

**BUILDING SAFER COMMUNITIES PROGRAMME BOARD
MEETING 6, 4 NOVEMBER 2014, 14:00-16:00
Edinburgh Centre for Carbon Innovation**

MINUTES

Members attended	Apologies	Also attended
Jackie Brock	Rose Fitzpatrick	Lorna Ascroft
Graham Hope	Lesley Fraser	Duncan Beamish
David Hume	Donald Henderson	Elisabeth Campbell
Karyn McCluskey		David Cowan
Susan McVie		Tom Hardy
Paul Johnston		Michelle Harrity
Martin Johnstone		Grant Manders
Lewis Ramsay		Fergus Millan
Wendy Wilkinson		

Welcome

1. Paul Johnston welcomed Graham Hope, SOLACE, to the Board. It was suggested that the NHS should be invited to join the Board.
2. Members reflected on developments since the Board last met in June and noted that:
 - the Commonwealth Games had involved young offenders as volunteers;
 - the referendum increased public engagement and we should make the most of that
 - the Smith Commission may deliver new powers that could help our work;
 - Police Scotland is currently engaged in an exercise to look ahead five years at future threats and priorities, e.g., cybercrime and sexual offences; and
 - the Wood Commission for developing Scotland's young workforce published its final report in June.

Victimisation Research

3. Susan McVie provided a summary of the research presented at the morning ESRC conference. The following points were noted:
 - There had been a significant change in the profile of offenders, with a significant reduction in the number of young male offenders. It was felt that changes in youth justice policy to keep young offenders out of the justice system had been a major influence on this change.
 - There were some consistent influences which reduced offending, namely reduced alcohol consumption and the certainty of being caught. The certainty of punishment was seen to be less influential on offending behaviour.
 - There had been a consistent downward trend in the five crime groups across local authority areas but a more varied picture for lower-level offences.
 - The big crime drops had been seen in the four big cities yet 70% of people in Scotland still thought that crime rates had remained the same.

- High crime areas saw the largest absolute fall in crime but their relative position remained unchanged – i.e., no high crime areas had become medium or low crime areas.
- The likelihood of being a one-off victim of crime or a repeat victim of property crime had decreased but the chance of being a multiple victim of crime had not reduced.
- The lack of data gathered about offenders represents a large gap in our evidence nationally as victim surveys do not ask victims if they have also offended. There was interest in looking at the overlap between perpetrators and victims.
- Staying on in school had a large influence on likelihood of conviction with those excluded by the age of 13 being four times more likely to receive a conviction. Fife and Tayside's use of inclusion units in schools was seen as an example of good practice.
- The Administrative Research Centre for Scotland had been established and can bring together and provide indirect access to police and health data, thereby removing some ethical concerns about sharing sensitive data.
- The next stage of the research was to analyse the very local factors that might be influencing changing crime rates, similar to the work that had been done in Seattle.

Action Point 1: Susan to share a link to the Seattle study with Board members and provide further details about the Administrative Research Centre for Scotland. Board members to offer Susan questions and suggestions for the next steps of her research. Programme office to consider whether to invite someone from the Dunfermline inclusion unit to present at a future Board meeting.

Phase 1 Update

4. Lorna Ascroft introduced papers 6.2-6.5 which provided an update on activity, a draft programme narrative and a proposal for programme champions. The following feedback was received:

Narrative Paper

- There was broad and strong endorsement for the programme narrative and members welcomed the fact that it would be updated as the programme developed.
- It was recognised that something even shorter and simpler could be developed for members of the public and community groups like community councils.
- The 'ambitions' section should be revised to ensure it did not undersell the substantial improvements the programme was seeking to deliver.
- The 'programme success' section could be more focused, summarising just the top three outcomes sought (e.g., reducing victims and harm; partners are experimenting and testing innovation; and sharing good practice). Measuring the views of communities about their experiences was also seen as important.

- The language in the text about communities needed to be revisited to ensure it is not in any way pejorative or patronising.
- A company limited by guarantee could be established in one of the six areas as a way of testing the impact of partners having a legal obligation to participate in the place-based work.
- The programme could provide support to the six areas to do some logic modelling/driver diagrams to help identify local tactics that could help deliver the high-level vision of the programme. There is a toolkit for this logic modelling available from work done in Seattle, which identified quick wins that could be delivered easily. Such logic models should focus on hopes and aspirations and not problems.

Action Point 2: Susan to share a link to the toolkit for logic modelling available from Seattle.

Areas Paper

- A meeting had taken place with Renfrewshire on 3 November. Colleagues there were delighted to be involved in the programme and committed to taking a place-based approach in Ferguslie Park and Johnstone. Their next step was to commence some neighbourhood profiling work.
- Drop-in engagement days mentioned in the Craigmillar update were not felt to be the most effective approach; door-knocking initiatives and engagement through health providers were felt to be better at reaching hard to reach people. Finding and engaging with community anchor organisations was also felt to be important.
- Support for action research in the six areas should be provided by the programme and the Scottish Government's Evaluation Framework provides a mechanism to allow this to be delivered.
- To build the rich picture of what is happening in the six areas Board members were invited to share any knowledge they had with the area champions.

Action Point 3: Board members to share contacts, knowledge and information they hold relevant to the six areas with the relevant area champion.

Champions Paper

- Members approved the allocation of champion roles set out in the paper.
- Fergus Millan will support Jackie Brock in her role as champion for Fraserburgh Harbour.
- Grant Manders will be champion for Polmont Young Offenders Institute.
- The role of champion will involve being an advocate for the Programme in the area or for the theme, mobilising people to deliver and finding out what it is in the area or theme that is different and working and what the learning is.
- Those who are champions for a theme will have a role to engage with the champions of all six areas to share their perspective and learning and influence activity in these areas, as well as across all of Scotland.

Phase 2 Update

5. Lewis Ramsay introduced Paper 6.6 which sought approval to proceed on Phase 2 work on unintentional harm. He noted that the following leads had been appointed:
 - Home safety: Jim Scott, Local Senior Officer
 - Data/intelligence: Richard Whetton
 - Road safety: Michael McDonald
 - Outdoor safety: to be confirmed
6. Members were happy with progress and approved the direction of travel outlined in the paper. Further consideration will be required in the future to agree what role champions might have in Phase 2 and to ensure consistency and cohesion with Phase 1.
7. The ability of the fire service and faith groups to be welcomed into people's homes was recognised as an asset in terms of promoting work to improve people's wellbeing.

Next steps

8. The next meeting will take place on 4 February 2015. Polmont Young Offenders Institute was suggested as a potential venue.

Action Point 4: Programme Team to arrange the venue for the next Board meeting, prioritising Polmont Young Offenders Institute.

AOB

9. Paul Johnston thanked Lorna Ascroft for her significant contribution to the delivery of the Building Safer Communities Programme on behalf of the Board and wished her well for her new post in health.

Building Safer Communities Programme Team

November 2014

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Action Point 1: Susan to share a link to the Seattle study with Board members and provide further details about the Administrative Research Centre for Scotland. Board members to offer Susan questions and suggestions for the next steps of her research. Programme office to consider whether to invite someone from the Dunfermline inclusion unit to present at a future Board meeting.

Action Point 2: Susan to share a link to the toolkit for logic modelling available from Seattle.

Action Point 3: Board members to share contacts, knowledge and information they hold relevant to the six areas with the relevant area champion.

Action Point 4: Programme Team to arrange the venue for the next Board meeting, prioritising Polmont Young Offenders Institute.