

CONFIDENTIAL



Evaluation of Rochdale Families Project Analysis of Police Recorded Incidents Data

John Flint

November 2010

Key Points:

- Analysis of police data for 13 families indicates a reduction from the period prior to Rochdale Families Project intervention compared to the period during project intervention of 57 to 29 recorded incidents, or 50 per cent
- There was a reduction in incidents for seven families and an increase in incidents for four families
- 11 of the families had no recorded incident since August 2010 and three families had no recorded incident during the project intervention period (two of these families had recorded incidents in the period prior to project intervention)
- 12 of the families had a recorded incident (and most had multiple incidents) in the 12 months prior to project intervention, indicating that referral processes are appropriate
- For most families, the recorded incidents were a mix of household members as alleged perpetrators and victims. Although many incidents relate to domestic disputes and concerns for safety/ missing persons, 10 of the 13 families had also been involved in alleged conflict (as perpetrators, victims or both) with individuals external to the household.
- Although there are caveats relating to the small sample size and differing comparative time periods, the data suggest a reduction in incidents, particularly in the second half of 2010 and a consequent reduction in police resources required.

1. Introduction

This report utilises command and control data provided by Greater Manchester Police to provide one quantitative measure of change in the circumstances and behaviour of families being supported by the Rochdale Families Project. Its aim is to complement the qualitative data being generated through other research elements of the evaluation. The presentation of the key findings is followed by an individual account for each family (in Annex 1).

2. Methods

A request was made to Greater Manchester Police for data relating to 14 families receiving support from the Rochdale Families Project who had given consent for agencies to share data about them with the University research team. Data was requested based on family names and addresses. For each family, data was requested for two time periods: the 12 months prior to their being accepted on to the Rochdale Families period and the period from their date of acceptance on to the project to 5 November 2010 (this second period varied for each individual family, from seven to 13 months).

There are five important caveats that need to be considered when analysing the data and reflecting upon the results presented in this report:

1. The sample includes only 13 of the 18 families being supported by the Rochdale Families Project. Four families did not agree to participate in the research and police data were not available for one other family due to family names or addresses not matching police records.
2. The sample size is relatively small and therefore, although we have included a percentage change in our findings, this percentage is subject to large changes as a result of a relatively small number of incidents.
3. The comparative time periods are not equivalent for some families, and in particular the period of project intervention is less than the comparative 12 month pre-project intervention period. The time period for comparing five of the families is only seven months, for the rest of the families it is between nine and 13 months.
4. Although, in our judgement, the patterns of results indicate that the Rochdale Families Project has had a demonstrable impact and will be a significant and consistent variable in understanding and explaining the results, it is not possible to directly and exclusively link changes to this specific intervention as other causal factors may have had an impact.
5. The data is based on police command and control data of reports of alleged incidents and the initial perceptions and actions of police operators and officers. The exact nature of the incidents, the validity of the reports and whether or not an offence has actually been committed cannot be verified by this data. There may also have been incidents during the study time periods involving the families that the police were not notified of.

3. Classification

We have classified the recorded incidents into four categories, in terms of incidents that involve:

- a) Household member(s) as reported perpetrators
- b) Household member(s) as reported victims
- c) Concerns for safety or reports of missing persons
- d) Other circumstances

It should be noted that the same incident may involve household members as both the alleged perpetrators and victims. The specific types of incidents within each category are presented in the notes to Table 1 below.

4. Results

The Scale and Nature of Recorded Incidents

The first finding is that 12 of the 13 families for whom data is available had a recorded incident (and most had multiple recorded incidents) in the 12 months prior to project intervention. This indicates that, despite the majority of cases being referred to the Rochdale Families Project by Heywood Community School, referral processes are appropriate and are accurately targeting vulnerable families. The fact that there were 57 incidents involving 12 of the families in the 12 months prior to project intervention also indicates that considerable police time and resources were involved. Linked to this, although many incidents relate to domestic disputes and concerns for safety/ missing persons, ten of the 13 families had also been involved in alleged conflict (as perpetrators, victims or both) with individuals external to the household. This suggests that these families are involved in (as perpetrators, victims or both) a significant amount of disturbance or disorder within Heywood, with a consequent effect on neighbours and the wider community (we do not have the data to provide the proportion of total recorded incidents in Heywood during the study time period accounted for by these families).

The data indicate the scale of vulnerability and chaotic lifestyles or circumstances within most of the families. The incidents include alleged serious offending, frequent domestic disputes and significant conflict with individuals external to the household.

The results of the data analysis are presented in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Recorded Police Incidents

	Pre-Project	During Project	Change
Household member(s) as reported perpetrator(s) (a)	27	11	-16
Household member(s) as reported victim(s) (b)	19	8	-11
Safety/Missing person	8	6	-2
Other (c)	3	4	+1
TOTAL	57	29	-28 (-50%)

N= 13 families/households/addresses

Note: Household members could be the perpetrators and victims of the same recorded incident.

(a) This includes alleged: grievous bodily harm; actual bodily harm; common assault; racially motivated order/assault; possession of drugs (in some cases with intent to supply); theft (shoplifting); theft (other); handling stolen goods; breach of bail conditions; breach of the peace; affray; domestic incidents; domestic violence; and rowdy/inconsiderate behaviour.

(b) This includes alleged: assault; burglary; criminal damage; suspicious circumstances/ prowlers; rowdy/inconsiderate behaviour; and theft.

(c) This includes hoax 999 calls; a sudden death; a report of fraud/seeking financial advice; and a report of a burglar alarm ringing constantly.

Changes

Analysis of data for 13 families indicated a reduction from the period prior to Rochdale Families Project intervention compared to the period during project intervention of 57 to 29 incidents, or 50 per cent. The most significant reductions related to incidents classified as involving household members as reported perpetrators or victims.

There was a reduction in incidents for seven of the families and an increase in incidents for four families. One family had the same number of incidents and one family had no recorded incidents pre or during project intervention. This differentiation in outcomes between families is important. However, there had been significant reductions in seven families, including from 12 incidents to one incident, seven incidents to one incident, and seven incidents to two incidents. In two further cases, there was a reduction from five and four incidents respectively in the pre-project period to no recorded incidents during project intervention. For two other families there was a reduction from seven and six incidents respectively in the period prior to project intervention to three incidents during the period of project intervention. In contrast, although one family had a significant increase (from three to nine incidents) in the period during project intervention, for the other three families

the increase was more marginal (by one or two incidents). In other words, the reductions in recorded incidents were generally more significant than the increases.

It is also very important to note that although two of the families had recorded incidents in October 2010, for four other families there had been no recorded incidents since July-August 2010, four of the families had not had a recorded incident since the March-May 2010 period and two families had not had an incident at all during the intervention period (one other family had no recorded incidents before or after the intervention). This finding suggests that the Rochdale Families Project may have an increasing impact on the levels of recorded incidents the longer that it is supporting a family.

5. Conclusions

Although the limitations and caveats of the data and analysis are very important and there is variation in the patterns between the families, the police data does indicate an overall significant reduction in recorded incidents. In particular, there have been large reductions for several families, including two families who have had no recorded incidents since working with the project, in contrast to the pattern prior to this intervention. It is also noteworthy that several families have had no recorded incidents since the summer of 2010.

The significance of these findings is threefold. Firstly the patterns suggest that the Rochdale Families Project is having a positive (but not consistent) impact. Secondly, the patterns of incidents suggest that there is a saving of police resources requiring to be allocated to these families. Thirdly, given that the majority of families had been involved in incidents affecting or involving individuals external to the households, the reduction in incidents will have a wider impact on neighbours and local communities as well as the domestic circumstances of the families.

Annex 1: Individual Family Case Study Data

Family A

- 7 incidents pre-project intervention (12 months period)
- 2 incidents during project intervention (11 months period)
- No incidents since March 2010

There were seven recorded incidents in the 12 months prior to project intervention. These included possession of cannabis, concern for safety of a child, rowdy behaviour and breach of the peace and intimidation of a neighbour. Two incidents related to the family as victims, including criminal damage to the property and harassment/ domestic violence. In the period during project intervention one incident related to rowdy behaviour and a second one was a burglary at the property. There have been no recorded incidents since March 2010.

Family B

- 7 incidents pre-project intervention (12 months period)
- 1 incident during project intervention (11 months period)
- No incidents since April 2010

There were seven recorded incidents in the 12 months prior to project intervention. These included two incidents of shoplifting, one of theft and one of rowdy/inconsiderate behaviour. Three of the incidents related to the family as victims, including one burglary and two incidents of rowdy/inconsiderate behaviour. In the period during project intervention there was one recorded incident involving a family member as a victim of assault. There have been no recorded incidents since April 2010.

Family C

- 12 incidents pre-project intervention (12 months period)
- 1 incident during project intervention (7 months period)
- No incidents since May 2010

There were 12 recorded incidents in the 12 months prior to project intervention. These included domestic violence, common assault, concern for safety of an adult (linked to an overdose) and an internal allegation of theft from the property against a member of the household. Seven of the incidents related to the family as victims, including four cases of burglary and theft, criminal damage and threats to damage. In the period during project intervention one incident, relating to domestic violence was recorded. There have been no recorded incidents since May 2010.

Family D

- 7 incidents pre-project intervention (12 months period)
- 3 incidents during project intervention (7 months period)
- No incidents since July 2010

There were seven recorded incidents in the 12 months prior to project intervention. These included two domestic incidents, concern for safety of child and child missing from home, 2 breaches of bail conditions and false use of a 999 call (by a small child). In the period during project intervention there were three incidents, including concern for safety of a child, a domestic incident and an abandoned 999 call (by a small child). There have been no recorded incidents since July 2010 (and discounting the abandoned 999 call, since April 2010).

Family E

- 0 incidents pre-project intervention (12 months period)
- 0 incidents during project intervention (13 months period)

Family F

No data

Family G

- 4 incidents pre-project intervention (12 months period)
- 5 incidents during project intervention (13 months period)
- No incident since March 2010

There were five recorded incidents in the 12 months prior to project intervention. These included rowdy behaviour, domestic assault and two missing from home reports. In the period during project intervention there were five incidents. One related to a sudden death and three of the others related to the family as victims of criminal damage, burglary and suspicious circumstances/ a prowler. One incident related to a domestic incident linked to theft of internal household property. There have been no recorded incidents since March 2010.

Family H

- 1 incident pre-project intervention (12 months period)
- 1 incident during project intervention (7 months period)
- Latest incident October 2010

There was one recorded incident of rowdy behaviour in the 12 months prior to project intervention and one recorded incident (in October 2010) of concern for safety of a child during the period of project intervention.

Family I

- 3 incidents pre-project intervention (12 months period)
- 9 incidents during project intervention (10 months period)
- Latest incident October 2010

There were three recorded incidents in the 12 months prior to project intervention, two of which related to the family as victims (proowler/ suspicious circumstances and malicious communications) and one of lost property. There were no recorded incidents in the period during project intervention, including a racially motivated assault/public order, breach of bail conditions, missing from home, concern for safety of child and three domestic incidents. In addition, there were two cases relating to the family as victims, including threats of violence and malicious communications. The latest incident was recorded in October 2010.

Family J

- 6 incidents pre-project intervention (12 months period)
- 3 incidents during project intervention (7 months period)
- Latest incident July 2010

There were six recorded incidents in the 12 months prior to project intervention, including an assault (actual bodily harm), two domestic incidents, a dog attack/bite, a missing from home and a hoax 999 call involving a child. There were three recorded incidents in the period during project intervention, including a dispute involving threats with a knife, a hoax 999 call and one incident with the household as the victim reporting suspicious circumstances and a prowler. The latest incident was recorded in July 2010.

Family K

- 0 incidents pre-project intervention (12 months period)
- 1 incident during project intervention (11 months period)
- Latest incident August 2010

There were no recorded incidents in the 12 months prior to project intervention and the incident during the project intervention period related to the household being concerned about fraud and seeking financial advice.

Family L

- 5 incidents pre-project intervention (12 months period)
- 0 incidents during project intervention (12 months period)

There were five recorded incidents in the 12 months prior to project intervention. These included affray and concern for the safety of a child. Two incidents related to the household as reported

victims of criminal damage and rowdy/inconsiderate behaviour and one incident was the report of a burglar alarm ringing constantly. There have been no incidents in the period during project intervention.

Family M

- 1 incident pre-project intervention (12 months period)
- 3 incidents during project intervention (10 months period)
- Latest incident August 2010

There was one recorded incident of grievous bodily harm (involving two members of the household as perpetrator and victim) in the 12 months prior to project intervention. There were three recorded incidents during the period of project intervention, including handling stolen goods and two missing from home reports. The latest incident was recorded in August 2010.

Family N

- 4 incidents pre-project intervention (12 months period)
- 0 incidents during project intervention (9 months period)

There were four recorded incidents in the 12 months prior to project intervention. These included two domestic incidents and two incidents related to the household as victims of criminal damage and theft from a motor vehicle. There have been no incidents in the period during project intervention.