

<b>10 October 2011</b>		<b>ITEM 8</b>
<b>Cleaner, Greener and Safer Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b>		
<b>Community Safety Partnership– improving value for money</b>		
<b>Report of:</b> Supt Ivor Harvey, Chair of Thurrock Community Safety Partnership		
<b>Wards and communities affected:</b> All	<b>Key Decision:</b> yes	
<b>Accountable Head of Service:</b> Lucy Magill, Head of Public Protection		
<b>Accountable Director:</b> Bill Newman, Director Sustainable Communities		
<b>This report is public</b>		
<b>Purpose of Report:</b> To request Cleaner, Greener, Safer Overview and Scrutiny Committee set up a small group to work with the Head of Public Protection and Thurrock Community Safety Partnership Manager to assist Thurrock Community Safety Partnership (TCSP) on improving their value for money by using the Audit Commissions tool.		

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Ten areas where community safety partnerships (CSP) and their responsible authorities can improve efficiency have been identified within the Audit commission's tool on *Sustaining value for money in the Police service*. Thurrock Community Safety Partnership carried out a self assessment in April 2011 and would like to revisit the self assessment with members of Overview and Scrutiny.

### **1. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 1.1 **That Overview and Scrutiny set up a time limited group to work with the Head of Public Protection and Thurrock Community Safety Partnership Manager to assist Thurrock Community Safety Partnership with improving Value for Money.**
- 1.2 **That the group prepare a briefing note to report back to Cleaner, Safer, Greener Overview and Scrutiny and Thurrock Community Safety Partnership Board.**

## **2. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

2.1 The community safety partnership (CSP) value for money self-assessment is one of a series of products produced by the Audit Commission from *Sustaining Value for Money in the Police Service*. The aim of the self-assessment is to help CSPs improve value for money.

### **2.2 Community safety partnerships**

Statutory crime and disorder reduction partnerships (CDRPs) followed the Crime and Disorder Reduction Act 1998. They became Community Safety Partnerships in April 2010.

2.2.1 CSPs enable 'responsible authorities' to develop and deliver local strategies to reduce crime and disorder. As of April 2010, responsible authorities are police authorities, police forces, councils, fire and rescue authorities, primary care trusts and probation trusts.

2.2.2 Responsible authorities have to:

- Convene a strategy group of all responsible authorities in the community safety partnership (and possibly, other organisations);
- Prepare a strategic assessment of local crime and community safety priorities, using information provided by partner agencies and the community;
- Produce a partnership plan to meet those priorities, evaluate implementation, and conduct a skills and knowledge audit of partners;
- Meet minimum standards of community consultation and engagement on issues of crime and disorder, substance misuse and reducing reoffending.
- Have an information sharing protocol for the community safety partnership and ensure each responsible authority has a designated information sharing officer.

2.2.3 The questions from the audit commissions tool have been used by the community safety partnerships executive group to identify issues for further investigation and to develop an improvement plan. The structure of Thurrock Community Safety Partnership can be found in Appendix 2.

## **3. ISSUES AND/OR OPTIONS:**

3.1 There needs to be a wider challenge of partners to improve collaborative working on some priorities and challenge of value for money.

3.2 Cost benefit analysis is not currently used by the Partnership and the audit commission have developed a tool which needs to be implemented.

## **4. CONSULTATION (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)**

4.1 Partners within the Thurrock Community Safety Partnership executive were consulted on the survey using the audit commission questions and carried out an initial self assessment. .

**5. IMPACT ON CORPORATE POLICIES, PRIORITIES, PERFORMANCE AND COMMUNITY IMPACT**

5.1 Implementation of this action plan will improve performance and deliver value for money

**6. IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 **Financial**

Implications verified by: **Mike Jones**  
Telephone and email: **01375 652772**  
**Mxjones@thurrock.gov.uk**

By challenging some of our priorities and improving collaborative working we should be working towards financial benefits. As yet these cannot be accounted for.

6.2 **Legal**

Implications verified by: **Jamie Hollis**  
Telephone and email: **01375 652 925**  
**jhollis@thurrock.gov.uk**

Community safety partnerships (CSPs) include representatives from the Police and Police Authority, the local council, and the fire, health and probation services within an area. CSPs were established under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, and are tasked with working together to develop and implement strategies to protect their local communities from crime. The Crime and Disorder (Formulation and Implementation of Strategy) Regulations 2007 require the strategy group to have in place arrangements to review expenditure of partnership monies, and to assess the economy, efficiency and effectiveness of such expenditure.

6.3 **Diversity and Equality**

Implications verified by: **Jane Potheary**  
Telephone and email: **01375 652472**  
**jpotheary@thurrock.gov.uk**

The group assisting Thurrock Community Safety Partnership with improving value for money will be tasked with completing Equality Impact Analysis on any proposals it puts forward which assesses both the HR impact and the broader impact on the wider community.

6.4 **Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Section 17, Risk Assessment, Health Impact Assessment, Sustainability, IT, Environmental**

None noted

## 7. CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The Community Safety Partnership identified areas which can be improved on however this needs further scrutiny to ensure value for money.

### BACKGROUND PAPERS USED IN PREPARING THIS REPORT:

- The audit commission report which can be found at: <http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/nationalstudies/communitysafety/policevfm/Pages/default.aspx>
- Detailed report prepared for the Thurrock Community Safety Partnership executive May 11

### APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT:

- Appendix 1 Self Assessment ratings
- Appendix 2 Thurrock Community Safety Partnership Structure

### Report Author Contact Details:

**Name:** Michelle Cunningham, Thurrock Community safety partnership Manager

**Telephone:** 01375 652301

**E-mail:** micunningham@thurrock.gov.uk

Appendix 1

<b>Area</b>	<b>Self- Assessment Rating</b>
Management and leadership of efficiency;	<b>Amber</b>
Threat, harm and risk;	<b>Amber</b>
Efficiency integrated into the policing plan;	<b>Green / Amber</b>
Service transformation;	<b>Amber / Red</b>
Organisational change;	<b>Green</b>
Collaboration with police and local partners;	<b>Green</b>
Workforce modernisation;	<b>Amber</b>
Efficiency planning and monitoring;	<b>Green</b>
<i>Sustainability of efficiency savings; and timescales.</i>	<b>Amber</b>

**Shaping Thurrock**  
To ensure a safe, clean and green environment

PREVENT

**Strategic Board**  
Including Joint Commissioning Group

DAAT  
(drug and alcohol)

**Executive: Funding and Performance**

Safety Advisory Group

Reduce Crime

Reduce Anti-social behaviour

Reduce Reoffending

PRIORITY	Action Plan Owner	Partner Delivery Group
Communication	Communication Action Plan – Jan Davison	TCSP Exec monitor
Youth Crime	Youth Crime Action Plan – James Waud	Stay Safe – Children’s TRUST
Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults	Vulnerable adults Action Plan – Michelle C	Safeguarding Adults Operational Board
Drugs and Alcohol	Drugs treatment plan – Jim N Alcohol	JCG – Exec TCSP exec & H & W Board

Hate Crime & Cohesion Strategy Group

Violence Against Women & Girls

Acquisitive and Violent Crime

PPO  
(Priority and Prolific Offenders)

MARAC

LAGS  
(Locality action group)  
Including Hate Crime Panel

NAPS

*Making Thurrock Safer*