

CRIME AND DISORDER PARTNERSHIPS SELF-ASSESSMENT FORM

GUIDANCE DOCUMENT

INTRODUCTION

Undergoing a self-assessment is a recognised method of identifying strengths and areas for improvement in organisations, businesses and public bodies. The main aim of conducting a self-assessment process is to promote continuous improvement in both strategic and operational delivery through identifying gaps and areas that require development. The Home Office is now introducing the concept of self-assessment to Crime and Disorder Partnerships (CDRP) as part of its promotion of an improved quality assurance and assessment process. Crime Concern has worked with the Home Office and the Government Office for the East Midlands to develop a model of self-assessment, which will support partnerships in their own self-development. The model described here has undergone substantial consultation and re-drafting and is now being piloted in the East Midlands in order to further improve and refine it. Next financial year the model is to become part of a statutory assessment framework.

This process of self-assessment provides an opportunity for Crime and Disorder Partnerships to assess their structures, policies, activities and performance against a base of fifty good practice criteria establishing good working practices. The form attached provides a method of recording the partnership's current self-assessed status and a baseline against which to assess improvements. Ultimately, this form will be web-enabled, allowing partnerships to complete the self-assessment in an electronic form. This will allow for the use of readily expandable text boxes as well as automatic feedback on results. During the pilot phase the form should be completed in a Word document. It should be noted that experience of self-assessment over the years in a variety of fields has shown that organisations undertaking self-assessments are as likely to understate the quality of their work as they are to overstate it. Care should be given to being as balanced in the responses as possible.

LINKS WITH EXISTING ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORKS

The self-assessment model is not intended to replicate other existing assessment or review frameworks. Where other work has successfully identified strengths or areas for improvement, this work does not need to be repeated (for example a Best Value Review). Instead the self-assessment form can be used to simply document previous work and draw together all assessment findings. Only in specific good practice criteria where no assessment of success or consideration has been given, need further assessment work be undertaken. The process of undertaking a self-assessment is intended to be limited in resource requirements and time as will be described below (see Conducting a Self-Assessment). Ultimately, assuming certain principles of conducting a self-assessment are followed and the assessment indicated on the form is valid and can be evidenced, the method of self-assessment are less important than the findings and the on-going aim of establishing a culture of continuous improvement.

THE SELF-ASSESSMENT MODEL

THE EXCELLENCE MODEL

The fifty good practice criteria are categorised into the nine criteria established under the Excellence Model, a system widely used across Europe in the public, private and voluntary sectors. This model has been supporting organisational development for over 20 years and is endorsed and promoted by the European Foundation for Quality Management and the British Quality Foundation. In addition, the Cabinet Office supports the use of the Excellence Model throughout central and local government and the public sector generally. The self-assessment process is designed to be self-explanatory and require no previous knowledge of the Excellence Model. However, it should also be recognisable to those who know the model as following the Excellence

structure. This introductory guide focuses upon key elements of the document, outlining the intended use of elements within it, and explaining some principles and options of how the self-assessment process should be conducted by crime and disorder partnerships.

THE SELF- ASSESSMENT FORM

The process of conducting a self-assessment will be further outlined below. The form used to record the findings of a self-assessment includes the good practice criteria, which CDRPs will be asked to assess their performance against (as well as guidance prompts for each of the fifty criteria), four options for categorising achievements, a section in which the CDRP should provide evidence to demonstrate their achievements, an additional comments box and an endorsement section where key partnership members are asked to sign the form to demonstrate their agreement with its findings. Each of these sections will be described below.

GOOD PRACTICE CRITERIA

The fifty good practice criteria within the document are drawn from a range of experience, reviews, national research and good practice. They have also been consulted on widely both with Crime and Disorder Partnerships and national organisations such as the Audit Commission. They are intended to provide a set of standards against which partnerships can identify their areas of strength and success as well as areas of their work that require further development. The fifty criteria are intended to encompass all aspects of a partnership's working practices. Successful implementation of each of the standards should ensure successful partnership working and crime and disorder reduction delivery.

GUIDANCE

Each good practice criterion is supported by a series of guidance prompts, which should be read before completing the self-assessment and used as a reference guide during a self-assessment. These guidance prompts are at the end of this document.

ASSESSING ACHIEVEMENT

Crime and Disorder Partnerships should assess their own working practices against each of the good practice criteria and rate themselves in one of four categories. These categories are:

- Gap identified;
- Working towards;
- Some success; and
- Doing well.

Clearly, these categories could be open to a certain amount of interpretation and subjectivity. To ensure consistency in approach to self-assessment the following guidelines should be followed when classifying levels of success.

Gap Identified: The partnership feels that, at present, it is not achieving the standard set out in the criteria and that this is therefore a gap in their current practice. Alternatively, only very limited progress has been made towards achieving the standard set by the partnership. Where this is the case, the partnership should have identified this area of work as an area requiring improvement. This could be described as minimal achievement against the good practice criteria.

Working Towards: The standard set out in the criteria has been identified as a gap in current practice and the partnership has developed responses or actions to address it. Some progress has been made towards achieving success in the area, but substantial further work is required. This could be described as partial achievement against the good practice criteria.

Some Success: To classify themselves in this category the partnership will have achieved significant progress toward the standard set. Alternatively, in criteria that could be broken down into a number of parts, the majority of aspects of the criteria have been successfully achieved with the remainder being areas under development. This could be described as significant achievement against the good practice criteria.

Doing Well: The partnership is delivering well on all aspects of the criteria. Note that there could remain some areas of development and refinement even with a partnership that defines itself as doing well against good practice criteria. This could be described as successful achievement of good practice criteria

EVIDENCE

To further avoid subjectivity, crime and disorder partnerships will be asked to demonstrate what evidence they drew on to categorise their success. The evidence box is not intended to require a written report under each criterion. Instead it should reference work undertaken or previous assessment or reviews reports which identified the level of success indicated on the form. For example, a CDRP could draw upon inspection and review documents such as Best Value Reviews and District Audit and HMIC inspections.

Other sources of evidence could include the partnership's own formal documentation including audits, strategies, action plans, successful protocols, IT based performance management systems, development plans and annual reviews. Alternatively, the partnership may wish to draw upon alternative evidence such as specific references made in minutes or internal reports, the findings of surveys undertaken by the partnership or one of its partner agencies, performance monitoring returns, staff appraisal processes, training reviews and evaluations. Where evidence is provided, it should be as specific as possible in order to adequately reflect the good practice criteria indicated. For example, a Best Value Review or District Audit Report could reference a significant range of elements of practice. Specific page and paragraph references will make demonstration of success under individual criteria a great deal easier.

In some situations even a unanimous assessment may not be readily evidenced. This may be due to the fact that some issues may be less materially evident. For example, some aspects of leadership describe an approach or style of leadership that may not be readily evidenced on a material basis. However, less material issues, such as the qualities of leadership should be possible to evidence by the impact they have. However, a lack of evidence may also indicate that this view, whilst shared is not based on fact but on a perception of where the partnership sees itself.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Included on the self-assessment form is additional space for further comments that the partnership might like to make in relation to the good practice criteria and how they have assessed their success in relation to it. This may be particularly useful where the individual criteria contain a number of separate elements, and where the CDRP feel they have achieved significant success on one aspect of the question but less so on another. In addition, the additional comment box allows for further text-based clarification of the strengths and areas for improvement identified. This further clarification could be very helpful in establishing a development plan based on areas for improvement identified through the self-assessment process. It could also prove an extremely good tool for the induction of new partnership members, staff etc. in that when read as a whole would provide a very good position statement of the partnership and its successes and its practice.

ENDORSEMENTS

To ensure that the self-assessment is a shared one, a range of partner agency representatives are asked to sign the form and endorse its findings. Agencies include those identified as responsible authorities under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and those to be included through the implementation of the Police Reform Act 2002. The form must be signed by those agencies legally identified as responsible authorities at the time of completion of the self-assessment process. It is recommended that the wider list of agencies listed are involved in the process, even if this is as a process of inducting a new partner agency into the partnership.

CONDUCTING A SELF-ASSESSMENT

PRINCIPLES

A self-assessment should be seen as a partnership process. The self-assessment should not be conducted (and the form completed) by one member of a partnership, or indeed one agency, but should be a shared view of the partnership as a whole. In practice a sub-group of the partnership is likely to undertake any additional internal assessment processes required, reference previous reviews and evidence and complete the form itself. However, the partnership as a whole (including those involved at both strategic and operational levels) should have an opportunity to discuss the self-assessment findings and to come to a shared view about the current position of the partnership, its achievements and where improvement is required. This could be done through a separate group meeting or a special steering group meeting. If such a meeting were not possible, then at the very least members of the partnership's steering groups and chairs of operational, action or task groups should review the findings and comment on differences of view. These individual views should then be collated and a conclusion drawn as to the appropriate response. This latter process should only be seen as a last resort when a face-to-face discussion of issues is not possible.

PRACTICE

In practice it will not be feasible for all agencies and participants in any single partnership to take part in a process of self-assessment. Instead, a range of options has been put forward for conducting the self-assessment. These include:

- The CDRP Steering Group invites a range of partnership members at operational level to a full-day self-assessment seminar. The self-assessment is used as the basis for group work to determine the partnership's view of its strengths and areas for improvement in relation to the good practice criteria. Possible methods of evidencing this view are put forward at the seminar. A sub-group or delegated individual then collates the appropriate evidence. Evidence is brought back to a subsequent meeting for confirmation and responsible authorities endorse the form.
- A small sub-group of the main partnership, including representatives of three or four key agencies, review existing assessments or other relevant evidence for assessment against criteria. Gaps in previous work or assessment processes are then filled through an internal review of strategy, structure, policy or practice in relation to the relevant criterion. This review could be conducted on an informal basis through discussions with key players in the partnership rather than any extensive formal procedure. The form is completed on this basis and then passed to the CDRP Steering Group. This group then invites key operational personnel working within the Partnership structure to a self-assessment seminar to review the findings of the sub-group and agree and changes required.
- Individual members of the CDRP steering group and chairs of operational groups are asked to complete the form, providing appropriate evidence of their views as and when possible. These responses are then collated and discussed (possibly on an anonymous basis) and a shared agreement reached. The agreed responses are transcribed on to the self-assessment form and appropriate evidence gathered. The responsible authorities then endorse this final version of the form with their signatures.

As this self-assessment process has yet to be piloted, it is not possible to give complete case studies of approaches taken to self-assessment and there may be a range of other possible methods of conducting the self-assessment process that would be equally valid.

EXTERNAL SUPPORT FOR THE SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS

It is worth reinforcing here that the process should be seen as a self-assessment and not one conducted by an external organisation. Engaging an external organisation to undertake the assessment would limit the level of input from the partnership itself as well as reduce ownership of the findings. However, there may be advantages to seeking external support for the process of self-assessment. Such external support could provide a range of roles including 'critical friend', facilitator of group work, and objective verifier of assessments and the quality of evidence.

THE PILOT

The self-assessment model is being piloted with CDRPs in the East Midlands region between September and December of 2002. CDRPs undertaking a self-assessment as part of the pilot process will be supported by the Government Office for the East Midlands, Crime Concern and Nacro. Crime Concern will be reporting the findings of the pilot and re-drafting the model during the first quarter of 2003 in preparation for the model becoming a statutory responsibility during the 2003/4 financial year.

The pilot will assess the quality of the model itself, the good practice criteria, the scoring system and the accompanying guidance. Any or all of these are likely to be improved and re-drafted throughout the process of the pilot stage. Support will be offered to a sample of partnerships throughout the East Midlands. All partnerships will receive support and advice from the Crime Reduction Team at the Government Office for the East Midlands. In addition an email based helpline service will be provided along with an email advice network to be provided throughout the process.

Due to the pilot nature of the process, this support will provide as flexible a range of services as possible. However, it is likely to include:

- advice on the self-assessment model including clarification of the meaning of good practice criteria, method of self-scoring, type of evidence required and the validity of that selected, additional comments and what may be appropriate to include;
- guidance on method of conducting the self-assessment, who to engage, how to ensure objectivity etc.;
- provision of a 'critical friend' role to ensure increased objectivity and minimise internal conflict; and,
- facilitation of group events such as partnership self-assessment seminars, group discussions

The support is likely to be delivered through one to one support on site, telephone advice and group work and facilitation.

The pilot self-assessments will be conducted between late September and December of 2002. Completed self-assessment forms will be provided to Crime Concern and the Crime Reduction Team in the Government Office for the East Midlands. Simple feedback forms will be provided to CDRPs involved in the pilot and the support staff working with them. In addition, two post-pilot consultation seminars will be conducted with CDRPs in January along with a number of confidential semi-structured telephone interviews. The GOEM CRT will also be consulted. A report outlining the findings of the pilot will be compiled and the model and its associated guidance re-drafted during February for approval by the Home Office. Copies of the report and the re-drafted model and guidance will be supplied by GOEM to CDRPs taking part in the pilot process.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA GUIDANCE

Below, each good practice criterion is supported by a series of guidance prompts, which should be read before completing the self-assessment and used as a reference guide during a self-assessment. The aim of these guidance prompts is twofold:

- they are intended to expand on the assessment statement and provide further clarification of the statement's meaning;
- they provide a series of good practice pointers which indicate steps towards establishing a successful achievement of the stated practice.

The guidance is not expected to be exhaustive at this stage in the pilot process, but to provide prompts to guide partnerships' assessment of their success against the good practice criteria. As crime and disorder partnerships work in a range of ways and include a wide range of structures, policy approaches and partner agencies, there may be alternative approaches which partnerships feel enables them demonstrate their success in each aspect of their work. Where this is the case, the partnership should indicate this in either the evidence or additional

comments box. The prompts should therefore be used as a guide to decide which of the four scoring categories is most appropriate.

As far as is possible the prompts have been designed to encompass the range of actions or approaches which CDRPs might undertake. It should be noted, however, that not all prompts would necessarily apply to all partnerships. In particular, partnerships functioning in areas of lower population and perhaps crime rates, may not consider some of the prompts appropriate to the scale of operation required in their area. Furthermore, it is not necessarily expected that partnerships will be able to meet all of the prompts in order to score highly. Through consultation, the series of prompts have been identified as 'ideal' approaches that partnerships may follow.

1 LEADERSHIP

1.1 The partnership is well led with leaders of appropriate seniority who provide direction, motivation, and commitment.

- The leadership of the partnership is clearly identified and agreed
- The chair of the partnership is elected on an annual basis
- Leaders are of a sufficient level of seniority to facilitate decision-making and to enable the partnership to negotiate internal and external relationships effectively
- Leaders do not dominate proceedings but provide clear direction with support from partner colleagues
- The style of leadership demonstrated at steering group level (and by the steering group as a whole) serves to motivate other partnership members to achieve to their maximum capability
- Leaders are committed to working in an open engaging manner recognising the role of participating agencies whilst understanding obstacles facing involvement

1.2 Partners have a clear understanding of the partnership's purpose, processes, structures for delivery and targets.

- The partnership has an agreed mission statement
- There is an agreed management structure which includes regularly timetabled partnership meetings
- There is a coherent partnership structure with clear lines of responsibility from executive and management groups to action and delivery groups
- Leaders have aligned the partnership's structure to support delivery of the Crime and Disorder Strategy
- Partners understand the partnership's values, aims, and objectives
- Procedures have been developed to facilitate effective partnership management, communication, and marketing

1.3 There is a culture of participation and collaboration between partners.

- Management and action groups are regularly attended by statutory and other relevant partners
- Regular operational contact exists between statutory and other relevant partners
- No single agency dominates proceedings in partnership meetings or the determination of priorities
- Leaders encourage and facilitate community involvement within the crime and disorder partnership

- Innovative thinking and working is generated through the use of the crime and disorder partnership
- Leaders are made aware of difficulties regarding participation and collaboration and work to overcome them

1.4 There is clarity and transparency in the way the partnership makes decisions.

- A formal decision making process exists through which tasks are allocated to action groups or other operational delivery mechanisms
- The basis for decisions is communicated to those delivering the results of decisions
- Executive and management group meeting minutes are made available to all sections of the partnership and are reviewed
- Action points are clearly documented in meeting minutes

1.5 Officers are valued and supported by partnership leaders in the delivery of crime reduction strategies.

- Leaders actively communicate crime reduction priorities to all sections of their organisation
- Leaders personally communicate the partnership's mission, vision, and strategy to staff
- The partnership has identified and, as far as possible, matched people's knowledge and competencies with its needs and strategy
- The partnership has developed and used training and development plans to ensure that staff match the needs of the partnership and its strategy
- The partnership designs and implements individual, team and partnership learning opportunities
- The partnership appraises and helps staff to improve their performance
- Leaders actively communicate where crime reduction activity fits in with other priorities

1.6 There are strong linkages with other local and regional partnerships and networks.

- Leaders, or representatives of an appropriate seniority, represent the Crime and Disorder Partnership on the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP), the Youth Offending Team (YOT), Drug Action Team (DAT) and other relevant local partnerships
- Consideration has been given to methods of bringing the work of the CDRP and the DAT together more effectively
- Joint work has been undertaken with other local partnerships, e.g. the LSP, New Deal for Communities (NDC), Single Regeneration Budget (SRB), DAT etc.
- Links have been made with other CDRP's, e.g. sharing of good practice, cross-border delivery of shared priorities, joint appointment of staff using pooled resources such as Communities Against Drugs (CAD) / Safer Communities Initiative (SCI)
- In two-tier local authority areas, opportunities for shared County-wide work have been explored and are being delivered where appropriate

1.7 Leaders adopt a responsive, pro-active, and accountable role in strategic partnership development.

- Leaders have ensured a process for the development, deployment and updating of policy and strategy is developed and implemented

- Key partners and partnership opportunities have been identified and engaged in line with the crime and disorder reduction strategy
- Leaders are aware of and responsive to national priorities and changes in the national policy and practice framework
- On an on-going basis opportunities to improve the working practice of the partnership are identified and adopted
- A Development Plan is in place and being delivered to ensure strategic improvements in partnership working

2 AUDIT AND STRATEGIES

2.1 The partnership identifies and uses appropriate multi-agency data sources to identify and review strategic priorities and baselines.

- The partnership collects data from a range of partner sources
- The partnership collects and analyses up-to-date information and knowledge in support of the crime reduction strategy
- Strategic priorities are directly based on the analysis of a wide range of data as well as qualitative information on crime and disorder
- Information and data on crime and disorder is collected on a quarterly / monthly / weekly basis and analysed to inform action and on-going prioritisation
- The partnership has a dedicated audit and information team (or function) to analyse and interpret data

2.2 The partnership has the necessary skills and equipment to analyse crime and disorder data.

- Training and staffing needs around crime and disorder auditing and analysis have been identified and are being delivered
- Officers trained in crime and disorder analysis are involved in audit and ongoing problem solving activity
- Appropriate IT equipment is utilised to ensure the rapid and functional use of data sources
- The partnership uses GIS mapping tools
- Partnership action groups can draw on analysis for on-going problem solving and monitoring of progress

2.3 Options for responses to problems are appraised drawing on national and local evidence-based practice.

- The partnership has used option appraisal techniques outlined in Home Office toolkits, or similar
- Evaluated activity is assessed in selecting and implementing crime reduction responses
- The audit includes a review of current activity and approaches and their impact and this information is used to inform strategy development
- The partnership shares and identifies good practice through attending regular networking meetings with other CDRP representatives
- Strategic partner representatives have received training in 'what works' so as to inform decisions on resource allocation
- Task group representatives have received training on 'what works' in their specific area of work

2.4 The partnership identifies and manages risks to the effective delivery of interventions.

- Risk analysis is undertaken for each aspect of the partnership's action plan
- When risks are identified they are managed and monitored
- The crime and disorder partnership has exit strategies in place for action delivered through short-term funding and maintains and aims to achieve sustainability of all measures (other than those intended to be short term in their approach)
- Individual project monitoring regimes are commensurate with the level of risk identified above an agreed minimum standard of monitoring

2.5 The partnership has developed detailed SMART action plans for each strategic priority taking account of relevant local plans and targets.

- The partnership's strategic priorities are being delivered through a clear and well formulated action plan or plans
- Action plans and targets are agreed by partnership members at both strategic and operational level
- Partnership action plans and targets are compatible with individual agency plans and targets
- Monitoring and evaluation methodology and procedures are established for each intervention
- Targets have been established for each action plan intervention which are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timed
- Timescales have been set and are monitored for each priority
- Action plans clearly assign delivery responsibility to individual partners or named officers
- Targets beyond simple reduction in levels by a percentage have been considered (e.g. reduction to an average rate, reduction compared to a comparator area etc.)
- Partnership targets do not simply repeat individual agency targets but bring some 'added value' to the work of constituent agencies
- The relative impact of multiple actions which may bring has been considered in setting targets

2.6 Partnership strategies have been formulated by all bodies required by the Crime and Disorder Act (responsible authorities, statutory consultees and invitees to participate).

- All agencies and communities named in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (CDA98) have been consulted on strategy priorities
- All named agencies and communities have had an active part in determining priorities
- Strategies add value to the individual work of partnership agencies and are not simply a re-statement of action already taking place
- Partnership strategies which have an element focusing on young people have consulted and engaged the Connexions service in the development and delivery of the strategy
- Leaders have ensured a process for identifying and implementing improvements to the delivery of the crime and disorder strategy

2.7 Strategic priorities are determined by evidence of local problems.

- Priorities are based on crime and disorder problems highlighted by the audit
- Evidence includes findings from local consultation including hard to reach groups, such as members of ethnic minorities; lesbian, gay and bisexual people; young people; drug mis-users and others identified in CDA98 Guidance
- Qualitative as well as quantitative evidence is used to determine priorities

2.8 Strategies acknowledge regional and national guidance.

- Crime Reduction Directors have been consulted in the development of strategies
- Relevant national targets have been incorporated into strategies
- Where strategies do not include national targets evidence is supplied as to why they have not been prioritised
- Strategies of neighbouring partnerships have been consulted and possible benefits of cross partnership working have been considered and implemented where appropriate

3 PEOPLE AND PARTNERS

3.1 Partners understand the roles, structures and core activities of other partners.

- Each partner organisation's role, core activities, capacity and limitations and role in relation to crime and disorder reduction is known and understood by the partnership as a whole
- Partner organisations are aware of the crime reduction contributions they and their partner organisation can/could make
- The partnership has utilised national good practice publications on involving partners
- Differences in organisational cultures, political accountability in decision making and resource allocation mechanisms are recognised and acknowledged by the partnership

3.2 All individuals involved in partnership working understand their role and responsibilities in delivering actions to achieve strategy targets.

- Terms of reference have been developed for the partnership and its constituent groups
- The partnership strategy and action plan is communicated to all stakeholders
- Partnership meetings at strategic and operational level are outcome focused
- The quality and achievements of partnership meetings are assessed and reviewed on a regular basis
- Action plans assign responsibility to individual partners in delivering interventions
- All staff employed by the partnership or providing services for the partnership (chairs or members of action groups etc.) are clear about their role and responsibilities and how their work contributes to the overall partnership strategy
- An induction programme for new partnership members and officers is in place

3.3 The partnership has consistent and appropriate involvement from the public, private and voluntary sector.

- There is public, private, and voluntary sector representation on the partnership steering group (strategic level), or an appropriate alternative method of ensuring adequate representation has been implemented
- The partnership has established strategic and/or operational links with the business community to identify shared priorities and opportunities to engage the business community in crime and disorder reduction activity
- Appropriate voluntary sector organisations are consulted in relation to the development and delivery of specific interventions
- Opportunities for building the voluntary sector's role in the delivery of crime reduction activity has been explored and implemented where appropriate
- Elected members are represented at the strategic and operational levels of the partnership
- As forthcoming responsible authorities, the police authority, the Fire and Rescue Service and the appropriate Primary Health Care Trust(s) are represented on the partnership

3.4 Partners have agreed and documented a plan for the necessary development of the partnership in order to deliver current local strategies.

- Partners have identified and agreed areas necessary for development
- The partnership has produced a Development Plan
- The partnership has undergone specific partnership development activity
- The Development Plan has a number of SMART targets and is monitored to ensure progress

3.5 The partnership regularly conducts and responds to a review of the multi-agency training needs.

- Multi-agency training needs analysis has been undertaken
- Multi-agency training needs analyses are undertaken on a regular basis
- An annual training programme has been agreed and funded
- An induction programme for new partnership members and officers is in place
- Crime Reduction Training on is delivered on a multi-agency basis

3.6 Individuals at all levels of the partnership possess the knowledge and skills required to submit successful internal and external bids for funding.

- Key individuals have been identified to submit bids on behalf of the partnership
- Individuals undergo training to acquire skills necessary to submit bids for funding
- The partnership is aware of and shares information on available sources of funding

4 RESOURCES

4.1 The partnership has agreed appropriate human and financial resources from partners' core budgets.

- Partner agencies contribution to partnership delivery is stated and recognised
- Dedicated officers from partner agencies work for the partnership as opposed to any individual agency
- Agreed financial contributions are made to the partnership to enable core activity to take place
- Partnership human resource plans are aligned with the crime and disorder strategy, the organisational structure and the partnership's key activities
- The partnership uses people surveys and other forms of employee feedback to improve human resource strategies

4.2 Partners have agreed pooled financial resources for dedicated crime and disorder reduction activity.

- Partners have contributed to a budget administered by the partnership for the delivery of crime and disorder reduction activity
- Shared resource allocation and use is monitored on a quarterly basis
- The partnership strategy is costed and funding allocated on a planned basis
- Operational groups within the CDRP have access to devolved budgets

4.3 The partnership has agreed and prioritised interventions requiring external funding to deliver actions detailed within strategies.

- The partnership is aware of external funding opportunities
- Gaps in locally available funding have been identified
- A resourcing / fundraising strategy has been established
- All bids for crime and disorder activity in the area are agreed and prioritised by the partnership
- Successful bids have been made for crime reduction funding
- The resources required to deliver the partnership's Development Plan have been established and identified

4.4 The partnership has agreed a resource management strategy aligned to delivery of strategic priorities.

- Action plan interventions are fully costed and resource requirements identified
- The partnership has a policy for the purchasing of goods, services and equipment which ensures accountability, good value and quality
- The partnership has ensured that resources available match what the organisation needs to achieve its purpose
- Funding is available for rapid response to emerging priorities or issues identified through problem solving

4.5 The partnership regularly reviews the effectiveness and benefits from human and financial resource expenditure and takes remedial action to ensure that the partnership secures value for money in its activities.

- Financial spend is regularly monitored with other performance management information and remedial action is taken where appropriate
- In monitoring the value for money of activities undertaken, individual project spend is related to impact
- The partnership undertakes cost benefit analysis on crime reduction interventions

5 PROCESSES

5.1 The partnership has agreed an appropriate response to Section 17 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998.

- Partners have received awareness training on Section 17
- The partnership is aware of, and have agreed, the response to Section 17 of relevant agencies in their area
- Opportunities to deliver the partnership's strategic priorities through the work of mainstream service provision have been identified and exploited wherever possible
- The local authority considers the S.17 implications of decisions made in committee as well as those made outside the committee process
- Any business or strategic planning undertaken by those responsible under S.17 builds in consideration of the implications for crime and disorder.
- Crime reduction is incorporated into appropriate officer's job descriptions
- Individual service departments have analysed the costs of crime to them and are working to minimise potential costs
- Partners have identified how their core business is contributing, and can contribute to

the partnership crime reduction strategy, and this has been stated in individual service / business plans

- The partnership's crime and disorder strategy compliments mainstream activities currently being provided

5.2 The partnership has a system to regularly review monitoring and evaluation data in order to ensure that levels of performance are sufficient to meet targets.

- An effective performance management system is in place to enable the management of the partnership's activities and performance
- Partnership action groups and strategic partners have been trained in the interpretation of performance management data
- Performance management is a standing agenda at partnership meetings and action is taken when appropriate to respond to poor performance

5.3 The partnership regularly conducts and reviews consultation around experiences and perceptions of crime and disorder with communities (including hard to reach and vulnerable groups) in the partnership area.

- Crime and disorder audits include information from consultation exercises
- Community views on the partnership's performance have been considered in the formulation of the strategy
- Consultation exercises (resident questionnaires / focus groups) are an integrated element of the partnerships delivery strategy and performance management system
- Consultation linked to specific crime reduction activity is periodically undertaken
- Specialist knowledge has been utilised to access hard to reach groups

5.4 The partnership has appropriate structures and protocols in place for the routine sharing and pooling of information between partners to ensure that partnership decisions and activity are driven by ongoing information use.

- A formal and effective information sharing protocol has been agreed and signed by partners
- The partnership has access to, and makes appropriate use of, on-going crime analysis information
- There is a clear understanding of the implications of, and distinctions between, the exchange of personal and de-personalised information
- GIS systems are used on an ongoing basis to direct crime reduction activity

5.5 The partnership's information sharing protocol sets out how Information Technology is used to gather, analyse and share information between partners and communities.

- The partnership has access to a single, shared database of crime and disorder information which draws together information from a range of sources
- The partnership makes available training to maximise the benefit of specialist technology
- The partnership has a formal process for communicating information to communities
- The partnership has a website
- The quality and integrity of available data sets is routinely improved through the use of 'data cleaning' technology
- There are clear guidelines to partners regarding the required format of data to ensure

compatibility of information sharing

- Individual partner agencies are, where feasible, changing their data gathering systems to ensure compatibility on a routine basis with the partnership's IT framework

5.6 The partnership has an agreed, clear and accountable framework for the delivery of the strategy

- The structure for the implementation of the strategy is agreed by all partners
- The structure for the implementation of the strategy is regularly reviewed (annually) and remedial action is agreed and taken where necessary

5.7 The partnership routinely adopts problem solving approaches in the delivery of its strategy based upon; effective scanning and analysis of data and local knowledge, combined with properly resourced responses with agreed monitoring arrangements

- The partnership collects and analyses multi-agency data at neighbourhood level
- On an on-going basis the partnership makes use of data analysis to identify developing problems in order to ensure timely responses
- Partners at all levels are provided with training on the problem solving approach
- The partnership's steering group (strategic) require task groups (operational) to demonstrate that they are taking a problem solving approach
- Action groups are equipped with the knowledge, skills, and resources to adopt a problem solving approach
- Monitoring arrangements assess whether action groups are adopting problem solving approaches

6 PEOPLE AND PARTNERSHIP RESULTS

6.1 Officers of the partnership feel their work is supported and valued.

- Officers have the opportunity to raise issues and propose potential actions to be taken at the partnership's steering (strategic) group
- There is an effective flow of communication between strategic and operational (action) level partnership groups
- Success of operational (action) groups is recognised at steering group level
- Operational groups are given a good level of autonomy over their area of responsibility including access to devolved funding

6.2 Officers feel that they have the appropriate skills and support to effectively manage partnership actions.

- The partnership has developed and used training and development plans to ensure staff match the needs of the partnership and its strategy
- Partnership officers have been trained in partnership working
- Seconded officers are selected according to their skills, knowledge and potential contribution
- Equal opportunities recruitment procedures are followed in recruiting staff both employed and seconded to the partnership

6.3 Training and support for partnership members is regularly assessed, reviewed, and acted upon to ensure that personal development needs are being met.

- The partnership designs and implements individual, team and partnership learning opportunities
- The partnership undertakes staff training needs analysis
- The partnership's development plan includes any requirement to improve the level of training and support provided to staff employed by or seconded to the partnership as well as those contributing through strategic or operational level groups
- New / seconded staff are fully inducted, and have access to a "mentor" within the partnership

6.4 Individual partners recognise the benefits of partnership action on their core work.

- Partners recognise and communicate the benefits of working with the partnership within their own organisations and to the communities to whom they deliver services
- Reductions in the negative impact of crime on core service provision is identified
- Benefits are recorded and costed to demonstrate the added value of partnership working
- The positive public relations impact of successfully working in a CDRP is recognised and communicated to service users

6.5 Individual partners recognise the additional benefits in achieving outcomes exceeding those that each partner could have achieved by working alone.

- Joint delivery of strategic priorities achieves demonstrably greater impact than individual agencies working alone
- Shared approaches to crime and disorder enables better understanding of the problem faced through

7 FOCUS RESULTS

7.1 Repeat victimisation figures and offender rates for offence and nuisance types prioritised in your strategy are regularly reviewed.

- Regardless of the type of offence or anti-social behaviour targeted in the partnership strategy, repeat victimisation and repeat offending rates are reviewed in order to determine the impact of repeats on reduction targets
- Figures are reviewed on a quarterly / monthly / weekly basis (depending upon the nature of the problem and the current capacity of the partnership) and utilised in a problem-solving process
- Performance information is communicated to all sections of the partnership
- There is an agreed process for addressing underperformance

7.2 Crime and disorder levels in focus areas are regularly reviewed.

- Figures are reviewed on a quarterly / monthly / weekly / daily basis in order to identify changes in patterns and potential need to adapt action to respond to changing patterns
- Crime and disorder levels are communicated to communities in focus areas

- There is an agreed process for addressing underperformance in focus areas

7.3 Socio-demographic data for groups benefiting from interventions are regularly reviewed to ensure equality of access regardless of age, disability, gender, ethnic origin, sexuality or location.

- The partnership takes action to ensure that interventions are targeted on the basis of accurate problem analysis rather than any other form of pressure
- The partnership has access to, and analyses neighbourhood level socio-demographic data relevant to its interventions
- The partnership has access to, and analyses data relating the number and demographics of people benefiting from interventions

7.4 Groups involved in consultation are informed of the impact and outcomes of that consultation.

- The partnership has mechanisms for ensuring the outcome of any community consultation is fed back to the community which provided the consultation
- Consultation is seen as the beginning of an on-going dialogue with groups engaged
- Opportunities for on-going involvement in action resulting from consultation is considered prior to consultation taking place
- Consultation exercises and feedback provided are reviewed and evaluated

8 COMMUNITY RESULTS

8.1 Your partnership measures and reports communities' awareness of and satisfaction with the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership.

- All individual projects review public satisfaction where possible and appropriate
- The partnership assesses public levels of satisfaction with services and service processes annually or at the end of an intervention, whichever is first
- Fear of crime is reviewed on an annual basis and tackled where prioritised by the partnership through the three year strategy

8.2 The partnership evaluates and feeds back the results of community consultation and involvement in relation to strategy development and delivery.

- The partnership publishes the broad results of all community consultation
- Regular public forums are held to inform communities of partnership activity and progress
- Where possible consultation events offer participants opportunities for on-going involvement in action which may derive from that consultation
- The impact of community engagement in partnership activity is reviewed and evaluated
- The potential benefits of engaging members of the community on an on-going basis is considered in the planning of consultation events and in action planning

8.3 The partnership encourages, facilitates, and manages the active engagement of community members within action plan delivery.

- The partnership has members of the local community represented in partnership decision-making processes
- The action planning process includes consideration of the role of community representatives and volunteers
- Action groups include representatives of relevant communities
- A volunteering strategy and plan has been developed and implemented
- Community volunteers receive appropriate training and support

9 KEY PERFORMANCE RESULTS

9.1 The partnership reviews progress against targets in strategies and Best Value Performance Indicators on at least a quarterly basis.

- The crime and disorder partnership has benchmarked its performance and processes against other crime and disorder partnerships
- All partnership members are aware of and trained in a common performance management system
- Accountability for performance is identified and agreed
- Progress against targets is shared with other local partnerships, Government Office, and Home Office
- Reasons for progress against targets are analysed and understood by the partnership
- Reasons for failure to achieve targets are analysed and understood by the partnership and remedial action is taken

9.2 The partnership has a system for assessing alternatives for failing or under performing interventions.

- All interventions have milestones or interim targets to aim for
- All interventions are monitored against milestones and SMART targets through consistent performance management procedures
- The partnership can identify through performance management procedures interventions which are not performing
- The partnership appraises alternative options for interventions which are not achieving milestones and targets
- The partnership has appropriate procedures to improve failing interventions through effective project management

9.3 The partnership has published an annual review of progress in implementation of strategies including achievements, outcomes and remedial action required.

- The review clearly states the partnership position in relation to strategy targets
- The annual review includes identification of value for money
- The annual review of progress is put in the public domain and actively communicated to all partnership members
- The annual review is pro-actively communicated to specified local communities
- All partners contribute to the annual review

9.4 Your partnership has processes in place for promoting the achievement of the partnership and partners.

- The partnership has developed a marketing strategy including the identification of a recognisable corporate image (name, logo etc.)
- The partnership has an agreed media protocol to ensure consistent messages are provided on partnership activity and crime and disorder issues
- Information about the progress on meeting strategic objectives is regularly communicated to local communities