

## **DUNDEE CITY COUNCIL**

**REPORT TO: SOCIAL WORK AND HEALTH COMMITTEE – 23 JUNE 2014**

**REPORT ON: RE-DESIGNING THE COMMUNITY JUSTICE SYSTEM: A CONSULTATION ON PROPOSALS**

**REPORT BY: DIRECTOR OF SOCIAL WORK**

**REPORT NO: 259-2014**

### **1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

The Policy and Resources Committee approved the Council's initial response to the Scottish Government consultation on Redesigning the Community Justice System on 11 March 2013. Reference is made to Article VI of the minute of meeting of Policy and Resources Committee held on 11 March 2013 wherein report 106-2013 was submitted in relation to Redesigning the Community Justice System – A Consultation on Proposals. This report updates Committee on the consultation and Government proposals to create a new national statutory body, provisionally named Community Justice Improvement Scotland (CJIS), to provide leadership and direction in community justice; to direct Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs) to plan and coordinate community justice services locally; and to create a National Hub for Community Justice Innovation, Learning and Development. The report recommends that Committee support the new model subject to various caveats which are outlined in the Council response due to be submitted 2 July 2014.

### **2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that the Social Work and Health Committee:

- Note the detail of the proposed new model and in particular, the respective roles and responsibilities of the Government, CJIS and CPPs, the relationship between the Government, CJIS and CPPs, the abolition of Community Justice Authorities and transitional arrangements as outlined in paragraphs 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3.
- Approve a Council response to the new community justice model, which appears to have a number of strengths which would help build on service improvements in Dundee whilst also including comment on areas which require further clarity and which is attached as an appendix to this report.
- Instruct the Director of Social Work to work with the CJA, CPP and key statutory and third sector partners to facilitate the transition to the new arrangements and provide an update report in 12 months.

### **3.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 3.1 There are no immediate financial implications but the new model will involve CJIS having responsibility for commissioning some services on a national basis, with CPPs able to exclude themselves where they can justify the services are already being provided and/or are not required locally. The Government is also reviewing funding allocations which will be informed by an analysis of the impact of Community Payback Orders, in terms of numbers, the types of requirements imposed by the Courts and levels of overall demand, alongside a unit costing exercise.

## **4.0 MAIN TEXT**

### **4.1 Background**

- 4.1.1 The previous report noted that a number of reports have stated public services, including those involved in community justice, could be more efficient and effective.

The Christie Report, Audit Scotland Report on Criminal Justice and the Commission on Women Offenders were all critical of a complex landscape, different governance arrangements and inherent barriers in structural and funding systems. In response, the Government stated the status quo is no longer acceptable and proposed 3 options, involving the creation of either a new national service; or enhanced CJAs; or local authorities taking the lead role within CPPs. The Council responded by stating the common areas in each of the models, in terms of multi-agency duties to reduce re-offending, nationally consistent commissioning, practice and performance frameworks and a need to demonstrate best value, impact and outcomes, were all welcome and that services should be managed, commissioned and delivered locally.

- 4.1.2 In Dundee, the Single Outcome Agreement already has a strong focus on reducing re-offending, with CJSW and key partners involved in the implementation of a whole systems approach for young and adult offenders. This involves a range of graduated interventions from Early and Effective Interventions through to Diversion from Prosecution, Community Payback Orders and the resettlement of short-term prisoners. The service is co-located with Police Scotland, Tayside NHS, Apex, Tayside Council on Alcohol and Venture Trust and delivers services to offenders who often present with complex risks and needs in respect of both themselves and others. The service recently submitted its second Annual Report showing the successful implementation of CPOs, which has required consultation with local communities on unpaid work. It is also closely integrated with the wider Protecting People agenda.

### **4.2 Government Response to the Consultation**

- 4.2.1 In response to the consultation, the Government has outlined a model which will firstly involve legislation requiring all key agencies to engage in reducing re-offending. A new body, provisionally named CJIS, will report to Scottish Ministers, along with the National Community Planning Group and COSLA Leaders where required. The body will be responsible for a national strategic plan, the development of a national performance framework, resource allocation and national commissioning. It will provide leadership and will work collaboratively with CPPs and locally Elected Members in the development and implementation of the strategy, with powers to mobilise rescue teams in exceptional circumstances. There are plans to hold regular meetings between Ministers and locally Elected Members to discuss and agree areas of mutual interest in improving offender management.

- 4.2.2 The second key aspect of the model will involve transferring responsibility for the planning and delivery of local community justice services from the 8 CJAs to the 32 CPPs. The CPPs will be responsible for developing a local strategic plan which cascades the national plan and performance framework. They will have operational accountability and will be required to report progress annually to the Government. The model retains CJSW within local authorities but allows discretion in the wider structure of services, including the implications of the integration of health and social care and integrated children's services. It means CJAs will be abolished but will be closely involved in transitional arrangements and supporting partners to understand the nature and extent of new roles and responsibilities. The CPPs will be required to consult with communities on priorities.

- 4.2.3 The third aspect of the model will involve the creation of a National Hub for Community Justice Innovation, Learning and Development. The Government proposes that a national strategy will be developed in conjunction with local partnerships and relevant delivery partners and stakeholders. The Government states it will undertake further work with these parties to establish which areas will assume responsibility for which areas. It says the work will involve close engagement with experts, such as the Scottish Social Services Council (SSSC), the Office of the Chief Social Work Adviser and the Care Inspectorate, who

already operate in these areas. There will be an emphasis on the further development and implementation of evidence based approaches towards reducing re-offending and extending best practice. The Government intends the new model to be in place by 2016-17.

#### **4.3 Proposed Dundee Position**

4.3.1 The proposed new model therefore broadly reflects the initial Dundee response to the three options. The commonalities of the models are being progressed and CJIS would provide the consistent leadership and direction, with an emphasis on collaborative leadership with COSLA, CPPs and local Elected Members. It therefore builds on the principles of Christie in terms of the national Concordat and SOAs. It also builds on arrangements in respect of CPOs, with requirements for CPPs to produce an Annual Report and consult with communities on priorities. The CPPs will assume local responsibility and accountability for reducing re-offending and there will be local discretion over how services are structured. Performance management and service improvement will be enhanced through the development of a new framework which focuses on evidence based practice and outcomes.

4.3.2 However, with an intention to recruit members of CJIS through the public appointment system, there are some reservations over its ability to fully represent the views of the whole community justice system. The model should at least involve a mechanism to ensure all relevant national and local agencies are signatories to strategic plans. The cost of the model, including the running costs of CJIS, its comparability to the 8 CJAs, any additional costs for CPPs and the resource impact on other agencies to meet new statutory duties and comply with the performance framework, have also not been quantified to inform views on best value. In terms of national commissioning, the model would benefit from some further flexibility where CPPs have opted in but local circumstances change and there is no longer any demonstrable requirement for the service to be delivered.

4.3.3 The relationship between CJIS and other, existing bodies carrying out similar roles in respect of either scrutiny or workforce development, such as the Care Inspectorate, SSSC and Risk Management Authority, could be further explained. The relationship between CJIS and the CPPs, particularly in respect of a definition of exceptional circumstances, must be clarified. There should also be further clarity on the required nature and extent of third sector involvement and whether this could ultimately undermine public sector delivery. Processes for involving the third sector should ensure that they complement rather than compete with existing services. The separate Government exercise on funding, involving the analysis of demand created by the CPO and the unit costing exercise must identify all costs and fluctuating trends.

4.3.4 Finally, the new model must involve a realistic implementation plan. It will require primary legislation, the creation of the new national statutory body, the development of a new national strategy and vision for the community justice services, the transfer of responsibility for local planning and delivery from CJAs to CPPs, the development of a new multi-agency performance framework and a new approach towards workforce planning and development in partnership with a complex range of existing organisations. The Government will require a clear plan in order to implement the model by the timescale indicated of 2016-17. These areas for clarification are covered in the proposed response to the consultation and will be submitted to the Government with approval of Committee.

#### **5.0 POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

This Report has been screened for any policy implications in respect of Sustainability, Strategic Environmental Assessment, Anti-Poverty, Equality Impact Assessment and Risk Management.

There is an Equality Impact Assessment attached to this report.

## **6.0 CONSULTATIONS**

The Chief Executive, Director of Corporate Services and Head of Democratic and Legal Services were consulted in the preparation of this report.

## **7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Scottish Government Consultation – The Future Model of Community Justice in Scotland.

**Jennifer G Tocher**  
**Director of Social Work**

**DATE: 27 May 2014**



## The Future Model of Community Justice in Scotland

### RESPONDENT INFORMATION FORM

**Please Note** this form **must** be returned with your response to ensure that we handle your response appropriately

#### 1. Name/Organisation

##### Organisation Name

Dundee City Council

Title Mr  Ms  Mrs  Miss  Dr  Please tick as appropriate

##### Surname

Tocher

##### Forename

Jennifer G

#### 2. Postal Address

Director of Social Work

Floor 2, Dundee House

50 North Lindsay Street

Dundee

Postcode: DD1 1NF

Phone: 01382 433205

##### Email

[jenni.tocher@dundee.gov.uk](mailto:jenni.tocher@dundee.gov.uk)

#### 3. Permissions - I am responding as...

Individual

/

Group/Organisation

Please tick as appropriate

- (a) Do you agree to your response being made available to the public (in Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site)?

Please tick as appropriate

Yes  No

- (b) Where confidentiality is not requested, we will make your responses available to the public on the following basis

Please tick **ONE** of the following boxes

Yes, make my response,

- (c) The name and address of your organisation **will be** made available to the public (in the Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site).

Are you content for your **response** to be made available?

Please tick as appropriate

Yes  No

name and address all available

or

Yes, make my response available, but not my name and address

or

Yes, make my response and name available, but not my address

- (d) We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Government to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?

**Please tick as appropriate**

**x**  **Yes**

**No**

## **ANNEX B CONSULTATION QUESTIONS**

### **Chapter 2**

**Question 1:** Do you have any general comments on the overview of the new arrangements for community justice?

The overview helpfully makes it very clear that the Scottish Government intends to introduce legislation to place new duties on key partners at a national and local level to engage in the planning and delivery of services to reduce re-offending; to jointly develop with Local Authorities and key partners a national strategy for community justice; and to devise a national performance framework which will be cascaded locally and explicitly state the required multi-agency contributions. It helpfully notes that such developments will be based on the desistance model and require a shared focus on the relevant risk and need factors typically associated with re-offending. In Dundee, we have considered throughout the consultation that these foundations will be essential in the development of nationally consistent, evidence based and mutually accountable approaches towards reducing re-offending. They must provide the parameters within which Community Planning Partnerships operate.

The overview also provides some helpful insight on the role of the new body Community Justice Improvement Scotland (CJIS). The roles, responsibilities and representativeness of CJIS would appear central to the success of implementing the new national framework in all areas. It is reassuring to note that the importance of CPPs is similarly emphasised, in terms of a collaborative approach between national and local bodies and local responsibility and accountability. In this sense, the model provides for continuity within Single Outcome Agreements, the local management and delivery of Criminal Justice Social Work (CJSW) and discretion over structures and working arrangements. It is helpful to note that the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Bill will place new duties on public sector partners to play a full and active role in CPPs and deliver outcomes through effective integrated working, which reinforces these aims and should be further cemented in the new legislation.

### **Chapter 3**

**Question 2:** What are your views on the governance and accountability arrangements?

The document goes some way in explaining the roles, responsibilities and accountabilities of Scottish Ministers, local partners, CJIS, the Board of CJIS and the Chief Executive of CJIS. The model offers the potential for clear lines of communication between each and allows for the collaborative development, implementation, review and continuous improvement of a nationally consistent strategy which recognises and respects local structures.

However, in addition to the statutory requirement for key agencies to engage, it would be helpful if further guarantees could be provided that CJIS would legitimately represent the views of the whole community justice family at a national and local level. At the very least, there must be a mechanism to ensure they are signatories to strategic plans. It would also be helpful if the Government could provide a clear definition of what exceptional circumstances might entail and how CJIS would work with CPPs where such circumstances are deemed to apply.

The document helpfully provides definitions of what is meant by commissioning, contracting and procurement. It indicates how CJIS will work with CPPs to establish the nature and extent of nationally and locally commissioned services, in ways which reflect strategic priorities, local needs, what works and best value. It helpfully states that local partners can opt out of nationally commissioned services, provided they are able to justify this in terms of existing local needs and service provision.

However, it would be helpful if further flexibility could be built into any national commissioning arrangements, whereby CPPs have the ability to opt out of existing nationally commissioned services where local circumstances change, the service is no longer required and resources could be re-directed towards emergent priorities. This degree of flexibility would promote the more efficient and effective deployment of resources.

It would also be helpful if the Government could indicate whether it expects any newly commissioned services might replace services currently being delivered by the public sector and what the decision making processes would be. It is essential that all the contributions of public sector agencies are fully recognised and appreciated within the strategic context in which they have historically been delivered and that they are provided with opportunities to continue in the new national arrangements.

The wider review of funding arrangements, involving an analysis of demand created by CPOs and a unit costing exercise, must also be sufficiently sophisticated to identify and acknowledge all the costs associated with delivering different inter-related services, demand trends over time, fluctuating levels of demand and the need for operational resilience. Commissioned services should also not duplicate or compete with existing services from either the public or third sector.

## **Chapter 4**

**Question 3:** What are your views on the arrangements for local strategic planning and delivery of services for community justice?

The proposed arrangements for the local strategic planning and delivery of services helpfully build on current SOA guidance on reducing re-offending and present requirements on CJSW to consult with communities on unpaid work and produce a CPO Annual Report. The proposals extend and reinforce this in respect of the expected contributions of all partners involved in community justice and the co-production of all strategic aims with localities. The proposed guidance on how to develop partnership arrangements and on collecting and sharing multi-agency data to identify need and evidence outcomes is welcome. It is reassuring to note that Local Authority duties under the Social Work (Scotland) Act 1968 will continue.

In respect of Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA), it would be helpful if the current national and the 8 regional Strategic Oversight Groups (SOGs) could be retained to oversee and develop arrangements for the assessment and management of risks posed by certain types of offenders. At national, regional and local levels, the SOGs would inform and be informed by both CJIS and the wider policy agenda for Protecting People. The national strategy and performance framework, together with local CPP planning and delivery of services, should encompass the work of MAPPA and annual reporting could be incorporated within the newly required CPP annual report on reducing re-offending.

## **Chapter 5**

**Question 4:** What suggestions do you have on how a national performance framework for community justice in Scotland could operate under the new model?

The new national strategy for community justice should determine the content of the new national performance framework. The framework should then place clear responsibilities on all key partners for meeting objectives and targets relevant to their respective remits and roles. It should be based on a recognised model of organisational development which encompasses leadership through to outcomes, it should focus on the risk/need factors which desistance theory indicates can reduce re-offending and it should include both quantitative and qualitative indicators. For each factor, there should be accompanying guidance which supports partners to put the necessary strategic, operational and practice arrangements in place.

The national strategy and performance framework should then determine the required content of CPP plans and inform how services are managed, commissioned and delivered at a local level. The role of CJIS should include support to CPPs in having the necessary data gathering, self-evaluation and reporting arrangements in place and in facilitating a culture of continuous performance improvement. This will require close collaboration between CJIS and the CPPs, including appropriate timescales for the development and implementation of the model. It will also be necessary for the interface of CJIS with inspection bodies to be very clearly defined. Inspections would reflect the overarching multi-agency principles of the model.

Similar approaches, such as Key Elements of Effective Practice Quality Assurance Frameworks, have been successfully implemented in other jurisdictions for multi-agency practitioners, managers and strategic partnerships. They include guidance and requirements in respect of the key indicators of quality on specific themes which relate to reducing re-offending, such as substance misuse, mental health and employability. This includes assessment, planning, communication, service delivery, training, management, service development and monitoring and evaluation. They help align strategic priorities with practice and encourage a shared approach within and between agencies.

## **Chapter 6**

**Question 5:** What are your views on the functions to be delivered by Community Justice Improvement Scotland?

The proposed functions, which broadly cover leadership, performance improvement, resources and national commissioning, are welcome. It is essential that each of these proposed functions are reinforced within the new legislation, that the legislation places duties on all key partners to engage and that the new body is genuinely multi-agency and not confined to CJSW. Its proposed roles regarding the oversight, development and delivery of national training are also welcome.

**Question 6:** Does the name “Community Justice Improvement Scotland” adequately reflect the responsibilities of the new national body and the functions?

The name suggests the roles of the new body will be restricted to performance improvement. Clearly, this will be its main focus but its proposed roles will also include what appear to be the wider, inter-related and complimentary functions of

providing strategic leadership; prioritising, allocating and re-distributing funding in accordance with need and best value; commissioning; workforce development; and developing and evaluating intervention programmes. A more appropriate name might therefore be 'Community Justice Scotland', with the vision and mission statement of the body clearly reflecting its multiple functions and purposes.

## **Chapter 7**

**Question 7:** Are the skills and competencies in paragraph 105 and referenced in paragraph 106 sufficient to allow the body to fulfil its functions as noted in Chapter 6?

The skills and competencies appear almost sufficient but although there is an understandable requirement for the body to include Social Work professional advice, there is no reference to other agencies. In order for the body to properly carry out its proposed roles and support key partners in carrying out their new legislative duties, appointed staff, the governing board and supporting sub-committees should be genuinely multi-agency and include members who are able to represent statutory and third sector organisations at a national and local level. Alternatively, all such agencies must be signatories to the national strategy and required to engage with it at a national and local level.

**Question 8:** Is the organisational structure shown at Figure 3 and the expected size of the staffing complement sufficient to allow Community Justice Improvement Scotland to fulfil its functions as noted in Chapter 6?

The proposed initial structure of 4 posts of a Chief Executive, Assistant Chief Executive and Directors of Operations and Corporate Services appears sufficient. However, it is difficult to comment on the suggested number of around 20 full-time staff until more detail is provided on their roles and responsibilities and the extent to which they may or may not duplicate the remits of existing organisations involved in leadership, scrutiny and workforce development. It will also be essential for the body to demonstrate, from an early stage, that its staffing establishment is more cost effective than current arrangements with the 8 CJAs.

**Question 9:** What other suggestions do you have for the organisational structure for Community Justice Improvement Scotland to allow it to fulfil its functions as noted in chapter 6?

It does seem possible that although CJAs will be abolished, CJIS could deliver its functions more efficiently and effectively by establishing leadership, advisory and developmental posts which cover the same or similar regional areas. The regions could, for instance, exist along current CJA lines or they could be coterminous with other national community justice organisations such as Police Scotland or the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service.

Some further consideration of its multi-agency staffing establishment and of clarifying its relationship with current regulatory, inspection and workforce development bodies, such as the Care Inspectorate and Scottish Social Services Council, would be welcome. There seems to be an opportunity to generate a genuine partnership body and approach at the national and local levels and to rationalise the number of organisations in order to minimise duplication and reduce cost.

**Question 10:** What are your views on the proposed location for the headquarters of Community Justice Improvement Scotland?

The proposed headquarters for CJIS in the central belt cities of either Edinburgh or Glasgow, using existing public sector accommodation if possible, would appear to make some sense as the majority of offenders and prisons are located across this region. However, as the body will need to carry out its functions across all areas and link with other relevant national bodies, it might equally be appropriate for it to be based in Dundee alongside the Care Inspectorate and/or SSSC. This would help to promote synergy between the organisations. Occasional home based working for staff likely to travel to different areas also seems to make sense.

## **Chapter 8**

**Question 11:** Are the professional areas noted in the list at paragraph 114 appropriate to allow the Board of Community Justice Improvement Scotland to fulfil its functions?

The professional areas cover the range of knowledge and expertise required across corporate and financial governance, community justice, health and social care, inspection and scrutiny, the judiciary and business and industry.

## **Chapter 9**

**Question 12:** What are your views on the arrangements for the national Hub for innovation, learning and development?

The proposed practitioner led national hub for innovation, learning and development is at risk of further confusing an already complex landscape and/or duplicating roles and responsibilities of other organisations, such as the Scottish Social Services Council (SSSC), the Institute for Research and Innovation in Social Services, Skills for Justice, the RMA and academia.

In order for CJIS to more efficiently and effectively carry out its proposed functions in this respect, consideration should be given to it commissioning services from the most appropriate provider(s). It would also seem possible for CJIS to facilitate local practitioner networks or extend existing practitioner networks and involve the range of partners from community justice and health and social care.

## **Chapter 10**

**Question 13:** What are your views on the arrangements in support of the transition process?

In partnership with the 3 Local Authority CJSW services in Angus, Dundee and Perth and Kinross, the Tayside CJA has included a focus on transitional arrangements in its draft Area Plan for 2014-17. This will include awareness raising of CPPs new roles and responsibilities, support in identifying local strategic priorities and providing training where necessary.

In Dundee, the Community Safety Partnership has already ensured the SOA and Delivery Plan include a strong multi-agency focus on reducing re-offending. The plan is informed by whole systems approaches towards reducing re-offending, from early

and effective interventions through to diversion from prosecution, community sentences and resettlement from prison.

The proposed new arrangements will help to reinforce and build on this approach, irrespective of whatever structural change takes place locally across the Council and within the Social Work Department and NHS in the interim period. The Community Safety Partnership is fully briefed on the consultation, supports the comments in this response and it or its equivalent will continue to be involved in all key developments.

However, whilst it will be important to drive the change forward, the proposed timescales to implement primary legislation, create a new statutory national body, develop a national multi-agency strategy and performance framework, transfer responsibilities for the local planning and delivery of services from the CJAs to CPPs and develop a new approach towards workforce development appear unrealistic.

## **Chapter 12**

**Question 14:** What impact on equalities do you think the proposals outlined in this paper may have on different sectors of the population?

The proposals should have a positive impact on equalities because they are intended to generate a nationally consistent approach towards reducing re-offending which is based on the desistance model and addresses known risk and need factors in local areas. However, this would be enhanced if the comprehensive performance framework suggested earlier in this response could include a measurable focus on anti-discrimination and equality of opportunity across the protected characteristics. For instance, if local analysis indicates that ethnic groups are more likely to be involved in the criminal justice system in local areas, then CPP plans should include a focus on how this will be addressed.

## **Chapter 13**

**Question 15:** What are your views regarding the impact that the proposals in this paper may have on the important contribution to be made by businesses and the third sector?

The involvement of both the third sector and business in the development and implementation of a national community justice strategy is welcome. The third sector has expertise in supervising and supporting offenders in areas such as employability; mentoring; outward bounds activities designed to improve mental health, self-esteem and social skills; and advocacy. Equally, businesses have key, transferrable skills in leadership and management, they could assist in the re-integration of offenders and they might helpfully promote links with the wider community.

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TOOL**

**Part 1: Description/Consultation**

<b>Is this a Rapid Equality Impact Assessment (RIAT)?</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Is this a Full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA)?</b>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Date of Assessment:</b>	28/5/14	<b>Committee Report Number:</b> 259-2014
<b>Title of document being assessed:</b>	Redesigning the Community Justice System – A Consultation on Proposals	
<b>1. This is a new policy, procedure, strategy or practice being assessed</b> (If yes please check box) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>This is an existing policy, procedure, strategy or practice being assessed?</b> (If yes please check box) <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>2. Please give a brief description of the policy, procedure, strategy or practice being assessed.</b>	A Government consultation on the structure of community justice services and how they are managed, commissioned and delivered to adult offenders	
<b>3. What is the intended outcome of this policy, procedure, strategy or practice?</b>	To consistently deliver high quality services to offenders and protect the public in accordance with the principles of best value.	
<b>4. Please list any existing documents which have been used to inform this Equality and Diversity Impact Assessment.</b>	Audit Scotland Report on Criminal Justice; Commission on Women Offenders Report; Christie Commission.	
<b>5. Has any consultation, involvement or research with protected characteristic communities informed this assessment? If yes please give details.</b>	Scottish Government is consulting widely across Scotland.	
<b>6. Please give details of council officer involvement in this assessment.</b>  (e.g. names of officers consulted, dates of meetings etc)	Glyn Lloyd, Service Manager, Criminal Justice Social Work.	

<p><b>7. Is there a need to collect further evidence or to involve or consult protected characteristics communities on the impact of the proposed policy?</b></p> <p>(Example: if the impact on a community is not known what will you do to gather the information needed and when will you do this?)</p>	<p>No, Scottish Government have this responsibility.</p>
--	--

**Part 2: Protected Characteristics**

**Which protected characteristics communities will be positively or negatively affected by this policy, procedure or strategy?**

**NB Please place an X in the box which best describes the "overall" impact. It is possible for an assessment to identify that a positive policy can have some negative impacts and visa versa. When this is the case please identify both positive and negative impacts in Part 3 of this form.**

**If the impact on a protected characteristic communities are not known please state how you will gather evidence of any potential negative impacts in box Part 1 section 7 above.**

	<b>Positively</b>	<b>Negatively</b>	<b>No Impact</b>	<b>Not Known</b>
Race (including Ethnic Minority Communities)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gender	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gender Reassignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Religion or Belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People with a disability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Age	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Socio-economic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pregnancy & Maternity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please state)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Part 3: Impacts/Monitoring

<p><b>1. Have any positive impacts been identified?</b></p> <p>(We must ensure at this stage that we are not achieving equality for one strand of equality at the expense of another)</p>	<p>Yes, the consultation proposes a new statutory body to provide national leadership and oversight of community justice services, including the development of a new multi-agency strategy and performance framework. The body would work with CPPs, which will have operational accountability and will be required to consult with communities at a local level. The purpose is to ensure services are delivered consistently in accordance with evidence based practice and local needs.</p>
<p><b>2. Have any negative impacts been identified?</b></p> <p>(Based on direct knowledge, published research, community involvement, customer feedback etc. If unsure seek advice from your departmental Equality Champion.)</p>	<p>no</p>
<p><b>3. What action is proposed to overcome any negative impacts?</b></p> <p>(e.g. involving community groups in the development or delivery of the policy or practice, providing information in community languages etc. See Good Practice on DCC equalities web page)</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p><b>4. Is there a justification for continuing with this policy even if it cannot be amended or changed to end or reduce inequality without compromising its intended outcome?</b></p> <p>(If the policy that shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination you must stop and seek legal advice)</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p><b>5. Has a 'Full' Equality Impact Assessment been recommended?</b></p> <p>(If the policy is a major one or is likely to have a major impact on protected characteristics communities a Full Equality Impact Assessment may be required. Seek advice from your departmental Equality lead.)</p>	<p>no</p>

<p><b>6. How will the policy be monitored?</b></p> <p>(How will you know it is doing what it is intended to do? e.g. data collection, customer survey etc.)</p>	<p>The Government requires responses to the consultation by July 2014 and intends to implement a new model from 2016. In the interim, Community Justice Authorities are required to work with CPPs to help facilitate the transition to the new arrangements. It will then be monitored by CJIS, CPPs and any external scrutiny bodies through the new performance framework. An annual report will be submitted to the Government and Committee.</p>
---	---

**Part 4: Contact Information**

<b>Name of Department or Partnership</b>	Social Work Department
--	------------------------

<b>Type of Document</b>	
Human Resource Policy	<input type="checkbox"/>
General Policy	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strategy/Service	<input type="checkbox"/>
Change Papers/Local Procedure	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guidelines and Protocols	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Manager Responsible</b>		<b>Author Responsible</b>	
Name	Jane Martin	Name	Glyn Lloyd
Designation	Head Of Service	Designation	Service Manager
Base	Friarfield House	Base	Friarfield House
Telephone	435001	Telephone	435017
Email	jane.martin@dundeecity.gov.uk	Email	glyn.lloyd@dundeecity.gov.uk

<b>Signature of author of the policy:</b>	Glyn Lloyd	<b>Date:</b> 28.05.14
<b>Signature of Director/Head of Service:</b>	Jennifer G Tocher	<b>Date:</b> 28.05.14
<b>Name of Director/Head of Service:</b>	Jennifer G Tocher	
<b>Date of Next Policy Review:</b>	June 2015	