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Foreword

It is nearly eighteen months since the National Probation Service (NPS) was formed. Throughout that time, our staff have delivered consistently effective services to the courts, offenders and victims. That is a credit to the commitment of everybody.

But I know that maintaining delivery has involved a lot of hard work and that there is more still to be done to make our systems work better, to build our identity and to maximise our impact within the resources available to us. And we need to deliver our contribution to the savings committed to as part of Transforming Rehabilitation to reinvest in those cases previously not managed by probation.

As with any major change in how the system is organised, our immediate priority has been to stabilise the system. There is a long list of small gains that have been achieved over the last year that build the resilience of the NPS. Where issues have arisen, you’ve increasingly shown the collective ability to fix them.

That is not to say that everything is perfect. I know from the time I’ve spent with probation staff that there are still frustrations. We must be realistic about the level of service that we can expect from others, but you have my commitment that we will continue to push for resolution to issues with central and other service provision.

The focus on resolving the immediate issues we have faced as an organisation has necessarily meant our concentration has been on what we do and how we do it, rather than thinking about the type of organisation that we want to create.

That is the shift we need now to make. The proposals set out in this document paint a picture of what service delivery across the NPS will look like, and how we will shape ourselves for the future.

COLIN ALLARS
Director of Probation

The Blueprint is in part about completing the job of Transforming Rehabilitation (TR). TR formed the NPS as an entity but it did not establish common ways of working across the organisation. E3 is also about preparing for the future challenges that we will face, including the continued expectation of reducing cost, driving improvement, and creating an organisation that can support the emerging shape of prison reform.

To meet these challenges requires an organisation that has established an evidence-based model of practice, applied consistently across the country, backed by a fair distribution of resource. The Blueprint sets us on a path to achieve that.

For some of you the proposals are likely to require changes to the way you work. For a very few, they may signal a more fundamental change in your role within the organisation. A great strength of probation staff is your commitment to the service and your ability to speak your mind. I encourage all of you to read the Blueprint and to work with us on how these proposals might best be refined and implemented.
Chapter 1  Overview

The National Probation Service (NPS) was created in June 2014 as part of the Transforming Rehabilitation Programme. The NPS brought together parts of 35 former Probation Trusts to form a new organisation with over 9,000 staff and a caseload of 90,000 offenders.

The NPS, as part of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) is a national organisation covering England and Wales, with the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) for NOMS overseeing the entire NPS delivery structure. However, the management arrangements for the NPS in England and Wales vary in acknowledgement of the distinct differences in the delivery landscape.

In Wales many of the areas of work necessary to make communities safer and improve reoffending rates are devolved to the Welsh Government. This includes housing, substance misuse, physical and mental health services, education, skills and training, child and adult safeguarding and local government (community safety). NOMS in Wales was established to reflect this unique situation. The Director of NOMS in Wales has overarching responsibility for the delivery of all of NOMS services in Wales, including direct responsibility for the NPS and public sector prisons and contract management responsibilities for privately contracted prison HMP Parc and the Wales Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC).

In England, the Director of Probation has direct responsibility for the delivery of probation services. Responsibility for public sector prisons and contract management in England sits with other directors within NOMS.
With the creation of the NPS in England and Wales, we inherited a positive legacy from the former trusts of high performance which we have, to your great credit, maintained over the last year. The harder legacy is that we have also inherited significant differences in how we do our job, how many people do it at what level, and at what cost. And, of course Transforming Rehabilitation has fundamentally changed the operating model for probation.

There are differences in the way court reports are prepared, the services provided to victims, the contributions we make to youth offending teams, how approved premises are managed and resourced, and the types of cases managed by Probation Officers (PO) and Probation Services Officers (PSO).

As a national organisation we need to address these inconsistencies to be able to provide a quality, equitably resourced public service across England and Wales. We have been working with the Performance and Analysis Group in NOMS to develop a resource allocation model that builds on the tried and tested Metropolitan Area Capacity Model that was previously used by a number of Probation Trusts. The model analyses the case load and activity within offender management and courts and will allow an equitable distribution of staff and resources throughout the National Probation Service. Getting the most from service delivery is in the interests of staff, offenders, victims, our partners, and the public as a whole.

The E3 Programme was created to define and implement the changes necessary to achieve a consistent way of working. E3 stands for Effectiveness, Efficiency and Excellence. Those three words define what we are trying to achieve through the programme.

- Effectiveness in better delivering on both our performance targets and securing the outcomes of reduced reoffending and public protection. We have successfully maintained performance throughout a period of sustained change. That is a huge achievement and is credit to the professionalism and commitment of our staff. But feedback from staff and partners as well as recommendations in recent audit and inspections have shown us there are opportunities to further improve service delivery.

- Efficiency in ensuring that every penny we spend makes the greatest impact. We need to find ways to reduce what it costs to deliver services to offenders while ensuring that we continue to protect the public and reduce reoffending. The relative efficiency of former Probation Trusts varied significantly. We are committed to using the opportunity of creating a national service to improve the overall efficiency of the organisation. Our proposals will deliver our contribution towards savings for reinvestment in the additional offenders now being supervised by probation. But they will also improve the quality of our provision.

- Excellence in the way that we operate as an organisation and the outcomes we deliver. Most former Probation Trusts worked to the European Excellence Model (EFQM) and many had achieved 5 star ratings. Our long term ambition within the NPS is to replicate those standards.
So what does this mean for us?

It is worth recognising that much of what we do will not change. Our purpose and the core of our work will not change. NPS staff will continue to assist Courts and the Parole Board by preparing reports which incorporate accurate and evidence-based assessments and appropriate proposals. We will continue to work with the NPS caseload of mainly sexual and violent offenders, focusing on reducing their risk of harm and enabling them to avoid further offending. We will use Approved Premises (AP) to monitor and support the most dangerous of these cases. Our unique contribution to multi-agency partnerships such as MAPPA, MARAC and Prevent will remain. We will work with victims to ensure that their voice is heard. We will fulfil our statutory duty to contribute to Youth Offending Services (YOS).

We also recognise that most of the proposals that we outline in this document are not new. They are delivery models that are already operating in parts of the NPS, and which were in place under Probation Trusts. We know that they work. We also know that they will release staff time and resource.

We are committed to ensuring that any proposed changes to service delivery have been made with due regard to our Public Sector Equality Duty [PSED]. We acknowledge that any changes to service delivery has the potential to impact positively or negatively on both service users and staff groups of particular protected characteristics. The intention of the E3 programme and this Blueprint is to show due care in identifying possible impacts and where necessary highlighting activity that should take place to either promote positive impact or mitigate against possible negative impact of proposals. We will continue to recognise differential need and are committed to ensuring services meet that need effectively.

Our proposals are based on evidence. E3 has looked at the evidence base on what is effective in reducing re-offending and risk of harm. This has included a review of research into effective Probation practice both in the UK and internationally, and discussion with HM Inspectorate of Probation and the NOMS Serious Further Offence (SFO) review team about their analysis of good practice. Even more importantly we have worked with and involved experienced probation professionals in the development of all of these proposals.

In applying consistency we will also want to preserve the local responsivity and partnership work that has been the driving force of so much innovation over the last few years. That will continue to be true, not least through the evolving relationships with the 21 Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs). Our aim through this programme is to become an organisation that is ‘consistently innovative’. Consistent in that we work to an agreed and equitable structure and that our processes and practice are founded on evidence. Innovative in that we provide our managers and staff with the opportunity to utilise their professional experience in the way we work, including with local partners and in contributing to the organisation’s continuous improvement. This model provides scope for flexibility to operate within different areas, including Wales reflecting the uniqueness of the devolved delivery landscape, and the NOMS in Wales focus on increased integration of delivery of offender management services across custody and the community.
It was always recognised that there would need to be change in how some of our work is undertaken and by whom, once the NPS had been established. The changes will for some staff be significant. They will remove some roles from the organisation and change what we ask of others, in particular PSO grades. We intend to create generic job descriptions for core roles (Case Administrator (CA), Senior Probation Officer (SPO), Head of Cluster/Function, PO, PSO), and these will be formally evaluated through the established job evaluation process. These will cover the range of roles at each grade. They will support our goal of flexible and multi-skilled staff.

For staff who read this document and see proposals that may change their role we would offer reassurance. It is important to stress that we do not believe compulsory redundancies will be necessary to achieve our ambitions. The NPS caseload is higher than we had planned for. Implementation of the changes described here will release the capacity to absorb that work among our existing workforce, but in some parts of the NPS and for some staff it will mean operating in a new way.

We have called this document a ‘Blueprint’ because it sets out for staff and partners an early and high level plan for what service delivery in the NPS will look like in the future. This Blueprint sets a high level direction for the future shape of service delivery in the NPS. We are sharing it in the interests of transparency and to give staff and stakeholders the opportunity to comment on those proposals. We want your help to support us in best making the shift to this new way of working. Significant further work is required to translate these design principles into a clear organisational structure.

1.1 Vision

The core role and purpose of the NPS is consistent with the 100 year history of probation in England and Wales. Our role is to protect the public, support victims and reduce reoffending.

We, alongside the rest of NOMS, have a simple vision:

“Preventing Victims by Changing Lives”.

Everything that we do should be with the aim of contributing to the delivery of that vision, whether that is in the advice we provide to sentencers, the support we provide to victims, the approach we take to the management and rehabilitation of offenders, the relationships we build with partner agencies, or the way that we support our staff to improve their ability to deliver.

As an organisation we have described ‘how’ we go about delivering on that vision through a series of organisational principles

- **We believe in the capacity of people to change.** We know that through excellent professional practice, strong partnership working and by making clear what is expected of offenders, we can help them change their lives
- **We are accountable.** We are proud of our role in protecting the public which is always at the heart of our decisions
- **We are collaborative.** We work with individuals and with national and local services to create a real and sustained difference
- **We are effective.** Our work is focused on delivering results and building on our skills and experience. Our work is based on evidence of what works, and on continuous improvement. This means embracing evidence and innovation to provide a service the public can be confident in
We are fair. We value the diversity of our staff, our communities and individuals, knowing that this strengthens our ability to be responsive and effect real and long-term change in how people live their lives.

We are professional. We trust and support our staff to make the best decisions for public safety, investing in their ongoing development, encouraging innovation and always striving for excellence.

The aim of E3 is to help us better deliver against that corporate vision and organisational principles.

1.2 E3 Approach

E3 has focused on six priority areas:

- Court Delivery
- Community Supervision
- Custody
- Victims Services
- Approved Premises
- Youth Offending Services

These areas represent the NPS core business, where there is most resource and where there is the greatest need to achieve consistency of delivery and operational model. They have the most impact in relation to the public, victims, offenders and staff.

We have not considered sex offender programmes as a separate review is currently underway. We have not included the role of Probation staff in prisons either. The Offender Management in custody review is taking place alongside the E3 programme.

Its design principles focus on achieving better rehabilitation of offenders through the effective targeting of resources. These are clearly congruent with the aims of E3. While the full details and implementation plan are still being worked through, we do know that a key design principle is that responsibility for Offender Management of those in custody should sit within the prison. It is likely that the programme will lead to changes in probation work with prisoners, and we will need to ensure that E3 is fully aligned to these.

Sex offender programmes and probation work in prisons will be reviewed as part of a second wave of E3 activity. That will also include a more detailed review of both administration and corporate support functions across the NPS.

We describe in more detail later in the document what changes there will be in each of the six priority areas and how we propose to implement them. These changes will mean that many of us will have to work differently and for some staff the changes will be significant.

Our new way of working will need to be underpinned by technology and processes that help staff in their job, and training support that will bring the best out of our people. Our new way of working will also be based on a number of principles that have shaped the proposals in this document.

These are:

1. The NPS will have a national, equitable approach to grading, role profiles and job descriptions. Staff doing the same job will work to the same job description, and receive the same level of support and core remuneration.
2. The NPS workforce will be multi-skilled with the ability to work across the organisation in different roles within the same pay band. There will be specialist teams but staff will be encouraged to move between teams on a regular basis to preserve and develop their range of professional skills and experience.

3. NPS staff must be competent to carry out their work and remain professionally accountable for what they do. Recognising the professional skills of staff, the emphasis for supervisors will move from routine countersigning of work to the provision of professional support and quality assurance underpinned by dip-sampling and quality audits.

4. The NPS will be an organisation that continues to invest in the continuous professional development of our staff.

5. The NPS will have a core delivery model underpinned by appropriate distribution of resource. This does not mean “one size fits all” and variations to the model will be agreed where this reflects geography or local offender needs, based on evidence.

6. The NPS will ensure value for money in everything that we do, while continuing to prioritise public protection.

7. We will ensure that the work undertaken in the NPS is evidence-based and meets a high standard of quality. There will be a focus on continuous improvement, and service innovation.

8. The outcome of discussions and decisions about design, implementation and review will consider equality implications with the intention of mitigating any negative impact on staff or service user groups covered by one or more protected characteristic. These considerations will be recorded and acted upon as part of the programmes’ Equality Analysis process.

9. The NPS will deliver against our commitments as set out in the TR Target Operating Model (TOM) and our annual Service Level Agreement with NOMS.

1.3 Proposals

A summary of the proposals is outlined below:

1.3.1 Court delivery

We propose that court work is resourced to maximise the proportion of court reports completed on the day consistent with meeting the needs of sentencers.

- There will be dedicated court services teams who will prepare all the Pre-Sentence Reports (PSRs) requested in the courts they service and will conduct all the enforcement work of their court
- The proportion of same-day short format reports will be maximised, with an ambition ultimately of up to 90% of court reports being completed on the day
- PSOs will form the majority of staff within the court teams, with PSRs reserved to POs only in certain specified circumstances
- The RSR/CAS process will be streamlined to reduce duplication and support timely allocation
• An effective proposal framework will be developed to inform the recommendations of PSR writers

1.3.2 Community Supervision

We propose clarifying the approach to community supervision.
- A new seven category tiering framework will be rolled out which better reflects the risk and need profile of NPS cases
- Cases will be managed by an individual officer
- High risk cases will be managed by POs. PSOs who have undertaken the appropriate level of training will hold low and some medium risk cases
- The Offender Supervisor role where it exists will be removed in favour of the delegation of certain specified tasks in support of the Offender Manager (OM)
- The use of group supervision in certain specified circumstances will be explored

1.3.3 Custody

We propose changes that will streamline processes and improve quality in parole work, recalls and the management of foreign national prisoners.

i. Parole
- Our proposals aim to make the parole process more efficient and make effective and appropriate use of release provisions
- The quality and timeliness of the parole process will be improved. A quality audit framework will be developed. OMs will have greater access to Public Protection Unit Database (PPUD) to enable smoother information sharing. There will be a pilot to test whether routine Senior Probation Officer (SPO) countersignature of all Parole Reports is necessary. We will press the case with partners so that OMs will contribute to most parole hearings via video link or telephone
- The NPS will explore Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) involvement starting earlier in custodial sentences as a means of ensuring that prisoners undertake necessary work before their parole date

ii. Recall
- The proposals aim to make sure that alternatives to recall are considered where suitable
- Staff will be expected to use measures short of recall where it is safe to do so, e.g. Secretary of State warning
- Whilst ACO/Head countersignature of recalls remains the norm, additional arrangements to support this will be explored and piloted
- Prompt use of MAPPA to drive risk management and sentence planning will be used to ensure that where it is assessed as safe re-release will be pursued
- To reduce unnecessary bureaucracy, executive re-release will be used effectively in appropriate circumstances

- The proposals aim to make the parole process more efficient and make effective and appropriate use of release provisions
- Whilst ACO/Head countersignature of recalls remains the norm, additional arrangements to support this will be explored and piloted
- Prompt use of MAPPA to drive risk management and sentence planning will be used to ensure that where it is assessed as safe re-release will be pursued
- To reduce unnecessary bureaucracy, executive re-release will be used effectively in appropriate circumstances
1.3.6 Youth Offending Services (YOS)

Subject to the outcome of the Youth Justice Review, we propose standardising the provision of resources and clarifying the role of seconded staff.

- A national framework will be agreed with the Youth Justice Board (YJB) which clarifies the NPS responsibility in Youth Offending work and the expectations of secondments.
- The framework will include a resource model based on the workload of each Youth Offending Team, staff will be seconded in accordance with this.
- NPS staff seconded to the YOS will work with high risk cases and with cases who will be transferred to NPS when they are 18.

1.3.7 Management structure

We propose introducing more consistency in the management structures in use across the NPS.

- Each Local Delivery Unit (LDU) cluster will be managed by a Head of Cluster with direct line management responsibility for SPOs.
- Additional support will be provided for complex LDU clusters.
- Case Administrators will be line managed by Senior Case Administrators.
- Administrative support will be provided to reduce time spent by senior staff on administrative tasks.

iii. Foreign National Prisoners (FNPs)

- It is proposed that FNPs will be managed by specialist divisional/regional teams potentially co-located with Home Office Immigration and Enforcement (HOIE) and prison staff. This proposal is dependent on the outcome of the Offender Management in Custody review and plans for expansion of electronic monitoring, and also requires clarification of the numbers of cases affected.

1.3.4 Victims

We propose harmonising the processes and staffing of victim contact work.

- A national case management system for victim work will be rolled out.
- Victim administration will be delivered through specialised hubs either at national or divisional level.
- A framework will be developed to reflect differing levels of Victim Liaison Officer (VLO) activity in different cases.
- VLOs will work in specialist teams, the VLO role will be reviewed and evaluated.

1.3.5 Approved Premises (AP)

We propose a standardised approach to referrals, staffing and the regime of AP.

- All AP will become accredited as enabling environments.
- A standard referral process will be established, using an electronic referral form in nDelius.
- Staff roles and grades will be standardised.
This chart illustrates the breakdown of expenditure on the E3 priority areas.
Chapter 2 Courts

2.1 What does the model look like now?

Following Transforming Rehabilitation the NPS has continued to provide a service to the courts but has felt the pressure of the new demands of providing a service to the CRCs and in particular the introduction of the Risk of Serious Recidivism (RSR) tool and Case Allocation System (CAS) processes. Changes to speed up court processes have also impacted on expectations of probation.

Whilst the former trusts all provided court services (as per the specifications), the NPS inherited many different ways of delivering them and a wide range of costs. In some former trusts the work was largely delivered on the day in court by PSOs whereas others relied heavily on POs preparing reports away from court. The range of what is delivered (SDR, FDR, Oral), differing court team grade mix and variations in cost per report are significant.

The E3 Court delivery proposal originates in the work led by the NPS Deputy Director for Courts and the Courts Strategy and Operations ACO group, to create a national model for court work delivery following the creation of the NPS.

2.2 What do we want the future model to look like?

The main objective of this set of proposals is to take the best of what is done in the NPS and to create a court delivery service aligned to the courts reform programme (and the NPS contractual requirements) which is known for its quality, reliability and value for money.

We will continue to offer the same services to courts but do so using our resources more efficiently and effectively, and in a more consistent manner across England and Wales.
The E3 proposal concludes with an exploration of removing the management of courts from the LDUs and keeping it within a separate divisional line management. This was a response to the view that without this the courts would always struggle to deliver best practice, potentially under-resourced and lacking the resilience to deal with staffing gaps or spikes in workload.

2.3 End state proposals

There are eight proposals within this work package, as follows:

2.3.1 Dedicated court services teams will prepare all the PSRs requested in the courts they service and will conduct all the enforcement work of their court.

The proposal will allow for the development of improved report writing, with appropriate and consistent advice and prepared at the most efficient level. The teams will be backed by dedicated administrators. The proposal is dependent upon the NPS obtaining sufficient space in court, the realisation of the Digital Courts programme, as well as access to appropriate IT and information from other agencies. NPS senior and local managers will continue to work with our criminal justice and other partners making the case for our requirements and ensuring that it is understood that without these we will be constrained.

It is recognised that there is a risk that staff in court teams could become detached from the LDU and could find it difficult to move back to offender management but the risk can be mitigated by consistent and appropriate mobility expectations across the NPS, as referenced earlier.

This will mean dedicated court teams doing the work that flows from their court, delivering as many reports as possible on the day, mainly delivered by appropriately trained PSOs. Reports will be delivered to a consistently high quality and in a format commensurate with their complexity, with SDRs reserved for those including assessments of dangerousness.

CRCs will receive their allocations on time, enforcement and report writing practice will be consistent across the NPS and variations will reflect only local geography.

The Courts Strategy and Operations ACO group wanted to explore using the model for report delivery in Wales as a potential national approach. There is evidence that it offers excellent performance with on the day reports nearing 90%, largely written by PSOs. This suggests excellent value for money and a good fit with Transforming Summary Justice. Colleagues in Wales are satisfied that the quality of reports is good.

The Courts Strategy and Operations ACO group also wished to explore the model for enforcement practice in London which manages enforcement through a hub supported by dedicated administrators. This was in response to the need to create a national model to replace a variety of legacy trust arrangements. The driver for this was the view that this would lead to improved quality and efficiency and probably a reduction in costs. There is, however, an acceptance that some areas of England and Wales are better suited to a hub approach than others and we recognise that geographical challenges will need to be considered.
The proposal is that court teams will prepare all reports and will rely on information from Offender Managers as they prepare reports on known offenders in NPS and the CRCs. There are good arguments for and against this, but a focus group of NPS operational courts staff did not support the alternative of Offender Managers in the NPS writing pre-sentence reports on these cases, instead preferring that Offender Managers prepare progress reports which they then pass to the court team.

2.3.2 Our ‘customer’, the Courts is clear that they wanted to deliver a higher proportion of same day delivery reports.
The NPS has thus far not set a target for the proportion of court reports to be completed on the day. The proposal is that, the challenges notwithstanding, there should be an NPS target. So we propose that we should aspire to 90% of all reports to be short format and on the day, (70% oral, 20% written) with only the remainder remitted as Standard Delivery Reports. (It is recognised that this is ambitious, more so for some divisions so this is an end-state target and would be unlikely to be realised before April 2017).

- In the short term it is proposed that 75% of reports should be short format and prepared on the day, (55% oral, 20% written) with 10% of reports remitted as SDRs and the remaining 15% short format reports prepared later

To achieve these targets effective local systems to provide required information in a timely manner will be essential.

2.3.3 The maximum number (likely to be up to 75%) of reports will be prepared by PSOs.
We therefore propose that appropriately trained PSOs will form the majority of staff within the court teams, with PSRs reserved to POs only in certain specified circumstances. Clearly in some parts of the country this is already in place and is working well. Indeed it is the practice in Wales which combines excellent on the day productivity with extensive use of PSOs (with a PO backup) on which this proposal is based.

In some parts of the country it is POs who are principally in court and the suggestion that court teams should be predominantly POs was considered. It was rejected because Wales offers a very persuasive, cost-effective model based on PSOs delivering good quality work, allowing them to exercise their skills to the full.

PSOs will use their skills properly, working to the maximum of their role boundary. This will allow the focus of POs to be on the more complex work. However it is recognised that in some divisions not all PSOs have the skills to deliver the work envisaged.

Our initial review of the PSO job description and role boundaries supports the view that this proposal is achievable.

The proposal will require a period of adjustment to allow some PSOs to be trained and develop the necessary experience to operate in this new context. For some divisions, a re-profile of the workforce will also be necessary. PSOs will prepare reports on a wide range of cases. They will not be expected to complete reports on sex offenders and we will not require them to write reports on domestic abuse or high risk and complex cases until they have been trained to do so.
2.3.4 Administrative hubs will be created for courts.
The Court Strategy and Operations ACO group was keen to explore how the administration of court work could be delivered more efficiently given the changed and increased volume of NPS work at court. The original proposal was that administration for court work would best be provided through a hub.

What is now envisaged is not a physical hub but one which is virtual and possibly combined with other areas of activity. It is suggested though that this proposal should be deferred until later so that the NPS can respond to later developments with the digital courts without a second wave of major disruption to the administrative staff who support court work delivery.

2.3.5 Streamlining RSR/CAS.
The proposal is that the process of determining whether an offender should be allocated to the NPS or the CRC and of notifying colleagues in prison about this should be streamlined. This is a complex issue and the ideal resolution will allow staff to complete the RSR as quickly and efficiently as possible, reducing double-keying and duplication but allowing CRC and prison colleagues to get the information they need in time.

The RSR is a predictor based on the most current and relevant research into future behaviour. It was originally intended to be used not just for allocation but also for ongoing risk assessment. E3 has been considering ways in which the process could be made more efficient while still providing sufficient information to allocate cases. No final decisions have been made. The types of options being considered are:

- Reviewing the format of the risk assessment in the CAS
- Reducing the information required in cases that are automatically allocated to the NPS
- Reconsidering when the static and dynamic versions of RSR should be used

We will continue this work collaboratively with colleagues across the system recognising that any decision to change arrangements may impact on others.

2.3.6 Effective proposal framework.
To support the development of consistent good quality reports we propose that the NPS will develop an effective proposal framework to be used by staff preparing reports. This will be based upon the work developed by Commissioning Strategy Group (CSG) on effectiveness, build upon existing proposal frameworks and will support demand management strategies.

2.3.7 Divisional enforcement hubs.
It has been proposed that enforcement activity will be grouped into divisional hubs supported by specialist teams including enforcement officers. This role, covering all magistrates’ enforcement work across a division could produce efficiency of process and scale, particularly in a metropolitan area.

In some rural areas due to travel distance and the lower volume of enforcement cases, generic court teams are arguably best placed to manage all work flowing from court including the administration of enforcement work.

Part of the proposal is to have administrative hubs (either virtual or physical units) to act as a single point of contact for all divisional enforcement work. However, changes resulting from digital courts may mean hubs are not fit for purpose in future and would need to be changed soon after their inception.

The NPS needs to examine whether other administrative work could also be undertaken from a hub, making the hub more resilient.
This model does though risk detaching LDUs from their courts so they will be unable to draw on court staff when under pressure (and vice versa). Using the resource flexibly may be challenging over large geographical areas. External dependencies (e.g. offender management in custody review, court closures) may impact on court structures and spans of control and significant changes to NPS governance structures now may be premature.

This option is being piloted in the North West as is the alternative model in the South West and London (in effect the status quo). By January 2016 the interim results of the NW pilot of this model will be available. It is recommended that following this there will be a further review and the option will either be confirmed as a proposal or withdrawn.

2.4 Impact on service delivery

Our approach is consistent with commitments being made by all Criminal Justice partners to improve speed and quality of delivery.

Preparing more reports on the day depends on getting the information the officer needs to make an informed judgement about risk and a professional proposal. This enables us to protect potential victims and to support the delivery of speedy justice, something cited frequently by victims as important. This is a particular issue in domestic abuse cases.

We will continue to work with the police to make sure that court teams are able to get the information they need (on the day) to prepare reports. We appreciate that safeguarding information is difficult to get on the day in most areas but it is rarely crucial to the sentencing decision.
Our proposals mean that the skills of PSOs will be fully used, while utilising POs for those reports that only they can prepare. The proposals will improve NPS productivity and fewer people will be sentenced without reports. Clearly this requires having enough appropriately trained PSOs in each division (see below).

We believe that dedicated court teams will provide an improved service and relieve the burden on field teams by preparing reports as efficiently and effectively as possible. We will need to guard against the risks that staff in field teams lose their PSR writing skills and become less familiar with court processes and that the court staff become detached from the field and find it hard to return to offender management work.

A national proposal framework (evidence-based) will support the delivery of a consistent, effective and efficient service in court across England and Wales.

2.5 Impact on staff

These proposals will have the greatest impact upon PSOs. To deliver more reports they will need to undertake training (beyond what is in the current VQ3 qualification) so that they are able to conduct risk assessments (including on domestic abuse cases) and are able to complete OASys. There is the potential for some modules from the forthcoming Community Justice Learning programme (which will replace the PQF) to meet this need. This is something which is being explored further.

The complement of PSOs varies significantly across the NPS divisions and some may need to increase the number of PSOs to implement our proposed new way of working. Given that the NPS is not using PSOs as fully as possible and there is considerable pressure on POs, these proposals will benefit both grades of staff allowing PSOs to fulfil their potential and POs to concentrate on the work that only they have the qualification, training and skills to deliver.

Excellent administration will underpin the successful delivery of the proposals and while it is possible to implement some administrative changes for enforcement (virtual hubs where these do not exist already), it would be a mistake to engage in major administrative change now, before the impact of digital courts is clear. In the next phase of E3 an administrative review will be needed to reshape how and what we do to work alongside the changed court service.

2.6 Conclusion

We believe these proposals will enable the NPS to continue to provide the level and quality of service required by courts and CRCs within the financial and staffing resources available to us.
Chapter 3  Community Supervision

3.1 What does the model look like now?

The NPS directly manages offenders who pose the highest risk of harm and who have committed the most serious crimes. At any one time approximately 40% of our caseload (42,500 offenders) are managed in the community.

The current operating model for community supervision (including pre-release work) varies across England and Wales and is reliant on approaches developed in the legacy Probation Trusts. The existing tiering framework does not adequately reflect the new NPS case profile and work was required to better categorise the caseload to enable appropriate and proportionate allocation of resources. In addition there is varying practice in relation to the allocation of work to Probation Services Officers (PSOs) which is inefficient.

This proposal has been informed by a review of the current tiering framework in consultation with practitioner groups, and a review of role boundaries and resource allocation processes to ensure appropriate and efficient allocation of work. The final outcome of the Offender Management in Custody review is likely to impact upon pre-release work.
3.2 What do we want the future model to look like?

The main driver for this work-package proposal is to produce a standard operating model for community supervision which delivers a high quality, effective and value for money service. It supports the development of a consistent approach to workload, with equitable spans of control and a fair distribution of work. The design of the operating model aims to ensure that the NPS provides opportunities for innovation and scope for improved service delivery and partnership collaboration.

Given the profile of the NPS caseload any future operating model needs to ensure consistent and defensible allocation decisions whilst maintaining flexibility in the scope of the Probation Services Officer role. A unified approach supported by an appropriate training and quality framework is required to provide organisational assurance and support individual practitioner development and effective practice.

The NPS future operating model builds upon the E3 design principles and learning from best practice in former Probation Trusts. The opportunities provided by being part of a national service will be maximised, including our ability to promote effective practice throughout the organisation, provide staff development and learning and influence partners to improve outcomes for offenders.

3.3 End state proposals

3.3.1 The introduction of a revised tiering/case allocation model based on static risk factors and clinical judgement to better reflect the NPS caseload profile (diagram 1). This framework will determine the grade of Offender Manager most appropriate for the case.

3.3.2 An individual casework approach- this model requires that one to one supervision is generally delivered by the individual with management responsibility for the case. This promotes the concept of continuity, acknowledges the importance of the relationship between the worker and the offender and reduces inefficiencies that can arise from the transfer of information between those involved which is required when working to an Offender Manager/Offender Supervisor model. There are also clear lines of accountability between Offender Managers and team managers.

Diagram 1 – Community Supervision Tiering Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final tier calculated following completion of ISP</th>
<th>Risk of Serious Harm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1</strong></td>
<td>D2 + Additional Factors*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2</strong></td>
<td>RSR 0-2.9% or OGRS 0-74% or Low (or no) RoSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1</strong></td>
<td>C2 + Additional Factors*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2</strong></td>
<td>RSR 3-6.8% or OGRS 75-89% or Medium RoSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1</strong></td>
<td>B2 + Additional Factors*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2</strong></td>
<td>RSR 6.9%+ or OGRS 90-100% or High/Very High RoSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>MAPPA Level 2s and Level 3s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monitor | Change | Control

Offender Management & Offender Supervision Activity

*Additional factors MAPPA cat 1 level 1, Child protection plan, IOM, vulnerability (defined by ‘yes’ on OASys section 8, present risk of suicide, self-harm or vulnerability)
3.3.3 PSOs will manage some medium risk of serious harm cases (up to C2 on the new tiering framework) supported by a relevant learning and development pathway. This will provide opportunities for PSO grade staff to be involved in more complex cases than is the case in some areas currently, but also provides safeguards to ensure reasonable and defensible decisions regarding allocation. There will be a period of transition to ensure appropriate training and professional support is established.

3.3.4 The model will include ‘case management support’ for Offender Managers with a range of specific tasks undertaken by other relevant grades to enhance offender supervision. Further work will be undertaken to identify relevant tasks that support the aims of the E3 programme, examples could include:

- Completion of referral forms (utilising available assessments completed by the case manager)
- Gathering of information from other professionals/ agencies (as directed within the Risk Management Plan completed by the offender manager)
- Sharing of information with other professionals/ agencies (as directed within the Risk Management Plan completed by the offender manager)
- Attendance at multi-agency meetings (not MAPPA or Child Protection Conferences - the offender manager should attend these)
- Accompanying the offender manager on Home Visits in complex cases

3.3.5 We are also keen to explore the potential for volunteers to support the work of the NPS. The use of volunteers was a feature in some former Probation Trusts and provided an additional resource to support OMs and interventions staff in the supervision of offenders. Becoming a probation volunteer was for some a positive route into future employment in the service. Given the profile of the NPS caseload it is acknowledged that any steps to utilise volunteers needs to be a carefully considered and managed process but we are supportive of this as a principle for further exploration. Given the size of the NPS there may be economies achieved through a national approach and managing volunteers/mentors may be best achieved through contracting with a provider, as is planned for circles of support for sex offenders.

3.3.6 Targeted delivery of supervision in groups in certain circumstances will be further explored. It is acknowledged that any use of group work based methods needs to be carefully considered. There are a number of possible options available in relation to the use of group based work that could be considered:

- The group delivery of intervention packages that are specific to the NPS cohort (i.e. not provided by the CRC on the rate card). These might include packages that address stalking behaviour, housing for sex offenders etc.
- The group delivery of intervention packages by the NPS where this can be done on a more cost-effective basis than is provided via the rate card, or by accessing existing community resource, e.g. by e-learning

The work on group-based delivery remains in development and further detail will become available as the design work progresses.
3.4 Impact on service delivery

The individual casework model has significant overlap with the current approach to service delivery and is well understood by service users and partner organisations. Having a single named offender manager responsible for the management and supervision of the case will result in increased contact time, facilitating a strong professional relationship between the worker and the service user.

Research evidence supports the importance of continuity of case management. HMIP reviews (Hanson and White 2006, Rice 2006) record the potentially serious risks of “building in discontinuities”. Kemshall (2008) notes that where risk is assessed and managed by different staff, the result can be failures in the delivery of risk management. In more therapeutic terms, the end-to-end model set out in the Offender Management Model (2006) and reaffirmed although in a different form in the recent Offender Management review (2015) is consistent with research findings that long term contact with a single worker is beneficial (Partridge 2004 quoted in McNeill and Whyte 2007). Further, research evidence supports the importance of clear accountability, so that it is clear in every case who is doing what and at which point. This is supported in Sheppard’s review of failures in mental health cases (D Sheppard quoted in Kemshall 2008). The NOMS SFO team have noted that in SFO cases which are managed by a PO as OM and PSO as OS, there is a tendency for both to cite a lack of clarity about their roles in the case.

The individualised approach lends itself to flexibility in working arrangements e.g. mobile working and arguably enables a more responsive approach to individual needs.

3.5 Impact on staff

The NPS will be an organisation founded on the continuous professional development of all its staff. While Probation Officers will remain the core operational grade of staff within the delivery of community supervision, Probation Services Officers will have a clear role in community supervision, including the offender management of some medium risk of serious harm cases. Some efficiencies will be realised through the rebalancing of cases and the more effective use of PSO grade staff in some areas.

The model seeks to ensure flexibility in the scope of the PSO role, responding to the individual characteristics, risks and needs of the offender. It is acknowledged that there will be a training requirement to underpin the introduction of this approach given the expansion in PSO work, albeit that training needs may not be consistent across divisions. A training needs analysis will be undertaken and a clear learning and development pathway established. New routes including completion of VQ3 Diploma in Probation Practice and where relevant modules from the forthcoming Community Justice Learning programme, will be agreed to ensure defensible decisions and appropriate professional development.

The model is well understood by NPS operational staff and this will represent an incremental, rather than a radical change. There will be clarity about the types of cases that are suitable for allocation to Probation Officers and Probation Services Officers. The case manager will be responsible for the offender management and supervision of the case with opportunities to access a range of task-based support and group-based activity in some cases.
3.6 Conclusion

Community supervision is a core part of our business and our priority is to deliver an effective and value for money service to the public in order to reduce re-offending and help to build safer communities.

The NPS future operating model seeks to build on the principles of effective, evidence-based practice and utilise learning from all parts of the organisation to inform a national, coherent and effective delivery of services to offenders which is affordable and sustainable into the future.

In summary our proposals are;

- A revised tiering model to better reflect the NPS caseload
- An individual casework approach
- PSOs to manage some medium risk of serious harm cases supported by a learning and development pathway
- Exploration of the concept of ‘case management support’ across a range of specific tasks
- Targeted delivery of supervision in groups where appropriate
Chapter 4 Custody

4.1 What does the model look like now?

Work with offenders in custody will continue to be a large proportion of NPS work. The NPS aim in relation to Parole, Recall and Foreign National Prisoners (FNP) work will continue to be work undertaken by PO and PSO grades according to the risk level they are able to manage.

The NPS caseload predominantly comprises of offenders serving lengthy custodial sentences for serious violence and sexual offences including Foreign National Prisoners serving 12 months or more and subject to deportation.

Since 1st June 2014, the NPS has had responsibility for the completion of all parole reports. These reports are critical in enabling the Parole Board to decide who may be safely released into the community on parole licence to the NPS.

The NPS has access to the Public Protection Unit (PPUD) database designed to support the General Parole Process (GPP) and used by all the agencies involved in the GPP, i.e. PPCS, establishments, and the Parole Board. However, the NPS current access is limited and we use it predominantly to identify and plan for Parole Reports. A pilot in Wales allows Offender Managers to have enhanced system access to improve the availability of information and documentation.

The current process for assuring the quality of parole reports consists of SPO countersignature of all reports and retrospective audits of a sample of reports. These measures have not produced the necessary improvements in the quality of the assessments which underpin the reports.
If offenders on licence are recalled to custody their cases are reviewed routinely by the Parole Board at set intervals which can involve an oral hearing. The Public Protection Casework Section (PPCS) has the power of executive release without referral to the parole board where the OM supports this, however this has been under used. Similarly, PI 24/2015 encourages practitioners to look for creative and responsive ways to secure compliance short of recall (whether in the form of additional restrictive measures or supportive protective measures) and we are yet to see its full effect given its recent implementation.

The NPS work with Foreign National Prisoners is undertaken differently across the divisions. Each division has a FNP single point of contact (SPOC) and this has improved information sharing and links with Home Office Immigration Enforcement (HOIE) which reduces gaps in service delivery and ensures prisoners can access appropriate prison interventions pending the confirmation of their immigration status. Wider developments also impinge in this area of practice, including use of electronic tags, and the recent announcement of a prison in Jamaica for returning Jamaican nationals. It is therefore important that the policy of the NPS, Prison Service and HOIE are closely aligned.

Additionally as part of the court process, the NPS is required to inform the Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRC) about remand cases allowing checks on immigration status to be made by HOIE.

### 4.2 What do we want the future model to look like?

We intend to focus on the early part of the sentence to ensure that prisoners undertake work with the aim of reducing risk to make release safe. A review of the timing of the MAPPA process will be undertaken to ensure the most effective and comprehensive assessment is available when needed to inform targeted sentence planning and improve information sharing.

We will make the best use of the interventions in custody and those eligible will be able to access them early in their sentence with professionals involved in the case working together more effectively.

We intend to make better use of technology in all areas of work with prisoners and in strengthening information sharing with other agencies.

Following release, we will consider the use of alternatives to recall where this is feasible and appropriate to manage risk.

We will enhance quality assurance of custody work by probation staff, especially in respect of Parole and Recall reports and reviews. Front loading quality assurance into the parole process will lead to better quality reports delivered on time so parole hearings are less likely to be adjourned as a result and there will be a corresponding increase in the release of suitable prisoners at first parole hearing.

We envisage working with colleagues in PPCS to maximise the use of telephone and video conferencing in more of our cases so that Offender Managers waste less time travelling to prison visits and oral hearings.
We believe that by improving the quality of parole reports we will mitigate the risk of removing the bureaucratic routine SPO signature. We also propose a wider use of ROTLs for attendance on accredited programmes, where these are not available in prisons.

We want to ensure a better use of PPUD information and an improved process will enable us to have access to all the documentation to prepare and complete good quality parole reports on time.

4.3.2 Recall

Our proposal is to improve the quality and timeliness of recall, thereby ultimately reducing the number of oral hearings. Additionally when appropriate we want to use executive re-releases more effectively where release has been recommended and encourage staff to be more creative in using alternatives to recall in appropriate cases.

With regards to the recall of prisoners we have inherited different approaches from the 35 trusts. Similarly, there are differences in the review of risk assessment and sentence plans following return to custody, and access to interventions which need to be completed to facilitate and reduce risk, prior to release.

Work with Foreign National Prisoners also needs to be harmonised across the NPS, particularly focusing on enhancing joint working with HOIE and prisons. We intend to standardise the work undertaken with Foreign National Prisoners (FNP).

4.3 End state proposals

4.3.1 Parole

A proposal has been made to review when the MAPPA process should commence, to ensure that there is a robust and comprehensive risk assessment, risk management and sentence plan available at the earliest opportunity. This will inform realistic and achievable objectives and maximise opportunities for release at the first parole hearing in the right cases. This proposal will be explored further with operational colleagues and Head of MAPPA at NOMS. This is with a view to finding the best way of securing the outcomes the proposal seeks to achieve. This proposal would require changes to the statutory MAPPA guidance and it falls to the MAPPA Responsible Authorities National Steering Group (RANS) to consult all agencies involved, including police forces and the Prison Service and to agree any proposed changes going forward.

Our proposal is to improve the quality and timeliness of parole processes. To achieve this we will develop a Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) that will allow the parole board to flag up cases that do not meet the required quality standard, support the use of the Parole Manual and enable dip sampling of cases through the offender journey. Linked to this there will be new and regular parole and oral hearing training for Offender Managers.
4.3.3 Foreign National Prisoners
We are exploring establishing specialist divisional units to be responsible for the management of FNP who meet HOIE deportation criteria and where possible, co-located models such as hubs (physical or virtual). Using the IOM approach to better coordinate with HOIE and a specialised workforce will provide a more effective way of managing this group of offenders. The Foreign National Unit would hold the responsibility for managing Foreign National Prisoners during the course of their sentence, through to deportation and release. The unit would need to have direct links with local LDU/Clusters within the division in order to arrange for the OM transfer should the offender be released into the community.

However, we have to work at a slower pace to allow for the Offender Management in Custody review to develop further before we can provide clearer details about FNP work. In the meantime a pilot FNP unit (in Maidstone) in South East and East Region (SEER) will test out these proposals.

4.4 Impact on service delivery
The QAF process will ensure that the author has a full understanding of the case and takes into account the victim’s perspective to produce a good quality report. This will enable the Parole Board to make an informed and rigorous assessment of risk without having to seek additional information. This will ultimately mean that parole eligible prisoners or executive re-releases are released without delay, which will in turn have a positive impact in respect of prison population pressures.

Working with partners in a coordinated way will enable decisions to be made much faster and provide a better quality report and information about offenders. An earlier, more comprehensive risk assessment including access to interventions and intelligence sharing will improve service delivery for all offenders and in particular, for FNP.

Specialist working in FNP hubs will improve staff knowledge and in turn have a positive impact on offenders. We will ensure that care and priority is placed on training when staff move into areas of specialised work.

4.5 Impact on staff
There is no change in the way staff are being asked to carry out the activities in relation to parole reports or recall. In both these areas of work a revised quality framework and the increased level of feedback will enable continuous improvement in quality.

Moreover, a comprehensive risk assessment and sentence plan that links to key professionals will support the aim of enabling more safe release of prisoners at an earlier point in their sentence.

Improved use of PPUD will enable better tracking of parole reports and enable staff to respond more promptly to any difficulties in preparing these.

A greater use of telephone and video conferences will reduce staff travel time to attend oral hearings. This will of course be dependent on suitable telephone and video equipment being available for staff to use and Parole Board and prison support. There will be some more complex cases where the attendance of the OM in person is appropriate.
Chapter 5 Victims

5.1 What does the model look like now?

The NPS has a statutory duty (Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act 2004) to consult and notify victims of sexual or other violent offences about the release arrangements for offenders where they are sentenced to 12 months or more in custody or those detained under the Mental Health Act 1983. This statutory duty is supported by the requirements of the Victims Code and guidance on the Victim Contact Scheme (VCS).

The VCS requires the Victim Liaison Officer (VLO) to contact and offer the victims of offenders a service within two months of the sentence being passed. The victims who choose to participate in the scheme may make representations about the offender’s licence or discharge condition, and receive certain information about the key stages of the offender’s sentence from the VLO. The NOMS specification for the provision of victim liaison confirms the VCS as a service for communicating and providing information to victims, not for counselling or advocating for them. Where appropriate, referrals can be made to organisations who can more appropriately provide support, counselling and advocacy services.

The NPS can exercise discretion to offer the VCS to victims who do not statutorily qualify (usually the offender is serving under 12 months) but present a high risk of harm to the victim. These are usually cases involving stalking and harassment, hate crimes or domestic abuse.
There are approximately 27 Victim Contact Units (VCUs) across the NPS. They have different staffing arrangements; some have administrative hubs based separately from VLO staff, other administrative staff are based within the VCUs and some units have no administrative support. Some VLOs are co-located within Offender Management Units and others hold surgeries to strengthen the interface between OM and the VLO. Some VLOs are employed as band 3 and others at band 4. A significant variation is that VCUs use a variety of databases, which makes it difficult to obtain national data or to share information. There is a pressing need for a national system.

We have inherited arrangements with no clear equitable, measurable allocation of cases based on low, medium and high complexity considerations, where VLO workloads vary and resource is not equitably allocated.

Some VCUs do not have (or do not have the required level of) administrative support; and this is exacerbated by the lack of, or limited functionality, within the existing local victim databases. These databases vary significantly in type and levels of functionality. Some lack the ability to record information effectively, to generate letters, and to provide prompts or relevant data.

5.2 What do we want the future model to look like?

We will have a delivery model which will provide clarity as to the specific roles of administration and victim liaison; and within this, we will establish a consistent set of processes which clearly identifies who is responsible for doing what. This approach will enable us to maximise the quality of the engagement between the VLO and the victim, whilst organising administration into a lean, consistent model.

There is no specific change being proposed to any of the roles or the work that administrative staff and VLO will do, other than to provide clarity and consistency of task. Within the context of the broader programme, we propose a flexible workforce that will have clear roles, duties and responsibilities and enhance the relationship between offender management and victim liaison.

There will be a consistent approach to victim liaison within the NPS and how the activity is organised. Specifically, this relates to how tasks are apportioned to administration and VLO functions. In addition to this there will be a national database with a nationally agreed framework for victim contact cases.

5.3 End state proposals

Our proposal is to standardise the operation for the Victim Liaison Unit (VLU) in line with the service specification for victim services. Successful delivery will see the effective organisation of administration processes which will allow (and maximise) the VLO resource to focus specifically on the quality of the engagement with the victim. Our proposal is dependent on the implementation of a new Victim Case Management System (VCMS) and the associated training of all Victim Services staff to use the system to best effect. Without the VCMS, the organisational proposal for administration will not be possible. This approach will enable effective management of the expectations of victims and other services, and achieve a more unified, consistent VLO work force. Finally, there is scope for further harmonisation, for example, the provision of templates and checklists to ensure best practice is followed.

As stated earlier, there is currently a variation in the pay “banding” of VLOs with some at pay band 3 and others at band 4. Our view is that the VLO role can appropriately be undertaken by band 3 staff. This is subject to the review of the job description and the job evaluation process.
5.3.1 Administrative Hubs
Our proposal is to separate out the victim administrator role, using actual or virtual hub models, thus enabling VLOs to focus on the direct work with victims. The hubs will receive referrals, engage with agencies for information, maintain records and provide support for the service. They will increase efficiency through the provision of a consistent ‘pathway’ of victim engagement and ensuring specific actions are achieved. Furthermore, they will provide a single point of contact for stakeholders (including external agencies), which will significantly improve the coordination of information relating to victim-offender contact; and therefore reduce the risk of poor victim experience.

5.3.2 VLO work
As stated above, it is important that we develop an organisational approach to measuring the victim caseload. This will allow the development of a consistent approach to resource and workload management, which will ensure the NPS is directing the right amount of resource, in the right place, at the right time (maximising impact and effectiveness). The illustration below provides an initial draft proposal by which cases could be considered, according to level of involvement required. However we need to do more work to refine the details of this approach and model further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH COMPLEXITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As Low &amp; Medium, plus more regular face to face contact, more liaison with OM/partnerships, check safety plan still applies. Attend oral hearing if no other agencies can attend. If risk increases refer to MARAC/MAPPA and attend these meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEDIUM COMPLEXITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As Low, plus face to face contact to assist with personal statement. Send written updates to MARAC/MAPPA/attend oral hearings if no other agencies can attend. If risk increases, move to high support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOW COMPLEXITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Send initial letter/leaflet, follow up, receive and assess information from others if assistance is accepted &amp; complete Risk Assessment. Carry out a visit (face to face) and, write up notes of meeting and send to the victim. After that, contact the victim when you receive triggers for ROTL, HDC or release on licence and update the victim annually. Sign post if required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 Impact on service delivery

We believe that the 'separation' of the administrative hub from the VLO victim engagement work and the establishment of a Single Point of Contact (SPOC) will significantly improve the quality, timeliness and consistency of the information we receive and enable follow up at key points within the process. In addition to this, there will be an improved flow of information gathered by the SPOC from within the NPS and from outside wider criminal justice agencies. For example from witness care and independent domestic violence advocates (IDVAs), which will enhance the quality of information/intelligence received by the VLO; and consequently enhance the engagement work with victims.

5.5 Impact on staff

Our proposal to have a divisional hub will mean changes to processes and the potential relocation of some administrative staff. This will provide significant benefits in service delivery.

5.6 Conclusion

We believe that by separating the administrative hub from VLO role, the organisation will achieve role clarity between the administrator and the VLO role. Consequently, there will be better consistency of service delivery to victims and the wider criminal justice service across the seven regions. The ultimate result will be that VLOs will be able to focus more time on victim engagement work. The strong inter-relationship between the work stream and the VCMS project will ensure that the new approach to data management can maximise the efficiency of the victim liaison process; improve the effectiveness of the current delivery model; and improve the service for victims.
6.1 What does the model look like now?

Approved Premises (AP) provide accommodation, oversight and support to the most complex and challenging cases managed in the community. Their residents are almost all on licence, having committed serious sexual and violent offences, and most are assessed as high risk of serious harm. There are currently 101 AP across the NPS, of which 89 are directly managed by the NPS (the rest being independent AP). They vary in their number of residents (nine have fewer than 15 beds, seven have more than 30), and also in staffing structures. Whilst they are all required to operate within the framework of the AP Manual (PI 32/2014), in practice there are a range of models of operation.

The main E3 proposals for AP address referrals, an operating model and a staffing model. We want to harmonise AP provision across the NPS, using best practice as the benchmark and ensuring value for money. The proposals would be likely to mean changes for most AP, although all proposals are currently in place in some part of the NPS and so have been tested out in practice.
6.2 What do we want the future model to look like?

AP will continue to make a vital contribution to the management of serious offenders in the period after their release from prison (and to a lesser degree prisoners released on temporary licence). They play an important role in the NPS, with staff who are skilled and trained to manage their residents in a positive and constructive way. They will work together with other AP in their division and across the NPS to ensure that AP places are available for those who need them most. The AP remit will be far more than simply providing accommodation; during their stay residents will undertake evidence-based individual and group activities designed to support their rehabilitation. Our ambition is that the referral process should be smooth, staff groups will be skilled and resilient, and that offenders should move on having benefited from their period of residence.

6.3 End state proposals

Our proposals are:

6.3.1 Enabling Environments Standard

All AP will become accredited by the Royal Society of Psychiatrists as ‘enabling environments’. Approximately half of AP are already accredited or in the process of being so, and we expect the remainder will be accredited within three years. We anticipate that this should improve the quality of staff interaction with residents, enable them to manage more difficult residents, reduce the level of recalls, and have a positive impact on parole. Training for staff will be required over the next three years to achieve accreditation.

6.3.2 Standard electronic referral process

We will roll out a standard electronic referral process, accessed through nDelius. This will be a more streamlined process, reducing duplication. In particular we envisage a significant reduction in demands on AP managers, some of whom report spending 30% of their time dealing with referrals, many of which are being considered by other AP at the same time. It will facilitate inter-divisional decisions and also resource-sharing. It will also mean an equitable distribution of the most challenging residents. Offenders will be placed where possible in their home divisions, but where placement across divisions is necessary this will become easier to arrange. The ICT requirement for this is likely to be met quickly. Staff in AP and LDUs will need some familiarisation training in the new process.

We anticipate this will mean offenders receive a more equitable access to AP and that it will enable us to prioritise AP places for the most challenging cases, so supporting their rehabilitation.

6.3.3 Divisional management of referrals

In order to ensure the smooth running of the referral process, it will be managed by a central ‘referral hub’ in each division. These arrangements are already in place in some divisions.

6.3.4 Standard Operating Model

AP come in different shapes and sizes, they operate within different neighbourhoods and vary in their resident mix. As a result they will continue to have their own individual character. Notwithstanding this, we believe they should have a common framework for their focus and activities and that they should all have a standard operating model.
The E3 AP work package has sought to define more clearly the purpose of the AP within the NPS through defining their functions and emphasising the essential elements of an enhanced regime. We have concluded that AP have three inter-related but distinct functions: public protection, rehabilitation and accommodation services. We will map the key AP processes associated with these tasks in EQuiP to ensure consistency.

Each AP will deliver an enhanced regime. We define this as purposeful activities, linked to resettlement and based on an understanding of desistence research, which are underpinned by the key worker relationship. The activities will include life skills, education, employment and social skills. We believe that this will improve outcomes for residents and reduce the levels of recalls.

A variety of arrangements are currently in place for procurement of aspects of enhanced regime; at present there are no proposals to change this.

We will introduce the concept of ‘standard’ and ‘complex’ AP. We will calculate this using returns to NOMS, using the criteria of level of risk of residents and the number of beds in a premises. It should result in small number of ‘complex’ regimes which will require additional staffing levels.

6.3.5 Standard Staffing Model

There will be a standard model for staffing which will apply to all AP. Larger AP will have additional staffing to reflect their greater numbers of residents. The proposed model focuses on the staffing required for the range of tasks undertaken in AP, and is affordable within the current budget.

- **Double cover at all times**

  There will be a minimum of two waking staff on site at all times. There will be agreed minimum and maximum shift patterns. This will ensure security and appropriate oversight, as well as compliance with health and safety expectations. Recognising that this includes a contingency, we will look at how this capacity might most productively be utilised.

- **AP Manager for each premises**

  There will be a dedicated AP manager (expected to be band 5) for each AP, who will be responsible for the smooth running of the premises, the line management of staff, and risk management decisions. Some AP currently have band 4 deputy managers on site with an SPO manager shared between more than one AP; however we have concluded that a single manager for each premises is the best model. We anticipate that the improvements detailed above will free up management time currently spent on reviewing referrals to enable greater focus on managing the premises. We will need to be clear what cover arrangements are appropriate when managers are absent.

- **Area Manager Role**

  An Area Manager (indicative band 6), with devolved budgetary responsibility, will manage clusters of AP. Clusters will be determined by the number of ‘complex’ and ‘standard’ AP and geography.

  This arrangement is currently in operation in several divisions. It enables more detailed attention to AP than can be achieved where the direct management is included in the portfolio of the Divisional Head of Public protection.
iv  Day and night staffing

We wish to prioritise the vital role played by key workers (indicative band 3) in AP in face to face work with residents, liaison with colleagues and partners and in purposeful activities. This work is most effectively undertaken during the day time, and these staff will therefore work primarily during the day. We will explore shift patterns which may include weekend day time working. Work which focuses more on “accommodation” services will be undertaken by residential workers (indicative band 2) whose working hours will include overnight and weekends. The second member of staff present during night and weekend hours provides security and monitoring services. In the light of this role profile we intend to explore the pros and cons of contracting out this work through a national contract. Evidence from AP which currently use this staffing model is that with a well-managed contract and appropriately trained contractor staff there is no increase in incidents. There will always be a senior manager on the 'out of hours' rota to provide support where necessary and to authorise recalls.

v  Administrative support

Each AP will have a 0.5 receptionist/administrator, and a 0.5 financial administrator to support the work of other staff.

vi  Standard payments to sessional staff

We have inherited arrangements which mean that sessional AP staff are currently paid different rates. We propose to harmonise these arrangements so they are paid at a standard rate, with additional payments for those working in London. The standard staffing model should reduce our reliance on sessional staff so that there is better consistency of staffing in AP.

vii  Out of hours enhancements

AP staff receive additional payments to reflect out of hours working. Processes for payment vary across the NPS. We propose to negotiate a harmonised system for these payments, which is fair and reflects the working pattern.

The E3 work package has also looked at areas including Health and Safety, Management Information and Quality Standards. We intend to use the outcomes of this work to make further improvements in the quality of AP services.

Further work streams are working on the Strategic Direction of AP, including the physical AP estate, facilities management, independent AP and AP for women. They will review the capacity, resident profile, and layout of AP with the aim of matching NPS need to resource, equity across the country and compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA). These work streams will make firm proposals following this large-scale review. We anticipate that this review will enable improved efficiency and effectiveness in the running of the AP estate.
6.4 Impact on service delivery

The changes we propose are predicated on Offender Managers managing their offenders in AP and AP staff managing the AP and its service delivery. AP staff would be better trained, better able to manage challenging residents, and offer an improved level of rehabilitative interventions. We expect that this would result in a reduction in recalls of AP residents and more positive move ons. We anticipate that there will be greater equality of access to AP places across the NPS and that this will enable better prioritisation of places for those who most need them. We anticipate that the increased clarity about the function and operations of AP will have an impact on Parole Board decisions to release in more finely-balanced cases.

As noted above, the E3 proposals are likely to mean changes for most AP. Where these involve significant staffing changes, these will need to be planned in order to minimise the impact on service delivery.

6.5 Impact on staff

As noted above, the improvements to the referral process are expected to free up staff time. The process of accrediting AP as enabling environments will mean staff become more highly trained. Focussing on purposeful activities and on formal key work will enhance the role of key workers, who will have more consistent contact with the residents and will be able to undertake more planned work. This in turn will develop their skills meaning they are more easily able to move to other roles in the NPS for career development.

Whilst there may be some concerns that concentrating the availability of key workers during daytime hours may reduce staff resilience to manage difficult situations at other times, this is not supported by evidence from the AP which already have this staffing model.

6.6 Conclusion

We believe that these proposals will lead to an efficient and effective AP estate across the NPS which has a single purpose and consistent structures in key areas such as staffing, referrals and interventions. We are confident this will mean that AP can continue to provide appropriate accommodation to those offenders who need it most, with beneficial effects on the reduction of serious harm and reoffending.
Chapter 7 Youth Offending Services (YOS)

7.1 What does the model look like now?

Since Youth Offending Services (YOS) were set up in 1998, Probation has played an integral part as a statutory partner in local services. This has included the secondment of probation staff to work in local Youth Offending Teams (YOT). These staff contribute to the multi-agency work of the teams and in particular to the transfer of YOS cases to NPS or CRC at the age of 18. The NPS has responsibility for the Probation contribution to more than 150 local YOS. Currently the shape of this contribution varies across the NPS, specifically in the numbers and grades of staff, whether these are directly seconded staff or staff recruited by the YOT but paid for by Probation, and whether additional funding or other support is provided. There are also variations in the focus of work which seconded staff undertake.

The proposals for YOS focus on harmonising staffing and working models, to ensure that these reflect both the needs of local services and best practice. The resources provided to YOS need to be reviewed to ensure a level of consistency and value for money. The proposals take into account changes in the profile of youth offending and in sentencing policy over recent years which have resulted in an estimated fall of 60% in the volume of cases managed by YOS. The Ministry of Justice is currently undertaking a review of Youth Justice which may have an impact on these proposals.
7.2 What do we want the future model to look like?
We will continue to support YOS work to fulfil our statutory responsibility. We are committed to the multi-agency focus in work with young offenders and to a continued fall in youth offending. We will continue to build and maintain positive links between Probation and YOS which benefit young offenders and the community. We will ensure an equitable use of resources across different YOS. We want seconded Probation staff to contribute their specialist skills effectively in the most appropriate cases.

7.3 End state proposals
There are three proposals for YOS work.

7.3.1 National Framework
Subject to the outcome of the Review of Youth Justice, we will agree an NPS framework which confirms the NPS responsibility towards YOS work. The framework will mean clear expectations of secondment arrangements for both YOS and NPS. It will ensure a consistent approach to YOS which meets statutory requirements.

7.3.2 Resource model
The framework will include a resource model based on the current workload of each YOS, with the contribution being in the form of seconded members of staff rather than financial. Seconded staff will be band 4 POs. In YOS where the resource model requires an additional member of staff to be seconded, there is scope for us to negotiate with the YJB about whether the additional resource should be a band 3 PSO, as is currently the situation in some YOS. This will apply in some of the larger YOS.

7.3.3 Standard workload
Seconded OMs will work with high risk offenders and those offenders who will transfer to the NPS when they are 18. The expected size of caseload for a full time seconded OM will be 25 cases, this takes into account the complexity of and level of intervention required with YOS cases which are high risk and/or transferring to the NPS. Where YOS caseloads are particularly low this may mean that the seconded OM does not work full time in the YOS.

7.4 Impact on service delivery
We will need to negotiate with the YJB, and also with individual local authorities to agree the resource model and transition arrangements. In some areas we expect there will be a reduction in probation contribution and we will need to agree arrangements to manage this transition carefully to minimise the impact on local services. Other areas are likely to see an increase in provision and planning will also be needed to make best use of the additional staff.

Agreeing the focus of the seconded OMs’ work means that they will make effective use of their risk assessment and intervention skills. It should also mean good quality risk management and a smooth transfer to the NPS for relevant cases.
OMs who have undertaken a secondment will be able to contribute to an increase in understanding and practice in work with young adults in the NPS.

We will need to agree with the YJB an arrangement for providing performance data so we can ensure that OMs are managing the correct cases and that transfer of young adults to the Probation adult services has improved.

The progress of the Youth Justice review may affect the timescale for putting these proposals into effect.

### 7.5 Impact on staff

These changes will provide OMs with a valuable development opportunity to be seconded to the YOT for a set period during their career, using their probation skills in a multi-agency setting to work with the most challenging young offenders whilst maintaining their NPS links.

We recognise that it will be important to support them in maintaining their knowledge and training in NPS work to ensure that they can remain flexible and mobile members of staff and so that they can continue to contribute to good practice in the light of their experience in youth justice.

We are aware that some staff who have been seconded to YOS for extended periods may have specific training needs on returning to the NPS. We will take this into account in planning the arrangements for their return.

### 7.6 Conclusion

We believe that E3 provides an opportunity for the NPS to agree an updated framework for the NPS contribution to YOS, which makes the best use of probation qualified staff and contributes to public protection.
Chapter 8 Management Structures

8.1 What does the model look like now?

The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) for the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) oversees the entire NPS delivery structure. The Director of Probation and the Director of NOMS in Wales report to the NOMS CEO.

Across the NPS as a whole there are 69 Clusters of Local Delivery Units (LDUs) covering 152 Local Authority areas. This is in line with the expectations of the Transforming Rehabilitation Target Operating Model that LDUs would be aligned with local authority areas and map to other partnership arrangements including Criminal Justice (Police Force) Areas and Community Safety Partnerships. There are some core areas of business that are managed outside of the LDU Cluster Structure such as Approved Premises, Victims Services and NPS seconded prison staff.

As with other parts of the NPS business, there is a variety of management structures across the country. There are inconsistencies in relation to the tiers of management and in some instances the grades and pay bands of staff undertaking similar roles. In addition, the proposed new models of delivery include changes to existing management structures. This Blueprint addresses some of these with others to be considered in the next phase of the E3 Programme.
At the LDU Cluster level, we want a resource model and management structure that takes into account the local variations in workload and complexities. We want to ensure that there is consistency in relation to pay bands and grading throughout England and Wales where managers are fulfilling similar roles.

Middle managers play a vital role in probation through supporting and enabling frontline staff to undertake good quality work with service users. Crucially they ensure that national policies are translated into action in local settings. We want middle managers to continue to provide this leadership. In particular we envisage a change in emphasis from a routine countersigning role to more structured quality assurance activities, with the aim that we consistently get things right first time and that there are clear lines of accountability.

To support operational managers in concentrating on core tasks, we see administrative staff as key to the delivery of the future operating model so it is critical that we have in place a management structure that supports and leads them most effectively.

8.3 End State Proposals

The line management structure in Clusters will be that Heads of Clusters directly line manage SPOs. This will ensure clarity of line management and accountability structures across the country.
Heads of Clusters will retain both operational and strategic responsibility for their LDU Clusters. There are a number of partnerships to which the NPS has a statutory duty, which require attendance at Boards and resources to be made available. Nationally there is variation in the grade of staff that attend such meetings. National partnership frameworks are being produced to specify which grade of staff will be required to attend meetings. Of the partnerships that have been reviewed so far, the early indication is that Safeguarding Boards and MAPPA SMBs will require the attendance of Heads of LDU clusters. YOS management boards will be attended by SPO grade. MASH and MARAC are likely to sit at Probation Officer level. The other key partnerships will also be reviewed.

We acknowledge that there is considerable variation between LDU Clusters in relation to the volume and complexity of cases, geography, partnership and court responsibilities. There is a strategic commitment to maintaining the LDU Cluster alignment with Local Authorities which means that it is not possible to equalise the workloads of LDU Clusters. To mitigate against this a tool has been developed to identify the most complex LDU Clusters. It is proposed that the most complex LDU Clusters should have additional support. The type of additional support that is being considered is twofold: the provision of additional administrative support for ACO/Heads to manage a variety of processes and interfaces, and additional management resource to support performance and quality as well as partnership working.

As part of the Approved Premises model we propose that an Area Manager with devolved budgetary responsibility will manage clusters of AP. We anticipate clusters will consist of seven or eight Approved Premises.

Our proposal is that Case Administrators will be line managed by Senior Case Administrators. This will provide specialist administrative oversight while also allowing SPOs to focus on line management of Probation Officers and Probation Service Officers.

There are a number of options under consideration for the line management of SCAs. We are clear that they will be within the operational line but are still considering who should best line manage them.

We are exploring the possibility of establishing a Quality Development Officer role across the NPS as an effective way of supporting managers and front line staff in improving practice.

8.4 Impact on Service Delivery

The revised LDU Cluster model will in, some cases, change the responsibilities of LDU Cluster Heads where there are currently Deputy Heads in place. It should be noted, however that not all Clusters have Deputies and therefore this model will bring more consistency. The introduction of a tool to identify the most complex Clusters and the provision of additional resource to support them will mean that there is a more effective and equitable distribution of resources.

The proposed case administration management model is intended to have a wider positive impact on the quality of case administration which will support improved quality of service delivery overall.
8.5 Impact on staff

With regards to the proposal to have Heads of LDU Clusters directly line managing SPOs we acknowledge that this will mean that existing Deputy Heads of LDU clusters will cease to undertake this. The process of moving from the current position to the new model will be carefully managed and the staff involved will be consulted appropriately. As already stated compulsory redundancies will not be necessary.

The Case Administration line management model is intended to positively support CAs in undertaking their role by providing specialist administrative management. It also widens career and professional development opportunities for administrative staff. It will also support more effective line management of POs and PSOs.
Chapter 9 Other Supporting Activity

Throughout the work of the E3 programme we have gathered and noted the requirements for ICT and estates.

We expect to see improvements in the effectiveness of our ICT systems as a result of digital improvements and greater in-house investment. Throughout the programme a common theme has been that the functioning of nDelius affects operational efficiency and that improvements are needed to its speed and efficiency. This will continue to be a priority for the NPS. Specific IT requirements are a key element in the success of the proposals in several work packages – e.g. laptops for staff working in courts and seconded to youth offending teams, a single case management system for victims work and an electronic referral process for Approved Premises. Work will continue to ensure that these are in place in tandem with the E3 changes.

9.1 Facilities and Estates

Over the last two years there has been a great deal of work on estates resulting from Transforming Rehabilitation. We will continue to work with the MOJ to ensure alignment of our needs and the estate, and specifically the needs identified under the E3 programme. These include sufficient space in every HM Courts and Tribunal Service (HMCTS) court building to facilitate an NPS co-located Court Services team, and locations for the hubs proposed under the enforcement, victims, Approved Premises and foreign national offender proposals.
Our estate will change significantly over the next two years as a result of the estate implications of the Transforming Rehabilitation Programme. CRCs have set their own estates strategies and in many areas this will see them move out of buildings that are currently shared between the NPS and CRC. We have developed our own strategy in response to our emerging business needs and CRC plans. The guiding principle in that strategy has been to ensure an operationally viable estate while taking opportunities to reduce the overall cost of the estate. Every pound spent on buildings is a pound that is not available to invest in services to offenders.

We will for example close some of the offender contact centres from which we currently work, and open some new buildings. This programme of moves has started and will continue over the course of the next two years.

Throughout, we will maintain an estate that is sufficient to meet our operational needs.

**Specific Estates Requirements**

The proposal to create administrative ‘hubs’ will require space to be found in the MOJ/wider Government estate to locate these small teams. The location of those hubs within the division has not been agreed but there is an argument to co-locate with the current divisional operational support hubs where space allows or with MOJ colleagues.

The proposal to develop group interventions for offenders would require an increase in the number of group or programme rooms in the estate. With planning and some re-modelling it is envisaged that there will be sufficient capacity in the estate following the implementation of the TR Estates Programme to increase the number of group rooms. Further work will be required to identify specific local requirements and estate and IT cost implications.

**Space at Court**

HMCTS has undertaken a consultation on proposals to close a number of courts. It is likely in the future that there will be fewer courts but each hearing a higher number of cases. We will require sufficient and suitable space in courts, underpinned by more modern ICT equipment, if we are to produce the majority of court reports on the day which that kind of case turnover will require. We are working with HMCTS, ICT and MOJ Estates to achieve that requirement.

**Approved Premises**

The AP estate operates at or close to full capacity. Through E3 we have started work to review the current AP estate and identify opportunities to increase bed spaces, through both remodelling of current facilities and identification of new sites that are suitable and where securing planning permission is potentially realistic. We are also comparing caseload forecast by region to the estate supply to ensure we seek to invest in the areas that need it most. This work will produce a future estates strategy for AP that we aim to have completed by April 2016.

**Facilities Management**

Facilities Management services, which includes services such as security, cleaning, maintenance and, in some APs, catering, are currently provided to us by Amey, Interserve and Sodexo through a contract held by the Home Office.

We are working with MOJ Estates to secure a tighter grip on these contracts and to ensure they better meet our needs. The current contracts will be transferred from the Home Office to MOJ by April 2016. This will bring contract management closer to the operational frontline and allow us to better voice our views on service delivery.
In parallel, we are contributing to work to replace these contracts early in 2017 and there may be options to link these with existing NOMS contracts so securing better value. We have run a series of workshops with staff already to highlight what is and isn’t working in current provision. An Operational Reference Group will be set up to contribute to both finalising those requirements and evaluating bidders’ proposals through 2016.

Learning and Development, CJL

We appreciate that there will be a need for support and development for some staff in some areas of the work. This is particularly the case for PSOs working in courts and community supervision in parts of the country where they will be taking on tasks they have not previously undertaken. We are committed to ensuring that all staff have the skills to fulfil their roles well, and planning is already in hand to provide this.

The new probation qualification scheme, Community Justice Learning (CJL), will be launched in April 2016. This will replace the current Probation Qualification Framework (PQF) and open up potential progression opportunities for staff in NPS and CRCs. It will be a work based programme comprising vocational qualifications and academic awards in a modular system. Employers will be able to sponsor learners to achieve the level of accredited competence required for the role and there will also be the opportunity for individuals to invest in their own progression, if they choose to do so. The academic awards will be accredited by universities and the procurement exercise to award those contracts is in progress to ensure a seamless transition for PQF to CJL. The numbers of learners recruited and sponsored through CJL will be determined by local workforce planning.
Chapter 10 Implementation Approach

The most important consideration in the implementation of any change programme is safeguarding operational delivery. We need to ensure the services we provide to the courts, offenders, and victims are prioritised throughout. Our approach to implementing the E3 proposals will put operational stability first.

That does not necessarily mean going slowly. Some of the changes we propose to make are to address current issues. They will improve service delivery and we should put them into place as quickly as we can. While this will mean the pace of change will be relatively fast our view is this is more effective than spreading the changes over a long period.

But wherever a change requires other things to be put in place first to prepare the ground we will do this. For example, suitable training for staff whose role is changing.

The exact timeframe for implementation will not be set until we have confirmed the design. But our starting point is that we want to start to see changes adopted from April next year. That will require intensive activity between now and then.

Many of the changes are inter-related. Ensuring we have the right staffing levels in court will require the release of staff from elsewhere in the organisation. Because of that, many of the changes will need to be implemented as a whole rather than phased.

Implementation will be managed at a divisional level to both provide assurance that the business is ready to make the changes and to manage the dependencies between different change activities. A change of this scale needs specialist support and we will be recruiting a temporary team to help managers implement these changes locally.
Chapter 11 Engagement

A number of different mechanisms have been put in place during the planning stage of the Programme to include staff input into the operating models outlined in the Blueprint document. Staff engagement activity has been taking place throughout the lifetime of the Programme and this will widen significantly during the mobilisation and implementation phases. Work package areas focusing on aspects of the operating model (e.g., courts, community supervision, etc.) have been largely made up of operational and management leads from each division working directly in that given area. In some work packages there have been focus groups of operational staff. This has allowed valuable input into designs from subject matter experts right from the start of the E3 Programme. Engagement with the wider staff group has been necessarily more limited.

We are publishing this document to provide a basis for staff and stakeholders to give us your views on the changes we propose and how they might best be implemented.

Feedback on the Blueprint and the E3 Programme more generally can be provided through a variety of different means.

One mechanism for capturing feedback will be via an online survey. This will ask for your view on a series of specific design questions.

Alternatively, you can send more general questions or feedback directly to the E3 Programme team via E3@probation.gsi.gov.uk.
A further valued resource for feeding back E3 related issues is via our Divisional staff E3 Champions. Our Champions have been working directly with the Programme to cascade key messages out to Divisions and also to encourage feedback from staff back to the E3 Programme team.

A series of national events have been organised to allow staff at all levels to comment and ask questions on the Blueprint. These will be held on 9th, 13th, 16th and 20th November. Divisional events will also be taking place locally to allow more specific Divisional awareness activity.

In addition to your individual thoughts, we are encouraging discussion of the Blueprint in teams with briefing material available to support managers to discuss this document.
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