THE NATIONAL COMMUNITY SAFETY NETWORK

Anti-Social Behaviour

Key Issues and Recommendations:
A Practitioners' Perspective

Final Report

July 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The National Community Safety Network (NCSN) is a practitioner-led organisation supporting those involved in promoting community safety and crime reduction throughout the United Kingdom. It was established in 1995 and has grown from 30 or so members at its inception to 430 members today. It is now a registered charity and a company limited by guarantee.

The mission of the Network is to:

- Give a national voice to practitioners working to promote safer communities across the UK

- Influence national policy and practice in the field of community safety

- Support the professional development of practitioners

- Promote joint working amongst relevant agencies and networks in the UK and Europe

Canvassing practitioners' views and using grass roots opinion to influence national policy is fundamental to the Network. Based on member feedback the Network has highlighted three current policy areas for consultation and action:

1. Anti-social behaviour

2. Improving relationships between Community Safety Partnerships or CSPs (also known as Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships or CDRPs), Drug Action Teams (DATs), those responsible for delivering on the youth crime agenda (eg Youth Offending Teams) and Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs)

3. Breaking down the barriers to improved partnership performance such as CDRP capacity, funding and infrastructure

This report summarises the work that has been undertaken to date by the Network on its first policy area of anti-social behaviour and it reflects the views of practitioners on the ground. The Network would welcome your comments on any aspect of the report, and would like to hear from you if you have any examples of promising approaches that you are willing to share or if you are able to help in any way with implementing the recommendations. Please pass on any comments or information by either by post, telephone, fax or e-mail to:

The National Community Safety Network, 1 Hunters Walk, Canal Street, Chester CH1 4EB
Tel: 01244 354090; Fax: 01244 354099
E-mail: enquiries@community-safety.net

Further information about the National Community Safety Network can be found on the website www.community-safety.net

The Network wishes to thank Andy Mills, Head of Service (Community Safety) at Leeds City Council, for leading on this piece of work on behalf of the NCSN Board of Directors. It also wishes to acknowledge the help of all of the contributors to the report, in particular the members of the Anti Social Behaviour Working Party which included members from a number of community safety partnerships around the country and a representative from the Local Government Association.

Finally the Network wishes to thank the two authors of the report (Jean Chinery of JC Consulting and John Hedge of Thames Valley Partnership) and also to thank Mark Smith of Cardiff Community Safety Partnership who produced an executive summary.

Ian Lawrence
Chief Executive of the National Community Safety Network

ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR - KEY ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS:
A PRACTITIONERS' PERSPECTIVE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The topic of anti-social behaviour (asb) was highlighted by NCSN members as one of three priority themes on which they wanted the Network, acting as the voice of community safety practitioners, to influence national policy. To take this forward, a period of research and consultation was initiated in an effort to improve the way asb-related issues are tackled in the UK[1]. A formal study was commenced in March 2004 and a time-limited asb Policy Working Group was established to ascertain and formalise members' views on this topic. This work was led by one of the NCSN's Board of Directors (Andy Mills).

The report is based on significant consultation with NCSN members: first, through an electronic survey to identify the key issues in relation to asb; secondly, through a workshop at the 2004 NCSN annual conference at which the 50 or so practitioners present prioritised the key issues; thirdly, through responses made by practitioners to a set of 16 questions based on the identified key issues; and fourthly, through subsequent debate of the preliminary findings with the 16 NCSN Board of Directors (most of whom are community safety managers) and other interested parties.

For the purpose of this executive summary, practitioners' feedback and NCSN recommendations are grouped by the four question categories of 'priorities and target setting', 'resources and costs', 'definition and information issues' and 'management of asb cases'. The additional questions put to the Audit Commission related to what auditors looked for in asb strategies.

1.   Priorities and Target Setting

Members felt the broad nature of asb and a lack of standardised asb data recording made target setting problematic and that targets were often vague and too focussed on enforcement at the expense of preventive work. The perception of asb and disorder by the general public was viewed as a concern in its own right, as it is often different to reality. It was suggested that more of a focus be placed on the role of Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) in tackling asb. Community safety partnerships also wanted more support to help them form links with those better placed than themselves to tackle environmental issues such as fly-tipping and graffiti. It was generally felt that each agency should have specific targets in relation to tackling asb.

With the above in mind, it is recommended that:

- asb be broken down into specific categories, with target setting developed accordingly, including targets on prevention which address identified risk factors;

- reassurance strategies, addressing the fear of crime, should be developed separately by partnerships to run alongside asb strategies;

---

[1] Although this was a UK-wide research project the report cannot be seen as being representative of the position of practitioners in Northern Ireland and Scotland where legislation varies to England and Wales.

- each RSL should be required to demonstrate how its asb strategy links into the local community safety partnership's asb strategy;

- partnerships and auditors should ensure that the targets of agencies that work on asb issues are 'cross-referenced' to assess levels of effective joined-up working;

- partnerships should consider the co-location or co-management of staff who have shared responsibilities for tackling asb, with the responsibility for management of asb data clearly assigned.

2.   Resources and Costs

Members challenged the lack of a national costing model for asb strategies as they found it difficult to argue for additional investment without clear cost/benefit analyses. It was suggested that the recharge of legal costs for asb work rarely takes place. Another issue of concern is that asb staff are often on short-term contracts, with future funding uncertain.

It is recommended that:

- a national model on the local costs of asb (including responses to asb) should be developed;

- the longer-term future of dedicated asb staff should be considered by each community safety partnership;

- dedicated asb budgets should be identified by partnerships (eg by considering as part of Local Area Agreement and Safer and Stronger Communities Fund negotiations);

- improved forward planning and funding for non-statutory providers of services to tackle asb should be developed (eg by considering as part of Local Area Agreement and Safer and Stronger Communities Fund negotiations);

- the government should consider as part of its 2006 Spending Review the provision of funding for asb through its mainstream allocations to public bodies rather than via short-term funding streams.

3.   Definitions and Information Issues

There is widespread concern among NCSN members over the Home Office's perceived reluctance to develop a common definition of asb for partnership use. Without commonly agreed definitions, comparing the performance of partnerships in tackling asb becomes impossible. Members also recognised that different agencies record asb in different ways, often on incompatible systems and that there is a lack of dedicated, analytical personnel. The use of customer satisfaction surveys was highlighted as a good way of assessing asb work.

It is therefore recommended that:

- a common definition of asb be developed nationally with input from the Home Office, practitioners and legal experts, with scope to distinguish between different forms of asb e.g. 'nuisance' and 'dispute';

- asb data recording systems used by police and local authorities be studied nationally to identify any inconsistencies (this could be further supported centrally by the provision of advice on data management and closer partnership working with the Police National Intelligence Model);

- partnerships need to have dedicated asb data inputting and analytical resources;

- a central storage facility for information such as model information sharing protocols, operating procedures and anti-social behaviour strategies should be provided which allows easy access by practitioners;

- asb work be mainstreamed within community safety at a local authority level.

(See www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/antisocial1.html for more information.)

4.   Consistent Management of Anti-social Behaviour

Members spoke of wide variations in working practices around asb cases, which may be partly due to a lack of training. However, it is thought that a national enquiry service for practitioners would encourage good practice. Such practice might include the use of ASBOs that have 'positive' or reparative elements e.g. unpaid work by offenders to deal with the consequences of asb.

Partnerships voiced a need for a fully developed 'toolkit' for interventions that would achieve greater consistency in the use of appropriate actions and reduce the need for anti-social behaviour orders (ASBOs) to be issued needlessly. Legally, awareness of where ASBOs and breaches fit into sentencing and enforcement policies needs to be raised. In this area it is felt that links between Local Criminal Justice Boards and community safety partnerships should be improved, and nationally work needs undertaking to address the inconsistencies in sentencing for breaches of ASBOs.

In terms of positive interventions, the Home Affairs Committee criticised youth-centred agencies and local authority departments for not engaging in this agenda. More emphasis needs to be placed on early intervention with families, schools and peers but this needs appropriate resourcing. It is seen as very important that the 'Every Child Matters' agenda and the asb agenda are more closely married up in the future at both national and local levels. A need for more local authority departments to become involved in asb interventions may assist in providing more 'positive' interventions.

More training modules were requested such as training packages for voluntary and community sector groups on how to tackle asb themselves. Community safety partnerships requested more assistance in developing good communication plans and relaying positive and accurate information to the public.

From this feedback it is recommend that:

- partnerships review the need for both operational and strategic co-ordination of asb work;

- partnerships be encouraged to develop and share models for consistent assessment of asb cases;

- 'positive' interventions should be developed further e.g. conflict resolution and mediation, which may be supported by multi-agency training for all staff who deal with incidents of asb e.g. via Community Safety Accreditation Schemes;

- awareness of where ASBOs and breaches fit into sentencing and enforcement policies needs raising and the inconsistencies in sentencing for breaches of ASBOs needs to be addressed centrally;

- more emphasis and resources need to be given to early intervention with families, schools and peers and the asb agenda needs to be more closely married up with the Every Child Matters agenda in the future;

- a national enquiry service should be developed, based on the 'Together' action line, and current practice should be evaluated and good practice shared more widely;

- more multi-agency training on how to tackle asb should be made available, together with improving training on developing community leaders;

- all community safety partnerships should have dedicated communications resources and strategies for getting messages across to the public.

Audit Commission

The Policy Working Group was directed to two reports on the Audit Commission's website that provided the following findings:

- there is limited cross-reference between categories within the key lines for enquiry in 'Corporate Assessment' of local authorities' performance i.e. criteria that are applicable to specific sections could also be applied to others, significantly so in some cases;

- criteria relating to crime prevention and the fear of crime should also be recognised in the section on asb, with a particular emphasis on data sharing and communication;

- although the key lines of enquiry within the Commission's Housing Inspectorate indicate the need for a clear policy on asb and tenancy agreements, there is little reference to the role of RSLs in this process.

From this, it can be surmised that there is a general need to update Audit Commission assessment criteria based on members' feedback.

A Possible Checklist

The above feedback and recommendations suggest a 'checklist' for more effective asb work. Such a checklist could include questions such as whether an asb strategy has:

- a standardised framework for actions and assessment?

- protocols defining roles and responsibilities across agencies?

- a range of preventive measures as an initial response?

- training and staff development plans?

- systems for relevant data to be collected and managed in an effective, pre-arranged manner?

When working in such a diverse subject area, it is also worth considering some of the following suggestions:

- giving more focus on early intervention within communities using approaches such as mediation and work with vulnerable families;

- each agency involved in asb-related work developing and adhering to relevant asb targets, including those working in licensing and health arenas;

- identifying and addressing the 'signs' of anti-social behaviour (graffiti, fly-tipping, vandalised bus shelters/phone boxes and abandoned, burned-out cars) through regular visual audits;

- encouraging the use of developments within ASBO legislation e.g. using 'bolt-on' ASBOs at conviction; making members of the extended community safety family (e.g. Police Community Support Officers and Community Wardens) aware of their duties in respect of asb and have their achievements recognised accordingly.

We should not lose sight of the fact that much good work continues to be carried out in the UK to tackle asb. However, there remains a genuine need to enhance partnership working to involve all statutory agencies and relevant non-statutory, community and voluntary agencies. The campaign against asb is all-inclusive and everybody has a part to play. With this in mind, there is a need for foresight to improve the confidence and uptake in 'partnership' working.

While there is a need to standardise certain processes, it should be recognised that a 'one-size-fits-all' approach may not necessarily work for everyone. We should all look to maximise the use of asb referral systems as a key component in reducing the problem – if this can be achieved we should also succeed in reducing other forms of crime e.g. auto-crime, criminal damage, hate crime, illegal drug use and underage drinking.

We also need to influence the media, in all forms, to maintain a level of responsibility and accountability when portraying images of youth in relation to anti-social behaviour. Demonising this section of society can have a damaging effect on communities.

What Next?

This executive summary paper is being distributed to all NCSN members attending the annual NCSN conference in Manchester in July 2005, with copies of the full report available in the members' area of the NCSN website www.community-safety.net. We will be examining ways in which some of the solutions identified can be taken forward. If you have any questions or comments or if you are able to offer any assistance with taking this work forward please contact:

The National Community Safety Network, 1 Hunters Walk, Canal Street, Chester CH1 4EB

Tel: 01244 354090; Fax: 01244 354099; E-mail: enquiries@community-safety.net

1. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY OF STUDY

1.1   During 2003 the membership of the National Community Safety Network identified anti-social behaviour as a priority subject area for the Network to conduct more research on. Members wanted the Network to act as a voice to air their views with national and regional government on some key issues they had identified in their efforts to tackle anti-social behaviour.

1.2   The Network decided to take forward work on anti-social behaviour by appointing one of its Board of Directors to lead on this priority. The study commenced in March 2004 by conducting a national trawl of the NCSN membership to gather information on the key issues in relation to anti-social behaviour. The e-mail alert sent out to all NCSN members can be found at Appendix A. The alert included a question asking respondents if they would be interested in joining an NCSN Working Group on this topic.

1.3   The findings from this national trawl were then fed into the Network's annual conference in June 2004. At this conference a seminar was held on the initial findings of the survey and the key issues for further work were prioritised by the 50 or so practitioners who attended that workshop. Nominations of interested people to join a new Anti-Social Behaviour Policy Working Group were also requested at the workshop. A summary of the issues identified from the e-mail survey of NCSN members and the workshop discussion held at the annual conference can be found at Appendix B.

1.4   Volunteers for this new NCSN Policy Working Group on anti-social behaviour were drawn from the two consultation exercises mentioned. Terms of reference for the group were compiled and the first meeting of the group was held in Leeds in September 2004. The Working Group agreed a set of questions to be asked of practitioners and the Audit Commission and a list of these questions can be found in Appendix C. Section two of this report provides an analysis of the answers that were obtained to these questions. Section three of the report provides a summary of the key issues raised by practitioners and makes some recommendations to address these issues in the future.

1.5   The second meeting of the working group was held in January 2005 at which all of the work undertaken was pooled and discussed. It was agreed that the results of this research would be written up by members of the group taking into account other recent anti-social behaviour research such as submissions to the Home Affairs Committee by the Local Government Association and Crime Concern and the work of the Local Government Information Unit (LGIU).

1.6   The Working Group met again in April 2005 to consider the findings of this research and a draft report was written following this meeting summarising all of the work up to that point. The draft report was made available to all NCSN members asking for any further comments. An executive summary of the report was produced for all delegates attending the NCSN annual conference in Manchester in July 2005.

1.7   This final report has been written taking into account the additional feedback received on the draft report from NCSN members. The NCSN is now examining ways in which some of the solutions identified in the study can be taken forward. It would welcome any views on how this can best be done or any offers of assistance with taking solutions forward.

2. CONSULTATION, FEEDBACK AND ANALYSIS

2.1 In total there were sixteen questions posed to NCSN members of Community Safety Partnerships or CSPs (also known as Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships or CDRPs), in relation to anti-social behaviour: three questions on priorities and target setting, three on resources and costs, three on definition and information issues and seven on consistent management of individual anti-social behaviour (asb) cases. Two questions were posed to the Audit Commission which related to what the auditors looked for when examining the content of asb strategies.

Priorities and Target Setting

2.2 The first question posed to practitioners asked whether anti-social behaviour was a priority in their partners' relevant key strategies (covering both statutory and voluntary agencies).

2.3 Most partners had tackling asb as a priority within their respective organisations, although the broad nature of asb as a concept inevitably meant that the specific priorities and concerns varied considerably. It is clear that fear of disorder and perceived disorder were concerns in their own right. Lack of common practice between some Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) in their strategies and responses to asb was raised as a concern although some examples of good practice in this respect were submitted to the Working Group.

2.4 Strategy development was seen as a more complex process in two tier areas than in unitary authorities, and the further issue of third tier (parish council) links with asb was also seen to complicate matters. Integration and co-ordination of the work of Education, Social Services, the Youth Service, Youth Offending Teams, Drug and Alcohol Action Teams, Housing, Environmental and Leisure Services etc. was seen as a complex issue, particularly for two tier authorities. Co-ordination of work on asb with that being undertaken by Fire and Rescue Services was also seen as important. As an example of this complexity a summary of the current position in the Thames Valley undertaken by Thames Valley Partnership (a community safety charity) in relation to each of these main agencies and departments is given in Appendix D.

2.5 Some respondents regarded the distinction between prevention, enforcement and resettlement as too rigid. There seemed to be universal agreement that there had been far more emphasis from the Home Office on enforcement than anything else and less focused thinking on assessment, capacity building for communities, good practice on early intervention, and the need for all these responses to be linked together in some way. It was felt that a coherent strategy, both locally and nationally, needed a balanced approach.

2.6 The next two questions asked about asb targets. The first of these asked whether there were key targets for asb in the partnership/partner strategies in terms of prevention/enforcement/resettlement. The second asked where the key gaps in targets were and what should be required of others to help tackle asb.

2.7   In the majority of cases the main targets for the prevention and resettlement strands in asb action plans were somewhat vague. The majority of organisations appear to publish very limited performance information in respect of results, impacts or outcomes related to their involvement with individuals. Some authorities appear to be doing good work in relation to mediation, community conferencing, and conflict resolution etc. but very seldom have targets for this work which may make attracting resources to it more difficult.

2.8   Under the prevention strand the need to tackle environmental crime (eg disposing of abandoned cars, collecting needles, removing graffiti and flytipping initiatives etc.) was recognised as important and targets on these individual components of environmental crime were often set as part of an asb strategy. However it was noted that links across departments were not always made, particularly in some of the smaller authorities, where the asb work was sometimes seen as being about interventions with perpetrators only.

2.9   Also under the prevention strand respondents wanted more preventive work on addressing mental health issues related to asb at an early stage.

2.10   Enforcement targets for asb work were much more common than prevention and resettlement targets as they were seen to be easier to measure (for example, keeping track of the number of complaints leading to formal action such as eviction or Anti-Social Behaviour Orders). Most partnerships expressed concern that they had not been given a precise enough definition of, or baseline assessment framework for, asb. This made it difficult both to assess the level of problems objectively and to monitor asb both within and across local agencies. Clearly the level and intensity of problems varied greatly across the country, and the way in which targets and attention had centred on enforcement options seemed to have created a 'one size fits all' approach to asb.

2.11   Concern was also expressed about setting targets for asb reduction just at the stage when the creation of new roles such as Anti-Social Behaviour Co-ordinators and Police Community Support Officers had, in the words of one respondent, "acted as a magnet for asb issues that may once have been ignored or not reported". There appeared to be little standardisation of recording of asb data across council departments and police forces (and sometimes within forces) and considerable variations in how that data was shared with, and analysed by, community safety partnerships. This aspect made target setting for the partnerships particularly problematic.

2.12   Target setting was also seen as problematic to partnerships because of the lack of comparable performance data between partnerships on anti-social behaviour.

2.13   It was felt that some agencies and departments are less enthusiastic about meeting partnership objectives because of other internal priorities that drive them. It was generally felt that each agency should have specific targets about asb. These should be cross-referenced to ensure an overall coherent strategy with clear targets and outcomes and need to be cross-cutting with other required policies such as licensing and public health policies. The importance of developing

some improved standard outcomes was stressed – without such measures it was thought to be very difficult to link the work of different organisations together in the co-ordinated way that was necessary to address asb effectively.

2.14   There was recognition that public perception and public confidence were key issues in both assessment and response to asb. The building of resilience and empowerment needed to be an integral part of any coherent response to asb, but this was often not the case, either because community development resources were limited, or because response 'packages' were over-reliant on enforcement. Visual audits were seen as an important way of assessing local impact, but cost effective techniques for assessing community concern and community confidence were urgently needed, and this should not be left in a piecemeal way to local authorities and partnerships.

Resources and Costs

2.15   The next three questions related to resources and the apportioning of costs. The first of these questions asked whether the partnership's asb strategy was costed and, if so, what the costings included. The second asked if the organisations or departments involved in delivering the asb strategy had formal agreements as to contributing resources. The final question of this section asked how costs were apportioned when anti-social behaviour order (ASBO) cases were progressed and who led on case management.

2.16   The overall impression was that there was very little consistency in thinking over what costs should be included when attempting to cost the delivery of an asb strategy. Clearly the resources needed to deal effectively with asb should include dealing with the consequences as well as the perpetrators. Some authorities measured the costs of clearing up the effects of asb (eg removing abandoned cars and flytipping) but found it difficult, or did not attempt to, cost any resilience building and community engagement work they undertook. Respondents felt that there should be some nationally agreed guidelines to help improve this situation eg a national cost breakdown produced on how to cost an ASBO spelling out the elements to include such as legal costs and staff time etc.

2.17   Some authorities had service level agreements or inter-agency protocols in place with Housing Associations and other agencies for tackling asb. However, even where these were in existence the recharge of legal costs for asb work did not necessarily take place. Others had no financial agreements in place with other agencies. One respondent reported a worry that there might be "a big problem if there is a flurry of civil ASBOs which reportedly cost £5,000 each time". One district authority expressed the view that although they had agreed with the police to take turns to pay for an ASBO they felt that this "let the County Council off the hook". Without knowing the number of ASBOs in advance it was found to be difficult to budget appropriately for them.

2.18   Budgeting and planning at the preventive and community development end of asb work seemed to be very limited, though clearly these aspects of responses to asb would particularly benefit from prioritisation and an investment approach. Many of the service providers in diversionary, preventive, and problem solving work are

non-statutory agencies, and there was recognition in responses to the difficulties non-statutory agencies faced when budgets were not clear or operated on a very short term basis.

2.19   In some cases the partner who had received the most complaints associated with asb about a particular individual or family was often the party who led on case management and who picked up the cost of any ASBO. However, generally the council's or the partnership's asb case workers or team tended to be directly involved in case management. This could be for a number of reasons, and often meant considerable work pressure, but it did have the merit of ensuring some consistency in case management. Most authorities welcomed the ring-fenced money that had been provided by the Government to employ a dedicated partnership Anti-Social Behaviour Co-ordinator, particularly the smaller partnerships. However, the short-term nature of the funding had meant that many staff were on short term contracts which had made it difficult in some cases to recruit quality staff. There was a worry that this ring-fenced money might not be available in the future. A major concern was expressed that dedicated resources to implement new strategies emerging from central government were not generally forthcoming.

Definitions and Information Gathering, Analysis and Sharing

2.20   The next set of three questions related to definitions of anti-social behaviour and to information gathering, analysis and sharing. The first of this set of questions asked what definition of asb was used locally.

2.21   The definition of anti-social behaviour used by most partnerships was the Home Office's definition or a slight adaptation of it, although reference was also made to the Housing Act 1996 section 153 definition. There were, however, major issues expressed about the continuing Home Office argument against developing a common definition for anti-social behaviour. The responses obtained to the question included the following:

- While asb was regarded as describing essentially lower levels of disorder, and not primarily clear criminal activity, then leaving definition as a matter for local interpretation was just about defensible. However, with the introduction of new penalties, a much widened net of activities, and very powerful sanctions, the crossover between crime and asb has become very blurred. A consistent national definition was now felt to be essential.

- Unfairness and inconsistency are bound to arise from the current approach to definition. There can be no doubt that asb is a 'Two Nations' issue – the fact that penalties and sanctions are much more likely to impinge on tenants than owner-occupiers is one obvious example. In areas with a mix, and complex patterns of tenure/occupancy, this can be very divisive.

- We are still left, as we always have been, with having to mediate very different perceptions of what is acceptable behaviour - typically between younger and older people. Anti-social behaviour work and concerns tend to focus on young

people. As long as we lack both a definition and a standard framework for assessment this is likely to persist, with adverse consequences for community cohesion and fear among older people. In fact, according to British Crime Survey findings, young people are very often themselves affected by asb.

- Much of the lower levels of asb activity are about different perceptions of reasonableness, rather than simplistically about perpetrators and victims - the behaviour may be perceived as asb, but the only way forward is by mediating between parties rather than trying to deal with a perpetrator and victim. Yet if we exclude such situations from defined asb behaviour we ignore some really serious and entrenched problems. In one area a serious situation may be resolved at an early stage as a dispute, whereas in an area without mediation exactly the same behaviour can continue until an ASBO is required.

- Since the current terminology is so vague and so tainted with the associated 'Neighbours from Hell' tag and others like it expectations are often raised because it is left as a subjective rather than an objective idea. What is 'serious' in a major inner city is rather likely to be different from 'serious' in a small rural area.

- We now have the curious position that the Home Office can issue through the Research and Development and Statistics Directorate a typology of asb by category, but cannot update the original legal definition. The report entitled "Defining and measuring anti-social behaviour" has provided helpful advice to practitioners who want to start measuring the problems in their area and progress being made to tackle them more accurately than previously. The report can be found at the following website address:

    http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/antisocial1.html

2.22   The next two questions on information issues asked about the main data requirements to enable successful consistent management of asb. The questions asked about what standards of data management were needed and whether there were any good tools/systems for information collection, analysis and sharing already in use.

2.23   Different agencies appeared to use and record asb information in different ways and on systems that were not always compatible. It was accepted that the main data requirements were for proper problem identification in terms of both personalised data (eg who was involved, their age, previous history and effectiveness of interventions etc.) and depersonalised data (eg the 'hotspots' where asb occurred). To undertake effective problem solving it was accepted that common data and service standards were needed between departments and agencies.

2.24   Most partnerships seemed to have developed their own purposely designed database whereas some just used predominantly police data. Some problems with police data were raised (eg "police asb data does not seem to have locational

details of the incident, only the location of the caller which is a big problem"). Surprise was expressed that the Home Office had not established best practice in this area of data management.

2.25   The provision of dedicated, analytical resources was mentioned as one way of improving data management and the uses to which the data was put. One respondent said that "most tasking seems to be done via the National Intelligence Model of the police which often does not include partners or partners' data". Information on the effectiveness of interventions also appeared to be very limited and so there was little robust data available to practitioners in terms of 'what works'. An example of this was practice and outcomes on Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABCs). Most areas had used these and results were often reported as good, but there had been little evaluative work undertaken to underpin good practice.

2.26   Some areas had introduced customer satisfaction surveys and it was felt that the feedback from such surveys generally helped to ensure more responsiveness from staff in meeting customer expectations. Others stressed the importance of visual audits, backed up by good reporting systems.

Consistent Management of Anti-Social Behaviour

2.27   The final set of seven questions to practitioners all related to the consistent management of asb cases. The first of these questions asked how the assessment of an asb case was undertaken so that the most appropriate interventions took place in a proportionate and timely way.

2.28   There appeared to be wide variations in arrangements for assessment although generally multi-agency panels were used to help achieve some consistency. Although each Community Safety Partnership now has an Anti-Social Behaviour Co-ordinator through the funding made available from central government, the roles appear to vary significantly. Some are more involved in detailed assessment than others who tend to operate at a more strategic level.

2.29   The large number of assessors (eg front line police staff, environmental health staff etc.) means that there is a permanent training issue not only on assessment but on different intervention options. Training tends to be worked up and delivered locally, and there was felt to be a strong case for nationally available training modules. The current approach to assessment tends to mean a great deal of localised decision making by a large number of assessors, with resulting inconsistencies. A lack of knowledge about more positive interventions which could be used was expressed. Some respondents called for a consistent national approach to assessment to be developed.

2.30   The second question of this set asked what structures and protocols were in place to help achieve consistent case management.

2.31   The responses to this question suggested that anti-social behaviour groups, multi-agency panels and inter-agency protocols were usually in place but the protocols varied in range and emphasis. Sometimes one protocol even conflicted with

another (eg one response stated "there is a completely separate information sharing protocol with the Children's Services Partnership that does not marry with the community safety ones established").

2.32 Engagement with RSLs was cited as a major issue given their number and the range of policies. This problem was thought to lead to much inconsistency in response to asb. It was suggested that this should be tackled at a national level between the government departments concerned.

2.33 The third question in this set asked about how good partnership working on case management could be achieved with a reasonable level of buy-in from the range of partners.

2.34 The keys to good partnership working cited here were good leadership and personal and strategic commitment from partners at a senior level as well as having appropriate structures in place for partners to get involved (eg multi-agency panels). Training (such as training for voluntary and community sector groups on how to tackle asb) was seen as essential and some good practice in this respect was provided. Improved links between, and/or co-location of, teams tackling asb was also cited as key to improving partnership working on asb.

2.35 The next question had a couple of subsidiary questions. It asked what the full 'tool kit' of interventions looked like, from preventive options through to ASBOs, and what the systematic relationship between them was. It then went on to ask whether there was evidence about what works well and in what circumstances and how the availability of the full range of options could be achieved in all areas.

2.36 Each area seemed to have developed its own toolkit so there was significant variation nationally (eg in the use of mediation and in the extent of protection offered to victims and witnesses). Not surprisingly, in the absence of a common assessment framework, a number of respondents pointed to differences between areas in level of response to similar types of behaviour, and the issue of proportionality is therefore an important one. This shows up both in use of Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABCs) before other preventive options had been tried, and differential use of ASBOs. Often a toolkit had been developed for individual agencies rather than an overarching one for partners and often the toolkit needed significant further development (eg improving the protection offered to victims and witnesses). More information on positive interventions and 'carrots' rather than 'sticks' was requested.

2.37 At the problem solving and preventive end of responses there was a recognition of the important contribution which community mediation was making both to local authority departments, RSLs and sometimes CSPs. Mediation tended to be stereotyped as being to do with neighbourhood dispute, whereas it could function well in a much wider range of group and intergenerational settings as well. However, funding could be precarious, and community mediation was not established everywhere. A stronger funding base for mediation, and more frequent use of it, was suggested by some respondents. However, the point was also made that effective policies on referral, reporting and review of cases sent for mediation were needed to ensure effective operation.

2.38   Similarly, restorative justice and community conferencing options were being developed as important early intervention options in a number of places. A strength of all the problem solving options was seen as their ability to build community resilience. A key issue raised in responses was the need for practitioners to be well informed about the range of options, and their roles in relation to each other. This needed to be addressed by local agreement and protocol and it was seen as important to avoid duplication.

2.39   It was felt that more emphasis needs to be placed on early intervention work with families, schools and peers but that this needs appropriate resourcing. The issue of joining up the work under the 'Every Child Matters' agenda with the work on asb was seen as a very high priority for the future and practitioners wanted to see more joined up national guidance on this topic.

2.40   Some respondents argued that community development skills should be regarded as 'toolbox' components, and their use incorporated into packages of solutions to asb, rather than seen as a secondary or subsidiary response. Many of these skills lay within Youth Services, who should be regarded as significant providers of both community development and diversionary work.

2.41   Youth Offending Services were seen as central to the provision of some of the targeted options in prevention and it was felt they needed to be better integrated into local strategy and inter-agency working than they often are at present.

2.42   There was thought to be great potential for further development of unpaid work by young and adult offenders to address the consequences of asb, whether as direct or indirect reparation, and some good examples of this were provided.

2.43   Respondents said that ABCs, ASBOs and other enforceable options are clearly tools of major importance in tackling significant asb problems, subject to the need for proportionality and consistency as suggested earlier. Respondents wanted more research into 'what works' with ABCs and for good practice findings to be promoted. Issues raised included the need to individualise contracts; the need for constructive activity; the need for remedial intervention when ABCs are failing; the need for 'buy in' from the range of key agencies and the need for appropriate budgeting for use of ABCs.

2.44   ASBOs were perceived as having dominated much of the professional and popular discussion of asb, and having at times been used as an unreasonably simplistic measure of how an area is doing in relation to asb. Responses on the place of ASBO within the toolkit underlined their importance, but also some significant concerns, which can be summarised as follows:

- Inconsistent use.
- High expense.
- The importance of witness protection.

- The need to incorporate other measures alongside ASBOs to achieve fuller and sustainable impact on the community, including publicity and involvement of the community - a good example quoted was the Leeds East End Park initiative.

2.45   A number of contributors indicated that they would like to see ASBOs with requirements for positive action rather than the current orders which only include prohibition of activity.

2.46   Respondents argued that resettlement support needed to be built into work with those on ASBOs, including those who are placed in custody for breach.

2.47   Respondents also felt that the use of ASBOs on conviction had been developing recently and they pointed out that the attractiveness of 'bolt on' ASBOs lay in their having nil cost to local agencies. The point was made, though, that there seemed to be confusion between the courts, the police, criminal justice agencies and local authorities about their respective roles and responsibilities in relation to these new penalties. There was concern about the absence of clear, good practice guidelines in this regard (eg showing how ASBOs on conviction would fit into the new sentencing arrangements under the Criminal Justice Act 2004). It was thought that the use of ASBOs on conviction should be monitored carefully.

2.48   The next question in this section asked how public expectations which had been raised on asb could be responded to and managed to best effect. Respondents were asked to outline how positive information was relayed to the public and what strategies and tactics worked in this respect.

2.49   Concern was expressed that it was getting increasingly difficult to manage the public's expectations on asb as the more the media publicise it the more people expect of councils and the police to tackle it without being given the necessary resources to do so.

2.50   Good information was relayed to the public via the development of positive media stories and provision of information on how asb had been tackled locally. Therefore the production of a communication strategy by partnerships was seen as essential. Some of the smaller CSPs found it difficult to dedicate the resources to produce a communication strategy of this nature. Some areas had produced self-help guides for local agencies and communities to help them tackle asb problems or were in the process of doing so.

2.51   The use of street wardens, police community support officers and detached youth workers to manage the public's expectations and undertake intergenerational work on asb was cited as very positive. This was particularly the case where their work was well linked into local anti-social behaviour and community safety strategies, although all too frequently work appeared to be not 'joined up'. Inter-agency training, "partnership branding" and effective local handouts and newsletters can enable staff in the various agencies to see themselves as part of a coherent overall initiative.

2.52   The findings of the Police National Reassurance project were thought to be important in establishing more clearly what works effectively with the public in reassurance and confidence building.

2.53   Practitioners were then asked about how information about best practice, good work and innovative approaches could best be shared within the field in their view.

2.54   Most of the answers to this question suggested the most effective method of sharing information on good practice and innovative approaches was networking of practitioners, development of a central enquiry service with practitioner input and through a user friendly website. One respondent commented "I find that there are lots of rules and processes about asb, but have found it hard to get good model cases to use as a basis for my work".

2.55   The final question to practitioners asked what the interface was like locally between the criminal justice system and the community safety system.

2.56   The interface between the criminal justice and community safety systems was seen as being generally at executive level only. Practitioners felt that inter-agency working needed substantial improvement. One example given was "I have wasted time making submissions to the Crown Prosecution Service that turned out to be not what was required, because it was not clear to me what was wanted". Another comment was "there have been difficulties in obtaining information regarding progress of post-conviction ASBOs and breach action at ground level".

2.57   It was felt that nationally work should be undertaken to address the inconsistencies in sentencing for breaches of ASBOs.

2.58   To date very limited guidance appeared to be available for probation staff on the assessment of anti-social behaviour for Pre-Sentence Reports following breach. Generally the lack of engagement with asb issues from probation both at a practice and a management level was seen as a significant issue. The links between the Local Criminal Justice Boards (on which local authorities are not represented) and the Community Safety Partnerships were seen to be very weak in many areas. While the development of processes to deal with Priority and Prolific Offenders had led to improvements in working links, much more needed to be done in other areas of joint concern, notably the resettlement agenda.

Questions to the Audit Commission

2.59   The first of two questions posed to the Audit Commission asked whether, in their view, asb was actually being addressed as a priority in agency strategies (eg the police) and in the key individual departments of local authorities. The second question asked whether the auditors examined how agencies contributed financially to the delivery of a district's asb strategy.

2.60   In answer to the first of these two questions the Working Group was directed to the Corporate Performance Assessment (CPA) 2005 Key Lines of Enquiry (KLOE) which is available on the Audit Commission's website at:

http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/CPA/Downloads/CAKLOEpractitioner.pdf

The other website link suggested was to the revised housing KLOEs where there is a large section on asb.

http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/reports/GUIDANCE.asp?CategoryID=ENGLISH^1628^SUBJECT^1200^GUIDANCE^ABOUT-HOUSING-INSPECTIONS&ProdID=0CD68C37-776C-4C8B-ACAE-133F5A1F727C

The relevant content of these two websites can be found at Appendix E. Some of the initial issues raised by practitioners from these documents were as follows:

- Within the key lines of enquiry for Corporate Assessment there is relatively limited crosscutting between the various categories. In the section on healthier communities, for example, the criteria on engaging with community groups and arrangements to engage with hard to reach young people are clearly highly relevant to the later sections on safer communities and on asb responses. It was felt that a similar cross-reference should be made in the section on older people. Here one of the key criteria is ' the extent to which the council and its partners have supported intergenerational working, such as projects that bring older people and younger people together to share skills and experience in, for example, arts initiatives or education activities.' This is of great relevance to local asb strategies as well. A third area thought to be in obvious need for crosscutting assessment is the section on drugs and alcohol.

- The mainstream lines of enquiry for asb are within the section on safer and stronger communities. Criteria for judgement on preventing crime and the fear of crime are generally relevant also to asb, including data sharing, section 17 work, links with the council's other strategies and media management. The specific section on reduction of asb includes the need for surveys and assessments, as well as the needs of victims, and the mainstreaming of asb work. Interestingly there is no reference to the need for a full range of 'toolbox' options beyond a general reference to prevention, enforcement and rehabilitation within an overall strategic approach.

- Key lines of enquiry within the Audit Commission Housing Inspectorate indicate the need for a clear policy on asb and tenancy agreements which back this up. Although there is an expectation about strong partnerships and involvement in the CSP there is no expectation that asb policies for RSLs should mesh with those of the local CSP. However one of the criteria for excellence is the availability of a full range of remedies, including problem solving options and that these are publicised to the wider community.

2.61   The Working Group were told at the end of January that the second question had been forwarded to staff working on District CPAs but at the time of writing of this report no reply to that question had been received.

3.   SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1   Following the same order as the questions and answers in the previous section of this report a summary of the key issues and some recommendations for ways forward for each set of issues are identified in this section.

Priorities and Target Setting

3.2   The key issues raised under the priorities and target setting section were as follows:

- The broad nature of asb makes target setting problematic.
- The perception of asb is often different to reality and is a concern in its own right.
- The lack of common practice between Registered Social Landlords and in how they fit in with local arrangements for tackling asb (as agreed by the police and local authority) is often problematic. [See example of good practice in this respect submitted by Stockton-on Tees in Appendix G.]
- Asb strategy development is more complex in two tier areas than in unitary areas.
- Currently there is an over-emphasis on enforcement options at the expense of prevention and problem solving options.
- Targets are often vague and enforcement targets are more common than prevention targets.
- Limited information is published in respect of results, impacts and outcomes.
- Links across departments are often not made in tackling environmental crime such as flytipping.
- Little standardisation of the recording of asb data and increase in reporting of asb makes target setting difficult.
- Targets and a common understanding of the problem are often not agreed between departments as other priorities drive them.

3.3   Some recommendations to address some of these issues are as follows:

1.   Anti-social behaviour needs to be broken down into specific categories and target setting then developed for sub-categories, including situational as well as social prevention measures. [This further categorisation of asb could be taken forward by the Home Office working with the police and community safety practitioners – the NCSN may be able to help facilitate this debate.]

2.   Reassurance strategies addressing fear of crime issues should be developed in their own right (but linked to asb and community safety strategies and their content and links reviewed by the relevant auditors) using techniques such as visual audits. Relevant findings from the Police National Reassurance Model should be shared with asb workers. [The NCSN may be able to assist with the sharing of such knowledge in the future.]

3.   Registered Social Landlords should be required to demonstrate how their strategies link with other local asb strategies. [There is a role here for the Housing Corporation and also for local authorities since strategic housing authorities are well positioned to provide a framework for local agencies to integrate their work on asb.]

4.   CSPs, LSPs and auditors should undertake some cross-referencing of targets to see if local targets 'join up' in both unitaries and across two tier authorities – an example of this would be to see how aligned the targets are of the youth service, Children's Services Partnership, community safety team/s and Youth Offending Team in addressing youth-related anti-social behaviour.

5.   Strategies for tackling anti-social behaviour need to be developed within the context of other work to address community cohesion and social inclusion, including youth inclusion (eg under Local Area Agreement arrangements).

6.   Partnerships should collect and publish longer term data on the effectiveness of interventions and the responsibilities for both providing the data and for managing the database should be clearly assigned.

7.   Partnerships should consider co-location or joint management of staff who have allied responsibilities for tackling anti-social behaviour.

8.   Risk factors need to be considered more closely and targets and resources for preventive work should be identified which address these factors. For example, a national study on how earlier intervention with mental health issues might be developed to help to prevent future anti-social behaviour was requested.

Resources and Costs

3.4   The key issues raised under the resources and costs section were as follows:

- No national model exists for costing an asb strategy (or aspects of it such as ASBOs) and there is no guidance for local partnerships as to what they should include if they were to attempt to do so.
- Recharge of legal costs for asb work is rarely taking place.
- It is often difficult to budget appropriately for ASBOs.
- Anti-social behaviour staff are often on short-term contracts and ring fenced funding for asb may be withdrawn shortly.
- Funding for non-statutory partners is often limited and short-term.
- The most fundamental need expressed was for central government to accept that good implementation of a new strategy requires appropriate, dedicated resources assigned on the basis of full and consistent costings. The resource issue is not just a problem for tackling asb but also for related issues too (such

as implementing new closely linked strategies such as the national alcohol strategy and the Priority and Prolific Offender scheme).

3.5 Some recommendations to address some of these issues are as follows:

9. A national model on the current costs of asb to local areas and the costs of responses to it should be developed. It is difficult to justify additional investment without clear cost/benefit analyses. [This is a recommendation that the NCSN would like to discuss further with the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit at the Home Office.]

10. Dedicated budgets for asb interventions should be clearly identified by the local Community Safety Partnership and the Local Strategic Partnership (eg by considering as part of Local Area Agreement and Safer and Stronger Communities Fund negotiations).

11. Budgets and protocols for asb interventions should be subject to scrutiny by scrutiny panels and external auditors, including liaison of RSL auditors with local authority and police auditors.

12. The longer term future and benefits of dedicated anti-social behaviour staff should be considered by each community safety partnership.

13. Improved forward planning and funding for non-statutory providers should be developed (eg by considering as part of Local Area Agreement and Safer and Stronger Communities Fund negotiations).

14. Government should give consideration as part of its 2006 Spending Review as to how the implementation of its new strategies can be resourced as good implementation of strategies requires dedicated resources based on full and consistent costings.

Definitions and Information Gathering, Analysis and Sharing

3.6 The key issues raised under the definitions and information section were as follows:

- Major concerns were expressed about the Home Office's perceived reluctance to develop a common definition of anti-social behaviour to use across partnerships.
- Different agencies record asb in different ways and often on incompatible systems: lack of sufficient, dedicated analytical capability seemed to be a common problem.
- The Police National Intelligence Model rarely uses partners' data or joint tasking mechanisms.
- Little robust data is available on 'what works'.
- Customer satisfaction surveys are working well where used.

3.7   Some recommendations to address some of these issues are as follows:

15.   A common definition of anti-social behaviour should be developed with input from the Home Office, practitioners and legal experts. It may be that continuing to argue for a simple definition is unrealistic. There is an argument for some new terminology, not least because of the need for public expectation to be more realistic and resilient. One possibility is to distinguish quite traditionally between crime, disorder, nuisance and dispute. They are all anti-social but they are potentially so different from each other that a catch all definition may not do. [NCSN may be able to help facilitate this debate.]

16.   More central advice on data management and common data and service standards is needed (eg all partners providing geocoded data to BS7666 standards).

17.   Community safety partnerships should ensure that there are dedicated, data inputting and analytical resources available to map and analyse depersonalised asb data and to input and analyse personalised data with appropriate safeguards in place.

18.   Police and local authority systems for recording anti-social behaviour incidents should be studied at a national level to examine inconsistencies and to make recommendations on how data could be improved.

19.   Improved partnership links should be established with the Police National Intelligence Model. Partners should be tasked and made accountable for asb work within this model (eg the model has been adapted in some areas such as Greater Manchester to allow for the use of information from other agencies).

20.   Government should ensure that a central storage facility for information such as model information sharing protocols, operating procedures and anti-social behaviour strategies is provided which would allow easy access to these documents by practitioners. [This is seen as a priority by the Local Government Association for further discussion with the Improvement and Development Agency.]

21.   Community safety partnerships should ensure that anti-social behaviour work is mainstreamed within community safety at a local authority level. This should encourage the use of common problem solving approaches across the whole range of community safety work including asb. These common approaches need to work with both people and places.

Consistent Management of Anti-Social Behaviour

3.8   The key issues raised under the consistent management of anti-social behaviour cases section were as follows:

- There were wide variations nationally in arrangements for assessment of, and action on, individual cases.
- There were wide variations nationally in the roles of Anti-Social Behaviour Co-ordinators.
- There was a lack of training on assessment and intervention options.
- More knowledge on positive intervention options was needed.
- There was a need to have a fully developed 'toolkit' of intervention options available to each partnership.
- There was a wide variation in protocols in place some of which were incompatible with each other.
- Training for voluntary and community groups was needed and existing good practice should be shared.
- Consistent and proportionate use of appropriate interventions was wanted based on consistent assessment processes – what merits an ASBO or a dispersal order in one area may be very different to another.
- Consideration needs to be given to where ASBOs and action following breach of ASBOs fit into current sentencing and enforcement policies.
- It was difficult to manage public expectations and often difficult to find skills and resources to produce a communications strategy.
- Some interventions were seen as very positive if 'joined up' appropriately eg intergenerational work by the youth service etc.
- More emphasis is needed on early intervention with families, schools and peers. Some good examples of a 'whole family' approach to this issue are given in Appendix F.
- It was hard to get access to good model cases or working examples.
- A national, central enquiry service was wanted staffed by, or with considerable input from, practitioners so that enquiries about anti-social behaviour and community safety issues can be answered and good practice shared.
- There were usually only executive level links only between the Criminal Justice System and community safety systems.
- Nationally there were inconsistencies in sentencing for breaches of ASBOs.
- Local Criminal Justice Board links with CSPs were weak in most cases.

3.9   Some recommendations to address these issues are as follows:

22.   Community safety partnerships should review the need for both operational and strategic co-ordination of asb work and the necessary skills to achieve this.

23.   Co-location of problem solving teams should be considered.

24.   Models for consistent assessment of asb cases should be developed and shared nationally. [This is a recommendation that the NCSN would like to discuss further with the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit at the Home Office.]

25.   Positive interventions should be developed further so that the full range is available in a planned way across all areas. This should include conflict resolving options such as mediation and schemes for incentivised pro-social behaviour such as developing further ABCs for adults.

26.   More emphasis is needed on early intervention with families, schools and peers and this needs appropriate resourcing and also needs to be joined up with the work of the 'Every Child Matters' agenda.

27.   Consideration needs to be given centrally as to where ASBOs and action following breach of ASBOs fit into current sentencing and enforcement policies.

28.   Nationally work should be undertaken to address the inconsistencies in sentencing for breaches of ASBOs.

29.   All CSPs should have both communications strategies and access to communications officers to implement them.

30.   Community development and resilience building approaches to asb need to be developed, enabling communities to tackle problems for themselves.

31.   'Joined up' training for all staff who may be involved in responding to asb is needed eg park attendants, police officers, youth service staff etc. [It was suggested that some of the money saved from the Crime Reduction Centre closure could be re-invested to help develop this type of local training.]

32.   National guidance and training for RSLs is needed on good practice. [The NCSN will discuss this matter further with the National Housing Federation.]

33.   A national enquiry service needs to be further developed with considerable practitioner input based on the single number telephone helpline model of the "Together" Action line. [This is a recommendation that the NCSN would like to discuss further with the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit at the Home Office.]

34.   Links between Local Criminal Justice Boards and Community Safety Partnerships need to be improved.

35.   Each community safety partnership should ensure that dedicated multi-agency panels to deal with individual asb cases are in place in their area.

36.   Each area should review the range of possible voluntary sector providers to see what contribution they could make to delivery of asb services.

37.   Community leaders training needs to be further developed and more widely available using such models as that developed by Milton Keynes. [The NCSN will discuss this need raised by practitioners with the Active Citizenship Centre at the Home Office.]

38.   ASBOs and Individual Support Orders (ISOs) should be capable of having 'positive' requirements including reparatory elements and the effectiveness of different types of ASBOs and ISOs should be assessed.

39.   Unpaid work by offenders should be used more widely in dealing with the consequences of asb. This should include both adults and young offenders. [This work will require further collaboration and appropriate guidance from bodies such as the Youth Justice Board, the National Offender Management Service, the National Probation Directorate and the sections of the Government regional offices which issue advice to CSPs.]

A Suggested Checklist for Good Quality ASB Work

3.10   Overall the suggestions and ideas expressed suggest a *checklist* for good quality asb work which would include the following:

- *A consistent framework for assessment, which is agreed across the area and, ideally, nationally.*
- *Protocols which define roles and responsibilities, and assist with common understanding of the problems and the proper structuring of responses.*
- *Consistent standards of timeliness.*
- *An approach which, following assessment using appropriate information, uses problem solving and preventive approaches as the normal first response.*
- *Agencies providing evidence based, problem-solving approaches, community development and prevention are fully involved in policy and operational structures.*
- *Training and staff development are available and can be updated and staff know how to go about finding good practice examples.*
- *Operational guidance is available and on a cross-agency basis.*
- *A full range of options is available, including early intervention, intergenerational projects, restorative justice and community conferencing. If there are gaps there is both recognition of this and commitment to working to fill them. Voluntary sector involvement in delivery of options to be expanded and compacts with them to be in place.*
- *Personalised and depersonalised data is being collected in a reliable and agreed way across the agencies so that a full picture about incidence and response is available.*
- *RSLs are fully engaged with the local processes.*
- *There are clear structures for both strategy and operation.*
- *A clear communication strategy both for professionals and communities. The findings of the Police National Reassurance project will be important in establishing what works effectively to address asb issues in the public's eyes.*

3.11   Such a checklist could be used by local scrutiny panels and auditors to help monitor that a balanced approach is being taken by partnerships. A successful strategy needs to include all the three elements of prevention, intervention and enforcement.

APPENDIX A: NOTICE TO MEMBERS SENT OUT IN MARCH 2004

The NCSN and Anti-Social Behaviour: Your chance to influence policy and practice

If you are a member of the National Community Safety Network (NCSN), and if you have skills and experience in the field of Anti-Social Behaviour, why not get in touch with us and make your views known? We are also looking for a small number of practitioners to join our national policy working group from June onwards, to help develop a plan of action.

Background:

1. The NCSN's membership has identified ASB as a key priority area for the Network to act as the voice for community safety practitioners with both national and regional government and thereby influence policy. I am leading on this priority on behalf of the Network's Board and now need your help.

2. **First,** I need to understand **your views on the key issues** that we need to address. I would suggest that we need to:

(a) consider ASB in its widest context (for example, including the liveability agenda and streetscene); and, as there has been considerable emphasis on enforcement:

(b) focus on where there are problems with implementing existing legislation, including the capacity of CDRPs/Community Safety Partnerships to deliver;

(c) raise the profile of effective preventive work and work towards a balance of enforcement and prevention.

I am also conscious of the need to avoid unnecessary duplication of work with, for example, the Home Office Anti-Social Behaviour Unit, the Local Government Information Unit, the Local Government Association and other bodies. We are in close contact with them on this subject.

3. **Second,** we would like to know if you or your organisation, as a member of the NCSN, would be interested in **participating in an NCSN working party** and then in any further **national policy group** (e.g. jointly with the Home Office) that may be created as a result.

You or your representative should be able to bring knowledge and expertise in an identified part of this policy area, and the member organisation needs to both allow you the time for this work and pay associated travel costs (if the latter is a real barrier the NCSN may be able to help).

4. Once we have ascertained members' view on the above issue, I shall convene a working group. That group will **develop an action plan** and link up with the other relevant organisations. We will then be in a position to make an important input into national policy before it is developed, rather than reacting to the aftermath.

Timescale:

5. We are intending that the responses from Members are analysed **in time for the NCSN conference in June**. There will be an opportunity in the conference programme for interested members (including those who expressed interest in being involved in the working group) to meet up and discuss at that point in time. We expect that the working group will meet between June and October, to develop an action plan that addresses the key issues.

6. **Please send us your comments on the following:**

   1) **What are the key issues on ASB that the NCSN working group should be addressing?**

   2) **What single change would your Partnership like to see in order to help you to deliver more effectively on ASB?**

   3) **If you wish to join the working group, or to nominate someone from your organisation, please give the name, job title, e-mail address and telephone number, and state what skills and expertise you are they could bring to the group.**

Responses should be sent to enquiries@community-safety.net (NCSN's Head Office) to arrive **no later than 30 April 2004**

Thank you for your interest.

Andy Mills,
Vice Chair,
** NCSN**

Note: ASB is one of the three Policy Areas on which we will be focussing over the next year or so. The other two are:

   1. **Looking at the policy and practice implications of closer working between DAT/CDRP partnerships and their links to Youth Offender Service teams and youth crime; and**
   2. **Looking at the roles, infrastructure, capacity and funding of core Community Safety Teams to see if they are structured and funded in a way that can meet expectations and facilitate delivery.**

APPENDIX B: ISSUES FOR ASB POLICY WORKING GROUP

The following is based on feedback from the E Survey & ASB Policy Issues workshop presentation at Conference

Priority Issues

Issues in order of priority	Comments
1) How do we access sustainable, equitable resources to tackle ASB effectively?	• £s to follow government policies? • Secure funding, ring fenced/mainstream resources to tackle ASB • Resources for legal costs • Influence funding and targets of 'other key players' - Youth Service is known to be under funded and yet eg detached youth work etc has a key role to play here • Need to clarify/develop understanding of resource allocation • Differences between smaller LAs, 2 Tier authorities, rural areas & Northern Ireland • Clarify who has responsibility for & lead for ASB management
2) How are ASB Cases managed?	• Process mapping of case management system/s • Identify/develop models of good practice/prepare toolkit • To include all aspects - not just enforcement e.g. mediation and case management/conferencing issues • May help identify gaps in service provision
3) What do we mean by ASB?	• Common definitions & classification needed - to aid comparisons • National ASB incident reporting system • Must be consistent/accurate - who should record ASB? • May influence resource allocation, if so will need to ensure common counting methods e.g. reports of ASB vs actual incidents
Issues in Order of priority	**Comments**
4) How do we ensure consistency in all aspects of case management?	• Audit of training requirements needed • Develop training programme to ensure consistency on all aspects of ASB management • Guidelines needed to help with above • Accessible to all stakeholders - to include Judiciary, Legal Departments

Other Issues

Other Issues in no specific order	Comments
5) How do we raise the profile of all agencies involved with ASB prevention and support?	• Signposting, who does what - links to training • Directory of agencies needed? • Promote role of specific agencies to ensure balanced approach 'with enforcement at one end' • To include all agencies - e.g. those who may help in identifying potential problems (including housing providers)
6) How do we make communities aware of our work and involve them in tackling ASB?	• Promote inter-generational communication - ASB not just the domain of young people (building tolerance) • Public awareness of what constitutes ASB • Creating local area agreements for estates • Diversionary activities - arts/sports, locally based • Witness support/use of professional witnesses • Role of PCSOs, Wardens, Neighbourhood Watch, etc - links to process mapping • Empowerment - build on & support/develop principles of 'Taking a Stand' awards and provide training in problem solving for community groups • Media strategy to avoid perception of 'us vs media' • Feed back via customer satisfaction - are we making a difference?
Issues in no specific order	**Comments**
7) Legislation - How do we know which is the most appropriate process to use to tackle ASB?	• Links to training e.g. best use of new/existing legislation - e.g. Support/Parenting Orders - what are sanctions for breach? • Appropriate use of legislation - e.g. ' to tackle drugs' • Who should lead ASB cases e.g. when linked to truancy? • Access to court information - e.g. outcome of breaches; leafleting (including associates) - may help with reducing fear in communities • Closer working with CPS • Need for consistent sentences - links to training • Clear policies for U16s • Develop a Positive Order to improve behaviour & engage with agencies • Human Rights Issues
8) What impact will the new licensing laws have on ASB?	• Need to investigate impact of local licensing policies & practice • Need to consider links with National Alcohol Strategy

9) How do we tackle issues linked to abandoned vehicles?	• Legislation to trace last owners of abandoned vehicles - may reduce arson
10) How do we share information across & between agencies?	• Information Sharing Protocol • Need for better joined up working to encourage/involve other agencies e.g. Health & Connexions • Changes to IT systems, will need to clarify what is needed • Accurate recording of ASB

APPENDIX C: QUESTIONS POSED TO COMMUNITY SAFETY PRACTITIONERS AND THE AUDIT COMMISSION

QUESTIONS TO PRACTITIONERS

Priorities and Target Setting

These questions are designed to tease out how asb actually fits into the strategies of agencies, and whether or not the resourcing of work is dealt with on a whole partnership or individual agency basis

Q.1   *Is anti-social behaviour a priority in your partners' (statutory and voluntary) key strategies for prevention/enforcement/resettlement? [Please state where it is and where it is not.]*

Q.2   What are the key targets for asb in the partnership/partner strategies in terms of prevention/enforcement/resettlement?

Q.3   Where are the key gaps in targets for asb and what targets do you think should be required of others? (e.g. does the youth service have targets for tackling asb and, if not, what do you think they should be?)

Resources and Costs

Q.4   Is your asb strategy costed? If so, please supply information and indicate what your costing does and does not include (e.g. does it include the cost of removing abandoned cars/flytipping etc or just the cost of dealing with individuals causing ASB?).

Q.5   Do the organisations/departments involved in delivering your asb strategy have formal agreements as to contributing resources?

Q.6   When (ASBO) cases are progressed, how are costs apportioned between agencies and who leads on case management?

Definition & Information

Q.7   What definition(s) of asb do you use locally (e.g. LGA's, Home Office's)?

Q.8   What are the main data requirements to enable successful consistent management of asb, and what standards for this should be achieved?

Q.9   Are there good tools/systems you are aware of for information collection and sharing, cleaning of data, proper problem identification and tasking and monitoring of effectiveness of work to tackle asb?

Consistent management of asb

Q.10　How is assessment undertaken so that the most appropriate interventions take place in a proportionate and timely way?

Q.11　What structures and protocols are in place?

A trawl of processes would be useful. You could look at how consistency is achieved, as well as how interventions could be taken as quickly as possible - operational guides, areas of delegation, professional discretion, and feedback from the community are all relevant.

Q.12　How is good partnership working to be achieved with a reasonable level of buy-in from the range of partners?

Though protocols and procedures are important the NCSN should have things to say about training and awareness raising on section 17, information sharing, and the nature of asb. How can this best be tackled, and are there some examples of success?

Q.13　What does the full 'tool kit' look like, from preventive options through to ASBOs, and what is the systematic relationship between them? Is there evidence about what works well and in what circumstances? How is availability of the full range of options to be achieved in all areas?

You should explore whether resilience building/diversion, intergenerational issues and community cohesion is taken into account.

Q.14　Public expectations have been raised considerably on asb. How can these expectations be responded to and managed, and how is good information relayed to the public? Which strategies tend to work, and what are the key components?

Q.15　How can information about best practice, good work and innovative approaches be best shared within the field?

Q.16　What is the interface locally between the criminal justice system and the community safety system?

QUESTIONS TO AUDIT COMMISSION

Q.1　Do you check whether asb is actually being addressed as a priority in agency strategies (eg the police) and in the key individual departments of local authorities?

Q.2　Do you examine how agencies contribute financially to the delivery of a district's asb strategy?

APPENDIX D: THAMES VALLEY EXAMPLE OF COMPLEXITY OF ASB STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT IN TWO TIER AREAS COMPILED BY THAMES VALLEY PARTNERSHIP

Anti-social behaviour strategy development continues to be a complex process particularly in two tier areas, and the further issues of third- tier (parish council) links with asb also complicate matters. The new funding arrangements through County authorities are giving real concerns to District Community Safety Partnerships about loss of local control. In two-tier areas prioritisation for asb among partners is a complex matter in relation to Education, Social Services, the Youth Service, Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) and Drug and Alcohol Action Teams (DAATs).

YOTs and DAATs appear to have operated better about the prioritisation of asb as a key strategy than most of the others, not surprisingly.

Other points to make are as follows:

- **Fire and Rescue.** The three Fire and Rescue Services in the Thames Valley have all made asb a priority and have focused primarily at the preventive level, though thinking is now going on about other options. They are all well connected with Community Safety Partnership structures and their contributions to policy thinking and data collection have been positive and well received. The Hoax Impact project engaging young people in secondary schools in West Berkshire is a good example of imaginative inter-agency work. The central innovation here is that the work with young people is going on within the school curriculum. This project involves West Berkshire Education Business Partnership, Vodafone, and Berkshire Fire and Rescue.

- **Social Services** tend to be less well connected with the issues, and is reflected in lower levels of engagement in CSP work. This is an important issue given their role with older people, children and mental health. In Buckinghamshire the county Anti-Social Behaviour Strategy Group has succeeded in achieving representation in respect of these issues, and clearly perseverance is important. Our impression is that for some Social Services Departments the awareness level on asb issues can still be quite low. This impacts adversely on the integration of strategies about health, children's services and early intervention. The implementation of the new Children's Trusts following the Children's Act will have significant strategy implications across the board, and the overarching objectives include both the achievement of safety and 'positive contribution', which are strongly relevant to asb.

- **Health strategies and health agencies** seem not to be well connected generally at strategic level, and again this reflects overall partnership involvement issues. This is true both of Primary Care Trusts and other National Health Service Trusts. Clear areas of mutual concern are alcohol and drug impact, fear of crime and its impact on vulnerable populations. Professor Jonathan Shepherd's scheme in Cardiff is highlighted as a very effective initiative on city centre alcohol and fully engaged the local Accident and Emergency Trust. Similar schemes operate elsewhere including Bedsafe in Bedford and the well- known Manchester City Centre initiative. Mental Health is an important area of concern. Research conducted by Alyson McVean of Buckinghamshire Chiltern College addresses the involvement of drug users and mental

health in asb. Overall on health issues there remain concerns about confidentiality constraints and a national initiative on this is probably necessary.

- **Youth and Community.** Our experience has been that Youth and Community services in the Thames Valley are often short of resources, and thereby can become marginalised from asb strategy and structures. There is also a view that since there is normally representation within YOTs that is where the youth and community input on crime and disorder is made. In fact the youth and community perspective seems vital in any inter-agency initiative, whether it is assessment of asb issues, or consideration of packages of response - on the basis that even if you get and ASBO you will also need to find ways of developing community confidence and resilience.

- **Licensing.** It is too early to say with any clarity how things are going on licensing, but the processes and powers involved are highly relevant to asb, and there should be linked strategies.

- **Local Strategic Partnerships.** We have found, at times, that the real influence strategically is being exercised at the LSP level, but that there can be confusion about how this fits together with the CSP and DAAT. LSPs are not in place in many of the Thames Valley authorities.

- **Housing.** The Thames Valley includes areas where all stock is managed by a lead RSL, and even in the areas which retain significant council managed stock there is substantial RSL presence. Housing providers have all had to produce their own asb policy and plan and the National Federation has taken a lead on this. The number of providers and the fact that they seldom operate co-terminously with local authority CSP boundaries can mean difficulty in co-ordination, problems in representation on asb bodies, and a lack of consistency on responses to asb, both in proportionality, and the range of options. Most RSLs, but not all, have agreements with Mediation schemes. Since all housing providers now have substantial powers, they need to be tied in more closely to other asb agencies, and consistent standards for intervention are needed.

- **Voluntary Sector.** Again, the situation varies enormously in respect of strategy and structures. Sometimes key non-statutory providers sit on case panels, but as a general rule the voluntary sector is not well represented on strategy groups, and the distribution of asb funding disproportionately goes to statutory agencies. A stronger lead is necessary to implement the national Compact and its codes of good practice. The emphasis of the Home Office ASB Unit on enforceable options has tended to marginalise early intervention, conflict resolution and diversion options.

- **Local authorities.** Partnership working is much harder than it looks, and coherent asb performance is much harder to achieve without consistent 'buy in' from some departments. Worse still there is still real difficulty in getting a shared recognition of interlocking responsibility. Part of the problem can be that people go into the silo of their own department's legislative brief and powers. There are some really good examples of what can be achieved when this is tackled, but finding a champion may be just as important as having the paper strategy. A frequently neglected sector is the management of parks and public open space. In the North East and the Thames Valley projects using offenders to turn round parks have been notable successes.

Training is clearly important on section 17 responsibilities. This is discussed in more detail later, but our experience in delivering section 17 training to councillors, and staff members has certainly been that asb is the main focus for their interest. There have been definite advantages in this work being undertaken by an independent provider.

- **Police.** Thames Valley Police is undergoing a major re-organisation into 5 Basic Command Units, and grouping 16 Local Police Areas, which are coterminous with CSPs. There will be an issue about whether to have a distinct Police asb strategy, or 16 local ones, worked up in partnership. In a number of the smaller CSPs Police input is a major part of Community Safety resourcing. Another somewhat overlooked area comes from the British Crime Survey findings about the disproportionate impact of asb on BME populations and young people. To what extent is this recognised in Hate Crime provision, and in Police Race Equality Schemes?

APPENDIX E: EXTRACTS FROM AUDIT COMMISSION'S WEBSITE – CPA 2005

5.2 Safer and stronger communities

Key Question

5.2.1 What has the council, with its partners, achieved in its ambitions for reducing and preventing crime and the fear of crime?

Inspection Focus

Evidence that:

- the council contributes to successful outcomes in reducing and preventing crime and fear of crime, in particular through effective partnership working.
- community safety issues are integrated into the planning and delivery of all council services (i.e. the council's compliance with section 17 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998).

Criteria for Judgement

Level 2	Level 3
• A Crime and Disorder strategy is in place but there is scope for more consistent delivery and more comprehensive analysis of the problems.	• The Crime and Disorder strategy is comprehensive and accessible and shows a proper analysis of the problems. It has strong links with the council's community and other strategies.
• There is scope for improving the working arrangements with all relevant partners.	• Partnership working is focused and shows an understanding of the roles and responsibilities of other members.
• The Crime and Disorder Reduction audit covers the key problem areas, but further analysis is needed to inform resource allocation decisions and targeted action.	• The audit is proactive, targeted and effective.
• There is some evidence of community consultation, including hard-to-reach groups, but the impact on decisions regarding local priorities is unclear.	• The community, including ethnic minority and hard to reach groups, has been asked for their views and these have been used to inform decisions about priorities and hot spots.
• Section 17 is acknowledged in principle, including a council-wide approach to tackling domestic violence, but it is inconsistently delivered and not embedded.	• The council can evidence how Section 17 has informed service delivery priorities, including domestic violence.
• The council has secured approved government funding but with a pocketed and silo approach.	• The council has contributed council resources and secured Government funding to support the strategy short to medium term (1 to 2 years).
• The council has some arrangements in place for recording projects as part of the Crime & Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) but they lack evaluation of performance, its own contribution and outcomes.	• The council contributes to performance management arrangements for the CDRP strategy and is able to identify council contribution through internal monitoring.
• Elected Members and senior officers demonstrate some knowledge of community safety priorities but actual involvement is ad hoc.	• Elected members and senior officers involvement is planned and systematic.
• The council has some publicity arrangements to work with the media to support public reassurance on fear of crime.	• The council has a media management strategy that, in partnership with other agencies, helps to provide public reassurance to reduce people's fear of crime.
• The council has some understanding of the nature of local problems and has arrangements in place to reduce signs of crime and disorder, for example, graffiti removal.	• The council shares information with partners to obtain a comprehensive picture of local problems, which is updated regularly and used to take action on 'signs' of crime, for example, graffiti, fly tipping.

Key Question

5.2.2 What has the council, with its partners, achieved in its ambitions for reducing antisocial behaviour (ASB)?

Inspection Focus

Evidence that the council:

- contributes to successful outcomes in reducing antisocial behaviour (ASB), in particular through effective partnership working
- takes a strategic approach, integrating its response to tackling antisocial behaviour across all services it delivers.

Criteria for Judgement

Level 2	Level 3
• The council has a policy and procedure in place internally for dealing with ASB. • The council has arrangements with its partners to handle reports of ASB and is able to respond to calls on a case by case basis. • The council and its partners disseminate publicity about ASB to the public and the public has access to an identified number to call. • The council monitors incidents of ASB on a case by case basis and undertakes surveys as part of an annual review of the service. • The council is able to provide some targeted support to victims and witnesses of ASB and records information about ASB incidents internally but has yet to share this more widely. • The council, with its partners, is addressing prevention, enforcement and rehabilitation issues in response to reported incidents of ASB but there is scope for improvement in the mapping of local activity or hot spots to take proactive action. • There are local initiatives to tackle ASB, which are shared across council services, and although the council is able to respond to expressed local concerns, these are not yet part of a planned or sustained corporate approach to improving the quality of life.	• The council has arrangements in place to enable the public to report ASB and respond to incidents, analyses them and has agreed definitions and criteria with partners. • The council routinely provides feedback to people who make reports about the action that will be taken in response to their report. • The council undertakes surveys and opinion-seeking exercises to establish local perceptions of the problems and extent of anti-social behaviour, in order to prioritise its enforcement and prevention actions effectively. • The council offers support to victims of anti-social behaviour, including when reporting issues or giving evidence in court cases. • The council shares information with its partners to obtain a comprehensive picture of the local problems, and this is updated regularly. • This is used to inform a joint approach with partners covering prevention, enforcement and rehabilitation in ASB cases as part of a planned and strategic approach. • The council integrates concerns about safety and ASB into all the services it delivers and into the planning of the local environment. • The council can demonstrate improvements in the quality of life of local residents as part of a corporate approach to sustain communities.

HOUSING KLOEs

Key Line of Enquiry	An Organisation Delivering an Excellent Service	An Organisation Delivering a Fair Service
Enforcing tenancy conditions and dealing with anti-social behaviour • Does the organisation effectively deal with all incidents of nuisance, anti social behaviour (ASB) and harassment by responding to incidents rapidly, in accordance with published procedures and their legal remedies? • How quickly and sensitively does the organisation handle neighbour disputes, promoting mediation where appropriate? • Have effective partnerships been formed at a local level with statutory agencies, council departments and other landlords to ensure the most appropriate response to ASB and the sharing of information?	• Has a comprehensive, clear and accessible statement of policies and procedures on ASB and takes a robust stance in tackling nuisance, ASB and harassment, which is reviewed regularly. • Has a tenancy agreement which contains clear and comprehensive conditions relating to nuisance and ASB and the sanctions available where these are breached. Has evidence that it has enforced these conditions when necessary. • Takes a proactive and innovative approach to combat anti-social behaviour through security measures, local lettings policies and community development activities, such as youth work. • Ensures that residents can easily report breaches of tenancy conditions, and has efficient and effective arrangements for dealing with them. Keeps complainants informed about the progress of their case from the point of complaint to resolution and beyond. • Has strong partnerships with other agencies eg, social services, environmental health, the police and other landlords in tackling anti-social behaviour and strong protocols for sharing information. Is an active member of the strategic partnership eg, the Crime and Disorder or the Community Safety Partnership. • Uses the full range of remedies as appropriate to address ASB, including mediation, injunctions and exclusion orders, acceptable behaviour contracts (ABCs), anti-social behaviour orders (ASBOs), possession proceedings and introductory/ starter tenancies – and publicises to the wider community the	• Can deal with one-off cases of nuisance, ASB or harassment well, but does not have a systematic approach to dealing with anti-social behaviour, abandoned properties or unauthorised occupation. • Has a statement of policies and procedures on ASB, but it is not comprehensive, clear or accessible. • Does not spell out expectations about anti-social behaviour clearly in the tenancy agreement and conditions. Has little substantive evidence that it has systematically enforced the tenancy conditions when breached. • Takes a generally reactive approach to dealing with anti-social behaviour. • Does not make it easy for all groups of tenants to report anti-social behaviour. • Has procedures, which are not clear to service users or staff and they are not implemented consistently. As a result, tenants receive an inequitable service. • Is involved in some partnership working but it is ad-hoc, and largely at the instigation of individual managers, with ad-hoc information sharing arrangements. • Demonstrates only limited evidence of proactive work to 'design' out crime and improve security measures for service users where appropriate. • Demonstrates only some successful use of the full range of remedies for ASB and the enforcement of tenancy conditions, so outcomes for service users is

	successful use of such remedies.	not consistent or very systematic, and undertakes limited publicity in the use of remedies to deal with ASB.
	• Has established good working arrangements with local courts to deliver efficient processes for legal proceedings, including witness protection.	
		• Demonstrates only patchy evidence on some estates of systematically managing difficult tenancies or seeking to make sustainable lettings.
	• Works with planning departments and/ or housing associations to ensure that crime prevention is a key issue in designing estate improvements and new homes.	
		• Generally places the onus on the victim to record and supply evidence to support complaints of, sometimes serious, anti-social behaviour.
	• Uses a range of methods to gather evidence - for example professional witnesses, CCTV, video cameras, noise monitoring equipment etc.	
		• Does not fully support victims or witnesses and there is little understanding or attempts to use professional witnesses or evidence gathering equipment systematically.
	• Works proactively to promote, support and sustain tenancies through mechanisms like the use of floating support, rather than terminating or demoting them.	
		• Does not always fully support perpetrators to amend their behaviour, where this is a reasonable remedy to addressing the ASB concerned.
	• Supports victims either directly or in conjunction with specialist care and support agencies.	
		• Has service users who believe that the organisation performs inconsistently in response to reports of ASB.
	• Fully supports perpetrators to amend their behaviour where this is a reasonable remedy to addressing the ASB concerned.	
		• Does not systematically monitor the impact of incidents and take action to improve the service.
	• Has service users who report a high level of satisfaction with the way anti-social behaviour is managed, whether they are victims of ASB or not.	
	• Records and monitors reports of ASB and other criminal activities and reviews strategies and policies in light of these to improve services.	
Estate management • Does the organisation comply with the statutory requirements and good practice in estate management?	• Has estates which are clean, tidy and attractive. Abandoned vehicles, graffiti and vandalism are dealt with swiftly according to set procedures.	• Does not maintain estates consistently well, with visible evidence of neglect and poor management in some areas. Abandoned vehicles, graffiti and vandalism are not dealt with effectively.
	• Systematically inspects all estates working with local residents to identify illegal parking, abandoned vehicles, footpaths, cleaning standards, condition of	• Has some good systems in place to identify problems in communal areas, but does not routinely involve

• Are estate grounds and other communal areas kept clean, tidy and attractive by working closely with service users, other departments and external agencies?	communal facilities (particularly play equipment) and graffiti. It deals quickly and efficiently with the issues identified. • Takes steps to identify those responsible for unauthorised dumping and other environmental damage, and takes appropriate action under its tenancy management or other, legal procedures. • Ensures that animals do not cause environmental damage or nuisance on its estates, and works well with dog warden and animal welfare organisations to remove stray dogs. • Ensures the most efficient use of its garages and parking areas, taking into account the needs of its services users – tenants and leaseholders - and other stakeholders, and design limitations. • Takes a proactive approach to increasing security and 'designing out' crime to communal areas. • Works in partnership to deliver services, where appropriate; has clear arrangements for referral and signposting to other services and actively seeks out learning and best practice from elsewhere.	service users in estate inspections and systematically identifying problems. • Lines of responsibility for different strands of the service are not always clearly defined leading to confusion amongst both service users and staff on who is ultimately responsible for dealing with problems in some parts of the service, which leads to unnecessary delays in resolving problems. • May deal with one aspect of the service well but not another. Eg, it may remedy the problem quickly, but not identify and resolve/deter the cause of the problem. • Can deal with one-off cases well, but does not have a systematic approach to dealing with environmental problems on its estates. • Responds reactively to environmental issues, often well, rather than planning ahead to avoid them. • Has not taken a systematic approach to dealing with parking and traffic management problems on its estates. Does not make the best use of available space. • Inspects its play equipment on a regular basis, but may be slow to repair or make it safe. • May have examples of good practice, but cannot demonstrate proactive work to 'designing' out crime and improve security measures for residents where appropriate. • Can show little evidence of preventative initiatives working jointly with local communities and other organisations.

APPENDIX F: TRAILBLAZER FAMILY ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR PROJECTS

Recently the Home Office announced nine Trailblazer, family anti-social behaviour projects designed to test out different approaches to tackling problem families (details below).

BIRMINGHAM: Choices project

Type of provision: Floating support delivered through dedicated team, managed by voluntary agency, hosted by the YOT

Staffing: Project manager plus 2 project workers, plus volunteers
Area: City wide
Eligibility: no restrictions on tenure, aimed at families threatened by eviction or following eviction
Numbers to be worked with: 25 families per annum from April 05
Referral routes: via BASBU only

Delivery:
Via Youth Offending Service who have contracted out project to partner agency who currently provide family work
Assessment by project worker to be followed by development of individual supervision plan
Interventions to last for up to 12 months (flexible dependant on needs)
Interventions will be delivered to family in their home or at project premises, supervised by project worker
Range of interventions to include parental support, living skills, budget management
Participation will be voluntary, refusal to work with project and address behaviour could lead to eviction and/or barriers facing future rehousing.

Outcomes:
Reduction in asb
Long term behavioural change amongst families
Prevention of eviction and subsequent homelessness

Contact: Paula Nesbitt Paulak.Nesbitt@Birmingham.gov.uk

BRIGHTON: Tackling anti-social behaviour: family and parenting support project

Type of provision: Project provides flexible packages of support, reinforced by enforcement, to be delivered through statutory and voluntary agencies. Includes some residential provision. Delivered by LA, working through multi-agency panel.

Staffing: One f/t co-ordinator to pull together statutory interventions plus extra interventions funded through balance of ASBU grant
Target: Initially LA tenants only, possible future extension to RSLs. Families committing high levels of asb, at risk of home loss, and asb is damaging family and community.

Assessment based on children's needs, parental needs and environmental factors (including needs of community). Eligibility decided by monthly multi-agency asb planning meeting following assessment process.

Area: City wide

Numbers: 6-8 families per annum

Referral routes: via asb planning meeting

Delivery:

Assessment:

Initial referral to project co-ordinator. Case conference to assess needs, provision and whether family is believed to be capable of change. Recommendations on what enforcement and support is needed agreed by asb planning meeting.

Implementation:

Lead professional will work with family. Co-ordinator to liaise with residents and wider community where needed. Any significant changes in circumstances, including escalation of behaviour will trigger a reassessment.

Interventions:

Support package will be drawn up by co-ordinator and agreed with family, and asb planning meeting. Wide menu of options to be offered, including intensive family support services as live-in arrangement or 24 hour call, plus mediation, reparation and restorative justice.

As well as floating support in existing home, options will include respite rehousing (either for whole family or one member), relocation to LA stock (including on probationary tenancy), rehousing in permanent LA tenancy following successful outcome.

Support package to be reinforced by enforcement measures as appropriate (including parenting orders, ASBOs, YOT interventions)

Steering group:

Children, Families and Schools service to input to development and possible management steering group

Outcomes:

Reduction in offending and asb by household

Prevention of eviction and homelessness

Preventing children becoming 'looked after' because of asb

Contact: Linda Beanlands, linda.beanlands@brighton-hove.gov.uk

BRISTOL: Whole family support programme

Type of provision: Intensive support for families on cusp of formal action. Family behaviour contracts to be developed, including consultation with community about standards of behaviour to be expected. Family group conference to be used to develop contract and address behaviour by outlining behavioural conditions and appropriate support.

Staffing: 2 f/t staff plus police secondee

Eligibility: families with history of asb on cusp of formal action (eg eviction, ASBOs, injunctions) who are being considered at citywide case conference and who are willing to engage with programme. No tenure restrictions.

Area: North Bristol, City-wide roll out April 2005
Numbers: approx 25 families per annum
Referral routes: families being considered by asb case conference via referral from housing, police or other agencies

Delivery:
Case conference determines legal action to be taken and whether referral is appropriate. In event of non-engagement with project legal action proceeds.
Development of family behaviour contract via family group conference involving whole family and relevant agencies.
Contract outlines expected standards of behaviour, multi-agency support and provision and clear process for formal action in case of contract breach.
Family contract to run for set period between 3-6 months with weekly contact by keyworker.
Possible range of support interventions include drug services, educational welfare and parenting support via Barnardos or Parentline Plus.
Decision on whether standards have been met to consider submissions from victims/witnesses and agencies and community groups.
Where appropriate restorative justice process to take place between perpetrators and victims at end of involvement.

Outcomes:
Decrease in number of ASB complaints associated with household
Increase in resolution of ASB prior to formal action
Increase in community's confidence to tackle ASB
Maintenance of tenancies/sustainable route back to settled housing for targeted families

Evaluation:
Qualitative: Impact statement/interview with complainants/victims prior to project engagement and at end of project engagement with family. Interview with family prior to project engagement and at end of project engagement with family. Where appropriate RJ feedback.
Quantitative: before/after comparison of ASB complaints from relevant agencies (housing, noise pollution, police). Using crime data analysis. Some estimates of cost effectiveness (project vs potential formal action)

Contact: Sue Strickland, 0117 9585104, sue_strickland@bristol-city.gov.uk or Helen Morgan helen_morgan@bristol-city.gov.uk

CAMDEN: Camden Intensive Parenting Programme

Type of provision: Intensive support to parents of children/young people committing most problematic asb and low level crime, offering a range of support, emphasis on interventions via therapeutically trained practitioners such as psychologists.

Staffing: one f/t senior practitioner. Post based in multi-agency liaison team (joint social services and CAMHS project).

Eligibility: parents of children/young people committing most problematic asb acts. Priority to referrals via Camden Town and Holborn YISPs, parents referred to Families in Focus by social services where there is an asb dimension.
Area: borough wide
Numbers: 2004-5 15 families worked with, 2005-6: 21 families worked with
Referral routes: asb action group, YOT, Education, Social Services, voluntary sector and YISP.

Delivery:

Initial assessment leads to a referral to existing parenting programmes if low/medium problems identified. If high level of problems are identified, then one to one work by lead professional plus referral to other support.
Participation in IPSS is voluntary or as a conditions of an ASBO. Continued failure to comply could lead to attendance becoming part of Parenting Order.
Interventions will include work on school attendance, parenting group programmes (Families in Focus model), plus therapeutic input (multi-systemic therapy) delivered to families and young people.
Year one delivery will be via home visits, with IPP lead professional accompanied by other professions already working with the family.
Year two will continue home visits, with potential to use court orders further if behaviour does not improve.

Outcomes:
Measurable reduction in behaviour problems presented by young people

Contact: Ronke Martins ronke.martins@camden.gov.uk

LEEDS: Signpost project

Type of provision: Intensive support to young people and their families in tackling asb

Staffing: Co-ordinator and youth worker and education worker. Plus sessional staff and admin support
Type of provision: Intensive support via dedicated team, working with partner agencies and commissioned services
Eligibility: 9-14 year olds, either served with ASBO, and ASBO warning, signed an ABC, or early involvement in asb with potential to escalate, and their families
Area: South Leeds focus, targeted at Beeston Hill (inner South Leeds) and West Ardsley (Eastleighs area)
Numbers: 20 families 2004-5; 2005-6 40 families
Referral routes: schools, housing, social services, ASBU (Leeds), police, Yot

Delivery:
Staff trained in assessment skills, and specialist issues around drug and substance misuse, mental health, domestic violence issues, conflict resolution and counselling skills and in solution focused brief therapy techniques.
Partnership working with schools/Education departments, young people will be offered incentives including one to one support at schools, access to supplementary education and access to leisure facilities.

Range of support to be purchased, including family group conferencing service (Children's Society); Positive Parenting Programme (Crime Concern), family therapy, counselling services and after school activities through primary schools.

Where families reluctant to engage, will incorporate attendance at project into conditions of ASBO

Outcomes:
Significant reduction of recorded asb amongst families
Reduction in neighbourhood complaints about asb incidents from families
Change in attitudes to asb (evidenced by questionnaires completed pre and post involvement)
Parenting capacity built (through attendance at parenting programmes etc)
Reduction of truancy and exclusions amongst young people involved with Signpost
Improvements in self esteem and confidence amongst young people

Contact: Dave Richmond dave.richmond@leeds.gov.uk, Munaf Patel mpsignpost@yahoo.co.uk

LIVERPOOL: Project in development

MANCHESTER

Type of provision: Intensive support to one family heavily involved in asb; plus targeted support for families identified by area case work panels where children are at risk of becoming 'looked after'

Staffing: One practice development post
Type of provision: Two elements: A) multi-agency intervention for one prolific asb family B) Specialist post to provide support for areas with highest levels of asb, via one to one support for parents plus referral to other support as needed
Eligibility: families identified by area case work panels as being most in need of this intervention. No tenure restrictions.
Area: Citywide
Numbers: Targeted at 50 children most likely to be taken into care because of their asb
Referral routes: Identified by area case work panels

Delivery:
A) Intensive work with one family
Multi-agency intervention for one family in TA, including key worker support, tagging technology and interventions to ensure school attendance.
B) Targeted support for families
New Practice Development post will support area case work panels, which focus on families known to have asb involvement.
Interventions will be targeted at families of children (mostly teenagers) at risk of being taken into care because of asb.
Postholder will work with practitioners to develop packages for families. support will include one to one work with parents and/or signposting to other services eg parenting courses, anger management, counselling.

Postholder will also manage key workers work on strand A.
From January to March 2005, funding will enhance delivery of ISOs and parenting orders to young people on ASBOs.

Outcomes:
Reduction in numbers of young people becoming 'looked after' as a result of their anti-social behaviour
Reduction in incidents of anti-social behaviour
Improvement in school attendance

Contact: s.woods-gallagher@manchester.gov.uk

SHEFFIELD: Trailblazer Plus

Type of provision: Enhancement to existing High Support Service to provide parenting interventions, plus new wrap around service for families not in High Support service where there are asb problems

Staffing: via existing posts funded from other sources
Eligibility: Priority to families in High Support Unit. For families not in High Support Unit, target group will be families where young people are subject to ABC or ASBO, known to Sheffield Homes ASB team, or involved in Yot or YISP
Area: City wide
Numbers: 30 families at High Support Service receive extra support in 2004-5, parenting courses for 15 extra families.
Referral routes: For those not in High Support Service, via Sheffield Homes, Yot or YISP

Delivery:
Increase capacity of High Support Service to deliver parenting courses. Assist parents to access necessary support through other services (eg drugs/alcohol support).
Provide more intensive targeted work with families in High Support Service, using group parenting training, and key worker support.
Remove barriers to accessing service by providing childcare, transport etc.
Enhanced service for families where children are displaying asb problems, via one to one provision, parenting courses, anger management, access to Father Figures course, plus support with transport and childcare. Personal development course for teenagers and a dinosaur course for younger children.
Set up 'virtual support framework' for families not in High Support Unit but where children subject to ASBO or ABC and family has support needs.
Provide access to High Support Service Parenting courses and other wrap around support.

Outcomes:
Reduction in incidences and levels of asb
Improvement in school attendance
Increased tenancy sustainability
Rent payments maximised
Increased compliance with court orders

Contact: Liz Bashforth liz.bashforth@sheffield.gov.uk, Julia Cayless
Julia.Cayless@sheffield.gov.uk

SUNDERLAND

Type of provision: Three pronged approach: a new tenancy support service for families at risk of eviction or who have been evicted, expansion of existing YISP provision so it becomes citywide; and expansion of support to parents who children are subject of YOS intervention.

Staffing: Two YISP workers
Eligibility: Families at risk of eviction or who have been evicted, cross tenure (for family support service). For YISP based provision: young people involved in asb
Area: Citywide
Numbers: 5 families over 12 months, no of young people supported by YISP to be notified.
Referral routes: LA anti-social behaviour officers, RSLs, accredited private landlords, homelessness service for tenancy support service; young people targeted by YISP and YOS for other elements of work

Delivery:
Tenancy support service
Families referred to tenancy support service will be assessed, criteria for acceptance will be that efforts have already been made to deal with behaviour and clear support needs exist.
Support will be provided by agencies who will provide tenancy support services and ensure appropriate multi-agency liaison on the case. Tenant will sign agreement for support plan, which will set out clear enforcement consequences of not engaging with the service,
Families will need to agree to work with scheme as acceptance criteria
Packages of support tailored for individual needs will be provided for average of 12 months. Regular reviews will determine length of support programme, Reviews will be by multi-agency panel.
YISP expansion
YISP activity will be expanded from North Sunderland to cover entire City
Young people will be supported by the 'Wear Kids' programme, providing mentoring and support, linking in to asb action. Strong links to tenancy relations team.
Parents of young people involved with YISP will be offered parenting programmes if needed
Parenting support
This will enhance existing support to parents whose children are involved with YISP or YOS via Barnardos to extend support to weekends and evenings.

Outcomes:
Indicators are:
Increase in length of stay in tenancy
Reduction breaches of enforcement measures
Increased co-operation with agreed support measures

Progress on relevant interventions eg alcohol/drugs treatment, employment, school attendance

Contact: Judith Morton judith.morton@sunderland.gov.uk

WESTMINSTER

Type of provision: Increase capacity of YISP provision in borough by creating a senior YISP to work with 13 to 18 year olds. Junior YISP – 8 to 13 year olds – given enhanced capacity to provide parenting support

Staffing: total team includes team leader, 4 key workers, floating support worker to work with families at risk of loosing tenancies plus administrator (ASBU funding enhanced by other sources)

Eligibility: young people aged 8-18, and displaying risk factors associated with asb or offending, no tenure restrictions, and their families.

Area: Borough wide

Numbers: 400 young people referred to YISP pa (200 to junior YISP; 200 to senior YISP); parenting support for 45-50 families.

Referral routes: no restrictions on agencies that can refer to YISPs, self referrals also accepted

Delivery:

Expansion of junior YISP by providing floating support packages to enhance current parenting support services for families at risk of eviction

Establishment of new senior YISP in the borough. The new Westminster YISP will provide a comprehensive service focused on 8 to 18 year olds from April 2005.

YISP panel widely publicised, and includes representatives of key statutory agencies, voluntary agencies and member of the community

All children and young people referred to the scheme will be assessed, those eligible will go forward to one of the two monthly multi-agency panel meetings. Others will be referred directly to other agencies for support and some will be worked with directly by the key workers.

Floating support worker seconded from housing association will work with families at risk of tenancy loss referred through both YISPs

Outcomes:

Prevention of asb by children and young people

Prevention of eviction

Rehousing following eviction

Improvement in school attendance and attainment

Reduction in number of young people in Westminster entering the Youth Justice system.

Contact: Eamon Brennnan ebrennan@westminster.gov.uk

APPENDIX G: TEES VALLEY HOUSING GROUP AND STOCKTON BOROUGH COUNCIL – PARTNERSHIP WORKING TO COMBAT ASB

The article below was submitted to the ASB Working Party as an example of a Registered Social Landlord working well in partnership with a local authority to tackle anti-social behaviour. The article appeared in Issue 7 March 2005 of 'Spotlight on Housing Management', which is the Chartered Institute of Housing monthly magazine which goes in as an insert to Inside Housing.

Tees Valley Housing Group and Stockton Borough Council - Partnership Working to combat asb

'As a relatively small RSL (around 4000 units), Tees Valley was not in a position to support a dedicated specialist officer to tackle anti-social behaviour on its estates. Instead, partnerships have been formed with other agencies, including Stockton Borough Council's ASB officers. Partnership working with a larger organisation has enabled Tees Valley to learn from shared experiences. Stockton Borough Council have assisted Tees Valley Housing Group to draw up Anti-social behaviour contracts, carried out joint interviews, advised on estate security measures, attended residents meetings to offer practical guidance and support, secured access to other partner agencies and developed links with community wardens. Additionally ASB officers have delivered joint training with the local police to Tees Valleys' front line staff. A service level agreement has also been secured with Stockton's legal department for the Council to tackle any legal cases within the borough. Tees Valley Housing Officers have also had the opportunity to shadow Stockton Tenancy Enforcement Officers to gain hands-on experience and training from specialists who deal with such cases on a daily basis.'

The local authority involve RSLs in monthly police led area liaison meetings where issues of asb are raised and multi agency solutions are proposed, this ensures the local authority are not working in isolation and the most appropriate support options or enforcement tools are used. RSLs are also invited to contribute to Problem Solving Group Meetings which deal with higher level cases of asb when eviction, injunction, ASBO, closure orders etc are under consideration.

The local authority Anti Social Behaviour Team holds information on actions taken to tackle ASB including action taken by RSLs on a single database to help us to map hot spots when overlaid with data from the crime and disorder mapping system Profiler. RSLs contribute to the cost of this system. It also offers a free referencing service and all RSLs in the borough (and many private landlords) use this prior to considering allocating a property to prospective tenants, the information we supplied covers 3 years housing history detailing: involvement in ASB, rent arrears, abandonment of tenancy and damage to property. The decision on granting a tenancy remains with the RSL or private landlord, if issues of ASB have been present, and the landlord wishes to grant the tenancy the Anti Social Behaviour Support officer can offer short term intensive support and assistance to help to get the family back on track. This service is also available to help sustain vulnerable tenancies. There are 130-150 landlords members and this scheme is proving to be effective in stopping the revolving door whereby tenants cause problems, lose their tenancy and then move a few doors away creating problems for the community again.

A protocol has been developed between RSLs and the ASB Team. The ASB Team use a customer satisfaction form to send to individuals when a case is closed.