

GWENT POLICE AUTHORITY
SERVICE DELIVERY COMMITTEE

Date: 15th July 2009

Item No: 5e

Heading: Monmouthshire Community Safety Partnership Action Plan - 2009 - 2012. Response.

Report Author: Chief Executive

SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to provide Members with a response to questions and observations made in relation to the Monmouthshire Community Safety Partnership Action Plan 2009 – 2012, raised at the Community Safety and Engagement meeting of 22nd April 2009.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

Members are asked to note the responses provided in relation to the original queries raised at the April meeting of the Committee and the commentary provided in relation to the target setting requirements of the Home Office Crime Team in Wales (HOCTiW) provide at paragraph 2.2 to 2.6 below.

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 At the 22nd April meeting of the Community Safety and Engagement Committee members were presented with the Monmouthshire Community Safety Partnership Action Plan for the period 2009 – 2012. The Action Plan outlined the proposed response of the Community Safety Partnership to identified Strategic Priorities which had emerged from an assessment carried out in 2007.

1.2 As this was the first opportunity members had had to comment on the contents of the plan, a number of questions and observations were raised which were passed to the LPU Commander and the CSP Coordinator to for their information and response as applicable.

2. PROPOSAL FOR CONSIDERATION BY COMMITTEE/CURRENT POSITION

2.1 The questions and observations raised, together with the associated responses, are

- a. The main Outcomes required against the priorities set (i.e. A, B, C, E) appear to share a 'blanket' increase or decrease of 5% as the Target Indicator. How were these targets chosen and agreed and how do they seek to support local policing requirements?

- 2.2 Response: In discussion with the HOCTiW, they informed us that the target setting data presented to the CSP is taken from iQuanta and uses 9 months data to December 2008. Rates are based on mid 2007 population estimates from the Office of National Statistics. The iQuanta peer comparison groups, which came into effect in April 2008, are used to make peer comparisons. This comparison shows whether a partnership is performing better than, worse than or at a similar level to its peers.
- 2.3 CSPs are given suggested targets based on a number of different target setting approaches (benchmarking and significant change), and areas they are then encouraged to consider these approaches when determining a sensible and achievable improvement target. More target setting guidance can be found within the planning area 2008/09 on iQuanta (<https://iquanta.net>).
- 2.4 As full data for the indicators were not be made available when this activity was undertaken, CSPs were advised to set two year targets (2009/10 – 2010/11) based on the 9 months of data.
- 2.5 The HOCTiW has agreed to provide the Police Authority with timely CSP target setting information so that we can consider the requirements within our Local Policing Plan production as applicable.
- 2.6 In Monmouthshire's case, the priorities for the CSP plan were identified by the Strategic Assessment process undertaken for Monmouthshire in 2007. Year one of the action plan has already passed with a maintained position being achieved. The targets in the action plan themselves are actually a 5% reduction over the next two years that seek a 3% reduction in year one and a 2% reduction in year 2. The targets were set and agreed by the Partnership, in discussion with the Home Office Crime Team, based upon the CSP position within the iQuanta matrix. They are being addressed through partnership tasking and coordinating meetings called CSAT's (community safety action teams) and JAG (joint action group).

The basis for the targets are that Monmouthshire CSP want to try and maintain a downward trend in crime as it is performing slightly less well than it's peers in the family of CSP's identified within iQuanta. Crime in Monmouthshire however, is generally low and efforts in reducing crime further needs to be balanced against the drive for improvements in public confidence.

- 2.7 In relation to commentary around the associated Domestic Abuse Plan (DAP) produced by Monmouthshire Domestic Abuse Forum, Ms Rachel Allen, the Domestic Abuse Coordinator for Monmouthshire welcomed the members input and informed us that the DAP has recently been absorbed into the CSP plan and is currently undergoing further review and as such the comments provided by members are timely and will be included in the review process. She also provided the following responses to the questions raised by members;

1. To facilitate the development and implementation of a quality co-ordinated joint agency response.

Question - What is MARAC? -

MARAC- is a Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference. This is a multi agency meeting that manages very high risk victims of domestic abuse.

Question – The evaluation success in terms of adopting the form used for assessment needs a target date.

Agreed. A more specific time scale of implementation is required. This will be dealt with in the review of the plan.

Question – Regarding the timescales of 2010 for the joint two Projects – what months in 2010 are the target dates? E.g.; Jan or Dec?

Agreed. This will be clarified during the review.

Question - Project 3 Housing and D.A. - was Action Plan produced and, if so, when?

The first section of the D.A. plan has been produced as a result of consultation carried out in 2008 and is aimed at meeting Objective 5 in the plan, to which this question refers and seeks to improve the current service provision for all victims and particularly increase the safe choices for women and children/young people who experience domestic abuse.

2. To improve the current service provision for all victims and particularly increase the safe choices for women and children/young people who experience domestic abuse.

Question - What are the evaluation success criteria for the second Project?

This relates to securing Women's Aid Refuge. The evaluation is to ensure secured ongoing funding and clear need and trends. The needs and trends need to be more specific and with assistance of the Joint Advisory Group and the CSP Action Plan and associated report this will hopefully provide the evidence to illustrate the need for the refuge therefore continue the funding - hence evaluation success is sustained funding.

3. To hold abusers accountable for their behaviour.

Question - Can the 'Action' be measured by the suggested Evaluation Success criteria i.e. increase in number of successful court convictions?

This could be evaluated by the number of Gwent convictions but there is no way currently that convictions can be 'localised' to Monmouthshire due to the way in which data is collected by HMCS, police and CPS. This is being look at via an All Wales Working group. The observation made by the members is valid in that we can change the outcome to have a 'Gwent centric' evaluation as this will give us a localised indicator.

4. Increase public awareness as to the issues surrounding Domestic Abuse and to challenge public perceptions that Domestic Abuse is acceptable.

Question - What 'outcomes' were the planned D.A. and Substance Misuse joint training in Projects 1 and 3 intended to result in - in other words, what results were expected to occur?

The outcomes, where to raise awareness of the links between Substance Misuse and Domestic Abuse for frontline staff to enable them to be aware of the indicators and increase referrals to either service. Many people develop alcohol or drug dependency manifested from experiencing domestic abuse. This can also be the case for mental health illnesses.

Additionally, the WAG service framework for domestic abuse and substance misuse problems (launched this month) has also been implemented. Forum members from the domestic abuse service and substance misuse service have recently attended a workshop to progress this implementation in Monmouthshire which will be reflected in the revised plan.

Question - When in 2011 was the deadline date?

Agreed. This will be clarified.

5. To protect and support children and young people in Wales from the negative impact of domestic abuse.

Question - Does the 'Evaluation Success criteria' measure whether the action has been achieved i.e. service implemented.

Agreed. This needs to be much clearer regarding what service and when and how we evidence the need. The evaluation will therefore need to be more specific as raised with quantitative measures included.

Question - Evaluation Success - How many more counsellors were sought?

Whilst funding from central government has been provided to increase hours, it is agreed that this measure needs to be more specific.

6. To educate and inform children/young people to enable them to make informed choices.

Question - Project 3 i.e. 'Income awareness of' - what does the current working mean? There are no evaluation success criteria shown against that Project.

This will need to be looked at by the agency leads as to whether this is a viable project. If so, it is agreed that there is a need for more specific evaluation criteria, for example, Who needs to be aware, what training does this refer to, how will the information be delivered, by when and by whom etc. Who will evaluate if the project is successful?

Question - Evaluation Success - how many teachers was it hoped would be trained?

Agreed, this needs to be specific and we will seek an education lead to specify this.

Question - what month in 2011 is the deadline for evaluation?

Agreed, this needs to be more specific.

2.8 Members are asked to note the responses received resulting from the questions raised by Mr Hathaway on behalf of the committee and are thanked for their observations which have been used to inform a recent review of the DV Plan.

3. STAFFING/PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 There are no staffing implications arising directly from the content of this report.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 There are no financial implications arising directly from the content of this report.

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 Mr Hathaway, the Force, Monmouthshire CSP and the Monmouthshire Domestic Abuse Coordinator have been consulted in relation to the contents of this report.

6. PROJECT ASSESSMENT FOR EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY MATTERS

6.1 This project/proposal has been considered against the general duty to promote equality, as stipulated under the Police Authority's Equality Schemes, and has been assessed not to discriminate against any particular group.

7. RISK ASSESSMENT

7.1 There are no specific risks identified in relation to the contents of this report.

8. STAYING AHEAD (2011 REVIEW)

8.1 There are no specific implications relating to the 2011 Review.

9. CONCLUSION

9.1 The responses to the questions raised by members provide a timely update regarding progression against both the CSP Plan and the associated Domestic Abuse plans for Monmouthshire. The initial observations provided by the Committee have been included in the revision of the DV Plan and members have been thanked for their useful commentary. The agreed provision of CSP target setting data to the Police Authority by the HOCTiW is also a welcome outcome resulting from the discussion undertaken in preparing this report.

10. CONTACT OFFICER

10.1 Mr Neil Taylor - Community Engagement Manager

11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Committee Report 22nd April 2009. Monmouthshire Community Safety Partnership Action Plan - 2009 - 2012.