

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

Policing and Crime Bill - Extending the duties of Crime Disorder Reduction Partnerships/Community Safety Partnerships to include reducing re-offending; and making Probation a 'Responsible Authority'

Part 1 - INITIAL SCREENING

1. Officers & Unit responsible for completing the assessment

PATRICK LINES
Partnerships Strategy Unit, Offender Management Strategy Directorate,
Criminal Justice Group

2. Name of the policy, strategy, function or project:

Extending the duties of Crime Disorder Reduction Partnerships/Community Safety Partnerships (CDRP/CSPs) to include reducing re-offending; and making Probation a 'Responsible Authority'

3. What is the main purpose or aims of the policy, strategy, function or project?

To develop a co-ordinated, improved and more effective partnership approach to reducing re-offending through:

- strengthening the role of the Probation Trust/Area on the CDRP/CSP;
- facilitating closer working between CDRPs, LCJBs and LSPs; and
- helping CDRPs to meet crime reduction targets by reducing offending as well as tackling social exclusion.

This approach will reduce re-offending, improve understanding of the link between crime reduction and reducing re-offending, and improve cost-effectiveness in those areas.

It is important to note that these proposals do not alter existing policy in respect of reducing re-offending. Rather they increase the capacity for an improved, better co-ordinated, approach for those bodies that make up the CDRP. These proposals will also lead to a better synergy between work to reduce crime and reduce re-offending recognising that the majority of crime is committed by those who have previously offended. And to locate offenders and their families within the wider plan of work to tackle social exclusion.

4. Who will benefit from the policy/strategy/function/project?

Beneficiaries will include:

- **CDRPs** - Probation Trusts/Areas have a key role to play at every stage of the Criminal Justice System and bring their knowledge and expertise in working with offenders from diverse groups. They will be able to support the CDRP in its work on the equalities agenda.

- **Probation** – a more effective and higher profile with other ‘responsible authorities’ on the CDRP - comparable with organisations such as police and local authorities – will increase their influence on proceedings and impact on shared targets.
- **Probation Trusts** - as ‘responsible authorities’ - will be in a better position to access other funding pools and resources and to jointly commission specific services for offenders to reduce re-offending.
- **Offenders** – better co-ordinated services that will support them to stop offending;
- **Public** – will ultimately benefit from living in safer communities as a result of a reduction of re-offending.

5. Has the policy/strategy/function or project been explained to those it might affect directly or indirectly?

Work to reduce re-offending based on the offender “pathways” is already well established. In effect these changes will simply bring about improved co-ordination agreement on priorities and a shared focus on both rehabilitation and holding offenders to account. The proposals were published in the Green paper and subject to discussion with a cross-section of probation and CDRP representatives. Positive responses have been received from various CJ agencies although we are yet to receive any from members of the community.

6. Have you consulted on this policy/strategy/function/ project?

Details were published in section 1.39 of the Green Paper (page 21). There was little reported interest in these specific proposals.

7. Please complete the following table and give reasons/comments for where:

- (a) the policy/strategy/function/project could have a positive impact on any of the diverse groups or contributed to promoting equality of opportunity and improving relations between groups;
- (b) the policy/strategy/function/project could have a negative impact on a diverse group, i.e. disadvantage them in any way. **If the impact is high, complete Part 2 - a full equality impact assessment.**

Diverse Group	E.g. of positive impact	E.g. of negative impact	Reason/comments
Men	➤ Focused and better co-ordinated services. Interventions based on need and risk, leading to reduced	➤ Prioritisation of resources for some tiers of offenders which might lead to de-prioritisation of resources in other	The proposals will not substantively change the way in which groups are identified for interventions. A

	re-offending and greater social inclusion.	offenders. The proposals will mean a greater focus on groups with high rates of re-offending and/or causing harm. Though this will vary from area to area it might mean, for example, targeting of young, male, offenders.	strategy to reduce re-offending already exists in each area – this approach will rationalise the process and lead to a co-ordinated, more effective system.
Women	➤ Focused interventions based on need and risk, leading to reduced re-offending and exclusion amongst women, who would also benefit from greater success with the perpetrators of domestic violence. Taking forward the recommendations that follow Baroness Corston's review of women offenders.	➤ Prioritisation of resources unlikely to be comparable to male offenders, based on relative offender population and risk.	Women offenders make up a relatively small proportion of the total offender population. The focus of the strategy (linked as it is to the PSA targets on high volume and serious re-offences) is unlikely to specifically meet all their needs.
Asian or Asian British people	➤ Focused interventions based on need, leading to reduced re-offending	➤ Prioritisation of resources for some tiers of offenders leading to de-prioritisation of resources in other offenders. As above, in some areas it is likely that BME groups will be disproportionately represented in the re-offending offender demographic.	Though BME groups may be disproportionately represented within the offender cohort this policy will not alter that except and insofar as improved access to interventions and programmes should lead to a reduction in that disproportionality. The drive to reduce re-offending will lead to safer and stronger communities.
Black or Black British people	➤ As above	➤ As above	➤ As above
White people (including Irish people)	➤ As above	➤ As above	➤ As above
Chinese	➤ As above	➤ As above	➤ As above

people			
Any other racial/ ethnic group (please specify)	➤ As above	➤ As above	➤ As above
Mixed Race people	➤ As above	➤ As above	➤ As above
Disabled People (please give details as to which group)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Focused interventions based on need, leading to reduced re-offending (positive) ➤ Offenders with mental health needs will benefit from commissioning of mental health services (to be included within the Offender Health strategy) 	➤ Prioritisation of resources for some tiers of offenders leading to de-prioritisation of resources in other offenders.	➤ As above
Gay, lesbian and bisexual people	➤ Focused interventions based on need, leading to reduced re-offending (positive)	➤ Prioritisation of resources for some tiers of offenders leading to de-prioritisation of resources in other offenders (negative)	➤ As above
Transgender people	➤ As above	➤ As above	➤ As above
Older people (50+)	➤ Focused interventions based on need, leading to reduced re-offending (positive)	➤ Older offenders are less likely to re-offend, and are therefore unlikely to be prioritised for resources (negative)	Evidence suggests directing resources at older offenders has limited value, as they are near the end of their offending 'career'. The strategy is unlikely to suggest anything specific targeted only at this group.
Younger people (17 – 25)	➤ Focused interventions based on need, leading to reduced re-offending.	➤ Transition arrangements between the youth and adult systems are not fully aligned, leading to potential disconnect in	Strategic aims related to youth offending (those aged up to 18) will not be covered specifically in this

		interventions and resources provided to young offenders.	strategy, as it will be included within the Youth Crime Action Plan. Whilst alignment will be sought, this could lead to different prioritisations between the youth and adult systems.
Faith groups (please specify)	➤ Opportunity to take increased advantage of the commissioning and partnerships environment to support interventions with offenders to reduce re-offending (positive)	➤ Joint commissioning could mean the involvement of faith groups is not maximised, as other partners are prioritised instead (negative)	Whilst not specifically mentioning faith groups, the role of the third sector (including voluntary and community groups) is emphasised through joint commissioning landscape and the contribution they can make to the services provided to offenders.

8. Please give a brief description of how the policy/strategy/function/project will benefit the diverse groups in the above table, i.e. promotes equality.

The proposals will benefit all the diverse groups mentioned in the above table by promoting policies designed to reduce re-offending and increase access to “pathways” and interventions for all affected groups. The proposals will create an environment in which services are co-ordinated and in which agencies work together to reduce re-offending.

9. What actions could be taken to amend the policy/strategy/function/project proposals to eliminate any minor negative impact?

The proposals will only have a minor negative impact, as decisions about prioritisation of resources (time, people, and money) mean there is likely to be an increased focus in those areas where the biggest gains (in terms of reducing re-offending and crime) can be made. However, alongside these proposals local criminal justice agencies will continue to carry out their specific duties that meet the gap for those specific tiers or sub-groups of offenders that have been de-prioritised.

It is also likely that greater success with the offenders who commit the greater volume of re-offences will free up resources that can then be re-directed to the potentially disadvantaged groups redressing the balance.

10. If there is no evidence that the policy/strategy/function/project promotes equality of opportunity or improves relations between diverse groups, what minor adjustments could be made to achieve this?

Is a full Equality Impact Assessment necessary:

Yes
No

Date completed:

10th October 2008

Signed by Line Manager:

Frances Flaxington

Date approved by Senior Management:

17th October 2008

A copy of this initial screening must be published along with the policy/ strategy/ function/ project outline. A copy must be retained by the Unit/ Department for audit purposes.