# **A Selection of Performance Indicators for Anti-Slavery Partnership Working – Evaluating Progress towards Creating Sustainability in Partnership**

This annex is intended to highlight a number of performance indicators related to objectives that some partnerships are seeking to achieve and the different partners needed to this end.  This document should help your partnership be more expansive in terms of what might be possible, for example, involving the wider community in anti-slavery initiative towards creating a slavery-free community.

You are encouraged to select at least one objective that relates to your anti-slavery partnership aims. You will need to choose the indicator(s) that best reflect the objective and for which you can collect information on and analyse to be able to demonstrate that you have made progress towards meeting your aims.

**Potential Objective 1 - Providing strategic coordination for anti-slavery work in your area**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator category** | **Sample indicator(s)** | **Possible data collection methods** | **Partner organisations** |
| Serious and Organised Crime Local Profiles | Depth of available data used  Frequency of local profiles produced, shared, and updated e.g. local profiles reviewed within a minimum of 12 months  Number of jointly planned actions as a result of local profiles | Data taken from various data sources (see potential objective 5 for further details) | Local multi-agency partnerships including social care, education, healthcare, private sector, environment, prisons, police, charities, local authorities, immigration enforcement agencies. |
| Action plan / Engagement plan | Local multi-agency partnership action plan produced that includes the following components:   * considers national action plan / UK modern slavery strategy * considers local context * inclusion of all key actors in action plan (including NGOs) * clearly states relevant agencies responsible for certain actions * clearly links activities to objectives (in results chain) * articulates assumptions and risks * Clear processes for coordination of action plan implementation, including regular multi-agency cross-sectoral meetings   Action plan reviewed within a minimum of 12 months  Number of other local partnerships in which modern slavery is firmly on the agenda (e.g. Serious and Organised Crime Group, Community Safety Partnerships, Adults and Children Safeguarding Boards, Health & Wellbeing Partnerships, Business Crime Partnerships, Homelessness Partnership)  Clear processes for engagement of external funders to ensure sustainable support for anti-slavery activities in line with national strategy and local priorities  Number of organisations (statutory and non-statutory) that have action plans or similar that contribute to delivering the overall aims of the Modern Slavery Partnership (MSP) Strategy / link into MSP action plan | Strategies and Action plan documents  Theory of change and/or logical framework based on all partners inputs  Engagement documents e.g. funding documents, Terms of Reference | All partners |
| Budget | Each plan of activity budgeted (and budget is realistic, budget provision made for individual, agency, or entity responsible for monitoring and reporting on outcomes of plan) |  |  |
| Accountability | Clear assignation of responsibility to a specific individual, agency or  entity (such as multi-sectoral committee) to oversee and coordinate implementation of action plan  Clear assignation of responsibility to a specific individual, agency or  entity (such as multi-sectoral committee) to oversee monitoring and reporting of action plan implementation |  | All partners, led by a particular agency e.g. Police, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, NGO – perhaps on a rolling basis |

**Potential Objective 2 - Providing operational coordination for anti-slavery work in your area** (see also Potential Objective 1)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator category** | **Sample indicator(s)** | **Possible data collection methods** | **Partner organisations** |
| Specific Points of Contact (SPOCs) identified within relevant agencies | Number of identified SPOCs in different partner agencies from 1 year ago | Consolidated records | All partners |
| Joint activities | Number of operations and activities planned jointly by enforcement, statutory and NGO agencies  Number of jointly planned activities *carried out* using the breadth of powers available to partners (Proactively work with and understand other law enforcement agencies powers and remit to jointly disrupt modern slavery in partnership.)  Increase in the use of additional orders against people suspected of involvement in modern slavery, e.g. number of Slavery and Trafficking Prevention Orders and Slavery and Trafficking Risk Orders by enforcement agencies to disrupt and prevent  An increase in the number of arrests of offenders involved in modern slavery due to joint operations  Improved conviction rates for offenders involved in modern slavery (due to early engagement between agencies including CPS)  Increase in joint disruption activity against mapped organised criminal groups | Consolidated records, minutes of meetings, action plans compared with actual activities (reviews of actions and results) | All partners |
| Enabling multi-agency working on a regular basis (sustainability of partnership activities) | Number, proportion and range of key stakeholders involved in:   * co-location * multi-agency safeguarding hub (MASH), or * multi-agency risk assessment conference (MARAC)   Frequency of multi-agency working / communications   * frequency of meetings * frequency of non-face-to-face communications   Funding arrangements e.g. clear processes for funding including engagement of external funders to ensure support for anti-slavery activities in line with action plan priorities | Minutes of meetings, Terms of reference, Information sharing agreements, Memorandums of understanding, funding arrangement documents | All partners |
| Dedicated Partnership Co-ordinator (see also ‘Accountability’ and ‘Budget’ indicator categories under potential objective 1) | A paid dedicated coordinator embedded in partnership |  | All partners – particularly OPCC funding for role [can be established from pooled budgets, in-kind contributions, or secondments from partner agencies on a rolling basis] |
| Referral Pathways / referrals management | Number of statutory bodies that have specific referral mechanisms for modern slavery within their organisation and using them  Development of joint modern slavery inbox for use by all partners for local referrals | Partner documents / self-reporting  Inbox development and use |  |

**Potential Objective 3 - Sharing information and resources** (see also Potential Objectives 1 and 2)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator category** | **Sample indicator(s)** | **Possible data collection methods** | **Partner organisations** |
| Information sharing – information flow and intelligence | Number of intelligence submissions among partner agencies from 1 year ago (can also assess by percentage of total submissions from different partner agencies; can also look at use of intelligence submissions for prosecutions.)  Development of a clear information reporting and sharing protocol between partners  Increase in the number and quality of relationships (and partnerships) with local NGO’s, faith groups, communities and businesses  Increase in meeting attendance to partnership meetings or other sub-groups on modern slavery e.g. NGO forum, multi-faith forum, local/regional forum  Increase in participation – sharing during meetings with partners and potential partners  Promotion of modern slavery helpline number by all partners  Improvements to the quality and quantity of referrals to the NRM  Implement a clear crime recording process where NRM and ‘Duty to Notify’ referrals are made by a first responder other than the Police to ensure these are recorded by the Police as crimes in line with Home Office counting rules  Engage with the Modern Slavery Police Transformation Programme and the ‘what works’ team to build an evidence base for modern slavery investigations and share best practice | Consolidated intelligence submissions  Number of bilateral memorandums of understanding (MoUs) between agencies; standard operating procedures available for referrals (local referral pathways guide)  Meeting minutes, survey of partners  Independent assessment / review | All partners |

**Potential Objective 4 - Involving the wider community in anti-slavery activity / Activities to raise awareness and responses**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator category** | **Sample indicator(s)** | **Possible data collection methods** | **Partner organisations** |
| Number of awareness raising projects in wider community | Number of Modern Slavery awareness raising projects in vulnerable and ‘hard to reach’ communities (community outreach events delivered by partners)  Modern Slavery public awareness campaigns and events (partners including multi-media organisations)  Training sessions to raise awareness of statutory roles and responsibilities  PREVENT days of action including hosting workshops  Increase in knowledge of housing rights to prevent vulnerabilities such as homelessness | Partner agencies self-reporting, awareness raising records | All partners |
| Baseline data: This looks at the availability of data to inform the development of awareness-raising activities | Availability of data on existing knowledge, attitudes, intentions of target group  Availability of data on risky and protective actions in relation to modern slavery | Existing research, household or intercept surveys (intercept surveys are conducted in person, generally in a public place such as a street corner, “intercepting” people) | All partners |
| Reach: How many people have been reached by, or exposed to the activity? This does not assess the  extent to which people have taken on board the awareness-raising messages. | Number of participants in an awareness-raising session  Number of people exposed to each mass media campaign  Number of people exposed to programme materials  Number of materials distributed (proxy indicator) | Awareness session records  Mass media data, Household or intercept surveys  Household or intercept surveys  Programme records | All partners |
| Changes in knowledge, attitudes and intended actions: Extent to which knowledge, attitudes or intended actions have changed as a result of the activity. This does not  assess the likelihood of this change  resulting in change in behaviour  (and cannot be used as a proxy  indicator for this) | Changes in number of target group that, e.g.   * Can name three warning signs for modern slavery (knowledge) * Know the number of a modern slavery helpline or anti-trafficking hotline (knowledge) * Would employ in decent working conditions a survivor of modern slavery (attitude) * Willingness to integrate a survivor of modern slavery within the community (attitude) * Would not buy something produced by forced labour (attitude) * Report they would seek additional qualifications before migrating (intended action) * Report they would take certain measures to make their job search and migration less risky (intended action) * Can identify the approved action on encountering a potential victim of modern slavery (knowledge) * Demonstrate they have learned skills to interview victims (skills) * Report they can apply training to their work (skills) * Report that they will apply the knowledge and skills learned in their work (intended action)   Improved knowledge of vulnerable community groups  More tolerant public attitudes towards homeless people and other vulnerable community group | Pre and post-test questionnaires for training sessions  Baseline and endline household or intercept surveys  Demonstration of skills in simulations | All partners in particular those involved in training, e.g. national NGOs with local representation such as Hope for Justice, Stop the Traffik |
| Retention of changes: Extent to which changes have been retained over time. This may be particularly important with regard to changes in attitudes and intended action where the effects of, for example, a training or community meeting might diminish over time. | Changes in the above indicators 6-12 months after the activity was completed | Follow-up with training participants  Follow–up household or baseline  survey | All partners |
| Changes in action/behaviour:  Extent to which activity has resulted in a change in action or behaviour.  This does not measure the extent to which changes impacts on modern slavery. It may be used as a proxy indicator if the link between the action and the reduction in modern slavery is sufficiently robust (e.g. based on verified assumptions). | Increase in people migrating through legal channels  Increase in people working through legal channels  Increase in valid calls to modern slavery helpline and anti-trafficking hotline | Records held by the organisation concerned | GLAA and partner organisations |
| Impact:  This assesses the actual impact on the modern slavery and human trafficking problem | Reduction in number of persons enslaved and trafficked  Elimination of modern slavery and human trafficking criminal networks  Exit and sustainable (re)integration of survivors | Longitudinal studies involving mixed methods (qualitative and quantitative) | All partners |

**Potential Objective 5 - Increasing understanding of the nature and scale of modern slavery in your area** (see also potential objective 4)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator category** | **Sample indicator(s)** | **Possible data collection methods** | **Partner organisations** |
| Serious and Organised Crime Local Profiles | Local profiles produced for each force area, each highlighting:   * Impact of modern slavery crime on local community * Modern slavery crime types in community (nature and scale – numbers convicted and number of victims; victimology) * Factors in comparison with the regional and national picture e.g. enablers, hot spots   Depth of available data used  Frequency of local profiles produced, shared, and updated e.g. local profiles reviewed within a minimum of 12 months  Number of jointly planned actions as a result of local profiles  Number of convictions linked to modern slavery crime  Increase in enforcement agencies’ understanding and awareness of the challenges faced by vulnerable community groups (e.g. street sex workers, homeless, asylum seekers and refugees, young people, workers in low wage/skill industries such as hand car washes, etc.)  Improvements to the management of threats to life (risk management) | Data taken from various data sources such as Organised Crime Groups Mapping, population statistics from the Office for National Statistics and data on local government websites, fraud and cyber-crime profiles, neighbourhood profiles and maps, local authority demographics data, troubled families programme data, ending gang and youth violence programme data, data on child exploitation, foreign national offenders, NCA assessments including the National Strategic Assessment of Serious and Organised Crime and those on specific threats such as corruption; housing and benefits data; immigration and demographic data from Border Force/Immigration Enforcement and ports police; National Referral Mechanism (a framework for identifying victims); local assessments of community tensions and hate crime (e.g. local authority assessments); urban street gangs by force area; local partnership strategic assessments; and police data sets.  Number of individuals convicted for the offences | All partners in local multi-agency partnerships, in particular police and crime commissioners, policing  teams, local authorities and other relevant partners (such as education, health and social care and Immigration  Enforcement) |

**Potential Objective 6 - Identifying and referring victims**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator category** | **Sample indicator(s)** | **Possible data collection methods** | **Partner organisations** |
| Numbers of victims identified and  assisted | Number of potential victims identified (can also distinguish between adult and child victims)  Number of victims assisted to exit their situation / number of victims provided with support  Number of victims referred to services  Number of child victims supported through the child protection system / local authority provision.  Number of victims identified through joint working activities e.g. screening and inspection visits (in comparison to number of victims identified in total)  Number of NRM and ‘Duty to Notify’ referrals for locality | Consolidated records of agencies responsible for identification and victim care services e.g. NRM and ‘Duty to Notify’ records.  Reports from support providers | All partners |
| Number of cases reported | Legitimate calls reporting cases to helpline or hotline | Helpline / Hotline records | Partners responsible for helpline / hotline data management |
| Number of victim identification activities | Frequency and coverage of screening in various contexts e.g. detention centres, houses of multiple occupancy (HMO) landlords, high risk labour situations such as hand car washes, street sex workers  Number of proactive labour inspections without immigration control  Frequency and coverage of screening at border points  Frequency and coverage of unannounced inspections e.g. labour, health, fire, trading standards inspections | Consolidated records of agencies responsible for identification | Various partner agencies including governmental organisations such as the GLAA and Police, as well as NGOs  GLAA and partner agencies excluding immigration enforcement |
| Coverage of victim identification activities / coverage of victim response activities | Number of different stakeholder groups identifying victims/active in National Referral Mechanisms  Location and geographic distribution of stakeholders involved in victim identification  Recruitment and training of local first responders e.g. local NGOs  Leaflets or cards for potential victims in a range of settings used in various languages  Leaflets or cards promoted and distributed through NGO network partners e.g. street pastors | Consolidated records of agencies responsible for identification and first response  Records of network partners |  |
| Introduce or expand peer education programmes as a means of improving detection (and prevention) | Number of peer education programmes tailored to different communities (i.e. by sectors, groups, and languages) | Consolidated records of agencies conducting peer education programmes including feedback | Partner agencies led by NGOs |
| Gaps in identification processes | Number and proportion of cases in which victims could have been identified prior to actual identification (e.g. prior contact with an identifying agent or first responder) | Victim interview data |  |

**Potential Objective 7 - Providing support and sustainable solutions**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator category** | **Sample indicator(s)** | **Possible data collection methods** | **Partner organisations** |
| Number and proportion of  victims participating in  decisions about services provided to them (proxy for engagement, empowerment, personal development and increased activities) | Number and proportion of victims working with service providers on a voluntary needs assessment and joint goal setting for support and (re)integration into society/ local community  Number and proportion of victims with the opportunity to provide anonymous feedback on services provided  Number of changes made to service provision based on victim feedback  At least 80 per cent of clients have a written plan of support, services, and a timeline with evidence of client input | Service provider documentation  Victim interviews  Survivor consultations  Feedback forms |  |
| Number and proportion of victims receiving voluntary care and support provision linked to the needs identified in an assessment | Safe accommodation  Medical care  Psychological care  Legal aid/advice  Childcare  Job search skills  Language /Interpreting services | Service provider documentation  Victim interviews | Relevant partner agencies including Local Authority services (e.g. Adult and Children’s Social Services, Local Authority Safeguarding Boards, Housing), NHS, Salvation Army, Red Cross, other NGOs |
| Outcomes for victims (non-NRM or post-NRM) | Outcomes can include:   * Voluntarily returned to their country of origin or residence * Transferred into the asylum system * Disengaged from the service (absconded/uncontactable/chose not to engage) | Service provider documentation |  |
| Number and proportion of victims offered and receiving employment assistance (proxy for personal development and increased activities; progress towards the provision of long-term support for survivors via additional drop ins and employment) | Provision of opportunities for work experience/apprenticeships/jobs for victims; Vocational training, by a qualified provider, linked to market realities, for example,   * Job placement at destination * Job placement at source * Business start-up loans or grants * At least 80 per cent of clients have stable employment and income 12 months after programme exit   Employability map of services to meet needs:   * CV workshops * Skill focused volunteer opportunities * IT and English classes | Service provider documentation  Victim interviews  Post-programme discussions with clients  Administrative income data  Employment mapping database | Relevant partner agencies, including business community e.g. Co-Op’s Bright Future Programme |
| Quality of services | Quality of services, as assessed by victims  At least 80 percent of clients provide documented feedback on available supports and services  Improved quality of service delivery  Victim support services are developed in line with reformed NRM process and clearly identify the roles and responsibilities of partners and the partnership  Review (every 6 months) the NRM and ‘Duty to Notify’ referrals for locality to establish communities most at risk, potential training needs and best practice | Victim interviews and feedback forms  Confidential comment boxes  Online surveys  One-on-one and group discussion sessions  Staff feedback and independent service evaluations |  |
| (Re)integration | Number and proportion of victims whose (re)integration indicates a sustainable solution:   * At 6 months * At 12 months * At 24 months   Victim feedback indicates sustainable integration, e.g. reduced isolation (perceived and enacted) | Follow up with victims through in-person and/or phone interviews |  |
| Post-(re)integration stable accommodation (also post-NRM and non-NRM provision) | At least 70 percent of clients provided with (relocation) support have documented stable housing | In person and/or phone interviews with clients  Review of professional assessments in case files |  |
| Client-led programme improvement | At least three programme updates based on client feedback made in programme years 1-2 | Organisational or programme quality improvement plans informed by client feedback |  |
| Victim support in relation to the criminal justice process | Number and proportion of identified victims who have received legal counselling / legal aid  Number and proportion of identified victims who have filed criminal complaints  Number and proportion of identified victims who have filed for compensation  Number and proportion of victims awarded compensation  Number and proportion of victims receiving compensation  Enhanced offender management and better sentence planning from court to prison and the community | Service provider documentation  Victim interviews  Positive feedback from victims and community | Lead agencies: CPS, Police |
| Housing | Improved local policy regarding housing vulnerable community groups  Increased quantity and quality of housing stock available (statutory and voluntary housing providers)  Number and proportion of emergency accommodation /premises for pop-up reception centres for pre- and no-NRM (proxy for progress towards provision of secure accommodation for the exclusive use of pre-NRM/no-NRM)  Increased capacity of service e.g. number of suitable non-emergency Survivor Reception Centres identified by partner agencies and utilised  Increased housing options available, e.g. use of private rented sector to meet obligations | Legislation; policy documents  Service provider documentation | Local leaders – councillors, political decision-makers and lobbying groups including partner agencies  Red Cross, Local Authority, and other partners |
| Number and quality of relationships with regional, national and international partnerships and agencies | Increase in the number and quality of relationships with regional, national and international partnerships and agencies | Documentation; feedback and independent reviews |  |

Sources:

* A Toolkit for guidance in designing and evaluating counter-trafficking programmes: Harnessing accumulated knowledge to respond to trafficking in persons (ICAT) - <http://www.respect.international/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/A-Toolkit-for-guidance-in-designing-and-evaluating-counter-trafficking-programmes-ICAT-2016.pdf>
* Hampshire Modern Slavery Partnership (MSP) Strategy document - <http://www.modernslaverypartnership.org.uk/partnership/>
* Pro-Act Research Reports and Papers on the ‘Identification and Support to Victims of Trafficking for Labour Exploitation’ - <https://www.labourexploitation.org/publications>
* Scottish Government ‘Human Trafficking and Exploitation Strategy’ - https://www.gov.scot/publications/trafficking-exploitation-strategy/pages/6/
* Serious and Organised Crime Local Profiles Guide - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/serious-and-organised-crime-local-profiles>
* Stop The Traffik, “End of Year 1 Project Report: Greater Manchester Modern Slavery Response Network.”