

Strategic Commissioning Framework for Community Justice Consultation Guidance and Feedback form

Overview

The Community Justice Strategic Commissioning Framework aims to support local Partnerships to develop effective joint strategic commissioning of community justice services.

Why We Are Consulting

We are consulting to make sure the Framework documents work for Partnerships, partners and stakeholders, and that it can be adopted by the sector to meet the needs of local areas, communities and individuals. With your support, we aim to create a common vision across the sector, guidance that enables partners to implement it and in parallel, priority improvements to system and structure over the next three years. We want to understand any activities partners think are necessary to enable effectiveness to be achieved. Your opinions will help to shape and refine the final versions, which we intend to publish at the end of 2019. Support to deliver on actions will be sought from Scottish Government via development of a business case.

To be able to answer the consultation questions, you will first need to download and read the following:

1. [Model for long term effectiveness in strategic commissioning](#)
2. [An 'Explanatory note', outlining the benefits, audience and use of the Framework](#)
3. [The 'Framework Guidance', outlining the processes and skills for effective delivery](#)
4. Executive Summary (to be uploaded to CJS webpages week commencing 1st July).

The current presentation of the Framework documents is for illustration only – final content will be redesigned and refined to maximise accessibility and value to its users.

If you have any questions, please get in touch – contact details are at the end of this form.

About this consultation

Participation is voluntary, and responses will be kept confidential. They will not be published.

The feedback form is in 5 sections. First we ask about you as a respondent, then about your views on each of the consultation documents, and finally about implementing joint strategic commissioning in community justice.



What Community Justice Scotland will do with your responses:

- ✓ We will collate and analyse responses from partners and share a summary of views with the sector. Comments will be anonymised.
- ✓ With the Scottish Government, we will decide on any changes to draft documents and share these with you.
- ✓ We will develop a business case for action to support partners with implementing joint strategic commissioning in community justice, in terms of structural/system improvements and direct support.

Section 1: Respondent information

1.	Are you responding as an individual, a partner or Partnership?		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Community Justice Partnership	(please state):
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Statutory partner	(please state):
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Non-statutory partner (including third/independent/ other sectors)	(please state): The Wise Group
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	(please state):
2.	Please provide your email address:	hamish _robertson@thewisegroup.co.uk	

Section 2: Model for effective implementation of strategic commissioning

The model for effective implementation of strategic commissioning proposes outcomes that this will achieve over the short, medium and long term.

With your input, we will refine this model to become a sector-wide vision for effectiveness over the short, medium and long term. It is intended to apply to Partnerships and across community justice in Scotland. We will also add actions by partners, once these are agreed.

3.	Please describe your overall thoughts on the model.		
	<i>e.g. How easy is it to understand? How easy will outcomes be to embed? Is it comprehensive?</i>		
	We welcome the creation of a robust, evidence-led model for supporting individuals at all stages of the justice system. This model is a welcome start.		
	There are a number of challenges with data in the sector and the model needs to address this directly. Firstly, there is not a consistent set of data gathered by statutory and non-statutory partners. Secondly, how data is used between partnerships varies. Thirdly, there is no current,		



	<p>comprehensive national baseline. We know from the 2019 CJS Annual Report that local Partnerships struggled to work towards the outcomes, and were in some cases, not gathering the same data – making geographic comparisons hard. The model doesn't provide a solution to this.</p> <p>The model is quite complicated, especially the Guidance document. We query the extent to which individual CJPs will engage with such a large and complex document – especially as it's presented as a "guidance" document.</p> <p>We agree there is a need to establish a set of key outcomes for establishing and supporting the development of strategic commissioning in local community justice partnerships. However, the model is unclear how this commissioning will ensure there is local adoption.</p> <p>It's unclear from the model how implementation will work. It may be more helpful to draw out the activities intended by CJS around commissioning and not attempt to address actions for local partnerships. It's not clear how the model will drive practice at a local level.</p>
4.	Do you agree with the outcomes in the model? Why do you say this?



	<p>We believed this document was going to be the definitive blueprint for strategic commissioning in community justice. However, the output is simply a guidance document – missing the opportunity to drive significant system change across 30 different CJPs. By nature of a guidance document rather than a strict structure/approach, there will not be consistency across 30 CJPs.</p> <p>The outcomes and impact in the model are vague – it talks about “improving” but this is a subjective terminology without any tangible goal in mind. For example, “Prevent and reduce reoffending” – may be better phrased as the number of people per 100,000 incarcerated or who reoffend.</p> <p>Too little change is expected in 10 years. We don’t think the goals for 10-15 years are stretch goals – especially without quantitative measures. A decade a long time to make change – in society we expect too much change in 1 year and not enough in 10, so we invite CJS to be more ambitious.</p> <p>Rather than telling 30 different CJPs what to do – knowing they will have their own local priorities – we believe the model should set out the nationwide goals and then it’s up to local partnerships to align their activities to meet the national objectives. Provided there is a clear framework to operate to, this will ensure the local activities will deliver the national outcomes</p> <p>There are too many outcomes to allow effective engagement from local partners.</p> <p>Not enough thought has been given to maximising economies of scale. Local delivery is important, but we recommend further consideration is given to the parts of the delivery that can be centralised to maximise value for money.</p> <p>Some of the outcomes are outwith the scope of what partners can achieve – for example, “Increased leveraging of resources”, “Increased prevention and earlier intervention”, and “Reduced impact of justice involvement” all require changes in budgeting, judiciary attitudes, government policy etc.</p>
--	---

5.	<p>Are there any gaps in the outcomes described in the model? If so, what are they and why do you feel this is the case?</p> <p>We welcome the desire for “Increased collaboration, coproduction and strengthened partnership working”, yet there is minimal reference in the framework to the role of the Third Sector. Multiple references are made to the collaboration needed, but the sector isn’t given the place it deserves.</p> <p>References to the third sector in the model are rolled up with “Statutory and non-statutory partners, third, independent and private sectors”, but given the value the third sector brings, and how integral it is to delivering services to vulnerable groups and supporting statutory services, we believe the</p>
----	--



	<p>involvement and value of the third sector needs to be called out clearer.</p> <p>In the Community Justice (Scotland) Act there was an aspiration to include the third sector as full partners in the CJPs, yet the third sector is not seen as one of the key partners in this model, which needs addressed.</p> <p>We recommend adding a short term outcome that CJPs are adapted to include third sector representation as full partners.</p> <p>There is no mention of the value for money provided by all partners – statutory and non-statutory alike. We believe services should be assessed and evaluated to ensure they provide value for money – allowing funding to be diverted to services which make the biggest impact.</p> <p>Through the smart justice agenda, there is a desire to move away from custodial sentences, yet there are no outcomes which explicitly cover this. We recommend this is reviewed.</p>
--	---

Questions 6 and 7 are specifically aimed at Community Justice Partnerships:

6.	Are the timescales outlined in the model achievable for your Partnership?
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, no support needed
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, but we would need some support
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, but we would need a lot of support
	<input type="checkbox"/> Not achievable
	If no, please explain your response:

7.	Please list any areas where you feel you will require support with implementing joint strategic commissioning as a Partnership:

8.	<p>Please list below any actions you think will be required, at a local or national level, to ensure effectiveness in joint strategic commissioning within three to five years?</p> <p>Actions might include an ask of a partner, or an offer from you.</p> <p><i>Please include a brief explanation of why you think actions are necessary. Please list <u>in order of importance</u>:</i></p>
	1.Ensure the third sector is represented as a full partner in the Community



	<p>Justice Partnerships</p> <p>2. Standardise data capture and consider centralising analysis</p> <p>3. In order to commission a national model that is delivered locally, there needs to be standardisation in service mapping and delivery. For example, employment programmes in Scotland all follow the Employability Pipeline, which allows organisations to clearly align their services these five phases. We recommend something similar for justice services.</p> <p>4. There is no accurate national picture of baseline data and outcomes measurement. This is a necessary first step to identify needs for commissioning of services and to measure and evidence the success of any such commissioned services.</p> <p><i>(add more actions if necessary)</i></p>
--	---

Section 3: Explanatory note for the Framework, and Executive Summary

9.	Please provide any comments you have on the Explanatory Note and Executive Summary.
	<p>The model does a good job of presenting a clear link in the Framework and Executive Summary to the wider justice strategies and policies.</p> <p>We welcome the references made to involving people with lived experience. We believe that the commissioning model needs to go a step further and involve those with “living experience” – that is, consulting with those currently in the system to get up to date input.</p> <p>The framework is primarily for CJPs – and unless the third sector is represented in the partnerships, then we don’t believe it will create the collaborative, integrated framework and delivery which the strategic commissioning framework is aiming to achieve.</p>

Section 4: The Strategic Commissioning Framework Guidance

10.	Please describe your overall thoughts on the Strategic Commissioning Framework Guidance.
	The framework provides a good starting point for CJPs to consider commissioning. It provides a lot of practical information on managing a



	<p>commissioning process.</p> <p>However, it feels quite confusing as a framework – as such, we think it will be hard to ensure consistency across the 30 CJPs.</p> <p>The framework needs to consider local issues and needs, but recognise that other wider issues like mental health, addictions, housing etc will all have a part to play. We recommend more consideration is given to joint commissioning and by default, use of joint budgets. This hasn't been covered in the commissioning and, although a complex area, a whole systems approach will deliver a better outcome in the long term.</p> <p>In the consultation meeting we attended (hosted by CJVSF), it was clear that the framework isn't something that CJS will enforce to create a national strategy for strategic commissioning in community justice – but publish it as a best practise guide. This dilutes the opportunity to make a significant impact. The result will be 30 different interpretations of the model and its implementation.</p> <p>In the Guidance, we would have liked to see examples of what has worked in strategic commissioning in justice so far. We feel the Public Social Partnerships would have been a good example to include.</p>
--	--

11.	<p>Do you have any comments on Section 1, “What is Strategic Commissioning?”</p> <p>The phrasing and terminology in this document doesn't suggest this is a strategic commissioning framework – it's written more as a set of best practise or options to pick from. For example:</p> <p>“The Guidance outlines tips, tools and principles to support Partnerships with the points above...The next section outlines key principles for good practice.”</p>
-----	---

12.	<p>Do you have any comments on Section 2, “Key Commissioning Activities”?</p> <p>2.2.1 – We welcome the references to people with lived experience in the process of commissioning.</p> <p>2.2.2 – We welcome references to engaging with third sector and recognition of the value it brings. However, this doesn't read like it's a required part of the framework, more like an optional choice if “capacity constraints” allow.</p>
-----	---



13.	<p>Do you have any comments on Section 3, “Key commissioning skills, competencies and roles”?</p>
14.	<p>Do you have any comments on Section 4, “The Commissioning Cycle”?</p> <p>4.1.2 – In order to map services and provide a joined up and easy to navigate pathway for individuals, we suggest there needs to be a standardised “National Offending Reduction and Support” pathway (like the Employability Pipeline) which services are mapped against. Rather than 30 different CJPs each taking their own approach to mapping services, it would have been more valuable for this commissioning framework to give a standardised framework for service mapping.</p> <p>4.1.3 – Assessing the needs of individuals is a large piece of work. Consideration needs given to how effectively and thoroughly CJPs can gather the rich data on the individuals who need services.</p> <p>4.2 – When planning activities, commissioners need to seek value for money in service delivery, and look for economies of scale through larger nationwide programmes. To support this, and deliver long-term funding options, we would like to see an explicit focus on funding from unified budgets in the planning stage.</p> <p>For example, we know from our own evaluations of New Routes Mentoring and Wise Choices that our programmes save money on NHS costs, yet none of our budget comes from health – it’s all from justice.</p> <p>There is also not a strong enough direction given to planning services using a whole system approach. It is alluded to, but not mandated.</p> <p>There is no attention given to the design of nationwide services. Rather than encouraging 30 CJPs to design services for their area, we recommend this strategic commissioning strategy should encourage nationwide services that are adapted for local delivery.</p> <p>Our programme, New Routes Mentoring – a Public Social Partnership – which works with up to 700 males on release from prison each year is a good example. It operates out of 13 prisons is delivered as a partnership of third sector organisations (led by the Wise Group) across Scotland. This ensures the service is the same for a customer anywhere in Scotland, that the same data is collected, and that the outcomes are standardised. This standardisation is augmented by the value of local partners who deliver locally in areas they know best.</p>



	<p>4.2.4 In respect of commissioning / tendering, if this is a long term vision, then more emphasis needs made on multi-year funding of projects, with break clauses where value for money is not achieved. Additionally, no reference is made to Public Social Partnerships (PSPs), which we know through our delivery of New Routes / Shine Women's Mentoring PSPs have resulted in a very successful model for delivery, which offers value for money. Instead, this section seems to encourage tendering as the main option for funding – which creates instability in the third sector. We recommend this section is reviewed.</p>
--	---

15.	<p>Further guidance CJS is developing a Digital Hub to support partners in community justice planning and delivery. It will host resources for partners to use.</p> <p>Please describe below any additional resources/guidance that you think would be helpful to partners as they develop joint strategic commissioning. <i>Include as much detail as possible.</i></p>

Section 5: Using the Strategic Commissioning Framework

16.	<p>Will the Strategic Commissioning Framework help you with developing long term planning, arrangement and improvement of services for people in community justice?</p>				
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">X</td> <td style="width: 40%;">Yes</td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 20%;">No</td> </tr> </table>	X	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
X	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		
	<p><i>Please explain your answer</i></p> <p>The Wise Group is committed to working closely with Community Justice Partnerships to support the development of national, evidence-led services to deliver smart justice in Scotland.</p>				

17.	<p>We may wish to contact you again to discuss your suggestions for joint strategic commissioning and to support development of the business case. Are you content for Community Justice Scotland to contact you again about this work?</p>				
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">X</td> <td style="width: 40%;">Yes</td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 20%;">No</td> </tr> </table>	X	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
X	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		



Please return your completed forms to info@communityjustice.scot and sarah.mccullough@communityjustice.scot by **Friday 30th August 2019.**

Thank you for your comments.

