

Community Safety Forum 2012



What is working well?

- Money – Financial and other resourcing support
- Excellent Co-ordination
- A well regarded core SaferMK team
- Professional support across a wide spectrum of topics
- A good concise Strategic Assessment
- Support in the commission of services
- Wider crime data, broader than what one organisation can provide.
- Regular Information
- Coordination on key community safety issues
- Good joint-working
- A useful JATAC process



What is blocking the partnership ?

- Funding/Resources
- Change/Uncertainty
- Politics
- Individual organisation priorities
- Evidence of data and a review of the need for services and other delivery mechanisms. Are we doing things in the right way, in the right areas? How would we know?
- Clarity of the current purpose of the partnership team/ A lack of understanding as to what the team can offer.
- Partnership working – 'Walking the talk' but not always enough action.
- Too many voices, the partnership should be ensuring opinions are gathered and a coordinated response for MK is actioned ensuring collaboration of partners.
- Health involvement including how the midlands merge will affect partnership activities.
- Delivery mechanisms are limited, for example relevant project managers to deliver what is discussed in meetings.
- Still perceived as very council, should the partnership be more multi-agency/independent?
- Partnership governance arrangements, partnership is not independent enough to respond to risky or other potential controversial issues.



What is wanted by partners?

- Directory of partnership – networks/individuals and organisations, who to contact and how to signpost people on to the correct agency
- A more leadership role
- Specific lead on ensuring the delivery groups are meeting their objectives, the current set-up is fragmented compared to a few years ago
- Management of transition
- Getting priorities right that reflect the whole partnership, ensuring consistency with organisations
- Long-term commitment from statutory partner agencies including clearer transparency of the future ahead.
- Good/Problem Demographics
- Assurances as to the long term direction and commitment of the partnership from MKC and other RAG members
- A stronger link with health professionals
- Reinstate admin support for the core team to support delivery groups.
- Greater support for NAGs and the development of more Junior NAGs including operational support.
- Better use of support services, eg – mediation/counselling, as they are currently underused by the partnership.
- More evaluation of activities and partnership processes
- To use the uniqueness of MK on many levels, parishes, transport, design ... to seek resources regionally and nationally to achieve our aims



What should our priorities be?

- Greater collaborative working with local delivery agencies, which will support the need to save costs with other partners.
- Preventional work, moved away from what 'worked' and a sense that the partnership can only fire fight. The partnership should be exploring and coordinating long term prevention solutions, that may cost now but we recoup rewards in the future.
- Combating behavioural aspects, more work and analysis is needed on social research and individual behavioural types to a local neighbourhood level that will support the correct targeted delivery.
- Priorities should be drilled down further to represent all community needs both geography and people.
- The partnership should have a more strategic role in the strengthening families agenda
- Joining up of the family agenda – to avoid duplication
- Partnership should review how they can use the Children and Family Practices better



What should our priorities be?

- Clarification of roles across all agencies in order to better share information that is targeted at the correct individuals within the wider networks, as information is not always cascaded down to where the information is required.
- A better system in place if things are not working to review and adapt if things are not working.
- Reduction of crime in open spaces and parks
- More targeted analysis and data sharing – quick wins however with promoting what already is available, however partners would like to see more in order that services are delivered correctly. This is more important for smaller partners who do not have this resource.
- A NEET engagement strategy and other grass root approaches to adopting prevention where it can be targeted on a wider partnership scale
- More support for the 18-25 year olds including access to opportunities and training, as above point.
- Engagement with health and better use of their data and resources.
- Teenage pregnancy
- Finding local solutions to local problems



Current Thoughts

- Do not promote the successes well enough and other resources and tools they have such as the mapping data. SaferMK should sell themselves more
- Concerned for the knowledge being lost through the Head of Service retirement – a question of this with a change to the landscape which includes the PCC should be seen as high risk, and managed as such.
- Whilst some good coordination occurs, there is still some aspects and delivery areas which appear fragmented, and in some areas a lack of an individual is beginning to show for some priority areas and gaps are beginning to appear.
- The partnership is good with maintaining useful networks



The future – where do we want to be in 3 years?

- Still here operating as a viable and effective wider partnership
- Maintaining a positive and aspirational partnership with a desire to continue to improve.
- Clear strategic agreement and direction to better support services being delivered by organisations who do not have the capacity or resource to both deliver and administrate to the necessary level that benefit outcomes to the statutory organisations.
- Good successful working relationship with the PCC, so that MK is not the forgotten tip of the north.
- A continued reduction on crime and other community safety issues
- Continued and improved holistic strategic assessment that can be used as a working document for the whole partnership.
- A victim engagement support strategy for MK
- An increase focus on community wants and needs
- Each RAG member are champions of a partnership priority and are responsible to ensure delivery
- That the things that have been a success are not left to dwindle and fade



What is the partnership not doing that it could?

- More effective communicating to all communities and the wider partnership
- More engagement work with the community and wider partners.
- Transparency and openness at RAG, – current lack of strategic direction for partnership to deliver and not enough commitment once decisions have been made, both resourcing and communication to their organisations.
- Utilise the voluntary sector more effectively by getting them involved particularly local groups such as Youth groups, Scouts and Guides.
- Delivering projects and initiatives, there is no structure to often deliver what is agreed resulting in outcomes being limited.
- Finding local neighbourhood solutions, resources mean that we do not always get delivery where it is needed most.
- Championing and utilising local and voluntary sector organisations working within the CJ system
- Enhanced mapping system, where should we be targeting our resources using integrated data not just MKC and TVP data.
- Business Community Partnership
- Needs a gap analysis as a CSP carried out.

