

Discussion

Areas to include

The discussion section should cover the following main areas:

1. Review progress from last strategy.
2. Provide an explanation of the main findings from the audit.
3. Make judgements about which areas may especially require attention.
4. Suggest any areas that may warrant further investigation in the future.
5. Lessons learned through the methods employed within the audit.
6. Review existing crime and disorder reduction and misuse of drugs work
7. Develop draft priorities for the strategy.
8. Consult on the findings of the audit and the draft priorities.

Some suggestions for information that could be included under each heading follow below.

1. Review progress from last strategy

- It is important to review progress on the previous crime and disorder strategy or, for drugs, the previous partnership drugs plan.
- Monitoring and evaluation frameworks established in the last audit and strategy round should provide important information as to what worked well and not so well in the last round.
- In order to ensure effective monitoring of this audit and strategy round refer to the monitoring and evaluation section of [this toolkit \(link\)](#)

2. Explanation of the main findings from the audit

- The main findings from the audit should be summarised in a logical manner. This could include:
 - ✓ The main issues in relation to crime, disorder and substance misuse.
 - ✓ The main characteristics of these issues.
- Possible explanations for these findings should be offered.
- Where possible attempts should be made to integrate the findings into relevant theories. Examples of possible theories are shown below.
- Based on the findings of the audit, simple predictions around the ways in which local crime, disorder and substance misuse trends may fluctuate in the future can be discussed, alongside any influence these may have on

shaping the strategy. For more information on methods for predicting future crime patterns see [Partnership Working](#).

- All DATs will have access to the Home Office's Drug Treatment Demand Model. This estimated demand for treatment based on the flow of persistent drug users into treatment from the criminal justice system and community referrals. There are plans to develop the model further with the aid of a small number of DATs.

Example:

- **Routine activity theory**

This theory says that we should "focus on crime incidents rather than on offenders themselves, examining how these incidents originate in the routine activities of everyday life" More information can be found in *Clarke, R.V. (1997) Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*

- **Rational Choice theory.**

This theory says that crime is committed by rational individuals who balance the advantages of opportunity with the costs of effort, detection and punishment. More information can be found in *Clarke, R.V. (1997) Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*

- **Lifestyle theory.**

This theory says that differential risks of victimisation are partly a function of the victim's lifestyle and a person's work and leisure activities vary their exposure to potential offenders.

3. Make decisions on which areas may especially require attention

- Decisions around strategic priorities should not be pre-empted; instead this process should lay the foundations for developing priority areas for the strategy.
- The responsible authorities and partners need criteria against which they can compare the different crime and disorder and misuse of drugs issues identified by the audit in order to decide upon strategic priorities. These criteria should be clearly articulated e.g. whether crime is compared by volume, rates of impact on victims, problem drug users in area etc. Information on comparison criteria can be found in [Hough and Tilley \(1998\)](#) p. 21-22.
- Show how the identified crime and disorder issues measure up against the chosen criteria.
- On drugs, strategic priorities are set against KPIs and the performance management framework for drugs is set out in the PMRP. However,

decisions around local priorities (which will need to be agreed with GOs in accordance with the performance management framework) will also flow from the audit process.

4. Areas warranting further investigation

- The audit may identify some areas of interest that warrant deeper investigation independent of the audit process. Any further work highlighted by the audit process should be briefly discussed here and also slotted into the partnership's planning processes for action.

5. Lessons learned through the methods employed within the audit

By looking again at the data used and the analysis that was conducted in the audit, useful lessons can be learned and applied in the next round of audits and strategies. Questions that could be considered include:

- Did the data collection, processing and analysis that was conducted work in the desired way?
- How were the stages of data collection/processing/analysis related to one another?
- Was any collection/processing/analysis conducted unnecessary or unused?
- How can the process be improved next time?

6. Review existing crime and disorder reduction and misuse of drugs work

- Are crime and disorder and misuse of drugs issues considered within wider policy making in partner agencies? For example, is the consideration of crime and disorder and misuse of drugs issues reflected within agency planning processes?
- The Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)/measures are linked to the National Drug Strategy (NDS) outcomes, individual policy area outcomes and Public Service Agreements (PSAs) of relevant responsible authorities. The KPIs are embedded in government department's performance management and inspectorate systems. This ensures that responsible authorities come to the partnership table with the consideration of the misuse of drugs already embedded in their planning processes.
- Provide a summary of resources currently allocated to crime and disorder reduction and misuse of drugs.
- Are some current high priority crime and disorder or misuse of drugs needs unmet?
- How will the needs highlighted within the strategy be funded?

- Does the strategy and supporting plan effectively co-ordinate and prioritise through a single local process that brings all the aims of the Drug Strategy with all other relevant agenda?
- Has the guidance in the Performance Management Resource Pack on the formulation of strategies been taken into consideration?
- Consider all relevant KPI , QUANTA and other relevant statistical data and how this can be applied to the strategy
- Consider performance on previous planning and how this can be applied to the devising of the strategy this year.

7. Develop draft priorities for the strategy

- It will be difficult for the partnership to focus effectively on too many primary objectives. The optimal number of priorities may be between five and seven, but it is for partnerships to decide.
- Partnerships are however, expected to negotiate and agree priorities with their Government Office for the Regions/National Assembly for Wales. On drugs, strategic priorities are set against KPIs and the performance management framework for drugs is set out in the PMRP. However, decisions around local priorities (which will need to be agreed with GOs in accordance with the performance management framework) will also flow from the audit process.
- It is good practice for a Partnership to explain the rationale for singling out the draft priorities for action. The Guidance on Statutory Crime and Disorder Partnerships gives some examples of criteria that may influence decision making are:
 - ✓ The issue represents a significant proportion of total crime or drugs misuse.
 - ✓ The issue represents a larger proportion of crime or drugs misuse than in comparable areas.
 - ✓ Rates are higher than in comparable areas.
 - ✓ The issue is increasing faster than other issues, or faster than in comparable areas.
 - ✓ The costs related to the issue are high for victims.
 - ✓ Victims may belong to especially vulnerable groups.
 - ✓ The public are anxious about the issue.
 - ✓ There is something that the partnership can do about the issue.

8. Consult on the findings of the audit and the draft priorities

- Carry out the consultation in line with the processes already laid out within the methodology section.
- Use the feedback from the consultation appropriately in order to help shape the final strategic priorities areas for the partnership.
- Ensure that the links between the consultation on the audit and the development of the strategy are clearly demonstrated.

Issues to consider

Merging the "Findings" and "Discussion" sections

- The findings from an audit could be discussed in the same section as they are presented. Therefore, the "Findings" and "Discussion" sections could be merged and labelled, for example, "Presentation and Discussion of the Findings".

Crime Statistics Tool

- The Crime Statistics Tool is an internet based tool for the public. The tool enables anybody with access to the internet to find out about levels of crime in their local area. When consulting on the findings of the audit, partnerships may want to cross refer to this tool. It will be available on the Home Office Website from February 2004(insert link)

Further Information

Clarke, R.V. (1997) [Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies](#). Criminal Justice Press: New York

Compact (2003) [Compact Code of Good Practice on Community Groups](#). London: Home Office

Home Office (1998). [Guidance on Statutory Crime and Disorder Partnerships](#). London: Home Office.

Home Office Crime Reduction Toolkit [Partnership Working](#). *"Anticipating Future Crime Trends in Crime and Disorder Audits"*.

Hough, M and Tilley, N (1998). [Auditing Crime and Disorder: Guidance for Local Partnerships](#) London: Home Office

National Drugs Strategy – Publications and reports generally at a national or strategic level.

www.drugs.gov.uk/ReportsandPublications/NationalStrategy