ASB are of course received by disparate agencies; however, they can also be received by different internal departments within organisations. The processes and procedures to map across or even search different internal systems for information about a particular individual or locality presents a real challenge. The ability to search across systems utilising a technical solution such as a search engine is of course the panacea, the police Genie system and LCC Enterprise system are examples. Such solutions however come at logistical and monetary cost which impacts their viability as a solution particularly for smaller authorities.

In practice most practitioners rely on ad-hoc local arrangements or such low tech solutions as fellow practitioners in other departments highlighting information verbally. There are inherent dangers in such a people centred approach particularly if at some crucial juncture the relevant staff are absent or simply fail to disclose. In the absence of technical remedy robust internal information sharing procedures should be employed to mitigate human error.

General feedback gave a sense that the report taking infrastructure was considered adequate and commensurate with the level and type of reporting being received. Reporting levels varied, in some cases these were in single figures with others considerably more. The robustness of internal arrangements for the sharing of information between or by other specialist colleagues or across disparate internal IT systems was to say the least vague. It would be more accurate to describe the situation as a resigned acceptance of the status-quo rather than a belief that it was a satisfactory situation.

Relying on the professional judgement of internal colleagues to simply tell you if they deem it appropriate has inherent dangers. There are potential solutions; suggestions are placed in a continuum below...

- The use of a common intra-departmental system would be the ideal but in reality unlikely to be implemented for administrative, cost, logistical and technical reasons.
- A technical solution to search across disparate internal systems.
- Established internal processes to share information stored across internal systems rather than relying on ad-hoc notifications by colleagues.

- As an alternative and/or to support the latter the relevant dept. /colleague placing a skeleton record on Sentinel with a back reference to the main case. As a negative some double keying would be required as well as the granting of access to a larger cohort of users with the accompanying training and security implications.
- Do nothing and rely on colleagues telling you and vice versa if they/you feel it is necessary.

## 8. Literature

Surveying the customer 'experience' was not within the scope of this review; however it was noted that generally victims/callers for service received little in the way of supporting literature. Such written material serves to reinforce verbal advice and sets 'customer' expectations. Lack of provision however is perhaps not so surprising given the potential costs. There are however some low cost partial solutions...

An alternative may be to formulate electronic leaflets to send to victims/complainants. It is accepted that not all will have access to such a format. Limitations accepted e-versions provide a lower cost strategy with the ability to make alterations easily, provide a multitude of formats and language versions with the ability to distribute speedily and cheaply across a range of platforms.

There may also be scope to jointly design and produce literature to support victims, there was some duplication with in the form of a 'partnership victim pack' giving generic advice and information. Literature has been produced before on an ad hoc basis, an agreed cross partnership set adds consistency and assurance regarding provision and with economies of scale hard copy versions may come at lower cost.

## 9. Assessing and Managing Risk

Reassuringly the principle that risk should be assessed at the earliest possible opportunity was consistently expounded by practitioners across the sub-region. It is perhaps an obvious statement but the effectiveness of any risk assessment is at least in part dependant on reporting methodology adopted and the expertise and experience of those undertaking the task.

Reports taken directly by practitioners provide the most reliable assessment of risk. Conversely arrangements to take initial reports using an intermediary such as a call taker or service desk can potentially cause issues. Apart from delays, victims/callers can find themselves having to repeat circumstances, with the potential for missed information or worst still opportunities lost to support victims or reduce risk.

There are a number of suggested mitigating strategies available...

- Scripted questions for call takers to support consistency, particularly useful when reports are being taken infrequently by non-specialist staff.
- Expedited practitioner follow-up, there should be minimal delay between report and practitioner follow-up, particularly important for higher risk cases. Ideally call takers should be able to directly input information onto systems and minimise delay and avoid double keying etc. However, logistically and technically mapping information across from call taking systems to Sentinel may prove too onerous at least in the short to medium term.
- Cross system checks and information gathering, such checks are particularly important to ascertain repeat victimisation and assess vulnerability. Anecdotally feedback suggested intra- system checking between departments such as housing and environmental health was limited.

With regard to the documentation and recording of risk, there initially appeared universal adoption of the matrix on Sentinel; this was indeed true of community safety practitioners. However, with one or two exceptions the same risk assessment process was not necessarily undertaken for cases managed by other specialists such as housing or environmental health officers. This did not of course mean no risk assessment was completed; just that it was not the Sentinel Matrix.

This review did not have the scope to examine this area further but potentially there may be ASB cases that fail to receive a consistent level of scrutiny simply because primacy for the case sits outside community safety. There may be value in examining the risk assessment process (if any) employed by non-community safety colleagues dealing with ASB.

The Sentinel risk matrix system has a heavy reliance on the use of professional judgment; the system was redesigned to minimise bureaucracy whilst allowing the practitioner to incorporate nuanced expert judgement. The latter however can subsequently be difficult to recall/justify with the passage of time. Striking a balance in streamlining assessment with minimal form filling and adequately recording justification is important particularly for high risk cases. In such circumstances in addition to the matrix it would be best practice to document decision making on the system, this occurs on an ad-hoc basis but should be part of a formalised protocol.

Perhaps obvious but nevertheless reassuring was a very strong link between risk and escalation, high risk incidents receiving priority with multi-agency referral and management. Examination of the referral process did however reveal an anomaly with regard to high risk ASB cases managed on internal systems other than Sentinel. The method of referral was such that non-Sentinel cases may fall through the gaps and never be seen by 'Victim First' (VF). VF receives police and partner high risk ASB cases managed on Sentinel for scrutiny and follow-up as required. A similar issue exists for other important groups, at time of

writing they do not receive any referrals from non-statutory stakeholders the most notable being registered social landlords. Accepting many will take high risk cases to JAG a process is required within RSL's to refer high risk cases to VF and address this gap.

## 10. Recording:

### Systems:

A single accessible case management system for ASB was the aspiration behind Sentinel, in reality the partnership 'landscape' is rather more complicated. ASB isn't confined to a single defined department and those charged with dealing with it are configured differently across the sub-region. Specialists may include housing or environmental health staff, some of these utilising different systems to record different aspects of community safety. There did not appear to be any clear inter-operability between departmental collegial practitioners. Add to this the operating practices of non-statutory partners such as registered social landlords (RSL's) and the picture becomes even more complicated.

There was a clear differentiation between crime and non-crime ASB incidents; predictably the Police take primacy for crimes. The situation became less clear for non-crime incidents... there was some feedback albeit anecdotal that victims for certain 'types' of call such as 'noise' complaints were being inappropriately signposted ... it was not within the scope of the review to substantiate this however there was a general working practice that an agency taking a non-crime report of ASB retained case management ownership and recording responsibility.

**Sentinel:** the original driver for the introduction of a single cross-partner case management system was to engender greater incident visibility which in-turn would support more informed responsive evidence based decision making. Sentinel was the system 'chosen' to undertake this vital role. The circumstances of system selection are not within the scope of this review or indeed relevant.

Sentinel as a case management system has been subject to incremental development much of which has been user led. Despite this some users held the view that Sentinel was functionally a poor system, however when asked to elaborate they were unable or unwilling to do so or spoke of historical issues that had been remedied in subsequent versions of the system. Obtaining coherent user feedback regarding the system was challenging.

It was difficult to decipher fact from anecdotal feedback; there was however a great deal of frustration regarding the lack of ownership, governance, development and succession planning for the system. This has resulted more recently in individual approaches by/to local authorities commissioning local system enhancements a situation which has inherent



dangers. A more joined-up approach is required to avoid duplication and fragmented development, a logical way forward would utilise a reinstated Sentinel user group or similar with a clear and jointly coordinated process for partners to effect system change.

There was amongst some an unsubstantiated supposition that Sentinel would either be imminently replaced or abandoned, in part this belief may have been fuelled by the relatively recent loss of Sentinel coordinator. Further feedback included a sense of frustration with some users feeling they were unable to influence system development and/or a belief that this would be inordinately slow.

Proactive steps need to be taken to recover system reputation... legitimate issues/concerns must of course be addressed; key is an effective means not only to communicate developments in usability but also to proactively address negative anecdotal rhetoric, left unchallenged such rumours can be extremely damaging.

Potential solutions must offer the opportunity for users to easily communicate concerns (anonymously if required) mirrored by a timely transparent response for all to see. This may take the form of...

- A 'suggestion box' and/or a 'question and answer section' on the system or elsewhere,
- A 'how to' section to take users through typical functions and tasks, seldom used or more advanced tasks such as 'back-end' searches.

There are help files on the system but these may benefit from update and revamp.

Partner Internal Systems: ASB reports do not solely reside on Sentinel; other departments such as housing and environmental health have their own case management systems. Generally speaking arrangements to map across or view this information was inconsistent and usually relied on individuals rather than systems and processes. Such a situation has inherent flaws with the potential for practitioners to be working with incomplete information. It is accepted that local setup and arrangements differ however a formalised process for information sharing should be in place.

Taking the above principle there is a similar issue with non-statutory agencies who now have responsibilities to manage ASB. Indeed under the ASB Crime and Policing Act 2014 registered social Landlords (RSL's) now have responsibilities in this area, with local authority housing stock diminishing their role in this area is set to expand. Accepting some JAG attendance there appears to be limited formal protocols between RSL's and local authorities regarding ASB case management. With what appears to be an acceptance that RSL's decide what and when they impart information

*Administration and functionality;* Sentinel is not a fully automated system and from time to time physical intervention is required to ensure smooth running, for example;

Administration such as addressing user password issues or access levels etc.

Coordinate and garner partner agreement for system configuration changes.

Managing the deployment/implementation of system changes

Coordination of system snagging and development

Providing a single point to address knowledge gaps, training and development amongst system users.

In the past the partnership collectively funded an administrator post to undertake this role.

The post-holder had over time built up considerable expertise and the scope of responsibilities expanded over time.

The loss of a Sentinel administrator resulted in the loss of coordination around the above 'services'; The reasons for the lack of succession planning for the role is not within the scope of this review, however, in the medium to long term processes and procedures must be developed to supplant administrator responsibilities above. As a priority a procedure is required to bridge the administrative gap around system passwords access etc. There are of course a number of possible options; an obvious solution could make use of enhanced Sentinel users to undertake the administrator role locally.

*System Development;* Sentinel is subject to ongoing development, such requests can emanate from a number of sources; it is absolutely vital that practitioners have and indeed feel they have an input and help decision makers filter and prioritise proposed enhancements. Previously this scrutiny used to occur within the 'Sentinel User Group' (SUG) a now obsolete entity.

Moving to the present; practitioners now attend The ASB Delivery Group, this provides the most pragmatic solution to reinstate the SUG function. It can either be incorporated into ASB Delivery Group business or perhaps more appropriately form a standing item within the ASB Delivery Group meeting agenda.

Procedurally there needs to be a clear process, (which is in development). Cost is always a factor when considering system development, the requirement for collective decision making across partners complicates matters still further. There is always the danger that inordinately lengthy and inflexible decision making protocols can frustrate and stifle system development... A solution would be to have a pre-determined cost threshold for developments, in so doing attaining a balance between unwelcome bureaucracy for smaller changes and required scrutiny and mandate for higher cost developments. The ASB Strategy Group provides a forum to sanction the latter with smaller low cost changes dealt with speedily through the SUG sitting within the ASB Delivery Group.

A clear coherent, transparent process to sanction system change and development will of course support system functionality. It will also if effectively supported and publicised help address many of the reputational issues referred to previously.

Training and System Use; Sentinel system users vary from extremely adept to those much less confident. It was no surprise that many system users giving negative feedback were typically only occasional users. Correlation between user ability and system usage is predictable and strategies need to be found to address the knowledge gap across the assortment of users of the system. A developer led 'one size fits all' training strategy is unlikely to suffice, instead there needs to be a user led training approach, one which accommodates the disparate types of user and supports the knowledge gap apparent for occasional users. This subject is examined further in the report.

A training needs analysis needs to be undertaken to better understand the user requirement across the partnership. Inputs are likely to cover...

- Basic User; training must be task focused with attention basic system functionality.
- Enhanced User; covering system administration.
- System support; readily accessible, up to date step by step "How to" help files designed to support occasional users who may wish to refresh knowledge.
- The above may be supported by 'you tube' style screencasts covering system functions.

## 11. Tactical Management:

Assessing and managing the threat risk and harm to people or instances in a locality...

Areas examined...?

- Management at the correct level concurrent with risk
- Systematic recording of actions
- Appropriate sharing of information/referral/case management.
- Use of incremental approach employing the range of options available in the ASB 'toolkit' ensuring tactics are consistent, proportionate and appropriate to circumstances.
- Do we utilise additional tactics to support victims and build the case, use of professional witnesses etc.
- Quality of recording and systems to support organisational memory and preventative strategies.
- Examination of tactical infrastructure, systems, forms, legal provision, training and expertise, does this stifle or support deployment of the range of tactical options.
- Support for victims, do we refer high risk cases to Victim First, what about ASB cases dealt with by other departments not on Sentinel?

- What about cases going to court, are high risk cases considered for special measures? Witness care?

#### Legislation:

The ASB Crime & Policing Act 2014 rationalised and simplified the suite of options available to ASB practitioners; it was a wholesale revamp of the ASB toolkit. Encouragingly feedback from practitioners would suggest there is confidence regarding knowledge of the new suite of powers.

That said, additional barriers are evident that may stifle full utilisation... this has in some cases resulted in a skewed 'bottom heavy' utilisation of the incremental approach, with a propensity to robustly utilise non-legislative tactics with what appears to be a reluctance to support the full range of more punitive actions when required.

#### Why the reluctance?

- Cost... the new suite of ASB powers brings into play a great deal of civil litigation.
- Confidence in using a new suite of powers
- Lack of local arrangements...
- Poor preparatory bureaucracy

There is some credibility for the latter two points... compared to previous legislative rollouts there was little in the way of accompanying procedural support from the Home Office, this was left for local design and implementation... The result has been inconsistent administrative and legal provision with larger authorities able to fund and cater for the changes more effectively than more poorly resourced ones. There may be scope in pooling resources and expertise, formalised logistical partnership arrangements e.g. pooled legal services which may bring cost savings and build expertise.

#### Response & Escalation:

### 12. Case Progress and Closure:

Ideally a victim or caller for service should...

- Have a clear and unambiguous understanding regarding the status of their case. For example cases going to JAG should have a clear process and protocol for case closure with an identified and accountable individual with the requisite knowledge and mandate to convey the necessary information
- An unambiguous process to inform the victim/complainant of the outcome and any further action intended. Actions should be documented and recorded onto Sentinel, both as a record required actions and to minimise duplication.

Feedback suggested that the above

- Consider communications and media strategy, do we want to publicise what we've done?
- Post incident analysis/ organisational learning, supporting future preventative strategies.
- Linked to the above consider post incident surveying/questionnaires to inform future service delivery.

Practitioners appeared confident that they had a clear protocol for case closure; however there was little to show post incident victim feedback, either via questionnaire or survey. That said there are more generic surveys such as the Crime Survey for England and Wales

#### Other Matters

- Partners had a good understanding of the incremental approach and endorsed the principles underpinning it. Non legal sanctions were well used however there were real issues with implementing elements of the ASB Crime & Policing Act 2014 which severely curtails the available 'legal options'

### 13. Next Steps & Recommendations:

A multi-faceted approach is required to deal with the issues outlined in this report; in addition to some of the possible solutions referenced in the report itself utilising a combination of the following tactics may also help...

- *Mentoring*; some local authorities have more experience in certain areas; they may have already undertaken particular tactics, for example undertaking applications for a civil injunction or a closure order. Having built up this expertise it would make sense to share it in a reciprocal arrangement with less experienced colleagues in other authorities.
- *Formalised Partnership*; acting as mentor to any number of partners may appear too onerous especially for smaller teams, there may be scope as has already happened in some localities for a less burdensome formalised partnership arrangement.
- *More effective meetings/practitioner forum's*; ASB practitioners attend meetings regularly, interacting with fellow practitioners; the ASB Delivery Group is an example. Examination of past agendas however reveals what appears a skewed focus on planning for future campaigns and work-streams. There is real scope to better utilise these gatherings to focus on problem solving, acting as a forum to share issues and solutions amongst peers. Such practise may well identify issues early and engender solutions or resource provision for mutual support.
- *Joint commissioning and purchasing of services*; contracting legal services is an obvious example, greater buying power potentially may result in better rates

together with an opportunity to pool and enhance expertise amongst lawyers and in-turn outcomes. It is accepted that there are political as well as practical considerations but even in these circumstances there may be scope to partner with any number of other LA's with real benefits to those less well resourced.

- *Joint working groups*; to work through issues that communally impact partners, it seems at the very least inefficient to design and draw-up individual documentation for a bureaucracy that is common to all.
- *Utilising joint infrastructure more effectively*; for example Sentinel is a common system and achieving a common standard would be more easily achieved if when practicable practitioners realised its full potential; for example there may be scope to utilise it as a common repository for documentation and stationary and promote a single version of the ASB documentation. Sentinel developments will soon it is hoped incorporate a folder structure which can be utilised for the purposes described.
- *Better use of what we already have!* the victim care package is an example; there seems little value in having a wish list of system enhancements, undertaking (and paying) for development to then fail to support deployment with an effective training/awareness programme and communication plan.
- *Revamped and updated protocols*; this does not necessarily require a rewrite of all procedures and associated documentation but at the very least a revisit to ensure they remain relevant and are cognisant of the revised toolkit. The incremental approach and JAG TOR are two obvious examples.
- *Training and system user support*; A training needs analysis to better understand the user requirement followed by rollout of tiered training reinforced by user development support materials.

#### 14. Conclusion:

The recommendations are not exhaustive but intended as a starting point to prompt discussion, support strategic decision making and support tactical delivery across a range of key business processes. The ASB Delivery Group is the obvious coordinating body for work-streams with larger pieces of work assigned to working groups.

Many of the remedial work-streams require collaborative working and clearly the potential benefits to some partners will be greater than others. Ultimately there will be collective benefits for all but perhaps more importantly a better service for victims.

## **LEICESTERSHIRE SAFER COMMUNITIES STRATEGY BOARD**

**8 SEPTEMBER 2016**

### **LSCSB UPDATE: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE DELIVERY GROUP**

#### **Background**

1. The Domestic Violence Delivery Group (DVDG) is a multiagency group which operates across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland (LLR). Its key purpose is to oversee the progress of the LLR multiagency domestic violence delivery plan, a copy of which is appended to this report.

#### **Notable developments and challenges:**

##### **Past Year**

2. Launch of Operation Encompass in Leicestershire. This initiative involves the County Council informing schools when children in their care are linked to a domestic violence incident. This allows the school to contextualise any changes in behaviour or marks the child may present with, better safeguarding the child.
3. Launch of the Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC) – a state of the art SARC has opened serving the communities of LLR. This excellent facility co-locates Independent Sexual Violence Advisors (ISVAs), crisis workers, medical staff and sexual offence investigators. It also arranges therapeutic care for the victims as they move forwards. It is seen as a national centre of excellence. As 47% of rape offences are domestic related, this strongly supports work to tackle Domestic Violence (DV).

##### **Coming Year**

4. Mapping of DV related referral pathways between key agencies. This ongoing work is being overseen by Detective Inspector Tim Lindley, who is chairing a multiagency task and finish group. Each agency is being asked to map out how DV related referrals are made to colleagues, and then provide evidence that the pathway is effective. These separate contributions are being amalgamated into a single document to give assurance that agencies are sharing information effectively.
5. Developing DV perpetrator management program. This work is underway as a pilot and utilises the Integrated Offender Management (IOM) methodology.

In one case study at Hinckley, this process reduced demand on the local authority, police, housing and East Midlands Ambulance Service, and reduced the subject's DV offending. The total cost savings were £3.5k for the police alone. As this program develops over the next 12 months, reoffending rate performance data will be captured and a more scientific method of identifying the right offenders to be managed is being developed.

### **Key issues for partnership working or affecting partners**

6. Chairing of MARAC – At present all MARAC (Multi-agency Risk Assessment Conference) Chairs are police officers. Non Police agencies/bodies will be encouraged to chair MARACs through a specific programme of MARAC Chair training.
7. De Montfort University are working with the DVDG group to develop PPIT (Priority Perpetrator Identification Tool) - When in full use, this will be used to identify the DV perpetrators who are subject to multiagency IOM

### **Recommendations for the Board**

8. To note the above update

### **Report author - DCI Jonny Starbuck (Leicestershire Police)**

Telephone 0116 222222 Ext 4813

Email: [jonathan.starbuck@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk](mailto:jonathan.starbuck@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk)

### **Appendix**

LLR multiagency domestic violence delivery plan.



PRIORITY AREA	ACTION AND ADDITIONAL AREA SPECIFIC DETAIL	LEAD	NEXT SIGNIFICANT MILESTONE WITH DATE (CAPTURED ON ACTION SHEET)	PERFORMANCE COMMENTARY WITH EVIDENCE NOTED ("WHERE ARE WE AT")
<p><b>1. Increase the number of people accessing specialist services</b></p>	<p>1. Deliver a Communications Strategy to launch the new specialist services for the City, County &amp; Rutland.</p>	<p>Simon Down (OPCC)</p>	<p><b>New service launched 1<sup>st</sup> December 2015 – How was this done?</b></p>	<p><b>Group agreed themes to be taken back to the OPCC: Elderly, Young people, Homeless/vulnerably housed, alcohol &amp; drugs, Mental health, How to be a friend to a victim of DV/Carer needs. Separate meeting to establish content, audience &amp; specific details. Attendees, Nicola Wilmot, Claire Weddle (UAVA), Julia Young (take to district colleagues), Sarah Meadows (UHL), Sally Clare (leicspart nhs)</b></p>
	<p>2. Deliver a campaign to target DV perpetrators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County</li> <li>• CARA Pilot</li> </ul>	<p>Tim Lindley</p>	<p><b>Revisit CARA business case with Lord Bach, 100 days. 8<sup>th</sup> November 2016.</b></p> <p>Group agreed to be put ON HOLD 26/01/2016</p>	<p><b>CARA is parked due to appointment of new OPCC await 100 days before Lord Bach supports. County/Rutland spot purchase to Jenkins Centre during trial, cohort 100 people 2/3 County/Rutland delivered to Jenkins. No other resources assigned for perpetrator work in County. Julia Young to be involved with CARA going forward &amp; support Jenkins Centre.</b></p>
	<p>3. Encourage reporting by victims and third parties across all protected characteristic groups and other identified under-served populations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County – Polish</li> <li>• City – Disabled People (HMT social media),</li> <li>• LLR – 16-18 year olds</li> <li>• LLR – Forced Marriage</li> </ul>	<p>City Stephanie McBurney County Gurjit Samra-Rai Rutland Hugh Crouch Victim First</p>	<p>City Council launching BSL Charter work on 1/12/15 - <b>UPDATE</b></p> <p><b>Claire Weddle to bring to next meeting Equalities Data for UAVA.</b></p>	<p><b>Themes in 1.1 above to be considered by OPCC in respect of steer for comms budget spending.</b></p> <p><b>JY County – established District Group DV specific to feed up to JCAB's – take back Polish theme, link to Comms for District reps.</b></p>
<p><b>2. Improve support for victims and their families</b></p>	<p>1. Ensure that Victim First and Project 360 (from RTC) integrating positively with UAVA.</p>	<p>Simon Down</p>	<p><b>Claire Weddle to meet with Victim First to establish referral protocols. Improvement in referral levels (360). Update next meeting, 6<sup>th</sup> Sept.</b></p> <p>Victim First to bring demographic stats for DV to May's meeting (17<sup>th</sup>)/Equality Impact Assessment from Victim Reassurance Board. <b>Completed presented at meeting 17/05/16.</b></p>	<p><b>Receiving good quality referrals but not enough of them. Two established members of 360 team others still receiving training.</b></p>
	<p>2. To develop and implement a strength based GP engagement plan.</p> <p>GP's improving/support DV victims &amp; families in directing to services. New DV Health Group set up and met formally on the 22<sup>nd</sup> Feb 2016. Key work streams: 1. Group to support 1 yr. DV pilot project (adapted version of IRIS) led by Women's Aid targeting GP 15 practices across WLCCG patch. 2. To finalise and circulate the GP DV self-assessment tool aligned to NICE guidelines for use by practices as part of development and assurance. 3. CCG Hosted safeguarding team to work with a minimum of 5 GP practices in the City who are or have been involved in SCR's and DHR's by undertaking a deep dive supported by the DV self-assessment tool. 4. To secure the support of the recently CCG appointed named GP lead for Safeguarding Children in promoting awareness of DV across LLR practices. 5. To consider policy and guidance for GP practices</p>	<p>Mina Bhavsar and Janette Harrison</p>	<p><b>Detailed update to be given at next meeting, 6<sup>th</sup> September.</b></p>	<p><b>Making progress with GP engagement. A GP DV Policy and Guidance is due out for consultation by 11.07.16 and we anticipate DV Training for GPs hopefully to commence in the autumn 2016, in addition to rolling out the West Leicestershire DV Project supported by Women's Aid.</b></p> <p>Priority of DV Health Group to secure GP engagement. This group will directly report into the LLR DV delivery Group.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Women's Aid DV pilot secured 1 year funding with 20 hrs/per week IDVA time to target 15 practices. CCG have identified 10 practices so far with a further 5 to be identified by Women's Aid.</li> <li>II. DV self-assessment near completion</li> <li>III. GP practices in the city identified.</li> <li>IV. CCG Named GP lead for Children Safeguarding appointed, and plans in place to work with practices to raise awareness of DV services as part of visits to practices. The named GP will be supported by other members of the CCG Hosted Safeguarding team.</li> <li>V. DV policy and guidance for GP practices to consider.</li> </ol>
	<p>3. Evaluate and develop a business case for further enhancement to the DV worker at the LRI.</p> <p>Identified as a Risk of cessation of service that has seen significant referrals in UHL. (Risk Register)</p>	<p>Sarah Meadows</p>	<p><b>Business case update and update based on development of De Montfort analysis at next meeting, 6<sup>th</sup> Sept.</b></p> <p>Analysis of DV Worker in LRI Pilot by De Montfort Uni end of May 2016.</p>	<p><b>Women's Aid Board agreed to continue funding until December 2016 when decision for sustainable funding. Increasing post from 3 to 5 days.</b></p>

3. Improve safety of victims	1. Improve understanding of factors in repeat domestic violence situations which are causing those repeats to occur.  <b>DAST Team</b>	Tim Lindley / Stephanie McBurney	<b>TL &amp; SMB to meet to progress.</b>	<b>De Montfort Uni carrying out work to develop definition and tool around serial DV offender and DAST team pilot new operating model.</b>
	2. Identify issues which relate to victims not being eligible for or able to receive a service (including establishing a data set). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refuge Support</li> <li>• Complex out of area</li> <li>• Immigration status</li> <li>• Data count gap analysis</li> <li>• Victims using violence</li> <li>• Under 13 yrs is a victim group that requires support</li> </ul> Discussions to take place with key services such as UAVA. Obtain initial info & identify how it can be obtained from people accessing the services. Emerged from Safe Homes Contract in City no income to public funds/struggling to find safe accommodation/large families struggling to find safe accommodation/drugs alcohol needs not engaging with support services/medical needs. No specific local protocol exists this need is growing.	Gurjit Samra-Rai	<b>Jonny Starbuck to meet with Gurjit Samra-Rai to discuss and progress.</b>	<b>Discussed through DVDG a list of potential factors has been established see bullet points in 3.2 Action. Task passed from James Fox to Gurjit Samra-Rai.</b>
	3. Map and check efficacy of pathways for adult and child safeguarding in relation to domestic violence (including DHR learning and actions).	Tim Linley	<b>DV Chair to attend next meeting, 27<sup>th</sup> July and review progress.</b> Form Task and Finish Group – COMPLETED	<b>Mtg 26<sup>th</sup> May organisations to map pathways and bring back to mtg on 27<sup>th</sup> July.</b> Task and finish group formed first meeting 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2016.
4. Effectively manage perpetrators to reduce harm caused	1. Reduce the offending of DV perpetrators through IOM.	Jonny Starbuck	Obtain & review re-offending rate data to see impact of process - November 2016.	Robust system now in place to task out, buy in from neighbourhood areas obtained. Identified through MARAC & where DVPO's successfully obtained. Training planned to NPA Commanders to reinforce expectations under the 7 pathways of IOM Model in February 2016. After 12 months review re-offending rate. Process to refer and, mechanism to do and buy in from neighbourhood policing.
	2. Agree a shared data set for adult DV perpetrators.	Jonny Starbuck		A problem profile has been requested from Police data
	3. Increase number of families where perpetrator and victim are both engaged in intervention/support.	Caroline Freeman	Information to be given at next meeting, 6 <sup>th</sup> Sept.	This information for Q1 is not yet available will be provided after the monitoring returns are submitted,
	4. Develop a Police Perpetrator Engagement Programme.	Simon Down		Based on CARA Module. Potentially ready to go, seeking authorisation from new OPCC, principal reserve set aside for this 16/17. Rutland has committed some funds towards the potential DV programme from its PLF allocation
5. Improve confidence within communities and satisfaction of service users	1. Increase understanding of what impacts on positive CJS outcomes.	L English		Tim Lindley speak with Dan Granger for advice on alternative CPS rep.
	2. Begin planning for a conference (to take place after April 2016) to highlight local practice and encourage involvement in partnership work. De Montfort coercive control event which DVDG will support.	S McBurney	Due to meet for conf planning update.	150 free spaces LLR practitioners. Early summer register interest, summer allocation.
6. A strategic and co-ordinated response	1. Co-ordinate training schedules across LLR. Training schedules from organisations for staff re DV related issues to establish gap analysis.	Julia Young	Template to be circulated to all partners to complete and return or bring to next meeting in May (17 <sup>th</sup> ).	Ongoing
	2. Draft 5year inter-agency DV Strategy/Strategies for LLR. Needs Assessments Required.	Gurjit Samra-Rai		City to start developing strategy.
	3. Identify University support for research into identified area of need.	Stephanie McBurney	Clear idea for milestones by May's (17 <sup>th</sup> ) meeting.	Bring to a future meeting; measuring improvement and wellbeing, progress on the service user narrative, recruited people to assist with comms side, serial perpetrators and adolescent to parent violence they are willing to put research capacity into. Working with Leicester University on PIF application. CF has established links with DMU for PhD on perpetrator.



This page is intentionally left blank

## **LEICESTERSHIRE SAFER COMMUNITIES STRATEGY BOARD**

**8<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2016**

### **LSCSB UPDATE: JOINT COMMISSIONING ASSURANCE BOARD**

#### **Background**

1. The purpose of the Joint Commissioning and Assurance Board (JCAB) is to oversee the monitoring and management of the United Against Violence and Abuse (UAVA) contract to provide the delivery of domestic abuse services across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland (LLR). The Board also ensures a consistent and joined-up approach across LLR when liaising with UAVA and is currently chaired by Simon Down from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

#### **Notable developments and challenges:**

##### **Past Year**

2. There have been some challenges over the previous year, which was to be expected given the amount of resource available to deliver such a vast service; however UAVA agreed to the conditions of the contract within the Commissioning Agreement and as such JCAB has a duty to support them to ensure those contractual agreements are not broken.
3. The primary issues have been:
  - Lack of face to face contact with victims;
  - Unanswered telephone calls to the helpline;
  - The lack of robust outcomes monitoring for partners to assess the impact of the service.

##### **Coming Year**

4. JCAB discussed face to face contacts with UAVA and agreement has been reached on the adjustment to the target figure. This was necessary due to a miscalculation by the Provider at the time of submission. In agreeing to this reduction JCAB emphasised that there was an expectation that professional judgement would be exercised by UAVA workers in deciding when face to face contacts are required.
5. The caveat to this reduction is that JCAB's assessment of the impact that this reduction has, will be based upon outcomes monitoring. Without strong evidence that demonstrates good outcomes, despite the reduction in face to face contacts, JCAB will revise the target and increase it again.
6. JCAB were pleased to see the progress made in relation to dropped calls and the greater detail in the monitoring which gives a much clearer picture of how

things are going and greater confidence in the quality of service delivery; this will continue to be monitored closely.

7. The level and standard of data received is improving and the providers have given case studies highlighting the positive outcomes of their integrated service.
8. JCAB has invited UAVA to attend the next Board meeting to present an overview of quarter 2 data, with specific reference to progress against the improvement areas.
9. JCAB shall continue to monitor and work with UAVA and other partners to make the best use of the resources available. Stakeholders will be contacted as part of the 360 degree review and there are also standing feedback opportunities available via UAVA and via the city council online feedback survey.
10. A County group has been established, chaired by Gurjit Samra-Rai, in order to update District and Borough Councils on discussions at JCAB and to take local concerns and issues back.

#### **Key issues for partnership working or affecting partners**

11. Capacity – partners from all agencies frequently highlight the effects of increasing demand against reducing resource.

#### **Issues in local areas**

12. There are no issues identified at this time affecting specific areas of the County.

#### **Recommendations for the Board**

13. That the Board notes the update.

**Gurjit Samra-Rai**  
**Leicestershire County Council**  
**Tel: 0116 305 6056**  
**Email: Gurjit.Samra-Rai@leics.gov.uk**