

**Black and Minority Ethnic
Cracking Crime Project**

An evaluation

5 December 2005



Institute of
Management
Consultancy



Table of Contents

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
INTRODUCTION	1
DELIVERY ARRANGEMENTS	1
METHODOLOGY	2
FINDINGS	2
INCREASING UNDERSTANDING OF BME CRIME ISSUES.....	2
STIMULATING NEW IDEAS AND BEST PRACTICE.....	3
CAPACITY BUILDING OF GROUPS AND FUNDING ASSISTANCE	5
PROPOSING POLICY CHANGES	5
CONCLUSIONS	6
RECOMMENDATIONS	10
2 INTRODUCTION TO THE BMECCP	11
BACKGROUND.....	11
OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS	13
METHOD OF DELIVERY	14
OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION	15
METHODOLOGY FOR THE EVALUATION	16
FINDINGS.....	17
3 INCREASING THE COLLECTIVE UNDERSTANDING OF THE EXPERIENCE OF CRIME AND ITS CONSEQUENCES IN BME COMMUNITIES.	18
OUTPUTS	18
LESSONS LEARNT AT REGIONAL OR NATIONAL LEVEL	20
INFLUENCE AND DELIVERY.....	21
4 STIMULATE IDEAS AND SHARE BEST PRACTICE ABOUT WHAT IS BEING DONE AND CAN BE DONE TO REDUCE CRIME IN BME COMMUNITIES.	24
OUTPUTS	24
DOCUMENTING BEST PRACTICE	25
SHARING BEST PRACTICE.....	26
5 IMPROVE OPPORTUNITIES TO ACCESS FUNDING FOR CRIME REDUCTION PROJECTS AND INITIATIVES IN BME COMMUNITIES.....	30
OUTPUTS	30
LEVEL OF FUNDING	33
IMPACT	34
TANGIBLE IMPROVEMENTS IN PRACTICE	35
6 PROPOSE POLICY CHANGES, WHICH WILL IMPROVE THE PRACTICE OF CRIME AND DISORDER PARTNERSHIPS AND KEY STATUTORY AGENCIES IN THIS AREA.....	37
OUTPUTS	37
GENERATING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS	38
RECOMMENDATIONS USEFUL ON REGIONAL SCALE	41
7 CONCLUSIONS	42
8 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	46
9 APPENDICES	47

Glossary

ALG	Association of London Governments
BLF	Black Londoners Forum
BMECCP	Black and Minority Ethnic Cracking Crime Project
CDRP	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership
CSAS	Community Safety Advisory Service
DfES	Department for Educational and Skills
DCS	Department of Constitutional Affairs
FADIS	Funding and Development Information Service
FAIR	Forum Against Islamophobia and Racism
FOTE	From Offending to Employment
GOL	Government Office for London
LAT	London Action Trust
MPA	Metropolitan Police Authority
MPS	Metropolitan Police Service
NOMS	National Offender Management Service
OCJR	Office for Criminal Justice Reform
OFCOM	Office of Communications
PPC	Press Complaints Commission
PAG	Policy Advisory Group
PB	Partnership Board
PAYP	Positive Activities For Young People
RHCF	Race Hate Crime Forum

1 Executive Summary

Introduction

- 1.1 The objectives of the Black and Minority Ethnic Cracking Crime Project (BMECCP), set up after a conference on finding solutions to crime from a black perspective, were to:
- Increase the collective understanding of the experience of crime and its consequences in BME communities.
 - Stimulate ideas and share best practice about what is being done and can be done to reduce crime in BME communities.
 - Improve opportunities to access funding for crime reduction projects and initiatives in BME communities.
 - Propose policy changes, which will improve the practice of Crime and Disorder partnerships and key statutory agencies in this area
- 1.2 The overall aim of the project was to support black and minority ethnic community organisations to engage effectively in crime reduction initiatives and to provide training and capacity building and develop policy for wider dissemination to influence stakeholders in crime and disorder reduction in London.

Delivery arrangements

- 1.3 The BMECCP was funded by Government Office for London to the tune of £378,663 over the two and a half years that it operated as an interagency project delivered by London Action Trust (LAT) and Black Londoners Forum (BLF), under the oversight of the Partnership Board that had representatives from GLA, GOL, ALG, MPS and the MPA, amongst others.
- 1.4 LAT with considerable experience at the grassroots level in working with community organisations involved in crime reduction work took responsibility for the delivery of capacity building and training in two Trident boroughs, Haringey and Lambeth. BLF with experience in Policy work amongst BME communities was responsible for the policy work with a London wide remit.
- 1.5 Activities and targets set for the project related to setting up a Policy Advisory Group (PAG), the creation of a database, advertising the project, implementation of training courses and one on one capacity building assistance, assistance with sourcing funding, production of newsletters, distribution of

funding advice newsletters, development of policy briefs, development of a website, arranging consultations, representation and influencing in a whole range of crime and disorder issues.

- 1.6 These activities were delivered by providing lower level support of training and information to all community groups in the two Trident Boroughs of Haringey and Lambeth and higher level one on one consultation to get funding for identified organisations that had the capacity to source funding. The policy work was delivered through researching the policy briefings and the website.

Methodology

- 1.7 The brief was to evaluate the extent to which the project had met its aims and objectives and to assess the impact of the project. This was carried out through a review of documents supplied and discussions with a selection of stakeholders represented by members of staff, beneficiaries, Partnership Board members, Policy Advisory Group (PAG) members and persons from crime disorder prevention organisations. Some problems were experienced in contacting stakeholders mainly because the evaluation was carried out after the project had ended.

Findings

- 1.8 The findings are based on specific questions answered by stakeholders on the evaluation backed by evidence provided during the review of documents.

Increasing understanding of BME crime issues

- 1.9 Over the two year period of the project most of the output targets were delivered or exceeded. The number of training workshops organised were 19 as against a target of 14, six newsletters were circulated rather than the target of eight; the FADIS bulletin was delivered to 1300 organisations exceeding the 600 projected; the website received 35,000 as against the projected 250 hits over the life of the project; a database of 3,000 organisations was collated as against the target of 600 organisations.
- 1.10 Three policy briefings on Race Hate Crime, Interpretation of Victimisation and Interpretation of s95 data were drafted as against the target of four in the delivery plan.

- 1.11 There were several lessons learnt from the project by the main stakeholders. Though the project had a very broad remit of dealing with all crimes from the black and minority ethnic perspective, it was able to bring the issue to the forefront of crime reduction agendas to the extent that ALG have ring fenced funding for BME community organisations working on crime reduction issues.
- 1.12 For instance, The London-wide Race Hate Crime Forum, which aims to improve co-ordination between the key agencies responsible for dealing with victims of race hate crime, have been able to use the BMECCP briefings as a backdrop to inform their work in relation to dealing with race hate crimes.
- 1.13 The project provided a forum for the Police and Home Office to have discussions with young Muslims on s44 of the Terrorism Act.
- 1.14 The high powered Partnership Board made up of the most relevant people involved in crime reduction in the city received policy papers and progress reports relating to the project. The intention was that the Partnership Board, led by their dedicated Chair, would then influence agencies at the local level through their networks. There is evidence that during the period of the project, there was a reduction of crime in the borough of Lambeth though there was no direct link to show that this could have been as a result of the project. The project however did some work with the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership, though not enough was done to influence them across London. The Chair of the Board however did visit a few of the projects.

Stimulating new ideas and best practice

- 1.15 The targets set for stimulating ideas on best practice were similar to what had been set for increasing the understanding of crime and its consequences for BME communities. These targets were in the main met through the creation of the database, the production of newsletters, consultations and drafting of policy papers and the website.
- 1.16 The website had a comprehensive list of organisations that were involved in the delivery of crime reduction projects across London. The project held consultations on Gun Crime, s44 stop and search, violence against women and knife crimes. There were also consultancies with several agencies such as the Independent Police Complaints Commission on trust and confidence, Criminal Justice Race Unit on young

black males, Crown Prosecution Agency on racist crime, Greater London Authority on anti gangs strategy and the National Offender Management Service on revolving doors.

- 1.17 There were several policy papers and responses to a variety of government legislation on issues such as – the Anti-social Behaviour Bill, the Criminal Justice Bill, Safety and Justice, Domestic Violence consultation.
- 1.18 The Project helped to stimulate thinking about the wider issues of race and class in dealing with crimes related to young black males.
- 1.19 The website, reports and newsletters were the main avenues used by the project for documenting best practice. The website listed a large number of organisations involved in crime reduction work but did not go on further to evaluate those that could be held up as exemplars. The newsletter profiled some BME organisations but did not undertake an in-depth analysis or document any model that has worked. The reports mentioned some organisations that had benefited from support but did not point to successes that could be replicated.
- 1.20 The project identified a range of issues that could have been developed as best practice and worked with some interesting organisations that could have been properly evaluated, but there was no evidence of a systematic approach to developing best practice. The Policy Advisory Group that was assembled did bring their expertise to bear on the development of policy but it would seem that the policy was developed without direct input from the community groups they were seeking to target.
- 1.21 Best practice was disseminated through the newsletters, the conferences, and the website and through a variety of consultations held with stakeholders. The young people benefited from the forums that enabled them to highlight different approaches to crime reduction. Films such as 'Bang Bang in the Manor' were shown on television and the Race Hate Crime Forum adopted used the work of the Project in developing their methodology for dealing with aspects of their work.
- 1.22 The consultations with the police were also beneficial to stakeholders in the sense that it ensured that the police heard views of young people who they would, under ordinary circumstances, not have met. There was a lack of any

systematic way of sharing best practice and there should have been targets set in the delivery plan that could have been measured.

Capacity building of groups and funding assistance

- 1.23 The project adopted a flexible methodology of working with community groups based on their needs. There were 19 training workshops delivered sometimes in conjunction with CSAS, which were attended mainly by organisations in the two boroughs but also by organisations from several other Boroughs in London. The topics covered unlocking funds, funding sources, fundraising strategy, monitoring and evaluation, partnership working and capacity building. Average attendance on the courses was ten participants.
- 1.24 The Project worked with over 27 community organisations providing them with hands on advice on a variety of issues from funding, roles and responsibilities through to project management and monitoring and evaluation
- 1.25 A total of over £288,000 had been raised for groups as a direct result of the intervention. This is an under-estimation as some organisations had raised higher amounts that were not monitored. The Chairman of the Partnership Board had encouraged several statutory sector agencies to provide funding for community groups.
- 1.26 An impact of the project was the creation of the Borough Commander's fund in Lambeth and the ALG agreeing to ring fence funds for community organisations. Many organisation also attested that as a result of the training and one on one support they felt more confident in looking for funding
- 1.27 Some of the community groups claimed that as a result of the workshops and capacity building, bulletins and newsletters, they have now developed networks of similar organisations and statutory sector contacts within the crime reduction area. Others have now developed policies and structures that will make it possible for them to engage in and contribute to crime reduction strategies in the boroughs.

Proposing policy changes

- 1.28 Several policy recommendations were made by the Project that sought to improve the practice of CDRPs and other statutory sector stakeholders. These recommendations covered a variety of crime issues: guns, knives, ex-offenders, race and faith hate, anti-social behaviour, representation and

engagement, trust, confidence and reassurance, stop and search and media strategies.

- 1.29 It is not clear whether these recommendations were developed based on the delivery work on the ground or based on the expertise of the Policy Advisory Group, and to what extent these can be implemented without an indication of the mechanisms to be used.
- 1.30 The recommendations of the project if accepted by the Board will be useful for dissemination to influence a wider regional audience, the funding and capacity building work lacked a regional focus but could be replicated in boroughs that do not have BME crime reduction programmes.
- 1.31 There were attempts by the project to make direct connections and contacts with local authorities and governmental departments and agencies. Though they were successful in influencing some of those contacted such as Ofcom and the OCJR, they lacked the gravitas as an organisation to make a resounding impact on most.

Conclusions

- 1.32 The general impression was that the Project made some resounding achievements in promoting and raising awareness of crime prevention and reduction issues within the BME communities and from a BME perspective. The project was very ambitious and although in some instances it was difficult to determine some outputs through lack of sufficient information, the evidence shows that overall most of the outputs in the delivery plan were achieved.
- 1.33 There were some benefits arising out of the implementation of the project. One success of the Project was that it raised and placed the issue of BME involvement in crime reduction firmly on the agenda of the key agencies involved in this area of work. These agencies were also able to engage with members of the BME community in full and frank exchanges to the extent that they were able to learn from the experience. The Project was also able to engage young people and get them to share their views on crime reduction strategies particularly from a young BME male perspective.
- 1.34 Black community organisations involved in crime reduction had an opportunity as a result of this Project to interact with key players involved in crime reduction in their local communities. The groups also benefited from training, support

and other assistance that led them to restructure their organisations and in some cases gain access to funding.

- 1.35 Overall many stakeholders felt that this was a positive project that may well have had a stronger impact if had been allowed to operate for a longer period.
- 1.36 The project required a varied skill set of policy, personnel and community development expertise as well as people with a knowledge of BME issues as well as crime prevention and reduction strategies. Staff employed was competent in their specialist field but there was a feeling that they were being stretched to other administrative tasks which reduced the time they had to spend on delivery of the project.
- 1.37 While some useful work arose from the PAG, its impact could have been greater if issues about its broad remit, its role, commitment and interface with other agencies had been adequately addressed. The PAG membership also changed frequently and at times proved very difficult to assemble for meetings, even when flexible methods of working was adopted.
- 1.38 The Partnership Board also comprised experts in the crime reduction field who were also committed to pursuing effective strategies to reduce crime. However, there were notable absences from some of the meetings which seem to have been compounded by frequent last minute cancellations of meetings. This did not appear to stop them from providing strong leadership for the Project.
- 1.39 The Project suffered from some issues relating to changes in operational staff, and lack of appropriate cover to deal with periods when staff was not in post
- 1.40 The BMECCP was funded by Government Office for London to the tune of £378,663 over two and a half years. The forward strategy had identified different sources for continued funding for the project after the initial two years. The Chair of the Partnership Board had asked, at a Board meeting, for the statutory sector members to assist the Project with funding. In the event specific funding for the continuation of the project was not secured.
- 1.41 There were adequate resources for the planning and implementation of the Project as envisaged.
- 1.42 There were positive social and cultural benefits of running the project. It enabled newer and smaller BME community

organisations to get involved in crime prevention and reduction issues and to take responsibility for resolving issues that were perceived to be within their community. In some instances the Project helped to bring the MPS and BME young people together in a process of rebuilding trust and confidence.

- 1.43 One important aspect was the provision of a voice for sections of the BME community who are marginalised in discussions relating to crime, particularly in relation to Stop and Search.
- 1.44 Since the Project was supported by a Partnership Board comprising all the key agencies involved in crime reduction and prevention and a highly committed and dedicated chair it was surprising that the Project could not gain the funding to continue the work that was being done. Whilst, we recognise that the Project's original remit was originally for one year which was eventually extended by another year. However during the life of the Project the intention was to seek funding to continue the work. The abrupt closure of the Project, however, does indicate inadequate forward thinking about the long term sustainability of the work done or how and in what form it should continue.
- 1.45 One explanation as to why the Project ended was perhaps that the work done was not considered strategic enough and was not able to link in or influence the local crime prevention agencies to commit to supporting its continuance. It could also be that fundraising for the Project was not given a high enough priority by the two organisations that implemented the Project. It is surprising that issues about the continuation of the Project arise only in reports to the Board in September 2004 which is only six months before the Project's funding was due to end.
- 1.46 Crime and disorder issues are very much on the national agenda at present and every effort should have been made to ensure the work of the BMECCP or the momentum of what has so far been gained is not lost. That this was not done represents a failing of the Project.
- 1.47 It would seem that there was no sense of urgency about the Project's own survival, despite several applications being made to secure funds for the project's continuation, no funding was secured. To some extent the lack of an evaluation and an assumption that the project would continue may have affected its ability to continue.

- 1.48 The impact of the Project could not be measured in this evaluation because the Project focused very much on delivery of broad targets. To the extent that the Project raised awareness, one could say that it met its objectives, but perhaps it should have looked to ensuring that its policy recommendations were implemented. It would seem that the Project was seen as responding to issues rather than being proactive in setting the agenda. This it could have done if its best practice work had been documented and disseminated in a more effective and systematic way.
- 1.49 Several lessons can be learned from the operation of the Project. The objectives set could have been more focused. The initial intention of using delivery on the ground to assist in the development of policy which would then be disseminated may have worked better if one organisation had taken overall responsibility for the BMECCP. Mixing delivery and policy and devolving the responsibility amongst two organisations with different foci and cultures created some communication problems and had implications for the supervision of staff.
- 1.50 Another lesson learned is that projects should be operated for longer time periods, unless there is a clear exit strategy, because closing projects that provide a service for BME communities creates a credibility problem and suggests that funders are not willing to sustain or resource issues that affect the BME communities. It is important that expectations are not raised about projects only for the projects to disappear, as this creates a very negative impression of "fly by night" operations.
- 1.51 By focusing the project around the Trident Boroughs opportunities to tap into the operations of other CDRP's who may have been more receptive to the work of the BMECCP, because of their lack of experience in dealing with BME crime issues, was lost.
- 1.52 Too many meetings were cancelled at short notice at both the Partnership and Policy level which did not bode well for the Project. Besides, the main operational officers for the Project never had an opportunity to interact with the Partnership Board which meant their resources were not being used to maximum effect.
- 1.53 The Project could have benefited more from the Partnership Board, PAG and other project partners being clearer on their roles and responsibilities and establishing clear links between

the PAG, Partnership Board, staff and beneficiaries on the ground.

Recommendations

- 1.54 The following recommendations are made based on our findings and conclusions.
- 1.55 Different approaches will need to be considered for delivery of a BME Cracking Crime remit. This may include links to agencies like Change Up and NOMS and using a range of experienced capacity building organisations and consultants as delivery partners
- 1.56 A Project with a BME Cracking Crime remit needs to be Pan London both in policy and delivery to ensure wider strategic focus.
- 1.57 Baseline data must be provided and objectives need to be more specific and focused. This will assist in setting realistic targets that can be effectively measured through regular monitoring to assess the impact and outcomes of such a Project.
- 1.58 Further work should be done to identify individual projects which can be rigorously evaluated to stakeholders with a crime reduction remit to enable best practice information be shared.
- 1.59 There needs to be clarity in focus and a better link established between delivery and policy with improved mechanisms for disseminating information and policy documentation.
- 1.60 Attention should be given to implementing improved mechanisms for engaging CDRP's and to widen the PAG and Partnership Board's membership to include their representation.
- 1.61 Structures will need to be put in place for better lines of communication internally and externally.
- 1.62 A charter should be drawn up with all Stakeholder agencies including Local Authorities to ensure they are signed up and committed to an agreed level of delivery of service.

2 Introduction to the BMECCP

Background

- 2.1 The Black and Ethnic Minority Cracking Crime Project (BMECCP) was set up after a conference to investigate how black and minority ethnic (BME) people could be involved in finding solutions to crime that affects the whole community. The conference was held in March 2002 and attended by a cross section of the black community involved in working on issues relating to crime.
- 2.2 The objectives of the conference were later restated as the aims of the BME Cracking Crime Project. These objectives were to:
- Increase the collective understanding of the experience of crime and its consequences in BME communities.
 - Stimulate ideas and share best practice about what is being done and can be done to reduce crime in BME communities.
 - Improve opportunities to access funding for crime reduction projects and initiatives in BME communities.
 - Propose policy changes, which will improve the practice of Crime and Disorder partnerships and key statutory agencies in this area
- 2.3 The report of the conference recommended the setting up of a project that would implement the recommendations that came out of the conference.
- 2.4 A BME Cracking Crime steering Group was formed to promote crime prevention and reduction amongst London's BME communities. This steering group was subsequently convened as the BME Cracking Crime Partnership Board with representatives from agencies and organisations that were involved in crime reduction and prevention activities. These included representatives from the following organisations:
- GLA
 - MPS
 - MPA
 - FAIR
 - GOL
 - ALG
- 2.5 Further research to determine a baseline was commissioned initially from OPM and later from Kingston Reid. The OPM report was not available to us but the Kingston Reid report was. This report was essentially a scoping of the involvement

of BME organisations involved in crime reduction in the boroughs of Islington and Haringey.

- 2.6 The Kingston Reid Report described experiences that black people had of crime and identified worthwhile initiatives at combating crime. It however recognised that black people were kept at the margins in terms of their involvement in policy development or initiatives, and that there was little representation of BME people on CDRP boards. The report concluded that it was as if black people were not part of the solution but were seen only as part of the problem.
- 2.7 The Government Office for London (GOL) decided to fund the project and a decision was taken to lodge the project with two organisations. GOL provided funds of £346,000 over two and a half years.
- 2.8 The London Action Trust (LAT) has experience of working on crime reduction projects and was highly placed to work on the ground with local organisations. The Black Londoners Forum (BLF) is an activist think tank that deals with issues relating to black and minority ethnic communities.
- 2.9 The overall aim of the project was to support BME community groups to engage effectively in crime reduction initiatives and to provide training and capacity building.
- 2.10 The delivery plan for the project widened the four main aims of the project into six objectives and divided this amongst the two organisations. Though a London wide approach was perceived, a decision was taken to limit the project to two boroughs. Two of the Trident boroughs, Lambeth and Haringey were chosen for implementation of the project.
- 2.11 BLF took responsibility for:
 - Setting up of a Policy Advisory Group (PAG) to develop policy and ensure that the views of BME Londoners are communicated to Crime and Disorder Partnerships (CDRP) and all agencies responsible for Crime Reduction Strategies in London.
 - The development of mechanisms, which ensure there is increased BME participation and representation in Crime Reduction Partnerships.
 - The provision of information and policy development from a black perspective in the community safety field.

2.12 LAT had responsibility for:

- The provision of fundraising advice, information assistance to BME community groups.
- The provision of advice and assistance to BME community groups in the development of appropriate organisational structures to improve their ability to deliver services aimed at crime reduction.
- The provision of appropriate training

Outcomes and outputs

2.13 The targets for outputs set in the delivery plan were to:

Objectives	Year one targets	Year two targets
To increase the collective understanding of the experience of crime and its consequences in BME communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Database (600 names) • Website (250 hits) • Newsletter (4 issues) • Web research • FADIS (600 distributed) • Workshops (6 held) • Publications (4 newsletters, 4 Policy Briefings by May 2004) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Database (600 names) • Website (250 hits) • Newsletter (4 issues) • Web research • FADIS (600 distributed) • Workshops (6 held) • Publications (4 newsletters, 4 Policy Briefings by May 2005)
To stimulate ideas and share best practice about what is being done and what can be done to reduce crime in communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Database (600 names) • FADIS (600 distributed) • Newsletter (4 issues) • Website (250 hits) • CCP Policy Advisory Group meetings (x3 by May 2004) • 7 workshops • 300 groups responding to participant survey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Database (600 names) • FADIS (600 distributed) • Newsletter (4 issues) • Website (250 hits) • CCP Policy Advisory Group meetings (x3 by May 2005) • 7 workshops • 300 groups responding to participant survey
To improve opportunities to access funding for crime reduction projects and initiatives in BME communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 funding workshops • 250 hits on website • 8 bids submitted • 4 successful bids achieved • 2 groups increased level of income • Database (600 names) • FADIS (600 distributed) • Newsletter (4 issues) • Workshops (7 held) • Outreach support (100 groups assisted with 1:1 advice by email and telephone; 12 groups outreach support) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 funding workshops • 250 hits on website • 8 bids submitted • 4 successful bids achieved • 2 groups increased level of income • Database (600 names) • FADIS (600 distributed) • Newsletter (4 issues) • Workshops (7 held) • Outreach support (100 groups assisted with 1:1 advice by email and telephone; 12 groups outreach support) • Bids submitted (8 by May 2005) • 100 groups assisted with advice (email and telephone) • 8 groups receiving one-to-one support • 2 non-funding workshops
To propose policy changes, which will improve the practice of Crime and Disorder Partnerships and key statutory agencies in this area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not feasible to assess whether the project enables greater BME representation on CDRPs by phase 1 (May 2004). <p>End of year policy report (50 copies downloaded from CCP website and circulated by email and post by May 2004).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not feasible to assess whether the project enables greater BME representation on CDRPs by phase 1 (May 2004). There is to be a further mapping exercise report to be submitted to the CCP board by June 2004 (authored by MPA). • End of year policy report (50 copies downloaded from CCP website and circulated by email and post by May 2005) • 40 newsletters distributed to crime reduction agencies <p>250 newsletters distributed to BME community groups</p>

2.14 The outcomes of the project as stated in the delivery plan was to achieve the following:

- Enable greater participation of BME community groups in crime reduction
- Facilitate a range of community projects to divert people away from crime
- Raise awareness of race-hate crime and possible actions to address it
- Challenge stereotypes on BME groups and their relationship with crime
- Increase funding to community groups involved in crime reduction
- Raise BME groups' awareness of agencies in the crime reduction field and their roles
- Improve BME groups' capacity to engage in partnership work
- Bring about a more favourable funding climate for BME groups to carry out crime reduction projects
- Represent the views of BME groups to funders, policy-makers and statutory bodies
- Encourage networking and information-sharing with other BME groups involved in crime reduction

Method of delivery

2.15 The London Action Trust adopted a method of providing support at two levels

2.16 Lower level support - available to all BME groups across London involved or intending to engage in crime reduction and included: newsletters and information; relevant funding information; website; and training opportunities.

2.17 Higher level support - Higher level one on one assistance relating to funding, capacity building towards sustainability of the groups and representation with local policy and implementation bodies. This was limited to groups dealing with young people in the two boroughs.

2.18 The work of the Black Londoners Forum related to conducting research, developing the database, developing the website, responding to papers and legislation, developing policy briefings and organising consultations, attending seminars and disseminating information on the project.

Objectives of the evaluation

2.19 The objective of the evaluation was to evaluate the extent to which the Project has met its aims and objectives and assess its impact. Specific questions to be answered in relation to each of the Project's objective were:

- **Increase the collective understanding of the experience of crime and its consequences in BME communities.**
 - What outputs were delivered to support this aim (as set out in the delivery plan or in addition to it)?
 - To what extent has the project helped directly to identify lessons learned and areas for improvement at the regional (or national) level?
 - To what extent has the project directly or indirectly led to local crime reduction agencies having a better understanding of how to deliver crime reduction and reassurance for BME groups
- **Stimulate ideas and share best practice about what is being done and can be done to reduce crime in BME communities.**
 - What outputs were delivered to support this aim (as set out in the delivery plan or in addition to it)?
 - To what extent has the project documented best practice and/or promising approaches
 - To what extent has the project shared best practice / promising approaches (e.g. through the BME Cracking Crime Board, London-wide and local delivery partners, or other knowledge management systems)
- **Improve opportunities to access funding for crime reduction projects and initiatives in BME communities.**
 - What outputs were delivered to support this aim (as set out in the delivery plan or in addition to it)
 - To what extent has the project helped groups access funding for crime reduction initiatives?
 - What is the impact of BME Cracking Crime Project interventions in terms of revenue generated (either in total or an average for groups)?
 - How far has funding raised succeeded in
 - a) putting BME organisations on a firmer footing
 - b) assisting them in meaningful participation with statutory crime reduction delivery partners
 - To what extent did the training and support provided lead to tangible improvements in practice within BME organisations (e.g. project management, fundraising, understanding of local crime reduction structures and processes)
- **Propose policy changes, which will improve the practice of Crime and Disorder partnerships and key statutory agencies in this area.**
 - How effective was the Project in generating recommendations for improvements to policy and communicating these to the BME Cracking Crime Board (this might be recommendations pertinent to local and pan-London agencies)
 - To what extent were the recommendations useful on a regional scale (for example, in linking with the broader policy context around engagement and capacity building)

Methodology for the evaluation

- 2.20 The evaluation was carried out over a three month period. There were delays in letting out the contract which meant that the project ended before consultants could begin the evaluation. The original intention was that the steering group would meet to have a discussion with the consultants before the start of the work. This did not happen and resulted in further delays to the evaluation which was initially intended to be completed within a month.
- 2.21 The methodology set out in the proposal was to:
- Hold an initial meeting with the steering group for the evaluation
 - Review background and other documents and the website
 - Identify persons to interview and implement the interviews.
- 2.22 It was intended that we would interview
- Four staff members
 - Ten beneficiaries five from each borough
 - Five Partnership Board members
 - Two officers from Crime and Disorder Prevention Partnership Boards
 - Five policy board members
- 2.23 We interviewed 20 stakeholders from 17 different organisations. A list of all those interviewed is presented in the Appendix. The interviews were mainly personal face-to-face interviews though a few were conducted by telephone at the convenience of the respondents.
- 2.24 We were able to review all the policy documents and the website and examined many of the reports that were provided to us long after the evaluation had started.
- 2.25 There were some problems with making contact with respondents and their willingness to participate in the survey; nonetheless we were able to interview a cross section of people who were involved in the project.

Findings

2.26 Our findings are based on specific questions answered by the stakeholders in relation to the delivery of the project and documents reviewed as part of this evaluation. The findings are grouped under the four main projects aims, restated below.

- Increase the collective understanding of the experience of crime and its consequences in BME communities.
- Stimulate ideas and share best practice about what is being done and can be done to reduce crime in BME communities.
- Improve opportunities to access funding for crime reduction projects and initiatives in BME communities.
- Propose policy changes, which will improve the practice of Crime and Disorder partnerships and key statutory agencies in this area.

2.27 Some of the findings have been repeated because the targets were similar for the different objectives.

3 Increasing the collective understanding of the experience of crime and its consequences in BME communities.

3.1 There were some issues about the clarity of this objective amongst some stakeholders. Some respondents felt it was not clear as to whether this objective related to community safety managers or diversity managers who are normally responsible for policing the policy or the hate race crime officers. This made it difficult for some respondents to answer this question, but some felt that it should be about raising awareness generally amongst practitioners, BME communities and the police. One of the main purposes of the project was to promote an understanding that BME communities were also victims of crime and therefore could be involved in seeking solutions to those crimes.

Outputs

3.2 The delivery plan for the two years stated several activities in support of this objective and several targets to be achieved over the two year period of the project. In the event, almost all the targets were achieved, and some were exceeded by the end of the project.

Table 1: Objective 1 Targets and Achievements

Item	Targets	delivered
Training Workshops	12	19
Publications - Newsletters	8	6
FADIS	600	1300
Website	250	35,000
Database	600	3,000
Publications: Policy briefings	4	3

3.3 The project delivered a variety of activities that was expected to raise awareness of crime issues amongst BME communities. These activities included conferences, the creation of a website, newsletters, training workshops, FADIS news bulletins and several policy briefings.

Advertising

3.4 There was evidence to show that a variety of media both conventional and unconventional had been deployed to attract participants to the programme. Some of these included outreach work at community centres and various places of worship. In addition information was circulated to organisations on databases collated as part of the project.

Database

3.5 Documents indicate that a database of over 3,000 organisations was created. We were unable to access this list to verify its existence. Therefore we did not have an opportunity to assess the range, size or geographical spread of these groups. If such a list exists it would have exceeded the target of 600 organisations set out in the delivery plan.

Website

3.6 A website was developed and aspects of it appeared to have been regularly updated during the period of the project. The website contains comprehensive information about the project and clear ways in which people interested could participate. It has a library resource that holds all documents that have been used as part of the BMECCP including progress reports, newsletters, training courses, events, database and other useful information. There was also a section that provided links to other projects and services run by London Action Trust such as: Funding and Development Information Service (FADIS), Community and Safety Advisory Service (CSAS) and information on From Offending to Employment (FOTE). The target was to have 250 hits over the life of the project but according to the website administrator there were as much as 35,000 hits. There was however no objective way of verifying who had used the site and whether they found the information useful.

3.7 From our discussions with beneficiaries most were either, unaware of the website or had not used it. Instead most regarded FADIS and the Newsletters to be the most effective means of dissemination of information

Policy briefing

3.8 The target for policy briefings in the delivery plan was four with the following three completed:

- - Race Hate Crime
- - Interpretation of Victimisation
- - Interpretation of S95 data

Lessons learnt at regional or national level

- 3.9 From the point of view of the project workers, a lot of lessons should have been learnt as a result of the work that was done over the two years of the project. Both GOL and the ALG have now given crime issues, as it affects the BME community, a greater priority with the ALG providing ring-fenced funding.
- 3.10 Though the thrust and focus was unduly biased towards gun, knife and street crimes that were seen as crimes committed by BME people, some priority was given to race hate crime. The London-wide Race Hate Crime Forum adopted a way of working, based on the work of the BMECCP for scrutinising the work of Local Authorities and the MPS. Other best practice and lessons have included the provision of a forum for the Home Office and the MPS to talk to young Muslims about s44 of the Terrorism Act and a method for consultation that has been used by boroughs when consulting with the Muslim Safety Forum.
- 3.11 The workers also felt that the City of London Police had adopted and implemented its strategies relating to trust and confidence issues with young Asian males. Hackney and Southwark CDRP's also received information through their GLA representatives who are also on the local CDRP. It seems that these two representatives were very receptive to the recommendations made by the BMECCP and to some extent individuals at Tower Hamlets and Haringey were also interested. We were informed that The Disarm Trust was set up, directly as a result of the conference, to fund organisations working towards the reduction of gun crime.
- 3.12 But the workers of the project also concede that there was a problem of communication between the policy aspects of the project and the work that was being delivered on the ground with beneficiaries. It would seem that there was no proper sense of who needed to benefit from the project and how.
- 3.13 Whilst there may have been many such beneficiaries of the work it has been quite difficult to judge to what extent the project may have had its desired impact on beneficiaries because the issue of impact was only raised by the Partnership Board late in the Project's work.
- 3.14 For instance though there was a Policy Advisory Group (PAG) in place it was difficult to determine how the members fitted within the framework of the BMECCPs as there was no

mechanism for how PAG would influence the work of CDRP's or the MPS.

- 3.15 There appeared to be no set structure for documenting the best practice agenda and no toolkit was developed for practitioners. Though there was a view that no case studies had been made available to help identify lessons or increase understanding of crime issues, we identified case studies within documents, although there was no evidence to show how they had been evaluated.
- 3.16 In the view of some respondents, other organisations, such as the Peace Alliance, a faith based cross borough organisation that sits on PAG and also works nationally with relevant statutory agencies advising on key policy issues around the wider crime reduction agenda, could have been examined as a better model to use to demonstrate best practice.
- 3.17 It has been difficult to substantiate the extent to which the BMECCP achieved this objective in a systematic way.
- 3.18 The project would have benefited from a better structure and more clarity around how best practice was to be documented and disseminated. The evidence of an organisation that could have been held up as a case study or something substantial as to how the lessons of this project could be replicated has been absent.

Influence and delivery

- 3.19 The setting up of a relatively high powered Partnership Board comprising many of the key agencies in the London region meant that the issue of crime as they affect BME communities would be given a higher priority and profile as they would be discussed at a higher level. It also meant that many of those agencies would be made more aware of race and equality issues and their impact on service provision.
- 3.20 The dedication of the chairperson has also helped in keeping the issue on the agenda. To a large extent his influence has helped to gain the support of people who otherwise would not have engaged in this agenda. Whilst this may have helped to influence members of the board, there was no stated mechanism for measuring the extent to which the Partnership Board has influenced local CDRPs.
- 3.21 There were regular progress reports and policy documents presented to the Partnership Board indicating outputs of the

project. There has been, however, very little work with CDRPs.

- 3.22 To some extent the CDRPs involvement in the structure of the BMECCP would be through their representation on the PAG. However, from a report produced by PAG in December 2004, they themselves recognised there were problems that needed to be addressed, such as the: "commitment and capacity of its members, the absence of effective communication lines between members, the breadth of the task of the PAG being too huge covering all the diversity of BME communities and whether PAG.....is properly representative." There were also contacts made with high profile members on the Greater London Assembly (GLA).
- 3.23 The workers on the project were under the impression that the members on the Partnership Board would be directly involved in dissemination, of what had been discussed at the Partnership Board level, to their respective organisations. This was not the intention of the objectives as they were set for the project and shows that there was a lack of understanding of this objective by the workers on the project. What most beneficiaries have accepted is that the project did raise their awareness of the racial dimension in decision making with regard to crime issues but the project did not target CDRPs and wider organisations involved in crime in a systematic way.
- 3.24 Whilst board members may have used the material gained from board meetings and the policy papers provided, they were not asked to make a commitment to share these with the wider agencies involved in crime reduction. This was clearly the responsibility of the project workers. However, though the methods and mechanisms for achieving this objective was written in the delivery plan, it was only towards the end of the project that issues about lack of qualitative information on the impact of the project was raised at the Partnership Board level.
- 3.25 Other aspects of the project included a conference in 2003 that gave both the partners and beneficiaries an opportunity to discuss issues relating to crime amongst minority ethnic people.
- 3.26 There is evidence that during the life of the project, there was a reduction of crime in Lambeth, however because of the lack of any quantitative or qualitative mechanism for measuring

the impact of the project, it is difficult to claim that this reduction was a direct result of the project.

- 3.27 The major partners such as GOL, in the opinion of the workers on the project, did not take an active enough role in the project. This view suggests that there was less clarity on this objective since in the view of the partners, the project was meant to provide them with newer dimensions and issues about the experiences of crime within the BME communities that the partners would then disseminate.
- 3.28 The general impression given by respondents was that there was heightened awareness that the BME community were very much interested in tackling crime but they were not all fully represented on boards that dealt with crime and to a larger extent had no voice on these issues.
- 3.29 The project however had no real mechanisms for measuring the impact of their efforts to influence crime reduction agencies to enable them gain a better understanding of crime reduction issues in the BME communities. No evidence is available to show that during the life of the project attempts were made to introduce these indicators. Some respondents felt that the four overarching aims were too broad and not SMART although the six objectives were more specific.
- 3.30 This is illustrated by one respondent's comment that, it is as if there was a tacit understanding that the aims of the project had been made so broad so as not to be capable of being evaluated.

4 Stimulate ideas and share best practice about what is being done and can be done to reduce crime in BME communities.

Outputs

4.1 The targets set in the delivery plan for outputs relating to this objective were the same as the targets for the objective of increasing the collective understanding of the experience of crime and its consequences in BME communities. The outputs delivered for this objective were therefore the same as for that objective.

Table 2: Objective 2 Targets and Achievements

Item	Targets	delivered
Training Workshops	12	19
Publications - Newsletters	8	6
FADIS	600	1300
Website	250	35,000
Database	600	3,000
Publications: Policy briefings	4	3

4.2 Specifically there is a section on the website that provides information on BME organisations that are involved in working on crime issues across London. Over 55 organisations were identified across 25 London boroughs and the matrix in the database provides a description of their projects and the methods that are used in their work with beneficiaries. The only London boroughs for which there was no information about projects were Barking and Dagenham, Bexley, Bromley, Hammersmith and Fulham, Kingston, Merton, Sutton and Waltham Forest.

4.3 The list of organisations delivering BME related crime projects seems to be comprehensive, however there is no indication as to how the projects that have been described have been evaluated and whether this is just a list of projects contacted or whether they are projects that are worthy of emulation and replication.

4.4 In addition to the website, the Project has been involved in direct consultations on crime issues.

4.5 In the absence of any specific mention of best practice in any of the documents reviewed during the project and with no mention of best practice in the end of year report submitted to the Partnership Board it has been difficult to decide what best practice was developed or disseminated during the period of the Project and what its effects, if any, have been on beneficiary groups.

- 4.6 The Project helped to stimulate thinking around the issue of BME young people and the need to focus on not just crime but the complex wider issue of the impact of how race and class affect them.

Documenting best practice

- 4.7 The website, policy papers, newsletters and the update reports to the Partnership Board were the main mechanisms that were used to document and disseminate best practice.
- 4.8 The second BME Cracking Crime conference held in December 2003 launched the BMECCP; and also provided participants with feedback on actions since the first conference in 2002.
- 4.9 A subsequent conference held to provide participants with feedback and a comprehensive update on the Project and share best practice was alleged to have been poorly attended. We have not been able to verify this since no attendance records or other beneficiary raised this concern.
- 4.10 Some views expressed were that the Project failed to take a long term view of how or in what form it could be taken forward beyond its initial two year period. Furthermore outputs would have been better achieved if all statutory sector agencies involved had commitment to the Project. Some felt that a lack of commitment, due, in part, to frequent personnel changes may have compromised the integrity of the Project.
- 4.11 There was also some discord between the staff that were delivering on the ground working with grassroots organisations and the staff that were involved in the documenting and dissemination of best practice. The newsletter that both LAT and BLF contributed to could have been better used to provide exemplars that had been properly evaluated rather than ad-hoc case studies.
- 4.12 The view of some members of the Partnership Board was that in the absence of any qualitative targets, the BMECCP was driven mainly by the need to achieve the outputs set in the delivery plan. The Board therefore could have been better involved in asking questions about the reports that they received and should have explicitly asked for best practise or evaluation of individual projects that the BMECCP regarded as beneficiaries. One Partnership Board member indicated that he took a more proactive approach by visiting Projects to evidence for himself the work they were doing as a result of the BMECCP.

- 4.13 The Kingston Reid Report and the earlier report that was supposed to be have been drawn up by OPM should have been used to establish a baseline for the operation of the Project. In any event this did not appear to have been done which left many of the Project's aims difficult to measure in terms of tangible impact, progression or outcomes.
- 4.14 While the BMECCP final report identified a range of issues in terms of best practice it did not point to any specific cases studies that the BMECCP worked with. Neither did it provide a best practice toolkit or any other documentation that could be used or adopted by practitioners and other stakeholders in the delivery of their service or in the way in which they engaged with BME communities or other agencies.

Sharing best practice

- 4.15 Some of the local grassroots groups in Lambeth and Haringey attested to being provided with useful advice that has helped them with their projects. It would have been very useful if, despite the short timescale of the operation of the Project, these were documented and shared amongst all the groups. Since no information was produced on why the identified projects worked better, there is no pointer as to how this successful work can be replicated elsewhere.
- 4.16 BMECCP did not connect with other projects elsewhere which may be seen to be delivering similar or complementary elements of services such as the BME Network in Westminster, set up by Westminster Voluntary Action Council to share or exchange best practice. We contacted the BME Network as it was suggested that the organisation was a possible example of best practice. They were not aware of the BMECCP and had no link at all with the Project. The Westminster Project dealt with capacity building and general issues of concern to BME and Refugee communities in their area. Crime was not a specific objective of the organisation. This lack of contact with the BMECCP may reinforce the concerns that the Kingston Reid report highlighted in that a lot of groups working within the crime agenda did not always regard themselves as such. From the information we gleaned there was insufficient evidence for us to conclude the merits of this organisation as a possible example of best practice. Further work should be done to identify individual projects which can be rigorously evaluated to enable stakeholders with a crime reduction remit to use the information.

- 4.17 The ultimate beneficiaries of the Project were the young people who were able to relate to different approaches of spreading the word about crime. For instance the use of film and theatre to deal with crime issues was highlighted by some films that the Project was instrumental in getting shown on TV - the documentary film on gun crime "Bang, Bang in the Manor" was televised on BBC3 earlier this year.
- 4.18 Another successful result was the training provided to young people to enable them to carry out focus groups relating to crime.
- 4.19 There was some evidence that there was dissemination of the project through BLF members. The project also sought to disseminate policy through events such as:
- The Mayor's conference
 - Creating Confident Communities conference
 - Victim Support event
 - London Schools event
- 4.20 The policy briefings helped the Police in consultations with members of the BME community especially those under the ages of 24 who are most affected by 'stop and search' but often not consulted when decisions are taken. The Police have through these briefings, managed to explore alternative avenues for dialogue with 'highly visible but less vocal communities' who, are often described as, 'hard to reach'. The Race Hate Crime Forum (RHCF) has been able to adopt some of the recommendations coming out of the project and questions raised by the project in policy briefings have been used to challenge and question Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and Local Authorities about their practice.
- 4.21 The project made an input into the gun crime consultation "Control of Firearms" Green paper and launched "Bang Bang in the Manor", a TV documentary on gun crime.
- 4.22 Though it was expected that key recommendations in the BMECCP reports would be fed back to the Local Authorities and the MPS through their direct links on the Partnership Board, this has not been implemented in a consistent way. Some organisations have been able to make use of the information, though there is no evidence to suggest that these recommendations have been adopted by all.
- 4.23 Policy documents were circulated to all 32 London Boroughs and the City of London which was followed up with telephone calls to gauge reactions. In the main, most Authorities did not

respond and some felt that they were not accountable to the Project. It remains to be seen whether some of the suggestions as to how to deal with young black males with respect to crime will be taken on board by some London boroughs; the proof of what they do will be in their CDRP delivery plans for the coming year.

- 4.24 One of the main issues for the CDRPs was that they were dealing with the totality of crime and it was difficult for them to just focus on issues relating to BME communities. The Partnership Board members would need to consider what recommendations to accept to filter down to the Boroughs. The Board's willingness to commit to the recommendations would greatly influence the take-up by local agencies.
- 4.25 The impact of this objective is however difficult to measure since there were no quantifiable targets set for monitoring during the period of the project and there was no guidance provided on what would constitute an acceptable quality of delivery. It is also difficult to judge performance of staff at the officer level since there were no qualitative performance indicators against targets within the delivery plan.
- 4.26 The Partnership Board members were expected to share best practice with their own networks but it is doubtful the extent to which the local authority members were themselves linked to their local CDRPs.
- 4.27 One good result of the Project was the way it helped to inform the work of the London Race Hate Forum. The work of the BMECCP with smaller grassroots organisations has provided a trigger for the RHCF to widen its membership in order to develop closer community links and therefore access more community voices. The Forum is investigating the possibility of establishing a local grouping of Race Hate Crime officers who will be encouraged to feedback, to the RHCF, information on specific issues of importance to the local communities.
- 4.28 The RHCF is extending their work to look at smaller unfunded or poorly funded organisations that have been identified as doing good work but need support financially or structurally. They are urging police forces and local authorities to identify what support they can provide to ensure that these groups continue working well or grow.
- 4.29 The website had been the main hub for individuals or organisations to use in sharing best practice, but there was no evidence that the relevant groups who could have benefited

were drawn to the site. There was no follow on advertisement to push organisations to the website. In any case the information on the website provided a list of organisations which were not properly evaluated neither was there any way of knowing how or why they were selected. The information was also not updated since September 2004. .

- 4.30 We could not assess whether there was any systematic way of sharing best practice that was developed for the Project. One of the issues that came out of the interviews was that the staff members in the two teams of the Project did not establish a system of working that would have allowed the work with the local organisations to directly inform the policies that were being developed by the policy team. The policy team relied to a large extent on the PAG whose meetings were patchy, not very well coordinated and therefore not as effective as it could have been as mentioned earlier at paragraph 3.22 above.
- 4.31 We can only conclude that there is not enough evidence to demonstrate whether the Project has been able to stimulate ideas and share best practice in the way envisaged in the delivery plan. It has however raised awareness about ways and mechanisms of involving BME people in tackling crime and the broader drivers of crime.

5 Improve opportunities to access funding for crime reduction projects and initiatives in BME communities.

Outputs

5.1 Objective 3 project targets were:

Item	Targets	delivered
funding Workshops	10	9
Publications - Newsletters	8	6
FADIS	600	1300
Website	250	35,000
Database	600	3,000
Bids submitted	16	undetermined
Successful bids achieved	4	4
Groups increased level of funding	4	4
Outreach support (email & telephone)	200	undetermined
Outreach support (email & telephone) 1to1	24	27
Groups to receive 1 to 1 support	8	undetermined
Non funding workshops	2	10

5.2 The Project adopted a methodology of working with BME community organisations on the ground. This methodology was based on the needs of the organisations and also determined by the need to provide the most effective intervention with groups that would ensure their performance would be improved.

5.3 Low level support provided for the groups involved the training programmes and the provision of funding information in the FADIS and the newsletters. There were 19 training programmes provided over the period of the Project of which nine were specifically funding workshops. Around six FADIS newsletters were circulated to over 1,300 organisations during the life of the Project against a target of eight. The level of telephone and email support given to groups could not be determined as no evidence was provided.

5.4 Higher level support was based on one-to-one consultation, intensive capacity building and hands-on support for some of the organisations. These were organisations that were assessed as capable of moving forward with what they had gained from the training seminars. However we could find no evidence to confirm that the target of assisting eight organisations was achieved.

5.5 Overall the Project worked with 27 organisations based in Lambeth, Haringey and Islington though there were beneficiaries from other boroughs in London.

FADIS and the Newsletter

- 5.6 Funding bulletins were made available to beneficiaries on a regular basis as were newsletters that provided more information about the operation of the BMECCP and other related issues. Regular updates of events were also provided in the newsletter.
- 5.7 Six editions of the newsletter were produced during the period of the Project and circulated to more than 3000 organisations, far in excess of the original 600 envisaged in the delivery plan. FADIS was sent to 1,300 organisations, the target was 600.

Training courses and workshops

- 5.8 It was envisaged in the delivery plan that 14 training workshops would be delivered over the period of the project. The Project delivered 19 of these workshops, sometimes in conjunction with the CSAS. The range of topics covered fundraising, monitoring and evaluation, project management, partnership working. We were able to examine a file containing application forms and attendance records for the training courses. Several of the participants came from the project area but there were a number outside the two target boroughs such as Roehampton, Croydon, Edgware, Hanworth, Orpington, Beckton, Harrow, Peckham, Bethnal Green, Bow Forest Gate, and Queens Park in West London
- 5.9 The following training programmes were delivered:

Training Course	Date	Attendance
Unlocking Funds	2/10/03	20
Funding Sources	4/11/03	11
Fundraising Strategy	27/01/04	16
Partnership Working	9/03/04	6
Fundraising Strategy	31/03/04	15
Partnership Working	24/04/04	9
Monitoring and Evaluation	4/05/04	6
Fundraising Strategy	19/05/04	12
Fundraising Strategy	21/10/04	12
Partnership Working	26/10/04	7
Fundraising Strategy	2/11/04	8
Monitoring and Evaluation	10/11/04	12
Partnership Working	18/11/04	12
Fundraising Strategy	11/05/05	10
Partnership Working	12/05/05	5
Monitoring and Evaluation	17/05/05	8
Capacity Building	18/05/05	13
Monitoring and Evaluation	1/06/05	2
Fundraising Strategy	9/06/05	6

- 5.10 We were not able to ascertain whether all the courses run were exclusively for the BMECCP and their target group or whether these training programmes were combined with other CSAS training programmes. These courses were jointly promoted and branded, giving the impression of a joint initiative. The view was expressed that CSAS were taking over the BMECCP remit, and this caused some disquiet.
- 5.11 Many of the groups that attended the seminars found them to be useful for networking between groups dealing with similar issues. It also provided an opportunity for like minded groups to get their voices heard and to explore joint working. However, a number of groups felt that some events did not focus on issues specific to their particular needs.

One-on-one assistance

- 5.12 One-on-one assistance generally proved to be the most beneficial for participants. This assistance was generally delivered to smaller organisations that employed less than three members of staff and also to umbrella organisations that were able to pass on some of the information to assist their member organisations. Some beneficiaries stated that not only did it help them to view fundraising from a strategic perspective but they also received advice on a variety of issues. For one participant for example the advice that they received on their lease was the most useful and vital.
- 5.13 A major benefit to participants was the fact that they could relate to the project workers delivering the advice and assistance who were from the black and minority ethnic community.
- 5.14 The target was to support 8 groups but as can be seen from tables 3 and 4, 27 groups benefited from one-on-one assistance across the two Boroughs.

Table 3 – Lambeth Groups

Organisation	Support Given
Your Story Mentoring	Bid writing
Kennington Youth and Community Project	Fundraising
Right Way Forward Mentoring	Project advice
SELAH	Funding advice
Esteem Youth Foundation	Policy Development Templates
BAF Theatre Company	Project Development Templates
New Leaders Foundation	Funding support
Ethiopian World Federation	Roles/Responsibilities MC training
Rasta International	Roles/Responsibilities MC training
The Light Outreach	Funding advice and support
Straight Aims	Planning and Project Management

Table 4 Haringey Groups:

Organisation	Support Given
Youth Retreat Project	Funding advice
Exposure	Bid writing – community fund application
Nu Mu	Funding advice
Adam Community Organisation	Funding advice
Pyramid Health and Social Care	Funding advice and bid writing
Sierra Leone Family Welfare Association	Funding advice
Black Arts Productions	Funding advice
Kurdish Community Centre	Project management advice and the development of crime reduction initiatives
Victim Support Haringey	Funding advice
Ackee Housing Project	Advice on how to involve users
Age Concern Haringey	Support with funding application
Access to Sport	Support on bids for working with BME youth
Arab Advice Centre	Support with funding application
Muslim Welfare House	Capacity building prevention of young men offending
Finsbury Park Partnership Blackstock Road Project	Project Advice
Kokayi Supplementary School	Funding Advice and Support

Level of funding

5.15 The target was four groups to increase funding. This was achieved: the following four organisations listed in the table below benefited from funds as a direct result of the Project. In addition two small grants funding rounds were distributed by LAT during the period of the Project.

Table 5 Funding Achieved

Group	Funding Source	Amount Raised
Your Story Mentoring (Lambeth)	Children in Need	£20,000
Kennington Youth and Community Project	Scarman Trust	£700
Arab Advice Bureau (Haringey)	Home Office	£5,000
Kokayi Supplementary School	Tudor Trust	£12,000
Lambeth Small Grants Fund 2004	Metropolitan Police	£100,000
Lambeth Small Grants Fund 2005	Metropolitan Police	£150,000
Total		£287,700

Source: LAT Final Report 2005

5.16 The above figures are an underestimation of what was actually raised by the organisations as a direct result of intervention by the Project. For instance one of the groups, Kokayi, claimed that they were able to raise as much as £74,000 as a result of the Project which we were able to evidence through their grant acceptance letters.

- 5.17 The Project was also able to ensure that different sources of funding were made available to groups. In Lambeth a Safety fund was established and managed by LAT as a direct result of the BME cracking crime project; a total of £250,000 was made available over the period of the Project (see Table 5 above). Some of the funding came on stream after the Project ended.
- 5.18 It was difficult to determine how many bids were submitted by the Project or groups supported by the Project as this information was not available. However, a number of organisations that was assisted by the Project submitted bids for funding as a direct result of the Project but was not successful. It would seem that some of them did not meet the criteria for funding because they were not in permanent premises.
- 5.19 The Chairman of the Partnership Board had also encouraged several statutory sector agencies to fund groups. Organisations such as ALG and The Safer London Foundation made funding available to groups partly as a result of their involvement with the BMECCP.
- 5.20 No specific sum of money was set in the delivery plan as a target for the Project to achieve for this objective.

Impact

- 5.21 In addition to the funds that have been made available, groups that the Project worked with directly and other groups will have benefited from the Project because of funding that became available as a direct result of the Project. For instance the £250,000 raised from the Lambeth Borough Commanders Fund over two years would have been distributed to organisations other than those that the Project worked with directly. The ALG, as a result of becoming aware of issues of BME crime, ring fenced an extra £250,000 over three years in its funding round for community safety initiatives which put many groups on a firmer footing in the delivery of their services and their ability to engage in meaningful participation. Appendix 3 provides details of the groups that the ALG supported.
- 5.22 The Project has helped to identify several smaller organisations that are working towards reduction of crime in the two London boroughs and has succeeded in making statutory sector organisations aware of their funding needs. Some organisations that have benefited from funding as a

result of the Project may not necessarily use the funds towards crime reduction projects but will improve their facilities or use it to improve their institutional capacity and their ability to generate more funding. For instance Kokayi were able to create more space with one added benefit that they will be able to hire out their facility to generate more funding, that will contribute to increasing the stability of their project.

- 5.23 Another instance of benefit is that the ALG is now looking at providing funding for organisations over a longer term period which will help ensure the sustainability of those groups.
- 5.24 The Project also managed to identify several smaller organisations, some of whom have never benefited from funding, but who are working towards crime reduction. Some of these projects have been brought into contact with statutory sector organisations. There is, however, no hard evidence that their participation was effective with these agencies as delivery partners. Some, however, feel that after several years of being ignored the authorities have started listening.
- 5.25 It is however too early to judge the extent to which these smaller organisations will be allowed full and beneficial participation. The Race Hate Forum, however, have started directing small groups to engage directly with authorities in the boroughs.

Tangible improvements in practice

- 5.26 Though no measurable targets were set in the amount of funding that was to be raised by the groups, the fact is that some of the groups, who still do not have the capacity to raise funding, because they do not have the right structures in place, have benefited from the training and the one-to-one capacity building sessions that were delivered. Some of them now claim that they understand the structures they need to put in place and the system of fundraising better. They are now aware of policies and procedures and quality systems that will help them to gain funding.
- 5.27 They also have an improved understanding of the structures that are involved in their sector of crime reduction and feel more confident that they can engage the authorities better. These organisations have also gained a wealth of knowledge and information on other areas and sectors that engage the

youth with whom they work. This is very useful for their future operation and growth, especially, since some of the institutions and agencies such as Connexions, Prospects and the system of YOT, CJS and Positive Activities for Young People (PAYP) may be linked.

- 5.28 The training and the capacity building sessions have helped some of the groups though it might be too early to evaluate the benefits. Also a longer term strategic view needs to be taken of the decision to provide higher level support in only two boroughs instead of making the project London wide.
- 5.29 Some groups interviewed felt that the training programmes on a variety of issues such as forming partnerships, monitoring, evaluation and fundraising assisted them in looking at their own structures in-house. The assistance would have been more useful if they had been provided with clear examples of strategies that worked in other organisations. However, based on the knowledge acquired through the Project they felt encouraged to improve their own performance through implementing better systems and structures in their organisations.
- 5.30 The Project had to work creatively with the groups on the ground and adapt sometimes to their styles of working. It was evident that though there was some work relating to the obvious areas of working around guns, knives and street crimes, there were other issues such as credit card fraud that was not specific to BME communities and at times there was a need to expand the focus of the Project to deal with such issues.
- 5.31 Though there was a list of BME groups who had used the services of the Project, there was difficulty in identifying what best practice had been shared with the beneficiaries.

6 Propose policy changes, which will improve the practice of Crime and Disorder partnerships and key statutory agencies in this area.

Outputs

Table 6 Objective 4 Targets and Achievement

Item	Targets	delivered
Greater BME representation on CDRPs	0	undetermined
End of year policy report number distributed	50	undetermined
Newsletters distributed to crime reduction agencies	40	undetermined
Newsletters distributed to BME groups	250	35,000

6.1 Four consultations were held over the two year period, which brought together people working on crime issues. These included consultations on:

- Gun Crime
- S.44 Stop and Search
- Violence Against Women
- Knife Crime

6.2 The Project also engaged in wide ranging discussions and consultancies with a variety of statutory sector agencies involved in crime work. These were:

- Criminal Justice Service Race Unit on young black males
- Independent Police Complaints Commission on trust and confidence
- Crown Prosecution Service on racist crime
- Metropolitan Police Service on s.44 stop and search
- Greater London Authority on anti gangs
- National Offender Management Service on revolving doors

6.3 Several policy papers on crime from a BME perspective were developed and circulated to various stakeholders to inform the best practice agenda. These papers included:

- BLF 1st Reading Briefing to the Antisocial Behaviour Bill, House of Lords - May 2003
- BLF 2nd Reading Briefing on the Criminal Justice Bill, House of Lords - May 2003
- Response to the Home Office's 'Safety and Justice' Domestic Violence Consultation - September 2003
- Crime & Policing and Black and Minority Ethnic communities (UK) fact sheet

- CCP Policy Development Report 1: A preliminary study, opportunities for BME sector engagement in statutory crime prevention/reduction initiatives (August 2003)
- CCP Policy Development Report 2: A qualitative study of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships managers in three London boroughs - barriers and solutions to greater BME sector representation and involvement in CDRPs (October 2003)
- Response to the Home Office's 'Policing: Building Safer Communities Together' consultation (January 2004)

6.4 These policy papers were developed in response to government legislation. It also pointed out best practice that had been developed as a result of the Project. These policy papers have been addressed towards persons and organisations who are involved in crime issues.

Generating recommendations for improvements

6.5 The BME Cracking Crime Project has generated some recommendations for improvements to policy that have been communicated to the BME Cracking Crime Board. These recommendations appear in the end of year report (May 2005) and are restated below. Details of where this report has been circulated have not been established therefore the target of 50 circulated could not be determined.

- **Gun crime** - A thorough national strategy that addresses issues related to the importation of illegal firearms needs to be established. Additional funding should be granted to police services fighting gun crime, particularly services that provide support for vulnerable victims and witnesses. A research study (or studies) that thoroughly investigates the accusation of the 'attractiveness' of guns to young people needs to be commissioned at the earliest opportunity.
- **The use of knives and weapons by young people** - Programmes and materials (e.g. for schools) aimed at diverting young people away from knife crime, and preventing young people from becoming involved in it need to be devised, implemented and evaluated
- **Ex offenders** - Within the context of the National Offender Management System (NOMS), projects that seek to incorporate ex-offenders in the prevention of crime should be encouraged and fully resourced.
- **Anti-gang work** - A multi-agency partnership to tackle the problem of the gang membership should incorporate grass-roots community organisations, replicating the successful interventions that have taken place in northern England and the United States.
- **Race and Faith Hate Crime** - All London boroughs should implement a multi-agency race and faith hate crime reduction & prevention strategy. These partnerships should also agree to annually report to the London-wide Race Hate Crime Forum to share

progress and seek advice. Projects that aim to prevent race and faith hate by adopting an educational approach should be implemented in the areas with the highest rates of these types of crimes.

- **Anti-Social Behaviour** - Restorative justice methods should be used as an alternative to Anti-Social Behaviour Order (ASBOs) for young perpetrators where appropriate. Local authorities should empower their community members to take action against ASB. This should include training for local volunteers such as street pastors or neighbourhood wardens.
- **Criminal Justice System** - Local authorities and criminal justice agencies should work closely with their local communities and organisations to assist in informing the community, and combat misinformation that can harm trust and confidence. Community safety policies must account for the cultural sensitivities of local communities, ensuring accessibility for all people. This is particularly important for new communities including asylum seekers and refugees.
- **Representation and engagement** - There should be marked improvement in the number of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) representatives on local Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships and Local Strategic Partnerships, especially in boroughs with a high BME population. Local authorities and criminal justice agencies should involve local BME communities throughout all stages of policy development. The local communities also need to be kept fully aware of the actions being taken.
- **Trust, confidence and reassurance** - All criminal justice agencies need to ensure that all strategies, policies and guidelines need to reflect outcomes of consultation exercises in terms of the priorities highlighted by 'consultees'. Without compromising security, the police should keep local communities retrospectively informed of developments with regard to the need to use s44 stops and searches. Officers supervising operations where these stops and searches are used should be closely monitored.
- **Community, family-based and faith-based remedies** - Regional and local criminal justice service deliverers should ensure that faith communities are closely involved in the crime prevention and reduction initiatives in their locality. Criminal Justice System service providers should also work closely with capacity building organisations around crime prevention and reduction issues. Community members should also be provided with training opportunities when this is necessary, such as parenting skills for parents who are looking to, or have been advised or ordered to address the offending behaviour of their children.
- **Stop and Search** - The two local police forces should communicate the tenets of the Freedom of Information Act in order to encourage officers to rely more heavily on police intelligence and be more equitable in terms of who they stop and search. Further research should be carried out with reference to 'successful' stops and searches (i.e. those that have led to an arrest) and why they were 'successful'. Research should also examine the evidence of the 'deterrence factor' of stop and search.

- **Resources** - All funding agencies should allocate sustainable funding for BME projects devised to fight current inequalities, at least until these inequalities significantly desist.
- **BMER (BME & Refugee) Youth** - All of the agencies responsible for youth services should provide affordable – if not free – activities to divert young people away from socialising on the streets. Consultation with young people should be carried out to find out their needs, and the recommendations should be implemented, or a youth-focused publication should provide an adequate justification regarding those recommendations that will not be implemented.
- **Media strategies** - All of the organisations and agencies that have been referred to in the recommendations above should consider the potential negative usage of their press releases concerning BME crime issues or the prevention of terrorism.

- 6.6 It has not been clear to what extent the two organisations, BLF and LAT worked together to provide the recommendations. However, the general feeling is that LAT was more involved in delivering work with the groups and pursuing their own contacts and presentations to the statutory sector without input into shaping the policies that was developed by BLF. It would seem there were inadequate structures in place to enable effective information flow between the two organisations. This weakness is evident in the lack of specific examples or analysis within the report of practical ways in which organisations involved in the BMECCP dealt with crime issues as users or service providers.
- 6.7 Some of these recommendations, though not having been approved by the Board, have been adopted and are being used by some statutory sector agencies already as a result of the BMECCP work. For instance the RHCF has adopted some of the recommendations and other work of the BMECCP as a backdrop to their work on race hate crimes. The City of London Police has also started changing their ways of working around stop and search and has set up a working party in response to the work of the BMECCP. Furthermore, the ALG have agreed to provide further funding to tackle the issue of crime amongst BME groups.
- 6.8 Some Policy Advisory Group members have started feeding these recommendations to the CDRPs in their boroughs and one member of the PAG now regularly provides an input at meetings organised by the crime safety coordinator in the London Borough of Southwark. There is, however no evidence of the Project having any systematic contact with the CDRPs in any borough.

- 6.9 The Project was focused on the Trident boroughs and there are issues as to how the recommendations in the Project's final report can be fed into or be relevant to other boroughs.
- 6.10 It is not clear whether the recommendations have been championed by all Partnership Board members and whether indeed they are committed in their role of influencing their networks to adopt any recommendations that came out of the work of the Project.
- 6.11 There is however evidence to suggest that the Project raised awareness of crime at all levels and that some policy recommendations that are practical and capable of being implemented have been made. The Project has increased the participation of some BME organisations in working with other bodies though these may not yet have been accepted by their local CDRP's.

Recommendations useful on regional scale

- 6.12 There was a general feeling from some of those interviewed from the Partnership Board that the recommendations of the BLF final report would, if accepted by the Board, be useful for wider dissemination and adoption on a regional scale.
- 6.13 The capacity building and funding aspect of the programme would have been more effective if it had been a London wide project as this would have had the impact of being better able to immediately influence policy at the wider regional level.
- 6.14 There were attempts made at several stages of the Project to directly engage central government agencies on the issue of crime, a London wide project would have had more clout with the government departments, agencies and corporations that were contacted, such as the Home Office, DfES, BBC, Office for Criminal Justice Reform (OCJR) Department of Constitutional Affairs, Press Complaints Commission and OFCOM.
- 6.15 Opportunities to engage in wider regional debate were not maximised. There was a lack of interface with the Home Office Change Up - a £6m initiative for the voluntary sector - where there was the potential to influence how this funding stream could target BME communities. There was no evidence that the Project had been able to harness the opportunity afforded to redress issues by the National Offenders Management System (NOMS).

7 Conclusions

- 7.1 The general impression was that the Project made some resounding achievements in promoting and raising awareness of crime prevention and reduction issues within the BME communities and from a BME perspective. The project was very ambitious and although in some instances it was difficult to determine some outputs through lack of sufficient information, the evidence shows that overall most of the outputs in the delivery plan were achieved.
- 7.2 There were some benefits arising out of the implementation of the project. One success of the Project was that it raised and placed the issue of BME involvement in crime reduction firmly on the agenda of the key agencies involved in this area of work. These agencies were also able to engage with members of the BME community in full and frank exchanges to the extent that they were able to learn from the experience. The Project was also able to engage young people and get them to share their views on crime reduction strategies particularly from a young BME male perspective.
- 7.3 Black community organisations involved in crime reduction had an opportunity as a result of this Project to interact with key players involved in crime reduction in their local communities. The groups also benefited from training, support and other assistance that led them to restructure their organisations and in some cases gain access to funding.
- 7.4 Overall many stakeholders felt that this was a positive project that may well have had a stronger impact if had been allowed to operate for a longer period.
- 7.5 The project required a varied skill set of policy, personnel and community development expertise as well as people with a knowledge of BME issues as well as crime prevention and reduction strategies. Staff employed was competent in their specialist field but there was a feeling that they were being stretched to other administrative tasks which reduced the time they had to spend on delivery of the project.
- 7.6 While some useful work arose from the PAG, its impact could have been greater if issues about its broad remit, its role, commitment and interface with other agencies had been adequately addressed. The PAG membership also changed frequently and at times proved very difficult to assemble for meetings, even when flexible methods of working was adopted.

- 7.7 The Partnership Board also comprised experts in the crime reduction field who were also committed to pursuing effective strategies to reduce crime. However, there were notable absences from some of the meetings which seems to have been compounded by frequent last minute cancellations of meetings. This did not appear to stop them from providing strong leadership for the Project.
- 7.8 The Project suffered from some issues relating to changes in operational staff, and lack of appropriate cover to deal with periods when staff was not in post
- 7.9 The BMECCP was funded by Government Office for London to the tune of £378,663 over two and a half years. The forward strategy had identified different sources for continued funding for the project after the initial two years. The Chair of the Partnership Board had asked, at a Board meeting, for the statutory sector members to assist the Project with funding. In the event specific funding for the continuation of the project was not secured.
- 7.10 There were adequate resources for the planning and implementation of the Project as envisaged.
- 7.11 There were positive social and cultural benefits of running the project. It enabled newer and smaller BME community organisations to get involved in crime prevention and reduction issues and to take responsibility for resolving issues that were perceived to be within their community. In some instances the Project helped to bring the MPS and BME young people together in a process of rebuilding trust and confidence.
- 7.12 One important aspect was the provision of a voice for sections of the BME community who are marginalised in discussions relating to crime, particularly in relation to Stop and Search.
- 7.13 Since the Project was supported by a Partnership Board comprising all the key agencies involved in crime reduction and prevention and a highly committed and dedicated chair it was surprising that the Project could not gain the funding to continue the work that was being done. Whilst, we recognise that the Project's original remit was originally for one year which was eventually extended by another year. However during the life of the Project the intention was to seek funding to continue the work. The abrupt closure of the Project, however, does indicate inadequate forward thinking about the

long term sustainability of the work done or how and in what form it should continue.

- 7.14 One explanation as to why the Project ended was perhaps that the work done was not considered strategic enough and was not able to link in or influence the local crime prevention agencies to commit to supporting its continuance. It could also be that fundraising for the Project was not given a high enough priority by the two organisations that implemented the Project. It is surprising that issues about the continuation of the Project arise only in reports to the Board in September 2004 which is only six months before the Project's funding was due to end.
- 7.15 Crime and disorder issues are very much on the national agenda at present and every effort should have been made to ensure the work of the BMECCP or the momentum of what has so far been gained is not lost. That this was not done represents a failing of the Project.
- 7.16 It would seem that there was no sense of urgency about the Project's own survival, despite several applications being made to secure funds for the project's continuation, no funding was secured. To some extent the lack of an evaluation and an assumption that the project would continue may have affected its ability to continue.
- 7.17 The impact of the Project could not be measured in this evaluation because the Project focused very much on delivery of broad targets. To the extent that the Project raised awareness, one could say that it met its objectives, but perhaps it should have looked to ensuring that its policy recommendations were implemented. It would seem that the Project was seen as responding to issues rather than being proactive in setting the agenda. This it could have done if its best practice work had been documented and disseminated in a more effective and systematic way.
- 7.18 Several lessons can be learned from the operation of the Project. The objectives set could have been more focused. The initial intention of using delivery on the ground to assist in the development of policy which would then be disseminated may have worked better if one organisation had taken overall responsibility for the BMECCP. Mixing delivery and policy and devolving the responsibility amongst two organisations with different foci and cultures created some communication problems and had implications for the supervision of staff.

- 7.19 Another lesson learned is that projects should be operated for longer time periods, unless there is a clear exit strategy, because closing projects that provide a service for BME communities creates a credibility problem and suggests that funders are not willing to sustain or resource issues that affect the BME communities. It is important that expectations are not raised about projects only for the projects to disappear, as this creates a very negative impression of “fly by night” operations.
- 7.20 By focusing the project around the Trident Boroughs opportunities to tap into the operations of other CDRP’s who may have been more receptive to the work of the BMECCP, because of their lack of experience in dealing with BME crime issues, was lost.
- 7.21 Too many meetings were cancelled at short notice at both the Partnership and Policy level which did not bode well for the Project. Besides, the main operational officers for the Project never had an opportunity to interact with the Partnership Board which meant their resources were not being used to maximum effect.
- 7.22 The Project could have benefited more from the Partnership Board, PAG and other project partners being clearer on their roles and responsibilities and establishing clear links between the PAG, Partnership Board, staff and beneficiaries on the ground.

8 Recommendations

- 8.1 The following recommendations are made based on our findings and conclusions.
- 8.2 Different approaches will need to be considered for delivery of a BME Cracking Crime remit. This may include links to agencies like Change Up and NOMS and using a range of experienced capacity building organisations and consultants as delivery partners
- 8.3 A Project with a BME Cracking Crime remit needs to be Pan London both in policy and delivery to ensure wider strategic focus.
- 8.4 Baseline data must be provided and objectives need to be more specific and focused. This will assist in setting realistic targets that can be effectively measured through regular monitoring to assess the impact and outcomes of such a Project.
- 8.5 Further work should be done to identify individual projects which can be rigorously evaluated to stakeholders with a crime reduction remit to enable best practice information be shared.
- 8.6 There needs to be clarity in focus and a better link established between delivery and policy with improved mechanisms for disseminating information and policy documentation.
- 8.7 Attention should be given to implementing improved mechanisms for engaging CDRP's and to widen the PAG and Partnership Board's membership to include their representation.
- 8.8 Structures will need to be put in place for better lines of communication internally and externally.
- 8.9 A charter should be drawn up with all Stakeholder agencies including Local Authorities to ensure they are signed up and committed to an agreed level of delivery of service.

9 APPENDICES

Appendix 1: List of document reviewed

1. BME Cracking Crime Conference Report
2. BLF Response to S44
3. Race Hate Crime in London
4. BME Criminal Justice
5. BME Cracking Crime Delivery Plan Delivery Plan: Year 1 (April 2003 – March 2004)
6. Black and minority ethnic cracking crime successes: may 2003 – nov. 2004
7. Black and minority ethnic cracking crime successes: may 2003 – jun 2005.
8. Cracking Crime Project Update – Sept 2003
9. London BME Cracking Crime Partnership Board 24 November 2004 Minutes
10. BME CCP December 2004 to February 2005 Update
11. Cracking Crime Project Update – as of week ending 18th June Cracking Crime Project Update
12. Black And Minority Ethnic (BME) Communities Cracking Crime Report On The Identification Of BME Community Organisations, Assessment Of Their Support Needs And Linkage To The Work Of Statutory Sector Partners
13. Cracking Crime Project Delivery Plan: Year 1 (June 2003 – May 2004)
14. Cracking Crime Project Delivery Plan: Year 2 (June 2004 – May 2005)
15. Minutes cracking crime: BME crime reduction network
16. Progress report for Partnership Board meeting - 13 march 2003
17. Update of achievements from BLF Policy Development Officer (Crime & Safety)
18. Black Londoners Forum BME Cracking Crime Delivery Plan
19. Delivery Plan: Year 1 (April 2003 – March 2004 Black Londoners Forum
20. BME Cracking Crime Project: Policy Advisory Group Review Day: 23rd November 2004
21. Cracking Crime Project Update – Sept 2003
22. Cracking Crime Project Update – as of week ending 18th June 2004
23. Cracking Crime Project Update – up to 31st August 2004
24. BME CCP Update Winter 04/05 Black Londoners Forum
25. Black & Minority Ethnic Cracking Crime Project 04/05 24th May 2005.
26. Black Londoners Forum A powerful voice for Black Londoners Delivery Plan: Policy and Citizenship Project April 2005 – March 2006
27. Crime reduction and prevention from a Black & Minority Ethnic Perspective
28. Recommendations for London's regional and local service deliverers with reference to Crime & Disorder Strategies and other delivery plans. February 2005
29. MPS response to issues raised by the Black Londoners Forum Black Londoners Forum A powerful voice for Black Londoners
30. Black & Minority Ethnic Cracking Crime Project (BME CCP) end of year report May 2005 David Dalglish
31. Controls on Firearms A response by the Black Londoners Forum on behalf of community members in attendance of the Cracking Gun Crime event, City Hall, 29th July 2004.
32. Review of section 95 statistics on criminal justice system and race
33. Questions for researchers
34. Stops and Searches under Section 44 of the Terrorism Act 2000 A response by the Black Londoners Forum on behalf of community members in attendance of a public consultation event held at London Muslim Centre, October 13th 2004.
35. Race Hate Crime in London: A yearly review: David Dalglish (BME Cracking Crime Project) December 2004
36. Statistics on Race and the Criminal Justice System
37. Report from BME Communities Cracking Crime Event April 2002

Appendix 2: List of people interviewed

Name	Job Title	Organisation	Stakeholder group	When 2005
John Trainor	Deputy Director	LAT	Staff	12/9
Wolete Gabriel Pauline Anderson	President	Ethiopian World Federation	Beneficiary	19/9
Jah Blue	Chairman	Rasta International	Beneficiary	19/9
Jerry Nicholas	Chairman	Kennington Community Centre	Beneficiary	19/9
Sasan Abtahi Michelle Adeyinka	Policy & Grants Manager (Community safety and Human Rights Section)	ALG	Partnership Board	20/9 26/9
Delroy Thomas	Mentor	Right Way Forward Mentoring Project	Beneficiary	22/9
David Dalgeish	Policy Development Officer	BLF	Staff	23/9
Roger King	Crime Reduction Director	GOL	Partnership Board	26/9
Nicola Speechly	Policy Advisor	GOL		26/9
Michael Gordon	Manager	409 Project	PAG	11/10
Gary Lewis	Chief Inspector – Stop & Searches Bureau	City of London Police? OR MPS??	Beneficiary	11/10
Terena Bennett	Community Safety Co-ordinator	L B Southwark?	PAG	13/10
Bennett Obong	Project Manager	Race Hate Crime Forum (RHCF)	Partnership Board	21/10
Toni Wiltshire	Community Safety Officer		PAG	24/10
Hugh Dale	Education Director	Kokayi Supplementary School	Beneficiary	1/11
Supt. Ian Jenkins	Superintendent – Safer Neighbourhoods Team	Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)	Partnership Board	3/11
Lee Jasper	Policy Director	GLA	Partnership Board	11/11

Appendix 3:

ALG Ring Fenced Funding 2004-2007 Grant Recommendations

Organisation Name	Total revenue grant awarded	Period covered by the award	Additional non-recurrent grant (recruitment costs and equipment purchases)
African Families Support Services	£72,035	2 ½ years	£700
Black Londoners Forum	£100,000	2 ½ years	-
Seedtime Projects	£13,600	6 months	-
Somali Family Support Group (SFSG)	£39,330	2 years	£1,500
South London African Women's Organisation (SLAWO) – Men's DV Project	£33,099	1 ½ years	£1,500
South London African Women's Organisation (SLAWO) – Youth Support Programme	£29,004	1 ½ years	£3,500
The Comedy School	£87,500	2 ½ years	£1,500
The Monitoring Group	£84,715	2 ½ years	£1,950
The Peace Alliance	£60,000	2 ½ years	-
Total	£519,283		£9,950.00

Appendix 4: Evaluation questionnaire

1 Name

2 Job Title

3 Role on the BMECCP project

4 *Project aim 1: To increase the collective understanding of the experience of crime and its consequences in BME communities*

4.1 What outputs were delivered to support this aim (as set out in the delivery plan or in addition to it)?

4.1.1 What targets were set in the delivery plan

4.1.2 What evidence do you have in support of the outputs

4.1.3 What methods and processes did you use

4.1.4 What information do you have about the contents of the programme

4.2 To what extent has the project helped directly to identify lessons learned and areas for improvement at the regional (or national) level?

4.2.1 Who were the main beneficiaries of this objective

4.2.2 How have they benefited from the programme

4.2.3 What documents are available as evidence

4.2.4 What specific lessons have been learnt and how have these been implemented

4.2.5 Are there any evaluation reports available

4.3 To what extent has the project directly or indirectly led to local crime reduction agencies having a better understanding of how to deliver crime reduction and reassurance for BME groups

4.3.1 What documentary evidence do you have to demonstrate the project's success in this objective

4.3.2 Are any action plans drawn up by beneficiaries available

4.3.3 Are there specific events that we can point to as evidence of this improved understanding

4.3.4 How has this translated into concrete projects on the ground

5 *Project aim 2: To stimulate ideas and best practice about what is being done and what can be done to reduce crime in BME communities*

5.1 What outputs were delivered to support this aim (as set out in the delivery plan or in addition to it)?

5.1.1 What targets were set in the delivery plan

- 5.1.2 What evidence do you have in support of the outputs
- 5.1.3 What methods and processes were used
- 5.1.4 What information do you have about the contents of the programme

5.2 To what extent has the project documented best practice and/or promising approaches

- 5.2.1 Who were the main beneficiaries of this objective
- 5.2.2 How have they benefited from the programme
- 5.2.3 What documents are available as evidence
- 5.2.4 What specific lessons have been learnt and how have these been implemented
- 5.2.5 Are there any evaluation reports available

5.3 To what extent has the project shared best practice / promising approaches (e.g. through the BME Cracking Crime Board, London-wide and local delivery partners, or other knowledge management systems)

- 5.3.1 What documentary evidence do you have available to show that you have been successful in this objective
- 5.3.2 Are there action plans drawn up by beneficiaries available
- 5.3.3 Are there specific events that we can point to as evidence of their improved understanding
- 5.3.4 How has this translated into concrete projects on the ground

6 *Project aim 3: To improve opportunities to access funding for crime reduction projects and initiatives in BME communities*

6.1 What outputs were delivered to support this aim (as set out in the delivery plan or in addition to it)

- 6.1.1 What targets were set in the delivery plan
- 6.1.2 What evidence is there to support these outputs
- 6.1.3 What methods and processes did you use
- 6.1.4 What information do you have about the contents of the programme

6.2 To what extent has the project helped groups access funding for crime reduction initiatives?

- 6.2.1 Who were the main beneficiaries of this objective
- 6.2.2 How have they benefited from the programme
- 6.2.3 What documents are available as evidence
- 6.2.4 What specific lessons have been learnt and how have these been implemented
- 6.2.5 Are there any evaluation reports available

6.3 What is the impact of BME Cracking Crime Project interventions in terms of revenue generated (either in total or an average for groups)?

- 6.3.1 What documentary evidence is available to show that you have successfully met this objective
- 6.3.2 Are there action plans drawn up by beneficiaries available
- 6.3.3 Are there specific events that we can point to as evidence of their improved understanding
- 6.3.4 How has this translated into concrete projects on the ground
- 6.3.5 How much funding has been raised by the groups and projects as a result of the intervention

6.4 How far has funding raised succeeded in

a) putting BME organisations on a firmer footing

b) assisting them in meaningful participation with statutory crime reduction delivery partners

- 6.4.1 Is there evidence to show that the funding base of projects have been diversified
- 6.4.2 To what extent can we say that the funding received has made the projects more sustainable
- 6.4.3 To what extent are these organisations collaborating with statutory sector partnerships
- 6.4.4 Can you provide us with some evidence of this

6.5 To what extent did the training and support provided lead to tangible improvements in practice within BME organisations (e.g. project management, fundraising, understanding of local crime reduction structures and processes)

- 6.5.1 Is there evidence of better processes
- 6.5.2 Has the training been translated into action plans
- 6.5.3 Are there fundraising strategy documents and proposals available

7 Project aim 4: To propose policy changes which will improve the practice of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships and key statutory agencies involved in crime reduction

7.1 How effective was the Project in generating recommendations for improvements to policy and communicating these to the BME Cracking Crime Board (this might be recommendations pertinent to local and pan-London agencies)

- 7.1.1 What strategic recommendations have come out of the project
- 7.1.2 How have these been communicated
- 7.1.3 How have the these been implemented
- 7.1.4 What documentary evidence is available

7.2 To what extent were the recommendations useful on a regional scale (for example, in linking with the broader policy context around engagement and capacity building)

- 7.2.1 What has been the regional and national impact of the project
- 7.2.2 How has this fed into policy within a national context

8 General impressions

- 8.1 What have been the achievements and successes of the project?
- 8.2 Did the project have the requisite technical competence to deliver?
- 8.3 Did the project run on budget and were opportunities to secure more funding available and utilised
- 8.4 Were there enough resources and support for the planning and implementation of the project?
- 8.5 What were the positive social and cultural benefits of the project?
- 8.6 To what extent was the project sustainable?
- 8.7 What lessons have been learnt on the operation of the project?
- 9 Did the project meet its objectives?
- 10 What were the constraints?
- 11 What improvements need to be made for the future?