## COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP BOARD
### AGENDA
Friday 12 December 2014, 13:30 - 16.30
Conference Centre, Barking Learning Centre, Barking

**Agenda Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Presented by</th>
<th>Time Allowed</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introductions and Apologies for Absence</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>1 minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>1 minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>2 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 1: Offenders

| 4 | Integrated Offender Management | Lucy Satchell-Day, Carina Heckroodt | 60 minutes | 13-32 |
| 5 | Reshaping Local Youth Justice – A response to the Carlile Inquiry | Dan Hales | 15 minutes | 33-50 |

### Section 2: Priorities and Analysis

| 6 | Strategic Assessment | Dan James | 30 minutes | 51-132 |
| 7 | Callover Report | Dan James | 10 minutes | 133-150 |
| 8 | Fire Service Priorities | Paul Trew | 20 minutes | 151-158 |
## Section 3: Business Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Safer Neighbourhood Board For information</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>159-164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Review of Recent Events</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
<td>165-166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentations on:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Counter Terrorism Awareness Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- White Ribbon Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Alcohol Awareness Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chair’s Report</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>167-172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Forward Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>173-176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Date of Next Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:30-12:30 2 March 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conference Centre, Barking Learning Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Post Title</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Bristow</td>
<td>Corporate Director of Adult and Community Services</td>
<td>London Borough of Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Ewing</td>
<td>Borough Commander</td>
<td>Metropolitan Police Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Morrow</td>
<td>Chief Operating Officer</td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham CCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Thompson</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham Safer Neighbourhood Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika Jenkins</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham Council for Voluntary Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Roberts</td>
<td>Senior Service Delivery Manager – NE London Division</td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham Victim Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glynis Rogers</td>
<td>Divisional Director Commissioning and Partnerships</td>
<td>London Borough of Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Laila Butt</td>
<td>Portfolio Holder for Crime and Enforcement</td>
<td>London Borough of Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina Heckroodt</td>
<td>Assistant Chief Officer, Barking, Dagenham, Havering and Newham</td>
<td>National Probation Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>[Formerly] Corporate Director of Housing and Environment Services</td>
<td>London Borough of Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Jenner</td>
<td>Corporate Director of Children’s Services</td>
<td>London Borough of Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Cole</td>
<td>Director of Public Health</td>
<td>London Borough of Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Trew</td>
<td>Borough Commander</td>
<td>London Fire Brigade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Satchell-Day</td>
<td>Chief Officer Barking, Dagenham, and Havering</td>
<td>Community Rehabilitation Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Magistrates Courts Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Chadha</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>Refugee and Migrant Forum of Essex and London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Farrant</td>
<td>Chief Executive (ex officio)</td>
<td>London Borough of Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-LBBD Advisers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Post Title</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gemma Woznicki</td>
<td>MOPAC Link Officer</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Kirby</td>
<td>Chief Inspector Partnership and Safer Neighbourhoods Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>Metropolitan Police Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LBBD Advisers and Observers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Post Title</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Hales</td>
<td>Group Manager Community Safety and Offender Management</td>
<td>London Borough of Barking and Dagenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Mhembere</td>
<td>Interim Group Manager Adult Safeguarding</td>
<td>London Borough of Barking and Dagenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Donovan</td>
<td>Support Officer</td>
<td>London Borough of Barking and Dagenham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact Officer:** Will Donovan  
Tel.: 020 8227 3092
E-mail: Will.Donovan@lbbd.gov.uk
COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP
MINUTES
Monday 8 September 2014
The Granary
13:00 - 16:00

Members Present: Anne Bristow (Chair), Andrew Ewing (Vice-Chair), Carl Blackburn, Rita Chadha, Matthew Cole, Helen Jenner, Martin Kirby, Sharon Morrow, Victoria Roberts, Glynis Rogers, Lucy Satchell-Day, Steve Thompson.

Advisers, Officers and Guests Present: Paul McLenaghan, Will Donovan (minutes), James Goddard, Dan Hales, Abi Kazeem, Pierre Rossouw.

Apologies: Councillor Laila Butt, Paul Trew, Sean Wilson, Ken Jones, Carina Heckroodt, David McClory, Peggy Mhembere.

187. Introductions and Apologies for Absence
The apologies were noted.

188. Declarations of Interests
None declared.

189. Minutes
The minutes of 9 June 2014 were agreed as an accurate record with one amendment: a paragraph to be added and distributed to further explain the measure of confidence in the Police. The following actions to be carried over:

Action 179a – Borough Resilience Forum to meet more often.

David McClory, Sean Wilson

Action 179b – Borough Resilience Forum meeting on 11 September 2014 to confirm the arrangements of the group who would hold high level discussions during an emergency and the names of this group.

David McClory, Sean Wilson

190. Strategic Assessment
This item was presented by Dan James (Research and Analysis Officer Community Safety, LBBD) and Dan Hales (Group Manager Community Safety and Offender Management, LBBD).

The presentation detailed the findings of the 2013 Strategic Assessment and work which has been completed or is ongoing following these findings. The initial findings of the 2014 Strategic Assessment have identified broadly the same priorities as the
2013 Strategic Assessment: anti-social behaviour, domestic violence, serious youth violence, re-offending and hate crime. Dan Hales asked the Board to consider potential issues which may require analysis for the 2014 Strategic Assessment. The Board were asked to consider potential issues relating from the PESTELOM analysis, broken down into: political, economic; social, technological, environmental, legal, organisational and media issues.

Potential current and emerging issues were discussed for further analysis in the Strategic Assessment, which will be brought to the 12 December 2014 CSP Board.

It was noted that the annual Strategic Assessment is now fully incorporated to the Community Safety Partnership and integral to its work.

The following actions were agreed:

Email Dan James with any additional potential issues to be analysed in the 2014 Strategic Assessment.

(All partners)

Incorporate issues discussed at the meeting into analysis for the 2014 Strategic Assessment and link this work up with the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and Pharmaceutical Needs assessment, which are also currently being developed, to ensure that there are not conflicting priorities.

Dan James

191. **Homelessness in LBBD**

This item was presented by James Goddard (Group Manager Housing Strategy, LBBD).

The item outlined the definition of homelessness and the current homelessness levels in the Borough. It was reported that the current demand for Council housing is the biggest the Borough has ever experienced. James noted that these issues are being addressed in the new Homelessness Strategy which is being drafted for April 2015 Cabinet. The item was presented for comment, for any issues from the CSP to be raised and to identify whether this Strategy should be the responsibility of CSP.

A query was raised regarding this work’s links to national organisations. James reported that there are plans to re-launch the Homelessness Forum to bring together the local third sector, Council, statutory organisations and national organisations together to work on this issue.

James reported that the Strategy will identify vulnerable groups and address their needs. It was noted that licensing for out of Borough placements is managed by the East London Housing Partnership.

Concerns were expressed by the Board that repossessions may
be an issue causing homelessness. It was reported that the loss of private rented sector is now top of the reasons for homelessness, with mortgage arrears also a major cause of homelessness. James reported that there is now strong pre-eviction work happening within Housing now to mediate with tenants and try to prevent eviction and it is planned to get the Landlord Forum to adopt this mediation work as well.

It was noted that “beds in sheds” is not currently a major issue in the Borough, although some incidents have been reported, and it was agreed that tough licensing enforcement of any incidents found would ensure that this does not become a wider issue.

It was noted that the East London Housing Partnership is controlled overall from Redbridge and Hackney. A team is managed directly by James in LBBD, and the work of this team will sync with what is done locally.

The Board noted the report and agreed to keep a watching brief over the Homelessness Strategy as it is not appropriate for it to report directly to CSP.

192. Immigration Act

This item was presented by Rita Chadha (Chief Executive Officer, RAMFEL).

Rita Chadha presented to the Board regarding the Immigration Act 2014. It was reported that there has been mixed publicity regarding the Act and that it may present an opportunity to address myths around immigration. Rita gave an overview of the effect of the Act in line with the content of the report.

It was noted that the Home Office are operating Operation Skybreaker which is being piloted in other London boroughs and not yet in effect in LBBD. It was reported that this will target business, houses of multiple occupation and registrar offices and will take action if any people there are found to be in the country illegally. It was noted that the early stages of this will largely involve intelligence gathering and later stages will be able to take removal action. It was noted that there will be a 70 day investigation period into marriages and civil partnerships which are suspected to be sham marriages and that immigration officers will visit registrars daily.

Rita commented that it may be hard to reach out to communities when strict legislation may push them underground. It was noted that in contrast the tough new Act also has the potential to reduce myths around immigration and demonstrate that immigrants are not given easy treatment.

Previous discussion of Operation Centurion was raised, concerns
regarding the Operation were sent to the Home Office. It was reported that the Home Office have replied to this letter and would like to attend a future sub-group meeting to discuss the CSP’s views.

It was noted that this work could link into wider discussions in the health sector, currently reporting to Substance Misuse Strategy Board, about healthcare provision for people with no recourse to public funds. It was noted that the CCG are currently awaiting guidance to ensure consistency of communication.

The Board agreed to set up a three month task and finish group to analyse the local social impact of the Immigration Act. This will be chaired by the Police and will have attendees nominated from LBBD Children’s Social Care, Substance Misuse, Domestic Violence, Strategy as well as Rita Chadha and a nomination or appropriate contributions from the CCG.

It was agreed to:

Confirm chair for task and finish group.

Nominate attendees for task and finish group and supply names to Andrew Ewing, copying in Will Donovan, by 19 September.

Report back to CSP in March 2015.

193. Borough Resilience Forum

This item was presented by Pierre Rossouw (Senior Civil Protection Officer, LBBD and Waltham Forest).

The Board thanked Mike Hamer for chairing the Borough Resilience Forum (BRF) previously. It was noted that following Mike Hamer leaving the Borough, Superintendent Sean Wilson will now chair the BRF.

The new Multi Agency Flood Plan was presented, which had changes made to the activation of the plan and how to engage with the public. It was noted that the BRF had approved the Multi Agency Flood Plan. The CSP Board approved the Multi Agency Flood Plan. The long and hard work of the BRF in creating the Plan was noted.
Pierre discussed the flood issue reported at the 9 June 2014 CSP Board. It was reported that a meeting is to be set up between the Environment Agency, Anne Bristow, Andrew Ewing and Ruth Du-Lieu to discuss the issue. The importance of ensuring the BRF was capturing all civil protection issues and not only flood risks was noted.

It was noted that a local pandemic flu exercise will take place on 3 October 2014. Partners were reminded of the exercise and health services emphasised the importance of attending to see effect of new Command and Control protocols. It was reported that a mass evacuation shelter draft plan will be viewed by the BRF this week. The potential for a mass evacuation plan exercise was discussed, the BRF to look at the capacity for this or a potential away day.

It was noted that the Ebola virus will be discussed at the BRF on 11 September 2014 and Public Health England will brief on the issue. It was reported that care providers have received the same guidelines as NHS providers to ensure there is a consistent message. It was noted that the local risk is perceived as very low but this potential issue is still being addressed.

Confirm date of exercise as 3 October 2014 and send reminder email to agencies.

Discuss potential mass evacuation plan exercise and capacity of senior partners to attend.

194. Integrated Victim Management Action Plan

This item was presented by Andrew Ewing (Borough Commander Barking and Dagenham Metropolitan Police Service).

An update was given regarding MOPAC 7 Sub-Group performance figures, the Borough is now the joint top of the Metropolitan Police Service for crime detection. It was noted that extra Police Officers and Sergeants have been assigned to the Borough which is expected to improve performance further.

This item presented two action plans to analyse work with victims, developed following analysis of routes through the criminal justice system and how victims drop out of this process. Victims who do not engage with the criminal justice system are analysed through Victim Support figures, so that levels of underreporting can be analysed.

It was noted that following the item at 9 June 2014 CSP Board which began this work there has been a report released of MOPAC Review of Victim Services in London. It was noted that this report’s conclusions largely support the findings of the CSP Board discussion and added a suggestion that Victim Support can feed in the views of the victims of domestic violence to this project.
The action plans were agreed.

195. Alcohol Awareness Week

This item was presented by Dan Hales (Group Manager Community Safety and Public Protection, LBBD).

This report presents plans for Alcohol Awareness Week 2014, which has been drafted and approved the Substance Misuse Strategy Board and Alcohol Alliance. The plans were approved by CSP Board, with further discussion to occur regarding potential contact during GP training time. It was agreed to bring back learning from this event to a future Community Safety Partnership.

It was agreed to:

Discuss potential work in protected GP training time with Dr Mohan.

Bring learning report to 12 December 2014 Community Safety Partnership.

Discuss Christmas alcohol campaign and funding at Alcohol Alliance.

196. White Ribbon Day

This item was presented by Glynis Rogers (Divisional Director Commissioning and Partnerships, LBBD).

This item presented proposals for events around White Ribbon Day including 16 days of activism around domestic violence. It was reported that these plans intend to raise the issue of domestic violence and zero tolerance of it across the Borough. It was noted that the Police Operation Athena, which targets prolific and dangerous domestic violence and hate crime offenders, will take place during this week and Council vehicles will have white ribbon and messages stating zero tolerance of domestic violence on them. It was noted that the local Chamber of Commerce have agreed for business to sign up to commit to having a domestic violence policy and provide support to victims.

It was reported that a domestic violence e-learning module has been written and that this will be made available to all partner agencies to get staff signed up. It was requested that all partner agencies request staff complete the module and suggested that there could be a prize for the agency with the most completions.

Further ideas for White Ribbon Day were discussed and it was agreed that these ideas would be investigated and used for 2014 or 2015 if it would not be possible to do this for 2014. Suggestions raised included:

- using policies such as tenancies to enforce zero tolerance of
domestic violence and get the issue discussed;
- gaining publicity by having staff of organisations photographed holding up a banner stating they do not condone domestic violence then challenging other organisations to do this. Photos can be shared through the organisations’ websites and twitter feeds and collated on the Council website;
- planning an additional walk or route promoting zero tolerance of domestic violence to take place in Dagenham or on the Heathway;
- covering the route of the white ribbon walk in white ribbons;
- placing white ribbons on the Council Christmas tree;
- sharing the e-learning module with the public if appropriate, or develop public-appropriate module for 2015. Offer prizes for completion and can be promoted through partner agencies’ twitter accounts;
- getting older students at schools to design a survey or learning module about domestic violence to allow them to discuss the issue;
- promoting events through Housing Associations; and
- providing Dagenham 66 Runners and Barking Runners with given t-shirts promoting White Ribbon Day.

The proposals for White Ribbon Day were agreed. It was agreed to:

Begin promoting White Ribbon Day to staff and the public ahead of the events.

All Partners

197. Performance Report and Dashboard

This report was presented by Anne Bristow (Corporate Director Adult and Community Services, LBBD).

The performance report was noted.

It was proposed to change the format of the performance report and Callover as the current format and restructure of the sub-groups has been successful in improving the sub-groups. It was proposed that the Callover process would now monitor the action plans of strategies and the Community Safety Plan and discuss any items rated red, with a dashboard to come to Callover. It was reported that if more information was requested by any partners then the one page summary could still be provided.

The proposed changes to Callover were agreed.

The combined Cohesion and Hate Crime Sub-Group was discussed. It was noted that it had been agreed at 10 December 2013 CSP Board that these two sub-groups would be combined into one meeting and the Tension Monitoring Meeting would meet when it is necessary to discuss tensions. It was agreed that Rita Chadha would chair the first meeting of this Sub-Group in January 2015.
It was agreed that:

Send suitable dates for Cohesion and Hate Crime Sub-Group to meet in January 2015 to Glynis Rogers.

198. **Information Sharing Protocols**

This report was presented by Dan Hales (Group Manager Community Safety and Offender Management, LBBD).

This report presented the revised Information Sharing Protocol (ISP) and a specific ISP relating to the Accident and Emergency Data Share. The ISPs were approved subject to CCG comments and were signed at the meeting.

It was agreed to:

Ensure this agreement covers both the National Probation Service and Community Rehabilitation Company.

199. **LBBD Council Vision and Priorities**

This report was presented by Sarah Welton (Strategy and Performance Officer, LBBD).

This report presented the new Corporate Vision and Priorities for LBBD Council which have been through Cabinet and are now being presented to partnership boards for comments.

The Board broadly welcomed the new Vision and Priorities, especially with regard to the emphasis on cohesion and One Borough. Rita Chadha commented that all ethnicity groups should be discussed in the report rather than only referring to some sections of the community. Carl Blackburn commented that the Vision and Priorities should reflect cuts and diminishing capacity and not create an over-expectation that the Third Sector will pick up services and does more with reduced resources. CSP requested these comments to be reflected in the Cabinet report.

It was agreed to:

Write comments into the report and provide feedback to the Leader of the Council.

200. **Disaggregation of Youth Offending Services**

This report was presented by Glynis Rogers (Divisional Director Commissioning and Partnerships, LBBD).

This report informed the CSP Board of the London Borough of Havering’s decision to disaggregate the joint Youth Offending Service (YOS) due to an internal restructure. It was reported that Havering had been very complimentary of services and that the joint
work had made major improvements to their YOS. It was noted that media reports had covered a Havering Member criticising the joint YOS but that subsequent statements and coverage had provided corrections to these points.

It was reported that the disaggregation may raise some financial issues for the YOS which are being analysed. It was noted that the experience of the joint YOS provides a model of consultancy of how to help improve seriously challenged YOSs. Officers noted that this decision was due to a restructure in Havering rather than poor performance and expressed sadness that productive and efficient partnership work between both Boroughs and partner agencies had ended.

201. Community Trigger

This report was presented by Dan Hales (Group Manager Community Safety and Public Protection, LBBD).

This report was presented to inform the CSP Board of the Community Trigger, a measure to allow residents to demand action on reports of anti-social behaviour if multiple reports have not been acted upon. It was reported that this new measure is introduced on 20 October 2014. The Board noted that due to a strong process for managing repeat reports of anti-social behaviour and low numbers of cases in the pilot scheme it is expected that very few requests for the Community Trigger will be made.

The Board discussed the Community Remedy menu of options and agreed that apologies are too low an intervention and counselling too high an intervention to be appropriate and deliverable.

It was agreed to:

Write to the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime to confirm these comments on the Community Remedy menu and the local process for the Community Trigger.

202. Chair’s Report

The Chair’s Report was noted.

195. Forward Plan

This item was presented by Anne Bristow (Corporate Director Adult and Community Services, LBBD).

The Board noted the forward plan, and it was agreed that (letters roll on from the previous actions):

(I) Anne Bristow asked Board members to consider items for discussion at the December 2014 and March 2015 CSP meetings, especially relating to the Third Sector. Any
suggested items to be forwarded to Will Donovan.

(m) Immigration Act Task and Finish Group to report back to the CSP Board at 2 March 2015 meeting.

(n) Learning from Alcohol Awareness Week to be brought to the 12 December 2014 CSP Board.

(o) MOPAC Hate Crime Review to be brought to the 12 December 2014 CSP Board.

196. Any Other Business

The Board noted that this is Carl Blackburn’s last CSP Board meeting before handing over to the new CVS Chief Executive. The Board thanked Carl for his active role in the Board and its Sub-Groups. Carl said it had been a pleasure to have worked with the CSP and reported that the new Chief Executive will be in post by 1 November 2014, subject to confirmation by 12 September 2014.

Paul McLenaghan reported that the Borough has been awarded £85,000 in match funding to install sprinkler systems in care homes and this will be released to the press soon. Chris also reported that Dagenham Fire Station will be relocated next month with its three appliances going to Harold Hill, Romford and Barking. Chris noted that London Fire Brigade are aiming to keep one appliance on the ground in Dagenham during the day to maintain response times.

Anne Bristow reported that the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime will be holding a meeting in Barking on 10 November and asked for all partners to attend or send representation.

197. RESTRICTED ITEM: Domestic Homicide Review

This report was presented by Glynis Rogers (Divisional Director Commissioning and Partnerships, LBBD).

The report contained the review of a domestic homicide in the Borough which was led by an independent organisation. The report detailed any potential learning from the case and questioned where there may have been opportunities for earlier intervention. The report presented recommendations for completion by December 2014.

The CSP Board were asked to approve the report to be passed to the Home Office, which was agreed. It was agreed to delegate authority for the action plan to the Domestic and Sexual Violence Sub-Group chaired by Matthew Cole.

It was agreed to:
Present the Domestic Homicide Review to the Domestic and Sexual Violence Sub-Group for approval to be passed to the Home Office.

Matthew Cole
1. Purpose of Presenting the Report

1.1 This item will discuss the way offenders are managed following the Transforming Rehabilitation changes to the probation service, which are outlined in Appendix 2. This item has been brought to this meeting to enable a discussion to take place at the time when the results of the Transforming Rehabilitation programme are known.

1.2 The Community Safety Partnership Board will receive two presentations, one from each of the two new probation organisations: the National Probation Service and the Community Rehabilitation Company. These presentations and reports will outline the work of the new probation services, the current Integrated Offender Management caseloads and any gaps which need to be addressed. The presentations and reports will introduce a discussion of Integrated Offender Management in LBBD and the Board will be asked to comment on the Community Safety Partnership’s future work towards this priority. Integrated Offender Management is an agreed priority of the Community Safety Plan.

2. List of Attachments

2.1 Appendix 1: Community Rehabilitation Company: Integrated Offender Management (IOM) Update

2.2 Appendix 2: Community Rehabilitation Company Transforming Rehabilitation Programme Update

2.3 Appendix 3: Community Rehabilitation Company Caseload Profile
1. Purpose of Presenting the Report and Decisions Required

1.1 This report is presented to provide the Partnership with an update on the Integrated Offender Management approach in Barking and Dagenham.

1.2 It is recommended that the Community Safety Partnership Board:

• take note of the contents of this report.

2. Introduction

2.1 Integrated Offender Management (IOM) is a strategic, multi-agency approach to tackling crime in the community. Aimed at those offenders whose offending is seen as a priority in terms of impact on Community, the response to these individuals involves LBBD Community Safety Team, Police, Probation, and other core agencies offering services that positively contribute to reducing risk of reoffending.

2.2 Offenders managed through IOM will receive enhanced intervention such as extra help from drug and alcohol agencies, more home visits from the police and probation, more frequent reporting or extra licence conditions.

3. Current Cohort

3.1 Current IOM cohort consists of 44 offenders:

• 22 statutory (subject to court order or licence);
• 22 non statutory (not subject to either of the above);
• male 33, female 11.
3.2 Each member of the cohort is given a RAG status Red, Amber, Green:

- **Red.** Those offenders that ongoing intelligence suggests are high risk of current re-offending and not showing any motivation to change;
- **Amber.** Those offenders that recent intelligence suggests are still at risk of re-offending but are showing the signs or the motivation to change; and
- **Green** Those offenders who are engaging and have responded positively to interventions. There is little or no evidence of offending.

3.3 There is also a Blue status given to those offenders who are in custody.

3.4 The current cohort RAG Status numbers for B&D are:

- red: 16
- amber: 10
- green: 4
- blue: 14

3.5 Since February 2014, 10 have been removed from the IOM cohort due to a sustained period where no intelligence of current offending was present. A further 19 have been added and a further 2 were removed but re-offended after only a short time and were placed back onto the cohort.

3.6 On 1 December 2014 Barking and Dagenham IOM will adopt the London-wide IOM Strategic Framework: This applies consistent criteria for assessing offenders as IOM suitable, based on OGRS scores. OGRS (Offender Group Reconviction Scale) provides an actuarial indication of risk of re-conviction. The application of the Pan-London criteria will increase the cohort size. An increase to 80 has been accounted for by the allocation of one additional police officer to IOM. Further CRC resource will be flexed into the IOM team as cohort numbers increase.

### The IOM Team

The current profile of the IOM team in Barking & Dagenham is:

- Metropolitan Police Service: 2 officers;
- Community Rehabilitation Company: 1 Senior Probation Officer (SPO), 2 Offender Managers; and
- LBBD: 1 IOM Female Pathways Coordinator, 1 IOM Coordinator.

3.7 There is currently some degree of co-location at Roycraft House, but discussions are ongoing to find a more integrated solution, possibly at Dagenham Police Station.

### 4. The IOM Panel

4.1 For the IOM to work well it is important for all the relevant agencies to work together, sharing information and developing strategies to deal with members of the cohort. Therefore IOM panel meetings take place on a monthly basis. This is to discuss new clients; individuals’ RAG status and interventions needed; problems or good practice to be raised with the Reducing Re-offending Group. This is not a meeting where every case on the cohort is discussed, as this is done on a day to day basis within the IOM team.
4.2 IOM panel members consist of:

- CRC SPO Lead;
- IOM Coordinator LBBD/CRC;
- Anti-social Behaviour (ASB) Manager, LBBD;
- ASB Coordinator, LBBD;
- Temporary Accommodation Manager, LBBD;
- IOM Female Pathways Coordinator, LBBD;
- Complex Needs, LBBD;
- Senior CRI drugs worker;
- KCA drugs worker;
- CRC 2 Offender Managers;
- Metropolitan Police Service 2 Officers;
- Community Engagement Advisor, Job Centre Plus (JCP); and
- North East London Foundation Trust Barking and Dagenham, Access and Assessment Team.

4.3 There is a full exchange of information between all the agencies represented at the IOM panel. All the members of the cohort are checked each morning on the Police systems to see if they have come to notice, with up to date intelligence being passed to the relevant agencies. If it is known that an IOM member is appearing at Court, Police, Probation or Drug/Alcohol agencies will attempt to be there. Links have also been formed with Together For Mental Wellbeing, who have Forensic Mental Health Practitioners based in the Police Station and Courts. They are aware of our IOM cohort and also feedback information to the IOM team.

4.4 Prison and home visits are now being carried out in conjunction with Police, Probation and Drugs/Alcohol workers. In line with her role, the IOM Female Pathways Coordinator has also formed good contacts with HMP Holloway and has carried out visits together with the above agencies.

4.5 There is a great deal of supportive work going on with the IOM Panel to enable cohort members to desist from re-offending. However when it is necessary and cohort members show no intention of complying with their requirements, the panel has shown it is prepared enforce robustly. For instance, recommending at court that custody is the best option.

4.6 The Coordinator roles have also been working hard to educate wider staff groups about IOM. For example, at the request of JCP the IOM Coordinator has given presentations explaining the role of Probation and the IOM to both JCP offices in Barking and Dagenham.

5. Performance Management

5.1 IOM success is not necessarily judged by how many people on the cohort stop offending alone. By the very nature of the people on the cohort most are entrenched in their offending behaviour or have multiple needs to address. Success should also therefore be judged by a reduction in the volume or seriousness of offending, or in the most entrenched cases, by how many times they have been arrested and brought before the court.

5.2 LBBD IOM has been instrumental in the development of a performance tracker. The Tracker measures the performance of the individuals and the cohort as a whole, and includes data on re-offending rates and also soft information about progress in
interventions. It also measures enforcement actions taken by the responsible agencies.

5.3 If the individual is complying the tracker will reflect this. If the individual is not complying, the tracker reflects this and shows what action the IOM is taking to disrupt that individual, i.e. arrests, stop checks, home visits, Probation appointments and drug tests.

5.4 The tracker was developed to ensure that all indicators were relevant and the data could be accessed easily. This has been accepted as best practice by the central IOM Project Team.

6. Examples

6.1 This section outlines examples of work undertaken by the panel to demonstrate IOM work in Barking and Dagenham to the CSP Board.

Examples of swift and effective joint working by panel agencies

6.2 There is now a full exchange of information between all the agencies on the IOM Panel with daily updates from the Police, Probation and drug and alcohol services. Members of the cohort are checked each morning on the Police systems. If any have come to notice, such as arrest, court appearance etc. This information is passed to the relevant agencies. If it is known that an IOM member is appearing at court Police, Probation or Drug/Alcohol will attempt be there and feed back the result.

6.3 An urgent home visit was carried out by Police and the IOM Coordinator to a victim, when it was found that the offender was being released early and it was felt they needed to be informed.

6.4 A professionals meeting was called by LBBD ASB team with less than twenty four hours notice, when it was felt a cohort member posed a threat to a member of the public. Probation and Police attended and an injunction was applied for. This resulted in the cohort member being arrested.

6.5 LBBD Housing and Housing Benefit have been able to assist cohort members to maintain their tenancies when in most cases they would have failed.

6.6 The IOM panel was aware that a new female cohort member was entering drug rehabilitation, directly on release from prison. The IOM Female Pathway Coordinator worked closely with the complex needs Social Worker to track her progress in rehab. They identified issues for the IOM panel to support her recovery and reduce her risk of re-offending. A visit to cohort member at the residential rehab was carried out and an action plan for discharge was agreed.

6.7 Probation and Drug Agencies recognise that cohort members sometimes experience difficulties in complying with the rigorous reporting requirements that occur when they are required to report to Drug Agencies plus supervision more than four times per week. In order to enable compliance the IOM Probation case manager works jointly with the Key Workers to carry out supervision meetings at the Drug Agencies; Home Visits and drug testing in the community.

Ghost Academy
6.8 Ghost Academy is a 12 week level 1 hairdressing course. It is designed for vulnerable female service users who have barriers to accessing mainstream ETE opportunities.

6.9 The IOM Female Pathways Coordinator identified The Ghost Academy as an opportunity for female offenders to gain work experience and qualifications while addressing their offending behaviour. Working together with other IOM agencies the first course has finished with five out of the ten candidates completing level 1 and now progressing to level 2. The second course has now started.

6.10 IOM is now working together with Probation to link the Ghost Academy with the Women’s Empowerment Programme being run as part of Havering IOM, but with capacity to accept B&D women.

Job Centre Plus Worker

6.11 B&D IOM, working in conjunction with Havering IOM and JCP, have been instrumental in the appointment of a JCP worker based full time in the Romford Probation office. This was initially to deal with the IOM cohort, however it now includes all offender for BD&H.

Case Studies

6.12 48 Year old male with drug issues. Has been subject to the criminal justice system all his life, spending most of it in custody. He came out of prison where he completed a detox. He was firstly found temporary accommodation out of the Borough and then moved back to the borough when he displayed a commitment to engaging with IOM. He lapsed at one point and was returned to custody. The IOM Probation Officer informed the court of his willingness to comply with IOM and he was given a community sentence to run along-side his licence. IOM was instrumental in him maintaining his tenancy during this period. He is currently drug free and not offending.

6.13 35 year old female cohort member who had been continually evading arrest by the Police and attendance at Court. Her behaviour as a result of her drug and alcohol use was also causing concern for her well-being. Mental Health, Police, Probation and the Drug and Alcohol Agency worked together to ensure the arrest of the individual. The subsequent arrest and prison sentence allowed this person to detox whilst in custody and offered an opportunity for her to move on. This individual is not yet at the point where she has the ability to make the most of these opportunities, and remains in custody.

6.14 21 year old cohort member, who did not complete a full education and has not had any form of employment has been supported by JCP, Probation and Police to gain a training programme. The programme requires him to travel some way across London for two weeks. This has been difficult for him but with the support of the IOM agencies he has now completed the programme and gained full time employment He has now completed his current Community Order.
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1. Purpose of Presenting the Report and Decisions Required

1.1 To update the Partnership on progress in the Transforming Rehabilitation Programme.

1.2 It is recommended that the Community Safety Partnership Board:

- note the information presented.

2. Transforming Rehabilitation: Preferred Bidder for the CRC

2.1 At the end of October 2014 the Ministry of Justice (MOJ) announced that the preferred bidder for the London Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC) is MTCNovo. MTCNovo is a joint venture between MTC, a private company, and Novo, a consortium involving a number of public, private and third sector shareholders.

2.2 Management Training Corporation (MTC) is an established provider of correctional services in the US, including the running of prisons and the delivery of prison programmes and interventions. In addition, MTC holds federal contracts to deliver employment programmes.

2.3 Novo is a consortium of third, public and private sector organisations including, but not limited to:

- RISE: the emergent London CRC mutual;
- A Band of Brothers: a charity providing social change pathways for 18-25 year old male offenders;
• The Manchester College: an educational provider;
• Thames Valley Partnership: a charity specialising in Restorative Justice and mentoring; and
• Amey: a public services provider working with local and central government.

2.4 Whilst MTCNovo is the prime provider, they will be working with other partners to deliver frontline services (Tier 2 providers). Currently it seems that the following Organisations are likely to be Tier 2 providers:

  • SOVA: a charity known for volunteer work. Likely to be involved in the under 12 months ‘Through The Gate’ work;
  • Crime Reduction Initiatives (CRI): a charity currently delivering drugs and alcohol services to offenders;
  • Northern Inclusion Consortium (NIC): a consortium of northern-based charities, specialising in drugs and women’s issues;
  • Prison Advice and Care Trust (PACT): a national charity supporting offenders and families affected by imprisonment;
  • St Andrew’s Healthcare: a not-for-profit mental health care charity;
  • Step Change Debt Charity: provider of debt management plans; and
  • Sanctuary Supported Living (SSL): a national provider of supported living housing for vulnerable people.

2.5 During the current ‘preferred bidder’ stage of procurement, existing publicly owned CRCs are prevented from engaging in dialogue with preferred bidders about their proposed operating models. However, the MOJ contracts for taking on the CRCs are expected to be signed on 4 December, followed by the mandatory legal ‘cooling off’ period. It is therefore expected that from 18 December, MTCNovo will be engaging with the CRC in London to explain the future operating model for the delivery of services going forwards and to start mobilising towards the start of contracted services on 2 February 2015.

2.6 Going forwards, contracts will expect proven reduction in re-offending rates, and it seems sensible to assume that MTCNovo will be keen to ensure that much of the effective ‘business as usual’ work being delivered by Probation staff in the borough continues. However, until 18 December, it is impossible to comment on whether there will be any changes to how that delivery will be structured, or on how MTCNovo propose to use its partners in delivery at a local level.

2.7 The Ministry of Justice has been clear throughout the bidding process that successful bidders will have responsibilities to engage with existing borough partnership arrangements, and MTCNovo will be aware of the important of working in partnership to reduce re-offending.

2.8 A further briefing can be given to the Partnership after 18 December 2014.
1. Purpose of Presenting the Report and Decisions Required

1.1 To present the Partnership with a snapshot profile of the current CRC caseload.

1.2 It is recommended that the Community Safety Partnership Board:

- note the information presented.

2. Introduction

2.1 The Partnership will be aware that, as part of the Government’s Transforming Rehabilitation Programme, London Probation Trust ceased to exist on June 1st. Since this date, Probation services in London have been delivered by two organisations: the National Probation Service (NPS), and the London Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC).

2.2 The CRC is responsible for managing offenders who pose a low or medium risk of harm and whom are not MAPPA registered. The NPS manages cases that pose a high risk of harm, or who are MAPPA registered. Whilst also having to manage a degree of risk of harm, the CRC is therefore focussed on reducing risk of re-offending.

2.3 Across London, the CRC is currently managing 24,650 cases. Locally, the CRC is managing 778 Barking and Dagenham cases, 11.3% of whom are women (88 current cases).

2.4 The CRC caseload, both locally and regionally, includes a wide range of cases in terms of service user pattern of offending, levels of need, and range of response required to address risk of re-offending. Key information from the current Barking
Dagenham caseload profile is presented below. Data is collected from our Case Management system (nDelius) and our assessment tool (OASys), with a comparison against the whole London CRC caseload profile.

3. Barking and Dagenham Caseload Overview

3.1 It is evident that the majority of our Barking and Dagenham cases are being supervised in the Community. This is a slightly higher proportion than that seen in the London caseload.

3.2 Acquisitive offending is the offence type that appears most often in the current caseload, but this can include a range of individual offence types: theft, handling, fraud etc. The second most prevalent offence type is violence, with rates similar to the London caseload.

3.3 13.6% of the caseload have committed drug related offences, significantly lower than the rate evident in the London caseload. However, this simply relates to the index offence, not to whether someone misuses drugs.

3.4 The figure for DV perpetrators relates to a flag in the case management system that highlights current risk of domestic abuse, usually because the index offence is related to domestic abuse. This does not therefore highlight all of the cases where risk of domestic abuse is present in the offender’s history, and needs to be monitored.

3.5 Again, Mental Health issues data relates to flags which highlight an area of risk, primarily related to formally diagnosed and recognised disorders.
3.6 The IOM cohort is also under-reported, as we move away from the use of a ‘PPO’ flag to the use of ‘IOM’, in our case management system. There are currently 44 offenders registered as IOM in Barking and Dagenham.

4. Needs profile

4.1 In common with other boroughs and the London caseload, Thinking and Behaviour is the main area of criminogenic need. This area includes a number of indicators of cognitive thinking skills deficits and problematic behavioural traits, for example: lack of problem solving ability, lack of consequential thinking skills, impulsivity, interpersonal skills, concrete thinking.

4.2 The attitudes domain of needs includes pro-criminal attitudes, attitudes towards community/society, attitude to supervision and motivation.

4.3 It is clear that ETE (Employment, Training and Education) is also a significant need in the caseload. Desistance research also indicates the value in addressing this pathway in reducing individual risk of re-offending.

4.4 Alcohol appears to be a slightly more prevalent need than drugs – a pattern that is reversed in the London caseload and other boroughs.

4.5 Relationships is an area that assesses experience of, and problems with, close relationships, whether with partners or families. Problems in this area often result from difficult childhood relationships or broken attachments. Resolving problems in this area tends to increase social capital and support.

4.6 Emotional Wellbeing includes, but is not restricted to, mental health issues. It therefore covers the range from severe diagnosed illnesses and disorders to
chronic but lower levels of anxiety and depression, isolation and difficulties coping. Experience tells us that this area is likely to be under-reported, partly because of service user unwillingness to reveal difficulties in this area, and partly because of assessors placing an overreliance on information around formal diagnosis.

5. Age profile

5.1 We have only slightly more 18-24 year olds in the caseload than the London caseload, but we know from current demographic analysis that this age group might expand in the future.

5.2 The largest group is the 25-34 y/o age range, which is noticeably larger than that in the London caseload. 66% of our current caseload are aged between 18 and 34, which in unsurprising, as desistance research is consistent in reporting that offending is partly age related, with people tending to ‘grow out of’ offending behaviour as they grow older and form more stable adult lifestyles.
6. **Caseload Re-Offending Rates**

5.3 Proven re-offending data is produced by the Ministry of Justice, and reported quarterly. Our re-offending rate for local Barking and Dagenham offenders supervised by the CRC is lower than that for the whole London caseload: 28.6% against 32.7%. This is part of an ongoing pattern, whereby our local rates tend to be consistently lower than the pan-London figures. We don’t have clear information explaining this difference, but borough crime and social demographics will partly contribute, as will effectiveness of multi-agency work to manage our borough’s offenders.

5.4 We are also maintaining our lower re-offending rate across different cohorts, including those who have requirements to attend community payback, offending behaviour programmes, and undertake drug and alcohol interventions. Our acquisitive crime and drug related offending cohorts are also demonstrating a lower re-offending rate. Our re-offending rate for the violence cohort is not showing the same lower level, and is marginally higher than the London average. It is difficult to comment on the reasons for this, without further analysis.

5.5 Of particular note, is the significantly lower rate of re-offending amongst the women’s caseload. Again, comment is difficult without further investigation, but this may be due to the particular demographics of this group. Of course, it is also the case that we have made efforts in the Borough to improve reducing re-offending pathways for women subject to IOM.
6. **Women’s Caseload**

7.1 The women in the Barking and Dagenham CRC caseload have a different profile than the caseload as a whole. This is unsurprising, given that a wealth of research shows that women offenders often present with different social and offending related needs, often linked to past experience of trauma. Information on the women’s caseload that highlight key differences is presented below.
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6.1 The 88 women comprising the Barking and Dagenham caseload are in line with the London women’s caseload, but there are key differences from the whole local caseload profile. The vast majority of women are being supervised in the community (93% vs 85% for the whole caseload). This is a positive, given that effective means of reducing women’s re-offending diversion from custody.

6.2 A significant proportion of our women are committing acquisitive offences (38% vs 25% of the total caseload).

6.3 A higher proportion of women have mental health flags registered on the caseload management system (5% vs 1.2%). As mentioned above, this does not represent the full range of mental health need in the caseload.
6.4 Women in Barking and Dagenham appear to have slightly higher levels of need than the London women’s caseload, in particular areas. Finance is an area where need level is slightly elevated, as is relationships, lifestyle and, marginally, alcohol. It should be remembered, however, that the women’s caseload is relatively small, so differences may have been inflated.

6.5 In terms of relationships, women have a higher need than the local total caseload (30% vs 26%). This is not surprising, given that women often present with histories of abuse. Women often struggle to disclose experiences of childhood and adult relationships, so this area is likely to be under-reported.

6.6 Another area more prominent in the women’s caseload is emotional wellbeing (22% vs 15%). Again, this is predicted by established research: many women present with lasting trauma as a result of experience of abuse. This can lead to isolation, anxiety, depression and other more serious mental health issues. At the same time, women are often unable to disclose trauma or deal with its effects without professional help. For this reason, this area is again likely to be under-reported.
6.7 There are a higher proportion of women offenders aged between 35 – 44 y/o than in the borough caseload as a whole (29% vs 19%). This may partially be explained by an understanding that whilst some male offending may involve discrete psychological components (impulsivity, lack of emotional maturity and coping skills, for example), women’s offending often seems to be characterised by multiple needs that are social, economic and situational, rather than simply psychological. These complex needs may not therefore simply recede with increased age and maturity.

6.8 Conversely, the women’s caseload has a smaller proportion of 18 – 24 year olds. The reasons for this are not currently apparent, but may reflect different rates of offending onset in young men and women, or may be about gendered system responses to anti-social or offending behaviour in children and young adults.

7. Conclusion

7.1 The presented data shows an expected range of offending behaviour in the CRC caseload. It also demonstrates that we have a high number of cases in the community. Given that the overriding aim of the CRC is to reduce re-offending, it’s therefore clear that we need to work in partnership with a range of community agencies in order to effectively address service user needs.

7.2 Alongside 1:1 supervision and intervention by CRC offender managers, service users also have access to a range of existing structured interventions across a number of pathways: for example, offending behaviour programmes to address thinking skills, domestic abuse, anger management; drug and alcohol interventions; ETE hub and partnership with Job Centre Plus; IOM pathways in partnership with LBBD and Police.

7.3 However, the data also suggests that there may be greater than reported need in certain crucial areas such as emotional wellbeing, mental health, and relationships. This suggests that stronger partnership working will be needed with statutory
mental health services, and community agencies that provide talking therapies, mentoring and day to day wellbeing support beneath statutory thresholds. This is particularly the case for the women’s cohort.
1. Purpose of presenting the report and decisions required

1.1 On 18 November this year, the government announced that they would be conducting a review into Youth Offending Services. Youth Justice Minister Andrew Selous stated:

“I believe now is the right time to take stock of how the YOT model is working and consider how best to ensure that local areas are able to tackle as effectively as possible the challenge posed by today’s young offenders.”

1.2 In addition to this, a number of factors including: the recent Parliamentarians’ Review into the Effectiveness of the Youth Court (June 2014), the 2012 Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishing of Offenders (LASPO) Act, the disaggregation from Havering Youth Offending Service, feedback from the YJB peer review that took place in April 2014, government proposals to launch a review of the youth justice system and internal discussions, all point to an opportunity to reshape how we deliver youth justice in Barking and Dagenham.

1.3 In response to these changes in the youth justice landscape, a working group of staff from across the YOS was formed in August 2014 to analyse these factors and consider the future direction of the service and the work that was needed to achieve this shared goal. Out of this came the ‘Tailoring Youth Justice’ programme, a service improvement programme split into six work-streams, aiming to make the required changes to drive the service forward, based on a model of ‘grass-roots’ change.

1.4 A briefing on the programme was taken to the YOS Chief Officer’s Group (COG) in September for information, who recommended that it be presented to the Community Safety Partnership (CSP). The purpose of this report is to inform members of the CSP Board about this programme. This programme has the
potential to entirely refocus and reshape our local service, therefore it is recommended that members of the CSP:

- discuss the local response to emerging issues identified in the Context section of this report;
- agree with the future model of the Youth Offending Service outlined in this report, in light of recent and future changes to the context of youth justice; and
- suggest areas where they may support the development of the Tailoring Youth Justice Programme.

2. **Context**

**Changing YOS cohort**

2.1 Over the last decade the overarching work of the YOS has matched trends across England and Wales: there is now a much smaller but more complex cohort of young offenders. The most recent Youth Justice Board (YJB) Annual Report (2012-13) sums up post-court work by saying that,

The biggest challenge facing us this year has been that of reoffending, as youth justice agencies now work with a much smaller, more troubled, group of young people.

2.2 Broadly, this has been demonstrated by a nationwide reduction in first time entrants (FTE) to the youth justice system since 2005. Barking and Dagenham have followed this trend and performed extremely well during this period, achieving the second biggest percentage reduction in London (46.94%) to their amount of FTE between 2005 and 2010. This was the last time that figures were published by YJB. Between 2007 and 2013 Barking and Dagenham have achieved a larger percentage reduction in FTE than the London and national averages, as demonstrated by the chart below:

![Reduction in First Time Entrants as a percentage of the 2007 level.](image)

2.3 The size and demographic of the YOS caseloads in the Borough has changed and it is predicted that it will continue to change significantly. The pre-court and out-of-court (OOC) caseload is increasing and is part of the overall capacity impact on the YOS.

2.4 In line with the picture across England and Wales, the post-court caseload locally is becoming smaller but more complex, with a noticeable increase in risk. In Barking and Dagenham 56% of young people starting orders between July 2013 and June 2014 were rated as medium or high risk of serious harm, which is an increase of 11% from the previous year.
2.5 Reoffending statistics also demonstrate the increased complexity of the cohort. The below chart presents the changes between the YOS cohort between 2005 and the 12 months ending September 2012. (The cohort is drawn from when an offence is committed and the offender is then tracked for one year, with an additional six months allowed for cases to go through the courts. Therefore any data released refers to a cohort who offended at least 18 months previously).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LBBD</th>
<th>London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort Size</td>
<td>-50.4%</td>
<td>-62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous number of offences per offender</td>
<td>110.9%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of offenders who offend whilst being tracked</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of reoffences committed while tracked</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 The LBBD cohort reduced greatly in this period, although less than the London average. However, the previous number of offences committed per offender more than doubled (against a London average of 58.8%). The proportion of young people who reoffend while being tracked and the number of offences they commit during tracking have also increased significantly above the London Average.

**Changing population in the Borough**

2.7 The cohort of Youth Offending Services is changing on both a national and local level. The young population in Barking and Dagenham is rapidly expanding. In terms of the YOS’s cohort, complexity of cases is increasing. However, more of the less complex cases are being dealt with out of court. This has a significant effect on how we work with young offenders and gives us an opportunity to consider how we deliver services.

2.8 In addition to this, the Office for National Statistics (2012) predicts significant increases in the 10-19 year old population in Barking and Dagenham. The table below presents the predicted changes between 2014 and 2030. In particular, Barking and Dagenham are predicted to have a much greater increase in these age groups compared to England and London.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicted percentage change in population between 2014-2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 year olds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 year olds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2012 - LASPO Act**

2.9 A new Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act was brought into effect in 2012. The Act created several reforms, which impact the youth justice system.
2.10 Perhaps the most significant change for Youth Offending Services as a result of the LASPO Act was the implementation of new out-of-court disposals; Youth Cautions and Youth Conditional Cautions, to replace reprimands and final warnings. These disposals, along with Triage, allow the police to issue young offenders with a sentence that does not require them to go through the formal court system.

2.11 The reduction we have seen in First-Time Entrants to the Youth Justice System (more details on which is given in the Performance section below) may be a result of more young people being issued with out-of-court disposals.

2.12 In addition to this, as the LBBD YOS decommissioned partner Catch-22, out-of-court disposals are now dealt with in-house, shifting the nature of the cohort that YOS Practitioners deal with.

April 2014 - YOS Sector Lead Peer Review into Youth Crime Prevention Services in Barking and Dagenham and Havering

2.13 In April 2014, a Peer Review was conducted into the delivery of youth crime prevention work across Barking and Dagenham and Havering YOSs.

2.14 The key observation made by the Peer Review team was that there was a lack of consistency in prevention services across Barking and Dagenham and Havering. They recommended that Barking and Dagenham bring the provision of out-of-court disposals in house to make more efficient use of resource and facilitate consistency. This recommendation was followed, with Catch 22 being decommissioned in September 2014 and YOS Practitioners taking on out-of-court disposals. This has shifted the make-up of the caseload and will inevitably impact the nature of service delivery, as these orders are far less intensive than regular court orders.

2.15 Other recommendations from the Peer Review have fed into the Programme and are referenced in the body of this report.

August 2014 - Parliamentarians Inquiry into the Operation and Effectiveness of the Youth Court

2.16 As mentioned in the introduction to this report, the Lord Carlile Inquiry into the Effectiveness of the Youth Court has acted as a driver and key starting point for the re-shaping of local Youth Justice services.

2.17 More information on the content of the Inquiry is given in the work-stream sections below. However, to summarise, the Inquiry suggests a range of reforms to the youth justice system with the recommendations being as follows:

- we recommend that Her Majesty’s Courts and Tribunal Service direct all magistrates’ courts to introduce a rota system, to ensure that a senior youth magistrate or youth ticketed District Judge is always sitting in the adult magistrates’ court when the youth court is not in session;
- children who have committed non-serious and non-violent offences, who have stopped offending, should have their criminal record expunged when they turn 18;
- we recommend that all legal practitioners representing children at the police station and practising in youth proceedings be accredited to do so;
where should be a clear presumption – in law – that all child defendants are dealt with in the youth court;

we recommend the piloting of a problem solving approach in court for children, which would include judicial monitoring and continuity in cases, and powers to ensure children’s underlying needs are met; and

we advocate building upon the existing referral order to place greater emphasis on the involvement of victims as well as the participation of families and wider support services to enable the process to address the harm of the offence as well as its underlying causes. The ‘Problem Solving Conference’ would be available to under-16s coming to court and should be initially piloted.

October 2014 – Disaggregation of joint YOS

2.18 A merger between the YOSs of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham (LBBD) and the London Borough of Havering (LBH) began in October 2012. A paper presented at the 8 September 2014 CSP Board Meeting notified the Board of the decision of Havering YOS to disaggregate from the joint YOS and This paper also noted the positive performance of the joint YOS. The performance of the YOS during the period of joint management with Havering and over the last five years is also reported below.

2.19 The disaggregation of the Youth Offending Services has the potential to positively impact service delivery in Barking and Dagenham, as it has increased management capacity to focus on the development and improvement of the service.

2.20 In addition to this, a full Lessons Learnt Report is due to be presented to the YOS Chief Officers Group (COG) on the 15 December. This details further learning that can be used to improve existing service in Barking and Dagenham and inform future integration efforts.

November 2014 – Government launch review of Youth Offending Services

2.21 On the 18 November this year, the government announced that they would be ‘taking stock’ of Youth Justice Services. More detail on this is given at Appendix 1. This is very recent news, but signals a national response to the changing Youth Justice context, which will undoubtedly impact on local service delivery. This will continue to be monitored to ensure that changes made to the LBBD YOS are reflective of the wider national context.

3. Tailoring Youth Justice Programme

3.1 In June this year an Independent Parliamentarians’ Inquiry into the Operation and Effectiveness of the Youth Court was published by a panel chaired by Lord Carlile of Berriew CBE QC. The Inquiry suggests a range of reforms to the youth justice system aiming to ‘divert children from the formalities of the criminal justice process, in which they flounder with little understanding’ (p.iv).

3.2 This report, which can be accessed publicly here, inspired debate among staff of the Youth Offending Service (YOS) around how service delivery is evolving to meet the needs of a changing cohort of young people and a changing landscape both nationally and locally.
3.3 This led to the development of a working group, who met for the first time on the 20 August 2014. At this meeting, the group discussed their readings of the Parliamentarian’s Inquiry and identified key priorities for the service, which fed into the initiation of 6 work-streams, each led by a member of the working group.

3.4 The overarching strategic driver, which emerged from initial discussions, was the need to ‘Tailor Youth Justice’. This tailoring encompasses the need to clearly differentiate between adult and youth justice systems, as well as the more specific need to deliver individualised solutions and interventions for young offenders in order to reduce re-offending.

3.5 Further priorities have been identified by the work-stream groups and their leads. The work-streams and their initial actions are outlined below:

**Policy Change**

3.6 This work-stream was designed to explore overarching changes to policy that affects delivery. There is a need to look at wider policy, particularly around young people’s contact with the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and courts. The key objectives of this work-stream are:

- to reduce the number of young people that go through the court system by increasing those that are dealt with out of court;
- to reduce inequalities that are found to be present in sentencing (e.g. sentencing varying disproportionally in correlation with any of the nine protected characteristics, which are defined here); and
- to improve partnership working with the courts and Crown Prosecution Service.

3.7 Reducing the number of young people that go through the court system was a key priority for the working group and a focus of the Parliamentarians’ Inquiry: ‘all too frequently children are prosecuted, when they might otherwise be diverted’

Evidence shows that once in the court system young people are more likely to re-offend, as Kirton (2013) states:

> Interventions for minor offences or even ‘risk’ of offending are often characterized as net-widening, to describe the way they draw young people into the youth justice system, perhaps unnecessarily and with negative consequences, accelerating the pathways towards custody and potentially deepening involvement in offending.

3.8 The below chart shows the YOS caseload for the financial year 2013-14 broken down by tier of disposal/order compared with our aim for future distribution of disposals/orders. The aim has been calculated based on initial analysis of existing cases that have gone through the court system, which arguably may have been dealt with out-of-court.

---
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3.9 Through further in-depth analysis and scrutiny of local data and cases, the work-stream will identify cases in which a young person was sent to court where they would have been better dealt with through an out-of-court disposal. This will then be used to develop a new protocol around the threshold and oversight of disposal decisions. This work will be carried out in partnership with those involved in decision making (the YOS and the Police) to ensure processes are appropriate and agreed.

3.10 Cases identified will also be analysed for demographic and other trends in order to better understand and address any disproportionality in disposals and sentencing.

3.11 In order to maintain this in the longer term, this work-stream will facilitate the creation an Oversight and Learning Group, acting as a scrutiny panel for out-of-court disposal decisions, which was a recommendation in the April 2014 Peer Review. The Oversight and Learning Group will involve an independent panel looking at disposal decisions made by the Police and YOS to identify where alternative disposals may have been used. The group will not influence decisions that have been made, rather will be used to inform future decision making. The group will be advised by a YOS Police Officer and YOS Operational Manager and it is envisaged that members of the group will include:

- community volunteers;
- a Victim Support representative;
- an officer from the Anti-social Behaviour
- representatives from the Community and Voluntary Sector; and
- a Court representative.

3.12 If this group is successful, the remit may be extended to cover other areas of service delivery.

**Initial Contact**

3.13 Provisional data from the YJB on Barking and Dagenham’s re-offending profile (part of the new Reducing Re-offending Toolkit initiative being piloted in a number of YOSs) suggests that if young people re-offend, they are more likely to do so early in their order. Of the 108 in the sample who re-offended, 63 (58%) did so in the first three months of their order. This was echoed in discussions by the working group, who asserted the importance of intervening with a young person coming into contact with the criminal justice system as early as possible.

3.14 The key objectives of the Initial Contact work-stream are:
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- to ensure that young peoples’ first contacts with each stage of the youth justice system (arrest, police station, court and YOS) are consistent, well-managed and appropriate to their age;
- to ensure that the criminal justice processes and expectations that a young person is likely to be subjected to, including the impact it may have on them in the future, are communicated clearly and inclusively from entry into the system; and
- to utilise early contact with a young person effectively in order to reduce risk of re-offending.

3.15 This work-stream will focus on designing clear and inclusive materials to be given to young people and their parents/carers at the point of entry to the various criminal justice agencies. For example, the group are devising an Induction Pack to be given to young people in court as soon as they are sentenced. These materials will be written in plain English and translated where appropriate. Staff will work with other agencies to ensure that information is explained thoroughly and accurately and that information is understood.

3.16 Service user consultation is integral to this work-stream. Focus groups and individual interviews will be conducted with a number of parents/carers and young people in order to understand their experiences of the system and identify gaps. This will then inform work-stream activity.

3.17 This work-stream will also look at existing local protocol around the use of appropriate adults in police stations, as these individuals provide important support and information to young people during their initial contact with the criminal justice system. Work will include ensuring that parents, carers, relatives or older friends who act as appropriate adults are well-informed and exploring policies on professional appropriate adults and out-of-hour appropriate adult services.

Strengths Based Approach

3.18 A key component of the Parliamentarians’ Inquiry is the need to shift approach when dealing with young offenders from focusing mainly on offences committed to a focus on young people’s strengths as a form of diversion. They quote Professor Neal Hazel, stating that the system should:

‘shift [young people’s] understanding of themselves to something more positive, so that you stop people thinking of themselves as street kids, as criminals and so on, and start to think of themselves as progressive members of the community, as engaged...’

3.19 As opposed to the deficit model, which focuses on the negative factors that lead to an individual offending, a strengths based approach identifies skills, knowledge and ability and develops these to support individuals to achieve positive outcomes.

3.20 This approach is fundamental to this work-stream, which will look at the interventions we currently deliver, with a focus on building positive narratives for young people. The key objectives are:

---
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for a focus on strengths to be embedded into the YOS culture and to be central to assessments and interventions used by all YOS staff;

- to continue to develop a pool of resources that are evidence-based and to ensure that staff are well-trained to deliver; and

- to ensure there is a holistic and integrated model of intervention, which draws on expertise of partners across a number of related agencies including: Children’s Services, Probation, Substance Misuse, Mental Health, Careers and Job Centre Plus.

3.21 Currently in Barking and Dagenham YOS, there is a focus on offending behaviour interventions that explore the reasons for offending and work to address these. The work-stream agrees that some offending behaviour work must be retained to ensure that offending is addressed and that the young person is punished for their actions. However, the work-stream is aiming for a culture shift from a system which is heavily focussed on offending behaviour, to one that centres on a strengths based approach. Evidence suggests that this approach is more likely to prevent young people from re-offending through enabling them to contribute and feel a sense of belonging to Barking and Dagenham; ultimately making the community safer.

3.22 Assessment is a key point at which the strengths based approach must be embedded. The current assessment tool, Asset, is due to be replaced by Asset Plus in mid 2015. Asset Plus facilitates a more in-depth and holistic assessment in which specialist staff and YOS practitioners work in tandem to assess the risk, vulnerability and needs of a young person. The implementation of Asset Plus should facilitate a strengths based approach.

3.23 Further to this, as part of the transition to Asset Plus, the work-stream are piloting a two phased assessment process involving two separate assessments, one based on offending, risk and vulnerability and a strengths based assessment. This aims to embed the strengths based approach into the work of practitioners and ensure that time is devoted to this approach.

3.24 In addition to assessments, the strengths based approach requires embedding into resources used for intervention. The YOS Girls Group is an evidence based, gender-specific programme developed by a group of YOS staff that focuses on strengths and capabilities of young female offenders. The programme has received recognition from the Youth Justice Board and the Howard League for Penal Reform. The work-stream agreed unanimously that all resources used with young people should be up-to-date and evidence-based. Members of the work-stream are conducting a full audit of existing resources and consulting with staff to identify any that are not thoroughly evidence based and are no longer fit for purpose.

3.25 In addition to this, more strengths based resources are required. Sections of the work-stream are developing new evidence and strengths based interventions following the model of the Girls Group, including a gender specific intervention for boys.

3.26 This work-stream also aims to increase the use of strengths based mediation techniques including family group conferencing. Work is underway to increase the number of families that receive this form of mediation. Furthermore, the work-stream is exploring the implementation of Problem Solving Conferences (as conceived in Chapter 7 of the Carlile Inquiry).
3.27 Where partnership working is strong in terms of governance of the YOS through the YOS COG, this needs to be reiterated at an operational level. Particularly as resources are reducing across a multitude of agencies, the YOS must reinforce links across partners to ensure use of resources is maximised and to avoid duplication of work. Identifying where these links are and increasing operational partnership referrals forms an element of the activity of this work-stream.

3.28 Service user consultation is integral to informing the activity of this work-stream. Focus groups and individual interviews will be carried out with a number of young people and their parents in order to understand their perception of the interventions they have received.

Victim and Community Focus

3.29 Victim services are currently in the spotlight on both a national and local level. A recent government statement issued on 14 September 2014 by Chris Grayling outlines plans for legislation in relation to victim services. The most relevant parts of the statement with regard to the YOS are:

- A new law will guarantee key entitlements for victims, previously set out in the Victims Code. This will include the right to make a personal statement and ask to have it read aloud in court; automatic referral to support organisations; information about individual cases at each and every stage; and an assessment of victims’ needs at the earliest opportunity; and
- transparency and accountability will also improve, with criminal justice agencies held to account and required to publish information on how they have improved services.

3.30 The Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime have signalled an increased focus on victim work in the near future, with particular attention to victims of domestic violence and Restorative Justice within Youth Offending settings.

3.31 In addition to this, the LBBD Community Safety Partnership have identified Integrated Victim Management as a key priority. Therefore, improving the victim journey is a key part of the local agenda.

3.32 It is crucial, therefore, that we consider how victim services and restorative justice for the victims of young offenders will be delivered in the future in Barking and Dagenham. There is space for improvement, in particular, around the utilisation of Restorative Justice (RJ). This was highlighted in the April 2014 Peer Review Findings Report, which stated with regards to restorative justice and victim work that ‘the time was ripe for a refresh’.

3.33 This work-stream aims to re-shape our victim provision, putting victims and restorative justice at the centre of what we do. The key objectives of the work-stream are:

- to provide a Restorative Justice Service that is flexible to the needs of victims and has the principles of Restorative Justice at its core;
- for Restorative Justice to be embedded into practice across the YOS;
- to ensure that the wishes of the victim and the community are properly listened to and taken into account when decisions are made regarding Restorative Justice processes, including reparation;
to increase, year-on-year, the number of victims participating in Victim-Offender Conferences; and

- to increase the community’s awareness of Restorative Justice, its underlying rationale and the processes involved.

3.34 It is important to note that the delivery of this work-stream is dependent on reallocation of YOS resource to fund a Restorative Justice Worker post, which will be central to the envisaged Restorative Justice Service. Currently the MPS fund a Victim Liaison Officer who is seconded to the YOS; however the Police have proposed to delete this post from June 2015. A paper is being taken to YOS COG on 15 December for decision, which recommends a review of the YOS establishment list to investigate the possibility of creating a Restorative justice Worker position.

3.35 One of the key areas for improvement is ensuring that YOS Practitioners engage more fully with the Restorative Justice Service. While practitioners have an understanding of restorative justice, there is a disconnect between the current victim provision and generic case management. This will be addressed through:

- re-fresher training for all staff on the core principles of restorative justice, funded by the YJB Restorative Justice Grant (a ring-fenced funding stream for restorative justice work);
- re-designing protocol on referrals to the Restorative Justice Service to enable the Restorative Justice Service to be more proactive in liaising YOS Practitioners;
- joint victim safety assessments to be conducted between YOS Practitioners and Restorative Justice Service; and
- Restorative Justice Service meeting with all young offenders at the start of their order and running regular victim awareness sessions with offenders, which will be included in intervention plans.

3.36 A number of scoping and research activities have been planned to take place in November and December 2014 to inform the activity of this work-stream. This includes service user consultation with victims of young offenders and site visits to successful YOS-based restorative justice and victim services. In addition to this, links are being built with a PhD scholar, previously an Executive Officer at European Forum for Restorative Justice, who is supporting with research.

3.37 Scoping will feed into the objective of increasing the number of face-to-face Restorative Justice Conferences between victims and offenders. Arranging Conferences has consistently been a barrier to service delivery, as victims can be reluctant to engage. However, a number of other services in the country are successfully running conferences and other forms of mediation, and the results are positive with an 85% victim satisfaction rate and a 14% reduction in frequency of re-offending4. Therefore the work-stream is exploring best practice and innovative methods of gaining buy-in from victims and offenders. Initial findings include playing pre-recorded messages from the victim to the offender and vice-versa, and filming mock Restorative Justice Conferences to show victims, so that they are aware of what to expect.

---

A need was also identified to raise awareness of Restorative Justice and its benefits in the community. In a number of European countries including Northern Ireland and Belgium, there is a higher success rate in terms of arranging Victim Offender Conferences. A reason for this could be that Restorative Justice is widely accepted as a normal route for offenders and victims, thus individuals are more likely to take part. The work-stream is developing publicity and communications to increase understanding of Restorative Justice in Barking and Dagenham. This will include a poster campaign and a re-fresh of publicity materials.

As well as this, work is being carried out to ensure that the victim voice is heard and has the potential to impact the work a young offender carries out while on an order. In particular, the work-stream is looking at victim input into reparation activities, enabling them to suggest activities where appropriate that could directly improve their lives.

The voice of the community is also integral to this. Members of the work-stream are working in partnership with the Anti-social Behaviour Team to utilise existing resident forums to gain residents’ input into victim work, particularly in relation to reparation.

The work-stream is now drawing together a comprehensive Victim and Community Plan, which will be presented to the YOS COG in March 2015.

Stakeholder Engagement

In the April 2014 Peer Review Report it was highlighted that partners within the Council did not have sufficient understanding of the role of the Youth Offending Service and its staff. In order for development to happen, engagement of and collaboration with our stakeholders is vital. This includes service users, residents and partner agencies. This work-stream centres on the engagement of partner agencies (as engagement of service users and residents is dealt with elsewhere in the programme). The key objectives of this work stream are:

- to work jointly with agencies that engage with young offenders to gain their input and enhance engagement with the YOS;
- to develop training for professionals around the nature of the youth offending system and the future vision for the YOS; and
- to develop protocols around working relationships with agencies to enable better joint working.

The key agencies/professionals identified as being integral to this work-stream are:

- courts and magistrates;
- Crown Prosecution Service;
- Solicitors and Legal Advisers;
- LBBD Children’s Services;
- LBBD Anti-social Behaviour Team;
- National Probation Service;
- Community Rehabilitation Companies; and
- MET Police.
3.44 Initial activity of this work-stream will involve consulting with agencies to gain input and set parameters for the programme. This will then be fed back to other work-streams in order to inform activity.

3.45 The remaining activity of this work-stream, including training is set to take place over the longer term, after other elements of the programme are better established.

**Supervision, Scrutiny and Support**

3.46 The Supervision, Scrutiny and Support work-stream will take the work of the other work-streams and ensure staff engage with the changes and are supported to do so. The key objectives are:

- to embed changes made as a result of the programme into staff culture and practice and ensure staff are equipped to develop and thrive in a changing environment;
- to ensure effective training, supervision and oversight processes are in place to support staff in the new way of working; and
- to use scrutiny processes to ensure that effective decisions are made from strategic to operational delivery.

3.47 The main activity of this work-stream will be informed by the work of the other work-streams, thus will be delivered over a longer period.

3.48 The key elements will involve developing training and support packages for staff, including peer review and oversight. A new Quality Assurance protocol has recently been developed by the YOS, which will be integral to delivering this work-stream activity. The work-stream lead is working closely with staff developing this protocol to ensure it complements the work of the programme.

4. **List of Attachments**
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Government launches review of YOTs

By Neil Puffett

18 November 2014

A review of how youth offending teams (YOT) work will be held by the Ministry of Justice, the government has announced.

Youth justice minister Andrew Selous said the review will look at how YOTs meet the needs of young people

Appearing in a pre-recorded video address to the annual Youth Justice Convention, being held in Telford, youth justice minister Andrew Selous said the "stocktake" exercise is an "area of vital activity".

"If we are to make significant and sustainable improvements in outcomes for the young people we work with, the services we deliver must continue to evolve," he said.

"The number of young people in the youth justice system has fallen and your efforts and professionalism have played a key role in this success.

"But this presents new challenges in how YOTs and partners in the wider system respond to these young people."

Selous said that while YOTs have achieved "an enormous amount" and have provided a blueprint for effective partnership working, they have themselves changed since their introduction in 2000.
He said: "The model is not one set in stone. We have seen local areas realising the YOT model in a wide range of ways.

"Some are taking on even greater responsibilities such as driving the troubled families programme while others have merged with neighbouring YOTs to reinvent how they deliver their services.

"It's for these reasons I believe now is the right time to take stock of how the YOT model is working and consider how best to ensure that local areas are able to tackle as effectively as possible the challenge posed by today's young offenders."

Selous said MoJ officials are working closely with the YJB on the review, and has written to chief executives of local authorities about it. He said the participation of YOTs is "absolutely critical" to the success of the work.

A CYP Now survey conducted in 2012, found that half of YOTs were run by managers with additional responsibility for services over and above youth justice.

As a result of ongoing funding cuts many YOTs have adapted the way they work to protect services.

Some have merged with other areas, some have introduced collaborative models of working, while others, such as Gloucestershire, have opted for privatisation.

Answering questions during a panel debate following Selous's address, MoJ official Paul Candler, deputy director of the youth justice policy unit, refuted suggestions that the review was "about privatisation".

"There is no secret plan in the MoJ about YOTs," he said. "It is about a stock take – getting information. What happens with that information I can't say.

"The alternative is not having the information ministers need about the performance of the youth offending system."

During his video address, Selous also emphasised the government's desire to take a "holistic approach" to ensure young people get the right start in life.

"Without the protection and support of a positive family network, the chances for children to succeed are significantly reduced," he said.

"That is why the government is continuing to do all it can to nurture and strengthen families."

He said a particular challenge for government is the impact of parental imprisonment on children, where "63 per cent of boys with a convicted father go on to be convicted themselves".

"We need to break this generational cycle of offending and I am overseeing work within government to improve support for these children and their families," he added.

Selous said next month he will be participating in a prison governors conference to consider
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how positive family relationships can support desistance and reduce intergenerational crime, as well as what prisons can do to improve the services on offer to the families of prisoners.

The Labour Party has previously indicated its desire to take action on the issue of parental imprisonment, with Shadow Justice Secretary Sadiq Khan pledging to assess the scale of the issue should the party win the next general election.

- See more at: http://www.cypnow.co.uk/cyp/news/1148224/yot-stocktake-assess-services-evolve#sthash.41okwdgl.dpuf
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1. Introduction

1.1 It was agreed at the 8 September CSP Board that the existing CSP Callover process had fulfilled its expectations and that now would be an opportune moment to refresh the way Callover is used.

1.2 Originally, CSP Callover was established in order to review performance and to identify and target areas of poor or declining performance. This performance analysis is now being carried out effectively by the CSP’s sub-groups. Therefore, it was proposed that Callover should now be used to conduct more in-depth analysis of areas of low performance and emerging issues; identifying partnership responses to one or two key issues per meeting.

1.3 The first meeting of this new format on 17 November 2014 conducted analysis of violence with injury. Violence with injury was selected for further analysis as it was the Borough’s only performance indicator which was rated as red. Street-based violence was also described as one of the Borough’s three areas of focus by the Police Borough Commander at the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) Roadshow meeting on 10 November 2014, along with domestic abuse and confidence in the Police. Partners acknowledge the extensive work being done across the CSP to address domestic abuse and the work to analyse and improve confidence in the Police being undertaken by the MOPAC 7 Sub-Group, thus violence with injury was selected for further exploration.

1.4 The new Callover format draws on new and innovative presentation techniques to visually explore and map data in an engaging way as part of an ongoing priority to be Digital by Design. Attendees at the first meeting were shown a large scale map of the Borough with levels of violence with injury over the last three years indicated for every postcode. The presentation tool allowed areas with significant levels of the crime type to be zoomed in on for further analysis. This allowed more detailed analysis of specific hotspot locations such as schools, stations and shopping areas.
Figures were available to give profiles for the time of day, day of the week and times of year of offences as well as profiles of the victims and suspects of cases. Each area was discussed by partners in order to identify the reasons for repeat instances of violence with injury and to discuss partnership response.

1.5 Notes from this meeting are included in this paper in section 2. At the close of the meeting partners agreed that this format was highly effective in terms of understanding an offence and encouraging innovative discussions around ways to tackle it. Because of the strengths of the new format it was agreed that this should continue and topics for further analysis for the 17 February 2014 meeting were agreed.

1.6 Attached to this report at Appendix 1 is a copy of the performance dashboard report for the CSP. The dashboard contains statistical information for all of the Commissioning Safety Partnerships performance indicators. For each indicator an in-depth one page summary sheet is available upon request.

1.7 This paper addresses the recent rise in violence with injury offences. It also outlines work being done across the CSP to address this. The attachments to this paper include the one page summaries for violence with injury and related offences at Appendix 2.

2. 17 November 2014 Callover

2.1 A presentation was given to the Callover meeting which identified locations in the Borough where repeat violence with injury has been reported. The meeting discussed why these areas could have repeated incidents and whether there was any potential action or further analysis which could be undertaken.

2.2 Key areas discussed were Barking Town Centre, licensed premises, shopping parades, retail parks and schools. Areas of repeated reports of violence with injury were clustered around these facilities. It was noted that there were few areas where violence with injury was repeatedly reported in high numbers, although several locations consistently had low numbers of incidents reported over the last three years.

2.3 It was agreed that the Police would undertake work with supermarkets sited where violence was repeatedly reported to ensure that their security personnel are trained to diffuse situations which occur in and around the shops. It was also agreed for Licensing Officers to investigate the potential to work with licensed premises where repeat violence with injury is reported in the area or whether current work with these premises is sufficient.

2.4 It was agreed that Dan James and Will Donovan would share this analysis with Safer Neighbourhood Teams in Wards where there were high levels of repeat violence so that they can co-ordinate local responses.

2.5 It was agreed that the next Callover meeting on 17 February 2015 would look at the following analysis:

- violence with injury hotspots overlaid with data regarding the level of antisocial behaviour, theft and criminal damage offences as well as deliberate fire;
• further commentary and feedback from partners as they review the findings and guide further analysis;
• further information regarding licensed premises;
• secondary schools, including input from Children’s Services, and the Pupil Referral Unit; and
• information regarding retail outlets, especially supermarkets.

3. Performance Area of Focus

Violence with injury

3.1 Recorded violence with injury (VWI) has seen an increase locally and across London. Year to date (YTD) at September 2014 there were 169 more VWI crimes reported compared to September 2013 (up 21%). In comparison the average across the Metropolitan Police is up 23%.

3.2 It should be noted that from the summer of 2013 a change in recording standards has broadened the definition of VWI, so that offences involving 17 year olds within the family or in relationships are now included within the figures.

3.3 Domestic violence (DV) offences are counted within the VWI indicator. The percentage of VWI that is DV has increased year on year suggesting that the rise in DV offences is impacting on the VWI figures. The rolling 12 month data at May 2014 below helps to illustrate this point:

i) 1,584 VWI offences between June 2012 to May 2013 compared to 1,734 VWI offences between June 2013 to May 2014 (9.4% increase and a difference of 150 offences). Of which:

ii) 619 of the VWI offences between June 2012 to May 2013 were DV compared to 719 DV VWI offences between June 2013 to May 2014 (16.2% increase and a difference of 100 offences). Therefore the majority of the increase in VWI has been down to the increase in DV (100 of the 150 offences).

iii) The data above for June 2013 to May 2014 shows that 719 of the 1,734 VWI offences reported were DV (41%).

3.4 In response, the CSP has overseen a number of activities and actions to support the increase in the number of domestic violence crimes reported. These include:

• Operation Dauntless, a Metropolitan Police Service-wide response to improving performance in this area. This is a multi strand project which is owned by the local Senior Management Team to look at all aspects of domestic abuse;
• Negotiated with the Association of Chief Police Officers to gain lead pilot status for Domestic Violence Protection Orders (DVPO). The first DVPO in London was issued by LBBD, the offender breached the Order and was remanded for six weeks as a result;
• Children’s Services have appointed a Domestic Violence & Child Sexual Exploitation Coordinator who is located with the Adult Services Adult Safeguarding Team alongside the Domestic Violence & Hate Crime Manager and MARAC Coordinator to ensure a coordinated response;
• Troubled Families Domestic Violence Coordinators (1.5 FTE) have been commissioned to work with a cohort of 40 families as identified where domestic
violence is prevalent alongside further multiple and complex needs. This project commenced on 1 August 2014;

- Ascent, a Violence against Women and Girls Consortium consisting of 22 specialist organisations providing domestic and sexual violence support to clients across the London region, has some funding to end March 2015 (with the possibility of a year’s extension depending on further funding from London Councils) to provide specialist support at a local level. They have met with LBBD to discuss provision of services to complement existing local services in LBBD and this work is being explored with the intention of it commencing as soon as possible;

- A young person’s Independent Domestic Sexual Violence Advocacy (IDSVA) Service and a Children and Families IDVAS posts are now in place as part of the IDSVA contract for 11-18 year olds; The Children and Families IDSVA is co-located in the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH);

- Children’s Services are coordinating delivery of a Domestic Violence Children’s Treatment Programme endorsed by AVA (Against Violence and Abuse). This programme is aimed at families where domestic violence is no longer present and the non-abusing parent is no longer residing in the family home. The programme is being delivered by colleagues within Children’s Services with some support from colleagues in partner agencies;

- New local domestic and sexual violence publicity materials have been published which are accessible from the Adult Safeguarding team. An online Domestic and Sexual Violence Directory of Services is being drafted for publication online using the same graphics to ensure consistency. Further publicity materials and campaigns are also in discussion including a business card for young people;

- White Ribbon Day 2015 plans are underway with a complement of awareness raising campaigns planned; Corporate Alliance Against Domestic Violence (CAADV) are working jointly on this programme and a fuller focus will therefore be on the impact of Domestic Violence on business;

- IDVA Support from Victim Support and Hestia now ensures victims are supported through the court process (victim attrition has been a long standing issue in Barking and Dagenham). This has seen victim non-attendance at court fall from 40% to 3%;

- The use of Special Measures (such as separate entrances to the Court and screens while testifying) for victims of domestic violence in the criminal justice system is being promoted and figures will be collated at the end of the year;

- The Police are driving compliance around the initial investigation in terms of gathering key evidence at the time of reporting, such as taking photographs of injuries;

- Positive action regarding suspects who are at the scene or have recently left the scene is being monitored as there is a correlation between successful detection and time to arrest;

- Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARAC) managing high risk cases;

- the Police are piloting a new specialist Domestic Violence Crime Advisor (Detective Sergeant) working within a Emergency Response Patrol Team 24/7;

- Police Operation Dawn Thunder, which arrests wanted suspects in early morning raids, is held each day;

- within the Police each team is being enhanced with a rolling programme of attachments for Emergency Response Policing Team (ERPT) officers being
attached to the Community Safety Unit for a month a time, with the ambition to expose all officers to seeing enhanced victim care and investigative process.

3.5 In addition to the response above the MOPAC 7 CSP Sub-Group (targeting reductions in the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime’s seven key priority neighbourhood crimes) have tasked a piece of analysis on this area separating out VWI offences which take place in public spaces and those which take place in residential spaces. Analysis is currently being undertaken and results will help to inform the Community Safety Partnership’s response.

4. **List of Appendices**

4.1 Appendix 1 – CSP Performance Dashboard

4.2 Appendix 2 – Violence With Injuries and Related Indicators One Page Summaries

4.3 Appendix 3 – Community Safety Plan Actions Relating to Violence with Injury
## Community Safety Partnership Performance Dashboard

### Crime Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Notifiable Offences (TNO's)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18,147</td>
<td>18,581</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>2,937</td>
<td>2,918</td>
<td>5,619</td>
<td>5,619</td>
<td>5,619</td>
<td>5,619</td>
<td>5,619</td>
<td>5,619</td>
<td>5,619</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>Monitoring only</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Indicators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>Monitoring only</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft Indicators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Monitoring only</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Person</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism Indicators</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Monitoring only</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence with Injury</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>Monitoring only</td>
<td>201 (+23%)</td>
<td>281 (+20%)</td>
<td>529 (+23%)</td>
<td>793 (+27%)</td>
<td>989 (+25%)</td>
<td>184 (+24%)</td>
<td>184 (+24%)</td>
<td>184 (+24%)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence Indicators</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>Monitoring only</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against the person</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>Reduction None in April</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against the person</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>Reduction None in April</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against the person</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Offending Indicators</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Reduction None in April</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Youth Violence (YTD)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Monitoring only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proven reoffending of young people</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>See source</td>
<td>See source</td>
<td>See source</td>
<td>Reduction None in April</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Orders (Statutory) - YTD</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Monitoring only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Orders (Statutory) - YTD</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Monitoring only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Orders (Statutory) - YTD</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Monitoring only</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Orders (Statutory) - YTD</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>Reduction None in April</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Orders (Statutory) - YTD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proven Re-offending Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate of proven re-offending</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>See source</td>
<td>See source</td>
<td>See source</td>
<td>Reduction None in April</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ASB Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of calls to the police reporting ASC</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9,455</td>
<td>7,717</td>
<td>7,541</td>
<td>Reduction None in April</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alcohol Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of alcohol late night (TBC)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9,455</td>
<td>7,717</td>
<td>7,541</td>
<td>Reduction None in April</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Drugs Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of individuals successfully completing drug treatment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Reduction None in April</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commissioned Services - Safer Homes Service (Victim Support)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim Support: Safer Homes - No. of homes visited and secured (YTD)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>Reduction None in April</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### File Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of referrals (TBC)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>Reduction 50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Total Notifiable Offences (TNO’s)

**Definition**

Total Notifiable Offences counts the total of all incidents reported to / discovered by the police and recorded as a crime.

**How this indicator works**


**What good looks like**

We are looking for a decrease in this figure, and would normally compare with the same period in the previous year, as crime is (broadly) seasonal.

**Why this indicator is important**

The data allows us to make performance comparisons with other areas and provides a broad overview of how well the borough is dealing with crime and disorder.

**2014/15 Target:** Reduction on last years figures

**History with this indicator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year to date</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change from previous year</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling 12 month period (for use below)</td>
<td>15,962</td>
<td>15,916</td>
<td>16,003</td>
<td>15,896</td>
<td>15,903</td>
<td>16,039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per 1,000 Res</td>
<td>83.76</td>
<td>83.52</td>
<td>83.98</td>
<td>81.79</td>
<td>81.83</td>
<td>82.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Overview**

Overall there has been no change in crime levels at September 2014 when compared to the same period in 2013 (down 23 offences reported but 0% change. The MET average performance is -2%)

**Actions to Sustain or Improve Performance**

No remedial action required

**Benchmarking**

For total crime Barking and Dagenham is currently ranked 21 out of the 32 CSP areas across the Metropolitan Police Force and just above the MET average (82.10 crimes per 1,000 residents). B&D on average has a rate of 82.53 crimes per 1,000 residents. Our position within our Most Similar Group (MSG) is now 8 of 15. We are now closer to the MSG average which is 80.39 per 1,000 residents.

Report author: Daniel James, research and analysis officer, Service Support and Improvement Team: daniel.james@lbld.gov.uk, 0208 227 5040.
Definition
Violence with Injury includes the following offences: Attempted murder, intentional destruction of a viable unborn child, causing death or serious injury by dangerous driving, causing death by careless driving under the influence of drink or drugs, cause or allow death or serious physical harm to child or vulnerable person, causing death by careless or inconsiderate driving, causing death by driving; unlicensed, disqualified or uninsured drivers, assault with intent to cause serious harm, endangering life, assault with Injury, Racially or religiously aggravated assault with injury, causing death by aggravated vehicle taking.

How this indicator works

Overall count or the offences listed opposite.

What good looks like
We are looking for a decrease in this figure, and would normally compare with the same period in the previous year, as crime is (broadly) seasonal.

Why this indicator is important
Violent crime is a priority crime identified by the 2013 Crime and Disorder Strategic Assessment. It is a MOPAC 7 priority crime type.

2014/15 Target:
Reduction on last years figures

History with this indicator
2013/14 = 1,693 (+6%)
2012/13 = 1,600 (+16%)
2011/12 = 1,897 (-5%)

Any issues to consider
Interpretation of what an injury is: Injury now includes pain regardless of whether it is visible or lasting pain this will now be recorded as ABH - thus putting it in VWI. This is a change in MPS Interpretation regarding crime classification.

Performance Overview
Recorded violence with injury crime has continued to increase YTD at September 2014 there were 169 more violence with injury crimes reported compared to September 2013 (up 21%). In comparison the average across the MET is up 23%.

Actions to Sustain or Improve Performance
The rise in Domestic Violence offences is impacting on the Violence with Injury figures. MOPAC 7 group have tasked a piece of analysis on this area separating out VWI offences those taking place in public spaces and those that are taking place in non public spaces. Analysis is currently being undertaken and results will help to inform partnership responses.

Benchmarking
We are currently ranked 28 out of 32 CSP across the Metropolitan Police Force with 9.58 crimes per 1,000 residents compared to the Metropolitan Police force average of 7.75 per 1,000 residents. Our positioning amongst our Most Similar Group (MSG) is 11 of 15 or 4th highest and therefore above the MSG average of 8.78 per 1,000 residents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Safety &amp; Public Protection Services / Crime and Enforcement Portfolio</th>
<th>September 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic Violence</strong></td>
<td>Source: Local Police Figures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**
Any incident of threatening behaviour, violence, or abuse (psychological, physical, sexual, financial or emotional) between adults who are or have been intimate partners or family, regardless of gender.

**How this indicator works**
Simple monthly and YTD count of offences reported. Rate per 1,000 residents is used to compare against other areas. For the rate per 1,000 population we use rolling 12 month figures against the 2011 Census figure for all individuals residing in the borough (187,029). This is consistent with Iquanta.

**What good looks like**
For monitoring. DV is likely to be an under reported crime. An increase in offences could show that more people recognise domestic abuse as a crime and report it rather than the situation getting worse.

**Why this indicator is important**
DV was a Community Safety Partnership priority for 2012/13

**2014/15 Target:**
Generally an increase in crimes reported is considered a good thing. If crimes reported is going down it should prompt services to ask ‘what are we not doing?’

**History of this indicator**
- 2013/14: 1,991 Offences, 10.65 crimes per 1,000 residents
- 2012/13: 1,588 Offences, 8.49 crimes per 1,000 residents
- 2011/12: 1,706 Offences
- 2010/11: 1,790 Offences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year to date</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling 12 months (for use below)</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>2,046</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>2,455</td>
<td>2,485</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>13.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate per 1,000</td>
<td>32 of 32</td>
<td>32 of 32</td>
<td>32 of 32</td>
<td>32 of 32</td>
<td>32 of 32</td>
<td>32 of 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Overview**
- There were 30 more crimes of DV reported in September 2014 compared to September 2013 (+ 18%).
- Using YTD totals there was an increase of 230 crimes reported between April 2014 to September 2014 compared to April 2013 to September 2013 (1184 vs 954 or +24.1%) B&D is the first in London to use the DV Protection notice. When police attend DV call out they can issue the notice to the alleged perpetrator which bans them from attending the premises for 28 days. If breached the individual is arrested and taken to court and there is the possibility of a prison sentence.

**Actions to Sustain or Improve Performance**
- Partnership responses include:
  - Operation Dauntless which is an MPS wide response to improving performance in this area
  - Improved our emergency response times to Domestic Abuse Calls
  - Positive action regarding suspects who are at the scene or have recently left the scene is being monitored as there is a correlation between successful detection against time to arrest
  - We are piloting a new Crime Advisor (Detective Sergeant) working within a Emergency Response Patrol Team 24/7
  - IDVA Support ensuring victims are supported through court process ( victim attrition long standing issue in B+D)
  - As of 1/4 we are able to use restorative approach for youth VWI where appropriate. Each team is being enhanced with a rolling programme of attachments for ERPT officers being attached to the Community Safety Unit for a month a time, with the ambition to expose all officers to seeing enhanced victim care and investigative process.
  - Children’s services have appointed a DV coordinator.
  - A young person’s IDVAS and a children’s IDVAS posts are now in place as part of the IDVAS contract

**RAG Rating: None**

**Benchmarking**
% Change compared to same time in the previous year (YTD at Sep 14 vs YTD at Sep 13): B&D = Up by 24.1% London average =up by 19.4%  
*Rate per 1,000 Residents (rolling 12 months): B&D = 13.29, Metropolitan Police Average = 8.28, this places B&D 32 / 32 or the highest in London.

Report author: Daniel James, research and analysis officer, Service Support and Improvement Team: daniel.james@lbld.gov.uk, 0208 227 5040.
### Youth Offending Service Chief Officers Group
### Serious Youth Violence (Barking & Dagenham)

#### September 2014

**Source:** Local Police Figures

---

**Definition**

**Serious Youth Violence** is defined by the MPS as ‘Any offence of most serious violence or weapon enabled crime, where the victim is aged 1-19.’

**How this indicator works**

We use the following formula using the latest rolling 12 month figures and the 2011 Census figure for individuals aged 1-19 in the borough (55,021).

**What good looks like**

We are looking for a decrease in this figure, and would normally compare with the same period in the previous year, as crime is (broadly) seasonal.

**Why this indicator is important**

Serious Youth Violence (SYV) is a CSP priority. The 2011 Strategic Assessment showed that it constitutes the next most significant element of the violence that occurs, after Domestic Violence. Analysis of robberies shows that it is part of a growing pattern of gang-related violence.

---

**2014/15 Target:**

Reduction on last years figures

**History with this indicator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Offences</th>
<th>Rate per 1,000 Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Month**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change compared to previous year</td>
<td>+20% / +2</td>
<td>-8% / -8</td>
<td>+32% / +4</td>
<td>+4% / +2 offences</td>
<td>+5% / +3 offences</td>
<td>+2% / +2 offences</td>
<td>+13% / +2</td>
<td>+10% / +2</td>
<td>+12% / +2</td>
<td>+13% / +2</td>
<td>+12% / +2</td>
<td>+13% / +2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling 12 months (for use below)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**% Change compared to previous year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% change compared to previous year</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>+20%</td>
<td>+21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>+32%</td>
<td>+14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>+4%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>+5%</td>
<td>+3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>+2%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Performance Overview**

Using YTD figures (83 at September 2014) there has been an overall increase of 2 SYV incidents reported (+2%) on the 81 reported at the same period last year.

**RAG Rating:** A

**Benchmarking**

% Change compared to same time in the previous year (using YTD figures): B&D = Up by 2%, London = no % change. **Rate per 1,000 Residents:** B&D = 3.25

This places B&D 21 / 32 in the London Rankings. London average is 3.07 per 1,000 residents aged 1-19 years.

---

**Actions to Sustain or Improve Performance**

- Consideration needs to be given to our good performance in 2012/13
- The gangs tactical meeting has been refreshed
- The gangs unit has been further integrated with IOM and Youth Offending Teams so they now come under one management route which will bring additional resources.
- MOPAC commissioned services are also signposting and referring appropriate individuals to address this issue.

---

Report author: Daniel James, research and analysis officer, Service Support and Improvement Team: daniel.james@lbbd.gov.uk, 0208 227 5040.
Community Safety Plan
2014 – 2017
Actions relevant to Violence with Injury
### DELIVERY PLAN

**Vision**
To deliver a robust Integrated Offender Management service, working in partnership to address causes of offending and reduce crime

**What will the CSP do?**
1. Facilitate partnership working and information sharing processes between relevant agencies
2. Support the development of intelligence around local crime in order to feed strategy and target resources appropriately
3. Oversee the delivery of sub-group strategies to ensure that crime and Anti-Social Behaviour are reduced

### KEY POINTS FOR DELIVERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>DELIVERY</th>
<th>SUCCESS MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Youth Offending</td>
<td>Effectively use resources and partners to reduce the numbers of young people offending and reoffending Be responsive to newly emerging issues and ensure mechanisms are in place to direct resources accordingly</td>
<td>A reduction in re-offending of young people A reduction in first time entrants to the youth justice system A reduction in young people sent to custody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Serious Youth Violence</td>
<td>Prevent young people from joining gangs Increase intelligence of Serious Youth Violence Locally Ensure enforcement is used where appropriate to bring gang members to justice</td>
<td>A reduction in Serious Youth Violence and violent crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. CCTV</td>
<td>Ensure CCTV is used to identify offending and Anti-Social Behaviour and to reduce crime – through detection, deterrence and enforcement</td>
<td>An increase in the number of crimes identified by CCTV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Priority Two: Integrated Victim Management

## DELIVERY PLAN

**Vision**

To ensure that all victims of crime in the borough are given the appropriate level of support to feel safe and to tackle issues that may have emerged as a result of being a victim of crime or Anti-Social Behaviour.

**What will the CSP do?**

1. Increase the feeling of safety in the borough for victims and their families
2. Ensuring consistent processes and referral systems are in place to support victims and facilitate integrated working
3. Oversee the delivery of sub-group strategies to ensure that victims achieve positive outcomes

## KEY POINTS FOR DELIVERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>DELIVERY</th>
<th>SUCCESS MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Serious Youth Violence</td>
<td>Support victims of Serious Youth Violence to feel safe</td>
<td>Reduction in repeat victimisation of Serious Youth Violence Reduction in sexual exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use restorative justice to enhance victim support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Youth Offending</td>
<td>Use dedicated Victim Liaison Officer to engage victims of Youth Offending and support them through the criminal justice system</td>
<td>Reduction in repeat victimisation of youth offending Increase in direct restorative justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Priority Three: Improve Confidence

### DELIVERY PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>To ensure that residents are aware of the work carried out by the Community Safety Partnership and its sub-groups and through this, to enhance the feeling of safety and public confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| What will the CSP do? | 1. Increase confidence in the Community Safety Partnership and local Criminal Justice services  
2. Consult and engage with the community to help design better services  
3. Ensure that relevant, informative and inclusive communications are used to build awareness of support services and issues related to crime and disorder  
4. Oversee the delivery of sub-group strategies to ensure that victims achieve positive outcomes |
| --- | --- |

### KEY POINTS FOR DELIVERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>DELIVERY</th>
<th>SUCCESS MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Serious Youth Violence</td>
<td>Increase confidence in the Serious Youth Violence Partnership and the feeling of safety through the reduction of Serious Youth Violence</td>
<td>A reduction in Serious Youth Violence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Purpose of Presenting the Report and Decisions Required

1.1 This report brings items for the Board to note regarding the current work and priorities of the London Fire Brigade.

1.2 It is recommended that the Community Safety Partnership Board:

- consider how they can assist in the delivery of London Fire Brigade community engagement activities; and
- considers the development of a “locations board” where the Fire Service, Local Authority and Police can discuss and agree strategies to address problem areas with high levels of arson and anti-social behaviour.

2. The London Fire And Emergency Planning Authority

Background

2.1 The purpose of this paper is to provide Board members with an understanding of the community safety work the London Fire Brigade (LFB) carry out as well as its Borough level activities and priorities. The LFB for many years was a service which only responded to incidents. However, our aim now is to stop fire incidents happening in the first place and our prevention activities fall into two broad categories:

- community safety (prevention); and
- fire safety regulation (protection).
2.2 To address the danger of fire and injuries from fire in the home, LFB have developed an active programme of community safety and education initiatives based on their extensive understanding of those most at risk. This means that LFB’s prevention work often involves working in areas of social deprivation and with people who are involved in anti-social behaviour, including deliberate fire setting. LFB works closely with Local Authority and Police partners as well as other agencies in the public, private and voluntary sectors and are active participants in the delivery of local area agreements with local strategic partnerships and crime and disorder partnerships.

2.3 The objective is to focus on people most at risk from fire, in order to measure this, the Borough Commander has targets with a focus on:

- reducing primary (serious) fires;
- reducing accidental fires in the home;
- reducing arson incidents;
- reducing casualties (injuries and deaths) from fires; and
- carrying out home fire safety visits, particularly in high risk areas.

2.4 The LFB has 20 fire safety teams located across London to enforce fire safety in the capital. The Fire Safety team is based at East Ham and serves most of the North East of London. Staff are attached to the London Borough of Barking Dagenham. They carry out inspections to ensure buildings meet statutory fire regulations and they will take action to enforce fire safety measures if necessary. LFB aims to improve the safety of buildings, including major projects affecting Borough infrastructure, working with developers at an early stage to ensure all possible fire engineering solutions are applied during construction. LFB also influences planners, designers and decision makers to improve safety for residents and visitors to Barking & Dagenham.

2.5 In order to meet organisational strategies and targets as set out above, LFB staff must focus on people most at risk. However, it is important that Board members have an understanding of the work that goes on by the LFB both pan-London and locally.

2.6 Pan-London activities are managed by teams based at the London Fire Brigade Headquarters for the benefit of all Londoners. These activities include:

**Escape plan**

2.7 The Borough Commander works with partners to provide residents with access to advice to follow if they live in a purpose-built block of flats or maisonettes, of any height, with shared communal corridors, external walkways, staircases or entrances. This is publicised as “know the plan” [http://www.knowtheplan.co.uk/](http://www.knowtheplan.co.uk/)

2.8 This provides advice to tenants and landlords of their rights and responsibilities.
Monthly Fire Kills Campaign

2.9 The majority of domestic fires with fatalities, smoke alarms were either absent or did not go off, a common cause is missing or flat batteries. This is why the Fire Kills campaign has a monthly campaign to increase fire safety awareness such as, Tick Tock Test when you change your clocks test your smoke alarm, fireworks and sky lantern as well as electrical and candle safety. Partners can assist in these campaigns by linking them to their web and social media sites.

Dementia

2.10 The LFB is now a member of the Pan-London Dementia Action Alliance working alongside London-wide organisations to support the National Dementia Declaration to make life better for people with dementia. The Dementia Friends awareness campaign is currently featured in the recent media launch. The Community Safety Development Human Behaviours team attend quarterly meetings and are working towards the LFB aims and objectives to:

- identify the options we can recommend to help keep people who live with dementia safer from fire and its effects;
- educate its staff about dementia and other cognitive and mental health issues; and
- support our staff whose lives are affected by dementia – if they develop it or if they care for someone who does.

2.11 Borough staff are signing up to become Dementia Champions with a plan to deliver Dementia Friends sessions to teams and colleagues within the organisation.

School Liaison Officers

2.12 Our Youth Engagement Strategy for the Borough has improved this year, this is due to the development of new contacts within the Borough. The team are committed to providing young people with educational and diversionary activities that can engage them and increase their self-confidence and their interpersonal skills. The Schools Team work a risk based programme of school visits working with pupils at Key Stage 1 and 2. Approximately 560,000 children throughout London have benefited from the schools fire safety programme. The knowledge they have acquired from this education can be used throughout their lives so reducing the number of fires and the effects of fire on a much wider scale.

Sprinklers

2.13 The Borough Commander will continue to work with the Local Authority on the installation of sprinkler systems. Modern sprinkler systems are very effective in limiting fire spread and fire and water damage. The Borough Commander will continue to strongly promote the use of sprinklers to protect both life and property. Barking & Dagenham won the LFB sprinkler competition winning over £86,000 match funding for the installation of sprinklers in high risk locations.
Unprotected

premises. Through Statutory Fire Safety Inspecting Officers the Borough
Commander will also continue to lobby for appropriate amendments to the
building regulations and to lobby individual developers for inclusion of
sprinklers in their developments, where the risk justifies their use.

Hoardings

2.14 Hoarding is by its nature is extremely difficult to identify, especially in Private
Owner Occupier and Private Rented Sector Housing. High levels of clutter
make it much easier for a fire to start and create a greater risk of fire
spreading, increasing the risk of injury and death. It also makes it very difficult
to escape and can lead to difficulties for firefighters tackling the blaze. The
Borough Commander is optimistic that partnership arrangements in place in
the Borough will result in these residents being referred to LFB. Agencies
such as adult social services and mental health charities seem to be aware of
the importance of this type of referral. I believe more work can be done to
refer hoarders and train partners in Fire Safety Risk Assessments.

3. Borough-led Community Safety

Safe Drive Stay Alive

3.1 Safe Drive Stay Alive is a hard hitting road safety message which has been
running in the Borough since 2011. It is designed to target the ‘new driver’ age
bracket that have a statistically high chance of being involved in injury
accidents. The production is seen by local year 12 pupils, currently the
Borough has 9 schools taking part. It is estimated that as a result of this
intervention 1800 year 12 pupils in the Borough receive this message every
year, hopefully influencing how they think about driver and passenger
behaviour. The next production is due to take place on 11 and 12 February
2015. Not all schools in the Borough take part in this event.

Road Traffic Collision and Safety Events

3.2 Barking and Dagenham Fire Stations have put on a number of multi-agency
RTC in junction with the LBBD to reaffirm LFB’s road safety message. As well
as these demonstrations an event called “stay safe and live healthy in Barking
and Dagenham” was held in Barking town square designed to encompass all
community safety. This event had around 50 partner agencies giving advice
on such things as mental health, healthy living, drugs and alcohol advice and
much more. The LFB will continue to support these events.

3.3 Due the rising numbers of RTCs in Whalebone lane Dagenham close to
Warren School, a multiagency RTC demonstration was organised in
conjunction with the MPS schools team for July 2014 to be held in the
playground of Warren School. On the request of the school this event has
been postponed, however staff are confident it will go ahead in the new year.
Citizen Day

3.4 Citizen day was held at Arden Crescent PRU (pupil referral unit). The Tuition Service is the only Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) providing for students aged 11-16 in the Borough. Nine secondary schools are served and the large majority of students have invariably been excluded, or are at risk of being excluded for persistent disruptive behaviour. The PRU also provides for a small number of vulnerable students with mental health needs. A small number of students have statements of special educational needs for their difficulties. On entry the majority of students are significantly under achieving because of the previous gaps in their education. Students come from a variety of social and economical backgrounds. The majority are from white British families with a very small number coming from minority ethnic backgrounds, the largest being from Black African and Caribbean families. There are around twice as many boys as girls. During Citizen day nine areas are covered with the LFB looking at Arson, the PRU also attend the safe drive stay alive presentation.

LiFE (local Intervention Fire Education)

3.5 The London Fire Brigade is helping to reduce anti-social behaviour by leading the way through the LIFE programme: a scheme which helps to address anti-social and dangerous behaviour in young people. The Life programme is targeted at young people aged between 13 and 17, who may have already begun offending, be otherwise at risk or are socially excluded. The scheme works by offering an intensive five day course that gives at risk and socially excluded young people the opportunity to focus on areas like leadership, confidence building, physical exercise and social skills. Young people build a rapport with the staff who run the courses who explain the impact and consequences of anti-social behaviour, encourage co-operative working and most importantly build confidence and self esteem in young people so they are less inclined to commit crime and instead continue with education or employment. The course mimics the real job of a firefighter as participants take part in a range of activities from using ladders, casualty rescue techniques and first aid, as well as learning about fire safety and prevention. Participants have their performance monitored and at the end of the week they take part in a passing out ceremony with friends and family present so they feel like they've really achieved something.

Community Fire Cadets

3.6 The Community Fire Cadets deliver an exciting youth engagement Programme which offers young people the opportunity to work alongside the London fire Brigade to gain a recognised BTEC qualification and life skills they can use in the workplace. Young people aged 14-18 attend one evening a week at a Dagenham fire station over a 12 month course. The course is designed to provide positive opportunities to improve community cohesion and reduce undesirable behaviour by enhancing key citizenship skills in young people, as well as learning firefighting skills alongside frontline firefighters, cadets learn how to handle money, job application techniques and healthy living. Attributes, such as teamwork, communications skills and
discipline are encouraged on the course – all of which cadets can use when they enter employment.

**Borough Arson Liaison Officer (BALO)**

3.7 The BALO role is a senior Officer role and has been developed to give each Borough Team and the Brigade a point of contact for Arson related incidents. Our BALO has developed a good working relationship with their nominated police counterparts and with council liaison officers sharing intelligence and information that has been the basis for a reduction in fire related anti-social behaviour.

**Private Landlord Registration Scheme**

3.8 The LFB has teamed up with the Local Authority in this scheme, working together has already resulted in over 1000 Home Fire Safety Visits being completed by LFB and Local Authority surveyors. This intervention has improved the safety of these residents from fire, there is an estimated 17,000 privately rented properties in the Borough so we have a long way to go.

3.9 The information above is not an exhaustive list but provides Board members with broad information on some of the work the LFB is doing to make residents of Barking and Dagenham and London safer.

**4. Facilities**

4.1 On 25 November 2014 Dagenham Fire Station closed for approximately 12 months to be demolished and re-built under the London Fire Brigade’s PFI programme. This will provide Dagenham with a state of the art fire station with facilities for the community.

4.2 The appliances and staff based at Dagenham which include two pumping appliances (fire engines) and an aerial ladder platform, along with their large animal rescue capability have been successfully relocated to fire stations in Barking and Dagenham and Havering.

4.3 Early indications are appliances continue to meet their attendance times to incidents within the Borough.

4.4 Dagenham Fire Station will have a Community Room when it is rebuilt in November 2015. The room has kitchen facilities and is available to all partners for engagement activities as well as local people for social clubs, mother and toddler groups or any event which benefits the community.

**5. Other Organisations’ Priorities**

5.1 Previously presented priorities of other organisations which have previously been discussed at the CSP Board are presented here for information.

**Community Safety Plan**
5.2 The Community Safety Plan set out three key overarching priorities built upon the priorities of all partner agencies:

- integrated offender management;
- integrated victim management; and
- confidence.

**Policing**

5.3 The major MOPAC crime priorities echo those in the Borough and include:

- reducing reoffending;
- reducing the seven most common neighbourhood crimes - burglary, violence with injury, robbery, theft from person, criminal damage, theft from motor vehicle and theft of motor vehicle;
- tackling substance misuse (including alcohol);
- reducing gang crime and serious youth violence;
- reducing first time entrants to the Youth Justice system;
- reducing violence against women and girls;
- roosting public confidence in the MPS;
- improving Integrated Offender Management (IOM); and
- achieving the three R’s - Reform, Rehabilitation and Reparation.
1. Purpose of Presenting the Report and Decisions Required

1.1 The Safer Neighbourhood Board (SNB) met on 10 December 2014. The agendas for both parts of the meeting are attached at Appendices 1 and 2 to inform Community Safety Partnership Board members of items discussed at the meeting. The Chair of the SNB, Steve Thompson MBE, will provide a verbal update to the CSP Board meeting to outline discussions held at the SNB and raise any items which may require discussion at the CSP Board.

1.2 The Community Safety Partnership Board is asked to:

- note the items discussed at the Safer Neighbourhood Board meeting on 10 December 2014; and
- discuss any items from the Safer Neighbourhood Board if required.

2. List of Attachments

2.1 Appendix 1 – Safer Neighbourhood Board Agenda

2.2 Appendix 2 – Open Public Meeting Agenda
# Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introductions, apologies for absence</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>5 mins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Notes of last meeting and matters arising</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 | Police Priorities for the next three months (Based on reports from Neighbourhood Policing Meetings)  
Inspectors reports:  
a) Barking  
b) Dagenham  
c) Whalebone | Chair  | 25 Mins |
| 3 | Performance Summary  
a) Recorded Crime Data  
b) ASB data  
c) Victim Satisfaction  
d) Complaints  
e) Stop and Search  
f) Independent Custody Visitors | Borough Commander | 25 mins |
| 4 | Update reports from:  
a) Serco  
b) Independent Advisory Group  
c) Stop and Search Group  
d) Victim Support  
e) IAG report | Kellie Finch  
Keith Hutton  
Steve Thompson  
Victoria Roberts  
From MOPAC | 20 mins |
| 5 | AOB  
Date of next meeting -23.02.2015 Barking Learning Centre | Chair  | 5 mins |
Barking and Dagenham Safer Neighbourhood Board – OPEN PUBLIC MEETING

Date: Wednesday 10 December 2014        Time: 7:15pm- 8:45 pm
(6.45 for refreshments)
Venue: Dagenham and Redbridge FC, Victoria Road, Dagenham, RM10 7XL

Agenda

There will be opportunities to ask questions after each agenda item

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Introductions, apologies for absence</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Notes of last meeting and matters arising</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Borough Commander's report to the SNB.</td>
<td>Chair/Borough Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Discussion and questions to the Borough Commander</td>
<td>Chair/Borough Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Current Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Priorities for Policing over the next three months ratified by SNB</td>
<td>Chair and feedback from Inspectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Presentation – Box Up Crime</td>
<td>Box Up Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Date of next meeting Monday 23 February 2015Barking Learning Centre</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Purpose of Presenting the Report and Decisions Required

1.1 This item will give three presentations on recent events held in the Borough. This focuses on White Ribbon Day, Alcohol Awareness Week and Counter Terrorism Awareness Week. The Board will be invited to analyse the events and provide any learning or potential ideas for the annual events next year.

1.2 The Community Safety Partnership Board is asked to:

- note the presentations; and
- discuss any learning or ideas for next year’s events.

2. Counter Terrorism Awareness Week

2.1 This item will be presented by Martin Kirby, Metropolitan Police Service Chief Inspector Neighbourhoods and Partnerships.

2.2 Counter Terrorism Awareness Week runs from 24-30 November 2014 and aims to raise awareness of the threat of terrorism and how residents and businesses can guard against terror attacks.

3. White Ribbon Day

3.1 This item will be presented by Peggy Mhembere, LBBD Interim Group Manager Safeguarding Adults.
3.2 White Ribbon Day and the 16 Days of Activism raise awareness of violence against women and girls and endorse the message to not commit, condone or remain silent about violence against women and girls.

3.3 This project encompasses a series of events in Barking and Dagenham to support the 16 Days of Action on Domestic Violence, which commences during November for 'White Ribbon Day' on 25 November. The campaign encourages people to wear a white ribbon and to make a pledge as a commitment to play their part in standing up to condemn violence against women. We aim to raise awareness and to publicise the support available for those experiencing domestic abuse, link to direct services and empower the holistic approach to addressing the impact of domestic violence across the partner agencies. The National Campaign of 16 Days of Action ran from 25 November – 10 December.

4. **Alcohol Awareness Week**

4.1 This item will be presented by Dan Hales, LBBD Group Manager Community Safety and Public Protection.

4.2 Alcohol Awareness Week in England and Wales runs from 17-23 November 2014 and encouraged people to think about how much they are drinking. Activities targeted the whole community, high streets, young people and older people. This year's theme was “taking back our health and high streets”, which provided an opportunity to deliver health messages relating to alcohol use within the community.
1. Purpose of Presenting the Report and Decisions Required

1.1 The Chair’s Report brings news to the attention of the Board. This includes events, changes to the membership of the Board and upcoming policy changes.

1.2 The Community Safety Partnership Board is asked to:

- note the Chair’s Report; and
- discuss any items from the Chair’s Report if required.

2. List of Attachments

2.1 Appendix 1 – Chair’s Report
Welcome to the Community Safety Partnership Board Chair’s Report

We have refreshed the Chair’s Report to present news items to the Board and raise some emerging policy. In this edition I give details of the very well attended MOPAC Roadshow, and we say goodbye to Dan Hales who will be leaving in January 2015. I also discuss upcoming policy which may impact upon community safety and the way we deal with crime and disorder. I would welcome Board Members to comment on any item covered should they wish to do so.

Best wishes,
Anne Bristow, Chair of the LBBD CSP Board

Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) Roadshow

The Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, Stephen Greenhalgh, visited the Borough on 10 November 2014 to discuss local policing following London-wide changes over the last year. The panel was chaired by the Leader of the Council, Cllr Rodwell, and included Helen King Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) Assistant Commissioner Territorial Policing and MPS Barking and Dagenham Borough Commander Andrew Ewing.

The meeting was extremely well attended, with over 80 attendees, and the panel commented that it was one of the biggest meetings hosted in London. This shows how passionately our residents feel about crime and policing. The panel also commented on how positive it was to see a group of young people at the meeting asking questions about how to get young people feeling more confident about reporting crime.

The meeting set out the changes which have been made as MOPAC have implemented the Local Policing Model (LPM) in the last year. The key MOPAC target, the 20/20/20 challenge, was outlined – reducing seven key neighbourhood, high victim crimes by 20%, increasing public confidence in the Police by 20% with a budget reduction of 20% over 4 years.

Chief Superintendent Ewing noted the strong partnership work which has taken place to reduce crime in the Borough and reported that with 18 months left of the 20/20/20 challenge; the Borough is in a very good performance position. He set out the main priorities in the Borough as domestic abuse, violence with injury and improving confidence. He noted that in early 2015 the Borough will have exceeded its full complement of Police Officers.

The meeting also discussed the successes in youth justice across London, where there have been major reductions in first time entrants to the youth justice system and a reduction in re-offending for young people leaving the youth secure estate. It was noted that the Borough’s preventative work has reduced youth offending in LBBD.
Dan Hales Leaving

Dan Hales, LBBD Group Manager Community Safety and Offender Management, will be leaving before our next CSP Board meeting. He will be taking up a role at MOPAC as Head of Strategy and Corporate Planning, which is a very exciting opportunity.

Dan took up his current post in April 2012. In the two and a half years since then the CSP has made significant reductions in crime in the Borough and Dan has played a key role in many of these successes. Dan has also taken on the role of Youth Offending Service (YOS) Manager and managed the joint service with the London Borough of Havering, contributing to the many successes and improvements which the joint service made to Havering YOS.

Dan has made a big contribution to the CSP and I would like to take this opportunity to thank him for all his hard work and to wish him every success in his new role. I will provide information on how Dan will be replaced in LBBD once appointments have been made.

Upcoming Policy

Unpaid Work

The Youth Justice Board (YJB) have announced that the Serco contract for Unpaid Work ends on 31 December 2014 and from 1 January 2015 the responsibility for delivering Unpaid Work will fall to local authorities. Unpaid Work Court Orders made up to this point will be delivered by Serco. £87,457, ring-fenced for two years, is being made available to YOSs to assist with funding this. Each YOS will receive a share of this fund according to Unpaid Work statistics for their area. The amount awarded will be absorbed into the YOS grant.

The London Community Rehabilitation Company has offered to deliver unpaid work from 31 December 2014 to 31 March 2015 at no additional cost to each individual YOS. LBBD have turned down this offer as the YOS Management feel that LBBD are able to deliver effective Unpaid Work from 1 January 2015.

Junior Attendance Centres (JACs)

The YJB have sent letters to Chief Executives asking if their Borough wants to take over the running of JACs from 1 April 2015. Funding from YJB to run JACs will be based on recent throughput numbers and will be protected for two years.

The YJB stated that if the Local Authority decides to take a JAC over, the Authority will have control over how they are run and who attends them. Local Authorities and YOSs which use JACs located in another (host) borough have no say in this decision, unless invited to comment by the host borough. There is no JAC in LBBD, the nearest centres are in Rainham and Stratford. A paper will be presented to the 15 December 2014 YOS COG to outline the potential impact of this change. The transfer of JACs was discussed at the 7 May 2014 YOS Chief Officer Group (COG), and partners commented that JACs are currently underused. JACs operate only on Saturday mornings and offer similar work to existing in-Borough interventions such as involvement in team sport and teaching life skills.
Serious and Organised Crime Local Profiles

On 13 November 2014 the Home Office published a guide to Serious and Organised Crime Local Profiles. This provides an overview of the development, distribution and effective use of Local Profiles on serious and organised crime. The full document can be accessed at this link.

The guidance is addressed to the Police and local partnerships who should be using local profiles to inform their action to tackle serious and organised crime. The guidance reflects learning from the development of Counter-Terrorism Local Profiles.

The Home Secretary introduces the guidance by stating that the response to serious and organised crime requires focussed and coordinated action from local partnerships. The guidance recommends the creation of local profiles of serious and organised crimes so that local partnership are aware of these issues in their area and take coordinated action against them.

The guidance emphasises the four main objectives of the Serious and Organised Crime Strategy (which can be accessed at this link), which are:

- pursue – prosecuting and disrupting people engaged in serious and organised crime;
- prevent – preventing people from engaging in serious and organised crime;
- protect – increased protection against serious and organised crime; and
- prepare – reducing the impact of this criminality where it takes place.

The guidance states that Serious and Organised Crime Local Profiles should:

- develop a common understanding among partners of the threats, vulnerabilities and risks of serious and organised crime;
- provide information on which to base the local response and action plans to these crimes;
- be written by the Police, with commissioning meetings held with local partners to understand the needs of the wider partnership. Consultation on its content, direction and use should take place with the partnership at an early stage of writing;
- have its actions feed into the local multi agency programme of action. These actions should be monitored by the policing lead at local partnership group meetings;
- cover local activity linked to: trafficking of arms, people and drugs, organised illegal immigration, modern slavery, high volume fraud and financial crimes, counterfeit goods, cyber crime and child sexual exploitation; and
- be shared with and used to brief local multi-agency partnerships on the threat from serious and organised crime within a specific local area.

The guidance recommends that the Local Profile includes data from Organised Crime Group mapping, fraud and cyber crime profiles, neighbourhood profiles and maps, local authority demographics, Troubled Families programme, Ending Gang and Youth Violence programme, child exploitation analysis, National Referral Mechanism and local assessments of community tensions.
Latin American Visit to Youth Offending Service

A group of delegates made up of heads of the juvenile system of Latin American countries paid a visit to the Borough to learn firsthand about the work of Barking and Dagenham’s Youth Offending Service (YOS). Councillor Laila Butt, Cabinet Member for Crime and Enforcement welcomed the delegates who viewed a presentation from Dan Hales on Barking and Dagenham’s YOS, how it functions and its many successes.

The delegation chose Barking and Dagenham as the UK destination not just because of its successes with youth offending but also on the recommendation of colleagues from a previous visit to the borough by a delegation from Panama. In addition, the service has also hosted visits from Japan, Sweden and the European Union. Another feather in the cap for the service was its management of Havering Council’s Youth Offending Service from 2012 which saw the Havering service taken in that time to performing well, work which included a restructure and management change. These lessons are not just being shared with other authorities across the country but across the world.

Before visiting Barking and Dagenham, the Latin American delegation also visited the Youth Justice Board in London. The visit helped the delegates to find out more about different European juvenile justice systems and good practice. The visit from was sponsored by EU funding (www.programaeurosocial.eu) and facilitated by the International Observatory of Juvenile Justice.

Cllr Laila Butt, said: “It was a pleasure and honour to welcome the delegation from Latin America to Barking and Dagenham. We are proud to have held successful visits from countries across the globe and are thrilled that other countries look to Barking and Dagenham as a place in the UK where they feel they can explore practices and systems. The YOS helps to instil in our young people a sense of social responsibility and encourages them to play an active role in making our Borough a safer and more resilient place while helping young people who have committed offences to raise their aspirations. We are extremely proud that our work in Barking and Dagenham has not only been recognised nationally but also by our peers both in and outside Europe.”
## Community Safety Partnership Board
### Forward Plan of Reports
Will Donovan, LBBD Support Officer
[Will.Donovan@lbdd.gov.uk](mailto:Will.Donovan@lbdd.gov.uk); 020 8227 3092

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: 2 March 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td><strong>Business</strong></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
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<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 June 2015</strong></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14 September 2015</strong></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td>Alcohol Awareness Week</td>
</tr>
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