

Key Lines of Enquiry

The Chairman has agreed the following key lines of enquiry (KLOE) to assist the Committee in developing questions about the Community Safety Partnership. In addition, some key questions from the Centre for Public Scrutiny's guidance on Scrutiny of Community Safety Partnerships are included.

KLOE:

- Please describe what measures are in place to assist with prevention and early intervention;
- Please explain the process of how children and adults are identified as vulnerable;
- Please explain the process of how children and adults are identified as 'high risk';
- Please explain what support is offered to vulnerable adults and children by Housing Officers, Social Workers and Probation Officers;
- Please explain why cases of domestic abuse are trending to rise;
- With regards to the Positive Pathways Scheme, please explain how it is decided if a child would be suitable to engage with the project;
- With regards to the Safer Places initiative, please explain why this scheme was originally closed, and why it had been decided to relaunch it;
- Please describe what effect extra-police presence has had on antisocial behaviour within Wokingham Town;
- Please give an indication of when the situation of antisocial behaviour in Wokingham Town is expected to have 'significantly improved';
- Please explain what is being done to engage more affected young people with drug misuse services;
- With regards to the Community Safety Partnership 2017/18 Committee update, please describe the progress that has been made in re-establishing a more joined up working, intelligence sharing and communication between Ward Members, the police and other community safety partners;
- Please explain how the Community Safety Partnership's priorities work with the Thames Valley Police and Crime Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan priorities.

Extract from Centre for Public Scrutiny: Scrutiny of Community Safety Partnerships (pg 13):

3.8 Rather than answering all of the questions, Members are advised to pick two or three from each theme to help identify areas that may benefit from scrutiny:

• **Efficiency:**

What are the latest statistics and trends in local crime? How do these compare to average regional and national measures and experiences?

How are the priorities of the CSP established?

Do the CSPs priorities match the interests of the PCC?

What role does each of the responsible authorities play in the CSP's work?

How are the responsible authorities' resources used within the CSP context?

Are all of the responsible authorities fully engaged in the CSP?

Does the CSP allow for joint tasking among the responsible authorities?

Is the CSP actions-oriented?

Are there improvements that can be made in the CSP's delivery of services?

• **Effectiveness:**

Does the CSP have strong leadership?

Does the CSP have a problem-solving approach?

Have the CSP's solutions and programmes proved to be sustainable? What evidence is there to support this claim?

How does the CSP compare with other CSPs in the region in terms of working practices and in relation to tackling crime and disorder?

Does the CSP have the best possible partnership working arrangements in place?

Does the CSP represent value for money? What evidence is there to support this claim?

Would a merger of CSPs improve their effectiveness? What would be the benefits/risks of a merger?

- Understanding local communities:

How is the local community involved in the work of the CSP?

Do the mechanisms for hearing local voices and concerns work effectively?

How are local voices and concerns fed into the CSP's agenda?

What evidence does the CSP provide to show that its work is based on local priorities? Is this evidence robust?

What is the experience of victims of crime within the CSP's area?

- Accountability:

Does the CSP produce data that is fit for purpose?

Does the CSP communicate its work and achievements clearly to the local community?

Is the CSP open to scrutiny and challenge? If not, how could the CSP be more transparent?

Do the responsible authorities share key crime data efficiently?

Does the CSP provide evidence of its successes? Is this evidence robust?

This page is intentionally left blank