Inputs | Activities | Outputs | Outcomes (Medium-term) | Impacts (Long-term)

Inputs

Financial
- £1,058,313 Home Office funding 23/24
- £1,047,170 indicative Home Office funding 24/25
- £566,992 Grip funding 23/24

VRP model
Serious Violence Reduction Partnership: nine specified or relevant authorities
Violence Reduction Unit and co-located GRIP personnel
Governance – Serious Violence Reduction Partnership (SVRP)
Delivery structure - Centralised VRU

Resources
Multi-agency working:
- Existing multi-agency partnerships
- Specified and relevant authorities
- Third sector and community organisations
- Serious Violence Duty

Data sharing/analysis
- Existing SNAs
- Networks with local authority analysts
- Existing data sharing agreements and arrangements
- Thames Valley partnership to establish Hampshire and Isle of Wight Together (HIT)

Young people and communities:
- Existing forums including OPCC Youth Commission
- Partners working with young people

Interventions
- VRU and local authority Commissioned interventions
- National evidence of effective interventions including YEF Toolkit

Support
- Guidance from the Home Office
- VRU themed networks
- VRU peer working
- CREST advisory response strategy support
- VRU Basecamp

Ministerial priorities
- Multiagency systems leadership
- Use of evidence and evaluation
- The effective sharing of data between partners

Activities

1. Multiagency and Systems Change
a. Engage executive level leaders in the Serious Violence Reduction Partnership (SVRP) to drive and support multiagency local delivery which is sustainable, trauma informed and builds on existing structures & resources.
b. Coproduce and actively support delivery of a response strategy to reduce harm and meet the SV Duty in response to the Strategic Needs Assessment.
c. Tactical Violence Reduction Partnership (TVRP) will promote the development of multiagency systems to produce effective problem solving to support at-risk individuals, communities and geographical hotspots
d. Seek to embed automated, data-led system responses

2. Data & Analysis
a. Specified and relevant authorities attend and collaborate at Data and Analysis Working Group (DAWG)
b. Collaborate and coproduce Strategic Needs Assessment (SNA) which meets the needs of specified authorities and CSPs.
c. Develop a partnership data tracker to increase understanding of partnership data relevant to SV and its drivers
d. Work with Information Governance to break down barriers to data sharing and where necessary formalise arrangements
e. Develop Outcomes Based Performance Framework to monitor progress
f. Develop Hampshire and Isle of Wight Together (HIOWT) common data platform and share using automation
g. Use partnership data to identify individuals, communities and geographic locations at increased risk of SV

3. Engagement
a. Specified and relevant authorities attend and collaborate at Engagement and Comms working groups
b. Map and carry out gap analysis of existing partnership engagement with communities and young people
c. Work in partnership to ensure that the community voice is consistently captured and informs activity
d. Ensure community voice captures cohorts most impacted by violence

Communications
a. Create VRP brand and website to communicate with partners and public
b. Celebrate and highlight work of communities and the VRP working together
c. Develop a strengths based counter-narrative

4. Interventions, Evaluation & Opportunities
a. Conduct gap analysis of existing provision within communities
b. Use the academic evidence base to inform commissioning decisions
c. Develop interventions with and for communities
d. Carry out joint commissioning for efficient and effective delivery
e. Submit joint bids that promote broad provision by a consortium of providers
f. Champion a public health approach which evaluates interventions to understand 'what works'
g. Incorporate learning from performance data and evaluations into the VRP strategy

Outputs

Multiagency & Systems Change
- Specified and relevant authorities' attendance at SVRP meetings
- Response strategy to drive VRP activity
- Partners' attendance at TVRP meetings
- Multiagency activities in response to at-risk individuals, communities and geographical hotspots
- Specified and relevant authorities accessing and sharing data via Hampshire and Isle of Wight Together

Data & Analysis
- Specified and relevant authorities' attendance at DAWG meetings
- Strategic Needs Assessment to understand the local picture of violence and inform priorities within the response strategy
- Partnership data tracker to monitor data sharing, barriers and actions
- Outcomes Based Performance Framework to monitor progress against the VRP strategic objectives
- Hampshire and Isle of Wight Together shared data platform
- List of at-risk people, communities and locations

Engagement
- Specified and relevant authorities' attendance at Engagement and Comms working groups
- Report capturing existing partnership engagement
- Survey for use across HIPS
- Young people, including most impacted cohorts, contributing their views across HIPS

Communications
- Website and products using VRP branding
- Regular communications between VRU and partners via website

Interventions, Evaluation & Opportunities
- Report capturing existing provision within communities
- Evidence based interventions commissioned and delivered with and for communities
- Jointly commissioned interventions
- Joint bids produced in partnership
- Young people, families and professionals reached through interventions
- Robust evaluation reports and lower level monitoring returns of interventions

Outcomes (Medium-term)

Multiagency & Systems Change
- Ownership and accountability to deliver the public health response to SV is shared across the partnership and specified and relevant authorities understand their role
- Violence reduction efforts are sustained in the longer term
- Multiagency working is strengthened and duplication is reduced
- Effectiveness of public health response to violence increases
- Reduced risk to public
- Increased protective factors and decreased offending in at-risk individuals
- Culture of streamlined and rapid data access to inform decisions

Data & Analysis
- Specified and relevant authorities maintain a comprehensive and ongoing understanding of the nature and drivers of SV, and the cohorts and locations impacted
- Access to data is efficient and not resource intensive via HIT
- VRP performance against outcomes is improved
- Partnership response strategy is focussed on priority issues, locations and cohorts

Engagement & Communications
- Partners have a shared responsibility and clear roles in Engagement and Comms using a consistent counter-narrative
- Positive working relationships and collaboration built between partners
- Partners maintain a shared and ongoing understanding of the views and needs of diverse YP and communities which is reflected in the partnership response to violence
- Trust is built between partners and public
- Partners and public are better informed about SV and the partnership response

Interventions, Evaluation & Opportunities
- Decreased risk factors and increased protective factors for young people and communities through evidence based interventions
- Commissioning and bidding processes are strengthened through collaboration
- Evaluation evidence informs the national evidence base for violence reduction
- Developments in the response to violence, including future interventions commissioned, are informed by evidence of the impact of current activities

Impacts (Long-term)

- Partnership response to violence is embedded and sustained through the whole-systems, public health approach
- Effective multi-agency working processes embedded

- Reduction in hospital admissions for assaults with a knife or sharp object
- Reduction in police recorded knife-enabled serious violence
- Reduction in all non-domestic homicides (Home Office Index)
- Reduction in locally defined serious violence
- Reduction in risk factors
- Increase in protective factors

- Increase in public trust in the VRU and partners
- Increase in YP's willingness to engage in support
- Increase in feelings of safety

Rationale

- Increases in serious violence; Hampshire within 20 areas nationally with highest rates

- Recognition of multiple partners responding to SV but not always working together

- Recognition of lack of robust shared data sharing arrangements

- Complex and varied drivers for SV, associated with vulnerability to other poor life outcomes

- Evidence supporting a whole-systems, public health approach to respond to SV

Contextual factors

- Complex geographical landscape; localities experience different problems relating to SV

- Complex web of partners with multiple local authorities within VRP

- Data required is often sensitive and lack of continuity with key gatekeepers impedes Information Governance development and continual sharing

- Risk factors amplified/complicated by Covid-19 and cost of living crisis

Assumptions

- Partners regularly and meaningfully engage with the VRP

- Partners share data with the partnership

- Communities are willing to engage to share their views

- Communities engaged are representative of the area and/or those most affected by violence

- Young people identified as at-risk are willing and able to engage with interventions

- There is sufficient capacity across the partnership to deliver the response to SV

- The response to SV is continued in any future absence of VRU funding

Other contributing factors

- Wider policy/activity affecting the drivers of SV (e.g. county lines and theft) alongside VRP-driven activity

- Co-interventions such as statutory support e.g. social care, received by young people engaging the VRP commissioned interventions

Risks
- Competing priorities cause a lack of partner engagement
- Alternate data sharing arrangements are prioritised by partners
- Insufficient data sharing provides the partnership with an incomplete understanding of local violence and risk factors
- Insufficient public engagement limits the partnership's understanding of public sentiment and so the strategy is not accurately informed by this
- Varied obstacles prevent interventions from delivering as planned
- An end to VRU funding leaves a gap in the facilitation of violence reduction activity