

**Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel
10th February 2015 (Panel Session 3) - Civic Suite 6pm**

Early Crime Interventions and Reducing the Risk of Reoffending

- 1.1 The Panel will review the role of the Partnership in the early intervention and prevention of crime and seek evidence of “problem solving” approaches from the Partnership. The Panel will also review the initiatives in place that seek to prevent vulnerable groups from going onto commit crime and ASB.

- 2.1 The Panel will review the Partnerships strategies to prevent reoffending, particularly with young offenders. The Panel will also evaluate what typical percentage and what crime types within Solihull are attributable to reoffending.

Background:

- 3.1 Crime has a massive detrimental effect on communities and has potential to place disproportionate financial and administrative demand on our local services. The Safer Solihull Partnership will work to proactively tackle offending and reduce the risk of re-offending whilst collaborating to reduce the fear and perception of risk posed by criminality reported by our communities.

- 4.1 Each year we produce a strategic assessment which gives an overview of where crime has occurred, the nature of the offences and victim and offender profiles. We analyse data provided by a number of agencies within the partnership and listening to our communities. This methodology provides the partnership with a capability to plan strategy aimed at tackling offending and increasing confidence based on evidence based analysis of previous annual trends. The partnership uses other information along with these statistics and will consider social trends, national patterns and community feedback. This holistic approach enables the partnership to set its priorities and proportionately allocate resources according to need and risk; ensuring it generates the greatest return for resource usage.

- 5.1 In addition to the partnership picture of crime and community safety issues the police mirror these long term practices on a daily, weekly and monthly basis; predominantly focussing on crime and anti-social behaviour. The dynamic nature of policing allows commanders to direct resources on a daily basis to target emerging issues using a variety of overt and covert tactics, both location and individual specific. The monthly profile enables them to look at what the priorities should be for the next month and deploy resources accordingly in a more mid-long term approach.

- 6.1 The partnership also adopts this approach to a lesser degree through its delivery groups and partnership plus neighbourhood meetings. This connectivity between Police analytical products and those of the wider partnership ensure that each agency within the Community Safety Partnership: Fire, Police, Probation, Health and the Council know where the areas of need are and are able to commission or de commission services appropriately.

Section One: Early crime interventions:

- 7.1 Often the police and partners are asked to tackle 'problem' places such as shopping centres or groups such as young people hanging around on the street. In these circumstances, we have to ask what events are causing concern. For example, if we are told 'we have a problem with youths outside the local shops', we ask what events are causing the issue – what are the youths doing at the shops that we need to stop happening?
- 8.1 Once we have decided that the issue we are dealing with is a problem that can be solved, there is a four-step process that we use to help solve the issues. This process has been used for many years to solve many different crime and disorder problems in different countries.

The process is known as SARA:

- 9.1 Scanning. In this stage, we define the problem clearly and specifically, so that it can be solved.
- 10.1 Analysis. Next, we understand the problem in detail so that we can choose solutions that are most likely to solve it.
- 11.1 Response. Once we understand the problem, we take action to solve it and identify what others can do as well.
- 12.1 Assessment. After responding, we check to make sure the response solved the problem. If it didn't, we work out why not before trying more responses.
- 13.1 Researchers have studied why problem-solving techniques sometimes don't work. We know that if a stage in the SARA process is missed then the technique will not work. Failure to define the problem specifically will result in poor scanning and analysis. These will lead to the wrong response and poor outcomes. When this approach is adopted well we have seen the greatest level of control of crime and community safety issues.
- 14.1 A back ground paper is attached to this overview for members that describes problem solving for the police and partners; UCL JILL DANDO INSTITUTE OF SECURITY AND CRIME SCIENCE - PROBLEM SOLVING FOR NEIGHBOURHOOD POLICING
- 15.1 Examples of early interventions that we know contribute to our greater understanding and problem solving approaches;
- 16.1 **Schools Panel:** A Police and School Panel now take place termly in the North of the borough and are attended by the local policing Chief Inspector, Neighbourhood Inspector and Head Teachers from all North Solihull Secondary Schools. The panel coordinates partnership activity including use of school liaison officers and a data sharing process which ensures schools are aware of all pupils currently linked to crime and ASB and on their school role. This enables the school to take appropriate action to divert their students from offending and support any safeguarding issues which arise as a result. The panel follows established best practice from Birmingham which has resulted in greater partnership working and a contribution to the reduction in offending for fewer than 18s. The panel is on its fourth meeting and is focusing on key themes over the next part of the academic year including Child Sexual Exploitation, Prevent and Counter terrorism and cyber bullying.
- 17.1 **A vulnerability portal** has been in place across the borough since September 2014. The portal allows police to refer vulnerable individuals into the Local Authority administrated Linking People Service. The service is managed by Age UK who triages each individual to understand need, assess risk and offers a tailored service to the vulnerable; affording access to over 250 third sector and statutory services to improve quality of life and reduce likelihood of harm. This service has been used over 140 times in the four months it has been operational offering early help to those in need prior to crisis point. The internal referral method has also reduced demand and bureaucracy requirements placed on police officers and partners, reducing time to assistance and costs.

Case example; Neighbourhood Policing Intervention –

18.1 The Elmdon area was identified as a key location in terms of crime and disorder levels through police tasking processes (as referenced above). Offending in this area was identified as being caused by unknown groups of youths using cannabis and committing acts of anti-social behaviour. A group of youths were identified by both the local police teams and youth service teams. The partnership approached the people with a strategy to engage and encourage integration/co-operation with agencies, increasing a sense of belonging to their community thus increasing the sense of social responsibility. Funding was arranged to run an engagement project culminating in a visit to Jaguar. The group engaged with Neighbourhood Coordinators and Youth Services subsequently co-operating in a scheme which contributed to graffiti removal and substance abuse awareness inputs.

19.1 Neighbourhood Police Teams are re-investigating all vehicle crime offences and burglary offences in key areas. Officers have visited all neighbouring properties (to offence locations) to improve crime prevention awareness, identify witnesses and educate communities of the crime type. Whilst in the area officers check all vehicles in the road, ensuring that they are locked and not displaying valuables alongside identifying insecure houses and advising residents.

Section two: Reducing the risk of reoffending:

The management of offenders, known as Integrated Offender Management (IOM) operates on the following principles:

- All partners tackling offenders together
- Delivering a local response to local problems
- Offenders facing their responsibility or facing the consequences
- Making better use of existing (and proven) programmes and governance
- All offenders at high risk of causing serious harm and/or re-offending are in scope
- Offering proportionate balance between change and control methods, balancing offender need/desistance potential against risk of harm to the community
- Identifying early intervention options to reduce offending and encourage recidivism

20.1 Solihull is committed to an integrated approach to offender management, with agencies working together to target offenders causing the most harm. Reducing re-offending creates fewer victims and safer communities. Solihull enjoys notable success in the field, recording one of the lowest reoffending rates of all Local Authority areas in England and Wales consistently over the last few years.

21.1 In 2013 it was noted that a number of other areas across the country had found increased efficiencies and improved outcomes by co-locating offender management teams. In January 2014 Solihull moved to a fully integrated co-located team offering a single point of access for offenders at an IOM 'hub', capable of delivering an all-encompassing OM service to offenders with proven performance results.

22.1 This has enabled the partnership to adopt a multi-agency problem solving approach and has vastly increased intelligence and information sharing protocols whilst reducing costs.

23.1 The co-location scheme has further assisted agencies to coordinate resources, plan and review how offenders are managed and adopt a 'common goal' approach to further reduce reoffending rates across Solihull. The preferred site was at Chelmsley Wood Police Station as it assisted agencies to engage more effectively within our communities most affected by crime. It also ensured a more localised approach, enhancing collaborative working by placing the OM team within a short distance of our key partners within substance misuse services and Solihull Community Housing.

- 24.1 The team regularly discuss the cohort of offenders who can best be managed. This includes PPO's (Priority and Prolific Offenders), HCCU's (High Crime Causing Users), DRR's (Drug Rehabilitation Requirements) and ATR's (Alcohol Treatment Requirements). However, consideration is currently being given to including serious Domestic Violence offenders, LDM (Local Diversionary Management – Young Offenders), Short Term Custody (less than 12 months) and MAPPA (Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements).
- 25.1 The team initially included direct offender management agencies – Police, Probation, Drug intervention programme DiP, with other agencies coming in to provide services to assist offenders in the seven pathways out of offending e.g. Substance Misuse Treatment Providers, Housing, Employment, Education and Training, Mental Health.
- 26.1 Other future initiatives include: establishing Restorative Justice Sentences and face to face conferencing between victims and perpetrators for the first time in Solihull, in line with Government strategy.
- 27.1 **Case Study A.** 12 months ago (2013) 'A' was within an active criminal group of offenders linked by intelligence and lifelong association to committing burglary dwelling offences and commercial robbery across the region. The majority of the group were arrested and imprisoned for their part in offences. 'A' continued their offending and although never caught, regular intelligence linked them to multiple offences of burglary and regional offences of robbery.
- 28.1 Through active partnership working, information sharing, intelligence gathering, targeting and disruptive tactics by means of intrusive offender management 'A' was diverted into rehabilitation and into employment via Pertemps. 'A' received training and received an initial offer of employment in unskilled work before progressing further into semi-skilled work.
- 29.1 Continuous monitoring remotely through the IOM one day one conference process has reassured partners that 'A' has held their employment now for a period of over 6 months. There has been no intelligence within the last 12 months to suggest that he is criminally active and there are all signs that his previous drug addiction is now being checked and managed. The current position is a stark contrast to that the previous 12 months with a reduced number of offences and reduction in the associated risk and threat. Although difficult to measure the timing of celebrating 'success' within this integrated offender management (IOM) approach within Solihull, this is one of many snapshots / case studies where IOM can make a real difference.

Examples of other interventions for the management of offenders;

Community Remedy

- 30.1 The remedy aims to ensure a victim lead resolution to low level or anti-social behaviour related crimes. There are two new routes of resolution which can be taken in addition to the already present signing of an anti-social behaviour agreement and community reparation. They are:
- 31.1 Rehabilitation – as of the 02/02/15 offenders can now be offered the opportunity to take part in a victim awareness programme. This aims to show offenders the impact of their crime on the community and victim.
- 32.1 Reparation – officers now have the ability to ensure offenders attend community work to resolve their crime. In Solihull offenders work with Environmental Services working in Parks across the borough to undertake a range of duties alongside local authority staff.

- 33.1 Ultimately officers decide which route each offender takes and ensure the reparation matches the crime, however the decision is made in careful consultation with the victim to ensure the correct outcome for victim and community.
- 34.1 **Restorative Justice (RJ)** Officers across the borough are now trained in RJ. RJ is being used to resolve crimes and disputes whereby a common understanding will result in a better outcome for victim and offender. Officers have undertaken RJ conferences to resolve a range of crimes including criminal damage, theft and most recently a racial offence in the North of the borough. Victim satisfaction is significantly higher in cases whereby the victim has had the chance to speak with the offender and whereby the offender has fully understood the impact of their behaviour. RJ is being considered by officers for all offences linked to ASB.

Other case studies – Reducing Re-offending

- 35.1 Neighbourhood Officers have bespoke plans to manage all medium risk offenders (as per the IOM grading System – specialist officers manage high risk persons) and adopt a range of tactics to control and encourage change in these people.

Offender Management:

- 36.1 **Case study B** - prolific Theft shops and stalls – The Partnership worked seamlessly with Solihull Integrated Addiction Service SIAS to move the location of prescription pickups away from Chelmsley Wood to minimise the risk of contact with previous criminal associates and drug suppliers who were likely to stimulate re-offending.
- 37.1 **Case study C** – Persistent and Prolific offender PPO – A same day prison recalls was achieved following an arrest and charge for vehicle interference due to close police/probation working relationships.
- 38.1 **Case study D** – Organised criminal gang OCG (Gang Member) – The Partnership working with Solihull Community Housing SCH ensured robust action to evict Harris from unsuitable premises from which he was breaching his licence conditions. Eviction notice served within 2 days and 7 days to leave.

Neighbourhood Policing – RJ & Community Remedy Work:

- 39.1 **Case Study E** A dispute between two neighbours prompted by a misunderstanding over a parcel delivery caused on-going issues. Both parties engaged in a heated verbal altercation which escalated into a minor scuffle with both parties receiving low level injuries.
- 40.1 An affray was recorded due to the inability to establish who the initial or primary aggressor was in the absence of any corroborative evidence, both parties conceded that an on-going issue involving loud noise and an unpleasant smell in one of the flats encroaching into the other was at the root of the discord and as neither wanted to pursue a formal complaint; the RJ process was explained and embraced by the neighbours.
- 41.1 An RJ solution was immediately convened at the flat of one of the parties involved with the consent of all present as welfare issues with children and an imminent move by one of the parties to another address elsewhere hindered a neutral venue or a deferred RJ.
- 42.1 The RJ was concluded with both parties expressing their concerns, acknowledging the impact their mutual conduct has had on each other and an undertaking to maintain civil relations. The prospect of a recurrence has been further averted by one of the neighbours relocating elsewhere for a larger property within the next few days.

- 43.1 A RJ was deemed to be the most appropriate and proportionate disposal option in the absence of any aggravating circumstances and concluded with the simmering tension and chronic disagreement between both neighbouring parties being managed and resolved.
- 44.1 **Case Study F;** Meaningful and successful RJ meeting involving residents from location A) and victims of a hate incident from location B .
- 45.1 The issues started when XX and his family moved into the flat some two weeks ago with a small child under the age of 1. He has been complaining of various degrees of noise emanating from residents from the flat above. XX attended the address and had a meaningful chat with XX before returning to his flat. The following day XX attended location b and complained about the drilling that was coming from the flat as she was ill, this resulted in a heated exchange and reference regarding the male returning back to his own country, she then returned to her flat.
- 46.1 All parties engaged in the RJ in a positive manner they all explained their own point of view and the effect on their quality of life. They listened courteously to each other and identified that all they both wanted was to live peacefully without interfering with others' lives. They could not agree with exactly what was said during the heated discussion but both parties agreed to apologise for any offence they may have caused to one another and draw a line under the incident to move on.
- Both parties agreed the following outcome to address the problems,
 - Each party has apologised to each other about any offences they may have caused during the verbal altercation. All parties accepted the apologies at the meeting.
 - To attend each other's address to inform the occupants if the level of noise is not acceptable and respond positively to the request.
 - Speak to the neighbour when carrying out DIY so that consideration can be given to the ill health of the occupant at number 10.
- 47.1 All parties contributed to the outcomes and departed the meeting in a positive manner having come up with a resolution between themselves.
- 48.1 **Case study G;** Offender was involved in a racially aggravated offence in school where they had made racial remarks to others and a racially aggravated criminal damage and an assault. Early intervention in this incident and educating all parties expeditiously was the key in what could of quite easily escalated out of control. Police had long discussions with the head teacher, victim, offender and both families regarding the incident.
- 49.1 The victim refused the Restorative justice approach and did not support the offenders being arrested. We were adamant that the matter should be finalised with a positive impact on the victim and that all those at the school including the offenders should understand that racism will not be tolerated. The Offenders were told that a simple sorry was not good enough and that they needed to come up with their own ideas on how to apologise to the victim whilst showing others in the school that what they had done was unacceptable.
- 50.1 Police planned an innovative way of resolving the crime and suggest that the offender complete a drawing depicting the negative effects of 'hate crime' which could be displayed as a message to other students. In partnership with the school the offenders completed posters which the school printed and are now being displayed at both the high schools in the local area.