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Statutory Changes to Community Safety Partnerships

1. Executive Summary

This instruction notifies probation of the statutory changes to Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) under the Policing and Crime Act 2009, which come into effect on 1 April 2010. They are:

- Probation becoming a responsible authority of CSPs, having previously been a co-operating body.
- A new duty to formulate and implement a strategy to reduce reoffending by adult and young offenders.

It also amends section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act to add a duty for certain defined authorities to consider reducing reoffending in the exercise of all their duties.

It introduces new guidance - *Reducing Reoffending, Cutting Crime, Changing Lives* - that has been specifically developed to help probation and other responsible authorities implement these statutory changes. *The new guidance must be read in conjunction with the guidance published in September 2007 – Delivering Safer communities: A guide to effective partnership working*.

2. Background

Following consultation through the Policing Green Paper published in July 2008, the statutory changes to CSPs were implemented in the Policing and Crime Act 2009, which received Royal Assent on 12 November 2009. Section 108 of the Act makes three substantive changes to the Crime and Disorder Act 1998:

- Probation becoming a responsible authority of CSPs, having previously been a co-operating body. The other responsible authorities are the Police, Police Authorities, Local Authorities, Fire and Rescue Services and Primary Care Trusts.
- It requires CSPs to formulate and implement a strategy “to reduce reoffending”
- It amends section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act to add a duty for certain defined authorities to consider reducing reoffending in the exercise of all their duties.

These new changes will come into force on 1 April 2010.

3. Desired Outcomes

Probation engages fully with CSPs as a responsible authority.

4. Application

All probation trust chief executives, assistant chief officers and probation staff who work with CSPs must read this instruction and the guide, *Reducing Reoffending, Cutting Crime, Changing Lives*, which has been developed to support the statutory changes to CSPs. In particular, probation staff must read the executive summary of the guide (attached) and the chapter which covers probation’s statutory duties as a responsible authority. The full guidance document is

---

1. With effect from 1 March 2010, Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships are now to be referred to as Community Safety Partnerships.
2. The bodies currently listed under Section 17 are: local authorities; police authorities; fire and rescue authorities; joint authorities; national parks authorities; the Broads Authority; the Greater London Authority; Transport for London; and the London Development Agency.
available as a web based tool⁶ and has been arranged to enable probation and partners to readily access relevant sections as and when required.

5. Statutory Requirements

Delivering Safer Communities: A guide to effective partnership working⁵ sets out the statutory requirements of responsible authorities in some detail. Many Probation Trusts have traditionally engaged well with CSPs, effectively acting as responsible authorities in the way they have contributed to strategic assessments, information sharing etc. For such Trusts there will already be a high level of awareness of what the main statutory requirements are for responsible authorities. However, for Trusts where involvement with CSPs has been limited, the statutory requirements will be less familiar and they must ensure that they read the new guidance in conjunction with the more detailed CSP Guidance referred to above and other specialist guidance and toolkits, links for which are provided in the guidance.

6. Resource Impact

An impact assessment on the impact on probation and partners was undertaken before the changes were proposed in the Policing Green Paper.

Since April 2008, the majority of partnership funding for tackling crime and anti-social behaviour has formed part of the Area Based Grant, which funds Local Area Agreements (LAAs) for three years. Local authorities are free to use this non-ring fenced funding as they see fit to support the delivery of local, regional and national priorities in their areas. The Policing and Crime Act 2009 makes no changes to these arrangements, nor does it place any new requirement on probation to provide additional funds to support the work of CSPs.

7. Mandatory Actions

Chief Officers & Chief Executives must ensure that their area is prepared to meet the statutory duties as a responsible authority with effect from 1 April 2010.

8. Guidance


http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/crimereduction055.htm

(signed)

Michael Spurr
Chief Operating Officer

---

⁵ http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/crimereduction055.htm

⁶ http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/guidance_for_effective_partnerships.pdf
EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

Part 1 - INITIAL SCREENING

1. Officers & Unit responsible for completing the assessment

PATRICK LINES
Partnerships Strategy Unit, Offender Management Strategy Directorate,
Criminal Justice Group

2. Name of the policy, strategy, function or project:

Extending the duties of Crime Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) to include reducing re-offending; and making Probation a ‘Responsible Authority’

3. What is the main purpose or aims of the policy, strategy, function or project?

To develop a co-ordinated, improved and more effective partnership approach to reducing re-offending through:

- strengthening the role of the Probation Service on the CDRP;
- facilitating closer working between CDRPs, LCJBs and LSPs; and
- helping CDRPs to meet crime reduction targets by reducing offending and tackling social exclusion.

This approach will reduce re-offending, improve understanding of the link between crime reduction and reducing re-offending, and improve cost-effectiveness in those areas.

It is important to note that these proposals do not alter existing policy in respect of reducing re-offending. Rather they increase the capacity for an improved, better co-ordinated, approach for those bodies that make up the CDRP. These proposals will also lead to a better synergy between work to reduce crime and reduce re-offending recognising that the majority of crime is committed by those who have previously offended.

4. Who will benefit from the policy/strategy/function/project?

Beneficiaries will include:

- **CDRPs** - a strengthened role will promote a level of equality across the country through Probation being required to work with the CDRP in preparing a strategy for the area.

- **Probation** – a more effective and higher profile with other ‘responsible authorities’ on the CDRP - comparable with organisations such as police and local authorities – will increase their influence on proceedings.
Probation Trusts - as ‘responsible authorities’ - will be in a better position to access other funding pools and resources and to jointly commission specific services for offenders to reduce re-offending.

- Offenders – better co-ordinated services;
- Public – will ultimately benefit from living in safer communities as a result of a reduction of re-offending.

5. Has the policy/strategy/function or project been explained to those it might affect directly or indirectly?

Work to reduce re-offending based on the offender “pathways” is already well established. In effect these changes will simply bring about improved co-ordination and agreement on priorities. The proposals were published in the Green paper and subject to discussion with a cross-section of probation and CDRP representatives. Positive responses have been received from various CJ agencies although we are yet to receive any from members of the community.

6. Have you consulted on this policy/strategy/function/project?

Details were published in section 1.39 of the Green Paper (page 21). There was little reported interest in these specific proposals.

7. Please complete the following table and give reasons/comments for where:

(a) the policy/strategy/function/project could have a positive impact on any of the diverse groups or contributed to promoting equality of opportunity and improving relations between groups;

(b) the policy/strategy/function/project could have a negative impact on a diverse group, i.e. disadvantage them in any way. If the impact is high, complete Part 2 - a full equality impact assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diverse Group</th>
<th>E.g. of positive impact</th>
<th>E.g. of negative impact</th>
<th>Reason/comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Focused and better co-ordinated services. Interventions based on need and risk, leading to reduced re-offending and greater social inclusion.</td>
<td>Prioritisation of resources for some tiers of offenders which might lead to de-prioritisation of resources in other offenders. The proposals will mean a greater focus on groups with high rates of re-offending. Though this will vary from area to area it might mean, for</td>
<td>The proposals will not substantively change the way in which groups are identified for interventions. A strategy to reduce re-offending already exists in each area – this approach will rationalise the process and lead to a co-ordinated, more effective system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Prioritisation of Resources</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Focused interventions based on need and risk, leading to reduced re-offending and exclusion amongst women, who would also benefit from greater success with the perpetrators of domestic violence.</td>
<td>Prioritisation of resources unlikely to be comparable to male offenders, based on relative offender population and risk.</td>
<td>Women offenders make up a relatively small proportion of the total offender population. The focus of the strategy (linked as it is to the PSA targets on high volume and serious re-offences) is unlikely to specifically meet all their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British people</td>
<td>Focused interventions based on need, leading to reduced re-offending</td>
<td>Prioritisation of resources for some tiers of offenders leading to de-prioritisation of resources in other offenders. As above, in some areas it is likely that BME groups will be disproportionately represented in the re-offending offender demographic.</td>
<td>Though BME groups may be disproportionately represented within the offender cohort this policy will not alter that except and insofar as improved access to interventions and programmes should lead to a reduction in that disproportionality. The drive to reduce re-offending will lead to safer and stronger communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British people</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White people (including Irish people)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese people</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other racial/ethnic group (please specify)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Race people</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled People (please give details as to)</td>
<td>Focused interventions based on need, leading to reduced re-offending</td>
<td>Prioritisation of resources for some tiers of offenders leading to de-</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Positive (opportunities)</td>
<td>Negative (challenges)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders with mental health needs</td>
<td>Prioritisation of resources in other offenders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay, lesbian and bisexual people</td>
<td>Focused interventions based on need, leading to reduced re-offending (positive)</td>
<td>Prioritisation of resources for some tiers of offenders leading to de-prioritisation of resources in other offenders (negative)</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender people</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people (50+)</td>
<td>Focused interventions based on need, leading to reduced re-offending (positive)</td>
<td>Older offenders are less likely to re-offend, and are therefore unlikely to be prioritised for resources (negative)</td>
<td>Evidence suggests directing resources at older offenders has limited value, as they are near the end of their offending ‘career’. The strategy is unlikely to suggest anything specific targeted only at this group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger people (17 – 25)</td>
<td>Focused interventions based on need, leading to reduced re-offending.</td>
<td>Transition arrangements between the youth and adult systems are not fully aligned, leading to potential disconnect in interventions and resources provided to young offenders.</td>
<td>Strategic aims related to youth offending (those aged up to 18) will not be covered specifically in this strategy, as it will be included within the Youth Crime Action Plan. Whilst alignment will be sought, this could lead to different prioritisations between the youth and adult systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith groups (please specify)</td>
<td>Opportunity to take increased advantage of the commissioning and partnerships environment to support interventions with offenders to reduce re-offending (positive)</td>
<td>Joint commissioning could mean the involvement of faith groups is not maximised, as other partners are prioritised instead (negative)</td>
<td>Whilst not specifically mentioning faith groups, the role of the third sector (including voluntary and community groups) is emphasised through joint commissioning landscape and the contribution they can make to the services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Please give a brief description of how the policy/strategy/function/project will benefit the diverse groups in the above table, i.e. promotes equality.

The proposals will benefit all the diverse groups mentioned in the above table by promoting policies designed to reduce re-offending and increase access to “pathways” and interventions for all affected groups. The proposals will create an environment in which services are co-ordinated and in which agencies work together to reduce re-offending.

9. What actions could be taken to amend the policy/strategy/function/project proposals to eliminate any minor negative impact?

The proposals will only have a minor negative impact, as decisions about prioritisation of resources (time, people, and money) mean there is likely to be an increased focus in those areas where the biggest gains (in terms of reducing re-offending and crime) can be made. However, alongside these proposals local criminal justice agencies will continue to carry out their specific duties that meet the gap for those specific tiers or sub-groups of offenders that have been de-prioritised.

It is also likely that greater success with the offenders who commit the greater volume of re-offences will free up resources that can then be re-directed to the potentially disadvantaged groups redressing the balance.

10. If there is no evidence that the policy/strategy/function/project promotes equality of opportunity or improves relations between diverse groups, what minor adjustments could be made to achieve this?

Is a full Equality Impact Assessment necessary: Yes ☐ No ☒

Date completed:

Signed by Line Manager:

Date approved by Senior Management:

A copy of this initial screening must be published along with the policy/strategy/function/project outline. A copy much be retained by the Unit/Department for audit purposes.

Issue date 08/04/2010
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Guidance on new duties for Community Safety Partnerships in England and Wales
Foreword

We all want our communities to be safe and we must continue to work together to achieve this.

Partnership working between local agencies is central to the delivery of safer communities and improving public confidence, and it has been a key factor in the overall reduction in crime over the past decade.

Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) across England and Wales have become a critical part of the local delivery landscape. They are now in an ideal position to co-ordinate the actions of the police, local authorities, housing providers, health services and other key players, including youth services and third sector organisations, all of which have a significant role in helping successfully reduce reoffending and in keeping communities safe.

We are delighted to be able to build on the strong track record of local partnership delivery by extending the statutory duties of CSPs to include reducing reoffending, and by formalising the critical role of probation by making it the sixth responsible authority of CSPs.

These changes will help responsible authorities focus better on the key elements that keep communities safe. This is particularly important when over half of all crime is committed by those who have already been through the criminal justice system. It will enable a more strategic engagement between CSPs and other local partners, such as the third sector, Local Strategic Partnerships, Local Service Boards and Local Criminal Justice Boards, in planning and commissioning services for offenders. For the first time local partners will be collectively accountable for reducing reoffending.

The critical link between crime reduction and reducing reoffending is clearly recognised in Public Service Agreement 23 ‘Make Communities Safer’. Extending the duties of CSPs will further strengthen this link and formalise the effective joint working that is already underway at a local level through Integrated Offender Management (IOM) and schemes such as Prolific and other Priority Offenders (PPO). These approaches demonstrate our shift in focus from offences to offenders and highlight how effective partnerships can help the prevention and detection of crime and the rehabilitation and resettlement of offenders once they have been punished appropriately.

Success in reducing reoffending can only be achieved by local partners working beyond traditional organisational boundaries. This guidance provides suggested practice and case studies to support the legislative changes to CSPs and help partners embed the new duties within their everyday activities. More effective partnership working as a result of these changes will help to reduce crime and reoffending, protect the public and improve public confidence in the criminal justice system, the police and in other local partners, in a way that allows people to see and feel the difference in their local communities.
Executive summary

PURPOSE OF THE GUIDANCE

Throughout this guidance the term Community Safety Partnership (CSP) will be used to refer to partnerships across England and Wales.

The guidance supports the statutory changes for CSPs contained in Section 108 of the Policing and Crime Act 2009 that come into effect on 1 April 2010:

- a new duty on CSPs to formulate and implement a strategy to reduce reoffending by adult and young offenders
- probation becoming a responsible authority of CSPs, having previously been a co-operating body. The other responsible authorities are: police, police authorities, local authorities, fire and rescue, and health.

As well as these changes to CSPs, Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, which places a duty on certain defined authorities1 to exercise their functions with due regard to the likely effect on, and the need to do all that they reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder, anti-social behaviour, and substance misuse in their area, has been extended to include reducing reoffending.

The changes should:

- improve outcomes for local communities and drive up public confidence by helping partners to deal more effectively with local crime and anti-social behaviour priorities
- further enhance the key role CSPs can play in bringing together and co-ordinating the actions of housing providers, health services, local authorities and other key players, all of which have a critical role in cutting crime and reducing reoffending
- improve CSPs’ access to information on offenders’ characteristics and their needs (for example, access to accommodation) in localities, enhancing the quality of strategic assessments and supporting targeted policing and interventions in known ‘hot spots’ for particular crime types
- strengthen local partners’ levers in negotiating and delivering against national indicators and improvement targets in Local Area Agreements to cut crime and reduce reoffending and social exclusion.

This guidance forms part of the National Support Framework (NSF) for CSPs and its main purpose is to explain:

- the role of CSPs in reducing reoffending
- the statutory duties of responsible authorities of CSPs
- how each of the responsible authorities can contribute to reducing reoffending
- how CSPs can work with prisons, Youth Offending Services, Local Criminal Justice Boards, and the third sector
- the importance of reducing reoffending and the pathways out of offending
- current approaches to offender management.

---

1 The bodies currently listed under Section 17 are: local authorities; police authorities; fire and rescue authorities; joint authorities; national parks authorities; the Broads Authority; the Greater London Authority; Transport for London; and the London Development Agency
Guidance on new duties for Community Safety Partnerships in England and Wales: Executive Summary

This guidance should be used in conjunction with *Delivering Safer Communities: A guide to effective partnership working*[^2], which forms part of the NSF and which sets out the hallmarks of effective partnership working for CSPs[^3].

**THE IMPORTANCE OF REDUCING REOFFENDING**

Reducing reoffending is fundamental to reducing crime in local communities and benefits everyone:

- every offender who becomes an ex-offender means safer streets and fewer victims
- turning people away from crime means less pressure on the resources of the criminal justice system and its delivery partners
- offenders who stop reoffending get the opportunity to repay their debt to society and improve their own life chances, as well as those of their children and families.

Adults and young people convicted of offences are often some of the most socially excluded within society. The majority of offenders have complex and often deep-rooted health and social problems, such as substance misuse, mental health problems, homelessness, high levels of unemployment and possibly debt and financial problems. Tackling these issues is important for addressing the offender’s problems and providing ‘pathways out of offending’, and to break the inter-generational cycle of offending and associated family breakdown.

Partnership working to reduce reoffending should be based on a shared analysis of need and a clear evidence base, building on existing work, including:

- Prolific and other Priority Offender (PPO) schemes
- Drug Interventions Programme (DIP)
- Integrated Offender Management (IOM)[^4]
- Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements[^5] (MAPPA)
- Safeguarding children and vulnerable adults.

**THE ROLE OF COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIPS IN REDUCING REOFFENDING**

The statutory changes provide CSPs with opportunities and tools to build on existing work to tackle crime in local communities. Home Office Regional Deputy Directors in Government Offices, National Offender Management Service (NOMS) Directors of Offender Management, Youth Justice Board (YJB) Heads of Regions and all of their respective representatives in Wales can play a key role advising and guiding CSPs in taking forward their new duties, including signposting access to data and research evidence.

CSP efforts to reduce reoffending should focus on activity at three levels:

- strategic planning to identify the profile of offender activity and needs in the area (for example, access to accommodation) informed by the pathways out of offending, as well as ways to ensure the protection of the community and victims. This should be reflected in the CSP partnership plan and align with the plans of the Local Criminal Justice Board (LCJB) and the NOMS Director of Offender Management (DOM)


[^3]: The hallmarks are: empowered and effective leadership; intelligence-led business processes; engaged communities; effective and responsive delivery structures; visible and constructive accountability; and appropriate skills and knowledge. Annex A provides more information.


Executive summary

- operational activity, informed by information shared among partners, and based on a problem-solving approach to target and reduce offending and protect the public

- at the individual level, case management intervention is required to assess individual offender need, to plan interventions based on this need and to co-ordinate access to these interventions (whether through court ordered statutory offender management or voluntary Integrated Offender Management).

CSPs should seek to integrate work on reducing reoffending with existing work to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour and tackle substance misuse where appropriate, for example, by incorporating reducing reoffending into the partnership plan. In taking forward the new duty, CSPs should find the ASPIRE model, used by probation to underpin statutory Offender Management, helpful:

- Assess the profile of reoffending in the area alongside crime information, drawing on the widest possible range of data streams (including social inclusion data) from existing and new partners, to produce the strategic assessment

- Strategically Plan for action, drawing on needs and evidence-based practice, with agencies contributing resources and commissioning services as appropriate, with consideration of early intervention, diversion from custody, enforcement and social inclusion

- Implement the plan by delivering case management-based interventions, drawing on mainstream and commissioned services and support

- Review performance, drawing wherever possible on existing multi-agency performance frameworks (such as the national indicator set (NIS) in England)

- Evaluate success to review impact on outcomes and ensure value for money.

The model has been adjusted from the original to fit a partnership planning context.

**STATUTORY DUTIES AS A RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY**

In many areas probation already engages well with CSPs as a co-operating body and has an understanding of the statutory requirements of responsible authorities. The new duties will support areas where engagement between probation and CSPs is less well-developed to build relationships and partnership working in a similar way. The creation of Probation Trusts and Local Delivery Units (LDUs) from April 2010 provides a good opportunity for probation to establish or consolidate this new role with CSPs.

Statutory duties for all responsible authorities include:

- agreeing senior appropriate representation on the CSP strategy group (and in the case of two-tier authorities the county co-ordination group), which will vary to reflect differences between unitary and two-tier authorities

- preparing and implementing an annual strategic assessment and three-year partnership plan to address crime and disorder, anti-social behaviour and other factors adversely affecting the environment, substance misuse, and reducing reoffending in the local area

---

6 The new duties only apply to providers of probation services operating within the CSP area in arrangements under section 3 of the Offender Management Act 2007 (www.opsi.gov.uk/Acts/acts2007/ukpga_20070021_en_1) which provides for them to be a responsible authority. Other probation service providers may operate under arrangements which provide for them to be co-operating bodies.

● preparing an information sharing protocol\(^8\) and nominating a designated liaison officer (DLO) from each responsible authority, whose role will be to facilitate the sharing of information with other partners. This includes depersonalised data which, under the Crime and Disorder (Prescribed Information) Regulations 2007,\(^9\) responsible authorities are required to share at least quarterly. The Regulations are being updated in early 2010 to accommodate the addition of probation as a responsible authority

● senior representatives attending one or more public community engagement meetings each year, ensuring that these are well publicised, that steps are taken to reach minority and hard-to-reach groups, and that the information collected from the community engagement is included in the partnership plan

● reviewing, at least once a year, whether the partnership has the requisite skills and knowledge to meet the statutory requirements, including the new duties to reduce reoffending. Probation can play a key role in advising the partnership on specific needs gaps and in sharing expertise

● ensuring that the partnership has in place arrangements for assessing the value for money\(^10\) of activities carried out by, or on behalf of, the partnership. The introduction of the PREview (Probation Resource Exercise View) tool for probation in 2010 should assist this

● engaging with the local authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee’s arrangements for scrutiny of the functioning of the CSP.

Updated implementation checklists for the statutory requirements of unitary and two tier partnerships are available on the Crime Reduction website.\(^{11}\) Delivering Safer Communities: A guide to effective partnership working sets out the statutory requirements of responsible authorities in more detail and provides suggestions on how to embed the hallmarks of effective partnership working.

**RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITIES AND REDUCING REOFFENDING**

This guidance looks at each responsible authority in turn to demonstrate some of the ways they can bring their expertise and experience to benefit the work of CSPs in reducing reoffending and cutting crime, and is not an exhaustive list. The responsible authorities of CSPs are:

● the police
● police authorities
● local authorities
● fire and rescue
● health
● probation (from 1st April 2010).

The guidance also covers suggestions for CSPs working in partnership with prisons, Youth Offending Services, Local Criminal Justice Boards and the third sector.

These statutory changes to CSPs have been developed with the input of local, regional and national stakeholders and provide an opportunity to embed partnership working across a wider range of agencies, to bring closer together the crime reduction and reducing reoffending agendas and to deliver a seamless service to the public in making local communities safer and building public confidence.

---

\(^8\) [www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/toolkits/ui0309.htm](http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/toolkits/ui0309.htm)


\(^10\) [www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/passport_to_evaluation(complete).pdf](http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/passport_to_evaluation(complete).pdf)

\(^11\) [www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/](http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/)