Partnership Priority Setting Matrix

This guidance describes an approach to support Community Safety Partnership (CSP) senior managers in making informed strategic decisions with regard to the prioritisation of resources. Although initially designed for use within Community Safety this matrix is flexible enough to be used by any partnership setting their priorities, for example Community Planning Partnership.

The guidance is split into two sections. Section A focuses on priority setting. The approach described is based on completion of a matrix which summarises the evidence from the partnership's Strategic Assessment. The matrix provides a framework within which different Community Safety concerns can be compared. The matrix will help partnerships focus strategies, service delivery requirements, tactics and action plans in the areas that will have the biggest impact on reducing harm caused by the subject areas examined. It is hoped that all 32 CSP's will adopt this matrix when priority setting allowing the national Community Safety priorities for Scotland to be evidenced.

Section B: Next Steps is much shorter and provides an initial framework against which CSPs can begin to examine the cost-effectiveness of existing strategies - as well as identify alternative approaches which may better target the underlying issues that are known to cut across a wide range of Community Safety concerns. The move towards *Prevention* and delivering more with less is a key message from the Scottish Government. As recognised within Public Services Reform there is a need to shift resources to deliver preventative actions, often with no additional budget(s).

Section A: Priority Setting

Previous approaches to prioritisation commonly adopted by Community Safety Partnerships have been based on variations of a 'risk matrix' model. These models rely on partners being able to quantify or measure a wide range of prioritisation criteria for example Community Concern or Impact on Victim and assign a representative score. There are many challenges associated with this type of approach. These challenges are fully-described in documents[1], which have supported the development of this guidance. The approach described here is instead designed to maximise the use of contextual information and expert knowledge whilst retaining focus on evidence produced during the Strategic Assessment process.

Description of the matrix

The two axes consist of:

- Subject areas
  These will be specific to each partnership and as described within the Strategic Assessment. They may include e.g. ASB broken down into Youth Disorder and Fire Raising, or Home Safety focusing on Unintentional Injuries

- Assessment Factors
  Used to evaluate the subject areas and include Seriousness, Scale, Trend, Community Concern and Achieving Objectives. These factors will be the same for each partnership

An example of a partially completed matrix is provided in Appendix A: Partnership Priority Setting Matrix. Once completed, the populated matrix can be used to compare the subject areas and identify those which present the biggest threat to the wellbeing and safety of the community.

Definitions

Definitions for each Assessment Factor are described in the next section and are provided threefold, to:

- Ease population of the matrix for the user
- Reduce subjectivity and ensure a consistent interpretation of the factors by each CSP
- Enable comparisons to be made across CSP's and thus a picture of Community Safety priorities for Scotland to be evidenced

Note: Definitions of subject areas are left to the discretion of the partnership although it is recommended that these are as detailed and specific as possible.

---

[1] Critical Review and Good Practice Report

Benefits of this approach

Simplicity

The approach is simple by design. Any member of A CSP should be able to understand and follow the guidance to use the matrix without additional technical or analytical support

Transparency

The layout of the matrix ensures there is a transparent and auditable framework around how partnerships set their priorities. The link between the Strategic Assessment and priority setting is also clear with research, evidence and analysis populating the matrix rather than 'worse-case scenario' thinking / planning

Terminology

Consistent and clearly-defined terminology adds clarity to the matrix making it easier for both user and reader. Using commonly understood definitions support information and expertise exchange both within and between partnerships.

Consistency

Clear and unambiguous Assessment Factors combined with a simple yet transparent methodology aids interpretation and promotes a consistent approach to prioritisation across the 32 Scottish CSP's

Objectivity

The suggested approach ensures that the matrix is only populated with *evidence and analysis* from the Strategic Assessment. The summarised evidence is then reviewed and assessed by the partnership. This approach better reflects the varied, often-complex nature of Community Safety issues and does not attempt to condense an often-complex situation into a single representative score. Nor does it allow any individual(s) to argue solely for their own agenda i.e. who shouts loudest wins

The Priority Setting Process

Subject Areas	Assessment Factors				
	Seriousness	Scale	Trend	Community Concern	Strategic Objectives
Step 1	Step 2				⟶
Step 3	Step 2				⟶
Step 3				.	

Step 1 - Adding Subject Areas
The user should list all subject areas down the vertical axis, providing as much detail as possible:

ASB	Dog fouling, noise nuisance, underage drinking, littering, vandalism
Domestic Abuse	Minor Assault, Breach of Peace, Domestic Abuse incidents
Fire Safety	Primary and secondary fires, wilful fire raising, home safety checks
Road Safety	Casualties/fatalities/injuries, driving offences, impact of road conditions

The above list is not exhaustive and given as examples only

Note: Steps 1 and 2 should be completed by the individual(s) responsible for compiling the Strategic Assessment. This should be done prior to partners coming together to discuss the actual prioritisation of subject areas i.e. at a Prioritisation Workshop. This will make discussion on the day more effective and less time-consuming.

Note: Subject areas may be a geographic location rather than issues, for example Youth Disorder within ward A

Step 2 – Assessment Factors: Completing the Matrix

The matrix should be populated by working through the assessment factors for each subject area in turn. Whilst the majority will require contextual evidence to be summarised from the Strategic Assessment others can be populated using figures.

The information used to populate the matrix should be drawn exclusively from the evidence and analysis within the Strategic Assessment and not be possible worst-case scenarios. This will ensure the partnership makes robust, balanced and evidence-based decisions.

Each Assessment Factor should be considered although it may not be possible to complete every cell of the matrix as this will depend on what data and evidence was available when compiling the Strategic Assessment.

Note: To make certain points stand out it may be worthwhile colour coding the bullet points i.e. using red to highlight higher levels of harm or crime or negative messages / points.

i. Measuring the *Seriousness* of the problem

The following aspects should be considered as part of VOL (Victim, Offender, Location) and/or PAT (Problem Analysis Triangle):

▪ <u>Impact on the Victim</u>	Can be physical, emotional or financial. Contextual information and evidence from the Strategic Assessment should be documented and can be combined with expert knowledge and opinion at the Priority Setting Workshop. Evidence of common repeat victimisation should be considered here
▪ <u>Impact on the Offender</u>	The harm caused to the offender, for example the substance user who commits crime to help fund their addiction, are they homeless, unemployed, claiming benefits, have previous convictions – this area is about understanding the offender and links to underlying factors
▪ <u>Impact on Environment / Location</u>	For example fire damage to property(s); fire damage to grassland as a result of litter being set alight; vandalism and graffiti within the City Centre

Note: The potential impact of events for which there is minimal evidence of occurrence (e.g. terrorist attack), should only be considered if Horizon Scanning supports the suggestion that something is likely to occur. In this case, evidence should be combined with expert opinion at the Priority Setting workshop.

Note: Although measurable information and evidence is desirable this won't always be achievable therefore including as much contextual information as possible will aid decision-making and make comparisons across subject areas easier.

Note: Not all Assessment Factors will be relevant to all subject areas for example violence against a person may not have an environmental impact.

Note: Assessment should only ever be based on direct impacts, i.e. known impacts on the actual victim and not hypothesised wider societal concerns or consequences for example the impact on victim's family - **unless there is compelling evidence to support this** - if there is evidence to suggest that children are commonly present at domestic abuse events or living in homes where prostitution occurs.

ii. Measuring the *Scale* of problem

The following aspects should each be considered to describe and understand the scale of the problem

▪ **Volume**	The number of crimes and incidents committed, can either be a number or contextual information e.g. ASB (in its widest sense) is a high volume crime whereas Child Protection may be low in volume

- **Under-Reporting** Levels of under-reporting may be difficult to quantify. However, it may be useful to consider whether under-reporting is likely to significantly skew volume figures

- **Frequency** Consideration might be given to how often the issue occurs - daily, weekly, monthly, yearly or seasonally. Some problems will be high in volume but only occur at set times of the year - increase in ASB during Halloween and Bonfire Night; increase in youth calls when the lighter nights arrive

iii. Measuring *Trend*

Consideration should be given to whether the issue is predicted to get worse or better over the period of the Strategic Assessment - this is drawn from the analysis and comparison of 5-years worth of data and baselines / averages. By comparing the current situation against what has happened previously and considering Horizon Scanning, predictions can be made around what is likely to happen in the future. Remember, these predictions should be solely based on the analysis presented within the Strategic Assessment.

iv. Measuring *Community Concern*

Is the issue of concern to the community? Answers will be found through a variety of collection methods including Community Safety surveys, local policing surveys, community engagement meetings etc. Contextual information, both positive and negative should be drawn from the Strategic Assessment.

Note: Care should be taken when assessing community concerns as feedback will reflect both real and perceived issues. Whilst public perception can in some situations be considered to be valuable 'local intelligence' it may often be more closely aligned with effects of the media and should therefore be compared against other factors and the evidence within the Strategic Assessment.

v. *Achieving National Strategic Objectives*

Partnerships should consider how tackling the subject area would demonstrate they are helping achieve the Scottish Government's 5 Strategic Objectives to make Scotland Wealthier & Fairer, Smarter, Healthier, Safer & Stronger and Greener. The assessment should use the Strategic Assessment to evidence the links to these wider agendas.

Step 3 - Priority Setting
The completed matrix should be circulated around partners prior to the actual Priority Setting Workshop taking place.

The completed Partnership Priority Matrix should form the basis for discussion around partnership priorities. The partners should review the matrix and - where relevant and agreed by the group - document any additional expert knowledge.

When assessing priorities, partners should first consider the *Scale* and *Seriousness* factors. Together, these essentially describe the overall size of the problem and should be considered the key factors affecting priority. Partners can use techniques such as moving subject areas up and down in the table (by simply cutting and pasting the row) to reflect the assessment by the partnership. Information on *Trends* can also be used to differentiate priorities.

Only once this initial ranking process is complete should partners consider the additional factors of *Community Concerns* and *Strategic Objectives*. The partners should use expert judgement to agree whether the evidence provided under these headings is sufficient to alter priorities.

At the end of this process, partners should have a ranked list of priorities and be able to determine which of these they will focus on.

Section B: Next Steps

Once the partnership has agreed its key priorities then the next stage is to develop strategies, action plans and recommendations for managing these. A second template (Appendix B: Strategy Evaluation Matrix) has been provided to assist with this. This template covers a number of different factors:

i. Cost to CSP

Consideration should be given to resources, including capital spend, staff time etc. currently invested in dealing with the issue.

ii. Cost to wider Community Planning Partnership

The cost to be considered is whether there is involvement from other partners in tackling either this issue or another aspect or consequence of the issue for example Community Safety colleagues employing youth workers to build relationships with youth offenders while Education and Social Work colleagues are also investing resources and offering support to the same youths.

Within Community safety it is known that many issues are linked to alcohol and drugs including ASB, Violence, Fire Safety, Road Safety, and Personal Safety and therefore a number of other partners and delivery groups will be tackling different aspects of Substance Misuse i.e. from Health, Education, Social Work, Justice perspective.

Other health costs to consider include the long-term impact of crimes and incidents that affect the increasing ageing population either through Bogus Caller Crime of Home Safety and falls in the home

iii. Existing Strategies

Examine what the partnership has already put in place to tackle the issue for example Home Safety Visits to reduce domestic fire incidents and/or falls in the home; youth workers being deployed in specific problem areas or communication campaigns to reduce the incidence of dog fouling.

iv. Performance

Partners should then consider whether the issue is showing the right direction of travel and is reaching targets. Discussion should focus on the effectiveness of existing strategies and the potential for new approaches to be adopted. There should be discussion around the benefit of continuing to invest resources into an issue that is showing year-on-year reduction versus withdrawing resources and the impact that may result.

v. Underlying Issues

Partners should examine the underlying issues; these may then show a causal link(s) and/or underlying symptoms identified within each of the subject areas. This should be evaluated based on evidence documented within the Strategic Assessment, for example hotspot for Domestic Abuse occurs within a ward which is 20% most deprived; highest volume of youth offending occurs with males between the ages of 12 and 15 most of which have low levels of attendance at school and have below average S4 educational attainment scores; the majority of violent offenders reside within a cluster of wards which are economically deprived and have low health outcomes.

To help complete this step evidence could be drawn from analysis of:

- Scottish Schools Adolescent Lifestyle and Substance Use Survey
- Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation
- Scottish neighbourhood Statistics around educational attainment scores
- Information Services Division broken down to ward level

safer scotland
SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT

Subject Areas	Assessment Factors				
	Seriousness	**Scale**	**Trend**	**Community Concern**	**Strategic Objectives**

Violence:
1. Robbery
2. Public Protection
   • Sexual Offences
   • Domestic Abuse
   • Forced Marriage
   • Child Protection
   • Adult Protection
   • Offender Management
   • Bogus Caller Crime
	• Robbery resulting in verbal and physical abuse, threatened with weapon
	• Substance use / dependency and offenders
	• Sexual assault / rape victims are females 16 and under
	• Large amount of Domestic abuse incidents involve verbal arguments
	• Domestic Abuse repeat victimisation reduced
	• ¾ of domestic abuse incidents occur with children present or in home
	• Bogus crime extreme cases people have lost their life savings, or have had to move into residential care
		• Third of offences not reported to Police
		• 13% of all reported crime is minor or serious assault
		• Violence overall decreased in last year 17% below 3-yr average
		• Robbery and Assault increased by 13% above 3-yr average
		• Sexual Offences decreased by 18% below 3-yr average
		• Increase in domestic abuse incidents
		• Bogus crime incidents occur during the week, early-mid afternoon, with a notable seasonal peak in Spring/Summer
			• Third of offences alcohol-related
			• Clear link to substance misuse and Robbery
			• Recorded rape offences increased (due to new legislation)
			• Alcohol related to sexual crimes
			• violence against women in teen relationships is a key information gap and is a rising issue
				• Community Safety survey highlights 84% of people feel safe walking in their neighbourhood during the day, this drops to 44% for during the evening
				• Police engagement paper reports that 60% of residents think Violence should be the number one priority for Police
					Helping achieve National Outcomes 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 – Wealthier & Fairer, Smarter, Healthier and Safer & Stronger

Road Safety	• Fatalities are young drivers under 25 • Young adults (aged sixteen to twenty-five) still remain disproportionately represented among casualties for all road user groups (both as	• Incidents occur at times of high vehicle density – arterial routes and major junctions	• Continue to meet national targets • Concern is serious child casualties that is above the target level • Cycle and pedestrian casualties rising • motorcycle casualties for 2011/12 is	• Local Authority consultations have shown that residents are 'highly concerned about the number of children being injured on roads'. • Residents feel that more money needs to	Helping achieve National Outcomes 4, 6, 7, 14, 16, 9, 11 – Wealthier & Fairer, Healthier, Smarter, Greener and Safer & Stronger

	drivers and pedestrians) making up a quarter of all casualties		currently higher than in any of the three previous years	be spent on urban roads in regards to speed calming measures	
Add more subject areas as required to match the number of subject areas described within Strategic Assessment					

Please Note: The matrix has been populated with example data only

Appendix B: Strategy Evaluation Matrix

safer scotland
SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT

Priorities	Assessment Factors				
	Cost to CSP	Cost to wider CPP	Existing Strategies	Performance	Underlying Issues
Violence	• Dedicated weekend Police patrols currently in operation, part-funded by local authority • Wardens employed extra hours at weekends • Campaign leaflets and posters (domestic abuse / bogus caller crime)	• Health colleagues working with victims of domestic abuse • A&E staff and Scottish Ambulance Service dealing with victims of assault	• Weekend Policing plan • Domestic Abuse and Bogus Caller campaigns	• No change	• Alcohol linked to number of offences • Violence occurring across partnership area in most 10% deprived wards • SALSUS results for 2010 show youths (13 to 15) drinking more than 2006 youths
Road Safety	• Throughout year dedicated inputs at all schools • Cost of local campaign including leaflets, promotional materials	• Road maintenance targeting hotspot areas introducing traffic calming measures • Schools engaging with inputs and visits to Risk Factory for all pupils	• National and local seasonal campaigns • Cycling proficiency certificate on offer to all primary schools	• Getting worse	• No pattern or trend seen across those involved in a collision or in location – occur throughout area on both urban and rural roads. Only pattern is fatalities continue to be under 25yrs with driver error, weather conditions and/or poor judgement of speed of other road users being cited as collision cause
Priority 3					