

COMMUNITY SAFETY AUDIT 1998/99: DRAFT ACTION PLAN**1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 To highlight the major issues raised in the report written by Peter Crisp on behalf of District Audit: *Community Safety, Audit 1998/1999*.
- 1.2 To suggest alternative courses of action which may be implemented in order to address these issues.
- 1.3 To inform the Partnership of the actions which have already been taken in respect of the report.

2. Background

- 2.1 The report by District Audit is a comprehensive analysis of the work of the Crime and Community Safety Partnership during its first year of operation. Many of its recommendations have subsequently been addressed, but others require detailed consideration by the Partnership.
- 2.2 The major outstanding issues are as follows:
 - (a) Which methods and structures should be adopted to ensure that the Partnership is able to deliver the crime reduction strategy with maximum effectiveness? *See recommendations 1 (p.4) and 11-14 (p.13) of report.*
 - (b) How are the costs of strategy implementation to be shared between the partners? *See recommendation 3 (p.4) of report and item 7: crime reduction targets.*
 - (c) How can the Partnership ensure that it maintains and considers regular feedback from the public, and in particular from the more vulnerable groups in the community? *See recommendation 7 (p.8) of report and item 4: Community Safety Forum.*
- 2.3 The report has raised a number of other issues, which are being addressed as in the table overleaf:

Table 1: Issues from Audit Report that have already been addressed

Reference	Issue(s)	Steps taken	Lead by
1-3 (p.4)	Maintaining focus during meetings and developing internal communication systems	Survey of members leading to standard agenda and agreement to provide regular briefings	RS/NC
4-6 (p.6)	Shortfalls in data, access to suitable I.T systems and refining costs of crime.	Issues are being addressed by the Data and Information sub-group.	Data Group
7 (p.8)	Ensuring that all hard to reach groups are consulted	Coordinators have scheduled consultation with remaining groups. Consultation strategy is being drafted.	NC/RS
8-10 (p.10)	Updating strategy, developing action plans and ensuring that targets meet "SMART" criteria	Coordinators are updating targets through delivery groups, for implementation in April 2000.	Delivery Groups
11-14 (p13)	Ensuring that the strategy is delivered effectively, and that it is coordinated with other plans and systems.	Targets are being synchronised with plans from partner agencies. Council committee reports are to be amended to highlight crime reduction issues (Section 17 of Act)	RS/NC
15-16 (p15)	Agreeing strategic objectives and targets and using outside evaluators	Targets to be finalised in January 2000. Outside evaluation currently being explored by coordinators. Paper to be presented to Partnership in February.	NC/RS

2.4 The above shall be incorporated into a full action plan following the discussion by the Partnership during the meeting.

3. Recommendations

3.1 That the Partnership considers the issues listed overleaf. Alternative courses of action have been suggested in order to facilitate discussion.

Table 2: Issues for detailed consideration

Reference	Issue	Suggested alternative courses of action
1 (p.4) and 11-14 (p.13) See also Item 5: Current structures	Which methods and structures should be adopted to ensure that the Partnership is able to deliver the crime reduction strategy with maximum effectiveness?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue existing model (see Item 5) • Circulate monthly bulletins, separating items for information and matters requiring decision • Adopt a three tier model (see page 3 of report), appointing executive board from Partnership members • Executive board to meet monthly or every two months, and full Partnership to meet six-monthly. • Hold annual or six monthly awaydays to discuss major issues
3 (p.4) and Item 7 (Crime reduction targets)	How are the costs of strategy implementation to be shared between the partners?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinators to estimate costs of meeting crime reduction targets • Partnership organisations to delegate shared budget for crime reduction / pump priming • Sub-group to be formed to recommend budget formulation • Partnership to negotiate funding for crime reduction under existing budgetary mechanisms • In addition, sub-group to be formed to consider whether and how to resource crime reduction initiatives. • Data and information group to provide detailed breakdown of costs of crime
7 (p.8) and Item 4: Community Safety Forum	How can the Partnership ensure that it maintains and considers regular feedback from the public, and in particular from the more vulnerable groups in the community?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinators to draft consultation strategy • Partnership to provide chairperson • Chair of Forum to provide regular feedback to Partnership, ensuring that public concerns are reflected in strategy review

Richard Solly
22 November 1999