

## Inputs

## Activities

## Outputs

## Outcomes

## Impacts

### 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

### 1. Multiagency and Systems Change

- Executive level leaders collaborate at Strategic Violence Reduction Partnership (SVRP)
- Set clear expectations of responsibilities under the SV Duty
- Coproduce and actively support delivery of a response strategy, embedding a public health and trauma informed approach
- Create a plan for sustainability of long-term change
- Through the Tactical Violence Reduction Partnership (TVRP), promote the development of multiagency systems to produce effective problem solving to support individuals, communities and geographical hotspots at-risk of serious violence using automated, data-led cohort identification

### 2. Data & Analysis

- Specified and relevant authorities collaborate at Data and Analysis Working Group (DAWG)
- Annually collaborate and coproduce a Strategic Needs Assessment (SNA) to understand the local picture of violence, inform priorities within the response strategy and meet the needs of specified authorities and CSPs
- Develop and maintain a Partnership Data Tracker to increase and sustain an understanding of data around SV and its drivers
- Work with Information Governance to break down barriers to data sharing and formalise arrangements
- Train partners on data sharing principles and requirements under the SV Duty
- Collaboratively develop and review Outcomes Based Performance Framework to monitor progress towards VRP strategic objectives
- Develop Hampshire and Isle of Wight Together common data platform to meet partnership needs using data science and existing dashboards
- Use partnership data for an automated, data-led system response to identify individuals, communities and geographic locations at increased risk of SV

### 3. Engagement

- Specified and relevant authorities collaborate at Engagement working group
- Map and carry out gap analysis of existing partnership engagement with communities and young people
- Work in partnership to ensure that the community voice is consistently captured and informs activity
- Ensure community voice includes cohorts most impacted by violence
- Develop tools to survey communities to support development of the evidence base
- Scope development of community hubs and partnership opportunities with community assets

### Communications

- Specified and relevant authorities attend and collaborate at Comms working group
- Create VRP brand and website to communicate with partners and public
- Celebrate and highlight work of communities and the VRP working together including meeting the SVD
- Develop a strengths based counter-narrative, including co-production with communities
- Develop a comms strategy

### 4. Interventions, Evaluation & Opportunities

- Specified and relevant authorities collaborate at Interventions, Evaluation and Opportunities working group
- Conduct gap analysis of existing provision within communities
- Use the academic evidence base to inform commissioning decisions
- Champion a public health and trauma informed approach to commissioning, including supporting partners' training
- Develop interventions with and for communities
- Understand local and national funding sources and coordinate joint bids
- Carry out joint commissioning for efficient and effective delivery
- Develop a VRP Commissioning and Evaluation Approach
- Evaluate interventions to understand 'what works'
- Share and incorporate learning from performance data and evaluations into the VRP strategy

### Multiagency & Systems Change

- Specified and relevant authorities' attendance at SVRP meetings
- Positive survey responses re. partners' understanding of roles
- Collaborative response strategy to drive VRP activity
- Sustainability plan
- Partners' attendance at TVRP meetings
- Multiagency activities in response to at-risk individuals, communities and geographical hotspots

### Data & Analysis

- Specified and relevant authorities' attendance at DAWG meetings
- Annual SNA to inform understanding of serious violence and the response strategy
- Partnership Data Tracker to monitor data sharing, barriers and actions
- Outcomes Based Performance Framework to monitor progress against VRP strategic objectives
- Hampshire and Isle of Wight Together shared data platform
- Specified and relevant authorities accessing and sharing data via Hampshire and Isle of Wight Together
- Regularly produced list of at-risk people, communities and locations

### Engagement

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

### Communications

- Specified and relevant authorities' attendance at Comms working groups
- Website, newsletter, social media and products using VRP branding
- Regular communications between VRU and partners
- Comms strategy document

### Interventions, Evaluation & Opportunities

- Specified and relevant authorities' attendance at Interventions, Evaluation and Opportunities working group
- Report capturing existing provision within communities
- Evidence based interventions which have been developed and delivered with and for communities
- Joint bids produced in partnership
- Jointly commissioned interventions
- Young people, families and professionals reached through interventions
- VRP Commissioning and Engagement Approach plan on a page
- Robust evaluation reports
- Monitoring returns from interventions

### 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
- Multiagency working is strengthened and duplication is reduced
- Violence reduction efforts are sustained in the longer term
- Effectiveness of public health response to violence increases
- Reduced risk to public
- Increased protective factors and decreased offending in at-risk individuals

### Data & Analysis

- Specified and relevant authorities maintain an in-depth and ongoing understanding of the nature and drivers of SV, and the cohorts and locations impacted
- Partnership response strategy is data-led and focused on priority issues, locations and cohorts
- Partnership has access to comprehensive body of relevant data
- Partnership response strategy is informed by progress against strategic objectives,
- Access to data is efficient and not resource intensive via Hampshire and Isle of Wight Together
- Culture of streamlined and rapid data access to inform decisions

### 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 young people and communities
- Views of local communities are reflected in the partnership response to violence
- Partners and public are better informed about SV and the partnership response
- Trust is built between partners and public

### Interventions, Evaluation & Opportunities

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

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

-High levels of public trust in the VRU and partners  
-Young people are willing to engage in support  
-Public feel safe

## Contextual factors

### Rationale

- Hampshire within 20 areas nationally with highest rates of serious violence
- Recognition of multiple partners responding to serious violence but not always working together
- Recognition of lack of robust shared data sharing arrangements
- Complex and varied drivers for serious violence, associated with vulnerability to other poor life outcomes
- Evidence supporting a whole-systems, public health approach to respond to serious violence
- Gaps in the national evidence base of what is effective for reducing drivers of serious violence

### 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 include those most affected by violence
- Young people identified as at-risk are willing and able to engage with interventions
- There is sufficient capacity and resource across the partnership to deliver the response to serious violence
- The response to serious violence is continued in any future absence of VRU funding

### Contextual factors

- Complex and varied geographical landscape
- 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 developments and continual sharing
- Risk factors have been amplified and complicated by Covid-19 and the cost of living crisis

### Other contributing factors

- Wider response and prevention policy and 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