



Report to Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee

Report of: Dean Butterworth (Interim Head of Community Safety)

Subject: Review of the Partner Resource Allocation Meeting (PRAM)

Author of Report: Simon Mitchell, Safer Neighbourhood Manager, 273 5971

Summary:

The Partner Resource Allocation Meeting (PRAM) was introduced in August 2012 to improve the way in which we identify and support the most vulnerable people in Sheffield experiencing anti-social behaviour.

This report provides detail on the progress of PRAM and includes feedback from a Local Government Association review of PRAM in June 2013.

The Scrutiny Committee is asked to provide views and comments on the recommendations for strengthening PRAM and our approach to preventing and tackling ASB across the city.

Type of item: The report author should tick the appropriate box

Reviewing of existing policy	
Informing the development of new policy	
Statutory consultation	
Performance / budget monitoring report	
Cabinet request for scrutiny	
Full Council request for scrutiny	
Community Assembly request for scrutiny	
Call-in of Cabinet decision	
Briefing paper for the Scrutiny Committee	X
Other	

The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:

The Committee is asked to consider the proposals and provide views, comments and recommendations.

Background Papers:

Local Government Association PRAM Peer Review

Category of Report: OPEN

**Report of the Interim Head of Community Safety
Review of the Partner resource Allocation Meeting****1. Introduction/Context**

1.1 In August 2012, the Partner Resource Allocation Meeting (PRAM) was introduced to the East of the city in order to:

- Improve the way in which we identify and support vulnerable people experiencing ASB;
- Provide leadership and accountability; and
- Better link ASB resources with Health and Social Care colleagues.

1.2 This report provides information on the progress of PRAM as well as providing details on the findings of the Local Government Association who conducted a peer review of PRAM in June 2013.

2. Review of the Partner Resource Allocation Meeting (PRAM)

2.1 The PRAM was introduced to the East of Sheffield in August 2012 following an initial review of the way in which we address anti-social behaviour (ASB). There were a number of issues and gaps that PRAM was designed to address and fill, namely:

- The impact of the 'Pilkington Serious Case Review';
- A lack of consistency in the way that vulnerable people experiencing ASB were identified and supported;
- Questions about how ASB practitioners linked with colleagues in Health and Social Care;
- Inconsistent information sharing between agencies; and
- Providing leadership and accountability.

2.2 The PRAM is a monthly meeting of senior practitioners from a wide range of partner agencies. The meeting is supported by an analytical product which helps to identify vulnerable people and locations experiencing ASB. Agencies are expected to share relevant information, come up with joint solutions and report progress back to the PRAM, with the overall objective of making sure that vulnerable victims of ASB are supported and the ASB dealt with.

2.3 The Local Government Association has provided an independent peer review of Sheffield's PRAM process and has made the following observations:

(+)

- PRAM is well supported both strategically and by frontline practitioners;
- It is dealing with appropriate cases and "there is a sense of enthusiasm and a positive attitude towards problem solving";
- There are strong relationships between agencies;
- Data and intelligence is shared and contributes to the production of meaningful action plans for the most vulnerable people experiencing ASB in the city; and
- There are strong links with other vulnerability forums (e.g.) the Vulnerable Adults Panel, MAAM and MARAC.

(-)

- Some cases that come to the PRAM are not high risk and this can clutter the meeting. This highlights an under-development of the NAG process to successfully filter cases;
- The process might be better informed by the inclusion of other data sets;
- PRAM is currently unable to show how its actions have affected risk in anything more than an anecdotal sense.

2.4 The LGA has further provided a number of recommendations based on their observations which provide a helpful next step, not only for the development of PRAM, but the whole structure for successfully escalating ASB cases. These recommendations are referred to in section 4 of this report.

3 What does this mean for the people of Sheffield?

3.1 Strengthening the PRAM will further ensure that we improve the way in which we identify those most in need of support and provide a more coordinated multi-agency response.

3.2 By extension, and by adopting the main LGA recommendations, we will also reinforce the escalation process for ASB cases ensuring that the majority of cases are dealt with more consistently at an area level.

4. Recommendations

4.1 The Committee is asked to consider the following proposals and provide views and comments:

- The PRAM should focus on only the most high-risk cases. Medium and low risk cases should be dealt with at the NAG;
- NAGs should be consistent in their approach and resourced as a critical part of risk identification and management;
- The role of the NAGs should be redefined and consistently agreed and their relationship with the PRAM clearly set-out, including referral mechanisms for high risk cases;
- In addition the NAGs should concentrate on vulnerable locations and tackling those forms of ASB which require a partnership approach;
- Developing a clear case referral flow-chart will help partners understand what cases should go where;
- A standard risk assessment matrix should be introduced so that the relative risk of each case can be assessed; and
- Work should be progressed to evaluate the impact and cost-saving impact of PRAM;
- Any changes made should be done so with due regard to sustainability in light of the continued reduction in Council and partner resources.