

Report to Safer & Stronger Strategic Board
15th July 2010**SUBJECT: Review of Safer and Stronger Communities Fund (SSCF) Revenue
(2011/12 allocations)****Chair of Partnership:** Cllr Sir Peter Brown**Lead Officer for further information:** Helen Turner, Community Safety Manager

1. Background and current situation (2010/11)

- 1.1 The SSCF grant is provided by the Home Office and is an Area Based Grant which is received by the Community Safety team via the Local Area Agreement (LAA). The total amount received for 2010/11 is £758,468 of which £88,565 is allocated at source (i.e. by Home Office) to the Young People's Substance Misuse Partnership (in Cambridgeshire, this is called the Young People's Substance Misuse Commissioning Group). Of the remaining funds, £86,000 has to be spent on capital projects, leaving £583,903 of revenue funding. Please see appendix A for 2010/11 allocation breakdown.

CAPITAL

- 1.2 The capital funding has been reduced by half for 2010/11 to a new total of £86,000.
- 1.3 The Safer and Stronger Board agreed to provide this funding to CSPs through an application process, where CSPs had to evidence a need for extra resources to tackle areas of high crime or ASB and to address national indicator targets.
- 1.4 Consequently, bids were invited from the county's five CSPs and in May 2010, the multi-agency panel decided to allocate the funding to projects which all aim to improve performance against the targets set for NI 16, NI 17, NI 20 and NI 32. The outcome of all these projects will be evaluated at the end of this financial year. A list of projects which have been allocated capital funding to date is attached as Appendix B. The process and value for money of the projects will be evaluated throughout the year.

REVENUE

- 1.5 2010/11 (This year's funding): The revenue element of the Safer and Stronger Communities Funding 2010/11 totals **£583,903**. Of this, £74,559 is earmarked by the Home Office for Cambridgeshire Drug and Alcohol Action Team (DAAT) who support local Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) in the implementation of the National Drug Strategy and Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy, leaving **£509,344 to be allocated by the Safer and Stronger Strategic Board**.

There have been 'in year' cuts made to all Area based grant funding. The actual amounts have not yet been confirmed and this year's final allocations are expected to be announced following the public spending review in the Autumn.

1.6 TOP SLICE

Historically, the Board have opted for a 30% topslice, which in both 2008/09, 2009/10 and 2010/11 have been awarded to countywide initiatives aimed at tackling issues such as domestic violence and reducing reoffending. The topslice currently pays for two Priority and Prolific Offender (PPO) Scheme Co-ordinators and two Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Workers (IDVAs).

1.7 In March 2010, The County Council made a decision to topslice external funding by 1%, to cover business administration costs. This has already affected the DAAT and the Domestic Abuse Unit but it was agreed to defer this action on the SSCF until 2011 as part of the revenue review. Consequently, this proposal includes the 1% topslice for administration of the SSCF in 2011/12.

1.8 The remaining revenue is currently allocated to the district CSPs and the formula has been based on a formula provided by Central Government to reflect: crime figures, Indices Multiple Deprivation (IMD) and population size. The allocations have not been amended for at least four years to reflect changes to those statistics. Four of the five CSP's use the bulk of their revenue to fund salary costs for partnership support officers and Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) caseworkers (see appendix C)

2. Scope, rationale and aim of review

SCOPE

2.1 The scope of the review includes only the SSCF revenue funding which is received by the CCC Community Safety team, who are the responsible authority for allocating the funding to CSP's (on behalf of the Safer and Stronger Strategic Board)

2.2 The funding for PPO and Domestic Violence (DV) are not part of this review as they will be reviewed within the Integrated Offender Management work which is being developed and the DV funding will be reviewed within the partnerships 'excellent services project' being lead by Making Cambridgeshire Count. In the event that nothing changes as a result of IOM and Making Cambridgeshire Count, then PPO and DV funding will also require review. Depending on the preferred option agreed these posts could be determined by a business case.

2.3 There are wider funding streams which resource crime and disorder partnerships but at this time these are not under review as it would require a much wider review impacting on other themed partnerships within the LAA.

2.4 The capital funding is not under review as the application process is in place and will be evaluated for value for money at the end of the year.

RATIONALE

2.5 Historically the allocations of SSCF have been made based on population size, deprivation and crime figures; however this does not currently reflect the areas of highest crime and highest deprivation as the allocation model has not been reviewed for over 3 years.

2.6 In January 2010 a countywide Strategic Assessment was carried out identifying **areas** of highest crime and crime **types**. Areas within the County e.g. Wisbech, Huntingdon and Cambridge City were clearly identified as having the highest crimes per 1000, yet they do not receive any additional funding to address this. Crime types of highest concern across the County were identified as: serious acquisitive crime (NI16), violent crime (NI20), anti-social behaviour (NI17) and domestic violence (NI32)

NI16: dwelling burglary, robbery, theft of or from motor vehicle

NI17: perception of anti-social behaviour (measured via Place Survey)

NI20: actual bodily harm or other injury

NI32: the percentage reduction in repeat victimisation for those domestic violence cases being managed by a MARAC (multi-agency risk assessment conference)

2.7 Following the Board's decision to change the capital funding in January 2010, the Board Members also asked for a review of the revenue funding to address areas of high crime and the priority national indicators (crime types).

2.8 To ensure the four main 'Safer' National Indicators (NI16, NI17, NI20 and NI32) can be tackled and resourced effectively it was essential to use a selection of statistical evidence to provide a clear picture of crimes per 1000. Crime figures have been provided by the CCC Research Team collated from the British Crime Survey (BCS), Domestic violence monitoring data and performance data have also been used to collate local crime figures in Cambridgeshire (Appendix D). For the purposes of this paper and devising a formula, "crimes per 1000" refer to those identified in the strategic assessment: serious acquisitive crime, violent crime, domestic violence and anti social behaviour.

2.9 The impact of taking out the IMD and populations statistics are as follows:

- There is higher deprivation within the county than crime, i.e. there are wards within Cambridgeshire within the top 10% of deprived areas of the country. In comparison, Cambridgeshire as a county ranks close to the middle of all Local Authority Areas for crime in the country.
- Home Office national statistics provide strong evidence that communities with higher deprivation experience higher crime rates, more incidents of domestic violence and more issues around drug and alcohol misuse. Therefore, the issue of crime cannot be tackled without considering deprivation. Since allocations of SSCF were determined originally, further SSCF funding has been allocated to address deprivation within Fenland. For example, a Neighbourhood Management programme which has now been mainstreamed within Fenland District Council. In addition, within the last few years, SSCF funding has also been allocated specifically to Fenland and Huntingdonshire Districts to tackle cohesion within areas of deprivation.
- Excluding population statistics appears to have less impact as areas with dense populations (within Cambridgeshire) appear to have better access to services, e.g. DV support, PCSO's, Police stations. Therefore deprivation, but not population, has been included within the business case criteria (options 2,3,4)

AIM OF REVIEW

2.10 Value for Money and Performance monitoring

CSP's and the Safer & Stronger Strategic Board have a duty (from April 2010) to evidence that partnership funding demonstrates value for money, i.e. funding is directly targeting the areas of highest crime and directed towards locally identified priorities which can demonstrate the impact of the funding.

Whilst there are monitoring and evaluation procedures currently in place, the process will require updating to reflect the value for money requirement.

3. Options for 2011/12

3.1 Revenue Funding to be reviewed: £509,344 (as per 1.5 above)

Topslice:

1% topslice for SSCF administration costs: £5,093.44

30% topslice £151,275

£81,973 for Domestic Abuse Unit

£69,300 for PPO scheme

Leaving **£352,975** to be distributed to the five existing CSPs in Cambridgeshire.

Summary of Options (details follow below)

<u>Option</u>	<u>Topslice</u>	<u>Benefits</u>	<u>Risks</u>
1. Formula based on crimes per 1000	<u>31% for admin costs, PPO and DV</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding allocation reflects number of recorded crimes rather than population size. Allows for local decision making and reflects the Making Cambridgeshire County subsidiarity principle 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding needs to be allocated on an annual basis and figures will be based on the year before, so any significant increases or decreases in figures will not result in changes in allocation immediately. Partnerships that bring down crime successfully one year will have their funding reduced the following year. Any reduction in revenue allocated to CSPs could impact on jobs locally
<u>2. 70% of funding ringfenced for salaries, 30% distributed based on crimes per 1000</u>	<u>31% for admin costs, PPO and DV</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of highest crime will receive appropriate levels of funding and key jobs will be protected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As for Option 1. Areas with less crime may receive less funding for posts, resulting in reducing hours or deleting posts if no alternative funding can be provided by partners.
<u>3. 70% of funding ringfenced for salaries, 30% allocated via a bidding process</u>	<u>31% for admin costs, PPO and DV</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of need are clearly identified and the focus is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CSP's with more capacity and experience with the commissioning

		<p>on main priority indicators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each project is thought through from start to finish and followed up with an evaluation that establishes good practice and learning points for future use. • Funding stream is transparent and clear. • Submitted bids can be used to seek funding via external grants. 	<p>process may benefit more from bidding process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process requires a great deal of administration and paperwork. • Possible to result in an area receiving no funding at all
<u>4. Shared Services</u>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexibility to target resource to areas of need • Build capacity between officers • Develop countywide systems and processes, reducing inequalities in service provision. • Reduce administration costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To work effectively one District, Constabulary or County Council would need to manage on behalf of all five CSP areas, requiring a high level of management support
<u>5. Stay as we are but made slight adjustments to reflect changes in crime rates, deprivation and population</u>	<u>31% for admin costs, PPO and DV</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes in funding arrangements, therefore no impact on posts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of high crime and NI's will not be resourced appropriately

Option 1 Highest crime per 1000 with top slice

Crimes (Serious acquisitive crime, all violent crime, anti-social behaviour and domestic violence) per 1000 formula Total funding: £352,975

XX crimes per 1000 in county (09/10 figs)

→ X% of total crime per 1000 09/10

X% of total crime per 1000 will equal X% of funding allocated

(I.e. if a CSP area records 20% of all crime committed per 1000 population, they will be allocated 20% of total revenue funding available)

Partnership	Crimes pr 1000	% of total crime per 1000	Allocation for 2011/12	Previous allocation	Change
Cambridge CSP	183.7	25%	(25% of £352,975) £88,243	£90,049	-£1,806
Safer Fenland Partnership	164.8	22.6%	£79,772	£61,256	+£18,516
Huntingdonshire CSP	141.8	19.5%	£68,831	£85,377	-£16,547
East Cambridgeshire CSP	124.6	17%	£60,005	£52,587	+£7418
South Cambridgeshire CSP	115.3	15.9%	£56,124	£67,273	-£11,150
Total			£352,975	£356,542	-£3567 (1% change)

Risks:

- Funding needs to be allocated on an annual basis and figures will be based on the year before, so any significant increases or decreases in figures will not result in changes in allocation immediately.
- Partnerships that bring down crime successfully one year, will have their funding reduced the following year.
- Any reduction in revenue allocated to CSPs could impact on jobs locally

Benefits:

- Funding allocation reflects number of recorded crimes rather than population size.
- Allows for local decision making and reflects the Making Cambridgeshire County subsidiarity principle

Implications:

Any substantial changes in crime figures trends in one area could have detrimental impact on another, e.g. Cambridge City crime goes up, Fenland stay the same so the following year, Cambridge City will get more funding, Fenland will receive less.

Option 2 Ringfenced funding for salaries (based on business case) and crimes per 1000 with topslice

All CSP's use at least part of their revenue funding to provide salary costs for partnership support and ASB caseworkers (see breakdown in appendix C) It must be noted that the County Council, District Councils, the Constabulary and other partners typically provide additional funding to these posts (on-costs, accommodation and equipment) and also provide funding for support staff for the partnerships.

Option 2 requires CSP's to provide a business case to demonstrate the need for any posts to support the CSP. The Business Case will include a set of criteria as follows:

- Meets District, County and Neighbourhood panel priorities
- Impact the funding will have on priority National Indicators
- Crimes per 1000
- Rurality: lack of accessible service provision which post adds value to
- Difficulty in providing service within rural area (travelling time and costs)
- Deprivation information: areas with higher deprivation demonstrate higher crimes and lack of cohesion and capacity to influence accessible services
- Demonstrates value for money
- Evidence of lack of funding from elsewhere, e.g. CSP partner agencies and reflects local circumstances, i.e. lack of income generation, e.g. low Council tax.
- Impact if post is deleted

Topslice: £151,275

Balance: £352,975

70% for salaries (based on successful business case): £247,082

30% as option 1 crimes per 1000: £105,892

Risks:

- As for Option 1.
- Areas with less crime may receive less funding for posts, resulting in reducing hours or deleting posts if no alternative funding can be provided by partners.

Benefits:

- Areas of highest crime will receive appropriate levels of funding and key jobs will be protected.

Option 3 Ring fenced funding for salaries (based on business case) and remainder of funding allocated via a commissioning process

70% for salaries	£247,082
30% ring fenced for bidding process	£105,892

Here 70% of funding is ring fenced for partnerships to build or maintain capacity through staff posts which support partnership work.

The remainder will be allocated to CSP's using the same process as for capital funding, where partnerships work together to identify common issues around crime and anti-social behaviour and either individually or jointly submit a funding application outlining project details and an implementation plan. The CCC Community Safety Team would be responsible for facilitating the process, monitoring expenditure + implementation and producing evaluation reports for the Board, with a view to ensuring value for money across the partnerships. Actual allocation would be decided by a multi-agency panel of which all CSP Chairs/Lead Officers and Constabulary are members.

Risks:

- CSP's with more capacity and experience with the commissioning process may benefit more from bidding process.
- The process requires a great deal of administration and paperwork.
- Possible to result in an area receiving no funding at all

Benefits:

- Areas of need are clearly identified and the focus is on main priority indicators.
- Each project is thought through from start to finish and followed up with an evaluation that establishes good practice and learning points for future use.
- Funding stream is transparent and clear.
- Submitted bids can be used to seek funding via external grants.

Option 4: Shared services

The common services to all partnerships are anti-social behaviour teams and partnership support staff. Whilst there is a requirement to retain local autonomy, there are some potential savings and service improvements to be gained by developing a cross-district approach to these services.

With all public services facing cuts yet still required to continue with the same level of service provision, this option presents an opportunity to develop sustainable partnership delivery.

Risks:

- To work effectively one District, the Constabulary or County Council would need to manage on behalf of all five CSP areas, requiring a different level of management support

Benefits:

- Flexibility to target resource to areas of need
- Build capacity between officers
- Develop countywide systems and processes, reducing inequalities in service provision.
- Reduce administration costs

Option 5 Stay as we are

SSCF based on the current formula but update to reflect recent changes in population, crime and IMD

Risks:

- Areas of high crime and NI's will not be resourced appropriately

Benefits:

- No big changes in funding arrangements, therefore little or no impact on posts.

4. Consultation

Consultation has begun (see the table below). A consultation log has been produced and this options paper reflects early discussions held with District Community Safety Officers. It is understood that all CSP's will be discussing the review at their partnership meetings during the summer.

The Partners who are being consulted on the proposal are as follows
Safer and Stronger Strategic Board
5 District CSP's
DAAT
Domestic Abuse Partnership
PPO Scheme
Cambridgeshire Constabulary

The consultation will take place with a number of meetings held with Chairs and Senior Officers once they have consulted with their own partnerships.

5. Timescales for implementation

	What	Deadline
1	Paper presented to Community Engagement Management team meeting	May 2010
2	Paper presented to District Community Safety Officers	June 2010
3	Paper presented to PPO, DAAT, DV	June 2010
4	Paper presented to SSSB with recommendations	July 2010
5	Consultation with CSP's at their meetings	July/ August 2010
6	Report back to SSSB and agree which option to take forward	November 2010
7	Develop new systems and process for funding allocations	November 2010
8	Confirmation of allocations to CSP's	November 2010
9	Allocate funding	April 2011

6. Recommendations

The Board is recommended to receive a more comprehensive report in November which will include the actual SSCF allocation for 2011/12, any wider implications on this funding from other budget cuts and the views of the five CSP's on the implications.

Source documents:

County Strategic Assessment 2010	CST office
Consultation log	CST office
Indices Multi Deprivation	Office National Statistics website
One place direct.gov crime ranking	CST office
Crime statistics : BCU, DV	CST office