BUILDING SAFER COMMUNITIES PROGRAMME BOARD
MEETING 1, 20 AUGUST 2013, 12:30 – 17:00
The Engine Shed, Edinburgh

Membership

Paul Johnston	Scottish Government (Chair)
Jackie Brock	Children in Scotland
DCC Rose Fitzpatrick	Police Scotland
Bob Jack	SOLACE
Rev. Martin Johnston	Poverty Truth Commission
Karyn McCluskey	Violence Reduction Unit
Prof. Susan McVie	University of Edinburgh
ACO Lewis Ramsay	Scottish Fire and Rescue Service
Wendy Wilkinson	Scottish Government

In Attendance

Kirsty Bosley	Scottish Government
Euan Dick	Scottish Government
Mike Foulis	Scottish Government
Jason Leitch	Scottish Government
Liam Macpherson	Scottish Government
Tom McMahon	Scottish Government
Shalani Raghavan	Scottish Government
Cheryl Smith	Improvement Service
Jennifer Stoddart	Scottish Government
Gill Wylie	Scottish Government

Item 1 – Welcome and Introductions

1. Paul Johnston welcomed members to the first meeting of the Programme Board. No apologies were received.

Item 2 – Evolution of the Project

2. Wendy Wilkinson provided a brief introduction to the Building Safer Communities Programme and the key steps that have been taken so far. The Justice Board asked for an approach to reducing crime to be developed resulting in the Building Safer Communities programme being created. The development of the programme has been in three distinct phases.

   - Phase 1 – Focused on developing an in-depth analysis of what works around tackling crime, set out in the draft Evidence Review that all Board Members have received;
   - Phase 2 – Focused on creating the conditions for change by ensuring the key messages from the evidence review were reflected in critical strategies, for example the work of the Early Years Collaborative;

- Phase 3 – To focus on the development and deliverance of projects and was endorsed by the Justice Board in February to be built around the 5 P's: prevention, partnership, people, performance, and potential.
- Suggested that the initial focus of the programme could be towards reducing victimisation from violent crime and reducing the number of homicides due to their disproportionate effect on individual communities Scotland.

Item 3 – Scoping the Programme

3. Jason Leitch led a presentation regarding the Improvement Framework approach that supports all Scottish Government change programmes. The presentation stressed that Improvement Framework aims to provide a method to implement change. The change must empower those at the frontline to make the changes and be evidenced by those at the frontline to see if the changes are being effective. An improvement aim that is a "clear stretch goal" should be set to be used as an aspirational motivation tool. Crucially six questions must be asked of the change being implemented to set out whether or not the change will be effective:

   i. Is there an agreed aim?
   ii. Is there evidence supporting the changes being made?
   iii. Is there a clear change method?
   iv. Can we measure and report progress on our aim?
   v. Are the people and other resources being used most effectively to enable improvement?
   vi. Have we set out our plans in a manner that can be spread?

4. The following points were made in discussion:

- The 90 day innovation approach was suggested as a way to make progress immediately rather than waiting for evidence if no evidence is currently available. This approach suggests 30 days for an informal, frontline evidence approach to identify the problems, 30 days of testing the change package, and 30 days to take successful aspects and hand over to mainstream agencies.
- Having immediate set numerical aims is not vital; instead the programme can get started with stretching improvement aims for action to be taken. The main focus is to make those on the frontline accountable for the change.
- A targeted, evidence-led approach was discussed. For example, looking at the key at risk groups – children, women, young males – or the difference between targeting those that carry out the most number of offences and targeting the number of incidents in general.
- A need to ensure that those leading the programme are open to innovation and don't become stagnant with their ideas was mentioned. Treating the problem as a crisis was also suggested to drive change.

5. Jason Leitch introduced Driver Diagrams to allow visualisation of the challenges encountered by the program and how to overcome these. Primary

drivers are used to describe the major changes that must be made to meet the aim with secondary drivers being smaller changes that can be achieved by tasks to fulfil the primary drivers. The driver diagram is an active approach to drive the programme forward.

6. The following points were noted in discussion:
   - Even if the information is not available to set a concrete aim at the current time a proxy aim can be set based on what is known or assumed to be known.
   - It is important that the programme can assess whether or not the drivers are actually driving change and, if not, are flexible enough to be changed if necessary.
   - Importance placed on the programme requiring rhythm to succeed rather than waiting on Board meetings for progress to be made.
   - Mike Foulis outlined the collaborative approach used in early years. This approach focuses on learning in the system around how to achieve change and requires constant communication as well as a large input of resources from those involved.
   - The crucial effective involvement and engagement of key allies including Local Authorities was discussed.
   - The difficulty in driving innovation was discussed with one solution mentioned to select a group of innovative performers and create the conditions to allow them to innovate. Clear and open information sharing was also noted as an important aspect of driving innovative change.
   - To avoid unintentional consequences it was suggested that change should be tested on a small scale first of all, utilising leadership and the driver diagrams to flush out any unintentional consequences.

ACTION POINT 1: To continue the discussion to refine the aim "off-line" before the next Programme Board in late October.

Item 4 – Summary of Programmes and Projects

7. Gill Wylie introduced the Assets Focused Interventions project. The project's suggested key elements are:

   i. Gathering and sharing information on whether or not asset based approaches work;
   ii. Clarifying the terminology surrounding the area to give a clear shared understanding of what different agencies and organisations mean by asset-based approaches.

8. The following points were noted in discussion:
   - The CashBack Link Up was seen as a potential good example as was the Violence Reduction Unit's work in Kilmarnock.
   - The need for clear terminology was reinforced, for example, do assets mean just people or physical assets too?

- Asset based Policing discussed as being about creating the space for communities to breathe and engage alongside robust enforcement where needed.
- Within communities, we need to understand the conditions that make some resilient and others less so.
- As asset based approaches are a key focus of Scottish Government thinking at present, the opportunity to focus and make quick progress on this area was identified.

ACTION POINT 2: Project outline agreed. Further work needed to define how this project will play a significant role in developing asset based approaches within local communities.

9. Jennifer Stoddart introduced the Violence Reduction Data project as an attempt to make multi-agency information sharing more effective based around three strands:

- Use information collected by Accident and Emergency departments to improve information sharing around incidents of violence to inform targeting of multi-agency interventions.
- Develop improved information sharing mechanisms and practice around the Multi-Agency Tasking and Co-ordination groups (targeting perpetrators of domestic violence) in development across Scotland.
- Development of a national performance framework around violence prevention to draw together the various agencies involved in violence reduction to begin to track the impact of interventions over time.

10. The following points were noted in discussion:
- Difficulties surrounding information sharing were noted with the gathering of all the different sources seen as a particularly challenging. It was recognised that the benefits for all agencies involved should be clearly articulated.
- Highlighted the importance of connecting work currently underway to explore the reasons behind reductions in crime.
- Barriers to improved information sharing were identified but it was agreed these were not insurmountable.

ACTION POINT 3: Project outline agreed. Final project plan to be developed and the scope refined to reflect the discussion.

11. Jennifer Stoddart introduced the Violence Reduction Education project. The project will aim to develop a consistent and collaborative educational offer to support the delivery of violence reduction messages in schools and other educational establishments.

ACTION POINT 4: Project outline agreed. Final project plan to be developed and the scope refined to reflect the discussion.

12. Cheryl Smith introduced the National Community Planning Support Network project. The project is rooted in the legacy of the Police and Fire Reform

programme and works with Local Authorities on scrutinising performance and priorities. Currently, the project is attempting to build a picture of what is happening across the country from the ground level upwards to meet the gap between what is happening and what is perceived as happening. This project is designed to offer a basic level of support for every Community Planning Partnership as well as more intensive support for a smaller number where specific issues will be tackled or approaches tested. In doing so, the project will seeks to assist Community Planning Partnerships to deliver transformative change around the four pillars of the public sector reform agenda.

ACTION POINT 5: Project outline agreed. Final project plan to be developed and the scope refined to reflect the discussion.

13. Jennifer Stoddart introduced the potential separate Evidence Base project to concentrate on the evidence surrounding the other projects. The Members were positive to this idea being explored.

ACTION POINT 6: Project outline agreed. Final project plan to be developed and the scope refined to reflect the discussion.

14. Paul Johnston suggested that rather than following the traditional project board approach for the five projects three advisory groups were created instead. One group to oversee the Violence Reduction Data and Violence Reduction Education projects, one group to oversee the National Community Planning Support Framework and Assets Focused Interventions projects, and on group to oversee the Evidence Base project.

ACTION POINT 7: This approach was agreed

Item 5 – Project Governance

15. The Draft Terms of Reference and Governance Arrangements were agreed. Members expressed a preference for bi-monthly meetings rather than quarterly meetings.

ACTION POINT 8: Project Governance and Terms of Reference were agreed. Meetings to be bi-monthly at least initially.

Item 6 – Any Other Business

16. Two upcoming stakeholder meetings were noted. Firstly, the National Safer Communities Conference is to be held on the 10th September at the Grand Central Hotel, Glasgow. The second being the Learning Network event to be held on the 8th October at Verity House, Edinburgh.

Item 7 – Date of Next Meeting

17. Mid-October if diaries permit.

ACTION POINT 9: Date of next meeting to be confirmed.