

Working together to reduce re-offending

National Commissioning Plan 2007 / 2008

# Commissioning Framework



Working together to reduce re-offending

National Commissioning Plan 2007 / 2008:

# **Commissioning Framework**

National Offender Management Service, Home Office, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Fry Building, 2 Marsham Street, London SW1P 4DF

ISBN-13: 978-1-84726-158-8

# Contents

<b>1. Foreword by Chief Executive, National Offender Management Service</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Strategic Intentions for Commissioning</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. NOMS Priorities</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4. Measuring Achievement</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5. Funding</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Glossary of Terms and Acronyms</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Annex 1: Contact List</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Annex 2: Explanatory notes on OASys quality and limitations</b>	<b>20</b>

## 1. Foreword by Chief Executive, National Offender Management Service

Good commissioning is a fundamental component of our plans to improve the way we manage offenders. As we move to a needs-based commissioning system, commissioners will make judgements about what type of service is needed to manage offenders effectively and to reduce re-offending. These judgements need to be based on the best available evidence about what is working and what isn't, what the priorities for improvement are, where and with whom resources should be invested.

We already have commissioners in place. They have signed service level agreements for 2006/07 with our existing public sector prison and probation service providers, and have taken over the management of some of the contracts with private sector providers. 2007/08 brings a further step in the development of commissioning across NOMS, with commissioners making investment decisions and able to negotiate changes to service mix in custody and the community.

In August, we published "Improving Prison and Probation Services: Public Value Partnerships", setting out our strategic intentions for developing contestability and our initial programme of competitions. This first NOMS Commissioning Framework sets out, more fully than elsewhere, our strategic intentions for commissioning, our priorities for investment and the performance measures for 2007/08.

The task for commissioners is to achieve better alignment between what is needed and what is provided. Getting this right will help to achieve better public protection and a reduction in re-offending.

***Helen Edwards***  
***January 2007***

## 2. Strategic Intentions for Commissioning

This chapter summarises the case for National Offender Management Service (NOMS) reform, what NOMS will deliver through commissioning, strategic intentions for commissioning, the regional 'centre of gravity' for NOMS commissioning and where accountabilities lie.

### 2.1. System reform

Crime is going down overall, but over half of all crimes are committed by people who have been through the criminal justice system before. Almost 60% of people coming out of prison or finishing community sentences re-offend within two years. Since 1997, spending on prisons has increased by over 30% in real terms, and spending on probation has increased by 70%, but more money is not the whole answer. Reform of the prison and probation systems is required.

The high re-offending rate indicates that we need to make more effective use of public money so that public protection is improved and re-offending reduced. An adult re-offending rate of almost 60%, coupled with some questions over public protection, is an unsatisfactory return on investment for the £4 billion plus spent on prisons and probation services each year by NOMS.

Commissioning is one of a number of strands in the reform of the system being undertaken by NOMS. Others include work with sentencers to ensure fines, imprisonment and community punishments can be used effectively by the courts; the introduction of end-to-end offender management (designed to protect the public and reduce re-offending by ensuring offenders are managed consistently throughout their sentence and that services are effectively targeted in the right place can be used and at the right time); and improving the systems available for assessment and case management. Commissioning, like offender management, aims to secure responsive service provision that is tailored to have maximum impact on individual offenders. Commissioning is a system of resource allocation that exists to align services needed, and demanded by the courts and offender managers, with what is actually provided on the ground.

Commissioning provides a new process for allocating money to services and service providers. It will be the process NOMS uses to redistribute resources from less effective services in order to invest resources in more effective services. As well as improving the mix of services provided, commissioners also intend to improve the provider mix by disinvesting from poorer performing providers and investing in more responsive and higher performing providers. Both of these commissioning actions will be undertaken to improve service provision, reduce re-offending and better protect the public.

This framework focuses on commissioning as the key delivery mechanism, and how NOMS invests its own resources to best effect. But that is not to understate the importance of the regional cross-government reducing re-offending boards and the importance of working in partnership with other departments and agencies.

NOMS cannot reduce crime and re-offending by itself. In addition to the financial resources NOMS spends on offender services, around the same again is invested by

other government departments. Just as 'Improving Prison and Probation Services: Public Value Partnerships' requires providers to work collaboratively, commissioners must do the same. Co-commissioning, joint commissioning<sup>1</sup> and partnership working are critical. Consequently, we are considering moving further towards joint targets across prison and probation, and across government departments to make a reality of the government's ambition for 'joined up government'. These may be difficult, since achievement of joint targets will inevitably be only partly in NOMS direct control, or in the direct control on NOMS providers but are expected to have a significant impact on delivery on the ground.

The Home Office's Five Year Strategy for Protecting the Public and Reducing Re-offending, published in February 2006, recognised the need for strong partnership working with local government, employers, the voluntary and community sectors and local people and communities in reducing re-offending. In November 2005, Baroness Scotland launched the Reducing Re-offending Alliances – Corporate, Civic Society and Faith/Voluntary Sector – which aim to encourage local organisations to work with NOMS and partners to reduce re-offending. These are being delivered by being integrated into the regional reducing re-offending plans and local plans and by aiming to embed reducing re-offending into existing community safety partnerships and Local Area Agreements.

The Civic Society Alliance is the key alliance for building relationships at a local level with local authorities, local organisations and local communities to ensure offenders have equality of access to local services such as housing and employment, as well as to purposeful activities like sport, leisure, music and the arts.

To assist the development of this Alliance, a demonstration project has been created in the East Midlands. This is testing out local models for engaging service providers, employers and communities in reducing re-offending e.g. through Local Strategic Partnerships and Local Area Agreements and is producing a toolkit of local partnership working.

## 2.2. The Regional 'centre of gravity'

Another consequence of the need to work closely with other commissioners and providers from other sectors is the regional 'centre of gravity' of NOMS commissioning. The Government's response to the Carter Report emphasised the need for regionalisation of commissioning:

"We believe that the task of integrating the management of offenders whilst in custody or under supervision in the community is best managed at regional level where effective links can be forged and joint strategies developed with complementary services, including health, education and employment."

Regional commissioning means:

- The commissioner is closer to service delivery and key agencies including Learning and Skills Councils, Primary Care Trusts, and Local Criminal Justice Boards, and the Welsh equivalents;

---

<sup>1</sup> By co-commissioning we mean two or more organisations aligning their commissioning strategies for shared or mutually beneficial outcomes. By joint commissioning we mean two or more organisations pooling budgets to commission services with shared or mutually beneficial outcomes.

- A better understanding of local and diverse needs and priorities;
- Local delivery through efficient sub-contracting;
- Cost-effective commissioning of services;
- Regional variation where necessary and appropriate rather than 'one size fits all';
- Closer proximity to those who commit NOMS commissioner resources: sentencers and offender managers.

### **2.3. Strategic intentions for commissioning**

In a developed commissioning system, commissioners will be:

1. Regulating the environment:
  - setting national minimum service quality and equality standards;
  - accrediting providers wishing to access public money;
  - licensing services so that a greater proportion of public money is spent on services which work and have an evidence base or whose effectiveness is being evaluated.
2. Influencing demand:
  - working with sentencers and offender managers, who commit NOMS financial resources through the sentences they pass and sentence plans they prepare, to align the services demanded by them with what is needed.
3. Allocating resources:
  - deciding which kind of services are most needed and setting priorities for investment in line with available funding;
  - selecting providers to deliver services who offer best value for money;
  - challenging existing providers to demonstrate value for money and seeing what other potential providers have to offer;
  - working towards 'open book accounting' in line with OGC guidelines.
4. Creating fertile conditions for improvements in service quality and cost effectiveness:
  - working with providers so that the services delivered closely match what is needed and demanded by sentencers and offender managers;
  - creating an environment which encourages potential providers of relevant, appropriate and effective services to offenders to work for NOMS;
  - using Service Level Agreements and contract negotiations / management to drive up performance;
  - promoting and applying procedures which incentivise good performance;
  - building capacity to assist providers of specialist services that redress inequalities.

NOMS commissioning will:

- (subject to legislation) operate in a fully contestable environment, giving commissioners alternatives to poorly performing providers and the potential to improve further the value for money from services commissioned;
- have competed approximately 25% of NOMS adult offender services expenditure;

- increasingly involve commissioners negotiating contracts or service level agreements with those organisations best able to meet identified needs, whether they come from the public, private or third sectors;
- be the conduit for the vast majority of NOMS funding flow to providers;
- have commissioners holding budgets for offenders from their region;
- have moved away from provider budgets based on historic funding patterns, to a funding system based more on payment by results, with providers incentivised to deliver performance improvements;
- be more joined up with other government departments commissioning activity and have joined up community and custodial services more;
- be supported by a performance management framework that will measure performance to include the delivery of equality and the achievement of parity of outcomes across all offender groups.

## **2.4. Accountabilities in a commissioner / provider environment**

In a commissioning environment accountabilities are split between the purchaser and the provider organisations. Changing Lives, Reducing Crime set out these accountabilities when the Government decided to introduce commissioning into NOMS in 2004:

- Providers are accountable for the efficient operation of their service;
- Commissioners are accountable for aligning need and demand within existing resource constraints, and for commissioning appropriate and sufficient prison places, community supervision and interventions through contracts and service level agreements with providers.

Accountabilities have to be split this way in a multi-provider, contestable environment. By 2010/11, we expect to have a plural marketplace with multiple providers from the public, private and third sectors delivering offender services. All providers will be expected to demonstrate they meet NOMS standards and the statutory duties as required by equalities legislation.

Commissioners and providers need to work together to achieve their common objectives. Providers deliver the services required to protect the public and reduce re-offending. Access to expert advice, accurate and timely data and service delivery facilities will be required from providers. Commissioning is in its infancy in NOMS and will rely on commissioners and providers working together to reform the custodial and community environment which will deliver the changes required in public protection and re-offending.

In fulfilling the functions outlined above, commissioners will:

- Treat all providers fairly;
- Act with integrity in the provision of services, adhere to national standards, seek out improvement and work positively in partnerships with other providers;
- Apply good practice in risk management to commissioning and promote it to providers;
- Recognise and respect the difference between commissioning services and line management of service provision;
- Observe and examine services at the point of delivery;

- Seek evidence that providers are meeting the general and specific duties specified in legislation.

### 3. NOMS Priorities

This chapter sets out NOMS priorities and the areas of focus for those negotiating 2007/08 SLAs.

#### 3.1. National priorities

NOMS priorities is public protection and reducing re-offending. NOMS has a target to reduce re-offending by 5% by 2007/08 working towards 10% by the end of the decade.

#### 3.2. 2007/08 SLAs areas of focus

Chapter 3 sets out how NOMS will measure achievement, and the headline measures and targets for 2007/08. In future years, the areas of focus are likely to become increasingly outcome-focused and be the product of detailed analysis of available needs and demand data, and our performance framework and measures will align with this.

Through the 2007/08 service level agreements, regional commissioners will negotiate changes to the mix of services historically delivered by NOMS providers. Some of these changes will be 'bottom up' proposals, driven from the front line. Other changes will be 'top down' to meet national priorities and secure appropriate consistency across England and Wales.

It is to secure this degree of consistency that NOMS is requiring SLA negotiations to focus on the following areas of service change:

- Public protection and offender management;
- Diversity and equality;
- Partnership working;
- Aligning demand for services with service need and with value for money.

The requirements in these areas for the 2007/08 SLA negotiation round are set out below. Most requirements focus on quality improvement matters, whilst others address issues of value and fairness.

#### ***Public protection and offender management***

- Extend the offender management process to offenders with determinate sentences with a custodial element, where the offender is either (i) assessed as high or very high risk of harm or (ii) defined as a 'Prolific and Other Priority Offender';
- Prioritise services delivered to cases assessed as high or very high risk of serious harm and prolific offenders including drug misusers;

- Increase the progress made in recent years on 'enforcement' so that action is taken against offenders who do not comply with the requirements of their licence;
- Demonstrate increased use among provider staff of effective offender management behaviours<sup>2</sup>.

### ***Diversity and equality***

- Within the scope of NOMS provider responsibilities, deliver greater equality of access to services provided for offenders in prisons or supervised in the community, irrespective of their race, gender or other characteristics to achieve greater parity of outcomes, where this is not the case, and to promote greater confidence in the criminal justice system among those groups where this is lacking or weak.

### ***Partnership working***

- Consider how best to demonstrate increased provider staff satisfaction with levels of co-operation received from other staff working for different providers.

### ***Aligning demand for services with service need and with value for money***

- Subject to funding constraints, liaison with sentencers, and assessment of risk to the public, seek to increase provision of appropriate non-custodial services for (i) remand prisoners, (ii) women offenders (iii) offenders committing low level offences and presenting a low risk of harm and (iv) offenders sentenced to short custodial sentences.

## **3.3. Signals for 2007/08 commissioning plans**

Within the published NOMS goals and priorities, the regional and national commissioning plans for 2007/08 will prioritise key services which protect the public from dangerous and prolific offenders. In particular through the services we commission, through implementation of the Offender Management Model, and through delivery of the Reducing Reoffending Delivery Plan, commissioners seek:

- High levels of commitment to local Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements and improved levels of collaborative work between provider organisations;
- Improved standards of risk assessment and management;
- A continued focus on work with Priority and Prolific Offenders;
- Increasingly to commission interventions across prison/probation boundaries;

---

<sup>2</sup> The NOMS Offender Management Manual summarises the research evidence on what constitutes effective offender management behaviour as:

- The firm, fair and clear use of authority;
- Modelling pro-social and anti-criminal attitudes, cognition and behaviours;
- Teaching concrete problem solving skills;
- Brokerage, i.e. using community resources;
- Forming and working through warm, open and enthusiastic relationships.

- To promote delivery through contracting out and partnership arrangements;
- To work closely with providers and co-commissioning agencies to ensure maximum impact for all resource investment, avoiding duplication of effort and conflict of direction;
- To work with providers to develop innovative specifications for old and new work which offer the prospect of efficiency savings and reduced overhead spending.

### ***Proposed actions for 2007/08***

- Diversity pathfinder programmes in the North West and East Midlands to advance effective commissioning for diversity;
- Performance tests of a number of prisons or prison clusters and a number of Probation Boards where necessary, as part of the overall performance management framework;
- Start a fundamental review of current levels of investment in, and distribution of / access to interventions and programmes in prisons and in the community (to be informed by the review of interventions planned by the Effective Interventions Board);
- Develop and publish commissioning standards which will differentiate expectations of contact and resource allocation between high and low risk offenders;
- Review arrangements for delivery of resettlement services to foreign national prisoners subject to deportation orders.

## **3.4. Co-commissioning and joint commissioning priorities**

If NOMS is to achieve its aims of reducing re-offending and protecting the public a multi-agency approach is vital. We need to ensure that the commissioning of interventions and other services is effective, joined up, and able to make the best use of available resources. Regional Offender Managers need to work with other commissioners so that they are strategic and collaborative in their purchasing, but also doing all they and their providers can to access resources for all offender groups to ensure that others are playing their part in protecting the public and reducing re-offending.

Co-commissioning activities and priorities refer in the main to England. Separate work is being undertaken in Wales which takes account of the devolved responsibilities of the Welsh Assembly Government, and the specific strategies to reduce re-offending in Wales.

The focus of co-commissioning during 2007/08 will be to support delivery within the following areas:

### ***Learning and Skills***

- Jointly taking forward the Green Paper 'Reducing Re-offending through Skills and Employment in partnership with DfES, Learning and Skills Council, Offenders Learning and Skills Service, Jobcentre Plus and the Corporate Alliance;

- A focus on working with employers and meaningful employment opportunities driving what is commissioned to help offenders into jobs rather than placing them on benefits.

### ***Physical and Mental Health***

- Strengthening commissioning of health services for offenders with the NHS and Primary Care Trusts;
- Extending offender health support in the community and improving continuity of care;
- Increased and improved provision of mental health services and support within custody and the community.

### ***Drugs and Alcohol treatment and support***

- NOMS integration in to the National Treatment Agency and Drug Action Teams treatment planning processes;
- Improving continuity of care and aftercare for offenders misusing substances;
- Increased and improved provision of offender alcohol interventions and services.

The prioritisation of these pathways will determine the scope of initial actions and investment decisions to support the development of co-commissioning to reduce re-offending. It does not however restrict regional or local discretion to develop co-commissioning in other areas where need is greatest or opportunities exist.

## **4. Measuring Achievement**

This chapter sets out NOMS headline and national measures for 2007/08.

### **4.1. Measuring Achievement**

NOMS relies on providers to deliver the services which have been commissioned to protect the public and reduce re-offending. How we measure provider performance, as well as whole system performance, is of vital importance. We need the right metrics to incentivise the right performance, and we need to be able to measure performance and make comparisons across localities and across and within providers. We are developing a comprehensive, more outcome focused set of performance measures for NOMS, joined up where possible with criminal justice and OGD partners, and which will align more closely with NOMS priorities and areas of focus.

This section sets out the headline and national measures and targets for 2007/08. Measures for 2007/08 have been subject to wide consultation including with commissioners, policy leads and providers. Provider targets will be finalised through SLA negotiations with commissioners and will be published in the NOMS business plan for 2007/08.

The approach for 2007/08 differs from past practice, which has been to set all targets centrally and disaggregate them to provide targets for individual prisons and probation areas. Now that the regional commissioning structure is in place, it allows ROMs to agree targets informed by available information on local needs profiles, capacity to deliver, and budgets, as part of their SLA negotiations with providers. There is still a need to set some targets nationally, for instance reflecting political priorities (e.g. to maintain the low level of escapes) or which are cross-agency (e.g. the speed with which non-compliance with a community order is enforced). We also believe that we should give clear indications of national priorities. However, for many areas of performance we want to adopt a local approach which enables us to target resources according to local need.

## 4.2. NOMS headline measures for 2007/08

The National Offender Management Service has been established in order to protect the public, and to reduce re-offending by 10% by 2010. During 2007/08, in support of these objectives, NOMS will:

- maintain the low level of escapes from prison (including no Category A escapes);
- reduce the rate of offences committed by offenders under the supervision of the probation service (shadow measure for 2007-08);
- ensure offenders comply with their licence or order;
- take swift enforcement action where offenders fail to comply with the requirements of their supervision;
- sustain the fall in the rate of self-inflicted deaths in prison;
- increase the proportion of National Probation Service funding spent on voluntary/community sector, and private sector delivery.

## 4.3. NOMS national measures for 2007/08

Nationally NOMS will measure and report on the following, recognising that to meet our reduction of inequality objectives performance information will need to be disaggregated in terms of race and ethnicity, gender, disabilities and age so we can understand more fully where the performance gaps are:

Target 1	No Category A escapes.
Target 2	To maintain the rate of escapes from prison/prison escorts below [x%].
Target 3	To maintain the rate of escape from court escorts below [x%].
Target 4	[x]% of risk of harm assessments and action plans are produced to prescribed timescales (by risk of harm category). (NOMS will also monitor whether the quality of assessments and action plans is appropriate as management information for 2007-08).
Target 5	To reduce the rate of offences committed by offenders under the supervision of the probation service.
Target 6	[x]% assessments completed which are to prescribed timescales (by risk of harm category). (NOMS will also monitor whether the quality of assessments and action plans is appropriate as management information for 2007-08).
Target 7	[x]% sentence plans prepared which are to prescribed timescales.
Target 8	[x]% of offenders who successfully complete their licence or order.

Target 9	Community penalty breach proceedings are resolved within an average of 30 working days from the relevant unacceptable failure to comply, and 65% are resolved within 25 days.
Target 10	[x]% of Pre Sentence Reports are completed to prescribed timescales.
Target 11	[x]% of prisoners from prison or police cells are delivered to court by the agreed time.
Target 12	The rate of drug misuse in prisons is reduced [as measured by the reduction in the numbers of those testing positive as a result of random mandatory drug testing].
Target 13	[x] unpaid work requirements are completed.
Target 14	Offenders achieve [x] educational achievements.
Target 15	[x] problematic drug users on drug rehabilitation requirements enter and are retained in treatment for 12 weeks and [x] prisoners complete drug treatment programmes.
Target 16	[x] % of offenders under supervision are living in settled and suitable accommodation at the end of their order/ licence, and [x]% of prisoners move to settled accommodation on release.
Target 17	[x] offenders under probation supervision find and keep employment or vocational training for [4] weeks or more during the course of their supervision and [x] prisoners enter employment on release <sup>3</sup> .
Target 18	x% of offenders with acute mental health problems have their transfers to appropriate facilities completed within 1 month of assessment.
Target 19	x% of offenders with requirements for a care plan approach are subject to the care plan approach.
Target 20	Offenders complete [x] accredited programmes, including [y] sex offender treatment programmes and [z] domestic violence programmes.
Target 21	x% of victims to be contacted within eight weeks of an offender receiving 12 months or more for a serious sexual or violent offence.
Target 22	The rate of serious assaults is less than [x%].
Target 23	The rate of self inflicted deaths is less than [x] per 100,000.
Target 24	The percentage of prisoners held in overcrowded accommodation is less than [x]%. [x]% of prisoners have appropriate access to health care.
Target 25	[x]% of prisoners have appropriate access to health care.
Target 26	The proportion of National Probation Service funding spent on voluntary/community, and private sector delivery is increased to 10%.
Target 27	Ethnic minority staff in public prisons and probation areas represent at least [x]% of the workforce.
Target 28	Staff sickness in public prisons and probation areas does not exceed an average of [x] days per annum.

<sup>3</sup> Either directly on release or finding employment or vocational training lasting at least [4] weeks following a Freshstart interview.

## 5. Funding

This chapter sets out:

- NOMS Budget for 2007-08;
- Commissioner Involvement in Resource Allocation 2007-08;
- SLA Negotiations.

### 5.1. NOMS Budget for 2007/08

NOMS provisional budget for 2007/08 is around £4.6 billion. This includes resources for:

- NOMS administration;
- the Youth Justice Board, the services it commissions and NOMS funding for community provision for juvenile offenders;
- adult offender services and the associated provider administration costs.

### 5.2. Commissioner Involvement in Resource Allocation 2007/08

Regional and national commissioners will negotiate financial allocations with service provider representatives for a range of services, facilities and interventions as set out in the scope of the Service Level Agreements. Following completion of negotiations, accountability for management of the agreed financial resources and delivery of the service levels agreed lies with providers.

The majority of NOMS financial resources will be allocated to providers following agreement of SLA financial values by commissioners with providers.

### 5.3. SLA Negotiations

Commissioners have an interest in getting a closer alignment between what is needed and delivered. They also have a role in increasing the value for money of adult offender services provision. The process of negotiating SLAs gives providers and commissioners the opportunity to address these issues together. SLA negotiations will finalise both the value of the financial allocation to each prison and Probation Board for 2007/08 and the performance levels to be delivered in return for the sums invested.

Limited variance to provisional allocations is expected in order to maintain the financial stability sought by both commissioners and providers and guaranteed minimum performance levels are required to meet Ministers expectations and NOMS value for money requirements.

## Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

Alliances	Baroness Scotland's initiative to build alliances with the Corporate, Civic and Faith & Voluntary Sectors that provide offenders the opportunity to access training, employment and mainstream services that help them to resettle and reintegrate into communities.
ANARP	Alcohol Needs Assessment Research Project ANARP is an audit of treatment, giving an assessment of the levels of alcohol misuse and the availability of alcohol treatment services throughout England.
ATB	Attitude, Thinking & Behaviour
Baseline funding	The funding initially allocated to a provider through the NOMS planning process. The actual value of SLAs is then the subject of local negotiation with the ROM.
BME	Black and Minority Ethnic Offenders
CARATS	Counselling, Assessment, Referral, Advice and Throughcare Services – drug services accessible to all prisoners in custody.
Category A	Category A prisoners are those whose escape would be highly dangerous to the public or national security. They are held in High Security Prisons which are the subject of a national SLA.
CDRP	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership, between police, local authorities, probation, health, voluntary sector and local groups of residents and businesses devising a strategy containing measures to tackle priority problems of crime and disorder. The strategy will last for three years, but must be kept under review by the partnership.
CIU	Community Integration Unit.
CJA	Criminal Justice Act.
CJIT	Criminal Justice Information Technology.
CJS	The Criminal Justice System, the generic term associated with those from the Police, Prison Service, Probation Service, Crown Prosecution Service, Youth Justice Board, Court Service, Victim & Witness Support and others.
Co-commissioning	Two or more organisations aligning their commissioning strategies for shared or mutually beneficial outcomes.
Collaboration	Two or more organisations working together to deliver mutual areas of interest and required outcomes.
Commissioning	NOMS has been designed with commissioning at its heart. This involves separating out the specification of services to be delivered from the delivery of those services.
Commissioner	The Commissioner decides what services are needed, sets priorities and enters into Service Level Agreements with providers to ensure these are delivered.
Commissioning	A document that sets out, for commissioners and

Framework	providers, NOMS strategic intentions for commissioning, NOMS priorities for investment and performance measurement in 2007/08 and the funding envelope for commissioners.
Community	A community is a group of people, defined by a geographical area, who are affected by crime and who justifiably expect to be safe within those communities while seeing reductions in the level of crime.
Community Orders	Under the Criminal Justice Act 2003 sentencing changed. Community Orders involve offenders doing things to help them avoid re-offending e.g. improve education or get off drugs. There is tough enforcement of these orders and those which are breached can mean more punitive measures or custody. Can include 12 different requirements, 1 or 2 for minor offenders, more for those found guilty of more serious crime. They can be tougher than prison.
Contestability	Contestability is not another word for competition. It is a situation where a provider faces a credible threat of competition in the provision of some or all of the services they deliver. For NOMS it is a programme for Prison & Probation Services to demonstrate that services are provided to the highest possible standard and achieve results.
Criminogenic Need	The needs, and priorities, as identified by the OASys process. These are defined as Accommodation/ Education, training & employability/ Financial Management & income/ Relationships/ Lifestyle & associates / Drug misuse/ Alcohol misuse/ Emotional wellbeing / Thinking & behaviour/ Attitudes.
CSB	Commissioners Support Bureau – part of the Commissioning and Partnership Directorate of NOMS.
CSIP	Care Services Improvement Partnership.
Custody	Prisons and other secure environments.
DAAT / DAT	Drug and Alcohol Action Team Drug Action Teams work locally to deliver the UK drug strategy.
DCLG	Department of Communities and Local Government.
DfES	Department for Education and Skills.
DH	Department of Health.
DID	Drink Impaired Drivers.
DIP	Drug Interventions Programme as used by the Prison Service to deliver drug treatments to those in custody.
Disinvestment	Disinvestment is the withdrawal or re-direction of funding when evidence indicates that required outcomes are not producing clear positive results or when higher priorities are identified.
DPAS	Drugs Prevention Advisory Service.
DRR	Drug Rehabilitation Requirement.
DTO	Detention and Training Order.
DTTO	Drugs Treatment and Testing Order.
EEA	European Economic Area.

ETE	Education, Training and Employment.
ETS	Enhanced Thinking Skills.
GO	Office which represents central government departments in a particular region.
GP	General Practitioner.
HCJ	Health in Criminal Justice.
HDC	Home Detention Curfew.
HMCIP	HM Chief Inspectorate of Prisons.
HMIP	HM Inspectorate of Probation.
HMP	Her Majesty's Prison: holds adult offenders.
HMP&YOI	HMP & Young Offenders Institution: holds juvenile (15 – 17) and young offender (18 – 21) year old prisoners.
HMPS	Her Majesty's Prison Service.
HMYOI	An establishment which holds Young Offenders (18 – 21).
HSE	High Security Estate – prisons for holding highest risk offenders.
ICCP	Intensive Change and Control Programme.
IDAP	Intensive Domestic Abuse Programme.
IDTS	Integrated Drug Treatment Scheme, the provision of substance abuse programs including drug and alcohol testing.
Improving Prison and Probation: PVP	PVP - Public Value Partnerships. A document setting out NOMS' initial intentions for creating lasting public value partnerships. <a href="http://www.noms.homeoffice.gov.uk/">http://www.noms.homeoffice.gov.uk/</a>
Interventions	Interventions are the programmes delivered by Prison or Probation services, drug action teams or others providers to address an offenders needs.
IPP	Indeterminate Public Protection.
Joint Commissioning	Two or more organisations pooling budgets to commission services with shared or mutually beneficial outcomes.
KPI	Key Performance Indicator – High level measure used to monitor performance in Criminal Justice Agencies.
KPT	Key Performance Targets. Targets that are set to ensure that KPIs are met.
LAA	Local Area Agreements.
LCJB	Local Criminal Justice Board.
LSC	Learning and Skills Council, the body now responsible for the provision of all learning and skills training for offenders.
LSCB	Local Safeguarding Children Board.
LSP	Local Strategic Partnership.
MAPPA	Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements. MAPPA provide the statutory framework for inter-agency co-operation in assessing and managing violent and sex offenders in England and Wales. Under the arrangements, Police, Probation and Prisons, supported by additional agencies including housing, health and social services combine forces to manage the risk to the public posed by dangerous offenders.

MAPPP	Multi-Agency Public Protection Panel. The critical few offenders that pose the highest risk are referred to a MAPPP where their cases are regularly scrutinised by senior representatives of local agencies.
MDO	Mentally Disordered Offenders.
MQPL	Measure of the Quality of Prison Life.
NDTMS	National Drug Treatment Monitoring System.
NHF	National Housing Federation.
NIMHE	National Institute for Mental Health in England.
NOMM	National Offender Management Model.
NOMS	National Offender Management Service : established in response to the Carter Report on Correctional Services Review with a remit of bringing the Prison and Probation Services into a closer working arrangement with each other and with those other organisation involved in Resettlement and Rehabilitation Services.
NOMIS	National Offender Management Information System.
NPD	National Probation Directorate - the body which advises Ministers on the setting of targets, measures and priorities for the NPS and issues any necessary directives.
NPS	National Probation Service, 42 separate bodies managed by Probation Boards.
NTA	National Treatment Agency who aim to increase the availability, capacity and effectiveness of treatment for drug misuse in England.
OASys	Offender Assessment System used by both Prison and Probation Services to determine, for either prisoners or offenders, the causes of their offending behaviour and hence what work and interventions are necessary to address that behaviour and so cut re-offending.
OBP	Offender Behaviour Programme.
ODPM	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
Offenders	Those who have been found guilty of an offence and are subject to either custody or community sentences.
OGD	Other Government Department.
OLASS	Offender Learning and Skills Service.
OM	Offender Management.
Partnership	To succeed we need to involve all those with relevant expertise to work with offenders. This can be complex but through working with those in fields of health, education, employment, local authorities and the CJS we can ensure interventions are comprehensive in addressing needs. We will also expect our main providers to enter into partnership arrangements.
Pathway Groups or PAT (Pathway Action Teams)	7 separate groups set up to address the requirements of the Pathways identified in the Regional Reducing re-offending Action/Development Plans.
PCT	Primary Care Trust. PCTs work with local authorities and other agencies that provide health and social care locally as commissioners.

PMF	Performance Management Framework.
Performance testing	A process under which those public service bodies who are failing to deliver to the required standard can be subject to robust management with improvement objectives being set for delivery within strict timeframes.
PPO	Prolific and Priority Offenders. A CDRP led initiative with Police, CPS, Prisons and Probation with LCJB coordination, working to effectively catch, convict, monitor and manage these offenders in the community or custody and work towards rehabilitating them.
Prisoners	Those held in Private and Public prisons.
Public Service Providers	HM Prison Service and National Probation Service.
Reception(s)	Reception(s) is the generic term to describe the process for those being received into prison. It includes identifying and assessing the immediate needs of prisoners, data collection, property management and the identification of any specific needs regarding their safety and health.
Regional Commissioning Plan	A document published by each Regional Offender Manager (ROM) to provide the foundation for a commissioning environment. The ROM sets out priorities, what is required of providers and the criteria for commissioning of services.
Regional Skills Strategy	Government Offices work with regional partners including Learning and Skills Councils and Regional Development Agencies to implement a range of Government policies including the National Skills Strategy and from this the regional plan is developed. Those involved include Job Centre Plus, local Learning and Skills Councils, Trade Union Congress, Confederation of British Industry, and regional employers and providers.
ROM	Regional Offender Manager (Director of Offender Management in Wales).
RRDP - RRAP	Regional Reducing Re-offending Delivery / Action Plan. The National RRDP was published in November 2005. It set out the Government's updated plans to reduce re-offending since the publication of the Reducing Re-offending National Action Plan in July 2004. It can be viewed in the publications section at: <a href="http://www.noms.homeoffice.gov.uk/">http://www.noms.homeoffice.gov.uk/</a>
Sentence Plan	A document which sets out the needs of an offender and how they will be managed during the time in custody, which, how and when the appropriate interventions will be delivered and by whom. This can be transferable between custody and community sentences.
SHA	Strategic Health Authority.
SLA	A formal agreement between two parts of the same organisation that specifies a service to be delivered and the responsibilities of each party to the agreement.
SP	Supporting People.

SSO	Suspended Sentence Order.
Stakeholders	Those organisations with a shared high level interest in ensuring that re-offending is reduced.
Sub-contracting	The use of a secondary contract to employ a third party to deliver a service as part of a larger contract.
Supporting People	The Supporting People organisation offers vulnerable people, including offenders, the opportunity to improve their quality of life by providing a stable environment which enables greater independence and so reduces the risk of re-offending.
Third Sector	The “third sector” describes the range of institutions which include small local community and voluntary groups registered charities both large and small, foundations, trusts, and a growing number of social enterprises and cooperatives. They share common characteristics in the social, environmental or cultural objectives they pursue; their independence from government; and in the reinvestment of surpluses for those same objectives.
‘through the gate’	A system whereby interventions that commenced in custody can continue to be delivered in the community without being affected by any change in that status.
Unpaid Work	Unpaid work - is work undertaken for the benefit of the local community. It is a punitive intervention that can be used as a creative resource for improving the local environment and supporting strategies on visibility and community engagement. Work cannot be for profit or financial gain. Also called community payback.
VCS	Voluntary and Community Sector.

## Annex 1: Contact list

North West Regional Offender Manager	Liz Hill Email: <a href="mailto:liz.hill@noms.gov.uk">liz.hill@noms.gov.uk</a>
North East Regional Offender Manager	Mitch Egan CB Email: <a href="mailto:mitch.egan@noms.gov.uk">mitch.egan@noms.gov.uk</a>
Yorkshire and Humberside Regional Offender Manager	Paul Wilson CBE Email: <a href="mailto:paul.wilson@noms.gov.uk">paul.wilson@noms.gov.uk</a>
Director of Offender Management for Wales	Sian West Email: <a href="mailto:sian.west@wales.gsi.gov.uk">sian.west@wales.gsi.gov.uk</a>
West Midlands Regional Offender Manager	Steve Goode Email: <a href="mailto:steve.goode@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk">steve.goode@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk</a>
East Midlands Regional Offender Manager	Linda Jones Email: <a href="mailto:linda.jones@noms.gov.uk">linda.jones@noms.gov.uk</a>
East of England Regional Offender Manager	Trevor Williams Email: <a href="mailto:trevor.williams@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk">trevor.williams@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk</a>
London Regional Offender Manager	Steve Murphy Email: <a href="mailto:steve.murphy@noms.gov.uk">steve.murphy@noms.gov.uk</a>
South West Regional Offender Manager	Kevin Lockyer Email: <a href="mailto:Kevin.Lockyer@noms.gov.uk">Kevin.Lockyer@noms.gov.uk</a>
South East Regional Offender Manager	Sarah Payne Email: <a href="mailto:Sarah.payne2@noms.gov.uk">Sarah.payne2@noms.gov.uk</a>
Head of Commissioners Support Bureau	Michelle Jarman-Howe Email: <a href="mailto:Michelle.Jarman-Howe@Homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk">Michelle.Jarman-Howe@Homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk</a>
Director, Commissioning and Contestability, National Offender Management Service	Guy Boersma Email: <a href="mailto:Guy.Boersma@Homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk">Guy.Boersma@Homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk</a>

## Annex 2: Explanatory notes on OASys quality and limitations

### 2.1. OASys coverage and use

OASys is now in general use but a full assessment is not required for all offenders. The relevant NPS national standards begin at the pre-sentence stage. Currently, in all cases in which a report is requested, NPS should, as a minimum, complete the OASys Risk of Harm screening tool. Unless the court directs otherwise, a full OASys assessment should be completed if one or more of the following conditions are met:

- the risk of harm screening shows that a full risk of harm analysis is required;
- the OGRS score (% risk reconviction within 2 years) is 41 or over;
- the court has adjourned for a full report because of the seriousness of the offence;
- the offender is a locally defined 'prolific or other priority offender' (National Probation Directorate, 2005).

Post-sentence, a full assessment should be completed in the community for all those cases designated at Offender Management Tier 2 and above, with the exception of those Tier 2 cases in which there is a stand-alone unpaid work requirement. A sentence plan is required in all cases, with a review of the sentence plan required within 16 weeks or at the termination of the sentence. In the prison establishments, all those offenders serving a custodial sentence of at least 12 months should be assessed within 8 weeks of sentence (HM Prison Service, 2005).

### 2.2. Validity filters

When analysing differing parts of OASys, the following standards of data completion have to be satisfied:

**Core assessment:** Each of the scored sections (1 to 12) within the core OASys assessment must have had at least four-fifths of their scored items completed – ensuring that each criminogenic need was assessed properly.

**Risk of harm:** In the risk of harm sections, the screening must have been completed, the decision whether to complete a full risk analysis should have been consistent with the information provided, and the four ratings of risk of harm in the community must have been recorded in those cases in which a full analysis was required.

**Initial sentence plan:** A criminogenic need must have been recorded within the 'objectives and plans' section.

**De-duplicating the data:** When producing risk/needs profiles, the OASys samples are restricted to the most valid assessments (with earlier assessments taking precedence) in each individual 'period of contact'. This de-duplication ensures that offenders can appear only once during a continuous period of supervision. However, we are not currently able to 'join' periods of supervision by the probation and prison services, so offenders moving in and out of custody may appear more than once during that sentence.

## 2.3. Interpreting the data

1. The use of OASys data is subject to the proviso that the findings should not be read as representative of the entire offending population and care should be taken in generalising the results. For example, if OASys is targeted at higher-risk offenders or offenders with certain offence types or sentence lengths, then the resulting risk/needs profiles will reflect only the risks and needs of these offenders.
2. The reliability of the data is also dependent upon assessors using OASys consistently. Common definitions are outlined in Chapters 6 and 8 of the OASys manual and need to be applied to ensure that risk/needs profiles from one probation area can be compared with those from another probation area.
3. Where identified needs are not being addressed within the sentence plan, it is likely that, in some instances, practitioners are restrained by the availability of suitable programmes, and, in other instances, they are prioritising other sentence requirements, criminogenic needs and risk of harm issues. It is also likely that, in certain cases, practitioners are taking into account further factors regarding the suitability of individual programmes, or are overriding scored criminogenic needs through their clinical judgements regarding links to offending behaviour.
4. With regard to sentence plan reviews, the quality of the data is dependent upon individual assessors fully recording the progress that has been made.
5. Interpreting changes in OASys scores should be done with caution, as we do not yet know the extent to which OASys is a reliable and valid measure of change. Some OASys score changes may reflect more information having become available, known as the 'disclosure effect', rather than any real differences in the offenders' circumstances. Also, as recognised by the statistical phenomenon known as 'regression to the mean', initially extreme scores tend to move naturally towards the average in the subsequent period. Once again, the quality of the data is dependent upon individual assessors fully and consistently reviewing changes in the offenders risk/needs profiles. In addition, we would advise against attributing the cause of any score changes to the 'effects' of any interventions as this conclusion has not yet been rigorously tested.
6. Small sample sizes can limit the generalisability of findings, and should be interpreted with a great deal of caution. Even with a sample of 100, if 50% of the sample have a certain criminogenic need, the criminogenic need percentage among future assessments could be anywhere from around 40% to 60%.



