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Executive Summary, Key Findings and Recommendations

This evaluation provides evidence that the One Team philosophy, ‘Think Differently; Do Differently’, is extremely successful in achieving its aims. This philosophy takes an all-inclusive people and residential approach to recognising issues that impact upon the well-being of the community. It seeks to innovate through creative initiatives that enable the community as part of the solution. The achievements that make up this success have been powerfully articulated by the community members themselves, whose voices and sentiments are echoed throughout this report. However, the degree of success of each One Team is dependent upon the commitment, knowledge, relationships and trust between the partners, including the community, as much as the support and trust between the members of the One Teams and the management of the agencies involved.

Given that the initiative was truly innovative in ‘think differently; do differently’, there is a need for those involved with One Teams to adopt a flexible approach to respond and manage the dynamic and developing practices that emerge as the One Teams mature. Managers need to acknowledge that effective collaborative working is challenging, and while it may produce thorny issues that need to be grappled with, this in and of itself, is an indicator of the complexities of both partnership working and the social problems that the One Teams are dealing with.

Working in partnership has a long history that has been codified in legislation and further developed in a number of directives (for example, the Crime and Disorder Act (1998), Working Together (2015)) and is now institutionalised practice for many of the public service organisations (McCarthy and O’Neill, 2014). What makes the One Team different and sets it apart from other partnerships initiatives, is a real commitment to enable and work with the communities in identifying the real causes that impact on their quality of life and developing a range of solutions that only a truly collaborative approach can deliver. This tactic was harder and deeper than traditional partnership approaches and required a greater level of trust, commitment and longevity; all the elements that previous research tells us contribute to the success of partnership working.

The research team was also asked to consider the social return on investment for the One Teams. However, estimating costs is a notoriously difficult activity and a fully costed project
needs to consider all costs involved from inception. Projects that involve numerous organisations and agencies become even more complex to cost and further complicated when the initiative being evaluated for social/economic return on investment comprise of three discrete projects each with a degree of autonomy and at different stages of development. Nonetheless, utilising the New Economy Manchester Model, a number of significant savings in social and fiscal benefits have been identified. For example, this evaluation suggests that the public value benefit of savings in the reduction of crime within the One Team area for the year January to December 2015 was £1,067,612.

While these benefits have important implications for long term cost savings for the organisations involved with the One Teams, the greatest social gains are overwhelmingly made within the communities that the One Teams serve. Members of the community become engage in taking responsibility to ensure that it becomes a safe secure and pleasant area in which residents can lead fulfilling and meaningful lives:

“I now have a purpose in life. I get up and set up for my voluntary work…because I do that, I can have my bacon roll and coffee free. Normally, I wouldn’t have enough money for breakfast. It means I can also talk to the other people..before I didn’t even know these people and they have now become my mates. Then, if it is not raining, I go and work in the park….no, if it had not been for this (the One Team), I probably would be dead now”

“I rent here, so I choose to live at Halcon unlike some of the residents who can’t move. I moved here because it is a great place to live….we went on the litter pick last week and we have such a great time. The children really look forward to it. I can meet my friends for a coffee at the van, so I can socialise as well the children. It’s a great place to live”

Thus, the One Teams philosophy can be summed up from the quotes above as one of enabling, supporting and providing.

It became apparent from the commencement of the research that this evaluation would be action-based research. This was, in part, due to the three One Teams and its governance structure being at different and various stages of development. While the One Team ideology held across all three Teams, the research also acknowledges that the One Team is an organic process, driven by the needs of the communities in which they were situated. Thus, the
findings of the research as they emerged were fed back to the co-ordinators and Governance Boards of the One Teams to support, inform and advance its development.

**Key Findings**

1. The philosophy of the One Team, ‘think differently; do differently’ is an innovative approach, that over time identifies the complex and changing needs of specific communities in relation to demand on service and which develops effective long term solutions.

2. If the One Team approach is delivered effectively, it demonstrates significant cost savings and social benefits for service providers and the local communities. However, the wider cost/social benefits will be maximised over a greater period of time as the approach becomes embedded into policy and practice.

3. If the residents of the communities in which the One Teams operate become engaged as members of the partnership, they then assist in identifying the issues and also become fully engaged in the solutions.

4. Good engagement with partner agencies and the members of the community within the One Teams has enabled a dynamic approach to problems within the community as they arise. However, if the engagement becomes fractious, the problems that develop within the community have the potential to develop into significant criminality across all crime types that become deeply embedded.

5. Specific communities have specific needs; the experience and expertise of the One Team co-ordinator will influence the approach and solutions developed and delivered within the One Team philosophy.

6. The proof of success in any partnership initiative is that the community members themselves corroborate outcomes have positively improved the quality of their lives. This has been articulated loudly by the service users residing in Halcon. The members of the community who were interviewed as part of this research confirmed the significant improvement that the One Team had in improving their quality of life and that engagement in the initiative cultivated an immense sense of pride in the community.

7. The One Team philosophy works most effectively when applied to defined, specific and geographically located communities of deprivation.
8. Interviews with members of the community within the Halcon One Team corroborated that residents engaged positively and the initiative was visible, human (in that they came to know the team and felt they could approach and speak with them), engaging and had made a significant difference to their lives and their community. Residents discussed the success of the One Team in terms of it being an ‘active and dynamic’ initiative that helped them, as members of the community, develop and deliver solutions rather than having solutions imposed upon them. This enabled a range of distinct activities/initiatives to be developed and implemented to ensure all residents at all levels could be engaged and involved with the work of the One Team. Such activities included litter picking, Chill and Chat, Link Power and Inspired to Achieve enterprises. This net-widening approach of community engagement contributed to the success of the One Teams.

9. The success of the One Team is dependent upon the commitment, understanding and dedication of the co-ordinator. Their role must be recognised in relation to the work and devotion they give over and above the daily challenges they encounter both at organisational and community level.

10. The role, approach, experience and expertise of the co-ordinator needs to correspond with the particular demands of the One Team area for it to be fully effective. The One Team co-ordinator has to develop a strong and enduring relationship with residents if they are to become part of the solution.

11. The One Teams, while dealing with the immediate crime/social issues for their areas also prevent more destructive, pervasive and persistent crime/social problems from developing.

12. The sharing of data and information by all partners is essential to the success of this approach. Where organisations are reluctant to participate in this data/information sharing process, the service users are denied the most effective interventions and the cycle of social problems persist.

13. The One Team approach is a longer term investment to longer term solutions. Circumvention of a commitment of long term investment will directly impact on the effectiveness of the One Team approach.

14. Changes to individual partner organisations (including policy, structure and practice) may have a significant (and potentially detrimental) impact upon the workings of the
One Team partnership. Considerations should be given to the impact of the One Team partnership work when a member organisation is considering organisational changes.

15. It was also noted that the governance structure for the One Team developed as the One Teams matured. While this development was necessary to support the development of the One Teams, the governance structure now in place is appropriate for the One Teams as they continue to operate.

16. The lack of continued investment and potential funding for the One Teams has had a negative impact for the One Team members. The continued uncertainty over the investment of the initiative and the continuity of the One Teams has resulted in a level of anxiety that has been detrimental to the wellbeing of members.

17. Competing organisational demands and initiatives can create conflict between the members of the One Team. The One Team philosophy is an over-arching set of beliefs and values that are not incompatible with member organisations own strategic values. Organisational demands and initiatives must be considered in relation to the demands required for those committed to the One Team approach.

18. Officers working in One Teams reported feeling empowered in their role. Generally they found that this did not conflict with their own organisational role but enhanced it and allowed them to seek creative solutions outside of the parameters of their job description to provide better multi-agency response to residents.

19. Officers working in One Teams consistently reported significant inter-agency communication benefits that improved working relations which mitigated fragmentation and duplication of the provision of services to individuals and families, often resulting in far more effective use of time. This was articulated by one member of the One Team “…we are no longer working in isolation….and can see how our actions dovetail into the wider action plans to help families and ultimately break the cycle of deprivation and reduce demand on service”.

20. The initiative demonstrates cost savings utilising the New Manchester Economy Method. While this data does show significant financial and social benefits, caution must be taken in the inference of these statistics as the Model does not take account of other initiatives taking place in the area that may have affected demand as well as the general Somerset trends in demand during this time period.
Recommendations

1. The performance culture of short term targets and performance measures needs to be revised to reflect the longer term investment of the One Team approach. The One Team ethos requires a longer term investment to deliver longer term sustainable and effective solutions.

2. The governance structure for the One Teams should ensure any organisational changes by member agencies to their home policies and practices have minimum negative impact upon the workings of the One Teams.

3. A commitment by senior managers from partners is needed to resolve underlying principles that set the tone for the philosophical approach to deal with the issues associated with partnership working such as data protection protocols, information sharing and governance. This is necessary to allow all partners to feel able to fully participate and commit to the One Team ethos.

4. A structured training programme should be developed for members of the One Teams to reduce misunderstandings within the One Teams and develop deeper common understanding of the issues, such as data sharing, domestic violence, Early Help, culture and skills of individual organisations.

5. In particular, the tensions that arise between members of the One Team and the competing demands being placed on them by their own organisation must be resolved through the governance structure.

6. Consideration should be given to the development of a more effective system of collecting and sharing intelligence/data for the One Team meetings as this is the driver for the activities and interventions of the One Teams.

7. The success of the One Team is also dependent upon a detailed understanding of the community prior to the initiative being implemented. Given the tailored approach of the One Teams, time must be given to develop and implement a tactical plan that addresses the community needs and is underpinned by organic development.

8. As with any service co-ordination effort, full consideration must be given to the context in which services are to be delivered.

9. The One Teams make a significant positive difference to communities; however this is more effective if the communities are geographically specific and have identifiable and discrete issues. While it was not always possible, time given to assess the immediate needs and social problems of that area to develop a strategic approach is
vital. This will also ensure that the co-ordinator has the relevant skills and engages with the relevant partners. It will further support organic development and growth that is effective and drills down into the social issues of that community over time.

10. Partnership, by its very nature, creates tension between the individual members and the organisations involved. Any tensions should be dealt with as soon as possible between agency managers or if necessary at governance level.

11. The role of an analyst is essential to the One Team structure. Given that the success of the One Teams is dependent upon the intelligence/information from a multitude of sources, this requires specialist analytical skills. An analyst can assist with providing reliable and robust data from the work of the One Teams that is essential to support initiatives, prove financial and social worth, and identify with further data requirements. Moreover, an analyst would provide the evidence to inform the organic development of the One Teams, thus ensuring an evidence-based process.

12. Consideration should be given to co-location of partner agencies. Research has demonstrated that co-location reduces many of the issues associated with partnership working.

13. The prospects of partnership working within the context of austerity and the performance culture across agencies may appear to be rather bleak. Members of the One Teams are stretched in the range of duties they are expected to perform. Yet, as the Government and Home Office have acknowledged, the One Team approach has delivered long term sustainable solutions that make a real difference to communities. There is still a great deal to be done to educate senior managers and the Government that the One Teams must be adequately resourced if they are to realise their long terms benefits.

14. The enduring success of the One Teams is dependent upon flexible approaches with skilled co-ordinators that are not risk averse, and that all members share a common purpose as well have a clear objective of the broader framework in which they operate. This culture needs to be fostered and encouraged through the work of the governance structure.

15. If the One Team approach is to be organic, a mechanism for process improvement and feedback about agency performance should be considered.
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Chapter One – Literature Review

The evaluation of the three One Teams in the ‘Think Differently: Do Differently’ approach draws upon a range of theoretical perspectives. It would be beyond the remit to include each and every aspect of the different issues and theoretical frameworks that the One Teams engage with: so for the purposes of the report, we have limited the literature review to considerations of the key themes in relation to practice, policy and the political context in which the One Teams operate. The chapter provides a concise overview of working in partnership, followed by childhood factors that are significant to the strategic work of the One Teams and the development of community based interventions. A brief literature review for domestic violence and anti-social behaviour are located in Chapters Six and Seven, which specifically considers these issues.

1.1 Working in Partnership

Scientific theory and research has, for some time now, provided an extensive body of knowledge that argues that social problems are both complex and multi-dimensional and are caused by a range of psychological, sociological, social and structural variables. In recognising these complexities, those working within the social improvement and crime prevention fields have argued that problems such as crime, addiction and disorder in our societies cannot be solved by one single agency but need to be tackled from multiple angles, applying a multitude of coordinated and targeted strategies by a wide remit of statutory, non-statutory, voluntary and private bodies; an approach which is now commonly referred to as partnership working (Rosenbaum 2002).

Academic reviews and evaluations of such partnerships have consistently argued that “partnerships are better than individual agencies at identifying and defining problems of greatest community concern” and are generally more effective in developing and delivering creative and targeted responses (Berry et al, 2011). However, as to what model of multi-agency working is most fruitful is not fully understood and the literature presents a number of different typologies into which effective partnership working can be placed.

The One Team approach can be best described as co-ordinated delivery where the main aim is to draw together a number of agencies involved in service delivery so that a more cohesive
response to needs can be adopted. In Berry et al (2011) rapid evidence assessment of effectiveness of partnership working in a crime and disorder context, it was noted that a co-ordinator driving partners forward was seen as critical to the success of many of the partnerships they evaluated. Other factors which were also identified with effective partnership working included:

- Partnership Focus – clarity regarding the problem to be targeted and activities targeted at the problem identified.
- Shared Values – shared values/ norms both at operational and strategic level.
- Leadership and Structure – strong leadership and clear structures in which roles and responsibilities are clearly defined.
- Communication and Co-Location – the co-location of partnership teams at delivery level to facilitate and build communication and common purpose.
- Evidence Led/Data Driven Activity – to guide decision making and support a problem solving approach.
- Flexible Structures – flexibility of partners and the avoidance of bureaucratic structures and processes.
- Number of Partners – only include those that can make a genuine contribution to achieving the partnership’s aims and objectives.

(adapted from Berry et al, 2011)

Berry’s review further contends that partnership working should be seen as an enabling mechanism in which to achieve common goals and as such should not be seen as an intervention within its own right. Its mere presence is not a guarantee that the partnership aims and objectives will be delivered.

Partnerships face numerous obstacles to implementation, and its greatest strengths such as the diversity of agencies and organisations presence, can also be its greatest weakness. However, in theory, Rosenbaum (2002) maintains the value of partnership lies in their responsiveness to the aetiology of complex problems and their ability to encourage interagency co-operation. Moreover, partnerships have the ability to address problems from multiple sources of influence and to target multiple causal mechanisms. As such, they have the capacity to achieve new, intensive and more comprehensive interventions by putting heads together to generate new ideas and by leveraging and co-ordinating resources from multiple sources.
Therefore, Rosenbaum (2002) argues that partnership working has a number of enhanced outcomes and benefits above and beyond what many considered as its traditional aim of social improvement and crime prevention and reduction. These include:

- Increase the accountability of organisations.
- Reduce duplication and fragmentation of services.
- Build positive public-private linkages.
- Increase public awareness of and participation in crime reduction initiatives.
- Serve to strengthen local community organisations.
- Be transformational, altering the way agencies do business by better data driven decision making and emphasis on problem solving and prevention.

1.2 Childhood Factors Affecting Educational Attainment, Poverty and Material Deprivation

Sections 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 are taken from The Costs of Child Poverty for Individuals and Society report by Griggs and Walker (2008).

There are a number of key studies that overwhelmingly demonstrate how specific childhood factors impact upon the life chances and opportunities of children. New analysis from Office for National Statistics (2016) examines the extent to which the circumstances children grow up in affect their future life chances. In recent years there has been considerable research into the degree to which children born into poor families grow up to become poor adults. These findings have shown that the UK has a low level of earnings mobility across the generations, meaning that there is a strong relationship between the economic position of parents and that of their children.

A large body of evidence links childhood poverty with poor educational outcomes. A review of the literature by Griggs and Walker (2008) found that family background is the most important predictor of academic success. Children from low-income households have lower educational aspirations and are more likely to require remedial help or special educational needs assistance than their better-off peers.
Difficulties of access and expense limit participation in pre-school education among lower-income families. Whereas young people from low-income households end up leaving school earlier and are around six times more likely to leave without qualifications than those from higher-income households. Children of non-manual workers are over twice as likely to go to university as those of manual workers. These educational outcomes are mediated by the home environment and parental influence.

Basic skills and formal qualifications are important for entry and progression in the labour market. Leaving education aged 16 into NEET status (not in education, employment or training) has been linked to later criminal activity, early parenthood, long-term unemployment and substance misuse. Moreover, educational disadvantage is likely to be transmitted to the next generation, with the children of low-skilled parents vulnerable to low educational attainment.

Parental educational level has the greatest impact on the likelihood of a low educational outcome for children. Holding all other characteristics constant and equal, the father’s education level has the biggest impact on the likelihood of low educational attainment. Children are seven and half times more likely to have a low educational outcome if their father has a low level of education, compared with a highly educated father.

The mother’s education level is also important though to a lesser degree; a child is approximately three times more likely to have a low educational outcome if their mother has a low level of education. Previous research has suggested that parental qualifications may impact on children’s educational attainment in a variety of ways, including through aspirations and genetic traits, as well as indirectly through the home learning environment and parental health behaviours (e.g. smoking, child nutrition, etc.).

1.3 Predictive Factors of Employment

One of the most significant outcomes of child poverty is the negative impact on later employment. The literature shows a strong relationship between growing up in a low-income household and labour market participation and progression in adulthood (Griggs and Walker, 2008).
Children who have been born and grown up in low-income households are more likely to be unemployed, work in low or unskilled jobs and be poorly paid in adult life. The relationship between employment and childhood poverty persists even when educational outcomes and background are taken into account.

There is debate as to why worklessness appears to be passed from one generation to the next. Some see the poverty experience at the heart of this cycle, while others propose that negative employment outcomes stem from the model parents set for children.

Inter-generational transmission of poverty means that a childhood spent in poverty increases the likelihood of being poor in later life. Most children remain in the same quarter of the income distribution as their parents.

Educational attainment is probably the most significant factor when explaining poverty. Households with a low level of educational attainment are almost five times as likely to be in poverty as those with a high level of education.

However, assessment of the financial situation is not a significant predictor of poverty once educational attainment is accounted for. This suggests that household income during childhood mainly impacts future life chances through the educational attainment of the child. Previous work has suggested that this operates through parents investing in their children through the home environment (e.g. home learning activities, health and nutrition) and providing financial capital for schooling.

Material deprivation provides an estimate of people whose living conditions are affected by not being able to afford certain items. These include being able to pay rent, mortgage, utility bills or loan repayments and keep their home adequately warm.

Educational attainment is the most important predictor of severe material deprivation in the UK. Those who have low educational attainment are 11 times as likely to be severely deprived as those with a high level of education.

The number of parents and children in the childhood household is also important. Children growing up in a single parent household are over twice as likely to be severely materially deprived as those who lived with both parents. The odds of severe material deprivation are
twice as high for those who grow up in households with four or more children compared with a single child.

1.4 Predictive Factors of Behaviour

There is ongoing debate as to the impact of growing up in poverty on later behaviour, however, an association between childhood poverty and behavioural outcomes is evident from an early age. Those growing up in low-income households have a greater likelihood of parent-reported behaviour problems than their more affluent counterparts. They are also more likely to be excluded from school. Later outcomes include risk-taking behaviour, aggression, involvement in crime, poor health-related behaviours and suicide (Griggs and Walker, 2008).

However, strong disagreement over whether crime can be considered a product of childhood endures. While most children who grow up with poverty do not become involved in crime, there are higher victim and fear of crime rates in disadvantaged areas.

The relationship between childhood poverty and other behaviours such as smoking, drinking and drug use is also contested. The relationship between poverty and suicide is more firmly established, being closely associated with the higher incidence of mental health problems amongst those growing up in poverty.

Being involved in criminal activity whilst young has been shown to have a negative impact on later life chances. Furthermore, the children of young offenders are more likely to live in poverty themselves, reinforcing the ‘cycle of poverty’. High crime and fear of crime rates also have a negative impact on communities.

1.5 The Development of Community Interventions

While there is a chequered history on family and community interventions, it was New Labour (1997 -2010) that focused on attempting to address some of the behaviours of certain families identified as inter-generational cycles of deprivation (Welshman, 2006). These initial interventions often resulted in families being the subject of any number of discrete and disconnected initiatives, which were often delivered in isolation and as short term measures.
However, following the Summer Riots in 2011, the then Prime Minister David Cameron, attributed, in part, the disorder to 120,000 ‘Troubled Families’. In particular, Louise Casey was appointed to develop and oversee the Troubled Families Programme. This programme was targeted at those families that were specifically identified as having problems and creating problems for the communities in the area they resided. These families were also identified as putting high demands on the public service sector, and the aim of the Troubled Families Programme was to develop new ways of working with these families in order to reduce the demands and costs on the services as well as improving outcomes for the families themselves.

Research has identified that only those Programmes that were able to respond holistically to the range of challenges facing these families influenced the success of the interventions. Significant, to this research, was that success of these Programmes was the referral and assessment process and how this was understood and interpreted by the partners involved. Successful interventions required that partners needed to share information, use that information collectively to inform the intervention strategy, and that all agencies signed up to that approach.
Chapter Two – Methodology

It was evident on commencing the research that this project was action-research and therefore utilised a range of research methodologies which investigates action and research outcomes at the same time. Given the different developmental stages of the three One Teams and the diverse strengths and experiences of the co-ordinators, the outcomes of the research were fed back into Governance Board as they emerged in order to support and enhance the processes and outcomes of the One Teams.

On commencement of the research it became clear that a flexible approach to gathering and capturing the data was required. This was due in part to the One Teams being at different stages of development and each having their own unique approach within the overarching One Team framework influenced by the experiences and expertise of the co-ordinator. This flexible approach enabled specific data for each One Team to be collected that may not have been possible if a rigid methodological approach had been adopted. In addition, this approach also enabled the dynamics and different characters of each Team to be captured as it developed.

The research was conducted over a period of 16 months from October 2015 to March 2017. Data and information was captured using a mixed method approach. Utilising a range of methods would enable the ideology and desire that the One Teams as an organic ‘bottom up’ process, led and driven by the needs of the communities they were set up to support, to be captured.

The methodological approach to the research took into consideration that the development and work of the One Teams were not restricted by a rigid or prescriptive framework of delivery. Consequently, it was felt that the evaluation and its approach needed to reflect this and not be limited by a rigid methodological framework that would constrain data gathering opportunities which may present themselves as the One Teams evolved. As such, a number of separate but interlinked research strands were utilised, including a practice and evidence literature review, a formative and process evaluation, a documentation review and analysis, participant observation and a case study outcome assessment.
2.1 Semi-Structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were carried out as part of the formative and process evaluation. Semi-structured formal interviews were selected in order to enable participants to explain as freely as possible their involvement and understanding of the One Teams and the communities in which they are located. Semi-structured interviews took place between February 2016 and March 2017.

These interviews included the three One Team co-ordinators, the Project Support Officers and the Data Analyst. The interviews provided a rich understanding of the One Team’s journey thus far within each area as well as captured the valuable experiences, opinions and thoughts of these core team members.

Interviews were also conducted with members from the following agencies: Avon and Somerset Constabulary, Social Housing Providers, Anti-Social Behaviour Officers, GetSet, Community Development Officers, Mind and Councillors.

Four semi-structured interviews took place in March 2017 with service users. These participants all came from one particular One Team area, therefore the data and analysis of the information, while may reflect the general themes of the One Team ethos, will be particular to that One Team project.

2.2 Questionnaires

Questionnaires were distributed by email to all members of the One Teams (across the three sites of North Taunton, Halcon and Wellington) in mid-December 2015. One Team members were defined as those in receipt of the minutes from weekly team meetings.

Respondents were asked to complete and return the questionnaire by email by the 15th of January 2016 to a Bath Spa email address; however returns were accepted after this date.

The questionnaire consisted of both open and closed questions and respondents were asked to provide as much or as little information to each question as appropriate. Reassurance was given that the questionnaire was not an assessment of their performance, but an opportunity for them to anonymously inform the researcher about their experiences, thoughts and
opinions of working as part of the One Team. Confidentiality was assured and participants were assured that data reproduced for reports would be anonymised; although by the very nature of the One Team structure, readers of the report may be able to identify roles. Where there may be a possibility of identifying an individual, for example to the uniqueness of the individual’s role, permission would be explicitly sought before reproduction. Respondents were asked not to include any identifying information of individuals or families which they worked with if used to illustrate points they wished to make.

A total of 136 questionnaires were distributed of which 3 were returned as undeliverable email addresses and 5 returned with automated “Out of Office” responses which were dated prior to the questionnaires being sent out.

A total of 29 questionnaires were completed and returned. This represents almost 22% return rate.

Three questionnaires were returned uncompleted as respondents felt they were either not sufficiently involved with the work of the One Teams or were unable to complete the forms due to current workloads.

In general, the response rate from the questionnaires was disappointing but not outside the norm for the method.

However, it must be noted that those who completed and returned questionnaires were from partners that were possibly more engaged with the work of the One Teams. As such, the findings should be read with this in mind. What was notable was that no questionnaires were returned by staff from Somerset Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (Sompar) and few, in percentage terms, were completed by GetSet staff.

Table 1: Questionnaire Distribution and Return Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North Taunton</th>
<th>Halcon</th>
<th>Wellington</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed and returned</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to complete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned ‘Out of Office’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Review of Documentation

As part of the evaluation, documents pertaining to the governance, structure and daily business of the One Teams were reviewed.


Reports for initiatives relating to the activities of the One Teams were also reviewed. These included reports for Chill and Chat, Mind Bridging the Gap, Link Power and Inspired to Achieve.

2.4 Observations

The One Team practitioner, manager and strategic meetings were attended and observed. These included the One Team weekly meetings, the Taunton Deane Strategic Partnership meetings at both Board (Gold) and Executive (Silver) level.

This enabled the research team to gain an understanding of how the teams operate at both a frontline and strategic level as well as allowing the researchers to achieve a comprehensive insight to the ideology and principles of the One Teams.

2.5 Case Studies

The case studies were selected by nominating 12 case files from each of the One Team areas. The case files were selected using Random Date Selector methodology. This method utilises a computer based programme to randomly select dates within a given time frame. For each One Team, (Halcon, North Taunton and Wellington) four dates between the 1 January 2015
and 30 June 2016 were randomly selected. The co-ordinators were asked to provide the minutes of the meetings pertaining to that date and three case studies were randomly selected from each set of minutes, giving twelve case studies for each One Team locality. The method varied according to the One Teams recording system and use of minutes. So for one One Team, a list of those individuals or families they were currently working with on that particular date was provided. These cases were then allocated a number and selected using a random number generator. For the remaining two One Teams, each case detailed in the meeting minutes was designated a number and a random number generator was used to select accordingly. The One Teams were asked for the selected case’s files and notes and alongside the relevant minutes to provide a comprehensive picture as possible of the individual or family selected and the involvement of the One Team.

Each case file was reviewed and the following information recorded:

- The demographics of case.
- The events which led to One Team involvement.
- The main issues and problems.
- The agencies involved.
- The reasons and rationale for the involvement of the One Team.
- The outcomes.

The case files provided were timelines of events as recorded in the weekly Team Minutes, but in some cases it also provided further information or documents such as ABC contracts, email correspondence and copies of referral forms.

In addition to the thirty six randomly selected case files identified above, a further thirty case files were selected specifically relating to domestic abuse and anti-social behaviour. From these 30 cases, utilising the Random Date Selector methodology identified above, case files were selected to provide five cases associating to domestic abuse and five cases relating to anti-social behaviour. Again, the One Team co-ordinators were asked for the selected case files and notes and alongside the relevant minutes to develop a full a picture as possible of the issues and the involvement of the One Team.
2.6 Other Data

A range of data sets were collected. These included:

Crime Data

- Crime data was collected for the years 2014, 2015 and 2016 for all three of the One Team areas to enable year on year comparison of crime rates and types. This data was collected from the Home Office’s Police UK website which provides police forces data.
- Avon and Somerset Police were also asked to provide the addresses of the top ten 101 and 999 call counts between March and November 2016 in each of the three One Team areas.
- Data for anti-social behaviour and domestic abuse were also provided by Avon and Somerset Constabulary.

Ward Community Profile Data

- Community profile data pertaining to each of the One Team areas was gathered. This included data on ethnicity, age profiles, school/education information, housing and indices of multiple deprivations.

Team Meeting Data

- Attendance data for the One Team weekly meetings was collected for the period between October and December 2016.

2.7 New Manchester Economy Cost Benefit Analysis

In terms of providing financial and social cost benefit analysis, the New Manchester Economy Cost Benefit Analysis model was utilised. However the data derived from this process must be taken with caution. This model should be adopted at the start of projects to realise true cost benefits and whether interventions represent value for money.
As the full costs for each One Team was not available, the researchers did not have the appropriate data sets or information in applying the model, thus any data produced in relation with the cost benefit analysis will need to be taken with this in mind.

2.8 Ethics Approval

Ethics approval was sought and approved for the research by Bath Spa Ethics Committee prior to commencement of the project.

2.9 General Observations on the Data Collected

In relation to the data collected, the following should be noted:

- The minutes and data recording processes were found to vary across the teams.
- In some files, information that was recorded appeared to be based on hearsay or opinion and not rooted in fact, which has made analysis of the data challenging.
- Some files/minutes were too brief and information was found to be incomplete or inconsistent or too complicated making it potentially difficult to ascertain what was happening and which agency/member was taking the lead.
- In other files/minutes, they did not always effectively capture data relevant to demonstrate the value of the One Teams.
- The removal of the police analyst position in March 2016 has meant that access to the data for the researchers was more challenging. Introductions to contacts at Somerset Intelligence was well received, although they too acknowledged they have faced resource issues and were therefore unable to provide data at either LSOA or One Team level.

Housing data from TDBC has been slow and when provided was not as complete as it may have been. Thus the data utilised in the evaluation is not as locally focussed or as rich in detail as perhaps we would have liked.
Chapter Three - Philosophy, Structure and Development of the One Team and the Demographics of One Team Areas.

The concept of the One Team initiative was first developed in 2012 in the Halcon area of Taunton. Halcon, according to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (2009, 2011 and 2015), is in the top 5% most deprived areas of the country and an area of high demand for the statutory organisations including housing providers, the social services, the health services and the police. The initial One Team project reflected the tenets of the Neighbourhood Policing Programme by Avon and Somerset Constabulary and built on the Five Year Plan drawn up by the Neighbourhood Police Sergeant, who was the Co-ordinator for the Halcon One Team.

While the Neighbourhood Policing Programme had established partnership working in the area, it was felt that the approach reflected in the Programme was not fully cognizant or addressed the ‘whole problem’ and as such failed to secure a collective response; a response necessary if a positive long term outcome for the community and the organisations was to be realised. It was therefore anticipated by understanding the community issues and needs better, and by bringing together the relevant agencies in a co-ordinated frontline delivery team it would enable the correct resources to be focused in the right places and positive sustainable outcomes for the community could be achieved reducing demand on services.

An initial evaluation of the Halcon One Team highlighted a sustained reduction in crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) contrary to other similar areas that had experienced increased levels of crime and ASB during the same period (Police Innovation Fund 2014/2015). Moreover, the evaluation demonstrated early savings and benefits in the form of a range of reductions including a significant reduction in demand for services. These reductions included a decrease in rent arrears as well as a decrease for blue light services. The reduction in rent arrears resulted in significant savings in legal costs associated with recovery of these monies and ultimately the cost of evictions. The New Manchester Economy Cost Benefit Analysis calculates the cost of a complex eviction of a tenant is £7,276 per case, while a homelessness application amounts to £2,724 per claim.
Figures also demonstrated an increase in referrals to the Children’s Centre, and notably, through the setting up a local Citizens Advice Surgery within Halcon, securing over £100,000 in unclaimed benefits for residents (Halcon One Team Interim Report November 2013).

Thus, the success of Halcon was measured not only for the cost savings to the response organisations involved but also for the benefits to the community in supporting them towards a more cohesive and sustainable neighbourhood.

Building on the success of the Halcon One Team, funding was secured from the Police Innovation Fund to roll the initiative out to two further high demand areas within the area: North Taunton and Wellington. Similar to Halcon, both areas were identified in the Taunton Deane Strategic Partnership as areas of high levels of disadvantage and deprivation. (Please refer to section 3.5 of this chapter for a more detailed review at the individual One Team areas.)

3.1. A Co-ordinated Approach

Critical to the concept of the One Team is the role of the co-ordinator. The complexity of service delivery in high demand areas can result in a mix of services that are multi-layered and fragmented. Due to the high demands of the communities in which the One Teams are located and the number of different agencies involved in resolving those demands, the initial project in Halcon highlighted the need for a dedicated person to provide local and sustained leadership; the role was to co-ordinate and support the various agencies involved in the delivery of services so that a more co-ordinated and cohesive response could be adopted. Service delivery co-ordination is therefore a means of facilitating referrals and co-operation between services to provide more widespread service access to community members. The co-ordinator would therefore afford both front line professionals reassurance together with a key point of contact for members of the community that would, for the first time, have ‘someone on hand in their community’ to approach with their concerns.

This direct connection into the heart of the community was highlighted by a member of the community themselves as being “..someone there whenever I had a problem which previously was never effectively dealt with. It sorted out issues quickly and I could manage with things now. Before, the police or housing didn’t really deal with problems and then
things just got worse…Now, for the first time in my life, I don’t have any problems. I never thought I would see a copper as a friend (laughs) but Andy is just brilliant” (Resident, Halcon).

3.2 Membership of the One Team

Each One Team includes representation from a number of organisations and agencies, and is structured by specific roles as follows:

- One Team Co-ordinator.
- One Team Project Support Officer.
- Neighbourhood police officers, supported by PCSOs.
- Representatives from the social housing sector.
- Taunton Deane Community Development Officers.
- GetSet Level 2 and Level 3.
- Children’s Social Care Level 4.
- Health and wellbeing providers such as mental health, drug and alcohol abuse outreach support workers.
- Domestic abuse support services.
- Citizen Advice Bureau advisor.
- Local Authority Benefits Officer.
- Representatives from local schools and colleges.

3.3 One Team Governance

The model of Governance adopted for the One Teams was organised within three distinct groups, Gold, Silver and Bronze, with the tactical and strategic responsibilities of each group defined in the Taunton Deane’s Strategic Partnership Terms of Reference. The role and function of these groups are detailed below. (However, it must be noted that this structure is currently undergoing review to reflect the changing dynamics and advancements of the One Teams.)
3.3.1 Bronze Group

The Bronze Group consist of the organisations that make up the One Teams in directly providing and delivering services to the residents of the community they are located within. These members make day-to-day decisions under the directive of the One Team Co-ordinator around delivery, problem solving and development of projects. The Bronze Group meet two to three times a week. The co-ordinator submits a report on the activities of the Bronze Group for presentation at the Silver Group meetings.

3.3.2 Silver Group (Executive Group)

The Silver Group comprises of the managers of those organisations who have staff who work as part of the One Teams. The remit of the Silver Group is to facilitate the concept of the One Team. Thus, it is a joint partnership group that supports and enables the One Team’s way of working. The Chair of the Silver Group attends Gold Group meetings and submits a report on performance and escalates any issues that have arisen within their Group. The recommendation is the Silver Group meet every 4-6 weeks.

Silver Group has representatives from a range of agencies and organisations including an Executive Councillor; Community Leadership Taunton Deane Borough Council; Sector Inspector Avon and Somerset Constabulary; Youth Offending Team Somerset County Council; Service Manager for Children and Young People Somerset County Council; Head of Housing Services Taunton Deane Borough Council; Head of Strategy and Health Taunton Deane Borough Council; Head of Health Somerset County Council; Empowerment Manager of Housing Association; Strategic Manager for Children’s Centres Somerset County Council; Mental Health Manager Somerset County Council and Somerset GP Commissioning Group Somerset Advice Network

3.3.3 Gold Group (The Board)

The Gold Group is made up of senior leaders who have a vested involvement and interest in the work of the One Teams. It meets when strategic and high level decisions need to be considered and actioned or high level policies implemented. Standing agenda items include securing a One Team work base, performance and monitoring, the key issues and headlines, and funding if and where gaps have been identified. This Group also has responsibility for allocation of resources, aligning budgets and work patterns. The recommendation is the Gold Group meet bi-monthly. The Gold Group is a small group of senior leaders that include: a
3.4 Working towards Enabling, Supporting and Providing

The individual One Team meetings vary according to each Team. In Halcon, these meetings are scheduled Monday, Wednesday and Friday mornings every week and generally last for about one hour.

In North Taunton the meetings are held on Tuesday and Thursday mornings.

In Wellington, meetings are held in the afternoon on Tuesday and Thursdays.

The One Team meetings are scheduled and organised at local Team level to ensure as many partner agencies can attend. It is worth noting that many of the same individuals from partner agencies work across and within all three of the One Team areas.

It was considered that regular meetings, two to three times a week, was essential in order that the One Teams could deliberate a full assessment as possible of demand across the seven days, and ensure early intervention and joint partnership problem solving where appropriate.

All meetings commence with a review of Police Logs together with relevant verbal information where appropriate from the members present. Where concerns about issues within the community are raised, intelligence is shared and links made about the issue/person/family, their wider family and associates thus ensuring information is up to date and accurate; this sharing of information is particularly important as the information contained in agency records may be out of date.

Discussions also take place around the demands of each issue/person/family within each of the partners’ own work streams. In doing so, agencies collectively assess the problem, identify a solution and allocate a lead professional to support and implement the agreed interventions. The team meetings enable partners to share information, generate actions and decide on the most appropriate intervention to mitigate the problem for those involved and significantly, the impact of the problem on the community. Where an issue/household/family/person are identified as having complex needs that necessitates sustained
support over time, a Family Action Plan is created that details the type of support required, identifies the organisation(s) to deliver the support and the most appropriate professional to take the lead on the case and feedback progress at the One Team meetings.

Minutes are produced for each meeting and distributed among One Team members via secure email.

### 3.5 The Communities in which the One Team Operate

The communities in which the One Teams are located have been identified within The Taunton Deane Partnership’s Priority Areas Strategy and Action Plan (PAS) as areas of deprivation. Deprivation is characterised by a broad range of factors which affect people’s quality of life and their capacity to participate fully in society. It is defined by levels of unmet need in living conditions and experiences. While levels of income and access to other financial resources are often crucial in determining the living conditions and activities of individuals, the concept of deprivation relates to a broader range of factors (Noble et al, 1999). Whilst, each of the areas have their own challenges all three can be characterised as areas for concern with regard housing, employment, income, education, health and crime.

#### 3.5.1 Halcon

The Halcon Ward was predominately constructed in the post-war period, and is in the main, made up of social housing. According to the mid-2014 population survey, the majority of residents identify themselves as White British, which is slightly above the average for both the district and county population. However Halcon has an above average number of residents who identify themselves of Polish origin compared with district and the county data.

The age profile of Halcon is young, with a much higher percentage of residents under the age of 50 years compared with both the district and the county. Almost 41% of the population in 2014 were estimated to be under the age of 50 years. In the district this figure is 35%. Of these it was estimated that 25.5% of residents in Halcon are 17 years and under and 16% of this age group are estimated to be age 9 years or under. This is compared to the district where it is estimated that 11.5% of residents are aged 9 years or under.

Halcon has twice as many households made of single family lone parents with dependent children than both the district and county average; with 12.75% households compared to
6.0% in Taunton Deane and 5.6% in Somerset. It also has an above average number of cohabiting couples and single person households but a below average number of households made up of married or civil partnership couples. Over 30% of households in Halcon do not have access to a car or van; nearly twice as many as the Somerset average of 15.9% and the district’s average of 17.5%. Of the 1,951 households managed by Taunton Deane District Council, in the Halcon Ward, 54% are in receipt of some kind of housing benefit and 9% of the Ward’s population were on the social housing waiting list in March 2016. This is compared to 4% in the district and 3% in the county.

In the most recent Indices Multiple Deprivation (IMD) of 2015, two of the four Lower Super Output Areas, (LSOA’s) in Halcon; Halcon Lambrook and Halcon Roman Road, were ranked in the top 5% most deprived areas nationally. Halcon Lambrook was ranked as the most deprived LSOA in Somerset. This area has shown a worsening across all domains except ‘barriers to housing and services’, which shows a marginal improvement since the last indices in 2010. It is also in the worst 5% nationally for ‘employment’ and ‘health deprivation and disability’ and in the worst 10% for ‘income’ and ‘education, skills and training’. Other measurable factors such as ‘crime’, ‘barriers to housing and services’ and ‘living environment’ are less of a concern but they still rank in the top 20% and top 30% concurrently.

Halcon Roman Road has shown a very marginal improvement since 2010 but still remains in the worst 5% nationally. ‘income’ and ‘education, skills and training’ remain within the worst performing 5% whilst it is ranked in the top 1% worst performing in the country for ‘education, skills and training’. The ‘health deprivation and disability’ domain has shown improvement from the worst 5% in 2010 to within the worst 20% in 2015. ‘Crime’, ‘barriers to housing and services’ and the ‘living environment’ are of lesser concern. Halcon East has moved from the 8th most deprived to the 10th deprived in Taunton Deane.

The Department of Work and Pensions in 2015 identified 430 children aged between 0 and 18 years of age living in Halcon were living in “out of work benefit claimant households” and according to Somerset County Council in 2015 more than twice the number of school age children living in Halcon were eligible for free school meals when compared to both the district and the county.

Two of the LSOA’s, Halcon Lambrook and Halcon Roman Road are ranked in the top worst 5% LSOA’s for Children and Young People’s Education and Skills, with Roman Road being
in the top worst 1%. According to the figures from Somerset County Council, 66% of all children in the Halcon Ward at the end of Key Stage 2 achieved a Level 4 or above in their reading, writing and maths in 2015. However, only children in the Halcon Blackbrook area of the Ward achieved above the county average of 79%; with Halcon East achieving 64%; Halcon Roman Road achieving 62% and only just half (54%), of the children living in the Lambrook area of the Ward achieving a level 4 or above. A similar pattern is also reflected in the GCSE results for the Ward. At county level 59% of all students achieved 5 A-C’s at GCSE which includes maths and English. In the Ward of Halcon, only Blackbrook North achieved above the county average with 75% of pupils achieving 5 A-C’s. In Halcon East 42% achieved 5 A-C’s, in Halcon Roman Road 31% and in Halcon Lambrook only 7% of pupils achieved 5 or more A-C’s including maths and English at GCSE. It is worth noting here that with regard to pupils with special educational needs the Halcon ward has 215.9 per 1000 pupils with special educational needs compared to 139.2 per 1000 across Taunton Deane as a whole and 147.1 across the county of Somerset.

3.5.2 North Taunton

North Taunton is made up of two Wards – the Lyngford Ward and the Pyrland and Rowbarton Ward. The majority of residents across the two identify themselves as White British. Although, a higher percentage of residents in the Lyngford Ward identify themselves as White Other with Polish and other European languages identified as being the most commonly spoken language among this group. According to the 2014 population survey, Lyngford West has a high number of under 5 year olds living in the area compared to both the district and the county. In contrast it has a lower proportion of school aged children living in the area compared to both the district and the county but estimates that a much higher number of young adults (29%) aged 20 to 39 years are living in the area compared to both the district (22%) and the county (20%).

The Ward of Pyrland and Rowbarton has slightly more households made up of single parents with dependent children when compared to the district and county; with 7.5% of households compared to 6% in the district and 5.6% in the county. In the Lyngford Ward there are also a higher number of households made up of single parents with dependent children but a higher number of one person households under the age of 65 years. Almost 24% of the population in the Pyrland and Rowbarton Ward do not have access to a car and van. In the Lyngford
Ward 27% of the population do not have access to a car. This is compared to the district where 17.5% do not have access to a car and 15.9% do not have access across Somerset.

In the most recent Indices Multiple Deprivation (IMD) of 2015, there are five LSOAs that are the focus of the North Taunton One Team; Lyngford East and Lyngford West in the Lyngford Ward and Pyrland North, Pyrland South and Priorswood in the Pyrland and Rowbarton Ward.

Lyngford East is located within the 10% worst LSOAs nationally. The ranking of this ward has worsened over the previous 5 years. Specific areas of concern (all worsening by rank) are ‘income’, ‘employment’, ‘education, skills and training’ and ‘crime’. These domains all appear in the worst 5-10% nationally. ‘health deprivation and disability’ is also a concern (worst 20% nationally) although it has shown an improvement in rank over the previous five years. Lyngford West is within the 20% worst LSOAs nationally. There are particular areas of concern relating to ‘income’, ‘employment’, ‘health deprivation and disability’ and ‘crime’. Crime across Lyngford (East and West) has shown a significant worsening over the past five years, going from an area that was in the top 50% nationally, to a locality that is now within the 5% worst performing.

The Department of Work and Pensions in 2015 identified 340 children aged between 0 and 18 years of age living in North Taunton were living in “out of work benefit claimant households” and according to Somerset County Council in 2015 more than twice the number of school age children living in North Taunton were eligible for free school meals when compared to both the district and the county.

The LSOA of Lyngford East is ranked in the top 10% worst for education, skills and training and two other LSOA’s are ranked within the top 20%. According to figures from Somerset County Council, 76% of children in the North Taunton Ward at the end of Key Stage 2 achieved a Level 4 or above in their reading, writing and maths in 2015. However, only children in the areas of Pyrland South, Lyngford East and Priorswood North Ward achieved above the county average of 79%; in Pyrland North only 61% of children achieved a level 4 or above. A similar pattern is also reflected in the GCSE results for the Ward. At county level 59% of all students achieved 5 A*-C’s at GCSE which includes maths and English. In the Ward of North Taunton, only children living in Priorswood South achieved above the county average with 73% of pupils achieving 5 A-C’s. In Pyrland South only 13% of children achieved 5 A*-C’s at GCSE including maths and English and in Pyrland South only
28% of children achieved 5 A*-C’s at GCSE including maths and English. Both Wards in North Taunton have a higher number of children with special educational needs.

### 3.5.3 Wellington

The majority of residents across the three Wards that make up Wellington identify themselves as White British. Wellington East has a slightly higher number of residents who identify themselves as Black or Minority Ethnic compared to the rest of Wellington, the district and the county. Wellington North has a higher number of children and young people between the age of 0 and 19 years compared to the district and the county and a higher percentage of adults aged between 19 to 64 years. In contrast it has a much lower number of older residents aged 65 years and above. Wellington East also has a high number of children and young people aged 0 to 18 years but a lower than average number of residents between the ages of 18 and 64 years. The Ward has a higher than average number of residents over the age of 65 years.

A higher percentage of households in Wellington North are made up of single parents with dependent children when compared to other areas of Wellington, the district and the county as a whole. Wellington North also has a higher number of cohabiting or married/civil partnership couples than other areas. A higher number of households made up of individuals age 65 years and over can be found in Wellington East. In Wellington North 20% of the population do not have access to a car; in Wellington East the percentage is 18% and in Wellington Rockwell Green only 17% of the population do not have access to a car or van. This is compared to the district where 17.5% do not have access to a car; 15.9% do not have access in Somerset. In Wellington North 5% of the population are on the social housing list compared to 4% in Wellington East and 3% in Wellington Rockwell Green. The district average is 3.5% and the county average is 3%.

Wellington North is within the bottom 20% nationally. Education, skills and training are a particular concern. This domain has a ranking of bottom 10%. Other significant concerns relate to ‘income’, ‘employment’ and ‘health deprivation and disability’. The other areas of Wellington perform well in comparison. Rockwell Green, Tonedale and Wellington North East are within the bottom 30-50% nationally. Wellington East and Wellington North West are both within the top 50% best performing LSOAs.
According to figures from Somerset County Council, 75% of children in Wellington at the end of Key Stage 2 achieved a Level 4 or above in their reading, writing and maths in 2015. Only the two LSOA’s of Wellington North West and Rockwell Green did not achieve above the county average of 79%. At GCSE level results for the Ward are mixed. Of pupils achieving 5 GCSE’s A* to C including maths and English, only three of the eight LSOA’s that make up the Ward achieved above the county level of 59%. The lowest number of pupils achieving 5 GCSE’s A* to C including maths and English are in Wellington East and Wellington North. Interestingly these two areas both achieved above the county average at Key Stage 2.
Chapter Four - Governance, Processes, Service Delivery and Effectiveness of the One Teams

This chapter is concerned with the key themes and findings in the effectiveness of the One Teams, the functions of governance in supporting the One Teams and ultimately the delivery of service to the communities in which they operate. Particular attention is paid to the processes and structures of partnership working as this is a key precept to the success of the One Teams. The chapter is divided into six discrete sections: governance structure and systems; partnership working; communication and information sharing; data collection; challenges to One Team working; and impact for service users of the One Team.

These sections reflect the research areas set out in the research proposal. The case studies, interviews and questionnaires with practitioners and key stakeholders provided productive information. The data obtained from detailed analysis of the case studies provided a rich insight into the complexities and challenges that the One Team’s encountered on a daily basis.

4.1 Governance Structure and Responsibilities

In the evaluative literature around partnership working, a number of sources have identified the importance of clear lines of accountability and governance structures for the success of partnerships. Fox and Butler (2004) found for example, that having a clear framework of responsibilities and accountabilities, combined with an environment that gets the most out of the individuals tasked with making the partnership work, was found to be particularly influential over success. Their research also found that leaders such as operational managers are in a position to maximise the likelihood of collaboration if their commitment can be seen by frontline staff.

Over the course of the evaluation there was compelling evidence to demonstrate that the One Teams were well managed and organised by the co-ordinators and Project Support Officers. Many of the One Team members referred to co-ordinators as being “strong leadership by passionate individuals who care about the communities” in which they worked and noted the hard work that goes on behind the scenes to ensure the meetings run smoothly. The value of
their role in co-ordinating complex cases was particularly highlighted by many. This included the sharing of relevant information in a timely and appropriate way in order to reduce duplication, and where appropriate in facilitating joint visits that other members of the One Team may have found challenging. Members of the One Teams also expressed a sense that the co-ordinators ensured that the team “knew what was expected” and that “any given action resulting from the meetings was clear, with appropriate time scales in which to complete them”.

However, it should be noted that concern was expressed by a number of members of the Wellington One Team that the loss of the co-ordinator for much of 2016 had caused difficulties and as one member put it “has left us in a bit of a muddle”. The post has now been filled and it has been reported that there is greater clarity on Wellington One Team’s purpose and direction.

The co-ordinators themselves see their role as one of monitoring progress, supporting agencies in their engagement with clients and where necessary to challenge other professionals to ensure the best approach and services for the individual or family is being delivered.

“The co-ordinator’s role is one to co-ordinate, not to get involved. Our role is to oversee complex cases and ensure the relevant organisations are involved. We provide a forum to exchange relevant information where more than one agency is regularly involved. To ensure concerns are raised and further support is sought” (One Team co-ordinator, 2016)

In initial discussions with co-ordinators and partners (early 2016), concern was expressed that there was a lack of support and guidance from senior managers and that no particular ‘body’ took ownership of the One Teams at strategic level. Co-ordinators reported that at times they felt “out to sea” with no clear management structure in place to support them in the daily business. More recently, it has been reported that the co-ordinator meetings that have been taking place have proved to be a great source of support and as it was strongly expressed that these meetings should continue in one guise or another in the future.

With regard to senior managers, whilst the hard work of a few was noted, it is voiced by many members of the One Teams that leaders do not truly understand the role of the One Teams and their daily work. This was forcefully articulated in relation to the Executive
Group (Silver) and the membership of this Group was questioned by many as perhaps not having the right agency/organisation representation with the right level of influence and commissioning powers. Consequently, co-ordinators do not appear to see this group as a true voice for the One Team way of working and have expressed frustration that updates and requests for help or information submitted to the group have been met with little else than being marked as point on the agenda which is not fully discussed or explored.

As such, it has been suggested that perhaps this group had “lost its way”. Suggestions were made that the Executive Group role should be more one of monitoring, identifying need, challenging and governing the work of the One Teams;

“What is needed is a cohesive Executive Group which represent the core daily business that is delivered by the One Teams partners, who through the sharing of data, agree evidence based priorities and outcomes and ensure that they are translated into frontline delivery to meet the needs of the differing communities. In doing so, delivery will not only be better targeted and as such cost effective for all those involved, but with evaluative mechanisms put in place learning outcomes can be fully recognized” (Senior Manager, 2016)

However, it is noted that a number of discussions have begun to take place regarding the future and the direction of the governance structure of the One Teams. While it is noted that these discussions are still in the developmental stages, it has been suggested that for the One Teams to be effective, the current Gold Group should be replaced by an over-arching county-wide governance body which oversees all One Teams within the county. This group could be supported by a cluster of more locally based governance groups that represent the core daily business

It is proposed that a more representative group of operational managers with responsibility for local service delivery will enable the One Teams to respond more swiftly and effectively to the changing needs of the communities as and when they arise. These proposed changes will further support defined mechanisms of accountability while governance will become transparent contributing to greater clarity of purpose and direction for the One Teams. The issue of lack of accountability and transparency is an area which the operational managers expressed a frustration with. It further would enable a more consistent way of working across the teams; something that is not felt to be the case at the current time:
“Each One Team is co-ordinated and works differently with regard to referrals and reporting requirements, which can make it hard to provide a fluent service— a standardised approach would be helpful” (Operational Manager, 2016)

4.2 Partnership Working

In identifying and highlighting the complex needs of the community, a key element of the One Teams was to advance and enhance partnership working in order to not only recognise the problems that presented within the community but also the causes. This would enable the One Teams to collectively identify solutions and prepare a case plan to ensure effective delivery of service. This approach was underpinned by the ‘Think Differently: Do Differently’ ethos; making sure that the right agencies were working with community members who required their services at the right time, in the right place and with the right interventions. This tailored structure is a key tenet of the One Team methodology. Such an approach can be summed up as one of enabling, supporting and providing to empower the communities they serve.

As part of the evaluation, the Project Support Officer was asked to collect and provide details of which agencies attended the One Team meetings for a three-month period from October 2016 to December 2016. The charts below illustrate the range of the partners that attended these meetings as well as detailing the regularity of their attendance.

It is evident from the charts that the main partners who attend and form the core members of the One Team teams are TDBC Housing, GetSet, and the Police. There is obvious input from a number of other agencies but their attendance appears to vary with regard to both the regularity and the location. While some may argue that those organisations who regularly attend the One Team meetings reflect community need, it is suggested that representation of agencies such as CAB, Sompar and Somerset Drug Alcohol Services are essential vital to all One Teams and their communities to ensure support to the community is readily available. Their regular attendance would also ensure greater continuity across the Teams.
Table 2: Halcon Partnership Attendance at One Team Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>October (13 meetings in total)</th>
<th>November (13 meetings in total)</th>
<th>December (10 meetings in total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDBC Housing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GetSet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Visitors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDAS/DAC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church/Pastor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired to Achieve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Power</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sompar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDAS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: North Taunton Partnership Attendance at One Team Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Taunton One Team Meetings</th>
<th>October (8 meetings in total)</th>
<th>November (9 meetings in total)</th>
<th>December (5 meetings in total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDBC Housing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDBC Debt &amp; Welfare</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB Team</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GetSet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Visitors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDAS/DAC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sompar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIND</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knightstone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4: Wellington Partnership Attendance at One Team Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wellington One Team Meetings</th>
<th>October (9 meetings in total)</th>
<th>November (9 meetings in total)</th>
<th>December (6 meetings in total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDBC Housing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GetSet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Visitors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDAS/DAC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIND</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Counsellors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knightstone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church/Pastor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired to Achieve</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellbeing Advisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of the case studies also highlights the involvement of the core agencies such as Housing, Police and GetSet. Of the thirty six case studies analysed, the Police were involved with twenty cases, TDBC Housing with twenty one and GetSet with thirteen. Children’s Social Care was also listed as being involved with thirteen of the cases and as such reinforces the need to ensure a positive working relationship between Children’s Social Care and the One Teams.

**Table 5: Agencies involved with One Team (of the 36 cases reviewed)**

Collectively, among partners, there is a strong understanding about the aims and objectives of the One Teams. Many members of the One Team reported a shared vision and a sense of common purpose and overwhelmingly stated feeling positive about working as part of a One Team. The general consensus was that it was good to be part of a team and learn from each other. Many of the One Team members felt that working in partnership had increased their knowledge and understanding of partner organisations, and as such, felt they had become
more aware of what support and services were available for their clients and the role other agencies can play. Some members suggested that being part of a One Team has enabled them to gain a better understanding of referral systems, grants and funding as well as a general understanding of the impact effective partnership working can have on the lives of vulnerable people.

Many team members referred to a “joined up consistent way of working” and highlighted it as a means to speed up processes, cut red tape and reduce the cost and demand on services through reducing the duplication and fragmentation of service delivery; issues that were evidenced in the case study analysis.

In general, it was felt that being part of the One Team improved efficiency and added value to their work with service users and being part of the One Team complimented and informed their roles within their wider remit outside of the team. No-one who was interviewed within the One Teams felt there was a conflict of interest between their role within their home organisation and the role of the One Teams, although a few front line delivery staff expressed a concern that there was a resistance by some operational managers to the One Team way of working. However, as the year has progressed and in further discussions at an operational level, this ‘void’ is beginning to be addressed. A number of operational managers consider the One Teams as an integral part of their daily business but expressed a concern that at times there was a lack of ‘cultural’ understanding between some partner organisations and an understanding of the pressures they were under to deliver services within the community. This was also echoed in conversations with voluntary/advisory agencies who expressed a concern that some One Team members did not seem to recognise that they were not a crisis service and worked on a referral basis in which clients could choose to engage or not.

Professional differences and boundaries were in general acknowledged among front line delivery staff. As one member stated:

“Although members report to their own management, they are required to carry out their roles within the auspices of the One Team and this can lead to working over and above the requirements of their job description and to undertake tasks that might not lie within their usual remit” (One Team member, 2016)

For this respondent, this approach was seen as positive and enhances job satisfaction. Another respondent took this further and felt that the purpose of the One Teams should be to
expand the expectations and roles of its members in assisting other agencies and services. Although One Team members are professionals within their field of expertise, they all generally possessed wider mutual aspirations and a determination to broaden their own working roles for the benefit of partners.

This way of One Team working was supported in the case study analysis, where there were examples of professionals undertaking tasks that may not lie within their usual remit, but was felt they were the best placed to take the lead with the client. In general, it was cited that this was predominately because either that particular professional had the best relationships with the individual/family or that their role was perhaps not seen as threatening to the individual/family in question, and as such, could be seen as a facilitating role that cultivated trust between families/individuals and the One Team partners. Developing this trust enabled further services and support when appropriate. This approach is illustrated in the case study below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action taken:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The role of the One Team</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents felt that One Team working leads to earlier intervention and more preventative work, and highlighted its role in helping to “identify vulnerable children, young people, adults and families in need of support and intervention”. The weekly team meetings
were seen as a place where concerns were discussed and issues identified or highlighted and responded to by the most appropriate service before matters reached crisis point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action taken:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The role of the One Team Sharing of information with Housing Association who does not attend One Team meetings to secure tenancy. Need quickly assessed and relevant bodies involved. As family do not meet criteria for statutory agency involvement the One Team will continue to monitor as vulnerable father with young child.

Being part of the One Team was also seen by front line delivery staff as enabling respondents to reach outside and across organisational boundaries and make it easier to leverage relevant resources. The One Team weekly meetings permitted the members to meet face-to-face and build relationships with colleagues from outside their ‘home’ organisation; as such they feel they are then more able to ask for help, guidance and support in meeting their client’s needs. For some members, given recent funding cuts, it was paramount that services were able to cross boundaries and leverage resources to ensure continuing support for vulnerable community members. One Team working was also regarded as supporting professionals to be more flexible in responding to client’s needs. Support from their One Team colleagues
enabled them to be more creative in finding solutions to problems which perhaps previously they would have been unable to do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action taken:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The role of the One Team</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The One Team approach undoubtedly provides better outcomes for communities in which they are located. Rather than separate agencies dealing with individuals/families as separate cases, the holistic and inclusive approach of the One Teams provides a response to both the causes and symptoms of the issues and problems. This approach is also effective for issues that may impact upon large segments of the community. One example of this is the identification of mental health problems within the community. When mental health issues were identified as a wider community problem, the One Teams organised training of their members and commissioned the Bridging the Gap project delivered by MIND.

The training of the One Team members in mental health issues enabled them to respond more effectively to these problems as well as extending their network of members. The following case study illustrates this practice. It concerns a young boy’s exclusion for drugs from school but deeper examination of the issue highlighted a wider drug problem within the school. The One Team was able to facilitate a drugs education program within the school.
### Case Study 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>Family with two children. Rent arrears. Mental health difficulties. Alcohol misuse, controlling behaviour, poor parenting skills. Number of agencies struggled to engage with family. Eldest child excluded from school for cannabis use.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action taken:</td>
<td>Home visit made and discovered that tenants could not read or write and were therefore not able to respond to letters from the housing association for rent arrears. Visit revealed family struggling to cope. Referrals made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Appropriate support put in place. Placed on One Team agenda. Rent arrears reduced. Eldest Son’s exclusion highlighted number of exclusions from same school for drug use. One Team arranged for drugs education programme in school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of the One Team</td>
<td>One team played a role of champion and commissioner of services. Facilitated education program for whole school. Monitor and support the family’s engagement. Identified wider community problem amongst school age children and drug use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the One Team approach promotes better well-being and cohesion within the community as interventions/actions tend to be completed quicker and more efficiently as joined up working is more coordinated. With this in mind, it was also felt by many members of the One Teams that it enabled them to achieve their own organisation’s aims and objectives more easily. It has, for some members of the Team, changed the way they approach their professional role as a whole. One Team working has increased their knowledge and understanding of multiple deprivation and its effects, which in turn has encouraged them to look further into the issue and behind the original problem and assess the individual’s needs more holistically. As one Team member reports they are no longer “working in isolation” and can see how their “actions dovetail into wider action plans to help families and ultimately break the cycle of deprivation and reduce demand on their service”.

### 4.3 Communication and Information Sharing

#### 4.3.1 Communication

Evaluative studies of multi-agency working have found communication to be a key factor for effective partnership working. For example, Frost and Lloyd (2006) found there needed to be
transparent structures within and between agencies and clear communication protocols for communication to be effective. While, Carpenter et al (2005) identified that frequent opportunities for communication were found to build effective communication links, which they suggest, the more contact partners have with one another, the more inclined they would be to seek further communication.

All frontline delivery staff that we spoke with felt that being part of the One Team had led to more effective communication between the partner organisations; the weekly team meetings were cited as a key factor in this. Many members felt that the meetings provided the opportunity for them to meet with colleagues from other agencies and build positive relationships, which enabled better communication and working relations. This in turn had helped to mitigate fragmentation and duplication in the provision of services to clients, as the meetings allowed for issues and concerns to be discussed in detail and appropriate referrals made. As one respondent stated:

“the meetings assist in ensuring agencies time and workloads were better managed through targeted and co-ordinated approaches” (One Team Member, 2016)

The meetings were felt to also enable professionals to come together to share and discuss concerns, identify issues and where needs be refer to the appropriate service before service user problems reached crisis point. As such this opportunity to communicate and collaboratively problem solve within the arena of the One Team meeting was highlighted as facilitating early intervention and reducing duplication and cost. The team meetings are also, as one Team member noted “a great opportunity to decipher fact from fiction”.

However, when members of the One Team were asked which agencies or organisations did not communicate well, nearly all listed Social Care, particularly Children’s Social Care, although a number did also mention Adult Social Care. Much of the literature around good partnership working highlights the key role of positive communication and how it helps to build an understanding of what each agency can contribute to the partnership, an appreciation of different agency contexts, an understanding of the range of perspectives involved and a positive regard for workers from other agencies (Atkins et al, 2007). The rolling out of the One Teams in 2015, coincided with a number of changes that have been taking place within the County’s Social Care Department; in particular Children’s Social Care. These changes are well documented but consequently may have impacted on Social Care’s capacity to interact and become involved with external organisations and partnerships. A number of
cases reviewed as part of our evaluation, listed Children’s Social Care as being involved. However, when examining the case notes it became apparent social workers that had been assigned to the family changed regularly, often within very short time frames, and on more than one occasion, it was noted that some families were not assigned new workers and the cases were closed without any formal withdrawal processes appearing to take place.

Unfortunately, this does appear to have led to some One Team members expressing a frustration with Social Care and some feeling that there is unwillingness by the Service to come along to the One Team meetings for relevant family discussions. It was felt that attendance of Social Care to the One Team meetings would assist in understanding how working together is in everyone’s interest, particularly the service users. It was suggested that if Social Care engaged with the One Teams it may lead to a reduction in inappropriate referrals. In part, this would be because members of the One Team would develop a better understanding of the role of Social Care, and with good sound advice mean that One Team members may be able to support those lower tier families instead and not refer them up inappropriately. As one member of the One Team suggests:

“The role of Social Care therefore would be one of signposting and advocacy. Their attendance at meetings would not result in them being bombarded with referrals but one of advice whose knowledge can be tapped into by others to enable them to meet their client’s needs successfully” (2016)

It was suggested that communication difficulties between Social Care and the One Teams during this transition period, led to a degree of conflict and stereotypical thinking with the lack of clarity and understanding of each other’s roles leading to a degree of frustration.

However, this situation is being readdressed with a number of discussions taking place at a strategic level, the publication of ‘Effective Support for Children and Families in Somerset (2016)’ and some joint training. This has led to greater clarity of the various levels of intervention and the different roles of the agencies which is enabling a better working relationship between Children’s Social Care and the One Teams to develop. As the rolling out of Social Care’s Team Around the Schools continues, it is hoped that closer partnership between the Children’s Social Care and the One Teams will develop further.
4.3.2 Information Sharing

Information sharing was highlighted by many members of the One Teams as being a key element of One Team working, and overall they reported feeling confident with regard to the sharing of information with most feeling that there was a clear information sharing protocol in place. However, some members did express a concern that information sharing boundaries were sometimes crossed and, perhaps at times, opinion rather than fact was presented. Examples of opinion rather than fact being presented were evidenced in some of the case notes that were analysed as part of this evaluation.

Evaluative literature on partnership working consistently refers to the importance that information sharing has on the success of initiatives and partnerships, and some team members did speak of the need for regular training around this issue. One member felt that being clear on the protocols around the sharing of information helped their confidence when communicating with partner agencies and as such suggested that training should be mandatory for all One Team members to enable quick and trustworthy relationships to be developed.

The minutes produced after each One Team meeting are integral to the sharing of information among the members. There is no standard template for the Team’s minutes and each One Team produces their minutes in varying formats. There has been some criticism from some team members that minutes are too long and therefore not an easy document to access effectively or quickly. The co-ordinators and Project Support Staff have over the course of this evaluation had several meetings to review how minutes could be standardised; but it would appear little has come from these meetings and the teams continue to produce the minutes in their chosen format. Two of the teams have streamlined their minutes, presenting them under themed headings and colour coded in terms of seriousness with one team reducing the minutes to only include the events discussed at that particular meeting and the historical information moved to family plans. It is suggested that standardising approaches to team minutes may help toward developing a more consistent approach across the teams.

A number of case studies examined illustrated where a number of positive outcomes had been achieved through targeted communication and information sharing, and in particular the importance it plays in safeguarding some of the more vulnerable members of the community. However, there was some frustration expressed by a few team members around the issue of gaining the clients consent to share information and it was felt this was creating a barrier to
partnership working between a number of key organisations, in particular Children’s Social Care. It was suggested that this issue was distracting from the conversations that should be taking place around safeguarding and duty of care. Whilst it was not possible to demonstrate this concern through the case studies examined, conversations with a number of front line workers from differing organisations do suggest that this is a concern for many members of the One Teams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> School expressed a concern around poor attendance and a change in one of their pupil’s behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action taken:</strong> Joint visit made by school and housing officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes:</strong> Found a number of adults living at property; thought to be related to mother’s new partner who was aggressive and demonstrated controlling behaviour of mother. Family proceeded to move out of county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The role of the One Team</strong> Safeguarding concerns passed onto relevant staff at new school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Single female parent with 5 children of various ages. Drink and alcohol misuse. Rent arrears. Children’s Social Care involved as older children under care order. Concerns over youngest child. Number of agencies worked with mother over the years but failed to change behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action taken:</strong> Concerns expressed by housing for arrears and school with regard to parenting capacity and poor school attendance of youngest child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes:</strong> Youngest child taken into care and re-engaged with education. Positive move for child and enjoying placement and school. Mother supported in reducing arrears and downsizing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The role of the One Team</strong> Facilitating and co-ordinating information exchange between several partners. Relevant information passed onto Children’s Social Care to support their work with family and Care Order. Referrals supported and ensured appropriate timescales were adhered to. Continuing support of mother - Referral made for mother to attend Inspired to Achieve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Highlighted through the police logs which are discussed at each One Team meeting. Case of serious ASB between tenant’s neighbour and her partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action taken:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of the One Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Data Collection

The One Teams collect a plethora of information as part of their work with families and individuals; much of which is recorded in the team meeting minutes and on Family Plans. However, much of this information is recorded in a word processing document and as such cannot be easily interrogated for specific information, facts or figures.

As part of the original project in Halcon, it was anticipated that the community could be better understood through ‘community mapping’ that would identify needs as a method to bring together the relevant agencies in a co-ordinated frontline delivery team. This approach would ensure the right resources could be focused in the right places and positive sustainable outcomes for the community would be harnessed much quicker, thus reducing demand on services. To enable this to be achieved, the community mapping exercise in Halcon was carried out using Avon and Somerset Police’s criminal information and intelligence management system, Anacapa i2. Information was gathered from various sources to form a comprehensive community map that created a full and detailed representation of the area, enabling professionals to quickly identify the needs to be addressed.

However, the interviews of those involved in the mapping exercise, revealed that using the i2 system was “extremely time consuming to produce, to keep up to date and as soon as it was printed, was out of date”. It was therefore felt that it would be impossible to replicate this mapping for all three One Team areas and an alternative method would need to be sought. It is the researchers understanding that multi-agency meetings to discuss how to capture the information to be used for the community map were held in the early stages of the North
Taunton and Wellington One Teams being developed and this resulted in the production of a community mapping form. The idea behind the form was that individuals from all partner agencies would carry copies of the form with them and complete it when they visited a property. The completed forms would be collated and used to identify areas of need (such as literacy / drug use / alcohol use) and this would enable a targeted intervention by the relevant agency.

In practice, however, this too did not succeed due to lack of agency buy-in / capacity to complete the forms at each visit.

Given the challenges with the community mapping form, subsequent meetings were held with the One Team co-ordinators, the Project Support Officers and the data analyst. It was agreed that the best way to capture the data for the community map was a spreadsheet format that could be interrogated using specific filters such as pivot tables, filters etc. A separate spreadsheet would be produced for each One Team and would be backdated to the beginning of 2016; some eight months backlog. However in reality, this was found to be extremely time consuming, and although completed, when the data analyst left the project in March 2016, only one of the One Teams have been able to keep the spread sheet up to date and this in itself is a crude document that does not enable in-depth investigation to inform policy or practice.

If evidence based practice is to be realised and the One Teams properly supported in recording and utilising the data that they gather on a daily basis, then effective analytical systems and support is essential. Capacity will need to be identified not only to undertake the analysis but also to collect and feed in the data and information.

One Team partners have a number of different data resources that they can access to inform and drive forward their daily business. Some of these are already utilised such as the Police Logs and rent arrears data but there is disparity between the Teams as to how this data is utilised. In the literature reviewed, the use of evidence and data to guide practice is highlighted as key to successful outcomes. It is therefore suggested that in developing any action plans, the One Teams should utilise the resources available from the wider communities to aid and inform their practice as well as being able to integrate their own information/data systems.
It is suggested that the Vulnerable Localities Index is a model that the member organisations of the One Teams could develop. This model was developed by the Jill Dando Institute and the Central Police Training and Development Authority in an attempt to deal with some of the deficiencies of crime mapping that has emerged since the Crime and Disorder Act of 1998. The Index aggregates a wide range of data such as crime, deprivation and demographics and initial evaluation appears to suggest that carefully chosen variables can accurately highlight areas of disproportionate concern to multi-agency partners (See Reece-Smith 2013).

4.5 Challenges to One Team Working

As the three One Teams have developed over time, the ideology and desire that they are an organic bottom up process led and driven by the needs of the communities they were set up to support continues through enabling, supporting and providing. However, this ideology is set against the backdrop of the ever-changing landscape of funding, governance and public sector austerity, which over the course of the last two years has been influential in the One Team’s evolution. This backdrop has inevitably created tensions, periods of uncertainties and consequently change which at times has impacted on the One Team’s daily business. It was noted that uncertainties, whether due to funding, impact of organisational change or challenges working with partners, if not suitably dealt with or the issue not redressed through the appropriate process may have an impact upon the well-being of the members of the One Team.

Organisational change has been highlighted by a number of interviewees as having a significant impact on the One Team’s daily business. The introduction of the Operating Model by Avon and Somerset Constabulary in 2015 was raised by a wide range of respondents as cause for concern. The Operating Model re-ordered the police officer working pattern to ensure they were on duty at times of high demand. This model makes for a better effective system for the police force but had a negative impact on the partnership approach of the One Teams. Police Officers are now not as readily available for meetings and it was felt that it restricted the role they can play more generally within their community. Other partner agencies expressed a concern that Avon and Somerset Constabulary are perhaps not as visible at meetings as they once were and a few respondents felt there was a sense that the police were withdrawing from the One Teams. Whilst PCSO attendance is clearly appreciated, a
few respondents expressed a concern that PCSOs did not have the experience or powers that police officers have and which was an essential element of the One Teams.

The realignment of GetSet back in 2016 also featured as a concern among respondents. Many felt it had affected staff from GetSet to engage with the One Team way of working as they were no longer attending meetings as regularly as they once did. “Having (once) attended every meeting, providing regular updates and bringing families to the meeting for referral, we are now lucky if we hear from them once a fortnight”. The realignment of GetSet, as a number of respondents to the questionnaire observed, has meant that they are more limited in the work that they can do, that there are longer waiting lists and it is now more difficult to refer to children’s centres. Respondents also expressed a concern that GetSet workers’ geographical area had increased substantially and as such were now unable to provide the hand-holding role to families that they once could. The hand-holding role played an important role in the One Team’s success of engaging with hard to reach families. GetSet services are seen among many respondents as having an integral role to play within the Teams and the changes will have an impact of the work of the One Team’s as a whole. The realignment, it is felt by some respondents has left a number of GetSet workers feeling torn between the demands and restrictions of their home organisation and those of the One Teams.

Staffing resources, retention and the temporariness of some posts were also highlighted by respondents as a challenge to the One Team’s daily business. Staffing issues not only undermine effective delivery but if on-going, bring in to question, the partner organisation’s commitment to the initiative. There have, for example, been periods of time where the recruitment of Estate Officers from Taunton Deane Housing has been particularly challenging. This has created serious problems for the One Teams and was felt to impact on the effective delivery of services to some of the most vulnerable members of the community.

There is also a sense among the three One Teams that there is an imbalance with regard to police resources. Officer numbers do not appear to be equal across the three teams nor seem to be deployed in relation to need. There is a sense with some co-ordinator’s that the One Teams are powerless to truly make an impact on crime and other social problems; without suitable police input they cannot access appropriate advice, support and guidance from within the Constabulary to address issues effectively.

The ability of some police officers to be able to change their shifts to enable them to attend One Team meetings and community events while other officers could not, was also raised as
a cause of concern by team members and the co-ordinators. The respondents also raised the issue of the lack of discussion on how the One Teams and Beat Teams should work together in relation to the One Team’s role, its aims and objectives and its relationship to the Constabulary’s daily business and tasking of personnel.

Similarly voluntary organisations play a key role within the One Team. However there appears to be a disparity across the Teams as to which voluntary agencies play a key role and which do not. It appears that this disparity is in part, due to the volunteer who covers that geographical area not being available to attend One Team meetings rather than there not being a demand for the services they provide. This is something that perhaps needs to be addressed if continuity is to be achieved across the three Teams.

Lessard et al (2006) has highlighted the need to ensure that the role and work of all agencies involved is understood and is paramount to effective partnership working. Ignorance of services offered by other organisations poses difficulties for collaborative practice and developing a partnership culture. The understanding of partner organisational cultures and processes can assist multi-agency work. While those front line professionals who took part in the research were developing an understanding of other organisations way of working, respondents among managerial staff expressed frustrations that some partner organisations expectations of the services they could provide were unrealistic. For example, several non-statutory bodies expressed a frustration that their colleagues from statutory organisations did not recognise that they were not a 24/7 service provider.

A number of partner organisations reported over the course of the evaluation that they felt the time and resources that were required to be truly committed to the One Team working was challenging. As one respondent commented:

“The One Team meetings are so frequent it is very hard to commit to attending each one. Due to the make-up of my team, they are not always located in the area of the One Team, so we have to consider travelling times and the impact on the rest of the day job” (Member of One Team, 2016)
4.6 Impact for Service Users of the One Teams

As discussed throughout this report, the impact and difference that the One Teams make to the communities they serve, is significant. This evaluation confirms that if the correct investment is made to enable, support and deliver effective solutions to the causes and symptoms that impact upon particular communities, over time both the financial and social benefits are substantial. This is confirmed by those individuals and families who reside in the area (please note that residents from only one One Team area were interviewed) who spoke passionately and articulately about the real differences it had made to their quality of lives. These differences included from ‘now having a reason to live’ by involving the community members in taking responsibility for their wellbeing and the wellbeing of their community to protecting residents from sexual and violent exploitation.

One story from a resident sums up the positive impact the One Team had had on her and her family. She was a female who lived with her partner and two children:

“I rent my property in Halcon, so I choose to live here, unlike other residents who do not have the option to move. I have become involved with activities I would never have done elsewhere…….Andy and his team are brilliant……last Saturday we went on the litter pick, my girls love it. We walk up one way and come back another and then we all go for lunch at the hall. The kids can play with their friends and I see other people on the estate……I’ve even started to persuade my partner to get involved…..he and his brother have been a bit naughty in the past so they don’t speak to the police, but yes, he has said hello to Andy…..I also feel that I can go and talk to people in the Centre (Acorn Centre) if I have any problems and concerns……There are a lot of activities on the church green for the children in the holidays. I can have a coffee with my neighbours and the children get out to do things…it’s good for everyone….I would not move from Halcon, it’s the best place I have lived”.

So, for this resident, the One Team had persuaded her and her family to take responsibility for her community in terms of ensuring it was a clean, attractive place to live with activities that promoted a sense of being a ‘safe and secure’ environment. Her contact with the agencies promoted a deeper sense of trust and confidence between them. They were comfortable to report positive events that had occurred in their lives (such as family weddings etc) as well as concerns they may have in relation to issues in the community.
Another resident spoke of the work of the One Team as ‘saving his life and having a reason to live’:

“I couldn’t get a job, so I ended up just spending my days doing nothing. I was really down and felt no one was interested in what I did……The estate also used to be a shithole….people would knock on my door and want money and things……it is different now. If anyone knocks on my door and I don’t like them, I speak to Andy……Andy and team got me involved every morning….. I also help keep the area clean, so I plan my day around this….in summer I am more busy cos more people drop litter in the summer…..I used to do that once, now I get cross when people do it (laughs)”.

This resident also spoke of having no purpose to his life and on occasions feeling suicidal prior to his engagement with the One Team. He now structures and organises his day around his commitment to the activities of the One Team, giving him a sense of purpose, responsibility and commitment as well as enabling him to organise and manage his time keeping. For both these residents, positive communication and engagement with other residents in the community appeared to enrich and contribute to both their wellbeing and the wellbeing of the community. The One Team approach to this resident was to engage him in small steps and this gave him a sense of value and worth. Moreover, he was developing life skills required to live a more fulfilling life.

One resident spoke eloquently of their interaction and relationship with members of the One Team:

“The PCSO would pop in to see how I was doing….I found this a comfort that there was someone there if I needed help….I found I did not have to repeat my story over and over again….I found that if I told my mental health worker that I was having trouble with my neighbours or my council tax, they would talk to the right people and they would help me….Even though I don’t have my daughter living with me anymore the Children’s Centre have said that they are here for me if I need something….The One Team have helped me get involved with the local groups and because of the One Team I do feel I have been able to move my life forward…..They have been very patient with me. They have never been judgemental…..I always feel supported by them which makes me feel safe to say that I need help. Before I never felt able to ask for help but now I can come down here (Acorn Centre) or to Link Power and ask if
there is someone around I can talk to. It doesn’t matter who it is I know the message will get passed on to the right person and they will contact me…..you never feel like you’re on a waiting list, they contact you really quickly…they are a group of people that are there to help who take you seriously”

These powerful words expressed by this resident detailed the difference the One Team approach had made to his life. Again, he felt valued, supported and empowered to deal with issues as and when they arose. His confidence in the agencies that he otherwise had lost confidence in was restored.

The final service user interview spoke of becoming involved with the One Team as the result of neighbour problems:

“my first experience with the One Team was we were having a nightmare with our neighbours with drugs….They came to see us and that’s how we got involved with the One Team…They dealt with our worries delicately and we felt supported…Halcon is now tidier. It’s a nice area. There is a sense of community….It’s good seeing police on the estate”

The four service user interviews illustrate the range of residents with their different needs and requirements. All so simply but so powerfully expressed the difference the One Team had made in their quality of lives and being a resident of the community.
Chapter Five – Concise Reflections and Observations from the Case Studies

This chapter provides concise reflections and observations of service delivery through analysis of the case studies. While the details from the individual case studies have been used where appropriate, to illustrate points being made throughout the report, it was agreed that there was little merit in just listing the case studies individually. In part, this was because the specific details contained within each case study could reveal identification of the services users, even though they were anonymised. However, a number of specific overall themes and findings emerged from the analysis of the cases, which triangulated other key findings from the interviews, questionnaires and documentation review. However, while this chapter briefly details the key observations from the overall collective analysis of all the case studies, it was felt significant to be included as a separate chapter of the report.

The case studies provided are from the period January 2015 to June 2016 (refer to Chapter Two for methodology of case file selection process).

5.1 Organic Learning and Development of the One Teams

The time frame in which the case studies are located has been a learning curve for all the One Teams and this is apparent in our analysis. Changes to practice and approach have taken place as the team’s experience has been developed. As such, approaches and ways of addressing and recording needs have changed.

In terms of development, the Wellington experience is perhaps the most challenging to assess as it has been without a co-ordinator for almost a year. When looking at the role of the Wellington One Team it was more difficult to fully understand decisions made and actions taken as those responsible are no longer involved.
5.2 Diversity of Service Users

The case studies selected for the research highlight the diversity of individuals and families that the One Team’s come into contact with. However, work with families with need rather than individuals’ with need tends to dominate caseloads particularly in Wellington.

It does appear that some families and individuals generate more input or attention from the One Team than others. It was noted that how the ‘story’ of the family or individual is presented by the referring agency has significant influence to the way the needs of the service user are responded to by the One Team.

5.3 Partner Organisations

The core partners within the One Teams are TDBC, Police and GetSet. Some agencies and organisations do not seem to have any input in certain One Team areas but do in others. There needs to be greater continuity across all three One Teams.

In the early days, the founding partners of the One Team were the Police and TDBC Housing. While these two agencies have an important role to play and other agencies are now part of the One Team partnership, caution needs to be given to ensure these two agencies do not dominate One Team meetings and activities, both to ensure a shared leadership with other agencies and to avoid over burdening of work on these two agencies.

5.4 Partnership Working and Engagement

The case studies illustrated how ‘partnership engagement’ is conceptualised and defined; it is noted that different agencies have different definitions of how this is defined. The One Team’s definition is one where engagement is active, motivated and dynamic through relevant and timely communication.

Some agencies appear to define engagement with a client as positive if they have spoken with them over the telephone and not always with face to face contact. For example, GetSet were working with a young mother and her young child. They had several conversations with mother over the telephone but not seen her face to face for some time. This lack of face to face contact was challenged by the co-ordinator and a police officer sent to check welfare.
The visit by the police officer revealed that mother had been ‘cuckooed’ and a drug gang had moved in and were using her property as a base for drug activity. Several men were arrested as a result of the police visit with one arrestee being a registered sex offender. The child was taken into police protection.

In relation to engagement by the service users, there are examples of where agencies deem a family not to be engaging as they have not responded to a letter. For example TDBC Housing sent numerous letters to one tenant who accrued significant rent arrears. The One Team made a home visit and discovered the tenant could not read and the family had multiple needs and were struggling to cope.

Consideration needs to be given to cases where there is only one agency working with that particular family/individual. It may be suggested that in these cases, there is no role for the One Team as there is argument that the agency should be trusted to get on with doing its job and to bring cases to the One Team only if they need additional services or support from other organisations. In trying to have knowledge of every family/individual/issue in the community there may be a risk that the One Team will undermine confidence and trust with its partner agencies.

There needs to be more trust in agencies and systems and understanding of referral processes and systems. However, in complex cases, the One Team’s role is clearly paramount and case study analysis shows its strengths lie in its ability to:

- Share and disseminate information.
- Facilitate joint working.
- Monitor progress, manage and follow up actions of all agencies involved.
- Challenge non-action.

The case file analysis demonstrated that many of these complex cases fall below the thresholds of a number of services/organisations, such as Child or Adult Social Care as well as those of the Avon and Somerset Constabulary, Mental Health Services, MARAC and SDAS. It has been suggested that the recent threshold increases by some organisations have meant that the One Team’s are increasingly taking on the lead role in cases of high and complex need which once would have been the jurisdiction of statutory services. There is a need to ensure that projects such as Bridging the Gap delivered by Mind for example are not used to ‘plug the gap’ and do not replace statutory agencies and their work.
The case studies revealed that One Teams often feed information to other organisations, but often this information sharing is not reciprocated.

The data sharing protocol is vital to developing relationships. Information sharing when at its best ensures positive outcomes for the community.

5.5 Managing and Reviewing Case Files

Analysis of the case files revealed that a number of cases had been open a long time and there is a need for more regular reviews to ensure action is not lagging. This links to the need for sustainable outcomes. Once a case is closed, there needs to be a system that enables the One Teams review the situation at a later date to check all is still well with the service user(s).

The case study analysis also demonstrates that the One Team co-ordinators have a key role to play in facilitating, influencing, challenging, negotiating and at times escalating issues of service users to other organisations. Consequently, the One Team when working at its best limits duplication and ensures timely responses; which in turn should reduce costs to agencies involved. However, the co-ordinators have expressed a need for an interactive system which enable them to monitor and evaluate more easily; one which facilitates regular reviews so to ensure that client’s needs are being met and agencies involved are ‘task and finish’ led. A system which enables them to become evidence based.

Of some concern was that the analysis disclosed that too much information in case notes appeared to be based on hear-say or opinion rather than verified fact. Hear-say or opinion, whilst could be important, needs to be clearly identified as that.

As the One Team corporate memory has evolved, it has been able to identify community wide issues and needs and as such is able to disseminate knowledge to partners and those responsible for local policy responses. For example the use of certain legal highs among school age children has led to an educational programme being implemented in local schools. Mental Health has also been highlighted as a cause for concern and this has been fed back to the One Team Governance Groups (Silver and Gold) which facilitated the commissioning of ‘Bridging the Gap’ project led by MIND.

It was evident in the review of the case file that the One Teams had begun to establish a collective corporate memory which was strengthened as continuity of agency representation
and engagement developed. This fed into the One Teams approach and their response to the needs of the community.
Chapter Six - Anti-Social Behaviour

This chapter provides information relating specifically to anti-social behaviour. The chapter has been written in a format that enables it to be read and reviewed as a stand-alone overview of anti-social behaviour within and of itself. This was due to the commissioning requirements for the research, which required both anti-social behaviour and domestic violence to be examined as specific aspects within the research. Thus, this chapter contains a concise literature review as well as national and local statistics in which to set the context of the work of the One Teams in relation to this behaviour.

Anti-social behaviour (ASB) was defined in the Crime and Disorder Act (1998) as “acting in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as the perpetrator”. Incidents of ASB include a variety of behaviours and outcomes that can blight the quality of life of a particular individual, group or community.

Examples of anti-social behaviour include:

- Nuisance, rowdy or inconsiderate neighbours.
- Vandalism, graffiti and fly-posting.
- Street drinking.
- Environmental damage including littering, dumping of rubbish and abandonment of cars.
- Prostitution related activity.
- Begging and vagrancy.
- Fireworks misuse.
- Inconsiderate or inappropriate use of vehicles.

It is acknowledged that different people have different expectations and levels of tolerance; what one person may find offensive or stressing, another person might view as innocuous.

The police, local authorities and other community safety partner agencies, such as fire and rescue and social housing landlords, all have a responsibility to deal with anti-social behaviour and to help those who are victims of such behaviour.
In October 2014, new powers came into force which enabled the police, local councils, social landlords and other agencies to better tackle anti-social behaviour, and assist victims and communities to feel safe in their own homes and neighbourhoods (Police, UK 2014). The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 introduced new measures to better protect communities from serious harm caused by anti-social behaviour. These measures included:

- **Criminal behaviour orders** which are issued by the courts after a person has been convicted for a criminal offence. Under the order, a person who has been convicted would be banned from certain activities or places, and would also be required to address their behaviour, for example by attending a drug treatment programme. A breach could see an adult face up to five years in prison.

- **Police dispersal power** allows the police to disperse anti-social individuals and provide short-term respite to a local community. The power is preventative and allows an officer to deal instantly with someone’s behaviour in a particular place and to confiscate related items.

- **Community protection notices** enables local authorities and police to stop persistent environmental anti-social behaviour, like graffiti, neighbour noise or rubbish on private land.

- **Public spaces protection order** is a power which allows a local council to deal with a particular nuisance or problem that is detrimental to the local community’s quality of life by imposing universal conditions on the use of that area. This can be used to tackle issues like dog fouling and restricting the consumption of alcohol.

- **Closure power** which allows the police or local council to close premises where anti-social behaviour has been committed, or was likely to be committed.

- **Absolute ground for possession** which speeds up the possession process in cases where anti-social behaviour or criminality has already been proven by another court.

The Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 also includes two new measures which are designed to give victims and communities a say in the way anti-social behaviour is dealt with:

- **Community trigger** which gives victims the ability to demand action, starting with a review of their case, where the locally defined threshold is met.
• **Community remedy** which gives victims a say in the out-of-court punishment of perpetrators for low-level crime and anti-social behaviour.

These powers, it is suggested are more flexible, quicker to obtain and less bureaucratic, making it easier for the police, local councils, social landlords and other local agencies to deal with anti-social behaviour and puts victims at the heart of the process (Police UK 2014).

### 6.1 Measuring Anti-Social Behaviour

Figures recorded by the police relating to anti-social behaviour (ASB) can be considered alongside police recorded (notifiable) crime to provide a more comprehensive view of the crime and disorder that comes to the attention of the police. It is important to note that any incident of ASB which results in a notifiable offence will be included in police recorded crime figures (and excluded from the ASB counts). This is to ensure there are no overlaps between the two.

Following the HMIC review in 2012, it was found that there was a wide variation in the quality of decision making associated with the recording of ASB. HMIC found instances of:

• Forces failing to identify crimes, instead wrongly recording them as ASB.
• Reported ASB not being recorded on force systems, for instance if the victim had reported it directly to the neighbourhood team or via email (as opposed to telephone).
• Reported ASB being recorded as something else, such as suspicious behaviour.
• Incidents that were not ASB being recorded as ASB.

Furthermore, data on ASB incidents before and after the year ending March 2012 are not directly comparable, owing to a change in the classification used for ASB incidents. From April 2012, ASB incidents also include data from the British Transport Police, so direct comparisons can only be made from 2012/13 onwards.
6.2 Rates of Anti-Social Behaviour

The police recorded 1.9 million incidents of ASB in the year ending June 2015. This compares with the 4.3 million notifiable crimes recorded by the police over the same period. The number of ASB incidents recorded by the police in the year ending June 2015 decreased by 9% compared with the previous year, continuing a downward trend.

Table 6: Recorded Incidents of ASB

From March 2012, a new set of 3 simplified categories for ASB was introduced:

- "Nuisance" captures incidents where an act, condition, thing or person causes trouble, annoyance, irritation, inconvenience, offence or suffering to the local community in general rather than to individual victims.
• "Personal" captures incidents that are perceived as either deliberately targeted at an individual or group, or having an impact on an individual or group rather than the community at large.

• "Environmental" captures incidents where individuals and groups have an impact on their surroundings, including natural, built and social environments.

Although all forces adopted these new definitions, an inspection in 2012 by the HMIC found that 35% of all incidents reviewed were incorrectly categorized and as such this should be taken into account when considering ASB incident figures.

In the year ending June 2015, 67% of the ASB incidents categorized by the police were identified as nuisance; 26% as personal; and 6% as environmental. This distribution may reflect propensity of reporting rather than the actual distribution of ASB by type.

Table 7: Categories of Anti-Social Behaviour Incidents in England and Wales, year ending June 2015

Source: Police recorded incidents, Home Office
6.3 Crime Survey for England and Wales Measures of Anti-Social Behaviour

Questions about respondents’ actual experiences of ASB in their local area were added to the year ending March 2012 Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) to expand on existing questions about perceived ASB. These questions asked whether the respondent had personally experienced or witnessed ASB in their local area and, if so, what types.

In the year ending June 2015, 28% of adults indicated that they had personally experienced or witnessed at least one of the ASB problems asked about in their local area in the previous year. This had not changed from the previous year. This figure included 10% of adults who experienced or witnessed drink related anti-social behaviour and 9% who witnessed or experienced groups hanging around on the streets.

Table 8: CSEW Experiences of Anti-Social Behaviour (years ending June 2014 and June 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Anti-Social Behaviour:</th>
<th>July 2013 to July 2014</th>
<th>July 2014 to July 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personally experienced/witnessed ASB in local area</td>
<td>28.0 %</td>
<td>28.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drink related ASB</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups hanging around on the streets</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loud Music or other noise</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsiderate behaviour</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter, rubbish or dog fouling</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism, criminal damage or graffiti</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle related behaviour</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People using or dealing drugs</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People being intimated, verbally abused or harassed</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuisance Neighbours</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begging, vagrancy or homeless people</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of control or dangerous dogs</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People committing inappropriate or indecent sexual acts in public</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CSEW also asks respondents about perceptions of problems with different types of ASB in their local area. In the year ending June 2015, 11% of adults perceived there to be a high level of ASB in their local area, which remained the same level as the previous year.
Since the year ending March 2005 the CSEW has consistently estimated that around a quarter of adults perceive a problem in their local area with “people using or dealing drugs” and almost a third perceive “rubbish or litter lying around” as a problem in their local area. Other anti-social behaviour indicators have tended to show declines over this time period, with the most pronounced decline for the "abandoned or burnt-out cars" category, which peaked at 24% in 2002/03 and has subsequently fallen each year down to 2% of adults in the year ending June 2015.

Table 9: CSEW Trends in the Anti-Social Behaviour Indicators, years ending December 1996 to June 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish or litter lying around</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People using or dealing drugs</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People being drunk or rowdy in public places</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers hanging around on the streets</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy neighbours or loud parties</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned or burnt-out cars</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Crime Survey for England and Wales, Office for National Statistics)
6.4 Rates of Anti-Social Behaviour in Avon and Somerset

Table 10:
Anti-Social Behaviour Incidents, year ending March 2008 to year ending March 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per 1000 of the Population</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Avon and Somerset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2007 – March 2008</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2008 – March 2009</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2009 – March 2010</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2010 – March 2011</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2011 – March 2012</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2012 – March 2013</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2013 – March 2014</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2014 – March 2015</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2015 – March 2016</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Police Recorded Incidents Home Office 2007 – 2016)
6.5 Rates of Anti Social Behaviour in the One Team Areas

Table 11: Rates of ASB within Halcon

![Graph showing rates of ASB within Halcon from January 2014 to November 2016. The graph indicates fluctuations in ASB rates with peaks in 2014 and 2015, and a general decline by 2016.]
Table 12: Rates of ASB in North Taunton
6.6 Four Case Studies of Anti-Social Behaviour in the One Teams

Case Study 1

The Situation: Concerns raised by number of residents about drug related activity in and around a close by property.

The Role of the One Team: Raised by local police officers at a One Team meeting. Tenants identified by TDBC Housing. Police collated intelligence. Believed tenant and her son (young adult) were using drugs and shoplifting to fund their habit. Contact was made with other residents in the street and a community survey was organized to assess impact. The police increased visible patrols in the area and over a 2 month period both the tenant and her son were stopped and searched and found in possession of heroin. Tenant and son arrested and charged and received prison sentence.
Outcome: Despite help being offered to tenant once released, behaviour continued. A closure order was successfully applied for at Taunton Deane Magistrates Court (under the provisions of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014). The property was closed and during the period of closure (initially for 3 month duration), the Council commenced proceedings for mandatory possession of the property using the new powers from the ASB Act 2014.

The tenant took advice and decided to terminate tenancy before the repossession hearing date. The flat has since been re-let to a new family.

Case Study 2

The Situation: A young female tenant was relocated into temporary housing in the One Team area after being evicted from her last property for anti-social behaviour. Identified as extremely vulnerable and suffers from mental health/ personality disorder issues, she has proven to be a real challenge for various support services and has been a particular demand on police and ambulance resources. Adult Social Care, Leaving Care and Somerset Partnership Mental Health Team all supported a move for her to the area because it was felt that she would benefit from the additional support that the One Team could provide.

The Role of the One Team: The tenant features on the One Team agenda and measures have been put in place to routinely check on her welfare. Following “learning” from a previous “serious case review” involving a vulnerable young person an overarching risk assessment document was produced so there was no confusion as to which agency was responsible for what. The tenant is regularly discussed at the One Team meetings and each of the agencies involved are asked to provide regular updates.

Outcomes: Progress has been made, calls to police and ambulance have reduced and housing (following recommendations from the mental health team) are looking to transfer her to more permanent accommodation within the area.

Case Study 3

The Situation: Young family with 8 children all aged less than 10 years made a number of complaints to the police and housing that they were the target of harassment from their next
door neighbour. The male next door had allegedly embarked on a campaign of deliberately harassing his neighbours by making excessive noise throughout the day (loud music), banging on walls at 2am in the morning, shouting obscenities over the garden fence within hearing of young children and making direct threats to the father. Tension between the two households increased due to a “clash of life styles” and it began to impact on the father’s health further who is registered disabled.

The tenant next door had lived in his house all his life (60 years). He made counter allegations about his neighbour’s behaviour and as there was no independent evidence to corroborate either side of the dispute, it was impossible for the police to take action or housing to take tenancy sanctions.

The dispute was referred for mediation but this failed. The reality of the situation was the neighbour relationship had irretrievably broken down. The Children’s Centre who was supporting the children identified the impact that the dispute was having on the children. School readiness and speech development in the younger children was put down to the emotional turbulence within the household which was a direct result of the on-going ASB campaign of harassment.

The role of the One Team: The family featured in many One Team meetings and police, housing and GetSet services had to invest time and energy in supporting both parties involved in the dispute. The One Team made a case for the family to be re-housed, but it was important they remained within the One Team area in order they could receive the on-going support. Housing authorised a management move to another 4 bed property on the estate.

Outcome: Since the move there have been no reports to the police, the children’s development has improved to the point that the GetSet family support worker has closed the case. The father’s mental health has improved and the family is much happier.

Case Study 4

The Situation: Large groups of young people were hanging around a local parade of shops and engaging in behaviour that was intimidating to both shop keepers and customers. On occasions, this has been reported to the police but the young people kept returning and
engaging in such behaviour.

The Role of the One Team: A questionnaire was developed and distributed to the local shop keepers to enable concerns to be evidenced. The Problem Solving Policing Team were contacted to advise on what can be done and what has found to work in other areas. Local PCSO’s talked with young people to identify why they were hanging around. Discussions with Taunton Deane Borough Council were held and the provision of a shelter in the park was pushed forward. In addition, the PCSOs led on a youth activity program.

Outcomes: Shelter in park provided. The young people no longer hang out around shops and the anti-social behaviour ceased.

6.7 The Role of the One Team in ASB

The four case studies in section 6.6 above highlight the role that the One Teams have in dealing with and tackling anti-social behaviour. These cases illustrate the wide range of behaviours that fall under the banner of ASB and how responding to each case demands a clear understanding of why individuals or families or groups are perceived to be anti-social by others in the community.

In particular, it can be noted that the One Teams utilize a range of tactics, including the relevant legislation in very specific applications to address the cause of ASB. The One Team approach to ASB is firstly, to fully understand what is causing the ASB before solutions are applied. Establishing the cause is what the One Team does extremely well, partly because of the ethos of the One Teams but also because they have detailed knowledge and understanding of the community. So, for example, in the case where someone had been evicted from a previous property for ASB, the One Team ascertained that her behaviour was manifest as part of her extreme vulnerability. Thus support was put into place to support her vulnerabilities and the ASB ceased. In another case, the ASB was the result of certain community groups needs not being met. In this case, young people did not have a place or space within the community in which they could congregate. So hanging outside the shopping parade became their point for meeting. This gathering of youths was perceived by some members of the community as anti-social. Therefore, in discussions with the young people, an appropriate place was created.
Therefore, the ethos which underpins the One Team also supports the reduction of anti-social behaviour by identifying the underlying causes to put in effective solutions. These solutions can range from use of ASB legislation to remove individuals or families or groups from properties or places to tackling the issues that create such behaviour.

In terms of rates of anti-social behavior within the One Team areas, while rates may be an indicator of success in reducing and tackling this issue, changing definitions, legislation and recording methods obscure the real accomplishments in dealing with, and preventing ASB. Moreover, as the case studies from the One Teams demonstrate, ASB generally is complex and multifaceted, often linked with a set of intricate behaviours, thus the reduction, redressing and prevention requires a more sophisticated approach than would initially suggest. The ethos of the One Team provides the framework for such an approach.
Chapter Seven - Domestic Abuse

This chapter provides information relating specifically to domestic abuse. The chapter has been written in a format that enables it to be read and reviewed as a stand-alone overview of domestic abuse within the report. This was due to the commissioning requirements for the research, which required domestic violence to be examined as a specific aspect within the research. Thus, this chapter contains a concise literature review as well as national and local statistics in which to set the context of the work of the One Teams in relation to domestic abuse.

Domestic abuse is not limited to physical violence. It can include repeated patterns of abusive behaviour in order to maintain power and control in a relationship. The cross-government definition of domestic violence and abuse recognises this and defines domestic abuse as:

“Any incident or pattern of incidents of controlling, coercive, threatening behaviour, violence or abuse between those aged 16 or over who are, or have been, intimate partners or family members regardless of gender or sexuality. It can encompass, but is not limited to, the following types of abuse:

- Psychological.
- Physical.
- Sexual.
- Financial.
- Emotional.”

(Home Office 2013)

With the exception of coercive and controlling behaviour, which was introduced as a new criminal offence on 29 December 2015, other acts of domestic abuse fall under generic offence categories in police recorded crime and criminal justice data, such as assault with injury.

Controlling behaviour is defined as:

“a range of acts designed to make a person subordinate and/or dependent by isolating them from sources of support, exploiting their resources and capacities for personal gain, depriving them of the means needed for independence, resistance and escape and regulating their
everyday behaviour.”

Coercive behaviour is defined as:

“an act or a pattern of acts of assault, threats, humiliation and intimidation or other abuse that is used to harm, punish, or frighten their victim.”

These definitions also cover so called ‘honour’ based violence, female genital mutilation (FGM) and forced marriage, and is clear that victims are not confined to one gender or ethnic group (Home Office 2016).

In order to achieve consistency across the county, organisations and professionals working in Somerset are expected to use this definition, when determining their response to domestic incidences.

While the definition focuses on people aged 16 years and over, evidence demonstrates that children are victims of domestic abuse too – either through witnessing incidences or themselves being in relationships.

### 7.1 Why Does Domestic Abuse Happen?

There is no single cause or factor that leads to domestic abuse. A number of risk factors have been identified as associated with perpetrators of domestic abuse. These include age, low academic achievement, low income or exclusion from the labour market, social disadvantage and isolation and exposure to, or involvement in, aggressive or delinquent behaviour as an adolescent (Flood and Fergus 2008; NSW Office for Women’s Policy 2008). Many of these same risk factors have been linked to an increased likelihood of aggressive behaviour and offending generally. Mouzos and Makkai (2004) found that, among those women who had experienced current intimate partner violence, the most commonly reported aspects of the male perpetrator's behaviour (and therefore risk factors for violence) were drinking habits, general levels of aggression and controlling behaviour.

Various situational factors, while not direct causes, may increase the risk of domestic violence. Some of these factors include family or relationship problems, financial problems or unemployment and recent stressful events or circumstances, such as the death of a family
member (Memmott et al. 2001). Povey et al (2009) found that women who were separated and women who were on their own with children were the two groups with the highest levels of risk for all forms of domestic abuse. They also found that the likelihood of becoming a victim of domestic abuse increased as levels of income fell and women on incomes of less than £10,000 were particularly at risk of all forms of domestic abuse. Women with long standing health issues were also more at risk of domestic abuse than women without long standing health problems (Povey et al 2009).

Alcohol is a significant risk factor for domestic violence, with research suggesting that women whose partners frequently consume alcohol at excessive levels are more likely to experience violence (Marcus and Braaf 2007; Mouzos and Makkai 2004). Alcohol use is also prevalent among victims of domestic violence (Nicholas 2005; White and Chen 2002). There is strong evidence of a relationship between heavy drinking and aggression (Wells and Graham 2003). However, not all people who consume alcohol become violent. One explanation for the role of alcohol in domestic violence is that the consumption of alcohol may facilitate an escalation of an incident from verbal to physical abuse because it lowers inhibitions and increases feelings of aggression (Nicholas 2005). There is also research that suggests because of its impact on aggression, the consumption of alcohol, either by the offender or victim, may increase the seriousness of a domestic violence incident, the severity of injuries and risk of death, with almost half of all intimate partner homicides found to be alcohol-related (Dearden and Payne 2009).

Research has also found that, after controlling for other factors, there are higher rates of domestic violence in those households in which there are children present (Romans et al. 2007). Watson and Parsons’ (2005) study in Ireland reported that the risks of experiencing domestic abuse were significantly higher for women with children. MacLeod’s Scottish Crime and Justice Survey on Partner Abuse (2009) found that a third of those experiencing partner abuse in the last year had dependent children living with them at the time of the most recent incident and 63% reported that the children were present when the abuse took place. Radford et al (2011) study for the NSPCC found that more children were exposed to domestic violence than exposed to the various direct forms of maltreatment and according to the Women’s Aid annual survey on just one day in 2015, two thirds of women living in refuge had a child or children with them (66.95% of 1864 women) and 6.12% (of 1864 women) were pregnant and it estimates that one in seven (14.2%) children and young people
under the age of 18 will have lived with domestic violence at some point in their childhood (Women’s Aid 2016). Stanley’s review on domestic abuse in 2011 found that domestic abuse is a key indicator for child abuse and neglect and suggests that in the general UK population, children and young people experiencing domestic violence are between 3 and 4.5 times more likely also to experience physical violence and neglect. Domestic violence has also been found to co-exist with child sexual abuse. The concurrence of domestic violence and child abuse and neglect in children’s services’ caseloads was found to be high; in over 50 per cent of Children Services cases and in the context of child protection cases, domestic violence is frequently found to co-exist with neglect involving lack of supervision or refusal of treatment (Stanley 2011).

It has been recognised that exposing a child to domestic violence is a form of abuse in itself, regardless of whether the child is the target of such violence or not (Flood and Fergus 2008), and that such exposure is related to the intergenerational transmission of violence (Tomison 2000). Exposure to violence in the home can lead young people to develop inappropriate norms concerning violence and aggression, and to model the behaviour and attitudes to which they have been exposed, increasing the risk that an individual will enter into an abusive relationship in adulthood, either as the perpetrator or victim (Flood & Fergus 2008, Tomison 2000).

Exposure to domestic violence has been associated with a higher likelihood of emotional and behavioural problems and can include:

- issues related to cognitive, emotional and social functioning and development which can lead to behavioural and learning difficulties;
- an increase in the risk of mental health issues, including depression and anxiety disorders;
- issues related to education and employment prospects;
- more accepting of or willing to excuse the use of violence against women;
- involvement in violent relationships with peers and conflict with adults and other forms of authority;
- increased risk of becoming perpetrators or victims themselves; and
- a detrimental impact on their future parenting capacities (Flood and Fergus 2008; Tomison 2000; VicHealth 2006).
7.2 Measuring Domestic Abuse

Domestic abuse is a very private crime. Victims of domestic abuse are less likely than victims of other forms of violence to report their experiences to the authorities because of beliefs that their abuse is not a matter for police involvement, their experiences too trivial, or from fear of reprisal. Thus there is significant under-reporting of domestic abuse by victims, and it is acknowledged that data on reported incidents and cases prosecuted, which has recently started being collected by the criminal justice system, represents the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike other crimes, it is often difficult to separate occurrences of domestic violence into discrete ‘incidents’: abuse may be continuous (e.g. living under a threat), or may occur with such frequency that the victim cannot reliably count the instances. Even if it were possible to put a figure on individual offences, and hence calculate a domestic violence ‘rate’, this would not be a particularly telling reflection of the number of people at risk. As such, any statistic describing the ‘level’ of domestic violence must be interpreted with care. Likewise, the way in which data on domestic abuse are collected differs between sources and organisations and data are collected over different timescales, can be based on offences, victims, suspects or defendants and can vary in the way cases are identified. So, when taken in isolation, these statistics may not provide the context required by users to enable them to understand the national and local picture of domestic abuse.

Statistics on domestic abuse are produced separately by a number of different organisations in England and Wales:

- ONS estimates from the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW)
- Home Office incident and police recorded crime and outcomes data
- Home Office Homicide Index data
- Crown Prosecution Service data (CPS) including; referrals, prosecutions and convictions

Recent increases in the number of domestic abuse-related crimes recorded by the police could be due, in part, to police forces improving their recording of domestic abuse incidents as crimes and to forces actively encouraging victims to come forward to report these crimes.
However, it is widely recognised that domestic abuse continues to be under-reported, with many more offences committed than are reported to and recorded by the police. The support services offered to victims of domestic abuse are also not reliant on the reporting of domestic abuse to the police. Estimates based on those interviewed in the Crime Survey for England and Wales during the year ending March 2015 showed that around 4 in 5 victims (79%) of partner abuse did not report the abuse to the police. The data held by the police can, therefore, only provide a partial picture of the level of domestic abuse experienced in England and Wales.

Similarly, data from the Crime Survey for England and Wales should not be viewed in isolation. The estimates from the survey show a higher level of domestic abuse, in terms of the number of victims, than other data sources. The CSEW also shows that the majority of victims will not report the abuse they have experienced to the police. Therefore, while the CSEW provides a reliable estimate of the prevalence of domestic abuse trends, they may not match trends in administrative data sources.

7.3 Understanding the Information Recorded by Police

As domestic abuse as a whole is not a specific criminal offence, offences that are domestic abuse-related will have been recorded under the respective offence that has been committed, for example, assault with injury. This means that while domestic abuse is part of the recorded crime series, prior to April 2015 it is not possible to determine how many crimes were domestic abuse-related. In response to a recommendation in the Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) 2014 report Everyone’s business: Improving the police response to domestic abuse, the Home Office began collecting information from the police on whether recorded offences are related to domestic abuse. Since April 2015 Police forces have been asked to ‘flag’ crimes as being domestic abuse-related if the offence meets the government definition of domestic violence and abuse and as discussed earlier, in December 2015 a new criminal offence of coercive and controlling behaviour was introduced.

Incidents of domestic abuse that result in a crime being recorded by the police are included in data on domestic abuse-related offences. To get a total picture of the demand upon the police that relates to domestic abuse, it is necessary to consider both domestic abuse incidents and offences.
In the year ending March 2016, there were a total of 1,031,120 domestic abuse-related incidents and crimes recorded by the police in England and Wales. Of these, 609,935 (59%) were not subsequently recorded as a crime and remained as incidents.

7.4 Recorded Crimes flagged as Domestic Abuse-related in England and Wales

Across England and Wales, the 41% of domestic abuse-related incidents that were subsequently recorded as crimes in the year ending March 2016 amounted to 421,185 offences. This proportion varied by police force area. Of these, 327,565 offences (78% of the total) were violence against the person offences, 37,503 (9%) were criminal damage and arson offences, 16,632 (4%) were public order offences, 13,120 (3%) were sexual offences and the remaining 26,365 (6%) were miscellaneous and other notifiable offences.

Overall, 11% of all crimes recorded by the police (excluding fraud) were flagged as domestic abuse-related. Violence against the person offences were the most likely to be domestic abuse-related, comprising a third (33%) of violent crime. The offence group with the next highest proportion of offences being domestic abuse-related was sexual offences.

Of the 43 police forces, 20 had 35% to 45% of domestic abuse-related incidents recorded as crimes. There were 5 police force areas with 50% or more of domestic abuse incidents recorded as crimes and the lowest proportion of all domestic abuse-related incidents recorded as crimes was 24%. Across England and Wales, 11% of all police recorded crimes were domestic abuse-related. This varied by police force area, ranging from 2% to 17% (Police recorded Crime 2016, Home Office). In England and Wales, 4.3% of men aged 16 to 59 said they had experienced domestic abuse. This prevalence for men varied across police force areas, ranging from 2.7% to 6.3%.

7.5 Domestic Abuse as Measured by the CSEW

For the year ending March 2016 the Crime Survey England and Wales estimated 1.8 million adults aged 16 to 59 experienced domestic abuse in the last year, equating to a prevalence rate of 6 in 100 adults. Women were more likely to say they have experienced domestic abuse than men, with an estimated 1.2 million female victims compared to 651,000 male victims, according to the survey (7.7% compared with 4.4%).
Table 14: Proportion of Adults aged 16 to 59 who Experienced Domestic Abuse in the Last Year, by Sex and Age group, three year combined dataset, April 2013 to March 2016 CSEW

![Bar Chart](image)

(Source: Crime Survey for England and Wales, Office for National Statistics)

7.6 Prevalence of Domestic Violence in Avon and Somerset

According to the Crime Survey of England and Wales 6.8% of people aged 16-59 years in Avon and Somerset experienced at least one incident of domestic abuse in the year preceding their interview. Of these 7.4% of females aged between 16 and 59 years of age experienced at least one incident of domestic abuse and 6.2% of males aged between 16 and 59 years of age. In comparison to other police force areas Avon and Somerset ranks 18th out of 42 Police Force Areas in England and Wales.

In the year ending March 2016, 24,974 domestic abuse related incidents and offences were recorded in Avon and Somerset. This is equivalent to 15 incidents and offences for every 1,000 people in the population. Of these, 13,594 were recorded by the police as offences. This is equivalent to 8 offences for every 1,000 people in the population (Home Office 2016).
7.7 The One Teams

The charts below show domestic abuse occurrences as recorded by the police in the three One Team areas between January 2014 and December 2016. Since April of 2015 police forces have been required to flag all occurrences regardless of whether they are finally recorded as crimes or incidents as domestic abuse related and as such this should be taken into consideration when comparing year on year data. Thus rises in occurrences since 2015 are not necessarily increases in an actual rise in the number of domestic abuse occurrences but may also be the result of either increased public confidence to report as well as the result of changes in recording methods.

Table 15: Occurrences Recorded by the Police as Domestic Abuse Related 2014 -2016; Halcon, North Taunton, Wellington
Table 16: Percentage of Domestic Abuse Related Incidents in the One Team Areas classified as either Offences or Incidents / Non Recordable; 2014-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classified as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents or Non</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recordable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halcon 2014</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halcon 2015</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halcon 2016</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Taunton 2014</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Taunton 2015</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Taunton 2016</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington 2014</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington 2015</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington 2016</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the year ending March 2016, 54% of combined domestic abuse related incidents and offences were recorded as offences in Avon and Somerset. Across the three One Team areas 59%, 62% and 63% of combined domestic abuse related incidents and offences were recorded as offences; above the county average.
Table 17: Breakdown of Domestic Abuse Incidents within the three One Team areas classified as offences 2014 -2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halcon</td>
<td>North Taunton</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Halcon</td>
<td>North Taunton</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Halcon</td>
<td>North Taunton</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime related Incident</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Blank</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Against the Person</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft &amp; Handling Stolen Goods</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offences</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offences</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.8 Case Studies

The eight case studies below illustrate the range of issues and challenges relating to domestic violence and the role of the One Teams in dealing with these problems.

Case Study 1

The Situation: A lady in her late 70’s approached a housing officer and disclosed she had been living in an abusive relationship for over 40 years. She cited examples of her husband’s abusive and controlling behaviour, such as reading the electric meter when he left her alone in the flat and questioning her about the electric usage whilst he was out, not allowing her to take baths and charging her £5 to use the tumble dryer. It was the first disclosure she had
ever made. The abuse was emotional and financial. None of this had been previously reported to the police.

The Role of the One Team: The Housing Officer arranged for the victim to attend Chill and Chat. A DASH risk assessment form was completed and a referral made to Somerset Integrated Domestic Abuse Service. A SIDAS outreach worker was appointed and made contact with the victim within 72 hours. Options were explained to her. The case was discussed in the One Team forum and it was decided to collate intelligence and support the victim to move out from the property. She had strong family support from her son and daughter (by a previous relationship), who had been banned from where she was currently living. It was agreed the lady would remain in her home with the “abusive” partner until she could be safely moved to a new address.

Outcomes: A suitable property was identified by TDBC Housing within a matter of weeks. Housing officers and the police attended on the day she announced she was leaving her abusive partner. She moved to a one bed bungalow near to her son. This came as a complete surprise to the abusive partner but the separation went smoothly. Support was offered to the abusive partner.

Case Study 2

The Situation: In 2016, the Domestic Abuse Co-ordinator (DAC, Chill and Chat) attended the One Team meeting. A police log which related to a domestic dispute over the weekend was discussed. The Police had attended but the log was closed as a “verbal argument”.

The Role of the One Team: A Housing Officer and the DAC were tasked, through the One Team process, to conduct a follow up visit to the victim. They were given access to the house by the victim’s children, who explained that their mother was unwell and upstairs. They went upstairs and the victim was in the bathroom complaining of severe stomach cramps. She suspected her partner had spiked a drink with “legal highs”.

An ambulance was called and arrangements were made for a friend of the victim to look after the children. The victim was taken to hospital and the DAC spoke with the friend and encouraged her to bring the victim to Chill and Chat the following Thursday.
Outcomes: The friend and the victim attended Chill and Chat. The victim disclosed she was still being harassed by her partner. She has banned him from her house but she was living in fear that he would return and force entry. In discussions with the DAC, the victim appeared to fit the criteria for a referral to National Centre for Domestic Violence (NCDV). A referral was made using the i-phone App. Within a couple of hours NCDV had contacted the victim and appointed a local solicitor. A non-molestation injunction was granted to effectively keep the abusive partner away from her and the children. The housing department arranged “target hardening” at her house. The Police placed markers on the command and control computer. Support was put in place to support the children (who witnessed the violence) by a level 3 officer from GetSet.

The victim and her friend now regularly attend to Chill and Chat and the DAC completed a DASH risk assessment form and referred the victim to SIDAS for further support. She scored 16 on the RIC.

Case Study 3

The Situation: A female is in an on/off relationship with male partner. It appeared that partner is physiologically and emotionally abusing female. There was no indication that physical abuse is happening. The male partner constantly undermines female’s confidence by verbally abusing her, calling her names and accusing her of being “messed up” in the head. He controls her movement and whom she associates with by threatening to leave her. He frequently does leave her and he returns to live with his parents on the other side of the town. He spreads rumours about her to mutual friends to the point they now avoid her. She is feeling increasingly isolated. During these periods of separation he loiters near her house and it appears he ‘spies’ on her. He sends her text messages to make it known he is watching her.

Following one of their many arguments, the male gave the female two unidentified tablets and told her to take them because it would calm her down. She took the tablets and returned home. At 4 am, her 4 year old child could not wake her so he called the police. Police and ambulance attended and forced entry to her home. They roused her and she claimed she had been drinking. A blood test revealed iron deficiency. She was treated at home. She failed to disclose she took the tablets because she didn’t want to get her partner in trouble. The couple split up for short periods but soon reconcile.
The role of the One Team: The female attended Chill and Chat and agreed to complete a DASH risk assessment. A referral was made to SIDAS. The One Team worked with Children Social Services with regard to concerns of the welfare of the two young children.

Outcomes: The children were removed on the grounds of safeguarding. The One Team has continued to support the female and regular contact is made to monitor her safety. She no longer reports incidents of DA but is concentrating on getting custody of her children back. The One Team is involved with the Children Social Services by participating in the child protection meeting.

**Case Study 4**

The Situation: A vulnerable young female with a one year old child was a client of GetSet. GetSet services were working with her but found it difficult to engage and the female rarely kept appointments. She was in a relationship with a man who was the father of the child and often spent the family budget on drink and his own personal entertainment.

The role of the One Team: The female was encouraged to meet her GetSet worker at Chill and Chat. At one meeting she openly disclosed that her partner had come home drunk and stolen the money she had been saving to pay for food over the Christmas period. She was left with no money and Christmas was only 2 days away. Practical support was offered in the form of food packages from the food bank and nappies supplied by ACORNS children centre. A RIC form was also completed and she disclosed incidents of physical and financial abuse. The police visited to give words of advice to her abusive partner. Details of the incident were fed into the police safeguarding intelligence system and Children Social services were notified.

Outcome: The female remained in a relationship with her partner for a further twelve months during which time the One Team monitored the situation. The couple, by then had a second child. The children are now under the supervision of Children Social services and are no longer with the mother. The One Team continues to offer the victim support but she remains difficult to engage with.
Case Study 5

The Situation: A female had met partner on the internet approximately three and a half years previously. He told her that he had a rough upbringing and a criminal past and that he was on bail for assaulting the new partner of his ex-wife. He moved to Somerset and stayed with the female at her property. It transpired that he was actually on bail for raping his ex-wife. He was subsequently arrested for breach of bail for the rape offence and was later sentenced to 4 years imprisonment for the sexual offence. By then his relationship with female had flourished and she made the decision to “stick by” him whilst he served his term of imprisonment.

He was released from prison on Licence, initially to a local bail hostel. They married shortly after and lived elsewhere in the county before moving to a Taunton One Team area. The female began to realise she was being emotionally and financially abused by her new husband. He became very controlling, accusing her of having affairs with work colleagues and he took control of all the finances resulting in building up rent arrears. She became terrified of his behaviour as his threats towards her became more frequent and aggressive.

He then assaulted her (pouring drinks over her and spitting on her whilst she was cowering on the floor). The police were called by her daughter and neighbours and he was arrested. He was charged with two common assaults and the CPS liaised with the Home Office to get his licence for the rape offence recalled. He was recalled to prison.

The role of the One Team: The One Team made contact with the victim and provided her with support during this difficult time. She received letters from her husband whilst he was in prison threatening to get friends to call on her suggesting she dropped the case. Housing completed a security survey on the flat and did some target hardening work. The local police contacted the prison to stop him sending letters. Reassurance patrols were completed. The Housing Association used the One Team evidence to support an application to upgrade her housing banding assessment.

Outcomes: Soon after, the Housing Association facilitated a move for the victim and her daughter. Her abusive husband does not know where she has relocated.
Case Study 6

The Situation: The lady has made complaints of assault on a number of occasions over the years and the police have arrested and charged the offender only for the case to fall down at court because the couple have reconciled and she has declined to give evidence. The female was encouraged to come along to Chill and Chat.

The Role of the One Team: The lady attended chill and chat and disclosed she had been assaulted and held against her will in her flat. She had not reported this latest abuse to the police.
A RIC and a SIDAS referral were completed. At that stage the lady was still reluctant to report the incidents to the police but was persuaded to allow a report to be made to the National Centre for Domestic Abuse (NCDV).

Outcome: She met the criteria for NCDV assistance and they appointed a local solicitor, who in turn applied for an Injunction to prevent her estranged husband from approaching her. The solicitor also persuaded her to report the incidents to the police. An Injunction is now in place and is backed with a power of arrest. The police are also investigating the assault and false imprisonment and SIDAS are offering the appropriate level of personal support to the victim.

Case Study 7

The Situtaion: Mother is a victim of physical and verbal abuse by her son, who has been arrested on more than one occasion for the assaults. Both parties have been offered support in the past but have refused. The mother is currently in rent arrears due to under occupancy as the son no longer lives with her. The mother has an Adult Social Worker.

The Role of the One Team: Following on from a Police log discussed at a One Team meeting the family were added to the family list on the Team’s minutes and a visit was made by the housing officer and support offered. Referral made to Adult Social Care for the son. A DASH form completed and the case was referred to MARAC. A managed move for the mother was requested.
Outcome: Son refused to consent to work with Adult Social Care and Mental Health. A managed move organised and mother now lives outside of the area. Son does not visit her as regularly and there have been no further reports of abuse.

Case Study 8

The Situation: A female came into the children’s centre expressing concern for her safety. Her ex-partner, who has had previous dealings with the Mental Health Crisis Team keeps turning up at her house and her work place and refusing to leave.

The Role of the One Team: The GetSet worker completed DASH form and rated it 14 on the scale. A referral was made to SIDAS. The Housing Association completed a safety check of the house and additional security was put in place. A TAU marker was placed on her address by the police and the local Community Beat Officers were emailed and informed of the case. The Adult Mental Health Team were contacted in relation to the ex-partner.

Outcome: A SIDAS worker was allocated and a non-molestation order put in place. A managed move was supported.

7.9 Helping to Identify and Support Victims of Domestic Abuse

In July 2016, training by the National Centre for Domestic Violence (NCDV) was offered to One Team members to enhance their ability to safeguard members of the public at risk of domestic violence. The aim of the training was to increase awareness on what they can do to support and help survivors of domestic abuse and how to access emergency injunctions. The training also included a review of Legal Aid, the benefits of civil orders, the ASSIS database and the Refer Direct App.

The training was well attended with 71 participants taking part from a wide range of agencies and organisations including Avon and Somerset Police, Sompar, GetSet, Housing Providers, Taunton Deane Borough Council, Health and Education. Feedback from front line staff who took part in the training has been positive and felt it has broadened their understanding of what domestic abuse is, how to identify and most importantly how to go about making the right referrals and seek the right support. As such, within the teams there does appear to be a
more general understanding of the issue of Domestic Abuse and the support and required action that is needed.

7.10 Chill and Chat

As a response by the One Teams to effectively deal with and support those who are experiencing or are at risk of experiencing domestic violence, an initiative referred to as ‘Chill and Chat’ has been developed.

Chill and Chat was initially introduced in 2013 to the Halcon One Team area after an analysis of police calls revealed a high proportion were calls to domestic related incidents. Where physical injuries were sustained arrests were made and support for the victim was sought through Somerset County Council’s commissioned service provider for Domestic Abuse via the completion of a DASH Risk Identification Checklist form, known as the RIC. However, this process did not assist those victims where no actual offence had taken place and often following police attendance the call out was recorded as a domestic incident and little or no further support to the victim was available.

In response to these findings the One Team in Halcon introduced the Chill and Chat coffee mornings, where following on from an incident a member of the neighbourhood policing team or if more appropriate a GetSet worker or Housing Officer would make contact with the household and invite the victim to the next Chill and Chat morning.

The morning is held in a neutral location within the community and aims to provide an informal, non-threatening and non-judgemental environment where women can come together and meet others who have or are having similar experiences.

The vision of “Chill and Chat” is:

“To provide an opportunity for residents within the One Team area who have experienced relationship difficulties (victims of any domestic abuse) to meet in an informal setting to develop trust, encourage peer support and promote awareness of the wider support that is available”.
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The Halcon One Team has been running “Chill and Chat” since April of 2013. Over this period of time has secured good attendance and has evolved in to “a peer support group” as well as a group supporting those who have been victims of domestic abuse. It regularly attracts seven to twelve females a week and although it is well established it importantly still sees new faces coming along which is testament to the group’s inclusivity and ethos.

Despite the success of Chill and Chat in Halcon, groups in North Taunton and Wellington have struggled in the past to attract numbers and establish themselves within their community. However, with the creation of the One Team Domestic Abuse Co-Ordinator (DAC) in October of 2016 all three One Team areas now offer Chill and Chat. In discussions with core One Team members it is felt that the creation of a specific post has added gravitas to the issue and provided an opportunity to solely focus on how victims of domestic abuse can be supported. The Domestic Abuse Co-Ordinator (DAC) attends at least one of each of the One Team meetings every week. This has helped her become established within the team quickly and for her to ‘spread’ the word amongst the wide range of agencies that attend. Concurrently, it has also enabled her to refer Chill and Chat attendees into other support services which they perhaps have not accessed before.

With groups in both Wellington and North Taunton only established within the last two to four months they are both already seeing an average of five to eight females attending the meetings a week, many of which have small children who they bring along.

GetSet staff are also involved in the scheme, which provides another avenue for these professionals to observe and monitor mother and child interactions and informally observe and assess any safeguarding issues.

Encouragingly there is evidence to suggest that a number of the ladies who have attended with children have also linked into other groups that are available at the community Children’s Centre and have begun to establish robust peer support; helping each other with problems that may have arisen that week or advising and supporting one another through stories of their own experiences of domestic abuse.

As the evaluation of Chill and Chat that was carried out in Halcon in 2015 states, it is impossible to quantify the effectiveness of Chill and Chat in terms of reducing demand on the
Police and other public services in attending incidents of domestic abuse. However, as the evaluation suggests, by not relying on a formal referral process based on predetermined criteria it can provide support to all females experiencing difficult relationships and can often respond much quicker to incidents of DA than perhaps the more traditional pathways. Our evaluation of the case studies did find evidence to support this (see for example case study 2 or case study 6 above) and as such it is suggested that Chill and Chat may help toward reducing the numbers of repeat incidents.

In discussions with the newly appointed Domestic Abuse Coordinator (DAC), the role of Chill and Chat within the overall provision of support and services for victims of DA appears clear and communication between Somerset Independent Domestic Abuse Services appears to be well established. In addition as member of the One Teams the DAC also helps to further establish the role of the One Teams within the wider community of Somerset County Council, something which many have expressed a frustration with in the past.

As always, while the evaluation of the Chill and Chat provides a statement of success, the most powerful testimony comes from the service users. One victim of domestic violence expressed her gratitude that such practical support was readily available:

“in the past I have relented and let my abusive partner back in my house simply because I didn’t have anyone else to turn to for advice or support. It was my easiest option at that time. I now feel that people care and I am not being judged as a bad mother. I am determined to cut off all links with my partner”.

7.11 The Role of the One Teams in Domestic Abuse

The case studies in section 7.8 above demonstrate that the One Teams approach in identifying, tackling and preventing domestic abuse is reinforced through their Chill and Chat initiative, which empowers members of the community to develop their own peer support groups. Chill and Chat has a significant positive impact upon victims as they confront and deal with both the immediate issues of stopping the abusive behaviour and the challenges of creating a new life thereafter.

The One Teams employ a range of strategies and approaches to recognize and identify those
who are being subjected to, or at risk of, domestic abuse. Acknowledging the power of peer support groups in assisting and advocating for those being subjected to, or at risk of, domestic abuse, the Chill and Chat initiative provides the cornerstone for victims to access the range of support services to meet their particular needs and requirements. Moreover, the victims are able to determine what additional support they require as they work through the solutions appropriate for their needs. In part, this approach recognizes the context in which the domestic abuse occurs and the dynamics between the abused and the abuser.

The systematic deployment of risk assessment in cases of domestic abuse provides an effective task, action and review process to ensure that the victim’s needs are met, particularly in relation to the wellbeing and safety of the victim and any children.

The One Team meetings also ensure that other agencies are kept fully informed of developments and issues relating to the victim, abuser and the family so that they are aware of the developments and are able to provide additional support or intervention if required at short notice.

Given the success of Chill and Chat initiative and the seriousness of domestic abuse, the following recommendations are made:

- That training on domestic violence is provided on a regular basis and that front line workers in the One Teams are encouraged to update their training annually to ensure they remain aware of any changes in the law and referral processes. The training also supports members of the One Teams to be confident in dealing with suspected or disclosed cases of domestic violence.
- Training on domestic violence should be part of any new member’s training package.
- The data held by agencies in relation to domestic abuse should be monitored and evaluated on a monthly basis by all One Teams.
- That future long term funding is secured for the Chill and Chat project for all three areas particularly as it has a clear function within county wide services.
- That the peer support process which has emerged from the Chill and Chat sessions be deepened and developed.
Chapter Eight – Social/Economic Return on Investment

There has been a shift in recent times for initiatives and interventions, particularly in the public service sector, to consider not only outcomes and impact but also that it represents value for money. In other words, initiatives/interventions and need to demonstrate the value of their work not only in terms of achieving difference but also in monetary value. This is often referred to as the social return on investment. A social return on investment approach enables the service providers an opportunity to realise the wider benefits of an initiative/intervention in that it compares the monetary benefits with the intervention costs (Phillips, 1991). Manning et al (2017) have identified four main methods of economic analysis: cost savings, cost effectiveness, cost utility and cost benefit. All methods are premised on monetised costs of intervention but set these against different types of outcomes as their name suggests.

The research team was asked to consider cost savings for the One Team interventions. However, as Manning et al’s report identifies, estimating costs is a notoriously difficult activity and assert that many estimates of costs are ‘highly misleading’ in that they fail to acknowledge the complete range of costs provided, whether they are set-up costs, volunteer costs or the overheads incurred. A fully costed project needs to consider all costs involved even where they may not be obvious. This becomes even more complex when numerous organisations and agencies are involved in a particular initiative and further complicated when the initiative being assessed for social/economic return on investment comprise of three discrete projects, each with a degree of autonomy in developing practice.

More significantly, in order to ensure obtaining social/benefit return of investment data that is robust, reliable and meaningful, the costing analysis framework should be developed at the inception of initiative. Types of costs for the cost analysis framework, should include direct costs, indirect costs and intangible costs. The framework format would also need to consider fixed as well as variable costs.

For the very reasons outlined above, while the researchers will provide some costings data based on the New Economy Manchester Model for both domestic violence and anti-social behaviour, this data cannot be reliably transferred to the One Team interventions and therefore remains limited. The New Economy Manchester Model has compiled an evidence
base of costs which bring together over 600 cost estimates in a single place. The derivation of
the costs and the calculations underpinning them have been quality assured and made
nationally available to support and inform intervention proposals and evaluations. However,
the New Economy Manchester Model stipulates that the data is a support tool prior to an
intervention undertaking their own, more detailed cost benefit analysis.

Data from the New Economy Manchester Model has been detailed below. These data provide
the costs for agencies to respond and deal with particular incidents. Some of the data is more
comprehensive for some incidents than others. But agencies can utilise this data against their
own performance information to estimate potential cost savings in relation to the work of the
One Teams.

**Table 18: Anti-Social Behaviour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Partners</th>
<th>Local Authority, Housing Providers, Police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eMetric</td>
<td>Number of incidences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Benefits</td>
<td>Cost per incident £673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Fiscal Benefits</td>
<td>Reduced fear of crime, Improved desirability of locality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Value Benefits</td>
<td>Cost to public services, physical &amp; emotional impact on victims</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 19: Domestic Violence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Partners</th>
<th>Local Authority, Housing Providers, Police, NHS, Probation, Other Criminal Justice Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>Number of incidences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Benefits</td>
<td>Cost per incident £2,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Fiscal Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Value Benefits</td>
<td>£10,738 (service costs £2,470; cost to employers due to absence £655; cost to victim £818; human and emotional impact £6,795)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 20: Child Taken into Care**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Partners</th>
<th>Local Authority, Social Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>Cost per year per child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Benefits</td>
<td>Cost per year £52,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Fiscal Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Value Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 21: School Based Emotional Learning Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Partners</th>
<th>Local Authority, Education, Police, NHS, Mental Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>Per child over a 10 year period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Benefits</td>
<td>Per child over a 10 year period £3,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Fiscal Benefits</td>
<td>Per child over a 10 year period £7,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Value Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 22: Complex Eviction for Housing Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Partners</th>
<th>Local Authority, Housing Providers, Police, NHS,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>Cost per incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Benefits</td>
<td>Cost per incident £7,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Fiscal Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Value Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 23: Homelessness Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Partners</th>
<th>Local Authority, Housing Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>Per case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Benefits</td>
<td>Cost per application £2,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Fiscal Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Value Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 24: Drug Misuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Partners</th>
<th>Local Authority, Housing Providers, Police, NHS, Probation, Other Criminal Justice Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>Per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Benefits</td>
<td>Per person £3,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Fiscal Benefits</td>
<td>Per person £9,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Value Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 25: Fire in a Domestic Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Partners</th>
<th>Fire Service, Police, NHS, Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>Per Incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Benefits</td>
<td>Per Incident £51,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Fiscal Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Value Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26: Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Number of incidences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Benefits</td>
<td>Average cost per incident of crime £609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Fiscal Benefits</td>
<td>Reduced fear of crime, Improved desirability of locality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Value Benefits</td>
<td>£2,933 per crime (service costs £609; economic costs £676; physical and emotional impact on victims £1,648)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: Crime Data for all Three One Teams Jan 2014 – Dec 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>Jan-14</th>
<th>Feb-14</th>
<th>Mar-14</th>
<th>Apr-14</th>
<th>May-14</th>
<th>Jun-14</th>
<th>Jul-14</th>
<th>Aug-14</th>
<th>Sep-14</th>
<th>Oct-14</th>
<th>Nov-14</th>
<th>Dec-14</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle theft</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal damage/arson</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other theft</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of weapons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public order</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from the person</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle crime</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence/sexual offences</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>3687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28: Crime Data for all Three One Teams Jan 2015 – Dec 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle theft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal damage/arson</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other theft</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of weapons</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public order</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from the person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle crime</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence/sexual offences</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>3323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, utilizing the New Economy Manchester Model, it can be calculated that for anti-social behaviour from December 2014 to December 2015, there would have been the following cost savings:

**Anti-social behaviour financial cost savings for the three One Teams**

- 1822 incidents for 2014 @ £673 = £1,226,206
- 1298 incidents for 2015 @£673 = £873,554
- Total cost savings in one year = £352,652

**For all Crime types financial cost savings for all three One Teams**

- 3687 incidents for 2014 @ £609 = £2,245,383
- 3323 incidents for 2015 @£609 = £2,023,703
- Total cost savings in one year = £221,680

**For all Crime types public value benefit for all One Teams**

- 3687 incidents for 2014 @ £2,933 = £10,813,971
- 3323 incidents for 2015 @£2,933 = £9,746,359
- Total cost savings in one year = £1,067,612

Cost-benefit analysis can identify and compare the social and financial costs and benefits of
the One Team, identifying cases where their partnership approach provides socially desirable results that an individual organisation alone will not. In addition, cost-benefit analysis, such as the New Manchester Economy Model, can assess the necessity and the efficiency of strategies proposed by the One Teams, such as Chill and Chat.

The New Manchester Economy data demonstrates that costings can be applied to the demand for public services and therefore to preventing demand. While the figures above demonstrate significant fiscal and social benefits, it also is evident from these data and the case studies that the One Team approach has a significant impact on preventing and diverting a range of issues which otherwise would have occurred without their work, for example domestic abuse, anti-social behavior, homelessness, evictions from property and crime. There is also evidence that through the Early Help emphasis of the One Teams, other health and social care costs will be prevented through this model, such as children taken into care and deteriorating mental health.

However when it comes to putting a financial value on the overall impact of the work of the One Teams, there needs to be caution and caveats around conclusions drawn. The One Teams, while having a shared and mutual ethos, all operate in different contexts with emphasis on local demands and requirements. In addition, other area and county wide projects and initiatives operated alongside the work undertaken by the One Teams. This was against a backdrop of organizational restructures and changes together with changes to how crime and other metrics were recorded. Nonetheless, there is confidence that the One Team approach has saved real and significant costs to the public sector and continues to do so.
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