

**A CURRENT VIEW OF
WORKING IN
PARTNERSHIP IN
SCOTLAND**



CONTENTS

PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND..... 4

METHOD..... 4

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 5

PARTNER COMMITMENT AND FUNDING..... 8

TASKING, INFORMATION SHARING, DATA AND EVALUATION..... 9

POLICE AND FIRE REFORM 11

LOCAL PRIORITIES FOR SCSN SERVICES..... 15

APPENDIX I: CSP RESEARCH PHASE I EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 16

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

SCSN would like to thank those partnerships which supported this research, for giving their time and for the candid responses given. For SCSN this is the continuation of a journey to plot and maintain a picture of community safety structures, practise and issues in Scotland. With an ever diversifying range of local partnership arrangements we hope this research encourages a common sense of identity and a foundation for the sector to champion local and national practise.

With thanks to the following Community Safety Partnerships:

Aberdeen
Aberdeenshire
Angus
Argyll and Bute
City of Edinburgh
Clackmannanshire
Comhairle nan Eilean Siar
Dumfries and Galloway
East Ayrshire
East Dunbartonshire
East Lothian
East Renfrewshire
Falkirk
Fife
Highland
Inverclyde
Midlothian
Moray
North Ayrshire
North Lanarkshire
Perth and Kinross
Renfrewshire
Scottish Borders
South Ayrshire
South Lanarkshire
Stirling
West Dunbartonshire
West Lothian

PURPOSE AND METHOD

PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

In autumn 2012, the Scottish Community Safety Network (SCSN) undertook a research project focusing on Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) in Scotland. This piece of work was particularly timely given the current climate of austerity and substantial changes in relation to national public sector reform.

The purpose of this research was to begin to build an up to date and comprehensive evidence base of current structures and existing practise in the community safety sector in Scotland in order to begin building an evidence base of what works and why.

Initial and full reports were shared with the Scottish Government's Community Safety Unit (CSU) and are also available on the SCSN Website at www.safercommunitiesscotland.org. The executive summary of the first report is included in this third publication as background information (see Appendix I).

This report follows up on areas identified for further research from Phase I, focusing on:

- Partner commitment and funding
- Tasking, information sharing, data and evaluation
- Police and Fire Reform

METHOD

During May and June 2013 SCSN staff spoke to 26 of the 32 CSPs in Scotland, covering both rural and urban areas across the country, and interviewed them using a proforma developed by the team as the basic structure for the dialogue. Unfortunately time did not allow SCSN to contact the remaining CSPs ahead of the publication of this report – City of Glasgow, Dundee City, Dumfries and Galloway, East Lothian, Orkney Islands and Shetland Islands – but responses from Dumfries and Galloway and East Lothian were received on the Police and Fire Reform questions.

Of those interviewed, 11 rural and small town CSPs and 16 urban CSPs were interviewed. Regionally this was nine east CSPs, seven north CSPs and 11 west CSPs.

In order to assist analysis of the information, a Survey Monkey questionnaire was created and completed by the team on conclusion of the interview process. The findings within this analysis are based on discussions between team members, discussions between SCSN and other CSP contacts, the Partnership Analyst's forum and in depth exploration of the interview responses.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PARTNER COMMITMENT AND FUNDING

Core CSP partners continue to be the Local Authority (typically criminal justice, community safety and housing departments) and Police and Fire and Rescue Service. Even then, only a relatively small number of these are a CSP with equal buy-in and responsibility and workload shared between all partners.

The third sector (typically this means Victim Support Scotland – there is minimal representation from other third sector partners in any of the CSPs), NHS and other Local Authority departments such as social work, trading standards, substance misuse and education have varied levels of involvement. Some CSPs report good engagement with these, particularly Victim Support Scotland; but a number of CSPs report having difficulty in engaging and maintaining contribution from partners such as the NHS and local authority departments like social work, substance misuse and education.

The private sector, Scottish Children’s Reporter Administration (SCRA), Scottish Prison Service (SPS) and Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Office (COPFS) are less involved across the board.

CSPs with a broad membership displaying equal buy-in and responsibility are characteristically in areas where there is strong leadership and an effective, supported and motivated partnership. There is some evidence that where there is a level of colocation this can also help to develop a strong partnership which encompasses a wider range of partners.

With many CSPs looking to strengthen their partnership working techniques to engage and maintain partners’ commitment to the partnership should be explored. The CSP Self-Assessment toolkit has been used by five partnerships to identify areas for development and CSPs would be encouraged to use this resource to assess their own priority needs.

Funded posts within partners tend to be funded by Local Authorities rather than jointly funded by all CSP partners, and almost all Local Authorities interviewed fund at least one post within the Police, Fire and Rescue Service or other partner; and some fund many more. Local Authority funding of these posts is estimated to be at least £6.6 million per annum, most of which is spent on funding posts within Police Scotland – typically community or campus officers, but also includes partnership analysts or researchers. Significantly less is spent by the CSP or Local Authority on posts within other partner agencies such as Scottish Fire and Rescue Service or NHS.

TASKING, INFORMATION SHARING, DATA AND EVALUATION

The majority of CSPs have devolved tasking through either thematic or geographical groups - these provide the operational arm to meet the targets of the CSP strategic assessment/strategy and to ensure timely responses to emerging issues. There is extensive evidence that local thematic and geographical tasking structures have had an impact on reducing crime and antisocial behaviour (ASB). All tasking meetings discuss ASB issues while 15 also consider the full complement of community safety priorities such as ASB, home safety, fire and road safety.

Information sharing between community safety partners has been standard practise for a number of years and it is encouraging to see that most CSPs share personalised information to allow the partnership to effectively tackle local community safety issues.

There are, however, differences in the scope of this – for example some CSPs share this type of information about risk on a daily basis to all partners across all areas of community safety; some will share this type of information at the tasking meeting only and some will share it with specific partners in line with child and adult protection legislation only.

This is reflected in the scope of Information Sharing Protocols (ISPs) – some cover all partners and all aspects of community safety, some cover most partners and ASB only and some do not have a partnership ISP but specific partners will share information using ‘thematic’ ISPs (usually just ASB and ‘public protection’). Many CSPs still cite difficulties with getting personalised and other information from partners such as social work, addiction services and NHS.

Highlighting progressive information sharing practises with the community safety network in Scotland may encourage CSPs to further develop and broaden their approach.

CSPs are accomplished at evidence based planning and evaluation principles are core to their work, however confidence in evaluation is highly varied. Perceived issues centre around a lack of skills and time to analyse data properly, and that people are not yet habitually considering evaluation as part of the project planning process; particularly for smaller projects or operational activity. Evaluation training is available through SCSN both online and as a course which can be commissioned for local delivery.

Partnership analysts, when present, have the main role within the CSP in relation to data use and analysis; and in their absence there is significantly less analysis produced, particularly for operational use within a CSP. CSPs are using data to plan their activities and monitor performance, but what they use is a very small proportion of the data available. Most CSPs would benefit from guidance on the type of data available and support on how to access, understand and use it. There is a specific demand for operational NHS data, A&E in particular, within CSPs.

The availability of SCSN training on evidenced based strategic planning provides access to guidance on data collection and should be more widely promoted across the sector. The need for accessible data supports the need for a national data base which SCSN hope to develop over the next year.

POLICE AND FIRE REFORM

CSPs are working well, with a proven track record of adapting to a changing landscape of public sector reform. CSPs are keeping pace with public sector reform, although they do not always feel involved or in a good position to be able to influence the process as much as they would like.

In the months since the new Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) and Police Scotland began, few CSPs have noticed any discernible difference on the ground. There were a number of common areas of concern expressed by the third of CSPs that reported a negative impact since the beginning of the single services. Some of those CSPs who had noticed no operational difference since 1 April 2013 also noted a number of future concerns along the same theme.

- Shift by Police Scotland from prevention and partnership working to enforcement-driven and performance output-led. The set-up of many new teams, often without consultation with CSP partners, resulting in duplication of work and a ‘silo’ approach
- Removal and/or change of role or focus of campus officers and road safety officers
- High turnover and uncertainty around personnel in both the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service and Police Scotland. Lowering of rank in personnel attending some CSP meetings is also a concern

- Apparent reduction in local autonomy, particularly for data and performance information

It would appear that very few of the interim local police and fire plans have been developed jointly with the CSP. While this is likely due to initial time pressures, CSPs have expertise in partnership working, evidence-based planning and problem solving structures and these must be embedded in future plans and service delivery by the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service and Police Scotland.

SHARING GOOD PRACTISE

As noted in Phase I of SCSN's research, CSPs are increasingly shifting away from project-based work and instead making core changes to the way in which services in partnership are delivered. This is seen as a direct result of budget restrictions and the impact of internal reviews/restructuring, with many focussing on trying to deliver the same level of service with ever decreasing staffing and budgets. At least 17 CSPs are still undertaking projects, and around five were at an early stage in planning and delivery. Examples of the types of project work being undertaken include:

- Working with the local armed forces around team building
- Regeneration projects
- Substance misuse problem-solving
- Educational projects targeting specific age groups
- National projects like No Knives, Better Lives (NKBL) or anti-sectarian initiatives

SCSN strives to facilitate sharing of practice through the production of practice notes for the website, articles in Safety Net-networks and through events. Indeed a series of thematic practice sharing events have been organised to consider shared practice with respect to Serious and Organised Crime, Alcohol and Drugs, and Hate Crime.

ANALYSIS

PARTNER COMMITMENT AND FUNDING

Partner Commitment

Core CSP partners continue to be the Local Authority, Police and Fire and Rescue Service, with between 21 and 23 of 24 CSPs viewing them as 'very involved'. Criminal justice teams, health and social care, community safety and housing departments are those typically represented by the local authority. Education departments, social work, Alcohol and Drug Partnerships (ADPs) and trading standards are less well represented. The third sector, private sector and NHS are less involved across the board, but these appear more ad hoc, and for the third and private sectors depends upon local arrangements and circumstance.

Only four CSPs class the NHS as 'very involved' partners, 17 as 'fairly involved' or 'a little involved' and two as 'not involved'. Many of them note that there is sporadic attendance at meetings from NHS representatives and their contribution to and/or role at meetings requires some clarity.

For CSPs, typical third sector representation comes from Victim Support Scotland, local substance misuse providers and sometimes the local third sector interface. There is a fairly even split in responses as to whether the third sector are very, fairly or a little involved in CSPs; and positively only two CSPs out of 24 did not have any third sector partner involved at all.

Private sector representation on CSPs is fairly limited and tends to be private Registered Social Landlords (RSLs). Most CSPs (14) state the private sector are fairly or a little involved, two CSPs have very involved private sector partners and four have no private sector involvement. HMP Addiewell is a particularly active private sector partner in the CSP areas it holds prisoners from. This is not necessarily replicable in other CSP areas.

The least represented partners on CSPs are Scottish Prison Service (SPS), Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service (COPFS) and Scottish Children's Reporter Administration (SCRA). Only one CSP has SPS involvement, three have COPFS involvement and one has SCRA involvement.

East CSPs tend to have more third sector involvement than their North or West counterparts – two-thirds (six of nine CSPs) have the third sector fairly or very involved compared to 43% of North (three of seven) and 55% of West (six of eleven) CSPs. The NHS are much more involved in urban CSPs compared to rural/small town CSPs with 11 of 14 urban CSPs rating the NHS as very or fairly involved compared to one of nine rural/small town CSPs. Two CSPs in the East are the only ones to have COPFS involvement.

Funding

The initial CSP research report highlighted that a number of Local Authorities spent a proportion of their budget on funding Police, Fire and Rescue Service or joint partnership posts, and SCSN were keen to explore these funding amounts and arrangements in more depth.

Funded posts within partners tend to be funded by Local Authorities rather than jointly funded by all CSP partners, and almost all Local Authorities interviewed fund at least one post within the Police, Fire and Rescue Service or other partner; and some fund many more.

There is a wide variation in funding arrangements and amounts:

Only three of 24 CSPs provide FRS with project funding; anywhere from £10,000 to £137,000pa; and one CSP funds half a post, but was unable to give a specific figure. The remaining CSPs / Local Authorities do not give the FRS any funding.

A quarter of (six) CSPs fund other partners. Other partners that are funded include a Victim Support worker and an analyst from a consultancy; but most is project funding which ranges from restorative services, taxi marshals and youth work services. The remaining CSPs / Local Authorities do not fund posts within other partners. More work would be required to ascertain the money spent on projects or other services such as mediation.

The largest amount of funding from local authorities is spent on Police Scotland – with 21 out of 26 respondents funding posts within the organisation. Funding either comes from the Local Authority's community safety budget or core Local Authority budgets.

Most posts are police officers who undertake some kind of community-based role such as safer neighbourhood teams or campus officers; others are partnership analysts and researchers or antisocial behaviour and police liaison officers. Across the 18 CSPs that could provide figures this totals approximately £6.6M per year, ranging from £15,000 to £2.6M per year and averaging £338,000 per CSP per year. Only four of the CSPs interviewed do not give any funding to the Police.

On average, North CSPs spend notably less per CSP on funding partners such as Police and Fire and Rescue¹: £24,428 on average per CSP compared to £226,747 for East CSPs and £183,772 per West CSP. Although all CSPs spend less on fire and rescue or other partners, North CSPs fund only the police.

TASKING, INFORMATION SHARING, DATA AND EVALUATION

Tasking

23 out of 27 CSPs that responded have a partnership tactical tasking meeting of sorts (though a number of these are not National Intelligence Model compliant or supplied with analytical documents to discuss); all of which discuss ASB. There is no geographical trend for those with no tasking meetings, although not having an analyst is a trait shared by them all and may provide some insight to this.

Eight tasking meetings discuss ASB only, with the remaining 15 including discussion on all community safety priority themes. All but three of the ASB only tasking meetings are in the West, and the reasons for them not including wider community safety themes should be explored in more depth. Again, not having a partnership analyst may be part of the reason.

Themes covered vary depending on the local context but the most prevalent discussed at partnership tasking meetings are domestic abuse; home, road and fire safety; substance misuse and, violence; and are discussed by 10 to 14 CSPs. Themes discussed less frequently are child and adult protection, serious organised crime, sexual crime, hate crime and acquisitive crime; discussed by six to nine CSPs.

CSPs vary in their approach but some will have a single meeting discussing all thematic areas, some have multiple thematic tasking groups (some geographical) and some will discuss everything except public protection issues which they view as the remit of the other groups within the wider CPP.

¹ Note that this does not include project funding or 'in-kind' support.

Some geographical trends are apparent in the scope of tasking meetings:

- East CSPs particularly cover substance misuse and domestic abuse at tasking meetings: Substance misuse - 71% (5 of 7) compared to 33% North (2 of 6) and 40% West (4 of 10). Domestic abuse – 71% (5 of 7) compared to 50% North (3 of 6) and 40% West (4 of 10)
- West CSPs particularly cover sexual crime at tasking meetings: 40% West (4 of 10) compared to 33% North (2 of 6) and 28% East (2 of 7)
- East and West CSP tasking meetings tend to cover home safety more than north CSPs – 71% (5 of 7) East and 50% (5 of 10) West compared to 33% (21 of 6) North
- East CSP tasking meetings tend to cover fire and road safety more than the others - 71%/85% (5/6 of 7) compared to 40%/50% West (4/5 of 10) and 66%/50% North CSPs (4/3 of 6)

Information Sharing

Information sharing at tasking meetings appears less problematic than it was historically now that CSPs are well-established – only one CSP does not share personalised information of any kind at tasking meetings; the remainder (22) share full personalised information about individuals of note. This does, however, depend on the partners round the table and will only be done with specific cases. It typically excludes child protection, adult protection and domestic abuse cases which are discussed in depth elsewhere, and serious organised crime, terrorism and drug intelligence; though there are some who have an innovative approach to information sharing who will share it.

Some CSPs will only share personalised information with partners to whom it is directly relevant, while others take the approach that all partners attending the tasking meeting do so in a capacity as a partnership. In practice this can mean that information about an individual whose lifestyle puts them at risk of having a fire in the home is only shared with the Fire and Rescue Service and Housing, for example, and not other partners round the table such as trading standards or Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service (COPFS). Other CSPs would share this information with all partners round the table with the understanding that they are bound by relevant legislation and local Information Sharing Protocols with regard to information sharing and handling.

Most CSPs have an Information Sharing Protocol (ISP) which permits information sharing between partners that have signed up. Five of the 26 CSPs that responded have ISPs which cover antisocial behaviour (ASB) only, and a similarly small number have thematic ISPs - separate ISPs for ASB, child protection and adult protection. The remainder have an ISP which covers all aspects of community safety and all partners that have signed up. Comparing these approaches and looking at the benefits each confers would be valuable in providing future guidance to CSPs

More than half of CSPs – 14 out of 24 that answered the question – still have difficulties getting personalised information from social work, addiction agencies and NHS partners, as well as depersonalised information from the NHS, particularly about A&E admissions. The frequency of data received from the NHS also means it is inappropriate for tasking meetings and CSPs are missing vital pieces of up to date information from a key community safety partner. Similar issues were also mentioned by some areas in relation the future frequency and detail of SFRS and Police Scotland data and information.

On the whole, information sharing has not changed since the start of Police Scotland and the SFRS, though the interviews were conducted within the first three months of the new services so changes may only become apparent in time. On a more positive note, three CSPs noted that there had been

an improvement in information sharing – all of these were in the West and were due to previously poor personal relationships.

Data

Partnership analysts, when present, have the main role within the CSP in relation to data use and analysis (19 CSPs). For the remaining 10 CSPs, there is no single person with the remit for community safety analysis. The Improvement Service are at present undertaking research into what products Partnership Analysts are producing, to complement this work. SCSN will ascertain what is produced by those responsible for data research/use in CSPs with no partnership analyst.

Few CSPs use data from the NHS, Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service, Scottish Children's Reporter Administration, Scottish Public Health Observatory; for example. Only two to four CSPs out of 19 that responded use this type of data.

Most CSPs use a range of national data including Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics, Census and Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation, surveys like the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey and Scottish Household survey and Police and Fire and Rescue Service data. 11 to 16 CSPs of the 19 that responded use this type of data. However this is a very small proportion of the data produced nationally. CSPs do not appear to be accessing or using the full range of data available.

The need for accessible data supports the development of a national data resource which SCSN hope to develop over the next year. Data CSPs were interested in were A&E data particularly around injury surveillance, domestic abuse, young people and substance misuse and accident statistics. Some CSPs simply wished to be notified each time new data is released. Many were keen to know what data is available and how to use it within their CSP.

Evaluation

Evaluation has been a key focus for the community safety sector in Scotland, with dedicated training and funding available to support evaluation locally. Despite this, there is still an apparent lack of confidence, a demand for SCSN evaluation training and information gleaned from the Safer Communities Award applications indicates that some people continue to struggle with evaluation methods and processes. . Reasons given by the CSPs interviewed for the perceived issues with evaluation were:

- Lack of skills to analyse the data properly
- Uncertainty around outcomes, outputs and performance indicators
- Time consuming, particularly when carried out by staff who do not routinely deal with evaluation or data analysis
- Historically not required, and people are not yet used to having to consider this as part of the project planning process

On-going training and support for evaluation was suggested as one way SCSN could assist CSPs with evaluation locally.

POLICE AND FIRE REFORM

The following is based on responses from 28 CSPs and general discussions with a number of other groups. Note that 28 CSPs responded about their general feelings since 1 April 2013, however only 26 CSPs answered the specific question about whether information sharing practises had changed since 1 April 2013.

22 of 26 who answered the question about the impact of reform on information sharing said there was no change in information sharing practise since the start of the single Police and Fire and Rescue Services. Three said they had improved due to personnel changes and one said practise had declined. Three who said there had been no change did note some future concerns, specifically around personnel changes and the new Police Scotland output rather than outcome performance indicator focus.

Of the 28 who answered the question about their general feelings since 1 April 2013, one CSP reported things had improved since the start of the services, 18 said there had been no noticeable difference on the ground and nine said there had been a negative impact. A number of the 18 who noted no change locally did, however, vocalise a number of concerns for the future which are detailed below along with key themes mentioned by those who had already begun to notice negative changes since the advent of the single services.

Please note that for some of the comments below this was individual reflection rather than the whole CSP – many who said they saw no change reported that they were still receiving what they personally required to do the role, and not necessarily reporting the views of the wider CSP. The converse is also true.

The CSP who said things had improved noted it was due to personnel changes which changed a poor previous relationship into a more positive one. While generally the improved focus on domestic abuse by Police Scotland has been welcomed by CSPs.

CSPs that felt there had been no change noted:

- That there had been no change in the level of personnel attending meetings
- Having a named local senior officer was beneficial
- That operational staff from the Local Authority were still working with Scottish Fire and Rescue Service and Police Scotland officers
- It was too early to tell for longer-term impact

Areas where CSPs highlighted areas of decline or concerns for the future:

Partnership

Partnership progression/development has slowed as both services have been understandably inwardly focused. There is concern that whilst there are good intentions to return to partnership working once internal governance arrangements have been resolved, personnel changes and time passed will mean partnership working may need to be re-built.

It would appear that new specialist alcohol anti-violence teams and domestic abuse teams are being set up locally and working in isolation from the local CSP rather than creating a partnership approach to shared issues.

Inputs from Police Scotland and the SFRS at SCSN's AGM in June 2013 acknowledged that the sheer scale of reform had resulted in a reduction in partnership working to focus on creating a firm foundation and secure internal structures for the new single services. The focus is now beginning to shift and both Police Scotland and the SFRS are committed to resuming local partnership working in line with their respective priorities.

- Police Scotland strategic priority - *'Work in partnership to improve safety & reduce crime'*

- Scottish Police Authority strategic priority - *'Make communities safer & reduce harm by tackling & investigating crime & demonstrating pioneering approaches to prevention & collaboration at a national & local level'*.
- SFRS – *'Working in partnership with local communities and organisations'*

As with all public and third sector organisations, both Fire and Police have been experiencing financial cuts, and recognise this means a collective response to local needs is required.

Personnel

Although Police Scotland and the SFRS are trying to minimise the impact of key personnel changes during their recruitment and redeployment stages, CSPs have raised a lack of continuity of meeting attendee(s) and a lack of communication generally from the services. Some CSPs raised the lowering in rank for certain meetings and local concerns that the officer may not be in the position to determine budgets or have decision making powers.

At the AGM, both services recognised the impact internal recruitment was having but assured CSPs that officers would need time to settle into their new roles and that there should be less personnel movement in the future – within Police Scotland officers will generally remain in a role until they have completed three years in the post or are promoted. Both services confirmed that despite a reduction in rank at CSP meetings, these officers all have appropriate decision-making authority to work with the CSPs.

Rumoured removal of campus officers and changes to partnership analysts posts are also a concern, and CSPs are seeking clarity on how funded officers will be tasked following the review. In addition, CSPs are keen to know how changes in local access to the national crime recording system will impact on the information and frequency of data sharing.

The removal of local road safety officers and move towards enforcement is of concern to a number of CSPs. However it is noted that other partners have a statutory remit for road safety education and prevention, and that the increase police enforcement activities linked to road safety will complement the work of these partners.

At the AGM CSPs were advised that only posts that were not funded by CSPs or Local Authorities will be subject to a wider review by Police Scotland, and the priority for police staff, be it campus officers, Local Authority Liaison Officers or analysts, will be the Police and SPA priorities. To meet the analytical needs of CSPs who do not have funded analysts it is likely that a centralised tasking model for analysts will be developed and from which police divisions and partners could commission work. Where CSPs directly fund police staff there should be no change in service provision.

Enforcement and Performance

The key concern is the change in agenda for police from prevention to enforcement, and increased performance focus on output indicators rather than outcome indicators. For example, information / data on *outcome* performance indicators that were previously shared with the CPP for the SOA are now apparently not being produced.

In addition the move to a single national database for police and changes to access levels locally, CSPs are apparently getting less data than previously locally agreed.

Police Scotland noted that prevention and partnership are a core part of the new performance regime but with significance budget savings Police Scotland have to made, priority would be given to delivering on their core function of enforcement , however, this would not be exclude future prevention and partnership working.

Local Plans

As SCSN's Phase I research highlighted, CSPs have had limited *involvement* in development of local police and fire plans which were produced by the services and taken to scrutiny committees for sign-off. Concerns have been expressed that as the scrutiny committees have only just been established that they may not be informed to provide comment and challenge on the local plans and how they fit with CSP plans and/or SOA.

A quick analysis of local plans would suggest they have been written to meet administrative deadlines and statutory requirements, rather than local need. For example where officers are in charge of multiple (and sometimes very different) local areas; with some exceptions the plans all have the same priorities. There is also a tendency for some divisions to adopt the national police priorities as local ones.

The main criticism of the SFRS is the slow pace of change; for example progressing things like local plans in the absence of the national strategic priorities (which are due to be released in September 2013) is a challenge. Conversely, Police Scotland are felt to have moved too rapidly in developing local plans with little local consideration or consultation with CSPs.

Both organisations recognise that the timescales to produce the initial local plans was extremely tight and had reduced opportunities to consult local partners. However these are interim one year plans and both organisations assured CSPs they would be consulted over the next year as they develop their three year plans for the future.

SFRS note that their single service strategic planning is out of sync with the Single Outcome Agreement (SOA) timescales, but this will hopefully be resolved by the SFRS Board and ratified by the Scottish Government in autumn 2013.

General

Strong CSPs and/or CSPs where SCSN's lead officer contact is at a more strategic level have reported feeling the negative impact more.

North- 29% (two of seven North CSPs) said there had been a negative effect of police and fire reform. Most did, however, note some degree of personnel change within both services.

East- 56% (five of nine East CSPs) said they had noticed a negative impact of police and fire reform. Many were concerned about an increasing enforcement focus from the police, as well as a removal and shift of focus around road safety. They also noted some degree of personnel change within both services and that this had sometimes led to confusion and inconsistent approach.

West- 27% (three of 11 West CSPs) noted a negative impact of police and fire reform. Most noted the rank and personnel changes, and a few noted the shift to enforcement.

SHARING PRACTISE

As noted in Phase 1 of SCSN's research, CSPs are increasingly shifting away from project-based work and instead making core changes to the way in which services in partnership are delivered. A small number of projects were shared with SCSN in Phase II of the research; however many are in an early stage of development and are unable to be shared with the network until they are more established. CSPs that were unable to share projects have either been very focused on internal reviews or no longer undertake dedicated project work as outlined in Phase I. Examples of new projects include:

- Community covenant in partnership with the armed forces
- Information sharing system

SCSN will continue to identify opportunities to promote good practice examples so that members can evidence the impact of community safety interventions with communities, across partnerships and nationally. We will share with the sector and key partners the evidence and learning from the research to increase partnership working around cross-cutting issues.

LOCAL PRIORITIES FOR SCSN SERVICES

All interviewees were asked “In the next six to twelve months, if SCSN were to do one thing to support your CSP, what would it be?” Responses have been broadly grouped as follows:

- Continuation of training programme
- Developing relationships with CPPs
- Supporting partnership working in areas such as serious organised crime and terrorism and sharing information about practise like joint tasking and information sharing
- Updates on developments and feelings about Police Scotland and the SFRS
- SCSN to speak for the sector at a national level, more than at the moment; and more information on national policy and direction
- To annually undertake this style of research to share the national picture.

Rural/small town CSPs tend to feel more isolated and out of touch with developments than urban CSPs – there were a number of comments, particularly from rural/small town CSPs, wishing to know more information about things happening nationally and best practise. They were also particularly keen for SCSN to maintain the training offered as they tend to have less internal training than larger or more urban CSPs.

APPENDIX I: CSP RESEARCH PHASE I EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

STAFFING AND STRUCTURES

CSP structures and staffing have developed from local need and circumstances. Most have some form of hierarchy ranging from two to five tiers covering the basic functions of joint scrutiny, joint strategic planning and proactive operational delivery.

The majority of CSPs have devolved tasking through either thematic or geographical groups - these provide the operational arm to meet the targets of the CSP strategic assessment/strategy and to ensure timely responses to emerging issues. There is evidence that co-location of services further increases the ability of CSPs to identify and address issues through daily tasking/communication.

CSPs with higher staffing levels tend to report greater partnership integration and a stronger partnership ethos, whilst limited or reducing dedicated partnership staff appears to weaken partnership engagement, prompt a return to silo working and limits CSPs ability to develop and innovate.

Just under half of CSPs have elected member representation at a strategic level, although most local authorities have an elected member with a community safety portfolio. With varying levels of elected member involvement and awareness CSPs across the board have identified a need for a greater understanding of community safety by elected members and heads of service to ensure improved leadership and local direction.

DELIVERY APPROACHES AND ACTIVITIES

Although strategic plans provide a shared focus and direction it is service delivery which results in safer communities, and as such, high functioning CSPs appear to have a good balance between strategic development and operational service delivery.

There is extensive evidence that local thematic and geographical tasking structures have had an impact on reducing crime and antisocial behaviour (ASB). Building on this success, some partnerships are now engaged in joint operational working, with joint partner patrols.

While information sharing between community safety partners has been standard practise for a number of years, there is evidence that this is becoming more frequent with the introduction of monthly, weekly and daily tasking; and that it is more targeted to support proactive multi-agency working focussing on at risk and vulnerable individuals e.g. Early and Effective Intervention (EEI) projects, Victim support and fire safety programmes to name a few.

The increase in joint working has also resulted in wider partner training for operational staff in areas such as terrorism, organised crime, adult protection and domestic abuse; increasing awareness and generating valuable intelligence.

Community engagement is a priority for almost all CSPs although CSP capacity was raised as a barrier to fully integrating community engagement principles into local practise.

EVALUATION AND PREVENTATIVE SPEND

CSPs are accomplished at evidence based planning and evaluation principles are core to their work, however confidence in evaluation is highly varied. Despite this apparent lack of confidence, CSPs regularly monitor and evaluate their performance against strategic and local performance indicators and can demonstrate their contribution to national targets and outcomes.

Around half of partnerships state that they do preventative spend however there is a general sense that the lack of proxy baselines make evidencing the cost benefits difficult; resulting in reduced confidence in the figures.

CROSS FUNCTIONAL WORKING

Relationships with Community Planning are well established and proportionately reflected within local structures. The majority of CSPs are happy with their level of involvement in the development of Single Outcome Agreements (SOAs). There are early signs of a shift towards joint CSP and Community Planning partnership plans with some areas developing a CPP strategic assessment. This was noted as both an opportunity, creating a more robust strategic assessment with community safety at its core; and a threat with the risk of CSP being marginalised.

There is mixed feedback regarding partnership working with Community Learning Development (CLD) with only a few having CLD as a partner at the table. Relationships with CLD appear to be mainly operational; however there are some good examples of joint working in relation to youth justice, ASB work in hotspot areas and intergenerational projects.

There is evidence that joint working between police, fire and local authorities is becoming the norm, however only a few exhibited partnership working with equal buy-in and responsibility and workload shared between all partners. These tended to be in areas where there was some degree of colocation and/or strong leadership.

POLICE AND FIRE REFORM

CSPs are working well, with a proven track record of adapting to a changing landscape of public sector reform. CSPs are, in the main, keeping pace with public sector reform, although they do not always feel involved or in a good position to be able to influence the process as much as they would like. An example of this is in relation to new local scrutiny arrangements, with a number of partnerships anticipating that a review of CSP structures and reporting methods will be required.

Indeed it is emerging that there is likely be a diverse range of local arrangements; the challenge for SCSN and other national bodies will be around servicing and supporting the diversity of local arrangements and establishing a common language.

It would appear that very few of the interim annual plans have been developed jointly. While this is likely due to initial time pressures, CSP have expertise in partnership working, evidence-based planning and problem solving structures and are keen to embed these in future plans and services.

EVIDENCE, PRIORITIES AND PLANNING

Evidence continues to take a central role in strategic planning and operational resource deployment within partnerships. The majority of CSPs use the strategic assessment process to develop strategic plans; while others use a workshop-based approach to developing priorities. The spread of partnership strategic assessments is largely in line with the location of partnership analysts.

While the use of strategic assessments is regarded as national good practise, initial findings from SCSN's recent training needs analysis on evidence-based strategic planning indicate that a number of CSPs lack capacity to develop a strategic assessment.

Around 65% of CSPs have action plans (linked to the strategic assessment where present) and most CSPs that do a strategic assessment have a corresponding community safety strategy. Other commendable approaches include joint strategies which incorporate the ASB strategy or where the community safety strategy is embedded within the CPP strategy.

Some CSPs have indicated that a requirement to submit their strategic assessment to the government and/or national organisation would help to add value and weight to the process and, in some cases, help facilitate their partnership to adopt the strategic assessment as an integral priority setting process, and elicit increased buy-in from elected officials and senior officers.

Some CSPs are moving towards an outcome-based approach, tackling cross-cutting themes and embedding prevention. Traditional police priorities are now less prominent across the board which may indicate a more equal partnership than in the early days of CSPs. ASB, violence, home and road safety and drug and alcohol misuse are priorities that feature heavily in CSPs.

FUNDING

In contrast to previous consultations, there were very few negative comments in relation to funding. In the main there appears to be an acceptance of austerity, with CSPs focused on doing the same, if not more, with less money; and still delivering on outcomes by becoming smarter about service delivery.

However a number of partnerships have raised concerns that expected further cuts will have an impact on the quality of services and while core community safety services should be maintained opportunities for development work, particularly around problem solving, preventative spend and early intervention will be severely limited.

Where partnerships retain a level of discretionary funding there is a sense that this provides more creative solutions and wider partner engagement.