

Minutes

Safer Gloucestershire - 9th July 2019, 10:00. The Leadon, Police HQ

Attendees

Andy Barge (AB)	Matthew Knight (MK)
Andy Dempsey (AD)	Mike Brain (MB)
Anne Brinkhoff (ABr)	Nikki Humphries (NK)
Chris Brierley (CB)	Pat Pratley (PP)
Craig Holden (CH)	Pete Tonge (PT)
Helen Pritchard (HP)	Richard Bradley (RB)
Karen Taylor (KT)	Ruth Greenwood (RG)
Kate Langley (KL)	Sarah Jasper (SJa)
Kezia Lane (KLa)	Sarah Scott (SS)
Mark Astle (MA)	Sophie Jarrett (SJ)
Mark Scully (MS)	

Apologies

Chris Spencer	Kirsten Fruin
Emma Savage	Mike Hammond – sub - Nikki Humphries

Speaker	Discussion Points Actions
Agenda Item 1: WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS & APOLOGIES	
CB	Apologies were noted.
Agenda Item 2: MINUTES FROM LAST MEETING 16.04.19	
CB	Minutes were provided with papers.
KLa	Safer Together Through Sport has three pilot areas: Cheltenham, Gloucester and Bourton on the Water. Events planned and progress good. The Board will be updated at next meeting.

Speaker	Discussion Points Actions
CB	Minutes were agreed as a correct record.
Agenda Item 3: SAFER GLOUCESTERSHIRE STRATEGY, DRAFT ACTION PLAN & STOCKTAKE	
AD	Overview of strategy provided.
	Latest draft has been refined to show the wide subject base and overarching consensus of leadership. The governance diagram has also been amended and will be taken to the Health & Wellbeing Board.
SS	AD was thanked for writing the strategy and noted that there were a few technical inaccuracies but would take these up with KT. It was suggested that the priorities should be towards the front of the Strategy and RB voiced that he felt that the 6 priorities identified were too many and asked if this could be reduced. SS suggested that maybe we could take 2 or 3 a year to focus on.
	AD stated that he didn't think 6 priorities were too many and although accepted their point indicated that the priorities will be taken in a phased approach and that the priorities identified reflect the spectrum of challenges faced by Gloucestershire.
AB	Concurred that a phased approach was right and felt that the strategy is a good catalyst to continue to conversation with SG and CSPs and address where the statutory responsibilities lie.
PT	Asked if the foreword could give more details regarding CB's role. This was accepted.
AD	Outlined the phased approach to be taken with the strategy and supporting work plan. The aim is to acknowledge the work underway and creates a synergy between district and corporate activity. Governance structures may be reviewed over time. The strategy will be informed by district reps and linked to a dashboard to inform performance. There is a need a performance matrix that tests the impact and suggested criminal justice, police activity, health, social care, education and youth justice. This is a guide for the secretariat to drive the work.
SS	SS supported the creation of a dashboard but questioned refreshing the needs assessment yearly as it would normally be refreshed every three years. RG explained that the thought behind an annual assessment is to reflect the Crime and Disorder Act review: CSPs have a three year audit and an annual strategic assessment to make sure that your priorities are current. CB clarified it would be every three years and on the premise that our working groups look at priorities areas and what value SG can add.
RB	Raised the local investment in Maiden and questioned whether there a better way to use this data. It was agreed that this was worth a discussion. PP said that Cheltenham used Maiden to analyse child poverty and this didn't cost any more than the agreed investment. PP also discussed locality based outcomes, suggesting that clarity of purpose and desired outcomes is required. It was felt it is important to check in the CSPs to make sure the relationship is right. CB stated that every CSP in county will be attended by a member of the OPCC to listen and contribute and be a part of a whole systems approach. PP pointed out that the DHR work is a shining example of how we're doing things at SG that make sense.

Speaker	Discussion Points Actions
AD	Spoke of secretariat involvement with district reps to ensure local issues are tackled. It isn't a top down approach but a two way relationship. PP agreed, and that this is hard to put down on paper and reflect in a strategy and that is why it is important to verbalise it here and by the OPCC going out to CSPs it really builds that capacity and understanding in all we do.
CB	Questioned how CSPs should receive information from SG. PP suggested that the secretariat is the direct link as all CSPs are now represented here and through informal dialogue.
PP	Concerned by GRASAC figures regarding how many people are on the waiting list and how long they have to wait. Questioned whether this is the best service or is there a better way to commission and asked what the role of SG is in this. RB stated that it is stark, 3 or 4 years ago looked at SV, it was a confused area and it was a lot worse than it is now. There are issues around counselling services which we hope to resolve soon, the commissioning of the services resumed SARC has been recommissioned, GRASAC are closing the gaps with male victims. The waiting times are slowly coming down but there is an increase in reported crimes but it is better than it was before. AD agreed that some information is very alarming- stark and unforgettable and this group needs to influence the subsequent development. He noted however, it is important to recognise that not all are commissioned at the same time and through the same lens. CB said the challenge is if we see things like this what is the role of Safer Gloucestershire?
SS	Suggested that some of the some of the groups are rationalised due to the number in existence. RB agreed with this and AD stated that the stocktake work will continue.
AD	Introduced Ruth Greenwood (RG) to provide an overview of suggested performance measures for a partnership dashboard. RG circulated the following paper:  SG Briefing note - performance.docx
RG	Explained that the paper was to provoke discussion, not a final product. The Board were asked if they have any measures that they use or think there are measures that can be used then to let us know. Suggested to think of themes under the 10 headings in the report. RG continued and stated that we should bench mark data and wherever possible, to include peer analysis. Any measures that we have need to be flexible to respond to district needs and priorities. The secretariat will develop the dashboard on what you agree and at the next board meeting will be able to present a more final draft to move forward with.
PP	Suggested it is important to ensure any measures fit with the strategy priorities. She suggested confidence measures could be obtained via pulse surveys: approx. four questions asked gain general feelings rather than longer, more complicated surveys. PP welcomed the implementation of dashboards and thankful for all the work that has gone on.

Speaker	Discussion Points Actions
KL	Also welcomed the use of performance measures but need to make sure that these reflect our principles and values. SJ agreed also but said that we need to be mindful and reflective on how we use the data. If we have higher levels of DA being reported this shouldn't necessarily be a bad thing as this shows that people are more confident in reporting.
AD	Concluded the item by stating that it is important to build on existing benchmarks of national metrics and link to our priorities. He suggested no more than 15-20 measures. This was supported by MS who was concerned about creating a 'huge machine'.
CB	Requested a further update at next meeting.
Agenda Item 4: PROBLEM SOLVING & DEMAND REDUCTION - PRESENTATION	
CB	Item postponed
Agenda Item 5: COMMUNITY ALCOHOL PARTNERSHIPS (CAPs) - PRESENTATION	
MK	<p>Mathew Knight (MK) Introduced himself as regional advisor for CAPs and provided background to the organisation which aims to reduce underage drinking and ASB among 18-25 age group within the night time economy. They piloted in 2007 in Cambridgeshire and by 2017 there were 150 CAPs set up and they aim to double this in the next two years.</p> <p>The benefits include: a catalyst for change, partnership working, targeting of high harm areas, flexible and adaptable, 6 KPIs where you go from here is up to you, always adapting to initiatives and issues. There are five elements to the work:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Education- schools (including primary), colleges & universities, parent education. Level 2 young health champion. Retail: free sessions – challenge 25 2. Enforcement- police, licensing and trading standards. 3. Evaluation- baseline surveys at the start of the 12 months. For all, young people, adults/parents, retailers and residents (optional) 4. Entertainment – diversionary activities, up £500- £1000 per event, example include zorbing, graffiti art, football. 5. Engagement- engaging with current events, open days, gazebos, posters and pull-ups. <p>CAP involvement includes funding, best practice from 170 CAPs, awards with opportunities to get together to celebrate as well as regional training. With any CAP project there is also an identifiable lead.</p>
CB	Opened the opportunity for questions. KL asked what the offer is for Gloucestershire. MK explained that for any LA where there is an identifiable need a CAP can be in place with no cost, just your time.
SS	Felt that any additional resource is useful, but would this duplicate what we have? MK responded by explaining that they don't replicate but work alongside and is dependent on the local area to what they focus on. SS said that she saw no issue and suggested that maybe we pilot it in Stroud and then potentially roll out.
CB	Suggested that this is brought back to Safer Gloucestershire in a year's time to discuss the Stroud pilot.

Speaker	Discussion Points Actions
---------	------------------------------

Agenda Item 6: DASV Concordat

HP	<p>An overview of the concordat was provided. There are 4 overarching commitments to sign up to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To ensure that those at risk of Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence (DASV) are responded to effectively and appropriately. 2. To ensure effective multi-agency working to provide a coordinated approach across partner agencies to tackling DASV 3. To ensure the public and other organisations are aware of the County response to DASV and the service that can be expected. 4. To review progress with commitments annually, share experiences and ensure continued high quality response to DASV. <p>The concordat is an overarching policy statement and quality framework for organisations across the county to join in a joint zero-tolerance approach to responding to DASV. It also includes supporting documentation.</p> <p>The current thinking is to launch in the '16 Days of Action'. SS stated that this at its most basic level is a way to socialise DA and make organisations more aware. She also reiterated that big launches are effective and along with HP would like SG to take the lead and sign up alongside the HWB in November and then roll it out across the county. HP welcomed any feedback on how to launch, also suggested to sign up as organisations to give support.</p>
MS	<p>Queried the term zero tolerance, and asked how this works. SJ said that the term zero tolerance is an ethos rather than an approach and we're agreeing that there is no acceptance of DA and we will work together to tackle it. PP if we have to explain what we mean by zero tolerance we may need to change the way it is phrased.</p> <p>CH agreed with the ethos of zero tolerance and asked about the partnerships of those signing up. This will include everyone around the table but asked about the broader business community and it being broader than just SG membership.</p>
HP	<p>Explained that the initial launch will target the public sector with a second wave looking at the VCS and then the private sector. CB asked why a split launch and not one big launch. SS explained that this is not necessarily going to happen but starting with the public sector will be easier and then the LEP/private sector can be approached.</p>
CH	<p>Queried where the work is being commissioned, as was unclear what part did the safeguarding adults board had in the decision making process. SS explained that she inherited it when they took on the chair of domestic abuse and sexual violence commissioning group and SJ inherited from action plan GAFU strategy as a county which sits on the health and wellbeing board. Had been sitting with DA commissioning group. It was agreed that this would sit under SG.</p>
CB	<p>It was agreed that HP will work with the secretariat to further develop and return with a proposition before the launch.</p>

Speaker	Discussion Points Actions
---------	------------------------------

Agenda Item 7: YOUTH JUSTICE PLAN 2019/20 - UPDATE

KL	<p>Explained that the plan for next year is currently under development and will review performance targets, national and local indicators, key challenges and priorities for the year. KL also explained that there are three key national indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the number of children becoming first time entrance into the CJS; 2. number of people seeking custodial sentences; and 3. reoffending rates for young people <p>Key highlights are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Gloucestershire Youth Justice Board is performing 11/152 nationally (Local Authority areas). • Gloucestershire is now the second biggest reduction of first time entry in the country. In 2013 216 young people were criminalised, in 2018 only 40. • There are two reoffending measures: reoffending rate and binary reoffending rate (re-offenses per reoffender). In terms of binary reoffending its positive (6/152) although there is a complex cohort of children who reoffend • Children receiving custodial sentences in Gloucestershire – performance better than south west and national averages (6 YP in 18/19 compared to 12 17/18) • Local targets; education, training and employment still a challenge (50% of complex cohort not in education, training or employment). From children first perspective, concerning themes around education in terms of exclusions, attendance, special educational needs, identified additional needs. • Restorative justice is doing well. Engagement with victims has increased as a result of Children First • High numbers of 17year olds with drugs possession, which doesn't fit local profile. • There is still lots to do with ASB • Challenges include over representation of mixed ethnic and black young people in data. The proposal is to develop baseline information and set out a plan of action and then address and reduce this disproportionality • Another challenge is with violent behaviour as well as harmful sexual behaviour
AD	<p>Stated that there is a struggle with the educational offer in the county. PP mentioned work developed by Chris Spencer to work with local schools in relation to fixed / permanent exclusions. Also mentioned Pittville School which is the first Restorative school in the county.</p>
RB	<p>Suggested looking at the Timpson and Lammy Reviews.</p>

Agenda Item 8: SEXUAL VIOLENCE PARTNERSHIP

RB	<p>Informed the group that a strategy will be written and informed by a needs assessment. The full needs assessment will be made available to the Board.</p>
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Agenda Item 9: DOMESTIC HOMICIDE REVIEWS

HP	<p>Updated members on progress with 3 DHRs and reported that that the Home Office are reviewing process of DHRs – a list of accredited chairs has been created by SJ.</p>
----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Speaker	Discussion Points Actions
---------	------------------------------

Agenda Item 10: VIOLENCE PREVENTION - UPDATE

SJ	Reported on discussions from the workshop and stated that she would be undertaking a Needs Assessment to gain a better understanding of the position in Gloucestershire, although the county does not have significant violence or knife crime rates.
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Agenda Item 11: SOCIAL ISOLATION AND LONELINESS DEEP DIVE – UPDATE

CB	In Emma Savage’s absence, members were asked to send any comment to KLa.
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------

Agenda Item 12: JOINT MEETING OF THE GLOUCESTERSHIRE HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD AND SAFER GLOUCESTERSHIRE PARTNERSHIP - IDEAS AND TOPICS TO BRING

CB	Suggestions to KLa.
----	---------------------

Agenda Item 13: ‘AROUND THE TABLE’ (AOB)

AD	Reported that Ofsted are due to visit in the first week of September in relation to children in care, care leavers and Prospects.
RG	OPCC is making an offer to all CSPs to become regular members of the partnerships. This will be core business for the OPCC and every effort will be made to attend.
SJ	CPD event with safeguarding adults – information available if required.
RB	Mentioned the move back to a National Probation Service following recognition by the MoJ if the issues with the CRC approach. MS to send KLa a PowerPoint presentation with more information for wider circulation.
CB	Asked all members to consider the data sharing agreement if they had not done so already.

Date of next meeting- 15th October 2019