



CRIME & DISORDER COMMITTEE AGENDA

7.30 pm

**Tuesday
29 November 2011**

**Town Hall, Main Road,
Romford**

Members 9: Quorum 3

COUNCILLORS:

Ted Eden (Chairman)
John Wood (Vice-Chair)
Becky Bennett
Denis Breading
David Durant

Roger Evans
Georgina Galpin
Frederick Osborne
Linda van den Hende

**For information about the meeting please contact:
James Goodwin 01708 432432
james.goodwin@havering.gov.uk**

What is Overview & Scrutiny?

Each local authority is required by law to establish an overview and scrutiny function to support and scrutinise the Council's executive arrangements. Each overview and scrutiny committee has its own remit as set out in the terms of reference but they each meet to consider issues of local importance.

They have a number of key roles:

1. Providing a critical friend challenge to policy and decision makers;
2. Driving improvement in public services;
3. Holding key local partners to account; and
4. Enabling the voice and concerns of the public.

The Crime and Disorder Committee considers issues by receiving information from, and questioning, Cabinet Members, officers and external partners, particularly the Responsible Authorities, i.e. Metropolitan Police, Metropolitan Police Authority, Fire and Rescue Authorities, and Primary Care Trusts, to develop an understanding of proposals, policy and practices. They can then develop recommendations that they believe will improve performance, or as a response to public consultations.

Committees will often establish Topic Groups to examine specific areas in much greater detail. These groups typically consist of between 3-6 Members and the review period can last for anything from a few weeks to a year or more to allow the Members to comprehensively examine an issue through interviewing expert witnesses, conducting research and site visits. Once the topic group has finished its work it will send a report to the Committee that created it and it will often suggest recommendations to the executive.

Terms of Reference

The areas scrutinised by the Committee are in exercise of the functions conferred by the Police and Justice Act 2006, Section 19-22 and Schedules 8 & 9.

AGENDA ITEMS

1 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman will announce details of the arrangements in case of fire or other events that might require the meeting room or building's evacuation.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

(if any) – receive.

3 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Members are invited to declare any interests in any of the items on the agenda at this point of the meeting. Members may still declare an interest in any item at any time prior to the consideration of the matter.

4 MINUTES OF THE MEETING (Pages 1 - 6)

To approve as correct the minutes of the meetings held on 14 July 2011 and authorise the Chairman to sign them.

5 WORK OF THE TRADING STANDARDS TEAM

To receive a presentation from Public Protection Service Manager.

6 CORE CASE INSPECTION OF YOUTH OFFENDING WORK IN HAVERING (Pages 7 - 10)

Report attached.

7 UPDATE ON THE POLICE REFORM AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT 2011 (Pages 11 - 16)

Report attached.

8 URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any other item in respect of which the Chairman is of the opinion, by reason of special circumstances which shall be specific in the minutes that the item should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency.

**Ian Buckmaster
Committee Administration &
Member Support Manager**

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
CRIME & DISORDER COMMITTEE
Committee Room 3A - Town Hall
11 October 2011 (7.30 - 9.10 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS

Conservative Group	Ted Eden (Chairman), Becky Bennett, Roger Evans, Georgina Galpin and Frederick Osborne
Residents' Group	John Wood (Vice-Chair) and Linda van den Hende
Labour Group	Denis Breading
Independent Residents Group	David Durant

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors .

All decisions were taken with no votes against.

The Chairman reminded Members of the action to be taken in an emergency.

41 MINUTES OF THE MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 July 2011 and of the Special meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees held on 28 July 2011 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

42 FUTURE OF THE SAFER NEIGHBOURHOOD TEAMS

Chief Inspector David Hay attended the meeting to give a presentation on the future of the Safer Neighbourhood Teams. He advised the Committee that the outcome of the review was that:

1. Safer Neighbourhood Teams would maintain their existing structure, with the ability to temporarily flex resources across ward boundaries in response to specific problems;
2. the principle of 2 PC's and 3 PCSO's (6 PCSO's on enhanced wards) would remain unchanged.
3. the default geographic area covered by every Safer Neighbourhood Team would continue to be the ward unless there were exceptional reasons to amend these boundaries so that they met local needs.

4. All Safer Neighbourhood resources will work to a shift pattern that meets local needs but which, in particular, will reflect Safer Neighbourhood demand and the desire of Londoners to have an appropriate number of officers on duty during evenings and weekends.
5. Frontline leadership of teams will be provided by Safer Neighbourhood Sergeants, who will cover either a team or teams depending on the need, demand and complexity of the policing environment.
6. Crime reduction and tackling Anti-Social Behaviour were objectives of Safer Neighbourhood Team activity.
7. Across London the number of Safer Neighbourhood Team Sergeants will reduce by 150.

For Havering this meant a reduction of 4 Sergeants, as a result of which the following wards would be paired and supervised by one Sergeant:

- Mawneys/Havering Park
- Pettits/Squirrels heath
- Hacton/Elm Park
- Upminster/Cranham.
-

Issues around the selection of the Sergeants and what happens to the four losing their positions were addressed by the Borough Commander and Chief Inspector David Hay. Chief Inspector Hay informed the Committee that staffing levels would remain the same and recruitment had taken place to bring them up to level.

One of the Councillors raised the issue of Will Perrin Court, he was given an assurance by the Borough Commander that the correct procedure to ensure the Metropolitan Police views were available to the Planners was followed.

The Committee thanked Chief Superintendent Hay for his presentation and noted the report.

43 **HAVERING COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP - PRIORITIES FOR 2011/12**

The HCSP Analyst delivered a presentation outlining the Havering Community Safety partnership priorities for 2011/12. The targets and progress to date were:

	End August	Target	Direction of Travel
Serious wounding	9%	-2%	▼
Assault With Injury	-4%	-2%	▲
Violence with Injury	-2%	-2%	▲
Residential Burglary	1%	-1%	◀▶
Non Residential Burglary	33%	-1%	▲
Taking/Theft of Motor Vehicle	8%	-1%	▼
Theft from Motor Vehicle	-4%	-1%	▲
Domestic Offences	47.5%	47%SD	◀▶
Anti-Social Behaviour	0%	-2%	◀▶
Fires	62%	217	Not reported

The Committee were advised that the Fire Brigade was not concerned at the number of fires during this period as this was the peak time for fires and previous experience showed there would be a drop off over the remainder of the year.

Details were given of the comparison with neighbouring boroughs and our I-Quanta family. In response to a question officers explained that the peak period for residential burglary was December and January, and it was during this period that the Partnership concentrated there efforts.

Details were given of the work in the Harold Hill Dispersal Zone and the boroughs comparative performance in respect of alcohol. Whilst there was a perception that there was a drinks culture in Romford Town Centre, the borough copes better than most areas.

Concern was expressed at the figures for Domestic Violence. The borough had a high sanctioned detection rate. However, experience showed that a victim would be victimised 30 to 35 times before it was brought to the attention of the police. Officers informed the Committee that repeat families were monitored at the Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC).

The Borough Commander informed the Committee that over a weekend, i.e. Friday night, Saturday night and Sunday night on average less than five people are victims of a criminal action in Romford Town Centre.

The Committee **noted** the report.

44 **COMMUNITY SAFETY FUND - EXPENDITURE TO DATE**

The Committee were advised that £220,188 had been made available to the Havering Community Safety Partnership from the Community Safety Fund. The Partnership had identified 9 Strategic Themes and allocated a pot of money for each theme. Decisions on what projects should be funded are recommended by individual working parties and approved by the Implementation Action Group.

The Committee asked how many Licence reviews had resulted from the under age sales work. Officers undertook to obtain this information for members. Officers advised the Committee that Havering has the highest rate of prosecutions for underage knife sales.

Funds had been made available to the Safe Haven project, run by the Street Pastors, to provide 2 door supervisors and a town link radio for the Deeper Lounge scheme. Unfortunately the Safe Haven had had to close on Saturday whilst new premises were found.

Officers informed the Committee that within one month of the launch of the Banking Protocol a rogue trader had been caught through the vigilance a bank teller.

Concern was expressed that the use of body cameras by the police could encourage violence. The Borough Commander advised the committee that there was no evidence to support this, and the cameras provided vital evidence to support prosecutions.

The Committee were advised that there had been a very low level of anti-social behaviour at Halloween due to the partnership work during this key period.

All projects were evaluated at the end of the year and given the reduced funding which would be available next year officers and the Partnership would need to look closely at priorities and ensure projects delivered value for money.

In the last two weeks £10,000 had been approved to support targeted work against scrap yards.

The report was **noted**.

45 **PUBLIC ORDER DISTURBANCES**

The Community Safety Manager informed the meeting of the action taken by the Council and partners in response to the Public Order Disturbances which occurred in August of this year. The quick and positive response of the local police, council and partners ensured that Havering did not suffer the levels of unprecedented levels of public disorder and criminality seen elsewhere in London and the United Kingdom. Quick response to perceived problems, good intelligence and excellent communications enabled the police to head off any trouble before it started.

The Council were carrying out a review with partners of what happened and were looking to identify the cost to the Council of their response and the cost to local businesses. The Council would also be applying to the Business Compensation Fund to assist local businesses.

The Borough Commander advised the Committee that there were 24 arrests in the borough, and 25 crimes were reported. On the Monday 60 to 80 people turned up in the Town Centre, however, most were there as spectators. Only a small number were looking for trouble.

The report was **noted**.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank



CRIME AND DISORDER COMMITTEE

Report

29 November 2011

Subject Heading:

Outcome of the recent inspection of the Youth Offending Team and Improvement Plan

CMT Lead:

Sue Butterworth

Report Author and contact details:

Ric Kashman

Policy context:

Youth offending Service

SUMMARY

This report addresses the recent inspection of the Havering Youth Offending Team by HM Inspectorate of Probation, together with the Improvement Plan arising from the inspection.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That Members note the content of the report and the attached Improvement Plan

REPORT DETAIL

1 Background

The Core Case Inspection of statutory Youth Offending Work in Havering took place in June 2011, as part of the national HM Inspectorate of Probation (HMIP) Inspection of the Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) programme.

The Inspectors examined a representative sample (38 cases) of youth offending cases from the area. Most of the cases were inspected were community cases with a small number (9) of custody cases. Most cases involved court orders which commenced with or were transferred to Havering YOT between September 2010 and January 2011. The exception to this sample involved custody cases where the low numbers of available cases meant inspectors had to look at work that was nearly two years old.

They reviewed case records and met case managers to reach a judgment as how often the Safeguarding, Risk of Harm (to others) and Likelihood of Reoffending aspects of the work were undertaken to a sufficiently high level of quality. This was judged against a 136 point questionnaire used for all Core Case Inspections

2 Results

The Inspectors judged each of the main categories of the inspection as follows:

- that the Safeguarding aspects of the work were carried out competently 58% of the time.
- that work to keep to a minimum each individual's *Risk of Harm to others* was undertaken competently 54% of the time
- that work to address the likelihood of reoffending make each individual less likely to reoffend was undertaken competently well enough 69% of the time.

Within their foreword, HMIP described this as a disappointing set of findings. However, the inspectors did also note a number of positive aspects to the Team's work. In particular, Inspectors felt that case managers and Youth offending Service (YOS) managers were keen to develop their practice and had responded positively to the inspection feedback.

A full report was produced by the inspectors, which included eight recommendations for improvement.

A draft Improvement Plan was developed and was presented to the YOS Local Management Board on 5th September 2011. Following scrutiny by the Head of Service and Director for Social Care and Learning, the Improvement plan was sent to HM Inspectorate of Probation, who subsequently approved the Plan in October 2011. The Improvement Plan is subject to quarterly monitoring meetings from the Youth Justice Board and local monitoring by the YOS Local Management Board. Both the Children's Trust Board and the Havering Safer Communities Partnership have also agreed to agenda the reviews arising from the Improvement Plan.

3 Findings of the Report

a) Following the Core Case Inspection, the Lead Inspector met and briefed the YOS manager on his findings. The headline findings for safeguarding, risk of harm and likelihood of reoffending are indicated above and in the report. The Lead Inspector was keen to identify both the Service's achievements, as well as the areas where he identified improvements were required.

b) In terms of the areas of work

- Assessment and Planning - Havering YOT's score was 67% (which is the national average),
- Delivery and Review of Interventions was 63% (3% below the national average) and
- Outcomes 67% (national average is 66%).

He also highlighted that the score for achievement of outcomes was at 70%, significantly ahead of the national average of 60%.

He summarised this last figure as indicating that staff were assessing and engaging children and young people in work that made a difference to their behaviour and led to identifiable outcomes.

c) Overall, he identified that community cases where the child was normally resident in Havering received a good level of service with good outcomes. He recognised that Core ASSET assessments were prioritised but wanted to see a clearer recognition of vulnerability for children and young people. This means that staff needed to clearly identify on the record, where an issue did not necessarily link to offending, e.g. mental health, and would not therefore lead to a high ASSET score (where the score is linked to the risk of re-offending).

d) He identified that the transfer-in cases (about a fifth of the cases inspected - higher in the team's current case load) had a major impact on the risk and safeguarding scores, as a result of the paucity of information being provided to Havering YOT. I was able to show him the transfer checklist that was introduced in February 2011 to alleviate this problem. The inspector felt that this checklist would assist in improving the quality of assessments. He advised that where external YOTs were not providing sufficient information to make clear assessments, the cases needed to be quickly escalated to resolve the issue. (The same problem regarding transferred cases was also identified by Ofsted in their recent Inspection of Children's Social Care cases).

e) Offending behaviour interventions. The inspector identified that there was a differential approach operating. Whilst he was encouraged by the individualised approach to assessing and meeting children and young people's needs, he wanted to see a more developed structure, to increase the consistency in this area of work.

f) He accepted practitioners' descriptions of work with managers, to identify issues and how work was modified as a result of this input. However, he felt the YOT needed to be clearer about our priority issues and in turn, the processes that need to be signed off by managers within the case record, so that this input is

identifiable and consistently applied. Whilst he noted work undertaken in line management supervision, he wanted notes about children and young people from these meetings recorded within the case record.

g) In custody cases he wanted to see more assessment and planning taking place so that the role of the case manager was clearly identifiable, alongside clearer links back into the community.

h) In the preparation for inspection, YOS managers identified problems with Careworks (the case management system recording system) whereby Risk of Serious Harm assessments and plans and vulnerability management plans cannot be updated without over-writing the original assessments. Staff have been advised to clone the original documents and then overwrite the clone to avoid this loss of information.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks: Nil

Legal implications and risks: Nil

Human Resources implications and risks: Nil

Equalities implications and risks: Nil

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The Youth Offending Team's Improvement Plan together with progress towards the milestones noted on the document is to follow.

Havering Core Case Inspection Improvement Plan (CCI publication date 31st August 2011)

No.	HMIP Recommendation for improvement	Areas for improvement (AFIs)	Who leads on this?	By When	Success criteria	Commentary
1	A timely and good quality assessment and plan, using ASSET, is completed when the case starts	i. Review the current risk management policy in the light of the CCI inspection to include information on RoSH and Vulnerability screening, sampling and risk of harm classification.	Service Manager	30 th November 2011	New policy available which gives guidance to managers and staff and provides clear guidance for dip sampling and audit	On target to complete this work by end of November 2011
		ii. Deliver improved recognition of safeguarding issues through joint case discussion between YOS social workers and Social care social workers	Operations Manager 2	30 th October 2011	Minutes of joint case discussions/ Duty and Assessment team meetings identify the involvement of YOS social workers	Joint managers meetings commenced. YOT based Social Workers identified and matched to Social Care teams

Havering Core Case Inspection Improvement Plan (CCI publication date 31st August 2011)

		iii. Achieve improvements in the of quality screening and assessment by providing CCI recommendations to all staff at team meeting; best practice messages and launch of revised risk management policy.	Service Manager / Operations Manager (1) / Operations Manager (2)	31 st December 2011	All staff aware of the CCI recommendations, best practice messages and revised risk management policy. Changes in practice identifiable via dip sampling and audit	On target to meet milestone - Team Development day 2nd December 2011
1	A timely and good quality assessment and plan, using ASSET, is completed when the case starts	iv. Create individual practitioner improvement plans based upon supervisors reading at least a third of the cases case prior to supervision and regular follow up, specifically around vulnerability and risk of serious harm (RoSH) screening and start assessments	Operations Manager (1) / Operations Manager (2)	Individual case sampling to commence by 3rd October 2011 with all practitioners having individual improvement plans by 18 th November 2011	Quality of Vulnerability and risk of harm screening and assessment recording at the start of each case improves for individual practitioners (identified via the case readings and checked against audit tools)	Case sampling has commenced Individual Individual improvement plans not completed at time of writing this report.

Havering Core Case Inspection Improvement Plan (CCI publication date 31st August 2011)

Page 13

1	A timely and good quality assessment and plan, using ASSET, is completed when the case starts	v. Undertake regular practitioner sampling of ASSET screening of RoSH and Vulnerability	Operations Manager (1) / Operations Manager (2)	Practitioner Group Sampling to commence by 30 th October 2011. First round of this work to be completed by 31 st January 2012	Increase and maintain consistency of team approach to screening and assessment of vulnerability and risk of harm.	On target to meet milestone to meet first round completion date
		vi. 'What do you think?' (WDYT) self assessment tool is used with children to inform assessments	Operations Manager (1) / Operations Manager (2)	30 th September 2011	75% or better of cases to be informed by the WDYT tool. (Where a child refuses this is to be recorded on the core ASSET).	Paper copies of the self assessment tool being given to practitioners - however not all practitioners have completed reports requiring tool - practice still being embedded.
		vii. Monthly 'off-line' audits ' of screens and assessments	Service Manager / Operations Managers (1) 2)	By 31 st October 2011	75% or more of screens and assessments are of a high quality	Commenced as a part of the auditing of cases

Havering Core Case Inspection Improvement Plan (CCI publication date 31st August 2011)

Page 14

1	A timely and good quality assessment and plan, using ASSET, is completed when the case starts	viii. Staff provided with training related to speech, language and learning styles of children and young people	Service Manager	31 st March 2012	Improved recognition by staff of speech , language and learning styles	Training provider being identified. Training informs action point 1ix below
		ix. Learning style (LS) questionnaire suitable for YOT identified and used by staff to identify learning styles	Service Manager	1 st May 2012	75% or better of assessments accompanied by a LS questionnaire which is used to inform assessment and plans	Identification of LS questionnaire will be determined by training
		x. Introduce an Integrated risk management plan to all practitioners as a replacement for all existing planning documents	Service and Operations Manager 2	31st December 2012	All risk management and vulnerability planning is completed on an Integrated plan	Aim of an Integrated plan is to reduce duplication and enable issues which are both a risk to the child and others to be identified and holistic intervention provided
		xi. Monthly audit re improvements in timeliness of ASSET, RoSH, integrated risk Plans	Information Officer	Commence December 2011	Data available to identify trends and improvements	Information officer will collect anonymous trend data

Havering Core Case Inspection Improvement Plan (CCI publication date 31st August 2011)

		xii.Information regarding quality assurance will be collated to provide evidence to managers and Board members of areas for development and progress	Service Manager / Operations Manager (1) / Operations Manager (2)	Commence November 2011	Improvements in quality are identifiable	Commenced with November information being used as baseline
--	--	--	---	------------------------	--	--

Havering Core Case Inspection Improvement Plan (CCI publication date 31st August 2011)

	<p>Specifically, a timely and good quality assessment of the individuals vulnerability and Risk of Harm to others is completed at the start , as appropriate to the case</p>	<p>iv. Sampling in supervision of RoSH and vulnerability assessments analyses identifies case managers involve consideration of risk to potential victims and a child's previous behaviour, including earlier offences which may be of a more serious nature than the current matter.</p>	<p>Operations Manager (1) / Operations Manager (2)</p>	<p>Individual case sampling to commence from 30th October 2011</p>	<p>Quality of vulnerability and ROSH screening and assessment recording at the start of a case improves for individual practitioners (identified via collated sampling and audit)</p>	<p>Commenced</p>
		<p>v. Monthly audit to identify improvements in timeliness of ASSET, RoSH, Vulnerability risk and vulnerability (or integrated) management plan</p>	<p>Information Officer</p>	<p>Commence October 2011</p>	<p>Data available to identify trends and improvements</p>	<p>Commenced but database is delivering information by period not individual cases making this more difficult to track.</p>

Havering Core Case Inspection Improvement Plan (CCI publication date 31st August 2011)

		vi. Sampling and off line quality assurance forms will be collated to provide evidence to managers and Board members of areas for development and progress	Service Manager / Operations Manager (1) / Operations Manager (2)	Commence October 2011	Improvements in quality are identifiable	Will be reported to December YOS Board
--	--	--	---	-----------------------	--	--

Havering Core Case Inspection Improvement Plan (CCI publication date 31st August 2011)

No.	HMIP Recommendation for improvement	Areas for improvement (AFIs)	Who leads on this?	By When	Success criteria	Commentary
3	As a consequence of the assessment, the record of intervention is specific about what will now be done to in order to safeguard the child or young person from harm and to minimise the risk to others	i. Create individual practitioner improvement plans based upon dip sampling in supervision and regular follow up, specifically around quality of vulnerability management plans (VMP) and risk management plans (RMP) (or integrated plan) including their link to victim issues and interventions	Operations Manager (1) / Operations Manager (2)	Individual case sampling to commence from 3 rd October 2011	Risk management plans are completed and of a good quality, in particular outlining the roles and responsibilities of staff in the management of the child's risk of harm, victims issues are addressed and the planned responses are clear in a minimum of 75% of audited cases.	Case sampling has commenced Individual Individual improvement plans not completed at time of writing this report.
		ii. Collate information quarterly from RMP and VMP (or Integrated plan) dip sampling and monthly audit to inform individual and group training.	Information Officer	Commence December 2011	Data available to identify trends and improvements in the completion of VMPs and RMPs	Information officer will collect anonymous trend data
3	As a	iii. VMPs and RMPs	Operations	Fortnightly	Review of the	Completed pre-

Havering Core Case Inspection Improvement Plan (CCI publication date 31st August 2011)

Page 20

	<p>consequence of the assessment, the record of intervention is specific about what will now be done to in order to safeguard the child or young person from harm and to minimise the risk to others</p>	<p>(or Integrated plan) (along with Vulnerability assessments and RoSHs) will continue to be updated by the practitioner and reviewed by the risk management panel at the required interval and updated (as identified in the risk management policy)</p>	<p>Manager (2)</p>	<p>risk management panel will continue to review and improve quality of RoSHs, Vulnerability assessments RMPs and VMPs (or Integrated plan)</p>	<p>Panel meeting records identify ongoing improvement of case manager assessments.</p>	<p>inspection (see 2i above)</p>
		<p>iv. Referral Order Contracts and Community Plans objectives are prioritised according to risk of harm.</p>	<p>Operations Manager (1) / Operations Manager (2)</p>	<p>30th October 2011</p>	<p>Objectives clearly identify the priority for work to reduce the risk of harm; quarterly audit of Referral Order Plans identifies that objectives are being prioritised by risk.</p>	<p>Completed Operations managers and Referral Order Officer all aware of this change</p>

Havering Core Case Inspection Improvement Plan (CCI publication date 31st August 2011)

		v. Dip sampling identifies that community and custodial plans incorporate the child's learning needs / learning style	Operations Manager (1) / Operations Manager (2)	31 st December 2011	Quarterly audit of custodial sentence plans identify that the child's learning style / needs	To be delayed to match training identified in 1viii
3	As a consequence of the assessment, the record of intervention is specific about what will now be done to in order to safeguard the child or young person from harm and to minimise the risk to others	vi. In supervision home visits will identified to ensure that they are taking place throughout the sentence in accordance with the level of risk of harm	Operations Manager (1) / Operations Manager (2)	31 st October 2011	Increase in the number of home visits undertaken to improve the assessment and management of risk by assessing the child in the family home and involving parents or carers	Commenced -NB reduced staffing and move to Redbridge court, a revised level of home visits will be undertaken based upon risk, with high risk cases being visited at home at least once every six weeks and all other cases visited at home at least once every 12 weeks.

Havering Core Case Inspection Improvement Plan (CCI publication date 31st August 2011)

		vii. Contributions to CAF or other assessments or plans designed to safeguard the child are identified and recorded.	Operations Manager (1) / Operations Manager (2)	3 rd October 2011	Audit identifies all occasions where external plans or assessments are completed.	No CAF completed since October; However referrals to Social Care identified
--	--	--	---	------------------------------	---	---

Havering Core Case Inspection Improvement Plan (CCI publication date 31st August 2011)

No.	HMIP Recommendation for improvement	Areas for improvement (AFIs)	Who leads on this?	By When	Success criteria	Commentary
4	Sentence plans in custodial sentences fully reflect the assessed likelihood of reoffending, identified risk to others and where applicable victim safety. They then specify who is responsible for the delivery of each intervention and when they will be delivered	i) In supervision managers will sample custodial cases to ensure that there is a timely intervention plan which is reviewed as required by national standards, with case managers actively involved in the custodial planning process.	Operations Manager (1) / Operations Manager (2)	3 rd October 2011	All custodial cases are identified via sampling as having a timely plan to which the YOS contributed,	Commenced
		ii. Where vulnerability or risk of harm to a victim (or others) is identified managers will read the custodial planning documents to ensure that that the secure unit is aware of these risks and that this information is incorporated into the custodial planning process.	Operations Manager (2)	31 ^s October 2011	The connectivity process is used to evidence that at point of sentence (or where the risk is identified) all risk documents have been transmitted to the custodial unit.	Met and information identifiable via Connectivity as being sent to the Youth Justice Board

Havering Core Case Inspection Improvement Plan (CCI publication date 31st August 2011)

No.	HMIP Recommendation for improvement	Areas for improvement (AFIs)	Who leads on this?	By When	Success criteria	Commentary
5	The plan of work with the case is regularly reviewed and correctly recorded in ASSET with frequency consistent with national standards for youth offending services	<p>i. In supervision managers will dip sample custodial cases to ensure that intervention plan is reviewed as required by national standards</p>	Operations Manager (1) / Operations Manager (2)	3 rd October 2011	Increase in the number of cases where the intervention plans are reviewed at the required frequency.	Commenced...
		<p>ii. Work will be undertaken with staff to further develop the intervention resources that are available and to work ensue that there is a more consistent application of those interventions</p>	Service Manager	31 st December 2011	Clear plan is available to staff to identify how to use resources available within the YOS.	In progress

Havering Core Case Inspection Improvement Plan (CCI publication date 31st August 2011)

		the safety of victims		safety issues.	to this work.
--	--	-----------------------	--	----------------	---------------

No.	HMIP Recommendation for improvement	Areas for improvement (AFIs)	Who leads on this?	By When	Success criteria	Commentary
8	Clear arrangements should be in place, that are understood and applied by staff, for all cases that are transferred in or out, or where work is undertaken by or on behalf of another YOS. Such arrangements should include agreement on responsibilities for all relevant aspects of assessment, planning and delivery.	i. All requests to accept 'transfer in' cases (temporarily or permanent) from another service will only involve a manager who will use the local transfer checklist, to ensure that all available information is available prior to work being undertaken. Where gaps are apparent in the information provided this and the efforts made to obtain the information will be noted on the case record. Where information is not forthcoming then the issue will be escalated to the	Operations Manager (1) / Operations Manager (2)	Ongoing use of case transfer checklist and recording	Case transfer notice kept on case record and a copy kept to audit effectiveness of process.	Completed

Havering Core Case Inspection Improvement Plan (CCI publication date 31st August 2011)

		YOS manager			
		ii. Where a case is being transferred to another YOT on a permanent or temporary basis the transfer checklist will be used to ensure that all relevant information is provided to the receiving YOT	Operations Manager (1) / Operations Manager (2)	30 th September 2011	All transfer out case audited at point of transfer and manager is able to identify that check list has been followed and this is noted on the case record by the line manager.	Commenced
		iii. Managers will ensure through supervision in temporary transfer or LAC cases that the responsibility for day to day work, reports, assessments and delivery is agreed in writing at the point of transfer.	Operations Manager (1) / Operations Manager (2)	30 th October 2011	Manager identifies that case record identifies an agreement has been reached as to which agency is carrying out each action on behalf of the child.	Commenced
		iv. Where a case is transferred into the borough a screen for risk of harm and vulnerability will be undertaken within 1 month of the child	Operations Manager (1) / Operations Manager (2)	30 th October 2011	All transfer in cases on audit have new screen completed and recorded on Careworks	Not yet audited

Havering Core Case Inspection Improvement Plan (CCI publication date 31st August 2011)

		transferring in.				
		v. In-house training will be provided to all staff around the national case responsibility protocol	Service Manager	30 th November 2011	All staff to sign off that they have received this training	To be completed on Team development day

CRIME AND DISORDER COMMITTEE

Report

29 November 2011

Subject Heading:

Police and Crime Commissioners

CMT Lead:

Ian Burns, Assistant Chief Executive

Report Author and contact details:

Jerry Haley, Community Safety Officer,
jerry.haley@havering.gov.uk,
01708 434370

Policy context:

The introduction of police and crime commissioners will have a considerable impact on local authorities.

SUMMARY

The Government is committed to replacing police authorities with directly elected police and crime commissioners (PCCs) in England and Wales. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act has completed its passage through parliament and elections for PCCs will be held on 15 November 2012 (although this does not apply to London).

The introduction of police and crime commissioners will have a considerable impact on local authorities. There will be a mutual duty on PCCs and community safety partnerships to co-operate. Both will also have to have regard to each others priorities when the commissioner (in London's case the Mayor) writes the police and crime plan and strategic assessments in the case of community safety partnerships.

The current assumption is that secondary legislation will be laid in time for the transition from the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) to the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPC) as a new functional body of the GLA at the beginning of January 2012. The proposed legal powers and duties for this new body and the assumptions made for the MOPC to be established are given in Appendix 1.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the committee note the report

REPORT DETAIL

Police and Crime Commissioners

Police authorities holding the police to account in Greater London, England and Wales will be abolished in November 2012 and replaced with police and crime commissioners in 42 police force areas. The City of London will remain the police authority for the City.

In London the role of police and crime commissioner for the Metropolitan Police will be carried out by the Mayor of London through the Deputy Mayor with responsibility for policing. For the rest of England and Wales the government's plan is for elections for the post of police and crime commissioner to be held on Thursday 15th November 2012 using the alternative vote system that is used to elect the London Mayor. The PCC's will then be elected every four years.

The main responsibilities of the PCCs are not unlike that of the police authorities that they replace. Namely:

- Secure an efficient and effective police force for their area
- Appoint the chief constable, hold them to account for the running of the force and if necessary dismiss them
- Set the police and crime objectives for their area by producing a five year Police and Crime Plan, in consultation with the chief constable
- Set the annual force budget and police precept, and produce an annual report setting out their process against the objectives in the Police and Crime Plan
- Contribute to the national and international policing capabilities set out by the Home Secretary
- Co-operate with the criminal justice system in their area
- Work with partners and fund community safety activity to tackle crime and disorder

However, although the PCC will set the local aims and objectives, operational responsibility for the day to day work of the police remains with the chief constable. Funding for the police will come from a variety of sources including the police grant paid by the Home Office, the precept the PCC sets and various other grants such as the Community Safety Fund.

PCCs and Community Safety Partnerships

Unlike police authorities, commissioners will not be 'responsible authorities' under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and will not be members of community safety partnerships.

There is however a provision that both organisations should co-operate to reduce crime and disorder and re-offending. A PCC when putting together its police and crime plan must have regard to the priorities of responsible authorities in their force area, whilst responsible authorities should give due regard to the police and crime plan whilst exercising their functions.

Alongside these provisions PCCs will also be able to make crime and disorder reduction grants to any organisation or person in their force area. In order to give PCCs a budget to make these sorts of grants the Home Office is looking to transfer various funds to PCCs from 2012.

The Community Safety Fund is due to be reduced by 60% from April 2012, will be paid to PCCs from April 2013 at the latest (in London this was transferred in April 2011).

Police and Crime Panels (PCPs) holding PCCs to Account

Alongside the relationship councils will have with PCCs through community safety partnerships, they will have a direct role in holding commissioners to account. A police and crime panel will have to be established for every police force area to scrutinise the PCC, and support them in carrying out their functions.

In London this role will be undertaken by a specific committee of the Greater London Assembly.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks: The Community Safety Fund is set to be reduced by 60% so this may have implications on for projects the HCSP funds.

Legal implications and risks: No direct legal risks

Human Resources implications and risks: There are no direct risks

Equalities implications and risks: There no direct risks

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Local Government Group: Police and crime commissioners: a guide for councils

MPA Report – The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011

Appendix 1 – Legal Powers and Duties of the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime

The Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPC) will have the following powers and duties

- Set the strategic direction and objectives of the MPS through the Police and Crime Plan which must have regard to the Strategic Policing Requirement (SPR) set by the Home Secretary
- Monitor the performance of the force including the priorities agreed within the Police and Crime Plan
- Hold the Commissioner to account for the performance of MPS officers and staff
- Decide the budget, allocate assets and funds to the Metropolitan Police Commissioner
- Secure that the Metropolitan Police Force is efficient and effective
- Provide the local link between the police and the public, working to translate the legitimate desires and aspirations of the public into action on behalf of the Commissioner on behalf the Commissioner to cut crime and anti social behaviour.
- Hold the Police Commissioner to account for the exercise of the functions of the Commissioner and the functions of persons under the direction and control of the Commissioner
- Publish information specified by the Secretary of State and information that the PCC considers necessary to enable the police who live within the Metropolitan Police area to assess the performance of the MOPC and Metropolitan Police Force Commissioner.
- Comply with all formal requests from the Police and Crime Committee to attend its meetings
- Prepare and issue an annual report to the Police and Crime Committee on the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan
- Keep abreast of all complaints made against senior officers and staff and deal directly with complaints against the Metropolitan Police Commissioner

For the MOPC to have these powers the following assumptions have been made:

- There is a political will for the MOPC to be established as soon as possible

- There will no changes to other governance arrangements involved in policing London (City of London Police, British Transport Police etc.)
- The London Assembly Police and Crime Committee (PCC) will scrutinise the MOPC
- The policy intention behind the Act is to strengthen democratic control of the MPS
- Commencement orders will be laid in time for the MOPC to come into force in January 2012 (without an election)
- The MOPC must be adequately equipped to discharge its statutory and legal functions. These include those laid out in the Act, any associated legislation and the Mayor's priorities
- The MOPC will be the recipient of all funding related to policing and crime reduction. Allocating the funding and setting the budget is the responsibility of the MOPC.

The Home Office have established a Police and Crime Commissioner Transition Board and a separate strand of this project (Strand 10) are to ensure the transition in London and arrangements go as smoothly as possible.