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**1. Purpose**

* 1. This report informs the Panel about the latest priorities and views of Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) ahead of a discussion with CSP representatives on the impact of the Commissioner and the role that CSPs can play in making communities safer and feel safer.
  2. It is recommended that the Panel and CSP representatives use the information and structure of this paper as a basis for discussion about their respective roles, including:
     1. What issues might the Panel raise with the Commissioner in future work?
     2. What changes might be made to the Principles of Engagement to improve the way in which CSPs and the Panel liaise on issues of mutual concern?

**2. Strategy: the Police and Crime Plan**

2.1 Each Community Safety Partnership has broadly agreed that the Commissioner’s Police and Crime Plan did ‘give regard to’ local priorities – and vice versa. In four district areas (Bradford, Calderdale, Kirklees and Leeds), the Commissioner and CSPs have launched *“a local vision for policing and community safety across each District with local priorities set in partnership with local communities”*.

2.2 At Panel’s last meeting, the Commissioner reflected on concerns that it was not desirable to have both a district-level iteration of the Police and Crime Plan and separate but complementary district Community Safety Plans as this could potentially duplicate work and confuse residents.

2.3 The Commissioner’s Police and Crime Plan includes priorities that may be best addressed at very different spatial levels. For example, the Commissioner describes how his approach to tackling serious organised crime is likely to require work with partners through the National Crime Agency. By way of contrast, his commitment to *“check that services provided in communities to tackle anti-social behaviour are dealing with the problem in the right way at the right time when people need them”* seems to have a greater bearing on local partners. All partners require a clear understanding of the Commissioner’s expectations of them.

2.4 The Community Safety Partnerships continue to recognise the commitment the Commissioner has shown to get out, meet and engage with communities across West Yorkshire. It is felt this provides a strong foundation for ensuring the Police and Crime Plan stays relevant.

2.5 In response to some local concerns, the Panel at its last meeting also secured the Commissioner’s commitment to use his influence with Health and Wellbeing Boards to press the importance of including some form of Community Safety Partnership or Criminal Justice representative in order to make the necessary strategic links.

2.6 Strategic topics that the Panel and Partnerships may wish to discuss include:

* What lessons could be learnt about the way the Commissioner and Partnerships develop their own strategies for the West Yorkshire and district levels respectively? Is there agreement with the Commissioner that there should only be one district-level document to eliminate duplication and prevent confusion for residents?
* Are CSPs clear about those priorities that the Commissioner is seeking to address first, and the roles they are able and seeking to play?
* Whether the Panel can be of assistance to CSPs in obtaining any further information required?

**3. Delivery: the Police and Crime Plan**

3.1 The Panel’s main focus is to support and scrutinise the Commissioner in delivering his Police and Crime Plan. Much of Panel’s recent work with the Commissioner has focused on the performance framework that will reflect his impact in making communities safer and feeling safer. CSPs have also identified a need for further information about the framework and the impact on partners. This is particularly important as partners look to allocate resources and design commissioning arrangements. Panel’s understanding is the Commissioner’s overall framework will include:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Event and Frequency** | **Content and Participants** |
| Strategic Planning Meetings  (Quarterly) | To ensure the Chief Constable’s planning and strategy for the Force is aligned to deliver the Police and Crime Plan  With Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Chief Executive, Chief Finance Officer and the Chief Constable. |
| Force Accountability Meetings  (Monthly) | To seek assurance that the Chief Constable is holding his Senior Leadership Team to account for delivering the Police and Crime Plan. This includes a broad examination of current performance and in-depth analysis of one specific topic, such as burglary or child sexual exploitation.  With Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Chief Executive, Chief Finance Officer, Director of Policy and the Chief Constable. |
| Community Outcome Meetings  (At least fortnightly) | For the Commissioner and Chief Constable to address current operational or organisational issues, such as decisions about selling police stations, a concern raised by members of the public and the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan.  With Commissioner and Chief Constable. |
| Budget Planning Meetings  (Monthly) | To monitor progress on budget, spending and savings. Taking decisions on resources when necessary.  With Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Chief Executive, Chief Finance Officer and the Chief Constable. |
| Monthly Performance Updates  (Monthly) | * Update on the ten indicators included in the Police and Crime Plan. * Performance by exception against other key crime types * Activity undertaken towards the Commissioner’s commitments. |
| Quarterly Performance Updates  (Quarterly) | As per the monthly performance update plus:   * Exceptional reporting of all crimes contained on iQuanta; * Performance update reports from those receiving grants from the Community Safety Fund; * Summary of casework and complaints; * Exceptional reporting of the public perception survey; * Summary and actions from external inspections; * Key actions from the Partnership Executive Group; * Internal Audit / Audit Committee views that can be made public; * Narratives from the Commissioner and Chief Constable. |

3.2 Encouragingly, no Partnership has felt the Commissioner is making it more difficult for them to meet their own priorities. Some suggested that transferring Community Safety Funding to localities might be made easier using a ‘lump sum’ and less bureaucratic reporting process. The Panel’s last meeting heard about the Commissioner’s progress in developing his commissioning framework for 2014/15:

*“The Commissioner acknowledged the timescale issue and explained the current position:*

* + - *The commissioning of victim support work is currently subject to Government delays; and,*
    - *Other elements of community safety work for which the Commissioner has responsibility should be complete by the end of the year.”*

3.3 Partnerships have been clear about their track-record in delivering practical and effective services at the local level. The Panel has been keen to impress upon the Commissioner the importance of capturing these successes and the Commissioner has articulated a long-term vision to use a *‘What Works’* database which will also incorporate academic findings.

3.4 In discussing the importance of capturing what works and developing an effective commissioning system, the Commissioner has been clear that opportunities need to be taken to increase expertise and work more efficiently. For example, that may mean that a particular CSP with proven expertise might take on the delivery of a particular programme across a larger area than the district.

3.5 The Commissioner has initiated a Partnership Executive Group to help work together to problem-solve, influence, innovate and galvanise partnership responses to crime, disorder, community safety and criminal justice issues. This Group is beginning to develop responses to the shared issues identified at the Commissioner’s conference on 10th May. They include:

1. Recording and sharing information more effectively to support real partnership work;
2. Build, use and share evidence of good practice more effectively;
3. Have greater focus on early intervention in delivering safer
4. Strengthen our engagement with communities;
5. Deliver the Victims Code.

3.6 Delivery topics that the Panel and Partnerships may wish to discuss include:

* Panel understands that the first quarterly update is to be made at the end of July. Do the CSPs see any requirement or benefit in refining their performance and delivery structures to take account of the framework for the Police and Crime Plan?
* What contact and direction have CSPs had from the Commissioner’s Office about the development of the commissioning framework? Do they feel they have had sufficient chance to influence the framework?
* If the Partnership Executive Group is operating at a West Yorkshire level, how might it relate to the operational work coordinated locally by the CSPs?

**4. Liaison between CSPs and the Panel**

4.1 The Panel and Community Safety Partnerships have agreed Principles of Engagement (attached as Annex A) that cover respective roles and the importance of working closely together. This provides the foundation for the quarterly ‘Local Perspectives’ report and the provision of information (e.g. meeting minutes) that help Partnerships to keep aware of Panel work. Whilst information will be relayed back to the Partnerships and Committees that have kindly provided information for the Panel, this can be further underpinned by Panel members de-briefing colleagues in constituent areas in order to put it in a firmer local context.

4.2 The Panel has also discussed with the Commissioner the importance of an open and responsive relationship with local Community Safety Partnerships and Scrutiny Committees. To that end, the Commissioner requested that Panel members might encourage local bodies to highlight any issues to his Office in order that they are resolved quickly.

4.3 CSP representatives and Panel may wish to review and strengthen the Principles of Engagement.

**5. Recommendation**

5.1 It is recommended that the Panel notes the common trends and views highlighted in this report. Suggestions for future work may be included in the Panel’s work programme and members may also wish to record items to raise with the Commissioner.