

This briefing note shows the scoring matrix by which the Community Safety Partnership priorities were identified for 2015 – 2016.

The purpose of the Community Safety Partnership Strategic Assessment is to ascertain which of Medway's community safety issues should be prioritised for the coming financial year 2015 – 2016. A scoring matrix is used, which allows for consideration of a range of factors to be considered.

The methodology employed in Medway is commonly used throughout the UK. Factors include:

- Perception of Community Concern
- Volume of Incidents
- Short Term Trend
- Trend Over Time
- Harm
- Partnership Contribution

The results are presented below:

	A: Public Perception	B: Volume	C: Short Term Trend	D: Trend Over Time	E: Harm	F: Partnership Contribution	(A+B+C+D+E)xF TOTAL	Rank
Domestic Abuse	0.5	5	1	3.75	3	100%	13.3	1
Road Safety	3.5	0	0.75	2.25	5	75%	8.6	2
Substance Misuse	5	0	0.75	0.75	2	75%	6.4	3
ASB	3.5	5	0.25	0.75	3	50%	6.3	4
Envirocrime	3	4	0.25	0.75	1	50%	4.5	5
Hate Crime	1	0	1.25	3.75	2	50%	4.0	6
Violent Crime	2	4	1.25	3.75	3	25%	3.5	7
Burglary	4	1	0.25	2.25	2	25%	2.4	8
Sexual Offences	0.5	0	1.25	3.75	3	25%	2.1	9
Criminal Damage	2.5	2	1	1.5	1	25%	2.0	10
Vehicle Crime	1.5	1	1.25	3.75	0	25%	1.9	11
Fires	0.5	0	0.75	0.75	5	25%	1.8	12
Shoplifting	0.5	1	0.75	2.25	1	25%	1.4	13
Robbery	1.5	0	0.5	0.75	2	25%	1.2	14
Theft	0	2	0.75	0.75	1	25%	1.1	15

## **Proposed Priorities**

As the above matrix shows, 5 community safety issues have scored higher than those others assessed. As such, the analyst proposes that The Medway Community Safety Partnership prioritises the following in 2014/15:

- Domestic Abuse
- Road Safety
- Substance Misuse
- ASB
- Envirocrime

However, due to the nature of ASB and Envirocrime, and in line with the current CSP priorities, the analyst proposes that these form one combined priority. The fifth priority therefore has been proposed as 'Reducing Reoffending' as this is a statutory requirement placed on all CSP's and is also a theme that runs through many of the community safety issues examined.

The methodology is explained below.

## Matrix Scoring - Methodology

The following table details how the different categories were assessed and matrix values attributed to achieve a final score. Each matrix category was also attributed a weighting value to indicate the importance or impact that it had in the overall scoring process and therefore establishment of priorities.

Matrix Category	Method	Matrix Scoring	Weighting
<p><b>Public Perception</b></p>	<p>This was identified utilising 2 separate sets of consultation questionnaires – one completed at community engagement events and the other that was emailed to Neighbourhood Watch / PACT groups using email. For each of these 2 sets of questionnaires, respondents were presented with 18 different community safety issues (including crime, ASB, envirocrime, road safety and fires) and asked to select the 5 issues that they believe should be prioritised by the Medway Community Safety Partnership. The results of the completed questionnaires were analysed and the percentage of residents prioritising each community safety issue calculated. A matrix value was then attributed according to the percentage.</p> <p>Once the 2 sets of matrix values were established, an average was taken for each community safety issue and entered into the matrix as a single value.</p>	<p>0 = No data / 0 - 9% of Respondents</p> <p>1 = 10 - 39% of Respondents</p> <p>2 = 20 – 29% of Respondents</p> <p>3 = 30 - 39% of Respondents</p> <p>4 = 40 – 49% of Respondents</p> <p>5 = 50%+ of Respondents</p>	<p>Weighting Value = 1</p>

Matrix Category	Method	Matrix Scoring	Weighting
<b>Volume of Incidents</b>	The volume of incidents was assessed according to the number of incidents recorded within each community safety issue in financial year 2013/14 and matrix values were attributed accordingly.	0 = 0 – 999 incidents 1 = 1000 – 1999 incidents 2 = 2000 – 2999 incidents 3 = 3000 – 3999 incidents 4 = 4000 – 4999 incidents 5 = 5000+ incidents	Weighting Value = 1
<b>Short Term Trend</b>	The short-term trend was established by calculating the percentage change in the number of incidents for each community safety issue between financial years 2012/13 and 2013/14. The percentage change was then allocated a matrix value according to whether there was an increase, decrease or stable number of incidents over time.	0 = No data 1 = Decrease: -11%+ (inclusive) 2 = Decrease: -6% to -10% (inclusive) 3 = Stable: Between -5% & 5% (inclusive) 4 = Increase: 6% - 10% (inclusive) 5 = Increase: 11%+ (inclusive)	Weighting Value = 0.25  Rationale = The short-term trend can be easily influenced by a number of factors such as social events, weather or agency implemented initiatives, thereby providing a misleading result. As such, it was still considered but given a lower weighting value.

Matrix Category	Method	Matrix Scoring	Weighting
<b>Trend over Time</b>	<p>The trend over time was established by calculating the percentage change in the number of incidents for each community safety issue between financial years 2011/12 and 2013/14. The percentage change was then allocated a matrix value according to whether there was an increase, decrease or stable number of incidents over time.</p>	<p>0 = No data            1 = Decrease: -11%+ (inclusive)            2 = Decrease: -6% to -10% (inclusive)            3 = Stable: Between -5% &amp; 5% (inclusive)            4 = Increase: 6% - 10% (inclusive)            5 = Increase: 11%+ (inclusive)</p>	<p>Weighting Value = 0.75</p> <p>Rationale = Whilst slightly more reliable than the short-term trend in identifying emerging issues, an increasing trend over time does not necessarily indicate a current problem, especially if the volume is low. Therefore, a lower weighting was given.</p>
<b>Harm</b>	<p>The total harm of each community safety issue was assessed utilising 4 criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Harm</li> <li>• Harm to Property</li> <li>• Psychological Harm to Individuals</li> <li>• Physical Harm to Individuals</li> </ul> <p>Each element was assigned a score between 1-4 according to the amount of harm they cause. The total for each category was then calculated and allocated a single value. The detailed harm matrix used can be found in Appendix 1.</p>	<p>0 = Total Score of 4 - 5            1 = Total Score of 6 - 7            2 = Total Score of 8 - 9            3 = Total Score of 10 - 11            4 = Total Score of 12 - 13            5 = Total Score of 14 - 15</p>	<p>Weighting Value = 1</p>

Matrix Category	Method	Matrix Scoring	Weighting
<p><b>Partnership Contribution</b></p>	<p>Each Community Safety Issue was also considered from the perspective of the possible contribution that the Medway Community Safety Partnership as a whole could make, as opposed to single agency issues. This was assessed by identifying the number of agencies that could contribute in reducing the total number of incidents or harm.</p> <p>Unlike the specialist agencies of Kent Police, Kent Fire and Rescue Service (KFRS), the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and Medway Council, who each provide more of a specialist service, the Kent Surrey and Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company (KSS CRC) works alongside these agencies and provides a service that cuts across many of the community safety issues examined. As a result, it was excluded from the matrix scoring process.</p>	<p>25% = Contribution possible from one partner</p> <p>50% = Contribution possible from two partners</p> <p>75% = Contribution possible from three partners</p> <p>100% = Contribution possible from four partners</p>	<p>All scores multiplied by this factor</p>

## Matrix Scoring

Once each individual matrix value has been established and its weighting value applied, the final step was to calculate the total for the 15 community safety issues examined. This was calculated by multiplying the sum of individual weighted scoring elements by the partnership contribution element.

This method allows for some components to be given greater importance through the use of weighting, whilst recognising that some issues are the province of only one or a limited number of partner agencies.

## Appendix 1 – Detail of Harm Assessment Table

	Community Harm	Harm to Property	Psychological Harm to Individuals	Physical Harm to Individuals	Cumulative	Overall Harm Score
Vehicle Crime	1	2	1	1	5	0
Shoplifting	2	2	1	1	6	1
Theft	1	3	1	1	6	1
Envirocrime	2	2	1	1	6	1
Criminal Damage	2	3	1	1	7	1
Burglary	2	3	3	1	9	2
Robbery	2	1	3	3	9	2
Hate Crime	2	1	3	3	9	2
Substance Misuse	2	1	3	3	9	2
Violent Crime	2	1	3	4	10	3
Sexual Offences	2	1	4	3	10	3
Domestic Abuse	1	1	4	4	10	3
ASB	3	2	4	2	11	3
Fires	3	4	3	4	14	5
Road Safety	3	4	3	4	14	5

1 = Little / No Harm    2 = Some Harm    3 = Significant Harm    4 = Substantial Harm

### Lead officer:

Tim England  
Head of Safer Communities  
Tel; (01634) 333534  
email: tim.England@medway.gov.uk