

Summary: Intervention & Options

Department /Agency: Ministry of Justice	Title: Impact Assessment of : Extend the duties of CDRPs to include Reducing Reoffending; make Probation a responsible authority	
Stage:	Version: 0.3	Date: 21 May 2008
Related Publications:		

Available to view or download at:

<http://www.>

Contact for enquiries: Patrick Lines

Telephone: 020 7035 3084

What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?

To improve performance on cutting crime it is essential that we refocus organisations to support work to reduce re-offending. CDRPs (including CSPs) have a key role to play but do not currently have a statutory duty to reduce re-offending and neither are probation a responsible authority. We need CDRPs to take ownership of this agenda and they must be properly constituted to co-ordinate the actions of local authorities and other key players, all of whom have a critical role to play in ensuring that resources are in place to support the effective management of offenders.

What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

1. To develop a co-ordinated and improved partnership -driven, approach to reducing re-offending
2. To strengthen the role of the Probation Service on the CDRP
3. To facilitate closer working between CDRPs, LCJBs and LSPs.
4. To help CDRPs achieve crime reduction targets through a reduction in offending and in tackling social exclusion.

The expected benefits will be a reduction in re-offending, greater understanding of the link between crime reduction and reducing re-offending , and improved cost-effectiveness in those areas

What policy options have been considered? Please justify any preferred option.

Option 1: Do nothing.

Option 2: To increase partnership activity on reducing re-offending through closer working between partners

Option 3: Make changes outlined in this paper.

Option 3 is the preferred approach. This will embed existing work and provide opportunities to maximise impact.

When will the policy be reviewed to establish the actual costs and benefits and the achievement of the desired effects?

When the approach is applied in practice, relevant impact assessments will be carried out.

Ministerial Sign-off For consultation stage Impact Assessments:

I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that, given the available evidence, it represents a reasonable view of the likely costs, benefits and impact of the leading options.

Signed by the responsible Minister:

..... Date:

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: Changes to statute	Description: CDRP to have RR as Statutory Duty; Probation as responsible authority
---	---

COSTS	ANNUAL COSTS		Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups' The estimated cost of the team required to apply the principles of the approach (if externally contracted). The cost will fall to MoJ. The annual average costs relate to the increased burden on the Probation Service, which we anticipate will, in time, be balanced by the gains from partnership working.
	One-off (Transition)	Yrs	
	£ 160,000	1	
	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)		
	£ 5,035,000	5	Total Cost (PV) £ 22,893,000
Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups' Small additional costs may be incurred by CDRP members in discussing RR. To a large degree this will, however, be about undertaking existing activity in different ways as we re-focus CDRPs on the overall agenda.			

BENEFITS	ANNUAL BENEFITS		Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups' The intention is to improve rates of reduction in re-offending and to cut instances of criminal activity through better joined-up working. At this stage these cannot be accurately quantified.
	One-off	Yrs	
	£ 0		
	Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)		
	£ 0		Total Benefit (PV) £
Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups' The changes will help develop a shared understanding of how crime reduction and RR inter-act. The approach will also facilitate improved inter-agency working.			

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks Key risk is the lack of CDRP level data on reducing re-offending.

Price Base Year 0	Time Period Years n/a	Net Benefit Range (NPV) £	NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate) £ -22.9m
----------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?		England & Wales	
On what date will the policy be implemented?		2009	
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?		MoJ/HO	
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?		£ 0	
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?		N/A	
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?		N/A	
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?		£ 0	
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?		£ 0	
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?		N/A	
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro 0	Small 0	Medium 0
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A

Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline (2005 Prices)		(Increase - Decrease)
Increase of £	Decrease of £	Net Impact £

Key: Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices (Net) Present Value

[Use this space (with a recommended maximum of 30 pages) to set out the evidence, analysis and detailed narrative from which you have generated your policy options or proposal. Ensure that the information is organised in such a way as to explain clearly the summary information on the preceding pages of this form.]

Background

1. Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) - and Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) in Wales - were established under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, which placed a duty on local authorities and police (the 'responsible authorities') to work together to combat crime and disorder. Subsequent legislation has extended the list of responsible authorities to include Primary Care Trusts, Fire and Rescue Authorities and Police Authorities.
2. There are currently 348 CDRPs in England and 22 CSPs in Wales. CSPs have a similar remit to their English counterparts in relation to crime. *All references to CDRPs in this document should, therefore, be read to include CSPs.*
3. These partnerships are in a strong position to bring together and co-ordinate the actions of local services, local authorities and other key players, all of which have a critical role to play in ensuring access to the mainstream resources that make up the seven 'pathways' to reducing re-offending, e.g. homes and jobs for offenders. Together, these, support the effective management of offenders and lead to reduced re-offending (including *serious* re-offending). They also have a vital role in supporting the delivery of Local Area Agreements (LAAs).
4. Traditionally, the Partnerships have focussed on crime prevention. But the Home Office Crime Strategy has helped to re-focus local partners by highlighting the links between reducing re-offending and reducing crime. We want to move CDRPs from a primarily 'catch and convict', 'prevent and deter' style of approach to one that also embraces reducing re-offending. Taken together these present a holistic vision of tackling crime. This change has also been supported by the work carried out by CDRPs with Prolific and Other Priority offenders (PPOs), on the 'rehabilitate and resettle' strand of the PPO scheme and there are also connections with the work of MAPPA.

The Case for Change?

5. The question of whether probation should be a responsible authority and whether the core duties of CDRPs should include reducing re-offending is not a new one. Indeed, it has been considered at one time or another since they came into being, but has been brought into sharper focus through a consideration of how to take the next steps on the crime reduction agenda and, for NOMS, how to access the services required to reduce offending behaviour. We know, for example, that securing accommodation, tackling health inequalities and gaining sustainable employment are key factors in reducing re-offending and that Local Authorities and other CDRP partners are critical partners in making this happen.
6. The issue arose, in part, out of the work on the Leicestershire and Rutland Civic Society Alliance project sponsored by NOMS and the Local Government Association. The aim was to embed reducing re-offending into the work of local partners and their plans. The concerns of the probation chief (who also chaired the LCJB) was that she did not have sufficient authority, with probation as a co-operating body, to change or re-cast the focus of the CDRP to this agenda or to get onto the LSP as a key partner. This view was

echoed by the Local Authority community safety lead who said a significant shift was required for the CDRP to understand that reducing re-offending played a pivotal role in crime reduction.

7. At an event for probation chiefs in Yorkshire/Humberside when asked what the one thing was that would make a difference, this change in role was again cited. Discussions with probation chiefs have confirmed that there needs to be a mechanism to refocus the CDRP and for them to understand that tackling RR contributes to overall crime, and that this agenda needs to be owned not just by the police but wider partners too. In the same way we see the advantage to CDRPs of having Probation contribute to their wider work. Unless we give them authority and formally set out the responsibilities of the CDRP there is little inducement for probation to bring their limited time and resources into CDRPs and related groups. Relying on personality and local circumstance alone is not sufficient. In addition it will help facilitate joint work between LCJBs and CDRPs on this (and other, common) agendas building on PPO links etc. This will also assist with work undertaken in conjunction with other partners such as health and education that are critical to tackling both social exclusion and reduced re-offending.

Increasing Probation's involvement

8. The Partnerships have also been engaging effectively with Probation and NOMS to reduce re-offending. **It is now proposed to increase Probation's level of input through adding, by statute, probation trusts to the list of 'responsible authorities'.**
9. Changing the status of probation trusts would formalise the role they have in participating in CDRPs / CSPs and give them an equal voice. Currently, as a co-operating body, probation boards are required to work with 'responsible authorities' in the audit and strategy development process. Probation Boards' current status, as a 'co-operating body', can lead to disparity across the country on how they work with Partnerships: from merely providing data and information to helping formulate local plans, through to fully assisting in the delivery of initiatives to reduce crime and disorder. By implementing this change, probation trusts will have more influence in shaping local action to tackle crime and the causes of crime.
10. There is a precedent for adding extra organisations to the list of 'responsible authorities'. The Police Reform Act 2002 amended the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to make Primary Care Trusts 'responsible authorities.' By amending the CDA 1998, we would place a duty on probation trusts to:
 - participate in an audit of crime and disorder, anti-social behaviour and drug misuse for the CDRP area or areas in which they fall; and
 - contribute to the development of local strategies that effectively deal with the issues which are identified.

The advantages of changing the status of probation trusts include:

- increasing the level of engagement from probation with Partnerships. It would also promote a level of equality across the country as probation would be required to work with the Partnership on preparing a strategy for the area;
- increasing the profile of probation with other 'responsible authorities' on the Partnership, thereby elevating the status of probation to the level of other

organisations such as police and local authorities; in turn increasing their influence on proceedings;

- Probation Trusts, as 'responsible authorities' could be in a better position to access other funding pools and resources; and could jointly commission specific services for offenders to reduce re-offending.

11. Probation will also be able to play a full role - as members of both – in bridging the gap between LCJBs and CDRPs.

The Options

- Do Nothing

12. There would be some support from stakeholders across the country for maintaining the status quo. There are a series of new initiatives and policy changes which could, potentially, improve the engagement at a local level with the reducing re-offending agenda.

13. These include:

- the cross government PSAs on safer communities, social exclusion and drugs;
- the new crime strategy and CJS Business Plan that both have reducing re-offending as an integral element
- the new local government performance framework with LAAs effectively the lead on improved co-operation in delivery of mutually beneficial outcomes
- increased commissioning, contestability and opportunities for joint commissioning
- the new Probation Trusts with the opportunities they present to specify under SLA's work with LSPs and CDRPs.

14. The obvious advantage of this option is that the renewed focus on joining-up agendas may lead to reducing re-offending being further embedded into local plans, without the need to make burdensome statutory changes. But there is an element of risk with this option: the new initiatives may not make the required impact at local level on reducing re-offending.

15. To counter this risk, we could consider working with one probation trust to understand the resources required for effective engagement with local partnerships and the benefits of focusing partners on this agenda.

- Increase Partnership Activity on Reducing Re-offending through closer working with Partners

16. This option is broadly similar to the 'do nothing' approach except in suggesting that we take the lead from those areas (of which there are some small number) that have already embraced this agenda and managed to embed reducing re-offending without the recourse to changes in statute. In effect, we would be saying that there are good practice examples that demonstrate how this can be achieved through closer partnership working and which highlight the scope that exists.

17. This is attractive in that it allows for local flexibility and for an incremental approach, whilst not pushing the agenda at a pace some areas would struggle to follow. However, this option is not recommended because it fails to address one of the central drivers to this work - namely that this agenda is too important to be allowed to be governed by the quality of local initiative and enthusiasm and is too vulnerable to changes in personnel

and priority. If we want to properly embed this in the work of *all* CDRPs and *all* Probation areas something more substantive is required.

18. This paper generally, therefore, should be seen as making the case for the third option - to make reducing re-offending a statutory duty for CDRPs and to make Probation a responsible authority.

The Cost

19. The cost identified in the RIA is, necessarily, no more than indicative at present. Our consultation has highlighted that the main burden in this regard would fall to the Probation Service. In itself, changing the statutory duty of CDRPs to include reducing re-offending would require little by the way of additional resource since we are, in effect, asking them to do much of the same work around crime reduction but to look at it from a wider perspective. We are asking them to refocus and reprioritise with the win being the contribution this work will make to tackling crime overall.
20. The cost to Probation, though hard to quantify with any degree of certainty, is likely to be far more significant. In part this is dependant upon the existing relationships and level of inter-agency working and, to an even greater extent, is influenced by the number and type of CDRP which Probation would be required to work with. The approach of Probation to partnership work varies across the country from significant engagement on the CDRP and sub-groups to nominal representation. The “win” for Probation is to set clear expectations and for them to contribute fully to both the overall crime agenda and to benefit from the increased support for offender rehabilitation, including opportunities for joint commissioning of services. In the table below we have summarised this information by estimating costs to Probation and CDRP by CDRP type and then multiplied this by the number of CDRPs in each category. This data is based upon interviews and questionnaires sent to a number of both CDRPs and Probation areas – an example of which is included in the Annex. We recognise that further work is required to substantiate this cost analysis. Table 1 is the ‘high level’ cost that, basically, equates to one data analyst and one SPO per area. Table 2 records details of those areas we interviewed and/or which sent in questionnaires. It does not follow, of course, that the costs indicated in table 2 directly read across to table 1 since these are local estimates, which vary considerably.
21. One constant from the interviews with areas was the need for an increased data analysis capacity. This requires some explanation. If CDRPs are to be given a statutory duty to reduce re-offending then it follows that they will need some management and performance information upon which to base evaluation of their progress. Currently it is possible to provide this (from central sources) at County/CJS area level but not possible to dis-aggregate beyond that. Our research suggests that asking areas to break this down to Unitary Authority level should be feasible and, whilst involving some cost, could reasonably be expected to be met from existing resource. Beyond the Unitary level, however, the costs become more significant and we should not expect the Probation Service to meet these from already stretched budgets. Good quality, robust data (often in the form of proxy measures) would be needed and we consider that a minimum of 1 additional Data Analyst per area would be required. This might be higher or lower depending on the mix of CDRPs within each area.
22. A number of Probation Areas have suggested that in order to properly develop links with each of the CDRPs and maximise their input and influence, additional resources in the form of both executive and senior staff would be required. This varies so considerably from area to area that it is difficult to hit upon a reliable average. In those areas where this work is already taking place and which are characterised by strong working relationships the change in duties and role would, in effect, be giving legitimacy and

context to already existing structures and practice. In other words this would not be about identifying a need for *additional* resource. However, it would be wrong not to acknowledge that this work places considerable strain on the limited resources of the Service. It is also the case that without a statutory duty to do so there is scope for Probation to “pick and choose” the CDRPs they work with, concentrating, typically, on County Groups (where they exist) and Unitary Authorities. Making the duty statutory and Probation a responsible authority might mean that they would be compelled to spread their resource more thinly. For this reason, we have allowed for additional costs even in those areas we would currently characterise as exhibiting ‘best practice’.

23. We consider, however, that further work is needed following publication of the Green Paper to look at the scope that exists for rationalising the extent of the engagement that would be appropriate to take forward this agenda at the local level. So, for example, we might want to mandate a requirement to work with (and play a full role) in Unitary Authority CDRPs, County Groups etc but look to see to what extent smaller, two-tier groups might be able to work together as a virtual group - if only around this agenda. This ‘compromise’ position might, for example, see both Probation and CDRPs coming together at BCU level rather than requiring compulsory attendance at ‘small’ CDRP meetings where the costs involved would outweigh the benefits.

24. We also acknowledge (indeed it is one of the central drivers behind this work) that the ‘cost’ to Probation of working more closely and in more depth with CDRPs would be offset to a significant degree by the added value that partners could bring to the resettlement agenda. In this way, for example, the time and effort expended on working with the CDRP should result in easier access to meeting the housing and education needs of offenders, should improve their access to the civic society and to health services and so on. In time, therefore, Probation would realise significant savings in the pursuit of their mainstream activity and ensure that the work of other agencies in regard to crime reduction etc was complimentary to and not counter to their own. We suggest, therefore, that the costs are likely to be higher at first.

Table 1 Summary costs

NATIONAL COSTS (EXCLUDING LONDON)	CDRP	PROBATION	TOTAL COST
Senior Probation Officers @ £45,000 Data Analyst @£50,000	No significant costs for CDRPS, although the requirement to share data and work in partnership might generate new processes. It is anticipated that the analytical resource - though sitting within probation - will shared by CDRPs.	41 SPOs	£1,845,000
		41 Analysts	£2,050,000
London (based on 12 ‘cluster’ areas)			
Senior Probation Officer @ £45,000		12 SPOs	£540,000
Data Analyst @£50,000		12 Analysts	£600,000

Total			£5,035,000

Table 2

	Responses	CDRP	Probation
CDRP 1 Urban and Rural Unitary 104	Portsmouth CDRP Leicestershire (including probation) (Middlesbrough) 1 Thames Valley Milton Keynes Reading Wycombe Runnymede	£2000 1 Data analyst £50,000 Nil (nil resource) (nil resource)	 1 SPO £45,000 (Teesside) 2ACO£120,000 2 SPO£90,000 1 Data analyst £50,000
London Borough 33	Southwark		1 SPO £45,000 1 Data analyst £50,000
CDRP 3 County 2 tier 233	Lancashire (12 district councils) Epsom and Ewell West Yorkshire 5 district councils) Devon & Cornwall		1 Data analyst £50,000 2 SPO£90,000 Surrey 1 Data analyst £50,000 1 SPO£45,000 1ACO £45,000 4 SPO £360,000

Equality and Fairness

25. The response of CDRPs/CSPs to crime and disorder, anti-social behaviour and substance misuse varies across England and Wales. By introducing these changes we will support a greater equality of service provision in relation to community safety issues to a wider range of people including, critically, those classified as socially excluded. .

26. These changes will also assist CDRPs and Probation in the Community engagement work they undertake. The importance of equality and fairness is recognised and promoted through the inclusion of Community Engagement as a national standard.

CDRPs will be expected to consult and engage their communities on a regular basis and to reflect their priorities in their strategic assessment and delivery plans.

Consultation with small business: the Small Firms' Impact Test

27. A Small Firms' Impact Test is not required as the provisions relate purely to service delivery provided by public sector agencies to tackle crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour.

Competition Assessment

28. A Competition Assessment is not required in this RIA because the proposal impacts only on the public services.

Enforcement and Sanctions

29. There are no sanctions for non-compliance.

Equality Impact Assessment

30. An Equality Impact Assessment (covering Race, Disability and Gender) will be completed before implementation.

Specific Impact Tests: Checklist

Use the table below to demonstrate how broadly you have considered the potential impacts of your policy options.

Ensure that the results of any tests that impact on the cost-benefit analysis are contained within the main evidence base; other results may be annexed.

Type of testing undertaken	<i>Results in Evidence Base?</i>	<i>Results annexed?</i>
Competition Assessment	No	No
Small Firms Impact Test	No	No
Legal Aid	No	No
Sustainable Development	No	No
Carbon Assessment	No	No
Other Environment	No	No
Health Impact Assessment	No	No
Race Equality	No	No
Disability Equality	No	No
Gender Equality	No	No
Human Rights	No	No
Rural Proofing	No	No

THAMES VALLEY PROBATION – 16/5/08

Delivering Safer Communities - Guidance	Identify the current level of the Probation Area's commitment to and engagement with the CDRP/CSP.	Identify any additional resource/or support from the CDRP/CSP Probation would need to discharge its Responsible Authority duties effectively.
<p>Strategy Group</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How is Probation represented on the 'Strategy Group' (District & Unitary/County)? 2. Does the Probation representative hold a Senior Officer position (ACO equivalent)? 3. Has Probation ever chaired the CDRP/CSP? 4. Does the Probation representative provide a link between a) the CDRP/CSP and b) the LCJB and the Local Strategic Partnership? 5. How does Probation input into the Strategic Assessment? 6. What are the links between Probation and YOTs and Prisons in the area in relation to the CDRP agenda? 7. How does Probation input into the Partnership Plan? Examples of any joint commissioning and specific partnership projects. 8. How does Probation contribute to the CDRP/CSPs performance management framework? 9. How well do you consider the CDRP/CSP currently links with the LCJB and the Reducing Reoffending agenda (PPO/DIP schemes, MAPPA PYO and YOS youth justice work, NOMS work)? 10. Are you content with Probation's current level of engagement with CDRP/CSP work? If not, why not? 11. Have you undertaken a skills and knowledge assessment of probation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attendance is, in practice, patchy given the resource and time implications of representation on all 16 of the TV CDRPs. An element of prioritization is required. 2. Predominantly at ACO level though on occasion delegated to Senior Probation Officer. 3. No 4. Conscious effort is made to fulfill this role given the read-across between the groups that Probation offers. The only other organization that commands such a position is the Police. This is recognized as a potentially big win if these changes come into effect. 5. Variable; involvement tends to be undertaken via the LAA process. 6. 1 seconded probation officer on the YOT in TV. Link to prisons (in this context) is minimal. 7. There is some involvement through, for example, helping to shape the work on domestic violence, PPOs etc. 8. Mostly restricted to PPO work at present 9. Works well on the PPO side. They dovetail in regard to some 'outcomes' on RR though they don't focus on that agenda as such. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To fulfill role of a responsible authority and provide full input on the reducing re-offending agenda would require at least 2 x ACO and 2 x SPO. 2. Would aim for ACO level representation. SPO acceptable. On occasion and dependant upon the agenda operational staff representation might be appropriate. 3. Might want to consider chairing thematic sub-group on reducing re-offending (or similar). 4. See this as one of the potential big wins of becoming a responsible authority. Recognized the value in linking up the two bodies. 5. Scope to do so would be increased. 6. See potential wins around linking prisons into reducing re-offending work involving, e.g. short term prisoners. No reason (if suitably resourced) that probation shouldn't help make this link. 7. As above, would look to develop plans around aspects such as short sentence prisoners. 8. Might want to look at aspects such as accessing housing/mainstream resources. 9. Big opportunity exists to extend activity to include RR and bring it together with the crime reduction agenda. This is the critical issue. 10. As above. Being a responsible authority would significantly increase Probation's influence. 11. This would have resource implications as additional training would be required. 12. N/A

THAMES VALLEY PROBATION – 16/5/08

<p>representation to ensure it meets statutory requirements?</p> <p>12. If so, have you undertaken any training/briefing/professional development work to improve skills and knowledge?</p> <p>13. Good practice examples – leadership and/or projects please</p>	<p>10. No. Resource limitations mean it is impossible to develop this as fully as is desirable. Being a co-operating body also means that there is a limit to the influence able to exert.</p> <p>11. Not formally, but recognize that this exists.</p> <p>12. N/A</p> <p>13. N/A</p>	<p>13. N/A</p>
<p>Information-sharing protocol</p> <p>14. Has Probation signed an information sharing protocol with the CDRP/CSP?</p> <p>15. Will this need to be updated if Probation becomes a Responsible Authority?</p> <p>16. Does Probation have a designated liaison officer responsible for facilitating the sharing of information with partners?</p> <p>17. Are there agreed processes for information sharing?</p> <p>18. Does probation submit depersonalized data sets on a quarterly basis?</p> <p>19. Has the new Probation reconviction data been discussed by the CDRP?</p>	<p>14. Yes, there are a number of these in place</p> <p>15. No</p> <p>16. No</p> <p>17. Yes, in regard to PPOs etc.</p> <p>18. Yes??[DN – My notes are unclear on this – anyone to clarify??]</p> <p>19. ????</p>	<p>14. No obvious need for any further protocols to be put in place.</p> <p>15. N/A</p> <p>16. This would need to be reviewed but the general requirements around data provision, data analysis etc suggest at least one additional data analyst post would be required.</p> <p>17. As above.</p> <p>18. No significant additional costs likely.</p> <p>19. N/K</p>

THAMES VALLEY PROBATION – 16/5/08

<p>Assessment & Planning</p> <p>20. How does Probation contribute to Intelligence-led decision making?</p> <p>21. Does the CDRP/CSPs current Strategic Assessment include any priorities on Reducing Reoffending aside from PPOs/DIP and MAPPA work?</p> <p>22. Are these specifically in the Partnership Plan?</p> <p>23. Does the Partnership Plan identify crosscutting links with Regional Reducing Reoffending Action Plans and Youth Justice Plans? And is there any references to homes or jobs for offenders or support for children and families</p> <p>24. Does the Partnership Plan cover how performance in Reducing Reoffending will be measured?</p>	<p>20. This is becoming an area of increasing activity and Probation recognize that this will continue to develop e.g. IOM</p> <p>21. As an ‘outcome’ of existing activity – e.g. getting drug users to undertake effective treatments, secure housing etc. Not expressed as RR explicitly however.</p> <p>22. N/A</p> <p>23. Only, where there is a read-across e.g. accommodation</p> <p>24. No</p>	<p>20. Likely to mean more such work if RR becomes a statutory duty.</p> <p>21. Clearly likely to lead to significant additional demands with probation the lead on RR as a partnership activity. Would aim to absorb this as part of the estimated cost of employing extra ACO etc.</p> <p>22. N/A</p> <p>23. Though there would need to be co-ordinated activity there was some skepticism about how widely partners see these plans as being relevant to their work.</p> <p>24. Possibly – but real issues around getting data disaggregated to CDRP level. Difficult enough to do this at CJS area level. Hard to hold CDRP to account on something you can’t measure.</p>
<p>Delivery</p> <p>25. How does Probation contribute to the day to day delivery processes and structures of the Partnership? (e.g. thematic sub-groups/project groups)</p> <p>26. Is the CDRP/CSPs delivery structure functioning well locally?</p> <p>27. Are any changes needed to this to enable Probation to contribute more fully?</p> <p>28. Does the delivery structure include a focus on Reducing Reoffending?</p> <p>29. How does Probation contribute to evaluating the impact of the Partnership Plan?</p>	<p>25. Through SPO in the main and sometimes via delegated activity.</p> <p>26. County Group works well. From a Probation perspective smaller CDRPs are less effective (though no doubt they meet the requirements of ‘local’ community needs and are less of an issue for other CDRP members).</p> <p>27. Looked at purely from the probation perspective (and CJS) then further rationalization of CDRP structures is desirable. Small, district CDRPS do not read across well to CJS areas.</p> <p>28. As above.</p> <p>29. Minimally</p>	<p>25. Would be keen to develop this work further and could do so if resourced appropriately.</p> <p>26. N/A</p> <p>27. Unlikely to be effected by proposed changes.</p> <p>28. Would look to see this developed as part of these changes.</p> <p>29. Would look to ACO/SPO to fulfill this role.</p> <p>30. N/A</p>

THAMES VALLEY PROBATION – 16/5/08

<p>30. Examples of good practice, concerns and what changes are required.</p>	<p>30. Work on PPOs the most obvious example of good CDRP/Probation/LCJB joint working</p>	
<p>Community Engagement</p> <p>31. Is there a Community Engagement Plan which includes Probation and/or Prisons?</p> <p>32. Is the CDRP/CSP involved in consulting the community regarding Community Payback/Unpaid Work? Please give examples.</p> <p>33. Has Probation been involved in face to face meetings with the community as part of CDRP events? Examples please.</p> <p>34. Has work to reduce reoffending specifically included in community consultations? Examples please</p> <p>35. Are there efforts to identify how the community may be informed, consulted and involved engaged in work to reduce reoffending and increase public confidence, again as part of CDRP work rather than separately by Probation?</p>	<p>31. Not a joint activity at present.</p> <p>32. No. [DN – missed this in my notes; is this right??]</p> <p>33. No</p> <p>34. No</p> <p>35. Not yet.</p>	<p>31. Significant scope exists to bring together the approaches of the LCJB and CDRP to community engagement. As a responsible authority and member of the LCJB Probation could (and should) play a full role in facilitating this.</p> <p>32. Might like to see this developed and can see how this would fit with a RR duty for CDRPs. Would need further consideration.</p> <p>33. Unknown.</p> <p>34. As above.</p> <p>35. As above.</p>
<p>36. How would NOMS benefit from the changes proposed? E.g a) access to mainstream resources that support OM b) accessing ESF and similar other funding streams</p> <p>37. How would this support you e.g in relation to joint commissioning an partnership opportunities</p>	<p>36. Benefits would follow from the enhanced status of Probation. Currently much depends on building good stakeholder relations and personal dedication. Formalizing the role of Probation as a responsible authority would significantly increase influence and mean they could not be marginalized. Help to move focus away from offences onto offenders.</p>	<p>36. Need to be mindful of the tension between being a responsible authority on a 'local' group but also part of a national organization. This could result in difficulties when it comes to, for example, setting local targets which don't co-incide with national indicators etc.</p>
<p>38. What are your concerns , if any?</p>		
<p>39. What support would you need from the MoJ/NOMS/</p>		

THAMES VALLEY PROBATION – 16/5/08

OCJR		

Any other comments you may have:

<p>Delivering Safer Communities - Guidance</p>	<p>Identify the additional costs to Probation of ensuring the CDRP/CSP focuses on reducing re-offending and implications for the partnership of a change in function.</p>	<p>Identify the additional benefits to Probation of changing the statutory duty of CDRPs/CSPs to include reducing re-offending; and including the addition of the Probation Area to the list of CDRP/CSP responsible authorities.</p>
<p>Strategy Group</p> <p>Ensuring Senior Officer representation</p> <p>Ensuring required other middle manager representation</p> <p>Any additional administrative support</p> <p>Inputs into:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the Strategic Assessment b) the Partnership Plan <p>Performance Management work</p> <p>Developing links with LCJB/Regional Reducing Reoffending Boards/YOS/Prisons/MA PPA etc</p> <p>Skills and Knowledge Development</p>	<p>We discussed this in general terms rather than looking at each aspect separately. The key issue was identified as being the ability to ensure adequate and appropriate representation on the 16 TV CDRPs. If the resource required for this (estimated at 2 x ACO, 2 x SPO and 1 x Data Analyst) was made available then it would be possible to dedicate the time required in order to mainstream RR on the CDRP agenda and ensure it became complementary to existing activity.</p> <p>This level of additional resource should help ensure that all the listed activities (e.g. assessment & planning, information sharing etc) could be fulfilled.</p> <p>Costs estimated at 2 ACO @£60K per annum; 2 SPO @£45K per annum and 1 Data Analyst @ £60K per annum. Total cost = £270K</p>	<p>This would allow Probation to increase the range of activity undertaken to help reduce re-offending and get additional ‘buy-in’ from a wider range of partners. The relationship between crime reduction, the delivery of justice (LCJBs) and reducing re-offending agendas could be better understood and tensions between them more easily resolved. Essentially, all the benefits already identified were confirmed.</p> <p>The current situation, which requires ‘middle’ managers to cover, between them, 16 CDRPs plus numerous sub-groups inevitably means patchy representation and an unfocussed approach to attempting to influence the agenda. This situation is exacerbated by the fact that CDRPs don’t routinely expect to consider the RR agenda. It becomes a question of identifying and gaining representation on just those groups considered to exert most influence i.e. prioritising. To a large degree this is dependant upon building local relationships as there is no obligation on the part of CDRPs to invite Probation to sit on all (or any) of the sub-groups.</p> <p>Where there is a ‘County Group’ it becomes much easier to see where the main influence is and to ensure consistent representation etc.</p> <p>The PPO scheme is a good example of how joint working can bring about improved results. It also exemplifies how crime</p>

THAMES VALLEY PROBATION – 16/5/08

		reduction (prevent and deter) can be aligned with delivery of justice (catch and convict) and, ultimately, increased desistance (resettle and rehabilitate). No reason why this principle should not be extended to other work areas.
<p><u>Information-sharing protocol</u></p> <p>Designated Information Officer</p> <p>Information Management:</p> <p>a) analysis</p> <p>b) processes for quarterly sharing depersonalised data</p>	<p>Information sharing recognized as key. But Probation area level data on RR is not as robust as it might be and largely meaningless at CDRP level. Little prospect of district level RR data being made available any time soon.</p>	<p>Would want to make maximum use of the opportunity to interrogate data coming from CDRPs (of which there is a lot) to see what it means for Probation. Unlikely that this could be absorbed as part of current staff capacity.</p>
<p><u>Assessment & Planning</u></p> <p>Probation involvement in:</p> <p>a) joint strategic analysis</p> <p>b) partnership planning</p>		
<p><u>Delivery</u></p> <p>Management representation on:</p> <p>a) thematic sub-groups</p> <p>b) project groups</p> <p>c) ongoing operational groups</p> <p>Probation contribution to:</p> <p>a) general CDRP evaluation</p> <p>b) delivery impact evaluation</p>	<p>The current CDRP structure (e.g. 6 in Berkshire alone) has little read-across to that of the Probation Service. In some of the districts they would not even have a probation office. Though the extent to which this applies will vary across the country it will be true to a lesser or greater degree in each of the 42 CJS areas.</p>	<p>The Probation Service can play a critical and pivotal role in embedding RR on the agendas of both the LCJB and CDRP and then ensuring synchronicity between the two. This would, of course, be that much easier if both bodies recognized this as a core function rather than an “add-on”.</p> <p>To work, the RR agenda requires a resource intensive approach. In TV they are planning to use some of the additional funding that has been provided to extend, for example, “tracker” work, thereby demonstrating that safety can be achieved without custody. Important to “sell” this type of approach to partners and can see how these changes might help bring this about.</p>
<p><u>Community Engagement</u></p> <p>Involvement in CDRP/CSP community engagement:</p> <p>a) surveys</p> <p>b) neighbourhood meetings</p> <p>c) public conferences</p>		

THAMES VALLEY PROBATION – 16/5/08

<p>Ensuring Reducing Reoffending is part of community consultation</p> <p>Follow up engagement with community organizations</p>		
<p>Ensuring access to mainstream resources and other funding streams:</p> <p>a) Negotiation</p> <p>b) Bidding work</p> <p>Additional commissioning work</p>		<p>Possibly increased opportunities to divert LAA funding to RR activity. Wouldn't want to over-sell the degree to which this would take forward partnership working. In some areas e.g. health this already happens as part of existing work with stakeholders and unlikely to be significantly advanced as part of these proposals.</p>
<p>Any other Costs/Benefits you can identify from requirements of a responsible authority contained in the 'Delivering Safer Communities Guidance'</p>		