

Judgment criteria for graded inspections

In assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of police forces, HMIC has made graded judgments in some areas.

Effectiveness

The crime inspection (fieldwork carried out between September 2014 and October 2014) provides the evidence to make graded judgments against three of the six effectiveness questions in this first PEEL assessment. For the purposes of the first inspection, graded judgments were only made in respect of the first three questions:

- How effective is the force at reducing crime and preventing offending?
- How effective is the force at investigating offending?
- How effective is the force at tackling anti-social behaviour (ASB)?

Every force has been given a graded judgment for each of the three questions above. These are:

- Outstanding
- Good
- Requires Improvement
- Inadequate

Graded judgments are made against published judgment criteria which define the expected standards against each of the above.

HMIC has reached a judgment after applying professional judgment to the available evidence.

The judgment criteria for the effectiveness questions set out the characteristics for each grade to provide an indication of the expected levels of performance. They are examples to help assess the graded judgments. They are not intended to prescribe

specific standards, or to be exhaustive lists of how forces are expected to perform at these levels.

Outstanding grade characteristics: How effective is the force at reducing crime and preventing offending?

The force has carried out a systematic assessment of the demand, threat risk and harm that it faces. This draws on a wide range of information and intelligence from a variety of sources and takes account of critical factors, including national requirements.

Force leaders set and champion clear strategic priorities in relation to crime reduction, preventing offending and anti-social behaviour (ASB). There is strong, visible leadership within the force and in the community.

The force identifies risks to victims and the wider community. It prioritises those at risk of becoming a victim. It gathers community intelligence, then uses a range of proactive policing tactics to reduce crime and prevent offending against these victims.

The force consistently uses the fullest range of possible investigative outcomes (prosecution, caution, community sanctions, etc.) to reduce crime and ASB. The force consistently considers the views and needs of the victim in determining the most appropriate result.

Victims are consistently at the centre of the force's policies and activities. The force has robust processes in place to ensure safeguarding and to protect the most vulnerable from becoming victims or perpetrators. There is excellent understanding at all levels of the organisation of: the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime, the enhanced support some victims are entitled to, and, provision of support throughout the victim journey. Staff consistently meet their obligations under the code.

The force is committed to crime prevention, ensuring victims are satisfied with the treatment they receive at the hands of police and working with communities. The force understands the contribution these make to reducing crime and increasing public confidence. The force prioritises the resources necessary to support this activity (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

The force has a systematic approach to reducing crime. It analyses the demand it faces to ensure it is able to deploy the right resources at the right time (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

Staff at all levels of the force consistently show commitment to effective crime reduction and the prevention of offending. Operational activity is clearly focused on crime prevention. Proactive and reactive measures regularly used. This focus is communicated consistently to all officers and staff and there are measures in place to check understanding.

The force uses its strong relationships with partners in order to identify offenders and

reduce reoffending rates. In conjunction with partners it provides protection to those most vulnerable, either as victims or perpetrators (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

The public receives strong and consistent levels of service in relation to crime reduction, satisfaction and the outcome of investigations.

The force has strong relationships with other local organisations. It is committed to these relationships through shared resourcing, understanding and goals, and invests in these relationships at all levels to prevent and reduce crime and ASB (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

The force employs a wide range of proactive and reactive tactics, utilising partners, neighbourhood officers, investigators and support functions to reduce crime/ ASB and prevent offending (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

There are consistent and systematic processes across the force to review activity and identify “what works”. This is used to continuously improve performance and service to the public.

The force consistently makes use of practices which have been proven to work to improve the way it reduces crime and prevents offending. It has a clear understanding of the needs of victims and witnesses in relation to their treatment.

The force consistently provides staff with opportunities for learning and development to improve their ability to prevent and reduce crime and ASB. The force consistently evaluates the impact of this training on services to the public.

Good grade characteristics: How effective is the force at reducing crime and preventing offending?

The force has carried out an assessment of the demand, threat risk and harm that it faces. This draws on a range of information and intelligence from a variety of sources and takes account of critical factors, including some national requirements.

The force leaders set and drive strategic priorities in relation to crime reduction, preventing offending and anti-social behaviour (ASB). These influence both the allocation of resources and daily activity within the force.

The force identifies risks to victims and the wider community most of the time. It prioritises those at risk of becoming a victim. It uses some preventive and proactive policing tactics to reduce crime and prevent offending against these victims.

The force uses a range of possible investigative outcomes (prosecution, caution, community sanctions, etc.) for crime and ASB, and considers the views and needs of the victim when determining the most appropriate result.

Victims are at the centre of policing activity. The force has processes in place to ensure safeguarding and to protect the most vulnerable, to prevent them from becoming victims or perpetrators. Staff that have contact with the public know about the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime. They are able to provide: the enhanced support some victims are entitled to and, provision of support throughout the victim journey with staff meeting their obligations under the code.

The force is committed to crime prevention and working with communities. It understands the contribution this makes to public confidence. It has considered and allocated the resources necessary to support this activity. Staff across the force show commitment to effective crime reduction and the prevention of offending (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

The force understands why crime is reducing or increasing. It uses demand analysis to deploy the right resources at the right time (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

Resources are allocated to crime prevention and operational activity takes account of this priority. The need for crime prevention is communicated to all officers and staff with measures in place to check understanding.

The public are satisfied with the level of service they receive in relation to crime reduction and investigative outcomes.

The force has relationships with partners that identify offenders and reduce reoffending rates. It provides protection to those most vulnerable, either as victims or perpetrators (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual

offences).

The force uses a range of proactive and reactive tactics, utilising partners, neighbourhood officers, investigators and support functions to reduce crime/ ASB and prevent offending.

The force has processes to review activity and identify “what works”. This is used to improve performance and service to the public.

The force makes some use of evidence based practice to improve the way it reduces crime and prevents offending. It has an understanding of the needs of victims and witnesses in relation to their treatment.

The force provides staff with appropriate learning and development to improve their ability to prevent and reduce crime and ASB, with evaluation of the impact of this on service to the public.

Requires improvement grade characteristics: How effective is the force at reducing crime and preventing offending?

The force has carried out a limited assessment of the demand, threat risk and harm that it faces. This draws on a narrow range of information and intelligence from sources but takes account of some critical factors, including some national requirements.

The force leadership has some priorities in relation to crime reduction, preventing offending and ASB. The priorities are not clear and/or do not appear to influence daily activity within the force.

The force does not consistently identify risks to victims and the wider community. It does not consistently prioritise those most at risk, or does not have a system by which to do so. It makes limited use of preventive or proactive policing tactics to reduce crime and prevent offending.

The force uses a limited range of possible investigative outcomes (prosecution, caution, community sanctions, etc.) for crime and ASB, and does not routinely consider the views and needs of the victim in determining the most appropriate result.

Victims are not consistently at the centre of policing activity. The force has some processes in place to ensure safeguarding and to protect the most vulnerable, to prevent them from becoming victims or perpetrators. There is a limited understanding at all levels of the force about the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime, the enhanced support some victims are entitled to and provision of support throughout the victim journey. Only a small number of victims are provided with support as set out in the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime.

The force demonstrates limited commitment to prevention and community engagement. The force has some understanding of how this contributes to performance and public confidence. It has only partially considered or allocated limited resources to support this activity (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

The force does not fully understand why crime is falling or increasing. There is limited use of demand analysis or evidence that the force deploys the right resources at the right time (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

Limited resources are allocated to crime prevention and crime prevention is not routinely reflected in operational activity. The importance of crime prevention activity is not communicated to all officers and staff.

The force has limited success at working consistently with partners to identify

offenders and reduce reoffending rates. It provides inconsistent protection to those most vulnerable, either as victims or perpetrators (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

A limited number of staff across the force show commitment to effective crime reduction and the prevention of offending.

The public receives a variable level of service in relation to crime reduction, satisfaction and investigative outcomes.

The force does not consistently work with partners to identify offenders and reduce reoffending rates. Partnerships lack substance and the police presence at meetings does not translate into operational practice which leads to reduction in crime. The force provides limited protection to those most vulnerable, either as victims or perpetrators (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

The force employs a limited range of proactive and reactive tactics, with limited evidence of partners, neighbourhood officers, investigators and support functions being used to reduce crime/ ASB and prevent offending (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

The force does not consistently review activity, identify “what works” or use this to improve performance and service to the public (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

The force makes limited use of evidence based practice to improve the way it reduces crime and prevents offending. It has limited understanding of the needs of victims and witnesses.

Opportunities for learning and development for staff to improve their ability to prevent and reduce crime and ASB are limited, not consistent across the force, and there is little evaluation of their impact.

Inadequate grade characteristics: How effective is the force at reducing crime and preventing offending?

The force has not carried out any recent assessment (within the last 12 months) of the demand, threat risk and harm that is faced by the public. It makes no, or limited, reference to national threats in any plans.

The force leadership has not set clear strategic priorities in relation to crime reduction, preventing offending or ASB. There is little evidence of force priorities influencing daily activity of officers and staff.

The force can not readily identify risks to victims and the community, or struggles to prioritise the needs of victims to reduce crime and prevent offending through proactive and preventive policing.

The force focuses upon, or operates a system which permits, only a very limited range of possible outcomes investigative outcomes (prosecution, caution, community sanctions, etc) for crime and ASB, and does not seek or prioritise the views or needs of the victim in determining the most appropriate course of action.

Victims are not at the centre of policing activity. The force has weak processes in place to safeguard and protect the most vulnerable from becoming victims or perpetrators. There is little understanding at any level of the organisation of the Code of Practice for Victims, the enhanced support some victims are entitled to and provision of support throughout the victim journey with staff rarely meeting their obligations under the code.

There is limited demonstrable commitment to crime prevention. The force has not allocated the resources necessary to support this activity (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

The force does not understand why crime is reducing or increasing. There is little evidence that reductions in crime have been driven by the use of demand analysis, and deploying the right resources at the right time (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

Crime prevention is not obvious in operational activity. The importance of crime prevention activity is not communicated to all officers and staff.

The force does not consistently use partners, neighbourhood officers, investigators and support functions to reduce crime/ASB and offending (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

Staff across the force do not show commitment to crime reduction and the prevention of offending.

The public receives a comparatively poor service in relation to crime reduction,

satisfaction and investigative outcomes.

The force has limited or weak relationships with local organisations; it makes little contribution to them to prevent and reduce crime and ASB. There is no evidence of co-funding, limited attendance at meetings, and little perceived value in the police contribution to partnerships (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

There is little evidence of the force employing proactive and reactive tactics, or using partners, neighbourhood officers, investigators and support functions to reduce crime/ ASB and prevent offending.

The force does not routinely review activity, or identify “what works” in order to improve performance and service to the public (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

The force makes little use of evidence based practice to improve the way it reduces crime and prevents offending. It has little understanding of the needs of victims and witnesses in relation to their treatment.

The force does not provide opportunities for staff to learn and develop, to improve their ability to prevent and reduce crime and ASB. The force has limited or no processes to evaluate the impact of such training.

Outstanding grade characteristics: How effective is the force at investigating offending?

All staff who are involved from first point of contact through to the point of conclusion are highly skilled and trained with individual training and development assessments; with plans and reviews in place to ensure continuous personal and professional development needs are met.

There is a strong focus on supporting victims in the criminal justice system which helps to reduce failed prosecutions. The force has a method in place to ensure it can learn from unsuccessful investigations and ensures that any learning is disseminated and acted upon.

The force places the victim at the centre of everything it does. It always ensures there are measures in place to ensure the best evidence is obtained (e.g. specialist interviewing, safeguarding and adherence to the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime). This is evident throughout the time the victim is involved with the police.

Investigators provide tailored support to victims who are most at risk of being victimised or vulnerable. Staff consistently recognise those entitled to additional measures and enhanced status and properly support them throughout the time the victim is involved with the police. There is a strong relationship with both the CPS and Witness Care services. Special measures are consistently requested at an early stage.

The force consistently makes use of current best practice and uses a broad spectrum of investigative approaches including the use of specialised support functions (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences). The force encourages innovation to ensure the best result for victims.

There is rigorous and effective oversight of all investigations; the force actively supervises staff and investigations, consistently using accredited and qualified specialists (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences). Case files consistently meet national standards.

The force constantly reviews its investigative methods to increase the likelihood of positive early resolutions (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences). There is full use of relevant intelligence and supervisors assure the quality of investigative practice. The force has robust, transparent procedures for reviewing investigations and results, including decisions to take no further action. Supervisors and investigating officers are comfortable giving and receiving challenge about decision making. The best interests of the public and the victims are recorded and fully considered.

The force is committed, invests in the skills and capability of staff, and a shared understanding, to a systematic partnership approach to prevent and detect crime

through the early identification of, and early intervention with, persistent offenders, (e.g. through IOM).

The force is committed to providing learning and development for the workforce. This includes evidence based good practice, such as authorised professional practice, professionalising the investigative process (PIP) and the tools provided by the College of Policing, to drive improvement at all levels of investigation. There is a method for evaluating the impact of this learning and its contribution to improvement in the services being provided.

Good grade characteristics: How effective is the force at investigating offending?

All staff involved in an investigation from first point of contact through to point of conclusion have the necessary skills and training to conduct a thorough investigation (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences). Training needs are continually assessed and monitored.

The force follows a victim-centred approach ensuring measures to achieve best evidence are regularly used. (E.g. specialist interviewing, safeguarding and adherence to the victims code) This is evident through the consistency of victim contact with the police.

The force protects those most at risk, recognising those entitled to additional measures and enhanced status. The force supports them throughout the time the victim is involved with the police.

The force has assessed its investigative processes and investigative outcomes and makes use of best practice. It uses a range of investigative approaches including the use of specialised support functions (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

There is oversight of all investigations; supervisors oversee staff and investigations, and accredited and qualified specialists are regularly used (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences). Case files meet national standards.

The force reviews its investigative procedures to promote the likelihood of a positive, early resolution (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences). Relevant intelligence is used and quality assured. The force has procedures for reviewing investigations and investigative outcomes, including decisions to take no further action. Interests of the public and the victims are recorded and fully considered.

The force has a systematic partnership approach to prevent and detect crime through the early identification of, and early intervention with, persistent offenders, (e.g. through IOM).

The force provides some learning and development for the workforce to improve their investigative skills. This includes promoting evidence based best practice, authorised professional practice, professionalising the investigative process and the tools provided by the College of Policing to drive improvement at all levels of investigation. There is evaluation of learning and its contribution to improvement in service.

Requires improvement grade characteristics: How effective is the force at investigating offending?

There are inconsistencies in the level of skills and training in the staff involved in the investigative process from first point of contact through to point of conclusion. There is limited supervision of staff and investigations. The force misses opportunities to use accredited and qualified specialists (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences).

The force has only a limited recognition of the need for a victim centred approach. It does not consistently ensure measures to achieve best evidence are regularly used. (e.g. specialist interviewing, safeguarding and adherence to the victims code).

The force has a limited range of processes, or a single process which does not always meet the needs of victims or protect those most at risk. It does not consistently recognise those entitled to additional measures and enhanced status and provides only limited support to such victims throughout the time the victim is involved with the police

There is limited oversight of investigations. Supervisors are not routinely included in advising and challenging staff on investigations. Accredited and qualified specialists are only used on a limited basis. Case files do not consistently meet national standards.

There is a lack of focus on positive, early resolution (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences). There is limited use of relevant intelligence and limited quality assurance. The force has limited procedures for reviewing investigations and investigative outcomes including decisions to take no further action. Interests of the public and the victims are not consistently recorded or considered.

The force has not compared itself with others and is not making use of current best practice or a broad spectrum of investigative approaches (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences). Availability of specialised support functions is limited.

The force provides limited protection for those most at risk. It regularly fails to recognise those entitled to additional measures and enhanced status. It does not routinely support victims throughout the investigation and any subsequent trials.

There is limited or inconsistent evidence of supervisory oversight of investigations or investigative staff, or the supervision lacks quality. Accredited and qualified specialists are not consistently available (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences). Case files do not meet national standards most of the time.

The force is not fully tackling persistent offenders, in order to prevent or detect crime (e.g. through IOM). There is room for improvement in its partnership working and its approaches to early identification of and early intervention with such offenders.

The force provides limited or inconsistent learning and development for the workforce. This includes evidence based best practice, authorised professional practice, professionalising the investigative process and the tools provided by the College of Policing to drive improvement at all levels of investigation. There is no method for evaluating the impact of this learning and its contribution to improvement in service for the public.

Inadequate grade characteristics: How effective is the force at investigating offending?

Too few staff involved in the investigative process have the correct skills and training to investigate from first point of contact through to point of conclusion (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences) . Training and development needs are not routinely reassessed or addressed.

Investigators rarely provide support to victims who are most at risk or vulnerable. Staff consistently fail to recognise those entitled to additional measures and enhanced status and to properly support them throughout the time the victim is involved with the police. There is a weak relationship with the CPS and witness care services. Special measures are not inconsistently requested at an early stage.

The force does not take a victim-centred approach. It fails to ensure measures to achieve best evidence are regularly used. (e.g. specialist interviewing, safeguarding and adherence to the victims code). This failure is evident throughout the time the victim is involved with the police.

There is little evidence of supervisory oversight of investigations or investigative staff, or the supervision lacks quality. Accredited and qualified specialists are not consistently available (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences). Case files do not meet national standards.

The force does not have a functioning investigative process. There is a lack of focus on a positive, early resolution (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences). There is little use of relevant intelligence and little / no evidence of quality assurance. The force has limited procedures for reviewing investigations and investigative outcomes, including decisions to take no further action. Interests of the public and the victims are rarely recorded or considered.

The force fails to adopt or make use of current best practice (specifically in relation to burglary, violent crime and serious sexual offences). It does not deploy a broad spectrum of investigative approaches including specialised support functions. It only uses a limited range of investigative approaches, often failing to use specialised support functions where appropriate and the best resolution for victims are rarely met.

The force lacks commitment to working with partners to tackle persistent offenders, or recognition that it both prevents and detects crime (e.g. through IOM).

The force lacks commitment to providing learning and development for the workforce. There is little evidence of the force recognising this development need or its contribution to improvement in service.

Outstanding grade characteristics: How effective is the force at tackling anti-social behaviour (ASB)?

Force leaders are committed to public engagement, both formal and informal. This leads to continuous improvement in the service the force provides to the community.

The force combines consistent, meaningful public engagement with the comprehensive use of all available legislation to disrupt, reduce and prevent anti-social behaviour, and safeguard vulnerable and / or repeat victims.

The force listens to the public and the partners the force works with. It has a commitment to a problem solving approach with the community and can demonstrate the success of its work on ASB from both short and long term initiatives.

The force prioritises work to tackle ASB. It has dedicated, well-resourced and well briefed teams working proactively in the community on ASB. The activity of the force is clearly linked to organisational and community priorities.

The force gathers, analyses and regularly distributes data and intelligence on ASB across the force. This analysis is consistently used to improve the service the force provides to the community.

The force has in place a consistent, robust method to identify repeat victims and / or locations to focus resources to disrupt / reduce / prevent ASB and prioritise vulnerable victims.

The force has strong relationships with partners to tackle ASB. This is evidence through shared resources, constructive attendance at meetings and shared understanding of problems relating to anti-social behaviour.

The force consistently works with partners to identify risks and to provide cohesive responses and early intervention to prevent the escalation of anti-social behaviour into sustained abuse, hate, and/or serious crime.

The force consistently provides appropriate training and resources to tackle incidents of anti-social behaviour, supports joint initiatives with partners, and encourages staff to build and drive activity with external partners.

Good grade characteristics: How effective is the force at tackling anti-social behaviour (ASB)?

Force leaders engage the public both formally and informally, force leaders communicate this to officers and staff in a way that positively influences their daily activity.

The force uses available legislation to disrupt, reduce and prevent anti-social behaviour and safeguard vulnerable and / or repeat victims.

The force focuses on results by listening to the public and its partners. It has a commitment to problem solving and can demonstrate successful outcomes from initiatives.

The force has dedicated teams working in the community, carrying out proactive activity relating to crime prevention, crime reduction and ASB, which is clearly linked to organisational and community priorities.

The force gathers and analyses data and intelligence about anti-social behaviour, which is distributed within the force. This analysis is used to improve the service it provides to the community.

The force has in place a method to identify repeat victims and / or locations to focus resources to disrupt / reduce / prevent ASB and prioritise vulnerable victims.

The force has strong partnerships, both statutory and voluntary, focused on anti-social behaviour, and works closely with these partners to accurately identify risks and priorities. The force contributes to joint plans for tackling anti-social behaviour.

The force works with partners to identify risks and to provide responses that can prevent the escalation of anti-social behaviour into sustained abuse, hate, and/or serious crime.

The force provides training and resources for staff to tackle incidents of anti-social behaviour. It supports joint initiatives with partners and, communicates with staff to build and drive activity with external partners.

Requires improvement grade characteristics: How effective is the force at tackling anti-social behaviour (ASB)?

Force leaders do not provide consistent or coherent commitment to public engagement. The force does not use the views of the public to improve the daily activity of the force.

The force meets the needs of some victims. It uses public co-operation and legislation to disrupt, reduce and prevent anti-social behaviour and safeguard vulnerable and / or repeat victims but could use a wider range of the legislative tools that are available.

The force focuses on short term results rather than long term problem solving. It has a problem solving approach, but it is not systematically applied. The force can evidence some successful outcomes from initiatives.

The force has teams working in the community, carrying out activity relating to crime prevention, crime reduction and ASB, that is loosely linked to organisational and community priorities.

The force has an inconsistent system for gathering and analysing data and intelligence about anti-social behaviour. This information is not distributed widely or easily accessible. This analysis is not consistently used to improve the service provided.

The force has a method in place to identify repeat victims and / or locations to focus resources to disrupt / reduce / prevent ASB and prioritise vulnerable victims.

The force has an inconsistent approach to identifying repeat victims and/or locations. It does not consistently focus resources to disrupt / reduce / prevent ASB and prioritise vulnerable victims.

The force has limited consultation with partners to deal with anti-social behaviour. When the force does work with partners, it is to identify general risks and priorities only.

The force works with a narrow field of easily reached partners to identify risks or provide responses to prevent the escalation of anti-social behaviour into sustained abuse, hate, and/or serious crime.

The force provides limited training and resources to tackle incidents of anti-social behaviour. It occasionally supports joint initiatives with partners, but is inconsistent in the way it engages with external organisations to build and drive activity.

Inadequate grade characteristics: How effective is the force at tackling anti-social behaviour (ASB)?

There is limited or no visible commitment from senior leaders to public engagement. There is no evidence of continuous improvement in the service it provides to the community.

The force does not consistently meet the needs of victims and lacks meaningful engagement with the public. It does not consistently use legislation to disrupt, reduce and prevent anti-social behaviour and safeguard vulnerable and / or repeat victims.

There is little or no evidence that intelligence gained from listening to the public and partners is used to drive activity. The force has no clear commitment to a problem solving approach and struggles to evidence successful results from short or long term initiatives.

There is limited or no evidence of teams working proactively in the community, on crime prevention, crime reduction and ASB.

Methods for gathering and regularly analysing data and intelligence about anti-social behaviour do not produce useful information for staff. Distribution of that data is partial and infrequent. Analysis is not systematically used to improve the service provided to the community by the force.

The force has a weak or limited system for identifying repeat victims and / or locations. It has limited success in focusing resources to disrupt / reduce / prevent ASB and prioritise vulnerable victims.

The force has weak relationships with local organisations, either statutory or voluntary sector. The relationships lack focus on tackling anti-social behaviour.

The force does not work consistently with partners to identify risks and/or provide cohesive responses to prevent the escalation of anti-social behaviour into sustained abuse, hate, and/or serious crime.

The force does not provide suitable training or prioritise resources to tackle incidents of anti-social behaviour. It does not support joint initiatives with partners, or, communicate with staff the need to build and drive activity with external organisations.