

Report of: Communities and Partnership Scrutiny Committee

To: City Executive Board

Date: 20th May 2009

Item No:

Title of Report: Tackling anti-social behaviour

Summary and Recommendations

Purpose of report : To present the findings and recommendations from the Communities and Partnership scrutiny review of tackling anti- social behaviour issues on estates

Board Member: Cllr Sajjad Malik

Report Approved by:

Legal: Lindsay Cane

Finance: Emma Burson

Recommendation(s)

1. To note and endorse the findings of the review report.
2. A joint management action plan is produced in response to the recommendations

1. Background

Why the Oxford City Communities and Partnership Scrutiny Committee decided to undertake this review?

Annual Talkback surveys identified an increase in concerns around particular types of anti-social behaviour (ASB) and its prevalence on estates

In 2007 respondents to the survey thought that the following ASB issues were more of a problem than in 2004:

- People being drunk or rowdy in public places
- Noisy neighbours or loud parties
- People using or carrying airguns or replica guns
- Conflicts or disputes between neighbours

The Committee also heard concerns from members about the nature and effectiveness of the workings between 2 of the internal teams taking a lead on addressing these issues. These teams are CANACT (Community Housing and Community Development) and Tenancy Services (Oxford City Homes)

Work to tackle ASB is multi-agency focused with the Oxford Safer Communities Partnership (OSCP) developing partnership focused action plans around the following themes:

- CCTV Management
- Neighbourhood Nuisance
- Neighbourhood Policing
- Single homeless

An initial focus for the review was agreed based around the effectiveness of multi-agency working, early intervention, management and resolution of ASB cases.

It became clear, early on, that the issues of the effectiveness of joint working between the Tenancy Services and the Canact Teams were pressing and so the Review Group (RG) decided to change the emphasis of its work to consider the way these services work together to identify, manage and resolve ASB issues.

2. Key Findings

1. The review has focused primarily on the effectiveness of joint working between the Tenancy Services and Canact Teams, to identify, manage and resolve ASB issues.

2. ASB incident data that has been collected by Oxford City Homes during 08/09 indicates that a large proportion of ASB incidents are around verbal abuse / harassment and noise nuisance. Interview and case evidence also highlights that the more complex and protracted ASB cases are underpinned by issues of drug / alcohol addiction and mental health problems.
3. Evidence of more localised issues or ASB 'hotspot' areas is not presently gathered by either the Tenancy Services or Canact Teams. Therefore the review has not been able to consider more detailed area profiles of ASB incidents and the implications for both teams.
4. The core findings and recommendations of this review are around addressing fundamental data gathering gaps and ensuring joined-up data collection between the teams. The teams are presently using 2 database systems that are not linked and provide discrete and limited performance / management data.
5. Case management of ASB incidents is very manually driven. The review has identified poor use of current data systems and a lack of management controls to ensure their use.
6. The review has highlighted tensions in working relationship between some Estate Managers and Neighbourhood Action Officers. (NAOs) At the heart of these tensions is the lack of clarity over overall case management responsibility and the role of the NAO and EM in the resolution of ASB. The review findings and recommendations have sought to identify the core skill base and complementary roles for each team.
7. The more complex cases of ASB that are underpinned by the perpetrators' addiction and mental health problems present significant challenges for both teams. The teams recognise this and are working towards developing improved mechanisms for early identification and intervention. The findings highlight that further review work is needed to identify how the role of Canact could be developed or expanded to manage these cases and encourage wider resolutions to ASB outside of enforcement actions.
8. The review notes that the Elmore Team ASB pilot project (a voluntary sector project that works with tenants with complex needs, aiming to provide intensive support to reduce their ASB) has had a significant impact on reducing the re-offending rates in relation to ASB case referrals it receives from Canact. This team's funding will currently cease in November 2009 and the review findings highlight the need to find more secure funding for this project or the services it provides.

9. A common feature of interview evidence has been a lack of consistency around communication and information sharing. The review highlights that this not only compromises good working relationships between teams, but affects residents' confidence that ASB incidents are effectively dealt with. The findings highlight that a key part of addressing this is the development of a local information sharing protocol. (the full report is attached as appendix 1)

3. Recommendations

Canact & Tenancy Services Teams

R1. A common linked database between used by both teams should be established as a matter of urgency. When designing this the added potential for other services partners in the field such as Environmental Health the Police and local RSLs should be considered. Choice of software should be taken forward via a cross service review team. The RG would wish to see "frontline" staff from both teams acting in an advisory capacity to the review.

R2. Both teams should consider carefully the outcomes requirements from data collection and management for themselves, the council and partners more widely. It would be expected that this would produce:

- Common coding of ASB by type, actions and interventions taken
- 'Housemark' coding, already used by Oxford City Homes, to become the standard coding system. Thus allowing the council to more comprehensively benchmark with other Local Authorities and RSLs around ASB incidents. Both teams recording ASB incidents to agree the format and management reporting framework e.g. around 'Hotspot mapping', profiles of perpetrator, geographic location etc. When considering the above links should be made to the data recorded from the Police via the Oxford Safer Communities Partnership.

R3 Management controls need to be put in place to ensure:

- Common standards of quality file maintenance and management supported and maintained.
- Procedures that govern case management and the authorisation of key actions are followed.
- Methods of working are supportive and collaborative and any inter-team disputes are speedily investigated and resolved.
- NAO caseload is accurately recorded alongside performance measures built around minimum and maximum resolution times. These times should initially be drawn from historic case management experience

- Caseloads are reviewed on a weekly basis based upon the above data.
- Twice weekly surgeries between NAOs and EMs take place.

R4 Procedural controls need to be put in place to ensure:

- Tenancy Services should have overall management of cases within their area involving OCC tenants. Estate Managers should closely liaise with NAOs who have day-to-day case management responsibilities. Referrals by EMs to Canact for ASB casework is agreed by all parties and based around the skills required to obtain resolution.
- That witness diaries are limited in use to cases where they will be an integral part of resolution and that the control of these and their content is checked both administratively and by managers as part of the regular review of cases
- The content and style of witness diaries is reviewed
- That an agreed approach to case closure is established including:
 - Clear responsibilities for communicating the closure of cases to witnesses, perpetrators and relevant agencies.
 - A Common standard of the reporting of cases closure
 - A monthly management review of all cases more than 6 months old. This should involve all agencies.

Canact Team

- R5.** Establish a common understanding of the key elements of a NAOs role e.g.
1. Manages the process of taking witness statements and to attend the interviews of witnesses taking on the role of explaining the legal and enforcement process and its ramifications.
 2. Co-ordinates and communicates the issuing of Acceptable Behaviour Contacts and Parental Control Orders with involvement of EMs.
 3. Communicate relevant intelligence from agencies particularly the Police.
 4. Takes a proactive part in managing multi-agency relationships around ASB.
- R6.** A structured induction programme for all members of the team is developed.

- R7.** A Review of the current staff structure within Canact takes place with the next 6 months. This should include:
1. A review of the current system of patches and whether this is the most efficient deployment of the team.
 2. Assess the administrative efficiencies that could be made through full utilisation of a common database.
 3. Consider how roles still need to be developed or expanded to manage an increasingly complex and vulnerable client base. The use of wider resolutions to ASB outside of enforcement actions e.g. expansion of Family Support Coordinator role, focused and bespoke training around mental health and addiction for NAOs, greater awareness and training in the role of a range support agencies and their support casework

Canact & Tenancy Services Teams

- R8.** Review the pros and cons of Canact and Tenancy Services working from the same location. Establishing efficient and better working arrangements.
- R9.** Review the service provider 'Mediation in Action'. Explore more efficient and successful methods for delivery.
- R10.** A comprehensive / structured training programme is developed by both teams (particularly around training issues highlighted by NAOs and EMs)
- R11.** To deliver either secure financing for the Elmore ASB project beyond November 2009 or ensure that these inputs are delivered by others.

Oxford Safer Communities Partnership

- R12.** To take the lead in developing a local (Oxford) information sharing protocol between agencies tackling ASB.

Canact Team

- R13.** The development of the Police Liaison Officer role within Canact Team is widened to ensure that agreed information sharing protocols are working and any issues are speedily dealt with. The Officer should also act as a conduit for the dissemination of enforcement orders to

agencies and act in an advisory capacity to agencies seeking specific ASB data.

R14. The development of a media strategy by the Oxford Safer Communities Partnership should ensure controls are put in place to manage and 'de-personalise' the publicity of enforcement orders against vulnerable individuals.

Oxford Safer Communities Partnership

R15. To develop a 'Respect' style policy for ASB to communicate:

- Agencies' roles and responsibilities for tackling ASB
- Details of reporting and referral mechanisms
- Customer standards around:
 - Initial investigation times by type of ASB case
 - Updates on progress of cases
 - Case Closure and communication
 - Customer satisfaction around the handling / management of ASB cases

4. Minutes of Community and Partnership Scrutiny Community -27th April

1. ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR REVIEW – REVIEW OF FINDINGS.

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended). The Chair explained that Councillors Lygo, Sanders and Wilkinson had formed the Review Group. Councillor Sanders presented the Review Group's findings to the Committee, with additional comments from Steve Kilsby (Neighbourhood Services Manager) Richard Adams (Community Safety) and Julia Woodman (Scrutiny Officer).

Key additional points made during the discussion included:-

- There was a need for a linked database and better case management systems for the CANAcT and Tenancy Services Teams;
- Greater control over, and better management of witness diaries would be helpful, as would an information sharing protocol, an easily communicated referral system and a structured induction and training programme for both teams;

- The Review Group appreciated the contributions made by both CANAcT and Tenancy Services, both teams spoke very frankly, were very co-operative, and were already working towards the implementation of some of the recommendations outlined in the report;
- It was noted that the Elmore Team was a great success, and that it would be important to try to preserve this, despite the fact that the funding would expire in November;
- The REACT system was at the heart of any improvements;
- Generally, there was a good relationship between the different parties, but a standardisation of procedure would be helpful;
- It was observed that CANAcT had a Family Support Worker, and it was suggested that there should be closer working with social services if possible. However, it was noted that some families and individuals were either not engaged with Social Services, or their problems were so great that they crossed several agencies. Social Services had clear statutory functions, but the Family Support worker had scope to be a little more flexible;
- The issue of boisterous student behaviour, particularly in the Cowley Road area, was also raised. The Committee was informed that there was a monthly meeting between Inspector Cooper (Neighbourhood Inspector for East Oxford) and a senior representative from Oxford Brookes University, and that Inspector Standish would also be meeting with the head of the University very shortly;
- It was noted that many tenants thoroughly appreciated the work of the Street Wardens.

RESOLVED:

- (1) to note and endorse the recommendations arising from the Review.
- (2) to recommend that the City Executive Board consider the report and recommendations within it.
- (3) that a Joint Action Plan with timescales is submitted to the next meeting of the Communities and Partnership Scrutiny Committee in June.

5. Comments received from Community Safety Manager and Tenancy Operations Manager

Community Safety Manager.

'There has been universal support for the need to undertake the review'

'The Community Safety Manager would like to re-iterate his support for the detailed review. In light of the findings of the review a CANAct Change Plan is being developed and will be implemented over the remainder of the year. The recommendations in the report will inform the process, in addition to issues relating to the wider service delivery the CANAct team perform'

Tenancy Operations Manager

'I would like the next step to be an action plan with timescales and named persons responsible for delivering the outcomes against each action.

I would also like to see a further Value for Money review around the HRA contribution to the Canact Team. Can this amount be used to provide more outcomes for more tenants? As a social landlord we are coming under more and more pressure to ensure value for money is delivered in all aspects of our service.'

6. Risk Assessment

A broad risk assessment has been undertaken and the risk register is attached as appendix 2. These are scrutiny recommendations, which if accepted by CEB will need a detailed officers response regarding their delivery. A detailed risk assessment will therefore need to be linked to a future delivery plan.

Name and contact details of author:

Julia Woodman

Scrutiny officer

Tel: 25(2318)

jwoodman@oxford.gov.uk



Communities & Partnership Scrutiny Committee

Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour

Contents

	Page
Section 1 – Introduction	9
Section 2 – Methodology	10 - 11
Section 3 – Findings	12 - 43
3.1. Evidence of the type of ASB on estates & prevalence	12 - 17
3.2. Data Management and monitoring of ASB incidents by Tenancy Services and Canact Teams	17 - 21
3.3. Case Management by Tenancy Services and Canact Teams	21 - 26
3.4. Roles and responsibilities of Canact and Tenancy Services in tackling ASB	26 - 39
3.5. Communication and information sharing	40 - 43
Appendix 1 – Scope	
Appendix 2 – Estate Manager interview framework	
Appendix 3 – Neighbourhood Action Officer interview framework	
Appendix 4 – Interview frameworks (Legal Services, Canact Team)	
Appendix 5 – Tenant Involvement Panel questions	
Appendix 6 – Registered Social Landlord survey	
Appendix 7 – Tenancy Services ASB cases referred to Canact	
Appendix 8 - Elmore Team Evaluation Report	
Appendix 9 – Referral forms to Canact	
Appendix 10 – Canact referral casefile	
Appendix 11 – Witness diary	
Appendix 12 – Canact staff structure	
Appendix 13 – Legal Services briefing on ASB enforcement actions	
Appendix 14 - Neighbourhood Action Officer Job Description	

Appendix 15 – Tenancy Services / Canact – Dealing with ASB complaints (procedural note)

Appendix 16 – Tenants Involvement Panel – Feedback summary

Acknowledgements

The review group would like to thank all of the officers and tenants who participated in the review and gave up their time from busy schedules. The recommendations are primarily derived from the candid but constructive interview evidence the Review Group gathered.

Executive Summary

1. The review has focused primarily on the effectiveness of joint working between the Tenancy Services and Canact Teams, to identify, manage and resolve ASB issues on estates.
2. ASB incident data that has been collected by Oxford City Homes during 08/09 indicates that a large proportion of ASB incidents are around verbal abuse / harassment and noise nuisance. Interview and case evidence also highlights that the more complex and protracted ASB cases are underpinned by issues of drug / alcohol addiction and mental health problems.
3. Evidence of more localised issues or ASB 'hotspot' areas is not presently gathered by either the Tenancy Services or Canact Teams. Therefore the review has not been able to consider more detailed area profiles of ASB incidents and the implications for both teams.
4. The core findings and recommendations of this review are around addressing fundamental data gathering gaps and ensuring joined-up data collection between the teams. The teams are presently using 2 database systems that are not linked and provide discrete and limited performance / management data.
5. Case management of ASB incidents is very manually driven. The review has identified poor use of current data systems and a lack of management controls to ensure their use.
6. The review has highlighted tensions in working relationship between some Estate Managers and Neighbourhood Action Officers. (NAO) At the heart of these tensions is the lack of clarity over overall case management responsibility and the role of the NAO and EM in the resolution of ASB. The review findings and recommendations have sought to identify the core skill base and complementary roles for each team.
7. The more complex cases of ASB that are underpinned by the perpetrators addiction and mental health problems present significant challenges for both teams. The teams recognise this and are working towards developing improved mechanisms for early identification and intervention. The findings highlight that further review work is needed to identify how the role of Canact could be developed or expanded to manage these cases and encourage wider resolutions to ASB outside of enforcement actions.

8. The review notes that the Elmore Team ASB pilot project (a voluntary sector project that works with tenants with complex needs, aiming to provide intensive support to reduce their ASB) has had a significant impact on reducing the re-offending rates in relation to ASB case referrals it receives from Canact. This teams funding will currently cease in November 2009 and the review findings highlight the need to find more secure funding for this project or the services it provides.
9. A common feature of interview evidence has been a lack of consistency around communication and information sharing. The review highlights that this not only compromises good working relationships between teams, but effects residents confidence that ASB incidents are effectively dealt with. The findings highlight that a key part of addressing this is the development of a local information sharing protocol.

Recommendations

Canact & Tenancy Services Teams

R1. A common linked database between used by both teams should be established as a matter of urgency. When designing this the added potential for other services partners in the field such as Environmental Health the Police and local RSLs should be considered. Choice of software should be taken forward via a cross service review team. The RG would wish to see “frontline” staff from both teams acting in an advisory capacity to the review.

R2. Both teams should consider carefully the outcomes requirements from data collection and management for themselves, the council and partners more widely. It would be expected that this would produce:

- Common coding of ASB by type, actions and interventions taken
- ‘Housemark’ coding, already used by Oxford City Homes, to become the standard coding system. Thus allowing the council to more comprehensively benchmark with other Local Authorities and RSLs around ASB incidents. Both teams recording ASB incidents to agree the format and management reporting framework e.g. around ‘Hotspot mapping’, profiles of perpetrator, geographic location etc. When considering the above links should be made to the data recorded from the Police via the Oxford Safer Communities Partnership.

R3 Management controls need to be put in place to ensure:

- Common standards of quality file maintenance and management supported and maintained.
- Procedures that govern case management and the authorisation of key actions are followed.
- Methods of working are supportive and collaborative and any inter-team disputes are speedily investigated and resolved.
- NAO caseload is accurately recorded alongside performance measures built around minimum and maximum resolution times. These times should initially be drawn from historic case management experience
- Caseloads are reviewed on a weekly basis based upon the above data.
- Twice weekly surgeries between NAOs and EMs take place.

R4 Procedural controls need to be put in place to ensure:

- Tenancy Services should have overall management of cases within their area involving OCC tenants. Estate Managers should closely liaise with NAOs who have day-to-day case management responsibilities. Referrals by EMs to Canact for ASB casework is agreed by all parties and based around the skills required to obtain resolution.

- That witness diaries are limited in use to cases where they will be an integral part of resolution and that the control of these and their content is checked both administratively and by managers as part of the regular review of cases
- The content and style of witness diaries is reviewed
- That an agreed approach to case closure is established including:
 - Clear responsibilities for communicating the closure of cases to witnesses, perpetrators and relevant agencies.
 - A Common standard of the reporting of cases closure
 - A monthly management review of all cases more than 6 months old. This should involve all agencies.

Canact Team

R5. Establish a common understanding of the key elements of a NAOs role e.g.

1. Manages the process of taking witness statements and to attend the interviews of witnesses taking on the role of explaining the legal and enforcement process and its ramifications.
2. Co-ordinates and communicates the issuing of Acceptable Behaviour Contacts and Parental Control Orders with involvement of EMs.
3. Communicate relevant intelligence from agencies particularly the Police.
4. Takes a proactive part in managing multi-agency relationships around ASB.

R6. A structured induction programme for all members of the team is developed.

R7. A Review of the current staff structure within Canact takes place with the next 6 months. This should include:

1. A review of the current system of patches and whether this is the most efficient deployment of the team.
2. Assess the administrative efficiencies that could be made through full utilisation of a common database.
3. Consider how roles still need to be developed or expanded to manage an increasingly complex and vulnerable client base. The use of wider resolutions to ASB outside of enforcement actions e.g. expansion of Family Support Coordinator role, focused and bespoke training around mental health and addiction for NAOs, greater awareness and training in the role of a range support agencies and their support casework

Canact & Tenancy Services Teams

- R8.** Review the pros and cons of Canact and Tenancy Services working from the same location. Establishing efficient and better working arrangements.
- R9.** Review the service provider 'Mediation in Action'. Explore more efficient and successful methods for delivery.
- R10.** A comprehensive / structured training programme is developed by both teams (particularly around training issues highlighted by NAOs and EMs)
- R11.** To deliver either secure financing for the Elmore ASB project beyond November 2009 or ensure that these inputs are delivered by others.

Oxford Safer Communities Partnership

- R12.** To take the lead in developing a local (Oxford) information sharing protocol between agencies tackling ASB.

Canact Team

R13. The development of the Police Liaison Officer role within Canact Team is widened to ensure that agreed information sharing protocols are working and any issues are speedily dealt with. The Officer should also act as a conduit for the dissemination of enforcement orders to agencies and act in an advisory capacity to agencies seeking specific ASB data.

R14. The development of a media strategy by the Oxford Safer communities Partnership should ensure controls are put in place to manage and 'de-personalise' the publicity of enforcement orders against vulnerable individuals.

Oxford Safer Communities Partnership

R15. To develop a 'Respect' style policy for ASB to communicate:

- Agencies roles and responsibilities for tackling ASB
- Details of reporting and referral mechanisms
- Customer standards around:

Initial investigation times by type of ASB case

Updates on progress of cases

Case Closure and communication

Customer satisfaction around the handling / management of ASB cases

Section 1 – Introduction

1. Why the Oxford City Communities and Partnership Scrutiny Committee decided to undertake this review?

Annual Talkback surveys identified an increase in concerns around particular types of anti-social behaviour (ASB) and its prevalence on estates

In 2007 respondents to the survey thought that the following ASB issues were more of a problem than in 2004:

- People being drunk or rowdy in public places
- Noisy neighbours or loud parties
- People using or carrying airguns or replica guns
- Conflicts or disputes between neighbours

The Committee also heard concerns from members about the nature and effectiveness of the workings between 2 of the internal teams taking a lead on addressing these issues. These teams are CANACT (Community Housing and Community Development) and Tenancy Services (Oxford City Homes)

Work to tackle ASB is multi-agency focused with the Oxford Safer Communities Partnership (OSCP) developing partnership focused action plans around the following themes:

- CCTV Management
- Neighbourhood Nuisance
- Neighbourhood Policing
- Single homeless

An initial focus for the review was agreed based around the effectiveness of multi-agency working, early intervention, management and resolution of ASB cases.

It became clear, early on, that the issues of the effectiveness of joint working between the Tenancy Services and the Canact Teams were pressing and so the Review Group (RG) decided to change the emphasis of it's work to consider the way these services work together to identify, manage and resolve ASB issues on estates.

Section 2 – Methodology

2. Review Group Membership

The Communities and Partnership Scrutiny Committee appointed a RG consisting of:

- Councillor Gill Sanders (committee member)
- Councillor Mark Lygo (committee member)
- Councillor Ruth Wilkinson (non executive councillor)

.A copy of the scope of the review is attached as Appendix 1.

3. Evidence Gathering

The RG decided they needed a sound qualitative base and therefore set about an extensive face to face interview process based round a pre-designed questioning framework. The following people were interviewed:

- All Estate Managers including the Tenancy Services Manager
- All Neighbourhood Action Officers including the Neighbourhood Services Manager,
- The Drug Strategy Officer
- The Family Support Worker and Police Liaison Officer
- The Senior Street Wardens
- The Youth Strategic Lead in Oxfordshire County Council
- The Elmore Team
- The solicitor in Legal Services responsible for this service

Appendix 2 shows a copy of the semi structured question format used with Estate Managers (EM)

Appendix 3 shows a copy of the semi structured question format used with Neighbourhood Action Officers (NAOs) and their managers

Appendix 4 shows all other question frameworks used

Tenants Involvement Panel

The RG sought the views of tenants through a focus group session held with members of the Tenant Involvement Panel. Panel Members were asked:

- What do you regard as ASB?
- If you had a problem with ASB who would you contact?
- What scale of ASB would cause you to contact any of the above agencies?

Panel Members were subsequently split into 2 groups. Those that had:

- Direct experience of ASB and had reported incidents to Canact or Tenancy Services
- In-direct experience of ASB on estates.

These sessions sought to look at:

- Whether tenants knew who to report types of incidents to
- Whether services intervene at the right time
- Management of cases and communication of ASB issues
- Case progression.

The full set of the questions used is attached as Appendix 5.

Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) using Canact Service

A questionnaire was sent to those RSLs who have or had a contract with Canact. These are:

- A2 Dominion
- Catalyst
- Vale Housing
- OCHA
- Charter Community Housing.

The survey is at Appendix 6 and sought to identify:

- The types and prevalence of ASB issues RSLs are dealing with on an Oxford wide basis
- Early intervention mechanisms and involvement of other agencies
- Referrals to Canact and case management.

Further evidence and research

To complete the picture and further understand processes and potential the RG:

- Received demonstrations of current data recording systems used by Tenancy Services (I –World) Canact (Uniform)
- Attended a demonstration of the 'React' ASB Case management system used by a number of RSLs e.g. A2 Dominion and OCHA.
- Tracked 10 ASB cases from Tenancy Services to Canact Team.
- Considered current procedures, protocols and proformas used by Canact and Tenancy Services
- Management information around cases from both services

Section 3 - Findings

4. Evidence of the types of ASB on estates and prevalence

To understand the nature of ASB the RG looked at the type and prevalence of incidents reported within the services

Evidence of ASB incidents by type are recorded by Tenancy Services using the I-World database. The Service in the last twelve months has begun to categorise ASB incidents and action taken using the 'Housemark' categories of ASB which are becoming the standard and allow for cross referencing between authorities. Housemark is a cross-sector UK wide ASB benchmarking service with over 200 social landlord members

Tables 1 - 3 below detail the number of incidents per quarter, incident categories and details of actions taken.

ASB incident data collected by Oxford City Homes

Table 1
Quarter 1 08/09 April - June

Type of ASB issue	Number	Type of action taken	Number
Verbal Abuse/Harassment/Intimidation Threatening behaviour	15	Early intervention by housing management staff	7
Noise	7	Acceptable behaviour Contract or agreement	3
Domestic Abuse	3	Mediation	2
Alcohol related	1	Notice seeking possession -	1
Litter/rubbish/fly tipping	1	Perpetrator supportive action / referral (not recoded elsewhere in actions)	1
Misuse of public areas/public space/loitering	1		
Garden nuisance	1		
Total	29		14

Table 2**Quarter 2 08/09 July – September**

Type of ASB issue	Number	Type of action taken (Top 5)	Number
Noise	38	Early intervention by housing management staff	40
Verbal abuse/ harassment / intimidation/ threatening behaviour	23	Referral to ASB Forum	8
Alcohol related	8	Perpetrator supportive action/ referral (not recorded elsewhere in actions)	4
Hate related incidents ((based on race, sexual orientation, gender, disability, religion, age etc)	4	Mediation	3
Pets and animal nuisance	4	Notice seeking possession / demotion	3
Garden nuisance	4		
Drugs/ substance misuse/ drug dealing	3		
Criminal behaviour / crime (not recorded in above categories)	3		
Nuisance from vehicles	2		
Vandalism and damage to property	2		
Physical violence	1		
Total	102		58

Table 3
Quarter 2 October – December

Type of ASB issue	Number	Type of action taken (Top 5)	Number
Noise	10	Early intervention by housing management staff	11
Verbal abuse/ harassment / intimidation/ threatening behaviour	12	Referral to ASB Forum	4
Vandalism and damage to property	6	Injunctions	2
Nuisance from vehicles	4	ABC Mediation Perpetrator supportive action / referral (not recorded elsewhere in actions)	1 action each
Physical violence	2		
Pets and animal nuisance	2		
Criminal behaviour / crime (not recorded in above categories)	2		
Drugs/ substance misuse/ drug dealing	2		
Garden nuisance Litter / rubbish / fly tipping Misuse of communal areas/ public space or loitering	1 case each		
Total	43		20

The tables show that most recorded ASB on estates are problems with noise, verbal harassment and intimidation. This is confirmed by the interview evidence from EMs and NAOs which highlight that noise problems are exacerbated by poor insulation problems in properties. In particular properties in Barton, the City Centre, Littlemore, Headington and Cutteslowe were highlighted. Further issues raised are around suitability and management of placements. An example of this was highlighted by a NAO where a profoundly deaf client with special needs was placed in a block of flats adjoining elderly residents. The tenant did not realise the noise problems she was causing until the case had escalated and had been referred to the Canact Team.

5. ASB “Hot Spots”

Evidence of more localised issues or ASB hotspots is more difficult to determine as neither the Canact nor the Tenancy Services Teams are collecting this data presently. The Uniform database (used by the Canact Team) does have links to an ASB monitoring module with the capability to analyse concentration of ASB incident but this is presently not being utilised by the team. (Data management limitations are discussed more fully in section 9) This is a major omission when managing the City Councils understanding and response to ASB

6. Prevalence Evidence From Interviews and Case Studies

Interview evidence with EMs, tenants and Registered Social Landlords (RSLs), has identified the following areas or housing specific issues:

- A growth in ASB issues linked to alcohol, drug addiction & mental health This was particularly highlighted in areas with a high concentration of one bedroom flats where more vulnerable single clients are housed. As an example: Riverside Court within the Jericho/Abingdon patch has around 35 of the 80 tenants with support packages. Around 50% of the tenants have mental health needs. A high proportion of these tenants have: physical health needs, drug and alcohol issues, learning disability, are ex-offenders. For some it will be the first move from hostel accommodation. Presently the Tenancy Sustainment Officer (based in Tenancy Services) works 3 days a week in a support role helping people to make phone calls, sort out issues with benefits etc. At inception Riverside Court had a dedicated worker based there. This was reduced to 3 days a week on the withdrawal of Supporting People Funding as above but this support has since been reduced to 1 day per week. Some extra support will come from the EM who will run a surgery there 1 day per week. The RG understand that grant funding or service charging to provide additional support is presently being investigated.

- Case study evidence highlights the underlying complexity of ASB cases linked to issues of mental health and addiction that EMs and NAOs are increasingly expected to manage and resolve. Appendix 7 gives examples of cases that the Scrutiny Officer tracked from Tenancy Services to the Canact Team.

As a response to this the Elmore Community Services Team (a voluntary sector service which provides practical help, emotional support, advocacy and outreach for people who have complex needs) is running an intensive support pilot between November 2007 and November 2009 for people who live in Oxford City, have complex needs and are at risk of entering into a cycle of 'crisis, crime, mental illness'. The pilot project aims to offer a variety of 'interventions' at an early stage of mental illness and offending behaviour. The most recent quarterly monitoring report (Sept – Dec 2008) showed that this team were currently handling a caseload of 64 of which 37% of the referrals were from the Canact Team. Details are shown at Appendix 8

- Temporary Accommodation is mainly concentrated in the east of the city and houses a high concentration of young vulnerable tenants. Most ASB issues here are linked to noise and drug use.
- Interview evidence from NAOs, EMs and the Drug strategy Officer highlight that Barton, East Oxford and Blackbird Leys have the more concentrated ASB problems linked to drugs and dealing from houses

Interview evidence from NAO's, EM's and Street Wardens highlight that Woodfarm, particularly Forrestors Tower and around shopping area have a concentration of ASB incidents linked to young people causing harassment and nuisance.

7. ASBOs, ABCs and Injunctions issued

Table 4 below shows the numbers of ASBOs, ABCs and Injunctions issued linked to ASB incidents. Unfortunately because of the limitations of data monitoring within Canact it is impossible to link this information to types of ASB. However it does highlight the low number of ASBO's during 2008 compared to available data on recorded incidents of ASB.

The interview with Legal Services outlined that Anti Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) were issued for harassment, violent behaviour, abusive language and ASB related to drugs and prostitution. A number have been issued to the same family members who have brought about a concentration of harassment and violent behaviour on an estate. ASBOs (issued in the Magistrate Court) are usually an escalation from an Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABCs)

Possession proceedings (eviction from the tenancy and issued in the County Court) are used for ASB cases primarily relating to nuisance and annoyance.

Table 4

Date	ABCs issued	Number of ABCs breached	Number of Parental Control Orders	ASBOs issued	ASBOs Breached	Notice Seeking possession	Evictions	Injunctions
Jan 08 – Oct 08 (previous years data available)	39	11	1	5	7	4	5	1

8. Conclusion

The available evidence highlights a picture of ASB that rarely reaches the severity where legal action (issuing of ASBOs and Injunctions) is required. Interview evidence suggests that ASB that is investigated around noise nuisance, harassment and violent behaviour does have a correlation with the perpetrators underlying mental health and addiction issues. The challenge for the Council is to ensure that they have well trained EMs with access to NAOs and other support agencies. In particular EMs and NAOs need to work together within a clear understanding of expectations and manage and produce a consistent set of data that can be used to inform and set a clear picture of prevalence, action and outcome. It is clear from all evidence gathering this does not currently exist. This lack of consistent, joined up and well thought through data management has made it impossible to reach more definite conclusions around trends attached to particular types of ASB on estates. It inevitably undermines the Council's proper understanding of ASB. This is discussed in more detail in the next section.

9. Data management and monitoring of ASB incident by Tenancy Services and Canact Teams

The RG looked at the overall record keeping and monitoring of ASB incidents by the Tenancy Services and Canact Teams. These teams are predominately the first referral point for a wide variety of ASB incidents on estates.

10. Database systems used by the teams

The two teams currently record incidents of ASB using two database systems: 'Uniform' (used by the Canact Team) and 'I-World' (used by the Tenancy services Team). Neither system is designed for case management and both services have endeavoured to adapt current software to enable this with varying degrees of success.

Two years ago an ASB specific case management system was purchased by the Canact Team linked to the Uniform system. The Property Systems Team (who maintain Uniform) was asked to deliver two training sessions around use of this case management system. The Canact Team are not using this system and interview feedback from NAOs suggested it was not user friendly and time consuming.

The RG attended demonstrations of both "I-World" and Uniform". The limitations of utilising "I- World" for case management were clear. The demonstration of the Uniform ASB case management system did not highlight an overly complex system as outlined by NAOs.

Data capture of ASB incidents is also limited. Historically and currently data recording systems are set without full consideration of what 'outcome' information would be needed particularly around; ASB trend analysis, ASB hotspots by type, the effectiveness of actions and interventions and the management of case load and complexity.

The two services have not worked together to develop a common system of recording basic information. This lack of common system and co-operation is significantly undermining to outcomes generally.

Tracking 10 cases from Tenancy Services to the Canact Team highlights the difficulties this causes with data management:

- The lack of a unique case ID used by both teams makes it difficult to track cases, perpetrators and witnesses across database systems. It should be noted that over 50% (an average of around 10 cases per month) of Canact's referrals are from Tenancy Services. This gives a protracted search process for any day to day queries and also prevents an instant joined up picture of progress to date on cases.
- Each database codes the ASB incident differently. The Uniform data base code ASB incidents generically as 'caution' to distinguish them from cases of noise nuisance which are input into the same system by Environmental Health Officers. This effectively means that the Canact team are unable to profile their caseload by ASB type. Tenancy Services have switched their ASB incident coding to link in with 'Housemark' categories (an ASB benchmarking service which Oxford City

Homes participates in). EMs however are not routinely recording case closures within this system and therefore it is not easy to extract new caseload from current caseload.

It is therefore currently not possible to get an overall picture of ASB by type across the City. This is particularly disappointing when Canact also takes referrals from RSLs and the Private Rental Sector so the Council should be in a position to analysis information to show a more complete picture of prevalence, trends and outcomes.

- A lack of common coding around actions and interventions taken prevents a combined picture of which agencies and interventions Canact and Oxford City Homes utilise. This data could inform the type of voluntary sector services the council may wish to resource or consider partnership links. 'Housemark' which Tenancy Services are presently using provides a comprehensive list of interventions and actions.
- A lack of system data protection around recording case sensitive information. Both I- World and Uniform, in their present forms, cannot password protect case sensitive data. This means more personalised data has to be retained in manual case files. The use of the ASB case management module in Uniform would allow for case sensitive information to be recorded via a secure setting on the S Drive.

11. Performance Information

The limitation of the databases combined with limited use of the software that is available has inevitably led to a paucity of data around the impact of a broad range of interventions and actions taken by the teams. Due to this the RG could not establish how successful actions taken to resolve ASB were.

The Canact team record more detailed information around:

- Referrals into the team by agency
- Enforcement actions taken and breached
- Cases closed and numbers successfully resolved

Whilst this is useful information, it does present a skewed picture of interventions and actions taken and one which presents the team as narrowly enforcement focused. The use of the 'Housemark' interventions and actions by both teams would provide a broader picture of the types of actions that are taken to resolve issues

Data is not routinely recorded by Tenancy Services on cases closed by intervention or those closed without resolution.

12. Conclusion

The council needs good quality data to inform good outcomes in this area. It is imperative that both teams work with 1 recording system designed to provide outcomes for day to day management, performance and overall trend and prevalence analysis.

13. What are services doing to address the database limitations?

Tenancy Services are exploring the purchase of a bespoke ASB case management system called "React". This has the potential to record ASB incident data on a multi-agency level and address the information needs of both services and the council. The advantages of 'React' are: a number of local RSLs have recently moved to this system, its ease of use and capabilities to link to existing Oxford City Homes software

The RG attended a demonstration of React and noted the following benefits:

- It has the capability to be expanded to use on a multi-agency level
- It can potentially link to the Northgate (Oxford City Homes software system) database allowing tenants details to be copied across.
- It can aggregate and link data on more complex cases e.g. features include 'super cases' which can be linked by common folders, linked case files by witness and perpetrator and known associates. Provide personal witness and perpetrator profiles and tenancy profiles which link into the main housing database. (name searches can also be linked against data held in the Northgate database)
- Case management has standard review, received and current status details with e mail alerts on review dates which escalate to manager e mail alert if ignored.
- A detailed incident log which negates the need for manual case files. Added to this evidence gathering proformas and linked scanned attachments could be used to provide an evidence base for legal file. Sets target dates against a range of referrals.
- A transactional log charts key actions and interventions on an individual or case basis and can therefore provide a more complete historic picture of action taken in respect of individual perpetrators.
- Security levels can be added to protect sensitive case information at all user levels.
- A cost management profile which can present costs for cases by type of action, intervention, time management and external costs. These can be aggregated on an area basis or by type of ASB.
- It can standardise actions taken by flowchart or by default actions which highlight a number of possible actions that could be taken at each key stages.
- Hotspot mapping by total and type of ASB, profile of perpetrator and geographic location
- Standard management and bespoke reports

It should be noted that many of these features are also part of the Uniform ASB case work system currently available in the CANACT Team. The unique features and added benefit of the 'React' system would be its 'web' links which allow multi-agency access. Use of 'React' by other large local RSLs would also make it easier to build a multi-agency profile of ASB incidents within the City.

The primary goal for both teams should be the establishment of a common database, with agreed standards of coding, case management protocols and management reporting.

14. Recommendations

Canact & Tenancy Services Teams

R1. A common linked database between used by both teams should be established as a matter of urgency. When designing this the added potential for other services partners in the field such as Environmental Health the Police and local RSLs should be considered. Choice of software should be taken forward via a cross service review team. The RG would wish to see "frontline" staff from both teams acting in an advisory capacity to the review.

R2. Both teams should consider carefully the outcomes requirements from data collection and management for themselves, the council and partners more widely. It would be expected that this would produce:

- Common coding of ASB by type, actions and interventions taken
- 'Housemark' coding, already used by Oxford City Homes, to become the standard coding system. Thus allowing the council to more comprehensively benchmark with other Local Authorities and RSLs around ASB incidents. Both teams recording ASB incidents to agree the format and management reporting framework e.g. around 'Hotspot mapping', profiles of perpetrator, geographic location etc. When considering the above links should be made to the data recorded from the Police via the Oxford Safer Communities Partnership.

15. Case Management by Tenancy Services & Canact Teams

16. Case management systems

The limitations and limited use of the two databases highlighted already has meant that case management systems are manually driven. The system is made more bureaucratic by two work locations (Town Hall – Canact and Horspath – Tenancy Services) and therefore 2 file systems.

Legal Services receive EM and NAO case files if any legal action is to be pursued. The RG considered them to be an independent and expert judge of record keeping around the more complex cases managed by both teams and therefore asked for their comments on the standards. The overall comments received were that:

- The management and quality of recording in case notes by some EMs is poor. Files notes were also disorganised and not chronologically arranged. (Compiling case notes that will be used as court documents has been identified by EMs themselves as a training issue.)
- Legal Services felt that as a common standard a file note should contain:
 - Comprehensive information in respect of each tenancy, including allegations of nuisance made by or against the defendant.
 - A record of housing management matters such as copies of warnings letters to the defendant and notices, before possession proceedings are issued.
 - A record of all interviews with the tenant detailing allegations and responses.

- Not all EMs are keeping a separate ASB case file. (This was also borne out by interview evidence which highlighted a lack of clarity around the need to compile an ASB case file)
- Missing case files from both services giving the necessity to reconstruct evidence and duplicate files. The 2 filing systems increase the likelihood of this without sound and consistent file management

It is recognised that even with sound modern electronic data management systems the need for paper files would not go completely. Nevertheless sound electronic data systems and good common file management would improve the current situation markedly

17. Management of referrals

Canact statistics show that the team handled 230 cases between January and December 2008. Just over 44% of these referrals were from EMs. The rest were as follows: 14% - the private rental sector, 26% - RSLs, 4 % - Temporary Accommodation and 12% any other housing

68% of referrals come to CANACT via EMs or RSLs but the rest come straight to CANACT from the public, the nuisance nightline, private sector housing, RSLs that don't buy directly into the service. For these first point referrals The CANACT Team provide a triage mechanism before further NAO investigation or referral onwards to other agencies. The fact that over 30% (69 in total) of cases came through this route in 2008 suggests it is well used and is potentially a good early intervention tool. It is also a distinct service that no other provider delivers to Oxford residents.

NAOs all stated that the referral process for RSLs was clear and standardised. The referral form used by RSLs is found at Appendix 9 and is both detailed and clear.

More confusion and disputes exist around referrals from Tenancy Servicers. (Some of this is down to lack of clarity over roles and responsibilities discussed more in the next section.) Referrals are usually made to Canact from Tenancy Services via the two weekly surgeries that take place between the teams where a Housing Surgery Referral Form is completed see Appendix 9. (Some headway could be made by the adoption of 1 referral form for all.)

Procedurally all agencies are asked to complete a case file (appendix 10) before referring. Currently the document is not used and all interviewees were unclear about its use, with EMs adding that it duplicated information contained in the existing ASB case file. This document would be superfluous if a joined up case management database was used by both teams

18. Overall case management

The overall management of cases between EMs and NAOs was a source of contention and dispute. A significant part of the problem is role clarity. Some of the issues are around clear assignment of the management of the case. The following quotes from an NAO and an EM serve to highlight the issue:

"EMs see it much more in terms of client and contractor relationship where as NAOs see it more as a client and consultant relationship e.g. they have been commissioned to do something and they should get on and deal with it in consultation with the EM!"

"Lines of responsibility are not clear. There is no clear guidance on who takes responsibility as the ASB case progresses"

Overall Case Management logically has to rest with the EMs who are responsible for and manage the tenancy and the patch. They need to be able to call on specialist help and support in dealing with some ASBO issues. The council has set NAOs as one of those avenues to gain expertise and specialist advice and support. NAOs need to be given the scope to conduct their specialist services on behalf of the EM when referrals are made but this must clearly be in liaison closely with EMs. Some procedures, but not all, detail this method of working but it is not routinely followed resulting in poor communication, a lack of control and responsibility, misunderstandings and poor working relationships.

Tensions between the 2 teams have reached the point where it is undermining sound delivery in some areas. As an example the regular two weekly surgeries between NAOs and EMs which are set to resolve day to day case issues are presently being handled by the Neighbourhood Services Manager because of the tensions that exist between the 2 teams. The RG feel that whatever the outcome for this service these tensions need to be resolved at management level as a matter of urgency

19. Management of Canact Caseload

An analysis of live cases by NAO for February 2009 showed great disparity between the numbers of cases that are currently managed by each officer. The range was from 16 to 49 current cases. NAOs currently work in three patches across Oxford (with a further NAO working with RSLs county-wide). On the surface it would appear that the system of patches is giving skewed workloads. Caveats need to be put around the accuracy of this data since it's clear from interviewing NAOs that not all are actively using Uniform to record case management where this data was extracted from. Even if this data were accurately

recorded it is currently impossible to historically analyse caseload. It is unclear to the RG how the Neighbourhood Services Manager assesses workload with any accuracy. Caseload clearly needs to be seen against a backdrop of complexity and intensity of resolution it is not clear that any of this information exists in a form that can be used by the manager to manage the outputs of his service and officers.

This has meant the RG could not accurately assess workloads or accurately assess whether the current system of patches is the most efficient way of deploying NAOs.

20. The monitoring and issuing of witness diaries

A significant number of ASB issues on estates revolve around neighbourhood disputes and harassment. Primary evidence for taking these disputes forward comes via the issuing of Incident Diaries which the complainant is asked to keep. An example of this is at Appendix 6

Interview evidence with EMs highlighted the difficulties these Incident Diaries present. They were thought to be unclear, overly detailed and not helpful in helping to gain the standard of evidence required to progress cases. The RG agreed that diaries need to be reviewed. Advice needs to be sorted on what standard of evidence is required from this source and this needs to be communicated clearly to tenants with examples.

The Administrative Assistant in the CANACT Team is responsible for monitoring the issue and return of witness diaries. The collection and follow up with diaries is procedurally meant to happen within 7 to 10 days of issue. This process has been made more difficult to control as diaries are not serially numbered and numbers of individuals using them has grown (Neighbourhood Policing Teams, Estate Managers and Neighbourhood Action Teams).

Evidence and comments from the Tenants Involvement Panel suggest these diaries have in some instances been left with individuals for a year or years without follow-up. One NAO admitted that they are sometimes used as a mechanism to placate tenants rather than as evidence gathering documents.

The lack of control or weighting given to the importance of incident diaries has the potential to negate the positive work that is ongoing through the Witness Support Programme where witnesses are contacted on a fortnightly basis and supported through the process whilst ASB cases are still current.

The potential outcomes of poor witness statement management noted from interview evidence are:

- Cases become more entrenched between complainant and perpetrator without swift and meaningful evidence gathering.
- Perpetrators become aggrieved with the protracted process and start to counter complain.

21. Case closure

The interview evidence from tenants and EMs highlights that cases involving neighbourhood disputes can be protracted without swift resolution or closure. As highlighted above some of this is due to poor management and quality of evidence gathering from witnesses.

Interview evidence with Estate Managers has also highlighted

- A lack of clarity of when a case should be closed.
- A lack of communication by the Canact Team when a case has closed, with the tenant unclear what action has taken place.

An analysis of live cases by NAOs in February 2009 highlighted that 9 cases were over 2 years old (one of these was 3 years old) and 20 were over a year old. The NAOs stated that their current caseload is subject to fortnightly 1:1 review with the Neighbourhood Services Manager.

Present procedure detail that a case should be immediately closed on resolution or within 3 months of no further action occurring. The case closure process should be reviewed. In particular teams need to agree who does what around the closure of cases. The closure of cases should also be linked to the current satisfaction survey process.

Based on evidence it is clear tighter procedural controls need to be put in place to manage live cases overall. This should include some consideration of the point of case closer if resolution is not thought in sight. Further the communication of this to parties to the dispute and also its management and resolution need to be considered.

22. Conclusion

Much of the duplication and bureaucracy of a manual case system would be overcome by a good joined-up case management database.

A good case management database will only be effective and efficient if it is used and the evidence highlighted above points to poor use of current systems and poor management controls to ensure their use. The purchase of the 'Uniform' ASB software module costing just under £6000 and its apparent 'obsolescence' is a costly demonstration of this poor control.

Complete and accurate record keeping will also only be effective if management controls are in place to ensure this happens.

A standardised referral process for all agencies would remove any confusion that currently exists around when to refer and accompanying information. The numbers of referrals from other agencies and the public also demonstrate that the Canact Team have a vital 'triage' role to play in the reporting of ASB incidents.

The lack of clarity around overall case management responsibility is at the heart of tensions between NAO and EMs. It is essential that one officer oversees the overall management. In cases where the ASB relates to Council properties the RG felt that management should rest with the EM, as they have overall management responsibility for the Estate.

Poor management control of witness diaries and a lack of clarity around closure of cases are a factor in ASB cases becoming more intractable and entrenched. Tighter procedural controls need to be put in place. Complainants and perpetrators also need regular communication on progression of cases, their resolution and are clear why some cases are closed unresolved.

23. Recommendations

Canact & Tenancy Services Teams

R3 Management controls need to be put in place to ensure:

- Common standards of quality file maintenance and management supported and maintained.
- Procedures that govern case management and the authorisation of key actions are followed.
- Methods of working are supportive and collaborative and any inter-team disputes are speedily investigated and resolved.
- NAO caseload is accurately recorded alongside performance measures built around minimum and maximum resolution times. These times should initially be drawn from historic case management experience
- Caseloads are reviewed on a weekly basis based upon the above data.
- Twice weekly surgeries between NAOs and EMs take place.

R4 Procedural controls need to be put in place to ensure:

- Tenancy Services should have overall management of cases within their area involving OCC tenants. Estate Managers should closely liaise with NAOs who have day-to-day case management responsibilities. Referrals by EMs to Canact for ASB casework is agreed by all parties and based around the skills required to obtain resolution.
- That witness diaries are limited in use to cases where they will be an integral part of resolution and that the control of these and their content is checked both administratively and by managers as part of the regular review of cases
- The content and style of witness diaries is reviewed
- That an agreed approach to case closure is established including:
 - Clear responsibilities for communicating the closure of cases to witnesses, perpetrators and relevant agencies.
 - A Common standard of the reporting of cases closure
 - A monthly management review of all cases more than 6 months old. This should involve all agencies.

24. Roles and responsibilities of Canact and Tenancy Services in tackling ASB. **CANACT**

The Canact Team was created in 2001 in response to growing concerns around ASB. They were originally funded from the Housing Revenue Account and operated within the then Housing Department. Things moved on and the service began to work more widely across all tenure. In recognition of this the service was moved into the General Fund (*Income is received from the Housing Revenue Account for ASB work referred from Tenancy Services*) The team's structure is attached as appendix 12

The model was based upon that created by Manchester City Council who were one of the first Local Authorities (LAs) to have a team dedicated to tackling ASB. The Oxford team has some unique features, one of which is the employment of a family liaison officer.

The team's focus is built around the LA powers in the Crime and Disorder Act (1998) to tackle actions that cause anti-social behaviour. The service in the council adds to this by tackling cases that are "not prosecutable as a criminal offence and which are not remediable through mediation". It is the guidance attached to the Act that introduced the use of Anti – Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs), Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABCs) and Parental Control Orders (PCOs) as enforcement solutions. Appendix 13 gives details of a Legal Services briefing around of the use of enforcement actions and their pros and cons.

The team's main purpose, as defined in the Crime and Disorder Act, is narrow particularly in reference to solutions and as highlighted in previous sections is not appropriate for a significant proportion of ASB cases that the council has referred to it. The team has recognised the need to build more links to a wider solution base that encompasses the work of support agencies.

Significantly and positively from the start the Canact Team has tried to instigate a multi-agency approach to finding solutions. An early stage of the investigation involves a multi-agency case conference to investigate issues and avoid a narrow sanction route. Examples of other agencies are Youth Offending Teams, Children and Family Services Teams and the Police

The team also uses Problems Solving Meetings (PSMs) which are multi-agency in nature and can be called at any time during an investigation. These focus on bringing to the attention of other agencies, specific issues with the aim of finding common solutions. The Elmore Team (a voluntary sector service which provides practical help, emotional support, advocacy and outreach for people who have complex needs) has been integral to introducing a broader solution base to discussions at these meetings.

25 The role of the NAO

This is not detailed in Canact's procedural document, but the NAOs job description (JD) (see appendix 14) details their core work as:

- Liaison with key agencies, such as the Police, to ensure exchange of suitable information
- Conducting detailed investigative work
- Liaising with housing agencies and private landlords to ensure progress on ASB casework

An overriding comment from EMs, Senior Street Wardens and the Tenants Involvement Panel is the lack of clarity around the role of the NAO. Interviews with EMs and NAOs highlight tensions over the lack of role clarity.

Interviewees said that tensions between the roles and responsibilities of EMs and NAOs have been there since inception and because of the lack of management intervention or resolution have become entrenched. Procedure documents do detail the work of the NAO and EM when dealing with an ASB complaint but the responsibilities for taking forward actions and overall case management are not defined (see Appendix 15). It is accepted that this area of work by its nature is changeable and fluid and mitigates against protocols that can address all circumstances. The RG did feel it imperative that a clear lead responsibility was defined for overall case management and as stated earlier this fits logically with the responsibilities of the EM

The lack of a structured induction process for NAOs adds to this role confusion. An induction process would provide context and parameters for the NAO role.

Common issues raised at interview were:

- Case involvement and management varies depending on the individual skills of the NAO and EM
- Some EMs regard NAOs as assisting, some regard them as interfering
- EMs felt they did all the groundwork
- NAO routinely allocate all the work to EMs at problem solving meetings
- If the case is successfully resolved the NAO takes the credit
- Lack of clarity whether cases need to be signed off by Canact before they are passed to legal for advice
- An inconsistency of actions taken by different NAOs

It is clear from the NAO interview evidence that without any detailed procedures governing their role or objective management control over it, "habitual" ways of working have developed, with differing role interpretation. This is highlighted by statements given by two NAOs around their core responsibilities.

Example 1

Routine Work:

- Acting as a conduit between public other services and agencies around ASB.
- Investigating issues from the general public to see if they can be progressed and by whom.
- Receiving referrals from other agencies to conduct the more detailed investigative work around identifying perpetrators, gathering evidence and taking appropriate actions (seeing what cases would be suitable to go to court) and interventions
- Managing the process of taking witness statements and jointly attending the interviews of witnesses with EMs taking on a clear role of explaining the legal and enforcement process and their ramifications.
- Attending and chairing multi– agency meetings, leading on PSMs and attending the Housing Surgery meetings.

Example 2

Routine Work:

- Close liaison with Police and Neighbourhood Policing Team involving regular patrols on patch with Police Community Support Officer or Neighbourhood Specialist Officer.
- Involvement in joint operations with local Police teams.
- Attending and chairing multi– agency meetings (Area ASB meetings).
- Receiving referrals from other agencies to conduct the more detailed investigative work
- Meetings as and when required with EMs and joint visits with EMs linked to ASB issues.

Interview evidence from EMs highlights that the relationship works better when the NAOs role is within example 1 and this is the one that links closely with the JD of the NAO.

Further disruptions to the working relationship between the teams have occurred with long term sickness absences amongst NAOs. Three of the NAOs have had long periods of sickness absence over the last 18 months and one NAO has had nearly continuous absence over this period. Delays in reassigning their work has meant that some EMs have been conducting the whole role with equal degrees of success.

On consideration the RG think there is a distinct role for NAOs to play in the resolution of ASB cases:

- In very complex cases. It was obvious that as the complexity of cases grew, so did the need for detailed and time consuming investigative work
- To act as a conduit between agencies when the resolution of an ASB issue does not fit neatly within any area. This is often the case and no other agency or service does this

- To continue to provide the emergency hotline to the public for a range of ASB issues and conduct initial investigative or triage work that can prevent escalation

Interview evidence has highlighted that the NAOs skill base is similar to that of EMs. This inevitably undermines an overall relationship that is set on the delivery of specialist skills. Tenancy Services Managers are currently calling for the whole service to be delivered by them as the skill level and outcomes are the same. Current evidence mitigates in support of this view and so an urgent view should be taken on what specialist skills are required, in what volume and in which places.

Developmentally the Canact Team have recognised they need to provide more specialist support and advice in cases where the perpetrators have complex needs. This gap is currently filled by the Elmore Support Workers attached to the ASB pilot. This has allowed the team to look at wider support solutions rather than immediate consideration of enforcement action but the underlying gap in skills remains

There are further training needs identified by NAOs which not only reflect the core part of the NAOs role but also reflect the changes and nature of the cases that the team manage. The following training and development areas were identified by NAOs during the interview process:

Generally

- Interactive updates around legislative changes that impact on ASB issues. Turpin and Miller have been used in the past on an ad hoc basis.
- Assertiveness training
- Mediation and negotiation training
- Awareness training in the complex needs of vulnerable perpetrators and their management.
- Awareness of the role of support agencies in providing resolutions to ASB issues (recognising that Elmore have had positive impacts here this needs to be sustained via training and development)

Induction process

- To have a structured induction process
- Advanced interviewing training

25. The Role of the Family Support Coordinator

This officer works 16hrs per week and is funded via the Oxford Safer Communities Partnership. She works with families with school aged children (up to 16years) where individual family members, who are perpetrating ASB, have profound problems that would not be addressed by the issuing of PCOs or ABCs. The worker sees a large proportion of children in the 12 – 13 year range and deals with a broad spectrum in the 10-15 year age range. She will only engage with the families if they voluntarily accept the referral and her maximum caseload is 6. Some of her work is intensive seeing families regularly for 1 day per week and some sporadic contact as the families become more independent and issues are resolved. The estimated average case time is around 6-9 months. The role is primarily one of a family counsellor.

Common issues are:

- Children excluded from school
- General school issues
- No social worker when the family need some intervention
- Statemented children not getting support
- Health problems

In the families she sees one of the issues parents will often have problems when engaging with more mainstream services because of literacy levels and levels of low esteem. Families are invariably chaotic and she will help these families set goals and help them to engage.

With a small caseload success rates can be skewed but the worker estimates that around 50% of cases are successfully resolved with no further ASB incidents. The worker indicated that the potential caseload far exceeds current provision. She has a small budget that allows her to employ services such as a family support service (Parent Link) and paid workers from the Youth Mentoring Service. She has developed close links with Youth Services, Youth Offending and Youth Diversion Teams.

The Worker keeps her own confidential case management system. The amount of information the officer can place on Uniform is limited by its lack of confidentiality but she can record the number of interventions she makes under Family Support Worker codes. The RG agreed from evidence there were significant service gaps in intensive family support and a number of families with entrenched problems often leading to ASB incidents. The Group wished to see this service area increased.

27. Drug Strategy Worker

The current role has been in place since September 08 and is funded by the Oxford Safer Communities Partnership. The officer's previous role was as a Drug Casework Officer. The latter role caused some tensions and overlap with NAOs particularly around lower level drug cases. Previously the Case Worker handled all the ASB cases related to more complex issues with the exception of Blackbird Leys where the NAO handled this work.

The Case Worker also handled ASB cases related to sex workers and brothels. Now this casework is handled by NAOs.

The Drug Caseworker did not keep either a current or historic record overall of cases relating to drugs and prostitution. The officer estimated that around 136 cases have been raised since she started in post in 2003 until the recent change of role with about 5 of these cases specifically related to sex workers.

The new role, as outlined, is one that has time-limited aspects. The officer will be working with Neighbourhood Action Groups (NAGs) to develop a range of toolkits which will help NAGs identify the types of drug issues in their agency, what powers are currently available to tackle the problems and options available to tackle specific issues. The Officer is hoping to develop further toolkits around; supporting the community, education and prevention, intervention and enforcement and landlord

involvement. A pilot around multi agency work is happening in Barton with work to link data analysis from the CDRP, DAAT and PCT to identify hotspot areas.

Other developments for the role are to co-ordinate multi-agency enforcement on drug issues and working with the Neighbourhood Policing Teams on Operation Falcon (the team which co-ordinates drug operations around the key areas of enforcement, consolidation and communication)

28. Police Liaison Officer

The officer attends multi-agency ASB meetings and shares information with NAOs only. The Officer has access to the Police 'Sedar' database via a terminal in the Canact office. This allows him to receive intelligence bulletins which he passes to NAOs. He produces a regular informal bulletin which he shares with NAOs and Neighbourhood Policing Teams. The job role is to facilitate the exchange of information under S115 of the information sharing protocols attached to the Crime and Disorder Act legislation for Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs). In addition the officer acts as an NAO in the City Centre and temporary NAO cover in North Oxford to cover for an NAO on long term sick absence.

The RG thought that this role provided too narrow a focus and reconsideration of the role could provide benefits across the whole service. Poor information sharing was highlighted as a significant issue with EMs, tenants and Street Wardens. The role of this officer's role should be widened to achieve improvements in this area and also provide a focus for the development and monitoring of local information sharing protocols. Consideration should be given to the efficacy of officers skilled in this area being used in the NAO role.

29. Links between NAOs and RSLs

The RG sent a satisfaction survey to the 5 RSLs that had contracts with the Canact Team to conduct ASB investigations. Three of the RSLs responded, 1 of whom is no longer contracted to Canact (A2 Dominion)

The feedback from the RSLs was very positive:

- The NAO provides invaluable expertise in taking witness statements, co-ordinating action that goes across several agencies including other social landlords and accessing information from other sources, such as the Police. (1 RSL commented they expected better cover provisions to take account of leave and sickness)
- In terms of case management, incidents were thought to be responded to on a timely basis, clearly communicated and cases were either successfully resolved or progressed by the team.
- CANACT co-ordinate the quarterly Oxfordshire ASB Forum meetings for all the RSLs who have contracts with them. RSLs see this as a good forum for sharing best practice and receiving general updates on current practices and issues in the field
- The Witness Support Scheme was thought to be a very effective service.
- Provides a good link with other services particularly the Police.

One comment received suggested that the contract provided for City cases to be given priority over county-wide cases and that RSL cases over the Oxfordshire border were not managed by CANACT. It was felt that contractual relationship should be around fees for caseload rather than boundary specific. It is hard to disagree with this comment.

30. Estate Managers (EMs)

31. Early intervention and identifying ASB by EMs

EMs along with the Neighbourhood Policing Teams will often be the first contact point for tenants to report incidents of ASB. A key part of the EMs role is early intervention and the resolution of ASB issues. EMs, through regular tenancy visits and patch patrols, are well placed to identify any ASB issues or potential issues and they highlight that most ASB comes to light from tenants contacting them or home visits.

Housing Surgeries were highlighted as a good mechanism for raising ASB issues, particularly for elderly and vulnerable tenants who are less likely to directly report incidents. They thought that these surgeries would be more effective if evening slots were available and they had the involvement of other agencies such as the Neighbourhood Policing Teams.

A number of useful areas are under development:

- Walkabouts. These happen on patches once a month. They have proved useful in identifying issues of low level ASB and breaches of tenancy agreement such as litter, graffiti, overgrown and messy gardens. The higher visibility of EMs was also thought to encourage tenants to identify further issues and problems. The area of the walkabouts is often informed by incidents of low level crime and vandalism and intelligence from the Police. EMs are working towards getting more frequent intelligence updates from police. This could be facilitated through the existing police liaison post in Canact.

EMs thought that walkabouts were particularly effective when combined with the Neighbourhood Policing Team because it allowed for swift action and acted as a deterrent particularly around low level ASB. This co-operative relationship between EMs and Neighbourhood policing Teams varies. It was clear to the RG that benefits could be derived from making it standard practice. The relationship with Street Wardens was good across all the patches they patrolled.

Multi service and agency walkabouts are also happening on a monthly or six weekly basis. These involve Parks, Cleansing, Neighbourhood Policing Teams, Housing Repairs, Councillors and Tenants Association representatives. This is reported as working well as a visible presence to encourage a range of issues to be identified and reported.

Interview evidence highlighted that the frequency of walkabouts differs between patches. EMs stating that they were awaiting a new procedure and protocols for the more formalised multi- service walkabouts.

- Risk Index. This has been developed by Tenancy Services to assess all tenants and inform the frequency of visit by an EMs. Table 4 overleaf shows the weightings used.
- Tenants with low scores will receive a visit every three years, whilst those scoring high will have a visit at least once a year. The weighting is seen as positive by EMs. The index has also informed distribution of workload and patches. EMs would like to see some further refinement around tenants with complex needs. This would help to proactively identify any problems before they have escalated to ASB incidents.

Table 4

	Field/Criteria	Weighting
Property	Flats	1
	Maisonettes	1
Tenancy Source Tenancy Type	Move-On	1
	Intro	1
Tenant	Under 21	1
	Over 75	1
	Support (Point for each)	1
	Caution/Warning	1
	ABS Type (point for each)	1
	ABS Cat Low (1, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13)	1
	ABS Cat Med (2, 4, 7, 8, 14, 15)	2
	ABS Cat High (3, 9, 10)	3
	ABS Intervention Low (1-7)	1
	ABS Intervention Med (8-11)	2
	ASB Intervention High (12-17)	3
	Don't Read or Speak English	1
	Disabled (Either Field)	1
Household	Only member of household	1
	Over crowding - (rooms v people)	1
Rent	Notice	1
	SPO	1
	Warrant	1

32. Tenancy Services and Canact's use of external agencies

Support agencies are used by EMs and NAOs in cases where perpetrators have complex needs often linked to mental health and addiction problems. Interview evidence highlighted that most support is received from:

- The Floating Support Teams (Stonham, Connections)
- Children & Families Services
- Community Mental Health Teams
- Elderly Services
- The Elmore Team
- Mediation in Action

Interview evidence from EMs, the Tenancy Sustainment Officer, the Family Support Worker, the NAOs and the Senior Street Wardens has highlighted a number of issues around support particularly floating support that is available for tenants with complex needs:

- Gaps in support provision particularly for those tenants who have or who are perceived to have low to medium level or sporadic support needs.
- Gaps in support provision for those who are deemed to have no identifiable mental health condition or personality behaviour disorders.
- A lack of overall support provision for tenants with learning disabilities
- Time limited floating support packages. Most packages will last for around a year with the aim that the tenant will be capable of living independently after this. A time limited package is clearly not appropriate for all. The perception amongst EMs is that the support package will last for the first year of the tenancy and then dissolve irrespective of ongoing needs.
- Allocation of tenancies to vulnerable high need tenants without intensive support packages. EM interviews highlight cases of tenants who fall into this category who are severely disruptive to surrounding tenants, where the intervention of support agencies is minimal and the management of the tenants falls to them.
- Tenants refusing the support packages offered to them or not engaging with support services.
- A lack of support for ex-prisoners
- Poor support and intervention for tenants with alcohol addiction. EMs noted this as an increasing trend.

Work is ongoing to help resolve some of these issues. Much of the work with support agencies is set to avoid "last resort enforcement action". The RG wished to highlight in particular the work of the Elmore Team who work with vulnerable tenants with very complex needs and aims to try to connect them to support agencies that can make a difference to outcomes. The RG interviewed the Elmore ASB Team and looked at the most recent evaluation report of their work which was done by 'Revolving Doors' (this is part of the monitoring arrangement from one of its funding bodies The Tudor Trust). The key findings from this report are attached as Appendix 8. The report highlights that the Team has a high success rate in getting individuals to not only link into support agencies but also to cease their previous

patterns of ASB behaviour and re-offending. The funding for this pilot is secure until November 2009. The RG think it important for the Council and the Oxford Safer Communities Partnership to explore secure financing for this project beyond the November date or ensure that these inputs are delivered by others. The work is both successful and invaluable and its loss would have a negative impact on the success of ASB resolution.

The RG thought that some of the time committed by the Elmore ASB Workers to Canact could be more usefully re-directed towards acting in an advisory capacity to EMs either via an office or telephone surgery. This would enhance early recognition and warning signs with vulnerable tenants who might need extra support and monitoring.

The Elmore Team work exclusively with adults. There is no service of this type for young people and particularly for those that are in the 'transition' age band (17, 18, 19 years) that fall between young person and adult services. Further review work needs to be conducted to assess the impacts of this.

The Tenancy Sustainment Officer (employed within the Tenancy Services Team) is viewed by EMs as a good link officer who is in touch with a variety of support agencies. This officer's remit has recently changed moving from working on a limited patch to acting as a central co-ordinator for all referrals onto support agencies. A central co-ordination point is seen as a positive step although the RG thought this needed to be reviewed after a six month period to ensure caseloads were manageable.

Resources attached to support agencies are limited and often stretched. The RG felt it vital that the best use of these was made and that EMs and NAOs work together through processes that prevented the escalation of problems. Actions and procedures should focus on early intervention and better risk management coupled with a better understanding of advocacy and gateways to support agencies. There is an acceptance of this in both teams

A significant issue highlighted by EMs is getting accurate information about a new tenants support needs and behavioural problems. This seems to hinge around a lack of consistency in the assessment of the level of vulnerability from GPs, Social Care Teams, Mental Health Services and general information sharing. This information is crucial to the ongoing management of vulnerable tenants and improvements in this area should be taken forward by the Housing Allocations and Options Teams.

Mediation in Action is an external agency used by Tenancy Services as a mechanism to help resolve neighbour conflicts and disputes. A significant number of EMs were critical of the service and questioned its value. Comments were:

- Only two meetings were arranged between tenants to see if the issue could be resolved through mediation.
- EMs have received comments from the mediation team that referred tenants were too challenging to work with. The mediation team are not used to

dealing with people with mental health needs or those displaying aggressive behaviour. This is where the support is needed

- EMs perceived the service to have a very low rate of success (this would seem obvious if the team cannot deal with the clients referred to them).

Some EMs felt they could offer the general mediation themselves with more training and provide independence working across patches. The RG thought that the current provision needed to be reviewed based upon these comments.

33. Training needs of Estate Managers

Interview evidence highlighted training needs for EMs and these are detailed below:

Induction

- Should involve shadowing of EMs and NAOs .

General

- More training on legal and enforcement remedies to tackle ASB. (specifically to include training on compiling case notes, injunctions and issuing of emergency injunctions (when to use them and how to take them forward).
- Witness statement and gathering “ good quality” evidence
- Empowerment skills with an emphasis on helping tenants to be more independent and self sufficient.
- Issuing of Fixed Penalty Notices.
- Opportunities to find out more about best practice and what is happening in other authorities
- How to manage vulnerable tenants
- Joint team building with support agencies

34. Conclusion.

There is a lack of clarity over the role of the NAOs and EMs in the resolution of ASB. This has led both teams to develop their own ways of working and even different ways of working within these teams. This has caused confusion, duplication and tensions in relationships. Inevitably it has served to undermine some of the outcomes from both teams

It is clear to the RG that both teams have an important role to play to achieve good outcomes and the council needs to act quickly to clarify and progress these roles and working relationships.

The RG would not want to be prescriptive about the shape of these roles but as a guide the group would wish managers to consider the following which has been derived from the evidence gathered.

When managing ASB on estates EMs will inevitably be presented with situations that are beyond their skill set or be too time consuming for them to adequately manage. Broad criteria can and has been drawn around this category of case but this can never be seen to be exhaustive or be applied as a hard and fast rule.

At this point EMs need to be able to call on specialist support and assistance to resolve the issue and NAOs are their point of call for this. NAOs in turn need to be skilled to deliver within this very specialist area and as has been seen in the evidence above a large number of cases referred will involved tenants with very complex needs and in particular addiction and mental health problems. NAO skills must be up to this job.

The importance of monitoring and data has already been concluded on above but to emphasis it seems crucial in terms of communication and good case management that 1 officer keeps control of the case and for council tenants this seems logically to rest with the EM. Conversely it would seem illogical to train EMs within a very specialist area of work that others have more time and skill to deliver on.

EMs should have the skills to spot problems early and have assess to support agencies and be trained in intervention methods that allow as many problems as possible to be spotted early and resolved without the need for more specialist intervention

None of the above should be left solely in the hands of officers with front line responsibility in either team. Managers need to be sure that cases are progressing and the most appropriate officer or support agency is working on the case and that it is being lead well. This should be possible through good data information produced by shared systems that allow a collaborative bi-monthly review to take place at management level

There are some skills that are common to both teams e.g. the skills to keep good information that can be used potentially as evidence, or the knowledge of and links to support agencies. These skills should be enhance and advance collaboratively and jointly

Support agencies are clearly crucial to both teams with some more so than others. It would seem sensible for the teams together to regularly review the services on offer, how they can be best used and where the gaps are. This is particularly so with the scarcity of these specialist services.

35. Recommendations

Canact Team

- R5.** Establish a common understanding of the key elements of a NAOs role e.g.
5. Manages the process of taking witness statements and to attend the interviews of witnesses taking on the role of explaining the legal and enforcement process and its ramifications.
 6. Co-ordinates and communicates the issuing of Acceptable Behaviour Contacts and Parental Control Orders with involvement of EMs.
 7. Communicate relevant intelligence from agencies particularly the Police.
 8. Takes a proactive part in managing multi–agency relationships around ASB.
- R6.** A structured induction programme for all members of the team is developed.
- R7.** A Review of the current staff structure within Canact takes place with the next 6 months. This should include:
4. A review of the current system of patches and whether this is the most efficient deployment of the team.
 5. Assess the administrative efficiencies that could be made through full utilisation of a common database.
 6. Consider how roles still need to be developed or expanded to manage an increasingly complex and vulnerable client base. These of wider resolutions to ASB outside of enforcement actions e.g. expansion of Family Support Coordinator role, focused and bespoke training around mental health and addiction for NAOs, greater awareness and training in the role of a range support agencies and their support casework

Canact & Tenancy Services Teams

- R8.** Review the pros and cons of Canact and Tenancy Services working from the same location. Establishing efficient and better working arrangements.
- R9.** Review the service provider 'Mediation in Action'. Explore more efficient and successful methods for delivery.

R10. A comprehensive / structured training programme is developed by both teams (particularly around training issues highlighted by NAOs and EMs)

R11. To deliver either secure financing for the Elmore ASB project beyond November 2009 or ensure that these inputs are delivered by others.

36. Communication and information sharing

Poor communication between teams was highlighted as a weakness from all interviews conducted (Legal Services, Tenants, Street Wardens, NAOs and Ems).

There is evidence of poor information sharing generally between teams across all areas of information but at the heart of many of the findings in this section is a lack of standardisation of information sharing particularly in relation to Police data. Common statements from interview evidence are that day to day information sharing with front-line Neighbourhood Policing Teams is good. Police feedback higher up the Neighbourhood Policing chain, particularly around serious incidents on estates is poor. The level of information exchange within Neighbourhood Action Groups (NAGs) was also felt to be driven by differing approaches of the NAG Inspectors rather than standardised information sharing protocols.

The Crime & Disorder Act 1998 (S115) gives CDRPs and the individual agencies a legal power to share information, for the purpose of preventing or reducing crime and disorder under an agreed objective. It is understood that based upon this legislation an information sharing protocol was developed county-wide between CDRPs. Presently no detailed information sharing protocols have been developed at a district based level by the Oxford Safer Communities Partnership.

37. The tenant's perspective

A focus group session was held with members of the Tenant Involvement Panel. The full findings from this session are attached as Appendix 16.

Most tenants report ASB incidents initially to EMs. After this Street Wardens and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) were the most common reporting option.

Satisfaction around communication is strongly linked with visibility and how approachable and contactable teams are. Generally PCSOs and Street Wardens are seen as visible, accessible and timely respondents to incidents. Tenants viewed this as a contributory factor to the decline in incidents of drug dealing, car crime and alcohol related incidents on estates. The walkabouts detailed earlier are perceived as a good mechanism for this.

Tenants' experiences of reporting initial incidents of ASB highlight a need for:

- Regular bulletins detailing which agencies to contact for particular incidents and the contact details for area teams. Tenants felt that 1 lead agency for reporting incidents would provide clarity
- More work targeted towards reassuring tenants around confidentiality. (Tenants are reluctant to report for fear of reprisals)
- Communication to tenants of who the Neighbourhood Policing Teams are and their contact details.
- Clarity over the role and remit of the Canact Team. Further comments were that the team were remote and difficult to contact. (highlighted by a letter to Tenant Involvement Panel member regarding closure of a protracted ASB case which lacked any contact names or rationale for why the case was now closed)

Focusing on tenants direct experiences as witnesses and perpetrators (mainly cross complainers) highlighted a number of issues on communication and feedback of ASB cases:

- Generally poor feedback on the outcome and progression of ASB cases
- Protracted cases with no resolution and poor feedback on why the agency has been unable to resolve the matter.
- Poor communication between services and agencies handling the case. View from tenants that agencies were unaware of actions of others participating in the case and there was duplication and inconsistent approaches by agencies.
- View that Tenants will lose or have lost faith in reporting incidents if not resolved or cases are not closed in a timely manner
- Accessibility of EMs differs and arranging 1:1 appointments is difficult.

Tenants would like to see:

- Cases resolved quickly or passed to other agencies quickly if things cannot be resolved within the council.
- Better communication links between agencies and services to produce more joined up services and information
- Service standards or timescales for responses to various categories of ASB and updates on progression of cases. Tenants felt that this would provide realistic expectations of what should or could happen as a minimum standard. It was also felt that this should be publicly reported e.g. number of cases, response times and resolution (The Oxford City Homes 'Respect' ASB Policy does specify target times for initial investigations linked to the severity of ASB but not response times to complainant).

38. Communication links between EMs, NAOs and Neighbourhood Policing Teams

EMs and NAOs are developing good links with Neighbourhood Policing Teams in their patches. Both teams feel that information sharing higher up the Neighbourhood Policing hierarchy (NAG Inspector and above) is still personality

driven. This is leading to poor dissemination of information in some patches. It has the secondary effect of causing tensions between teams where there is no apparent logic to the withholding of Police Intelligence linked to ASB casework.

The multi-agency ASB meetings linked to the NAG areas are seen to be working well by both NAOs and EMs. These include representatives from the Police, Park Rangers, Youth Workers, and RSLs and are a good mechanism to exchange information on complex and protracted ASB cases in the area which have multi-agency involvement.

Similarly problem solving meetings linked specifically to decision making around individual ASB cases are seen as an effective mechanism for getting multi-agency buy-in to solutions. Comments were that improvements could be made to ensure a broad spread of agencies attend these meetings particularly support agencies.

On a multi-agency level there is dissonance around the media portrayal of perpetrators. The Youth Offending Team is particularly concerned with the "naming and shaming" approach the local media takes towards vulnerable young people who have committed ASB incidents. They feel it often has a counter-productive effect on the behaviour of these individuals and undermines the work around stabilising their lives. The RG note that a Media Strategy is under development by the Oxford Safer Communities Partnership and would like to see an informed consensus from agencies around the reporting of ASB cases particularly those linked to vulnerable individuals.

Specific issues around inter-service communications are:

- Lack of information sharing and communication between NAOs and Street Wardens. Street Wardens thought that NAOs should be making more regular contact with Street Warden Teams (at least once a week) to regularly exchange information and to communicate outcomes and progress on ASB cases. Of concern is the fact that the follow-up around the issuing of ABCs and ASBOs is poor. The Street Wardens highlighted cases where they have only known about the issuing of ABCs weeks after they have been issued.
- Interview evidence with EMs was that information flow is one-way from EMs to NAOs. This seemed to be particularly around actions and police information. This would be more easily addressed if the regular surgeries between these teams happened and clarity existed around information sharing protocols.

39. Conclusion

The RG felt that the development of a local information sharing protocol is essential to provide a clear framework for the information sharing processes around ASB. It would also provide confidence to all parties in what is expected of them, their roles and responsibilities. The restrictions around the exchange of 'personalised' and 'sensitive' data is recognised. However procedures governing the exchange of information linked to risk management and overseen by 'Designated Officers' within agencies would lead to a more informed and standardised approach. The widening of the Police Liaison role in Canact to such a role should be considered.

The development of an Oxford Safer Communities Partnership Media strategy is seen as a positive step forward and the RG advises that this strategy includes reaching a multi-agency consensus around the media portrayal of vulnerable individuals.

To encourage ASB reporting by tenants and residents, more information updates need to be provided on an area basis so that it is clear who does what around ASB and contact details. This needs to include information around confidentiality around reporting.

The introduction of customer standards around progress of cases and closure of cases would help tenants get a clear sense of what to expect and lead to a greater confidence when reporting in the future. Specific customer standards could form part of the 'Respect' agenda policy. To do this effectively the Policy would need to reflect an Oxford city –wide approach to ASB and not just Oxford City Homes as it is presently.

40. Recommendations

Oxford Safer Communities Partnership

R12. To take the lead in developing a local (Oxford) information sharing protocol between agencies tackling ASB.

Canact Team

R13. The development of the Police Liaison Officer role within Canact Team is widened to ensure that agreed information sharing protocols are working and any issues are speedily dealt with. The Officer should also act as a conduit for the dissemination of enforcement orders to agencies and act in an advisory capacity to agencies seeking specific ASB data.

Oxford Safer Communities Partnership

R14. The development of a media strategy by the Oxford Safer Communities Partnership should ensure controls are put in place to manage and 'de-personalise' the publicity of enforcement orders against vulnerable individuals.

R15. To develop a 'Respect' style policy for ASB to communicate:

- Agencies' roles and responsibilities for tackling ASB
- Details of reporting and referral mechanisms
- Customer standards around:

Initial investigation times by type of ASB case

Updates on progress of cases

Case Closure and communication

Customer satisfaction around the handling / management of ASB cases

Appendix 1

Tackling Anti – Social Behaviour

Review Topic	Tackling ASB – Effectiveness of Inter-agency working
Lead Member Review Group	Cllr's: Ruth Wilkinson, Gill Sanders, Mark Lygo
Officer Support	Julia Woodman
Rationale (key issues and/ or reason for doing the Review)	<p><u>Local issues</u></p> <p>Performance monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Canact monitoring figures are very quantitative and process driven rather than outcome driven. <p>Communication</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misperception & negative media portrayals of ASB, this can be an inhibiting factor in effectively dealing with issues. <p>Coordination of Referrals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of referral protocols between OCC Services and agencies. • Services / agencies focus differs e.g. tensions between balance of enforcement against support for underlying issues of ASB • ASB issues often enmeshed with complex family / mental health / addiction issues
Purpose of Review/Objective (specify exactly what the Review should achieve)	<p>The review to focus upon inter-agency working around ASB issues on estates.</p> <p>Monitoring data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review current monitoring of casework by Tenancy Services & Canact Team and referrals to / and from other agencies

	<p>ASB Case Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To consider the work / experiences of Estate Management Teams in relation to ASB. Looking at prevalence of cases and referral to / intervention of other agencies. • To look at RSL experiences of ASB and the management of ASB casework. • To consider the role and level of intervention of the Canact Team and referral to other agencies. What interventions take place and is this governed by any protocols? (This will involve looking at the routes to the issuing of ASBO's) How is the success of any intervention judged? Does this differ between agencies? • To consider how wider support needs are managed and at what stage relevant agencies are notified / involved? • To look at how Canact / other agencies liaise with complainants of ASB / victims of ASB? 		
<p>Indicators of Success (what factors would tell you what a good Review should look like)</p>	<p>To ensure more outcome focus performance monitoring for ASB casework and referrals.</p> <p>An evaluation of the referral process of ASB cases to ensure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Common protocols exist or are established around intervention / referral 2. That support service links & intervention is timely / appropriate. 3. That any service gaps are clearly identified with linked implications / impacts 4. That any future / current resource gaps are identified with linked implications / impacts. 5. That a clearer strategy for communicating ASB issues is established. 		
<p>Methodology/ Approach (what types of enquiry will be used to gather evidence and why)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documentary evidence and best practice • Interviews with Estate Managers, Canact Team, RSLs, YOT, Police, Probation Services, Tenant groups, Tenants ASB Panel, Elmore Team 		
<p>Projected start date</p>	<p>Sept 08</p>	<p>Draft Report Deadline</p>	<p>Feb / March 09</p>

Meeting Frequency	Monthly - Fortnightly	Projected completion date	March 09
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------

Appendix 2 - CEB Report Risk Register

Risk Score **Impact Score:** 1 =Insignificant; 2 = Minor; 3 = Moderate; 4 = Major; 5 = Catastrophic **Probability Score:** 1 = Rare; 2 = Unlikely; 3 = Possible; 4 = Likely; 5 = Almost Certain

No.	Risk Description Link to Corporate Obj	Gross Risk		Cause of Risk	Mitigation	Net Risk		Further Management of Risk: Transfer/Accept/Reduce/Avoid		Monitoring Effectiveness				Current Risk	
		I	P			I	P	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	I	P		
1	Failure to deliver scrutiny recommendations would impact on the following corporate priorities: stronger more inclusive communities, reducing crime and ASB and transform Oxford City Council by improving VFM and service performance.	3	4	Failure to implement recommendations resulting in continued delivery of poor service within an area of significant importance to the Council and community.	Mitigating Control: Level of Effectiveness: (HML) Detailed joint action plans produced by the Tenancy Services and Community Safety Teams with attached timescales for delivery.	1	2	Action: Action Owner: Community Safety Manager & Tenancy Operations Manager Mitigating Control: Control Owner: Community Safety Manager & Tenancy Operations Manager	Outcome required: Milestone Date:	Q 1 ☹	Q 2 ☹	Q 3 ☹	Q 4 ☹	I	P