

Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner

Community Safety Partnership Funding Review 2017

Executive summary



Executive summary

The objective of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) funding review was to assess how the current £583,202 of Community Safety Partnership funding can be most appropriately apportioned to support the Police and Crime Plan 2017/21.

The review focused on three main areas:

1. Funding formula – Reviewing the current funding formula and identifying any associated strengths or weaknesses. Researching alternative funding formulas which may better apportion funding.
2. Management of funding – Looking at best practice nationally and consulting with key stakeholders about alternative options for managing the funds.
3. Pan-Sussex commissioning – Consulting on the possible opportunities and appetite for commissioning across Sussex.

Methodology

Single points of contact were selected for each area: Kate Payling for West Sussex, Catherine Fletcher for East Sussex and John Willett for Brighton & Hove.

Financial information was requested from the Heads of Community Safety and individual CSPs, concerning their spending over the last two financial years. No financial detail could be provided for the Drug Intervention Programme (DIP) or Youth Offending Service (YOS) which the Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC) contributes to and therefore this was not included as part of the review.

A questionnaire was designed and formed the basis of the interviews, online responses and workshops. It included questions around decision making at CSPs and how they evaluate and monitor the projects they fund. It also included an options paper with five options for the management of CSP funding. Heads of Community Safety and CSP Chairs were invited to a 1:1 interview with the respective Office of the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner (OSPCC) officer. CSP officers from West Sussex and East Sussex were invited to attend a workshop (one for East Sussex and one for West Sussex). These were facilitated by Kate Payling and Catherine Fletcher in order to gather the officers' collective views. The officers were also invited to fill in individual submissions of the questionnaire. As a unitary authority Brighton & Hove had an individual meeting with John Willett to gather their perspective. One hundred and thirty attendees from the CSPs were emailed and invited to contribute to the review using an online version of the questionnaire. A group consultation with the District Commanders at Sussex Police was held and facilitated by John Willett. In total, fourteen 1:1 interviews were conducted, two officer workshops and fourteen questionnaires were completed online. Responses were received from all CSP chairs, CSP officers and Heads of Community Safety.

The national review was led by Kate Payling who visited North Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire Police & Crime Commissioner offices (OPCCs) and contacted Surrey,

Thames Valley and Hampshire OPCCs by phone and email. The Association of Police and Crime Commissioners (APCC) were also contacted for comment.

There were three main phases to the review:

- Phase 1 - Consultation, research and data collection
This stage of the review ran throughout July, August and in to September 2017. It included the stakeholder interviews and workshops, gathering of the finance data and national review. This phase was extended beyond its original timescales to allow for delays in the return of information from CSPs.
- Phase 2 - Analysis and assessment
Phase 2 ran from September to the beginning of November 2017. It included qualitative analysis, quantitative analysis and the writing of this report.
- Phase 3 - Reporting and options
The final stage was the presentation of an options report to the PCC and her Senior Management Team in December 2017. A decision and implementation plan meeting was held in January 2018 with the decision communicated to key stakeholders in February 2018.

Results and analysis

Options analysis

Five options for the management of CSP funding were presented to participants. These were:

Option 1 - Maintain current position: The current position is maintained with Community Safety funding apportioned from the Police & Crime Commissioner to local authorities with indicated amounts which should be passed to individual Community Safety Partnerships & services for their use.

Option 2 - Funding directly to upper tiers: Community Safety funding is apportioned from the Police & Crime Commissioner directly to Upper Tier Authorities via their Executive to disseminate to individual Community Safety Partnerships & services dependant upon need.

Option 3 - Funding directly to CSPs: Community Safety funding is apportioned from the Police & Crime Commissioner directly to Community Safety Partnerships & services dependant upon need.

Option 4 - A Community Safety Fund is created: The Police & Crime Commissioner retains funds for Community Safety and instigates a process where Upper Tier, Local and District Borough Councils through their Community Safety Partnership structure can apply for funding for projects and services.

Option 5 - Blended model: The Police & Crime Commissioner maintains the current process in relation to allocation of Community Safety funding but retains a percentage of the allocated funds for central commissioning or grant funding specific services which will benefit communities pan-Sussex.

Participants were asked to rank the options in order of preference. A rank of 1 indicates the respondents most preferred option and a rank of 5 their least preferred option. The below table shows the options in order of popularity:

	Average rank	Instances ranked 1 or 2	Instances ranked 4 or 5	Total respondents
Option 1 - Maintain current position	1.8	21	4	28
Option 3 - Funding directly to CSPs	2.6	11	4	27
Option 5 - Blended model	2.6	12	4	27
Option 2 - Funding directly to upper tiers	3.6	9	19	28
Option 4 - A Community Safety Fund is created	4.3	2	24	29

Option 1, to maintain the current position, was the preferred choice by respondents. The least popular option was option 4, to create a Community Safety Fund, with comments primarily around the added bureaucracy and competition this would create. Option 2, funding directly to upper tiers, was also ranked as the fourth or fifth least desirable option in two thirds of cases because it was feared local priorities would be lost. Overall the main concern from respondents was if any of the options resulted in a reduction in funding.

Using comments from the consultation and our own research, a Strength, Weakness, Opportunity and Threat (SWOT) analysis was produced for each of the options.

Consultation

All CSPs emphasised the value they place on the funding from the PCC to help them tackle *“local issues for local people by local organisations”* and that *“with the new Local Policing Plan, CSPs are the only opportunity for community engagement”*.

The majority of projects funded by CSPs were grant funded rather than commissioned. Reasons given for this included lack of long-term funding and lack of commissioning expertise. The majority of CSPs wait for organisations to approach them for funding and then assess them against the CSP’s priorities (similar to the OSPCC’s Safer in Sussex fund). Exceptions to this include Arun CSP who do not grant fund and instead fund large-scale, innovative projects, and Lewes CSP who actively seek out best practice organisations to meet their priorities.

Many CSPs raised concerns about managing multiple priorities (between the CSP, District Commander, County Council, Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG’s) and the PCC) and the lack of data intelligence available to CSP officers. Concerns were also expressed about whether the OSPCC’s quarterly monitoring was proportionate to the level of funding which CSPs receive since for many, the PCC is not the main contributor to their overall Community Safety funding. Other concerns raised related to whether the PCC was funding services which are the responsibility of other statutory agencies, for example drug and alcohol services which should be funded by Public Health.

The general view on pan-Sussex commissioning was it could work, framed within specific themes and if it were managed by the OSPCC. The most popular areas for pan-Sussex

commissioning were crime prevention and preventing reoffending. Local implementation and local delivery of services was important to many. One participant commented *“It will be difficult to choose themes that are relevant across all district and boroughs considering the range and diversity of populations as well as wealth and poverty levels.”*

A quote from Chief Inspector Rosie Ross summarises the feelings many expressed during the consultation:

“This relatively small pot of money provided by the PCC to individual CSPs is a real asset and allows us to work with partners around the table to nip small problems in the bud; and have easy access to money to help solve it. Usually gaining access to funds for community problem solving is difficult with bureaucratic processes which take far too long. The CSP money cuts through all this bureaucracy and makes a real difference to how we can help reduce crime and work together in partnership. If we were sitting around the table trying to sort out community issues with no money – it would be a very different meeting”.

APCC

This year, the APCC commissioned a survey on the views of PCCs on how effectively CSPs are operating. The Chair of the Local Policing and Partnerships Portfolio Group is keen to encourage CSPs in his area to work more effectively and to that end has provided them with additional funding with the expectation that they proactively assist him in delivering his Police and Crime Plan. Nationally the picture is very mixed but the general response from PCCs is they are keen to reinvigorate CSPs.

National review

There are significant variations nationally on how PCCs apportion funding. This review consulted with North Yorkshire, Nottinghamshire, Surrey, West Mercia and Thames Valley OPCC. In North Yorkshire the funding was distributed three ways: 15% directly to CSPs, 40% to a Community Safety Fund (with 14% specifically attributed to mental health services) and 45% retained for central commissioning. In Nottinghamshire, the Safer Nottinghamshire Board identifies the top ten highest crime wards in the county and the funding is divided equally between these. In Surrey the CSPs are able to apply for funding from the OPCC for specific projects via a dedicated Funding Hub. Thames Valley apply a formula based on five elements and top slice 10% for other initiatives.

Financial review

The most popular suggestion during the consultation for how the PCC's funding should be apportioned was using a formula taking into account projected population (weighted at 40%) and crime rate (weighted at 60%).

Brighton & Hove and the pan-East Sussex partnership were both unable to provide a breakdown of how the PCC's funding was spent.

Income and expenditure:

In 2016/17 the total income of the CSPs (not including Brighton & Hove or pan-East Sussex partnership) was £1,184,881 of which £637,971 was spent (54%). In 2015/16, the total income was £1,647,232 of which £1,011,870 was spent (61%). Over two years this equates to 58% of cumulative CSP income being spent.

2015/16 & 2016/17	PCC funding	CSP total income	PCC funding as a % of total income	CSP spend	CSP spend as a % of total income
Adur & Worthing	£190,320	£1,255,496.77	15%	£667,919.08	53%
Arun	£95,160	£370,762.00	26%	£113,139.00	31%
Chichester	£84,588	£117,486.00	72%	£97,060.00	83%
Craw ley	£95,160	£153,154.00	62%	£86,760.00	57%
Eastbourne	£52,528	£55,998.74	94%	£55,998.74	100%
Hastings	£71,824	£172,324.00	42%	£71,824.00	42%
Horsham	£84,588	£193,213.00	44%	£151,115.00	78%
Lew es	£43,952	£43,952.00	100%	£35,984.00	82%
Mid Sussex	£84,588	£254,260.02	33%	£248,604.98	98%
Rother	£46,900	£74,840.00	63%	£84,411.93	113%
Wealden	£52,796	£140,626.00	38%	£37,024.00	26%

Reserves:

In 2015/16 the CSP's collectively had £533,467 in reserves. In 2016/17 the CSP's collectively had £511,980 in reserves. The majority expressed reserves were necessary due to the uncertainty of year on year funding which was unhelpful for future planning and longer term projects.

	2015/16	2016/17
Adur & Worthing	£222,161	£212,376
Arun	£77,794	£81,329
Chichester	£18,636	£28,323
Craw ley	£44,912	£21,482
Eastbourne	£20,000	£20,000
Hastings	£0	£0
Horsham	£67,362	£59,470
Lew es	£39,000	£29,000
Mid Sussex	£0	£0
Rother	£0	£0
Wealden	£43,602	£60,000

Recommendations

Funding formula

Regardless of whether the management of community safety funding is changed, it is recommended the funding formula is revised as of 2019/20. The current formula is not

objective or transparent and there was a strong appetite among interviewees for the formula to be changed. The most popular option throughout the consultation was a funding formula using projected population (weighted at 40%) and crime over the last four years per 1,000 population (weighted at 60%). This would address an imbalance in the current funding formula which negatively impacts East Sussex CSPs and favours Adur & Worthing CSP. Adur & Worthing CSP is an outlier, receiving substantially more funding from the PCC than any other CSP, despite their population and crime rate being comparable with others.

To bring it in line with the rest of Sussex, it is also suggested the pan-East Sussex partnership funding be reallocated to East Sussex CSPs at the earliest opportunity, to ensure a consistent approach across the counties.

	Current funding formula	Revised funding formula	Difference to current funding formula	
			Number	%
Adur & Worthing	£95,160	£53,591.18	-£41,568.82	-44%
Arun	£47,580	£50,425.28	£2,845.28	6%
Brighton & Hove	£80,000	£83,354.70	£3,354.70	4%
Chichester	£42,294	£39,954.56	-£2,339.44	-6%
Crawley	£47,580	£53,862.13	£6,282.13	13%
Eastbourne	£26,264	£50,917.06	£24,653.06	94%
Hastings	£35,912	£59,797.40	£23,885.40	67%
Horsham	£42,294	£39,244.26	-£3,049.74	-7%
Lewes	£21,976	£36,479.43	£14,503.43	66%
Mid Sussex	£42,294	£39,872.64	-£2,421.36	-6%
Pan-East Sussex	£52,000	£0.00	-£52,000.00	-100%
Rother	£23,450	£36,757.43	£13,307.43	57%
Wealden	£26,398	£38,945.92	£12,547.92	48%
Total	£583,202	£583,202.00	£0.00	0%
<i>East Sussex</i>	<i>£186,000</i>	<i>£222,897.25</i>	<i>£36,897.25</i>	<i>20%</i>
<i>West Sussex</i>	<i>£317,202</i>	<i>£276,950.05</i>	<i>-£40,251.95</i>	<i>-13%</i>

Based on comments received during the consultation, it is further recommended funding be committed for more than one year to give the CSPs stability, reducing underspend and reliance on reserves. It is also hoped this will encourage innovative and longer term work.

Management of funding and pan-Sussex commissioning

Based on the findings of this review, it is recommended Option 5, the blended model, is implemented as of 2019/20. CSPs will retain the majority of their funding and the OSPCC will retain a percentage for pan-Sussex commissioning of anti-social behaviour and crime prevention initiatives.

Strength	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSPs retain the majority of funding • Portal commissioning for domestic abuse across East Sussex and Brighton & Hove is best practice • The majority of CSPs agreed that this was an option they would support if it was done with local implementation and knowledge in mind, particularly for crime and reoffending prevention initiatives • Continuity of service and joined up, consistent approach to performance monitoring commissioned services • With change in funding formula, some CSPs would not see a decrease in funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns were raised about whether all CSPs would benefit from the pan-Sussex commissioning • Would countywide rather than Sussex-wide be more appropriate? • The percentage retained by the OSPCC would need to be reviewed regularly and evidence based • Two tiered local authority structure makes this option more complex • Will likely require additional investment from the PCC to ensure viability • Lengthy implementation process • Resource intensive for commissioning team at OSPCC • Although percentage investment in pan-Sussex commissioning will be equal across all CSPs, the change in funding formula will see some CSPs' funding decrease further than others
Opportunity	Threat
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using OSPCC expertise in commissioning to support CSPs • Lobbying power • In 2015-17 £181,447 was spent on preventing offending and reoffending Sussex wide. £250,363 was spent on anti-social behaviour. Better value for money could be achieved by commissioning pan-Sussex • Pan-Sussex commissioning with local implementation, co-design and co-production • Co-design process could strengthen relationship with OSPCC and CSPs as well as between the CSPs themselves • Evidence and needs based commissioning • Upskill CSP officers in commissioning process • Consistent does not mean homogenous • District and Boroughs would want an equal place at the table to County Councils 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be perceived as reducing funding although CSPs will be receiving services for their investment. The majority of CSPs wanted to retain 100% of funding. • Would need to be a balance between planning and reactive. Needs flexibility to react to emerging local issues • Who is accountable? • Concerns were raised that previous attempts, for example Sussex Homeless Outreach Reconnection & Engagement (SHORE), were overly simplistic

Using the revised funding formula mentioned above and in the context of additional funding received by the CSPs from other sources, if the OSPCC retained 20% of PCC funding from each CSP, it would be apportioned as follows:

	Current funding formula	Revised funding formula	Difference to current funding formula		20% allocated to pan-Sussex commissioning	Difference to current funding formula		Impact on total funding*
			Number	%		Number	%	
Adur & Worthing	£95,160	£53,591.18	-£41,568.82	-44%	£42,872.95	-£52,287.05	-55%	-11%
Arun	£47,580	£50,425.28	£2,845.28	6%	£40,340.22	-£7,239.78	-15%	-4%
Brighton & Hove	£80,000	£83,354.70	£3,354.70	4%	£66,683.76	-£13,316.24	-17%	Unknown
Chichester	£42,294	£39,954.56	-£2,339.44	-6%	£31,963.65	-£10,330.35	-24%	-19%
Crawley	£47,580	£53,862.13	£6,282.13	13%	£43,089.70	-£4,490.30	-9%	-5%
Eastbourne	£26,264	£50,917.06	£24,653.06	94%	£40,733.65	£14,469.65	55%	53%
Hastings	£35,912	£59,797.40	£23,885.40	67%	£47,837.92	£11,925.92	33%	14%
Horsham	£42,294	£39,244.26	-£3,049.74	-7%	£31,395.40	-£10,898.60	-26%	-26%
Lewes	£21,976	£36,479.43	£14,503.43	66%	£29,183.55	£7,207.55	33%	33%
Mid Sussex	£42,294	£39,872.64	-£2,421.36	-6%	£31,898.11	-£10,395.89	-25%	-10%
Pan East Sussex	£52,000	£0.00	-£52,000.00	-100%	£0.00	-£52,000.00	-100%	Unknown
Rother	£23,450	£36,757.43	£13,307.43	57%	£29,405.95	£5,955.95	25%	17%
Wealden	£26,398	£38,945.92	£12,547.92	48%	£31,156.74	£4,758.74	18%	7%
Total	£583,202	£583,202.00	£0.00	0%	£466,561.60	-£116,640.40	-20%	
<i>East Sussex</i>	<i>£186,000</i>	<i>£222,897.25</i>	<i>£36,897.25</i>	<i>20%</i>	<i>£178,317.80</i>	<i>-£7,682.20</i>	<i>-4%</i>	<i>-3%</i>
<i>West Sussex</i>	<i>£317,202</i>	<i>£276,950.05</i>	<i>-£40,251.95</i>	<i>-13%</i>	<i>£221,560.04</i>	<i>-£95,641.96</i>	<i>-30%</i>	<i>-10%</i>

*Impact on total funding is calculated using 2016/17 total income data (including income from other sources) and is indicative only.

This would result in £466,561 going directly to CSP's and £116,640 being retained for pan-Sussex commissioning. The impact this would have on total community safety funding including YOS & DIP is as follows:

	2017/18 current funding	2018/19 transition year (phase 2)	2019/20 implementation (phase 3)	% change
East Sussex	£419,079	£419,079*	£411,396.80	-2%
West Sussex	£531,075	£531,075	£435,433.04	-18%
Brighton & Hove	£264,892	£264,892	£251,575.76	-5%
Pan-Sussex commissioning			£116,640.40	
Total	£1,215,046	£1,215,046	£1,215,046	0%

*Re-distribution of pan-East Sussex partnership funding amongst East Sussex CSPs

Monitoring

As per comments made during the consultation, it is also recommended the quarterly monitoring be revised to ensure it is proportionate. It is suggested this is designed in partnership with the CSP officers.

Chair rotation

As a result of the national review it became apparent Sussex CSPs are unusual in being chaired by elected members. It is therefore recommended the chairing of CSPs be rotated amongst CSP attendees, thereby enhancing ownership and joint problem solving of challenges. It is hoped this would also encourage greater participation from other agencies

