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# Chart 1: Victim First Performance Data Year 1 (01/10/2015 – 30/09/2016)

132 (1%) we were unable to contact the victim due to incorrect contact information. This was fed back to the referrer

423 (4%) victims did not respond to phone contact and it was unsafe to leave a message or send information. This was fed back to the referrer.

6,849 (73%) victims received a basic support service:

* **1,979** victims received a phone call outlining the support available but chose to decline ongoing support
* **1,298** victims did not respond to telephone contact but were sent support information by post
* **106** victims were given details of their local victim support service as they did not live in Leicester, Leicestershire or Rutland
* **3,466** victims received basic support between October and December 2016, however the accurate status is unknown.

**9,434 cases came through to Victim First from October 2015 and September 2016**

2,030 (22%) victims were provided with tailored, **enhanced support**

# Chart 2: Victim First Performance Data Quarter 1 (01/10/2015 – 31/12/2016)

242 (7%) came through from other agencies and self-referrals

**We offered support to 3,712 victims and witness between 01/10/2015 – 31/12/2015**

3,470 (93%) of these cases were referred to us by the police

We provided support to 246 (7%) victims and witnesses

3,466 (93%) status unknown

# Chart 3: Victim First Performance Data Quarter 2 (01/01/2016 – 31/03/2016)

482 (36%) victims were provided with tailored, **enhanced support**

**1,333 cases came through to Victim First from January 2016 and March 2016**

87 (6%) victims did not respond to phone contact and it was unsafe to leave a message or send information. This was fed back to the referrer.

783 (58%) victims received a basic support service:

* **420** victims received a phone call outlining the support available but chose to decline ongoing support
* **355** victims did not respond to telephone contact but were sent support information by post
* **8** victims were given details of their local victim support service as they did not live in Leicester, Leicestershire or Rutland

# Chart 4: Victim First Performance Data Quarter 3 (01/04/2016 – 30/06/2016)

34 (2%) we were unable to contact the victim due to incorrect contact information. This was fed back to the referrer,

102 (7%) victims did not respond to phone contact and it was unsafe to leave a message or send information. This was fed back to the referrer.

343 (24%) victims were provided with tailored, **enhanced support**

980 (67%) victims received a basic support service:

* **538** victims received a phone call outlining the support available but chose to decline ongoing support
* **414** victims did not respond to telephone contact but were sent support information by post
* **28** victims were given details of their local victim support service as they did not live in Leicester, Leicestershire or Rutland

**1,459 cases came through to Victim First from April 2016 and June 2016**

# Chart 5: Victim First Performance Data Quarter 4 (01/07/2016 – 30/09/2016)

234 (8%) victims did not respond to phone contact and it was unsafe to leave a message or send information. This was fed back to the referrer.

1,640 (56%) victims received a basic support service:

* **1,021** victims received a phone call outlining the support available but chose to decline ongoing support
* **549** victims did not respond to telephone contact but were sent support information by post
* **70** victims were given details of their local victim support service as they did not live in Leicester, Leicestershire or Rutland

98 (3%) we were unable to contact the victim due to incorrect information. This was fed back to the referrer.

**2,930 cases came through to Victim First from July and September 2016**

958 (33%) victims were provided with tailored, **enhanced support**

# Referral Sources

## Referral Sources for Overall Cases

# Referral Sources

## Referral Sources for Cases receiving ‘Enhanced Support’

# Crime Types

Victim First received cases from 35 different crime types between October 2015 and September 2016. This table shows a breakdown of the cases Victim First received between October 2015 and September 2016, and how many cases have received ‘Enhanced Support’. This table does not illustrate which occurrence types are included in each crime type. Please see quarterly reports for this information.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Crime Type | Overall | Enhanced Support |
| Admin – Police Generated Resource Activity  | 561 | 164 |
| Admin – Cancel/Exit/Err During Create | 3 | 2 |
| Admin – Pre-planned Events  | 1 | 0 |
| ASB – Animal Problem  | 6 | 2 |
| ASB - Drunken Behaviour  | 1 | 0 |
| ASB – Inconsiderate Behaviour  | 31 | 9 |
| ASB – Malicious Nuisance  | 108 | 46 |
| ASB – Noise Nuisance  | 14 | 8 |
| ASB – Nuisance Neighbours  | 85 | 44 |
| ASB – Shouting and Swearing  | 4 | 1 |
| ASB – Throwing Things  | 1 | 0 |
| ASB – Trespass  | 2 | 0 |
| ASB – Vehicle Crime  | 4 | 1 |
| NVC – Burglary  | 721 | 206 |
| NVC – Criminal Damage  | 484 | 152 |
| NVC – Drugs  | 3 | 1 |
| NVC – Fraud and Forgery | 258 | 73 |
| NVC – Other Offences  | 171 | 64  |
| NVC – Weapons Possession  | 5 | 1 |
| NVC - Public Order Offence  | 152 | 49 |
| NVC - Robbery | 92 | 21  |
| NVC - Sexual  | 232 | 114 |
| NVC – Theft  | 538 | 128 |
| NVC – Vehicle Crime  | 150 | 45 |
| NVC – Violence  | 875 | 254 |
| PSW – Civil Dispute  | 2 | 1 |
| PSW – Concern for Safety  | 19 | 7 |
| PSW – Domestic Incident  | 605 | 240 |
| PSW – Missing Person | 1 | 0 |
| PSW – Misper, Unauthorised Absence  | 1 | 1 |
| PSW – Wanted Person/Court Order/Bail  | 1 | 0 |
| PSW – Firearms  | 3 | 1 |
| PSW – Pets/Domesticated Animals  | 6 | 1 |
| PSW – Hoax Calls  | 1 | 1 |
| PSW – Sudden Death  | 4 | 4 |
| PSW – Wildlife  | 5 | 1 |
| RTC – Slight  | 227 | 30 |
| RTC – Damage  | 3 | 1 |
| Unknown | 333 | 109 |

This bar graph shows the 9,434 overall cases Victim First received between October 2015 and September 2016 (blue) segregated through crime types, and the graph also shows how many in which crime types received ‘Enhanced Support’ (orange).

***Note:*** *This pie chart does not include data from Oct 2015 – Dec 2015.*

# Warnings and Flags

## This chart illustrates the warnings and flags identified for overall cases and those accepting ‘Enhanced Support’ that were received by Victim First between October 2015 and September 2016.

##

# How many victims reported to the police prior to, and following the support they received from Victim First?

# This chart shows how many victims from self-referrals which Victim First received between October 2015 and September 2016 reported to the police prior to receiving support from Victim First.

This chart shows how many victims from self-referrals which Victim First received between October and September 2016 had reported to the police as a result of the support received from Victim First.

# Repeat Victims

This chart shows how many victims, from the cases Victim First received between October 2015 and September 2016, were repeat victims of any other or the same crime.

# How many victims have had prior support from Victim First?

This chart shows how many cases, of those which came through between October 2015 and September 2016 to Victim First, had had previous support from Victim First.

## Demographics

The following charts breaks down the demographic spread of cases received by Victim First between October 2015 and September 2016.

# Geographic Areas

## This table illustrates the areas in which our service users reside.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Area  | Overall  | Enhanced Support  |
| Abbey | 124 | 38 |
| Aylestone  | 45 | 15 |
| Aylestone Park | 1 | 1 |
| Beaumont Leys | 128 | 41 |
| Belgrave | 57 | 17 |
| Blaby | 280 | 97 |
| Braunstone  | 109 | 35 |
| Braunstone Town  | 42 | 12 |
| Braunstone East | 1 | 0 |
| Braunstone West  | 1 | 0 |
| Castle  | 182 | 42 |
| Castle Hill  | 2 | 0 |
| Charnwood  | 679 | 234 |
| City Centre and St Andrews  | 417 | 135 |
| Clarendon Park | 6 | 4 |
| Coleman | 32 | 8 |
| Crown Hills  | 1 | 0 |
| Cottesmore  | 2 | 1 |
| Evington | 79 | 16 |
| Eyres Monsell  | 47 | 19 |
| Fosse  | 63 | 16 |
| Freeman | 59 | 20 |
| Hamilton | 20 | 8 |
| Harborough | 268 | 71 |
| Hinckley and Bosworth  | 352 | 129 |
| Humberstone | 47 | 17 |
| Knighton  | 61 | 14 |
| Latimer  | 33 | 7 |
| Latimer North  | 1 | 1 |
| Laugham  | 1 | 0 |
| Market Bosworth  | 6 | 1 |
| Market Harborough | 5 | 3 |
| Melton | 110 | 36 |
| Netherhall and Thurnby Lodge  | 4 | 2 |
| New Parks  | 121 | 54 |
| North West Leicester  | 284 | 82 |
| Northfields  | 8 | 3 |
| Oadby and Wigston | 166 | 53 |
| Oakham  | 8 | 1 |
| Rowley Fields  | 26 | 10 |
| Rushey Mead  | 55 | 17 |
| Rutland  | 51 | 6 |
| Ryhall and Casterton  | 1 | 0 |
| Saffron | 38 | 17 |
| Spinney Hill  | 73 | 15 |
| Stoneygate  | 75 | 24 |
| Thurncote  | 50 | 11 |
| Uppingham | 1 | 0 |
| Westcotes  | 78 | 17 |
| Western Park  | 81 | 18 |
| West Knighton | 1 | 0 |
| Wycliffe | 10 | 2  |
| Leicester (City)  | 1,989 | 605 |
| Leicestershire (County) | 1,925 | 560 |
| Rutland  | 64 | 15 |
| Other than Leicester  | 211 | 44 |
| Unknown  | 1,533 | 560 |

# Identified Needs and Support Provided

## The following charts shows the need levels identified at the start, review and end stage of support, in relation to each of the areas of the Needs Assessment. Each of these charts is then followed by a further chart relating to that Needs Assessment area, showing in detail the specific actions taken by caseworkers to address the needs. The following charts do not include data from Oct 2015 to Dec 2015 as the Needs Assessment was introduced in January 2016.

##  Personal Safety

## Shelter and Accommodation

Mental and Physical Health

Drugs, Alcohol and Other Harmful Behaviour

Family

Social Interactions

Education and Employment

Finance and Benefits

Outlook Attitudes and Beliefs

Any Other Issues

# Length of Support

This bar graph illustrates the support provided to service user whose cases had been supported and closed between January and September 2016.

# Summary

**REFERRALS**

* **Referrals to Victim First were high during the first quarter of service delivery with 3712 cases** coming to us between October and December 2015.
* **Referrals then reduced significantly in the second quarter** compared with the previous months: **1330** between Jan and Mar 2016 compared to 3712 between Oct and Dec 2015.
* Having discussed this with our colleagues within the OPCC, we concluded that this reduction appeared to be a result of the new NICHE Victim and Witness Contact Management Report ‘VCOP’ form which Police Officers were required to complete as of 12/11/15 to initiate the referral through to our Service with explicit victim consent. Previously this was not required and therefore many referrals may have been referred through to us automatically without the victim explicitly consenting to this referral. For comparison, had the following numbers of referrals through the Police around that time:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| October 2015:  | 1229 |
| November 2015:  | 1344 |
| December 2015:  | 897 |
| January 2016:  | 388 |
| February 2016: | 423 |
| March 2016: | 381 |

* The fact that the reduction in numbers referred via Niche did not take place until mid-way through December was likely to be due to the fact the Niche team initially provided a high level of support to Police Officers following the change, via an email to the officer in question to flag any referrals which weren’t made. This practice went on for several weeks after the 12/11/15 process change.
* **In the third quarter, referrals rose slightly from 1330 to 1459**.
* **Referrals then increased by over double in the fourth quarter, rising from 1459 to 2930.** This was no doubt partly due to the significant efforts made by Victim First and the OPCC to work with the Police to raise awareness of the service and to embed the importance of officers referring through Niche.

**SUPPORT PROVIDED**

* Whilst the annual figure for those receiving Enhanced Support is 22% of the overall referrals that we have taken, the picture has changed across the year.
* During the first quarter, there was no system in place to distinguish between the different types of support offered. We have therefore simply recorded the supported cases as ‘Enhanced’ and the remainder as ‘Basic’ in the annual headline chart (Chart 1).
* With this in mind, **the number of victims receiving ‘Enhanced Support’ rose from 246 (7%) in Quarter 1, to 482 (36%) in Quarter 2, dropping to 343 (24%) in Quarter 3, before rising significantly to 958 (33%) in Quarter 4.**
* Those victims receiving a **‘Basic Support’** service were a relatively unknown amount in Quarter 1, but made up a proportion of the 3466 (93%) who did not accept ‘Enhanced Support’. In **Quarter 2, this figure was 783 (58%), rising to 980 (67%) in Quarter 3 and then increasing again to 1640 (56%) in Quarter 4.**

**REFERRAL SOURCES**

* Again, we do not know the referral sources for the first three months due to the limitations of Niche at the time. However, since we introduced our own Performance Framework and Database in January 2016, we were able to pull out the following headlines from Quarters 2 - 4:
* **The vast majority of our referrals (86.7%) came from the Police through the Leicestershire Crime Report ‘daily download’.**  The Police also referred a further 2.3% of our referrals through other channels over the year, although this process has reduced in the last quarter with more officers using the correct Niche process.
* Other key referral sources, although far fewer in numbers than the Police referrals, include **Action Fraud (3.5%), Self Referrals (2.4%) and Sentinel for High Risk ASB cases (1.2%).**

**CRIME TYPES**

* Over the year, it’s perhaps most interesting to focus on the types of crime for which most victims sought ‘Enhanced Support’ from us, rather than purely drawing out the overall referral numbers for each crime type.
* **The crime type for which we supported most victims was ‘Violence’ (254 victims receiving ‘Enhanced Support’). This was followed by ‘Domestic Incidents’ (240) and Burglary (206).** The next highest figure is for ‘Admin- Police Generated resource Activity’. This may be due to the fact we have recently received such an upsurge in cases referred to us by Police through Niche, with officers being guided to record offences as ‘Admin’ or ‘Unknown’ if the actual type of offence is unclear during the early stages of the investigation.
* We provided **‘Enhanced Support’ to 114 victims of Sexual Offences.** Of note, this figure constituted **49% of all of the Sexual Offence victims referred to Victim First (232 in total for the year). This was the highest percentage of victims accepting ‘Enhanced Support’ out of all of the crime types, closely followed by ‘Domestic Incidents’ at 40%.**  To provide perspective, only 29% of the 721 Burglary Victims referred to us accepted ‘Enhanced Support’. This might indicate that victims of these ‘specialist’ Sexual and Domestic offences are in greater need of the support we offer.

**OTHER HEADLINES**

* The data indicates that 8 victims who self-referred to Victim First reported the crime to the Police as a result of the support provided to them.
* 682 of the victims referred to us during the year were Repeat Victims, with 348 (51%) of these cases going on to accept ‘Enhanced Support’.
* 137 victims that were referred to us had previously been supported by Victim First. 59 (43%) of these went on to accept further ‘Enhanced Support’ from us, perhaps indicating their satisfaction with the support they had received from Victim First on the previous occasion.

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

* Throughout the year, we did not receive a good level of demographic data from those referring victims to us. Whilst we put systems in place to seek to record this information ourselves, this was inconsistent giving us patchy data. Based on the information we did gather, the following headlines emerged:
* We provided ‘Enhanced Support’ to twice the amount of females (1010) compared to males (502).
* Interestingly, only 22% of the males referred to us accepted ‘Enhanced Support’ compared to 31% of females, perhaps indicative of gender stereotypes around males being considered ‘weak’ for accepting emotional support.
* We provided ‘Enhanced Support’ to a broad range of ages, with the most common age bracket being 31-40 year olds (315), followed by 41-50 year olds (245) then 19-25 year olds (216).
* From the data we gathered, most of our victims stated that they were not Disabled or preferred not to say. Of those victims who stated that they did have a disability, the most common was Mental Health Difficulties.
* The majority of victims with a recorded Ethnicity whom we provided ‘Enhanced Support’ to were White: British (273) or White: Other (152). The next most common recorded ethnicity was Asian/Asian British: Indian (67) and Asian/Asian British: Other (48).
* With regard to recorded Religion, the majority of victims receiving ‘Enhanced Support’ reported as having No Religion (257), followed by Christian (118), Muslim (42) then Hindu (40).
* The vast majority of supported victims with a recorded Sexual Orientation stated that they were Heterosexual (517), followed by those who preferred not to say (73). Only 8 of the victims who received ‘Enhanced Support’ were recorded as Gay, 8 as Bisexual and 4 as Lesbian.
* For Communication Needs, 1201 victims receiving ‘Enhanced Support’ were recorded as having No Need, with 23 recorded as Vulnerable and 20 as having a Language need.
* The number of victims referred to us from Leicestershire (1925) and from Leicester City (1989) were almost identical, with a similar percentage of cases accepting ‘Enhanced Support’ (29% and 30% respectively).
* Whilst we only received 64 referrals from Rutland across the year, 23% of these cases accepted ‘Enhanced Support’ (15).

**IDENTIFIED NEEDS AND SUPPORT PROVIDED**

* The majority of victim needs were in relation to Personal Safety, Shelter and Accommodation, and Mental and Physical Health.
* The most popular type of support was recorded as Telephone Emotional Support.
* The other most common support services provided were Target Hardening Referral (24/7 Locks), followed by referral to UAVA, referral to Mental Health Nurse or to a GP, and Advocacy support was also popular.
* With regard to length of support provided for those victims receiving an enhanced support service, thevast majority of victims choose to receive support for no more than 1-2 days.
* The next most popular time scale for enhanced support is 6-10 days, with longer periods of support proving less popular but still useful for some victims, the longest being 11 months.