

Overview and Scrutiny – Briefing Note

Topic:	How can the newly established Probation Service in Nottingham mitigate the risk associated with its transformation
Requested by:	Nottingham City Council, Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Submitted by:	Jo Mead – Chief Executive Officer The Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire and Rutland Community Rehabilitation Company Limited (DLNR CRC) Sarah Chand – Deputy Director (Midlands) National Probation Service
Date submitted:	12 September 2014

Impact of changes locally and mitigation

- ❖ The breadth of service provision overall should not change.
- ❖ The work has been split between both providers and the NPS (National Probation Service) and the CRC (Community Rehabilitation Company) take different leads e.g. the NPS undertakes all Court work, whilst the CRC delivers the vast majority of interventions.
- ❖ The NPS and the CRC have agreed who attends which Partnership Meetings and Boards and both will act as a probation provider single point of contact for partners as appropriate.
- ❖ A change for partners is that they now need to engage with both probation providers, rather than just one organisation.
- ❖ Communication and engaging with local staff already familiar to Councils and partners is key; the staff and the work have not changed, even though the structure has.

How will the new Probation Service work?

- ❖ It works by the NPS and the CRC working in partnership with each other, as we are inter-dependent.
- ❖ The work has been split between both providers.
- ❖ The NPS is responsible for managing high risk and MAPPA (Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangement) offenders, court work, enforcement, Approved Premises, and victims.
- ❖ The CRC is responsible for managing low and medium risk offenders, interventions, and Through the Gate work.
- ❖ The new Target Operating Model lays down processes which ensure a flow of information between both organisations.

- ❖ Our engagement with partners remains as before, but it is simply now an expectation on both organisations.

Management, Accountability, Partnership Work, Scrutiny of CRCs

- ❖ CRCs will have a major contract with NOMS for service delivery, including delivering some services to the NPS e.g. domestic abuse programmes. The National Offender Management Service (NOMS) will manage that contract and hold the CRC to account.
- ❖ Partnership work is a core part of probation provision and will, therefore, be reflected in the ongoing work of the CRC.
- ❖ The CRC is currently running as a wholly owned private company, entirely within the public sector. This will change over the coming months as the company is sold.
- ❖ Local accountability remains important, and the CRC will remain part of such arrangements as the Criminal Justice Board for the foreseeable future.

Timescales and Influence on Award and Services

- ❖ The competition is being closely managed by the Ministry of Justice.
- ❖ Contracts are based largely on the desired outcomes (reducing reoffending) with flexibility left in how those outcomes are achieved, so there will be the usual scope to influence the way in which services are delivered.

Risks arising from Payments by Results – What if the Contract Fails?

- ❖ The payment by results element to the future contract is not yet finalised, and will be negotiated between the bidder and the Ministry of Justice.

Risk Assessments – Managing an increase of risk

- ❖ The NPS undertakes the initial risk assessment for all offenders, which indicates which provider will offender manage the case. This includes young offenders who are transferring into probation from the Youth Offending Service. 'Transition to Adulthood' schemes are in place for these young adults on both the NPS and CRC sides.
- ❖ Both providers are expected to remain alert to risk factors and re-assess both risk of reoffending and risk of harm on a regular basis.
- ❖ If CRC colleagues believe a risk of harm has escalated to high, there must be a conversation with NPS colleagues and appropriate actions are agreed.



- ❖ If the risk of harm is confirmed as having increased to high, the case transfers to the NPS.
- ❖ If the risk of harm has increased but is not assessed as high, the case remains with the CRC.
- ❖ Once a case belongs to the NPS, it will remain there until the end of that Order, even if the risk of harm is assessed as having reduced to medium or low.
- ❖ Ultimately, the final decision on risk of harm assessment rests with the NPS.