



The Scottish  
Government  
Riaghaltas na h-Alba

Reducing Reoffending Change  
Fund Evaluation of  
Year 1 – Public Social  
Partnership Development

Crime and Justice



social  
research

**REDUCING REOFFENDING CHANGE FUND  
EVALUATION OF YEAR 1 – PUBLIC SOCIAL  
PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT**

**Ian Clark, Lorraine Simpson and Rob Shipway  
Iconic**

Scottish Government Social Research  
2013  
Reducing Reoffending Change Fund Evaluation of Year 1 –  
Public Social Partnership Development

This report is available on the Scottish Government Social Research website ([www.scotland.gov.uk/socialresearch](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/socialresearch)) only.

**The views expressed in this report are those of the researcher and do not necessarily represent those of the Scottish Government or Scottish Ministers.**

© Crown copyright 2013

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk)

## **Table of Contents**

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	LEAD ORGANISATIONS AND LEADERSHIP	8
3	PARTNERSHIP WORKING	17
4	SERVICE USER INVOLVEMENT	31
5	CO-PRODUCTION	35
6	SUSTAINABILITY	43
7	CONCLUSIONS	52
	APPENDIX 1 – REDUCING REOFFENDING CHANGE FUND ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	57
	APPENDIX 2 – YEAR 1 DEVELOPMENT FUNDING AWARDS	58
	APPENDIX 3 – CONTEXTUAL DOCUMENTS	59
	APPENDIX 4 – LEAD ORGANISATIONS	60
	APPENDIX 5 – DEVELOPMENT FUNDING BREAKDOWN	61
	APPENDIX 6 – MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING PARTNERS AND SIGNATORIES BY ORGANISATIONAL TYPE	62
	APPENDIX 7 - PUBLIC SOCIAL PARTNERSHIPS SURVEY RESULTS	63
	APPENDIX 8 – SERVICE USER INVOLVEMENT	66

# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

## **Introduction**

The Scottish Government commissioned Iconic to evaluate the development of Public Social Partnerships (PSPs) during Year 1 of the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund (RRCF). The research is the first part of a package of work to evaluate the development and delivery of the RRCF, and focuses solely on how organisations awarded Development Funding have used the funding to develop Public Social Partnerships, and what has been achieved in this initial six-month period.

## **Aims and Objectives**

The evaluation addressed the following questions:

- Why did the organisations choose to get involved with a PSP? What did they hope to get out of this model of working?
- What activities did organisations undertake as part of the PSP development? How successful or unsuccessful do they feel these were?
- Do they feel that the PSP model is having a positive, negative or no impact on the quality of the service that has been/is being developed? What is it about the model that is having this impact, if any?
- What impact has the model had on partnership working? What mechanisms have been put in place to ensure an equal working relationship between partners and are these successful?
- What challenges are they facing through the process?
- Do they feel that the service being developed through the PSP model is likely to be sustained after the Change Fund ends. Why or why not?
- Are they achieving what they wanted to from being part of a PSP model? Would they be part of a PSP model again?

## **Methodology**

The evaluation comprised a mixed approach. It incorporated a document review covering Reducing Reoffending Change Fund specific and other contextual information; an e-survey of PSP partners; depth interviews with staff from each PSP lead organisation, a cross section of partners, national stakeholders and individuals from bidders not awarded Year 1 Development Funding or organisations involved in mentoring or reducing reoffending that did not bid for Year 1 Development Funding; and observation of PSP meetings. Research tools for all tasks were agreed in advance with the Study Steering Group.

## **Overall key findings**

### **Lead organisations and leadership**

There was significant variation in the size, scale and experience of the third sector organisations that led the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs.

Lead partners' motivation for applying to the Change Fund focused on the availability of funding to expand or develop services and the opportunity to work in a new collaborative way with the public sector.

The lead organisations undertook a wide range of activities in the development of PSPs and they were generally viewed as successful. Lead partners described their involvement in the PSP process in positive terms, and identified a range of benefits from the experience.

Challenges were also faced by the third sector lead organisations including limited experience, difficulties in assuming the leadership role and issues engaging partners within the timescale. Interviewees identified both advantages and disadvantages of third sector organisations leading PSPs.

### **Partnership working**

Partners were evenly divided between the third and public sectors and generally, interviewees felt the right partners were involved. Public sector partners were predominantly the eight Community Justice Authorities and local authorities. The involvement and the role of key public sector partners - local authorities, Community Justice Authorities, NHS and the Scottish Prison Service – varied significantly between PSPs.

Partnership meetings played a significant part in the PSP development process, the frequency, format, and size of the meetings varied significantly.

Organisations performed a variety of roles as lead, providers, referral, support and strategic partners.

The impact of the PSP model on partnership working was said to be evident in improved relationships, better understanding between partners, the development of trust, and the development of shared values.

Overall there was a sense of equal partnership working although there was a view that this was a challenge in the time available. The main mechanism to ensure equal partnership working was dialogue to address issues. Learning from the experience was also highlighted as an important means of developing equality in the future.

A number of challenges to partnership working were encountered and they involved the limited timescale available to develop PSPs, the competitive nature of the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund, the different approaches of partners, the need for clarity at the outset on some issues, the input of different personnel, and the issues faced in discussing sustainability.

### **Service user involvement**

There was significant involvement of service users in the PSPs using Development Funding in a variety of ways including focus groups, depth interviews and surveys. There were also some innovative approaches including the use of video to capture the views of one hard to reach group.

The third sector led the involvement of service users and public sector partners played an important supporting role in many PSPs. Existing links and an understanding of service users, including hard to reach groups, were identified as key factors in the success of the service user involvement.

Service user involvement mainly consisted of consultation to gather views on existing services and PSP proposals rather than direct engagement in the service design process. PSPs recognised the importance of engagement and most had developed proposals during Year 1 for ongoing engagement.

Service user involvement was viewed as successful as it identified a number of issues and an impact was evident in several PSPs with services redesigned following input from users

### **Co-production**

In the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs co-production primarily focused on third and public organisations working together to design interventions with service users' views fed into the process following consultation.

Two approaches to co-production were identified: refinement of an approach proposed by the lead organisations, and a more fundamental approach to the design of a new service from scratch - feedback on involvement in the latter process was positive. Views on the success of the two approaches varied and precluded conclusions about which was more effective.

The co-production process typically involved a number of tasks involving a wide range of partners to identify gaps and evidence need, consider how schemes linked with existing and developing interventions, and define objectives and outcomes. The process varied between PSPs and some challenges were faced.

The process of co-production was one of the elements of PSP development that partners found most valuable, in terms of learning about services, sharing knowledge and experience and fostering a system of close joint working. The majority of partners felt the proposals were co-designed and the process had had a positive impact on the quality of services developed.

## **Sustainability**

Discussions around sustainability occurred in all PSPs and resulted in written commitments from public sector partners to underwrite services in the future in 13 of the 14 PSPs. The commitments were subject to a number of caveats.

Commitments to underwrite services came mainly from Community Justice Authorities (CJAs) and this was welcomed by partners. The CJAs were largely seen as the most appropriate organisation to provide this commitment in the circumstances.

The limited commitment of some public sector partners that could benefit in the long term from savings resulting from a reduction in reoffending was highlighted by interviewees. Partly this was because some public sector partners had not been invited to join the PSPs and partly it was because funding pressure and the 2014/15 spending review meant that some public partners could not provide written commitments to underwrite services at this time.

Interviewees highlighted challenges during sustainability discussions including engaging all public sector partners, the limited timescale, working across administrative borders, and the prevailing funding and policy environment.

The interviewees were unsure about whether the services developed through the PSP model would be sustained after the Change Fund ends mainly because of the caveats attached to the commitments to underwrite services. Despite this partners welcomed the requirement to consider sustainability at the outset as they felt it would allow them to hold public sector partners to account in the future.

A number of other issues were highlighted by interviewees during discussions about sustainability including mixed views about competitive tendering, concerns about best value, intentions to source additional funding, and the importance of non-financial sustainability.

## **Conclusions**

The 14 organisations awarded Development Funding in Year 1 of the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund used the funding to develop Public Social Partnerships and proposals for mentoring services. The Development

Funding enabled the lead organisations to undertake a range of activities which were generally viewed as successful.

Overall, interviewees felt that strong partnership working occurred during the PSP development process. They also highlighted that co-production and extensive service user consultation had a positive impact on the quality of mentoring services developed. Constructive discussions on sustainability occurred which led to commitments from some public sector partners to underwrite services in the future subject to caveats.

Interviewees highlighted challenges throughout the PSP development process. The limited time for PSP development was felt to be the main issue as it was highlighted as a challenge to partnership working, service user involvement, co-production and sustainability. The challenges had not generally dissuaded interviewees from future involvement in the PSP model.

# 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This evaluation assesses the development of Public Social Partnerships during Year 1 of the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund. The overriding aim of the evaluation is to examine how organisations awarded Development Funding in Year 1 of the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund have used the funding to develop Public Social Partnerships, and to examine what has been achieved in this initial six month period.
- 1.2 The Reducing Reoffending Change Fund is one of three Change Funds created by the Scottish Government to help drive a decisive shift towards preventative spending. It was launched in August 2012 to provide offenders with substantial one-to-one support through evidence-based mentoring schemes, and to promote strong, equal partnership working between third and public sector organisations. Public Social Partnerships were prescribed as the partnership model.

## Public Social Partnerships

„A Public Social Partnership (PSP) involves public and third sector bodies co-designing services or interventions to deliver agreed social outcomes. This approach encourages effective partnership working across sectors, places the third sector at the heart of service design and delivery, and explicitly emphasises outcomes rather than activity“<sup>1</sup>.

- 1.3 PSPs originate from Italy where the public and third sectors have jointly developed, designed and delivered services which are focused on improving outcomes for service users in relation to services that the public sector is seeking to commission. Public sector procurement is at the heart of the concept which consists of three phases: 1) design, 2) piloting and 3) tendering. PSPs therefore provide third sector organisations with a different role in the process of commissioning public services compared to the traditional purchaser and supplier model.
- 1.4 The PSP concept was first piloted in Scotland in 2006. Three PSPs were developed and a review<sup>2</sup> of the pilots identified seven common lessons which the report authors felt had the potential to inform any future roll out of PSPs in Scotland. The lessons were:
  - PSP partners from the public and third sectors must buy-in to shared problem definition and solutions.
  - High level public sector support helped to counter fears about the innovative and riskier approach to public service delivery.

---

<sup>1</sup> Reducing Reoffending Change Fund Year 1 Guidance

<sup>2</sup> „Public Social Partnership in Scotland Lessons Learnt (Forth Sector Development, 2007)

- Culture change is essential and includes entering into partnership as equals, having a clear and shared understanding of the outcomes, sharing information, and being open to a change in funding (investing to save for the public sector and investing to gain for the third sector).
- Scale and scope are important so partners understand the problem, buy-in to it, and design a manageable service, and so the level of investment and resources are proportionate to the value of the services implemented.
- There was a clear need for capacity building and development support for participants within both the public and third sectors.
- Good communication and relationship building within and between the sectors was invaluable in achieving buy-in.
- Time and resources are required as progress was markedly longer than expected, and future projects should consider whether the opportunity merits the allocation of resources required to support it.

1.5 The Scottish Government launched a PSP pilot programme in 2009 involving ten PSPs. These PSPs covered a range of policy areas including one focused on reducing reoffending. A small number of organisations involved in the pilots have also been involved in bids to the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund<sup>3</sup>. The learning from these PSPs informed „A Practical Guide to Forming and Operating Public Social Partnerships“ (Scottish Government, 2011). The Guide includes the following description of a PSP which emphasises that co-design and commissioning are at the heart of the model:

„A strategic partnering arrangement which involves the third sector earlier and more deeply in the design and commissioning of public sector services“.

1.6 More recently, a number of strategic PSPs have been developed across Scotland. Ready for Business<sup>4</sup> is supporting these PSPs as part of the „Developing Markets for Third Sector Providers“ support delivered on behalf of the Scottish Government. Some of the organisations involved in these strategic PSPs have been involved in the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs, including a number of the partners from HMP Low Moss PSP. Drawing on their experience of supporting PSPs to date, Ready for Business has highlighted<sup>5</sup> the key aspects of the PSP model as follows.

**Table 1.1: Ready for Business’ Key Aspects of a PSP**

Key PSP Themes	PSP Triggers	Benefits of a PSP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service Design</li> <li>• Equal Partners</li> <li>• Consortia Building</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• End of a contract</li> <li>• Recognition of existing issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deliver provider market</li> <li>• Cultural change</li> <li>• Iteration through piloting</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> HMP Barlinnie, Theatre Nemo, Falkirk CVS, Falkirk Council, and Aberdeen Council.

<sup>4</sup> A consortium of Ready for Business Procurement LLP (Social Firms Scotland, Community Enterprise in Strathclyde, and Senscot), KPMG, Social Value Lab, and MacRoberts LLP

<sup>5</sup> Ready for Business presentation to the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund bidders in November 2012.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Benefit</li> <li>• Capacity Building</li> <li>• Intermediary Support</li> <li>• Engaging Service Users</li> <li>• Piloting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service review process</li> <li>• Structural changes</li> <li>• New innovations or delivery approaches available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simpler, innovative services</li> <li>• Better outcomes for users</li> <li>• Embedding social values</li> <li>• Funding</li> <li>• Changing public sector focus</li> <li>• Develop capacity of the third sector</li> <li>• Sustainability</li> <li>• Inclusive commissioning</li> <li>• Transparency</li> </ul>
--	--	--

1.7 Based on the above sources, key elements of PSPs can be said to be partnership working, service user involvement, co-production, and sustainability. These four elements are adopted in this evaluation as a framework to assess the development of the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs and the report structure reflects these key features.

### **Public Social Partnerships in the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund**

1.8 The Review of Community Justice Funding Group agreed in early 2012 that PSPs would be the delivery mechanism for the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund. The group has a broad membership<sup>6</sup> demonstrating that many of the key stakeholders from the public and third sectors were involved in the discussions to adopt the PSP model. We understand that a number of delivery mechanisms were considered alongside PSPs. The main drivers for the PSP model were identified by some of those involved as:

- A desire to implement change – in keeping with the Change Fund ethos - which could be assisted by adopting a new model of working.
- Political support for testing new models of delivery in Scotland.
- The national agenda to promote the role of the third sector in the delivery of public services.
- The Christie Commission's recommendations that public services should be built around organisations working collaboratively to address outcomes, and to constantly seek to improve performance, reduce costs and be open, transparent and accountable.
- The attractiveness of the PSP model in terms of building in co-production and sustainability at the outset.

1.9 A unique feature of the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs was that it was prescribed that a third sector organisation must lead the partnerships. The reasons for this appear to be partly pragmatic, as the

---

<sup>6</sup> The Scottish Government Community Justice, Third Sector Division and Analytical Services Divisions, Convention of Scottish Local Authorities, Scottish Prison Service (SPS), Community Justice Authorities, Association of Directors of Social Work (ADSW), the Criminal Justice Voluntary Sector Forum, The Robertson Trust, Inspiring Scotland and the Centre for Justice Innovation.

Third Sector Division has part-funded the pilots, and partly policy-based with the Scottish Government<sup>7</sup> highlighting that:

„The third sector's distinctive attributes of responsiveness and flexibility, innovation, connectivity and community assets and the trust and relationships it can build with offenders gives it an essential and increasing role to play in reducing reoffending“.

## **Reducing Reoffending Change Fund**

1.10 In Year 1 (2012/13) of the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund two strands of funding were available – Development and Delivery Funding. Development Funding up to a maximum of £40,000 per applicant was available to support third sector and public sector organisations to develop a PSP to develop plans for service delivery in Years 2 and 3. Delivery Funding was also available to third sector organisations to support the expansion or enhancement of existing mentoring interventions. For both strands, mentoring was to be targeted at two groups of offenders: prolific male offenders, typically aged up to 25, and women offenders of all ages. The Robertson Trust administered applications for both strands of the Change Fund on behalf of the Scottish Government.

1.11 The Guidance stated that Development Funding was made available in recognition that „the formation of robust, effective partnerships takes time and resource, and preparing a detailed application can place significant demands on organisations“. The funding was intended to cover the costs of a) project workers to assist partnerships to develop their proposals, and b) activities to increase the capacity of the partners to deliver their proposed interventions, such as training staff. The Guidance included the following examples of ways in which project workers could progress PSP development:

- Mapping existing service provision and needs in the partners' areas of operation, to enable proposed mentoring schemes to be positioned strategically for maximum effectiveness.
- Identifying other key partners to potentially involve in the partnership.
- Helping the partnership to set up a steering group.
- Coordinating the involvement of service users in the design of interventions.
- Considering how the proposed mentoring schemes would form robust working links with existing and developing interventions in the area of operation.
- Coordinating engagement with Ready for Business.
- Exploring any potential for sources of additional funding for the interventions, and options for funding the interventions beyond April 2015.

---

<sup>7</sup> „Redesigning the Community Justice System. A Consultation on Proposals“ (Scottish Government, 2012).

- Drafting a Memorandum of Understanding, outlining each partner's responsibilities.
- 1.12 In total 31 applications were received for Year 1 Development Funding by the September 2012 deadline. Bids were assessed by the Decision Making Group<sup>8</sup> against criteria shown in Appendix 1. The Group approved bids from 14 organisations worth a total of £426,000; the awards ranged from £39,991 to £15,000 as shown in Appendix 2. The Robertson Trust provided feedback to the 17 unsuccessful Year 1 bidders via e-mail with more detailed feedback available on request.
- 1.13 All 14 PSPs awarded Development Funding submitted Year 2/3 bids by the January 2013 deadline. In addition another six bids were submitted from PSPs that did not have Year 1 Development Funding although they had all benefitted from Year 1 Delivery Funding. Following an assessment of the bids by the Decision Making Group against criteria shown in Appendix 1, six PSPs were awarded Year 2/3 funding. Five of these PSPs received Year 1 Development Funding.

#### *Support available to Lead Organisations Year 1*

- 1.14 The Scottish Government and The Robertson Trust supported the 14 partnerships awarded Year 1 Development Funding as follows:
- Guidance for Year 1 and Year 2/3 bidders provided a range of information, a web link to Scottish Government guidance on best practice in PSP development and bidding templates.
  - Both the Year 1 and Year 2/3 Guidance highlighted that general advice and support in creating and operating partnerships was available from Ready for Business.
  - Two workshops in November 2012 attended by over 60 organisations, featuring presentations by The Scottish Government, The Robertson Trust and Ready for Business and a question and answer session. At the second workshop it was announced that bidders could call on Ready for Business for support in developing their PSP proposals.
  - The Robertson Trust was available to answer bidders' queries throughout the bidding process and a significant number of enquiries were fielded.

#### **Research Brief**

- 1.15 The Scottish Government commissioned this evaluation to examine how these 14 projects have used the Year 1 Development Funding to develop PSPs, and what has been achieved in this initial six month period. Specifically, the evaluation is intended to address the following questions:

---

<sup>8</sup> The Group consisted of Scottish Government Community Justice Division, Third Sector Unit and Justice Analytical Services, The Robertson Trust, SPS, and ADSW.

- Why did the organisations choose to get involved with a PSP? What did they hope to get out of this model of working?
- What activities did organisations undertake as part of the PSP development? How successful or unsuccessful do they feel these were?
- Do they feel that the PSP model is having a positive, negative or no impact on the quality of the service that has been/is being developed? What is it about the model that is having this impact, if any?
- What impact has the model had on partnership working? What mechanisms have been put in place to ensure an equal working relationship between partners and are these successful?
- What challenges are they facing through the process?
- Do they feel that the service being developed through the PSP model is likely to be sustained after the Change Fund ends. Why or why not?
- Are they achieving what they wanted to from being part of a PSP model? Would they be part of a PSP model again?

1.16 This evaluation does not cover the Delivery Funding activity during Year 1 or the mentoring services to be delivered in Years 2 and 3.

## **Methods**

- 1.17 A mixed methods approach was adopted for this evaluation, as summarised below. Research tools for all tasks were agreed in advance with the Study Steering Group.
- 1.18 A document review was conducted at the outset covering Reducing Reoffending Change Fund specific and other contextual documents. The Reducing Reoffending Change Fund documents included the Guidance, the successful Year 1 bids (in full), the Year 2/3 bids (in part) submitted by the PSPs with Development Funding, and a range of documents supplied directly by some of the PSPs such as the findings of their service user engagement and mapping exercises. The contextual documents are listed shown in Appendix 3.
- 1.19 Depth interviews were undertaken across all 14 PSP lead organisations which involved face-to-face interviews with 28 individuals and 1 telephone interview. The interviews were conducted with 24 staff from the lead organisations who were involved in the PSP development process and 5 interviews with external support brought in with the Development Funding.
- 1.20 An e-survey of PSP partners was distributed to 168 individuals named in the 14 Year 1 or Year 2/3 bids with Development Funding. In total, 61 responses – a response rate of 36% - were received from 31 third sector respondents, 17 local authority respondents, 9 respondents from other public sector organisations and 4 non-specified returns. Responses covered all 14 Year 1 Development Funded PSPs.

- 1.21 Depth interviews were undertaken with 34 individuals from a cross section of partners from across the 14 PSPs to gather partners' views on the PSP development process. The interviewees were drawn from local authorities (16), third sector organisations (14), NHS (1), SPS (1), Police (1) and Alcohol and Drug Partnerships (1).
- 1.22 PSP meetings were observed at the Alternatives, NHS Lothian and The Richmond Fellowship led PSPs.
- 1.23 We conducted depth interviews with 21 individuals from national stakeholders, including the Scottish Government's Community Justice Division and Third Sector Unit, The Robertson Trust, SPS, ADSW, COSLA, Ready for Business, all eight CJAs, and the Scottish Mentoring Network.
- 1.24 Depth interviews were conducted with 16 individuals from bidders not awarded Year 1 Development Funding, or organisations involved in mentoring or reducing reoffending that did not bid for Year 1 Development Funding. These interviews were conducted to gather additional views on the PSP development process.

## **Report Structure**

- 1.25 The remainder of this report presents the findings of the evaluation including the specific study questions. The report is structured around the key elements of a PSP identified above – partnership working, service user involvement, co-production, and sustainability; the prescribed third sector-led PSP approach is also reflected in the report structure. The report is structured as follows:
  - Chapter 2 focuses on the lead organisations and leadership
  - Chapter 3 focuses on partnership working
  - Chapter 4 focuses on service user involvement
  - Chapter 5 focuses on co-production
  - Chapter 6 focuses on sustainability
  - Chapter 7 brings together our conclusion on the RRCF PSP development process and the impact of funding.

## **2 LEAD ORGANISATIONS AND LEADERSHIP**

2.1 A unique feature of the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs was the specification they must be led by third sector organisations. This chapter therefore focuses on the organisations that led the PSPs and the leadership they provided. The chapter starts with an overview of the lead organisations and their leadership responsibilities; it then addresses the following research questions:

- How the projects have used the funding to develop PSPs
- Why did the organisations choose to get involved with a PSP? What did they hope to get out of this model of working?
- Are they achieving what they wanted to from being part of a PSP model? Would they be part of a PSP model again?
- What challenges are they facing through the process?

2.2 This is followed by a summary of partners' views on the advantages and disadvantages of third sector organisations leading PSPs.

### **Summary of key findings**

- There is significant variation in the size, scale and experience of the third sector organisations that led the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs.
- Lead partners' motivation for applying to the Change Fund focused on the availability of funding to expand or develop services and the opportunity to work in a new collaborative way with the public sector.
- The lead organisations undertook a wide range of activities in the development of PSPs and the activities were generally viewed as successful.
- Lead partners described their involvement in the PSP process in positive terms, and identified a range of benefits from the experience.
- Challenges were faced by the third sector lead organisations including limited experience, difficulties in assuming the leadership role and issues engaging partners within the timescale.
- Interviewees identified both advantages and disadvantages of third sector organisations leading PSPs.

### **Overview of PSP leadership role and summary of the lead partners**

2.3 The Year 2/3 Guidance specified that the lead partner in all Reducing Reoffending Change Fund bids should be a third sector organisation with the capacity and experience to manage the proposed service. The Guidance also emphasised that the third sector should be at the heart of service design and delivery.

2.4 Appendix 4 provides an overview of the 14 third sector organisations that led the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs. All of the lead

partners were medium or large third sector providers; none were small<sup>9</sup> organisations. The scale of their service provision varied - five operated nationally and the remainder typically provided services within one or two local authority areas. There were differences in each organisation's experience, including the extent to which lead partners had previously worked within the justice sector and their experience of delivering services to reduce reoffending. Eight of the lead organisations had experience of PSPs prior to their involvement in the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund, which mainly involved participation in the HMP Low Moss PSP.

- 2.5 The experience of lead partners was discussed in interviews. In PSPs where the lead organisations had direct experience of working in criminal justice, they were more likely to have pre-existing relationships with partner agencies to build on, which was seen as an aid to development of the PSP. Some interviewees felt that those lead partners with a history of PSP working were in a strong position due to a clear understanding of what the partnership needed to achieve within the development period. A minority of interviewees, however, suggested that there was a risk that these partners came with preconceived models of working - for example, strong ideas about the number of partners that should be involved in design - that were not necessarily appropriate for this round of PSP development. The organisations involved in HMP Low Moss PSP consulted during this evaluation have been very positive about the experience which they felt had helped in the RRCF PSP development process.
- 2.6 Partners involved in more than one PSP were able to compare differences in lead partners' levels of skill and experience. Some highlighted that larger third sector organisations had an advantage in terms of experience of high-level cross sector working, being able to draw on resources and administrative support, and having more time to devote to PSPs' development.

### **How the projects used the funding to develop PSPs**

- 2.7 Appendix 5 summarises how lead organisations proposed to use the Development Funding. It shows that approximately two thirds of the funding was proposed for staff costs (68%), with other proposed expenditure including lead partner costs (15%), consultants (6%) and service user involvement (4%).
- 2.8 Interviews with the lead organisation highlighted that their staff committed a significant amount of time and energy to the PSP development process. In the majority of PSPs, senior staff from the

---

<sup>9</sup> Small is defined for the purposes of this report as 5 or less paid staff or income of £100,000 or less. Medium lead partners are organisations which have more paid staff or higher income than this, but only operate within a limited number of local authority areas (usually one area). Large lead partners are organisations that operate nationally.

lead organisation – such as Chief Executives and Directors of Operations - took a hands-on role in PSP development. In part this was linked to the impact that the proposed PSP service would have on the organisation, for example where it represented a significant addition to their services or a strategic shift in direction for their organisation. In the medium sized third sector organisations, input from senior staff was also linked to the organisations' structure where they did not generally have alternatives such as development staff. In some lead organisations, including some where the proposals were a relatively small part of their overall services, senior staff were involved but to a lesser extent and day-to-day work was undertaken by other members of staff. Interviewees reported that the presence of senior staff in lead partners sent clear signals that the PSP development was a strategic priority and this helped to foster buy in both internally within organisations and externally across partners. There were also variations in the number of staff involved in lead partners' development work. Larger organisations often had a bigger team dedicated to the PSP to allow them to share the workload and the learning.

- 2.9 In some cases partners viewed the Development Funding as a collective PSP resource, and described being asked for consent and/or views on how it was to be spent. In others areas there was some - albeit limited - criticism of the Development Funding as partners were not aware of how it had been used, suggesting that lead partners controlled the funds.
- 2.10 The majority of interviewees - including all bar one of the lead organisations - felt the Development Funding was very important to the PSP development process. The main benefit highlighted was that the funding provided internal and external staff time which was required for bid development for years 2 and 3. Several lead organisations stated that they would not have been able to develop their bid in the way they did without the Development Funding. The PSP that did not view the Development Funding as important stated that they would have bid without it.
- 2.11 There were mixed views about the signals that Development Funding for Year 1 sent to stakeholders. Positive feedback included the perception that it gave the RRCF credibility, signalling that an extensive amount of work was required during the development process. These interviewees suggested the resource differentiated the Fund from other initiatives in that it signalled both the process (development) and the final output (application) were valuable. On the other hand, a small number of interviewees suggested the resource attracted opportunistic bidders to the process.
- 2.12 Seven PSPs used external consultants. Partners within these PSPs explained that their consultants might have enhanced partnership working because, when treated as a collective PSP resource, they reinforced the feeling of equality among partners. There was also a

view that external consultants increased capacity, brought objectivity to the process or significant experience and expertise.

- 2.13 Interviews with a sample of organisations that were unsuccessful in their initial bids for development funding highlighted that they had also committed a significant amount of time to the bidding process. These organisations were understandably disappointed with the outcome and some questioned the reasons given for rejection but accepted the decisions. One of the unsuccessful Year 1 Development Fund bidders went on to prepare and submit a Year 2/3 application, committing a significant amount of time to that bid (which was also unsuccessful). Despite this they highlighted positives from the process in the form of new and/or improved relationships and the design of a useful service, for which they hoped to identify alternative sources of funding. Other unsuccessful Year 1 bidders said they did not feel able to progress their PSP without the financial resource, with one taking the initial rejection as a signal that they were not appropriate for the Fund.

### **What activities did organisations undertake as part of the PSP development?**

- 2.14 Lead partners described a range of activities involved in PSP development, which aligned with the way that funds were used as summarised above. The tasks most frequently mentioned were:
- to create and implement a plan for PSP development
  - appoint existing/recruit new staff and/or consultants to undertake PSP development work
  - identify and engage PSP partners and wider stakeholders
  - undertake mapping activities
  - facilitate and input into the co-production of service design
  - consult with service users
  - produce the Year 2 & 3 funding application
  - access support and guidance as necessary
  - project manage the PSP development process.
- 2.15 Interviews established that overall the activities were positively evaluated by partners and were generally viewed as successful. The PSP survey (see Appendix 7) supports these findings as it found a significant majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that:
- A range of activities took place as part of PSP development (88% of respondents).
  - The activities were well attended and relevant (77%).
  - The activities were successful and boosted partnership development (71%).

### **Why did the organisations choose to get involved with a PSP? What did they hope to get out of this model of working?**

- 2.16 The main motivation for lead partners' involvement in PSPs was the opportunity to access funding to develop or expand a service that fitted the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund criteria. In the majority of cases, the provision of services to reduce reoffending was already core business for the lead organisations, including a number with mentoring services, and where this was not the case mentoring/reducing reoffending were areas the lead organisations had a strategic rationale for developing.
- 2.17 Some interviewees also suggested that the process offered a means of engaging partners in service design and securing support for the project that was developed. For example, one PSP lead partner had already begun working on the extension of an existing mentoring service to other areas of Scotland and they viewed the Change Fund as an opportunity to engage wider partners more closely in the expansion process and a funding source that could cover the cost of development and, potentially, the delivery stage.
- 2.18 Although a secondary factor, some lead organisations - and other partners - highlighted that the opportunity to work in a PSP appealed to them. These interviewees welcomed the opportunity to work in a new, collaborative way with partners and they hoped the PSP development process would result in closer working relations between the third and public sectors.
- 2.19 Five of the lead partners did not initiate their PSPs' development as it was first identified by a public sector partner who then sought a third sector organisation to work with. This was most prominent in the development of the national women offenders PSP which was initiated by CJAs following the findings of the Commission on Women Offenders. The CJA Chief Officers' agreed they would support a national women offenders mentoring service and they identified a national third sector organisation to develop a PSP focusing on this target group.

**Are they achieving what they wanted to from being part of a PSP model?  
Would they be part of a PSP model again?**

- 2.20 A significant majority of lead organisations – and other partners - described their involvement in the PSP process in positive terms. Most linked achieving what they wanted to from the PSP model directly to their success or otherwise in securing Year 2/3 funding above any other benefits.
- 2.21 Outwith the desired funding outcome, the majority of lead organisations were of the opinion that the PSP development process had been beneficial and they had achieved something tangible from it. The benefits highlighted included an opportunity to engage new and existing partners, build closer working relationships through collaborative working and secure cross-sector support for the project that was developed. A small number of lead organisations also

highlighted that they had increased their profile and they saw this as a positive aspect that could be beneficial in the future.

- 2.22 Some lead organisations highlighted that their lead role had put them in a strong position to steer the PSP's development, including the ability to determine how resources should be used and discretion over which partners to approach in the initial stages of PSP development. A small number of lead partners said this was empowering, and on that basis they would seek opportunities to join other PSPs in future. For example, one lead partner explained that previously they would not have considered or felt able to ask a public sector partner to get involved in design, provide support for a funding application or supply data that would evidence its need. This organisation suggested that co-designed services are strong, credible and more likely to complement local strategies. They felt that co-designed funding applications are much more likely to be successful, and they planned to work with public sector partners on bids much more often in future.
- 2.23 For the above reasons, lead organisations – and other partners - stated that they would, generally speaking, be part of a PSP again, despite the challenges faced.

### **What challenges are they facing through the process?**

- 2.24 The lead organisation identified a number of challenges they have faced through the PSP development process including:
- **Timescale** - The majority of lead organisations suggested that the timescale for PSP development was a significant challenge which impacted on the scope of proposals with some commenting that there was only enough time to develop plans with known partners, in areas they already operated in.
  - **Leadership** - Two medium sized third sector organisations identified initial challenges in assuming the leadership role within PSPs. Their examples include a lack of confidence, difficulties in co-ordinating meetings across a range of partners, and finding it challenging to direct public sector staff who formerly had a role in commissioning their services.
  - **Engaging partners** – some lead organisations described challenges engaging partners where they had preconceived ideas about the lead organisation's levels of professionalism and misunderstandings about services they offer. A small number of interviewees from the lead organisations said their views were not taken seriously because the public sector viewed them as less experienced and less professional.
  - **Understanding of PSPs** - some leads identified a challenge at the outset in terms of their understanding of what a PSP was, and one suggested their unfamiliarity with the model initially dissuaded them from bidding. The majority of lead organisations however felt that the Guidance and support was sufficient for understanding of what was required.
  - **Experience of the justice system** – most lead organisations had significant experience of the justice system, however where they did not,

challenges were faced, particularly at the outset. For example, one lead partner reported that at the outset, they assumed the CJA Chief Officer would co-ordinate with the relevant CJSWs, and when this was not done a CJSW representative described annoyance at this oversight and frictions in the initial stages. The opposite assumption was made in another PSP - their lead assumed that CJSW colleagues would confer with the CJA Chief Officer, only learning that this was not the case quite late in the partnership's development.

### **The advantages and disadvantages of third sector leads**

2.25 Third sector leadership of the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs was prescribed by the Decision Making Group at the outset. This distinguished the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs from other PSPs in Scotland which have not prescribed which sector lead organisations should be from. Several interviewees from both third and public sector organisations questioned the rationale for having a third sector organisation as the lead. They suggested that the PSP development process should include identifying which organisation is best placed to fulfil the leadership role, irrespective of their sector. This final section sets out interviewees' views on the advantages or disadvantages of third sector leads.

#### **Advantages**

- 2.26 A number of public sector partners described experiencing a positive change in their views as a result of witnessing leadership from a third sector organisation. This was mainly because the process allowed them to learn about others' services and revisit preconceptions. They described learning about cultural differences in ways of working, sharing information and managing decision-making. For example, one partner explained that they had previously assumed that third sector organisations were small-scale, they realised this was assumption was wrong when they learned about the full extent of the lead partner's services and undertook the mapping exercise of other services during the PSP development.
- 2.27 A small number of public sector partners suggested that the third sector was in a better strategic position to develop national programmes than public sector partners, because bodies such as local authorities or health boards would find it more challenging to establish a national programme that had support from each local area. Some interviewees also believed that the public sector is unable to work as quickly as the third sector, which would have hampered the development of national bids within the timescale available for PSP development.
- 2.28 Some interviewees were of the opinion that the third sector was likely to innovative, flexible, and have closer relationships with service users than the public sector. Many third sector partners suggested that the sector has these attributes, describing their organisations as better placed to lead PSPs as a result. However, many public sector partners

suggested that those qualities are not exclusive to third sector and that their staff are similarly innovative, adept at engaging with clients and designing services.

## **Disadvantages**

- 2.29 Interviews with third sector organisations involved in mentoring and/or reducing reoffending that did not apply to the RRCF highlighted that some smaller third sector organisations self-excluded from bidding, feeling that the development process would be too resource intensive, even with the possible support of Development Funding. Some of the smaller third sector organisations that applied for development funding but were unsuccessful also felt they were disadvantaged by size.
- 2.30 A minority of partners interpreted the specification that third sector organisations should lead PSPs as a signal that public sector partners were to take a reactive role in the formation of PSPs. For example, one public sector partner suggested that it was not their sector's role to initiate applications and they were surprised to learn that counterparts in other areas had done so. This interviewee felt that an open platform, or clearer guidance about who could initiate bids, would have resulted in greater input from public sector partners, and resulted in applications that were potentially more aligned with local justice strategies. Other interviewees suggested a more central role for the public sector would also have helped some PSPs to capitalise on the public sector resources and connections with relevant services.
- 2.31 A minority of third sector leads suggested that public sector partners are able to work faster than third sector colleagues because they have equipment such as smart phones which allow them to respond to emails quickly. There were however other lead organisations with equivalent access to technology as their public sector partners.
- 2.32 Interviewees also identified disadvantages which were connected with the size of the third sector lead rather than their third sector status. These issues were:
- Some interviewees felt that the predominance of major national third sector organisations as lead organisations – and partners - undermined the change element of the RRCF, suggesting that they were likely to use the funds to continue or adapt existing services rather than develop new approaches. These interviewees suggested that smaller third sector organisations are more likely to be innovative, and therefore well placed to develop approaches which represent significant change in practice or service delivery.
  - There were some concerns that the success of PSPs led by larger organisations in Year 1 might result in smaller organisations becoming excluded from criminal justice provision. A number of partners and potential partners said they believed the large third sector lead organisations would absorb most of the delivery funding in years 2 and 3.

- There was a view among some interviewees that smaller third sector organisations were disadvantaged in their ability to engage partners compared to large third sector organisations that had a higher profile which encouraged partners' confidence and willingness to work with them.

### **3 PARTNERSHIP WORKING**

3.1 Partnership working is a key feature of the PSP model. This chapter assesses what impact the PSP model has had on partnership working, what mechanisms have been put in place to ensure an equal working relationship between partners and whether these have been successful, and the challenges to partnership working. The chapter starts with a brief summary of the partnerships covering their membership, meetings and structures, and partner roles. Finally, the role of key public sector partners is discussed given the importance of engaging the public sector in partnership working.

3.2 The key findings are:

- Partners were evenly divided between the third and public sectors and generally, interviewees felt the right partners were involved. Public sector partners were predominantly the eight Community Justice Authorities and local authorities. The involvement and the role of key public sector partners - local authorities, Community Justice Authorities, NHS and the Scottish Prison Service – varied significantly between PSPs.
- Partnership meetings played a significant part in the PSP development process, the frequency, format, and size of the meetings varied significantly.
- Organisations have fulfilled a variety of roles as lead, providers, referral, support and strategic partners.
- The impact of the PSP model on partnership working was said to be evident in improved relationships, better understanding between partners, the development of trust, and the development of shared values.
- Overall there was a sense of equal partnership working. The main mechanism to ensure equal partnership working was dialogue to address issues. Learning from the experience was also highlighted as an important means of developing equality in the future.
- A number of challenges to partnership working have been encountered and they involved the limited timescale available to develop PSPs, the competitive nature of the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund, the different approaches of partners, a perceived lack of clarity at the outset on some issues, the input of different personnel, and the issues faced in discussing sustainability.

#### **The Partnerships**

##### **Partnership Membership**

3.3 The PSP survey found that a significant majority of respondents (84%) agreed that the right partners were on the PSP (see Appendix 7). In total the 14 PSPs involved 150 partners<sup>10</sup> and Appendix 6 shows that

---

<sup>10</sup> Partners identified in the Memorandum of Understandings (MoU). Includes one PSP that submitted six MoUs, and for the purposes of this analysis the six MoUs are counted as one

membership is almost equally divided between the third (47%) and public (53%) sectors. Within the third sector, there were slightly more partners from national organisations (39) than regional/local organisations (31). Only one MoU included service users as a partner.

- 3.4 The public sector's involvement in the PSPs varied by organisational type. The CJAs were listed as partners in all 14 PSPs and local authorities were listed as partners in 12 PSPs, thereby demonstrating a strong commitment to the PSPs, at least on paper. Other public sector organisations have been involved in fewer PSPs - SPS and the Police were listed as partners in 4 PSPs, ADPs in 3 PSPs, and the NHS in 2 PSPs. In part this was a result of the PSPs' focus, for example, whether they were focused on offenders leaving prison or serving community sentences.
- 3.5 Not all 150 partners signed up to the acceptance section<sup>11</sup> of the MoUs. Appendix 6 also shows that 111 individuals were named as signatories and they were divided evenly between the third (50%) and public (50%) sectors. Within the public sector, most signatories were from local authorities and CJAs.
- 3.6 Interviews established that PSP membership was driven by a number of factors. The lead organisations highlighted that they invited many of the partners to join the PSP bid on the basis of existing relationships that pre-dated the Change Fund. Lead organisations reported that good working relationships were an important consideration because they were comfortable working with these partners, could trust them, and in some cases felt the timescale meant there was limited time to engage new partners. In most cases the lead organisation and their invited partners formed the core of the PSPs and the lead organisations emphasised that this helped the PSP develop their proposals in the time available.
- 3.7 Some PSPs did seek to engage new partners. This was mainly driven by the lead organisation's own efforts to broaden the partnership by bringing in potential delivery partners or referrers of service users, as well as expertise on justice and mentoring. Some lead organisations highlighted that CJAs and The Robertson Trust – on behalf of the Decision Making Group - signposted some organisations to them as potential partners. The reaction to this was mixed with a small number feeling uncomfortable and suggesting it was unwelcome as it was viewed as outside interference in the Partnership. Overall, the involvement of new partners was seen as a positive aspect of the PSP

---

overarching MoU and individuals named in more than one MoU are counted only once. The 150 total contains both individuals and organisations depending on the information contained in the MoUs.

<sup>11</sup> All the MoUs contained an acceptance clause which read „we the undersigned, as authorised signatories of the Parties to the PSP, have read and accepted the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding between the identified Provider(s) and the Public Sector Partners and accept these“.

development process by lead organisations and partners as it brought new ideas and enthusiasm to discussions and, in some cases, challenged the views of the lead organisations and their existing partners.

- 3.8 Two lead organisations used questionnaires to gather information on partners and potential partners' experience of mentoring, service delivery and links with other organisations. These organisations viewed this as a useful exercise which aided the PSP development process as they had a clear understanding of partners' experiences and capabilities.
- 3.9 The vast majority of the individuals listed as signatories had signed the MoU. The majority of missing signatures appeared in one particular MoU and interviews with two of the organisations highlighted that their involvement and support for the PSP was limited. Although this was an isolated incident it demonstrates challenges around partnership working existed behind what was presented in the MoUs.
- 3.10 Overall the make-up of proposed PSPs did not change significantly from Year 1 bids to Year 2/3 bids. A small number of organisations involved in early discussions around Year 1 bids were not subsequently been part of the Year 2/3 bids. The main reason identified by some of these organisations, was a looser fit between their particular skills or experience and the proposed PSP as the finer details of the PSP developed.

### **Partnership meetings and structures**

- 3.11 One of the suggested uses of the Development Funding was the establishment of steering groups to guide the partnerships.
- 3.12 During Year 1 all bidders held a series of partner meetings to progress their proposals. The format, frequency, and size of the meetings varied significantly by PSP. There was a mix of formal minuted meetings and less formal meetings, frequencies varied from every two weeks to every six to eight weeks, and the size of meetings varied from less than five to approximately 20 attendees. In general, the more formal meetings involving all partners were in essence the Governance Groups and the less formal, non-minuted meetings tended to be core working groups. In addition, there were numerous one-to-one meetings in all PSPs which tended to focus on detailed elements of the proposed service.
- 3.13 These partner meetings were the mainstay of the PSP development process at which discussions took place on a wide range of issues – existing services, target groups and need, service gaps and opportunities, service user involvement, service proposals, sustainability, partnership structures, and bid writing. All partners including the lead organisations reported that these meetings were an essential part of the PSP development process that gave partners

opportunities to discuss the key issues. The PSP survey found these meetings were felt to be open and encouraged dialogue (88%). Interviewees in all PSPs stated that the meetings were constructive and led to impacts such as improved or new relationships between partners, which was highlighted by a number of interviewees as one of the most positive aspects of the PSP development process. The meetings also resulted in tangible outputs such as existing service mapping, needs analysis, and draft service proposals which were an integral part of the bids. Many interviewees also highlighted that the meetings were challenging at times and the challenges to partnership working are discussed later in this chapter.

- 3.14 The PSP survey established that there was agreement that governance was strong and accountable (67%) although the strength of agreement was lower than a number of other questions in the survey (see Appendix 7). Some of the interviewees felt that governance was a challenge partly because of the necessity for a strong lead to ensure the tight bid deadline was met. The survey also found that there was agreement that PSPs met regularly to a firm agenda (75%) and information was shared among partners (83%). The existence of less formal meetings was reflected in the lower level of agreement in the survey that meetings were minuted (68%).
- 3.15 A demonstration of the strength of partnership work was the level of agreement that the partnership had a clear vision (83%), partners were involved in developing the vision (80%), and partners understand the purpose of the partnership (85%). The interviewees generally supported this view, although there was a view expressed by some partners that the vision was developed by the lead organisation and partners had less input than the survey suggests.
- 3.16 During Year 1 partners discussed the form and responsibilities of the partnership structures proposed for Years 2 and 3. Interviewees highlighted that these discussions were instigated by the lead organisation and varied across the 14 PSPs. Some lead organisations viewed developing the structures as an important part of the overall PSP development process that helped embed ownership during the bidding stage, whereas others viewed partnership structures as less important at that stage of the process. The resultant proposals for partnership structures were outlined in all 14 MoUs. The firmness of these proposals varied from those with individual named members and specified frequencies, to those where the responsibilities of the Governance Group was not defined. Three types of partnership structure were proposed:
- Single tier structures – proposed in seven PSPs adopting the Governance Group model included in the Year 2/3 MoU template. The seven PSP were all sub-national bids led mainly by medium sized third sector organisations.

- Two tier structures - proposed in four PSPs where strategic and operational groups would be developed; two of the PSPs were national and two were regional.
- Locality based structures - proposed in three PSPs that covered more than one administrative area where local steering groups would operate beneath an overarching Governance Group.

3.17 Analysis of the MoUs highlighted that the Governance Groups” proposed responsibilities included:

- Overseeing and guiding the PSP and service delivery.
- Ensuring the services work to the intended outcomes.
- Scrutinising the use of resources.
- Holding partners accountable to ensure their responsibilities are fulfilled.
- Sharing of best practice where local PSP steering groups exist.
- Highlighting local and national issues which may impact on the PSP.
- Engaging other stakeholders.
- Disseminating learning from the services and the PSP.

### **Partner roles**

3.18 The PSP survey established that there was broad agreement that PSPs had set out clear roles and responsibilities for partners (81%), and the roles built on individual partner strengths (77%). Interviews support these findings although there was a view that roles and responsibilities were less clear at the outset.

3.19 PSP partners had various roles within the PSP which are summarised below:

- **Lead** - The lead organisation”s role was covered in detail in the previous chapter.
- **Providers** - Many of the third sector organisations were primarily involved in the PSP because they were the proposed service providers that will deliver support directly to service users. Their involvement was said to be important in bringing expertise to the service design process and in most cases they had an existing relationship with the lead organisation.
- **Referral** – Some of the partners had been involved in the PSP as they would be the main referral agencies for service users and their involvement has brought an understanding of the criminal justice system which has informed service design. The referral partners tend to be public sector organisations although some are third sector organisations.
- **Support** – A small number of partners were not directly involved in the provision of services or referral of service users but provided complementary or onward referral services.
- **Strategic** – Public sector partners including the CJAs, ADPs and local authorities had a strategic role in the PSP linking it to the wider criminal justice system; they also had a potential future commissioning role.

3.20 The roles described above were not in all cases mutually exclusive.

## **Impact of the model on partnership working**

- 3.21 The fieldwork established that the PSP model was felt to have had an impact on partnership working in terms of improved relationships, better understanding between partners, the development of trust, and the development of shared values.
- 3.22 The PSP model relies on partners working together to jointly define, design and ultimately, deliver services. A number of partners involved in the PSPs emphasised that the intensity of the joint working and the collaborative approach had resulted in a very positive impact on the nature of their relationship with other partners. For some this has been the strengthening of existing relationships whereas for others this has been the establishment of new positive relationships. Significantly this included improved relationships across the public and third sectors and new relationships with organisations including local authorities and CJAs. The interviewees felt that this impact would have benefits for partnership working in the future both within the PSPs and in joint working on other initiatives.
- 3.23 Numerous partners reported that their involvement in the PSPs had led to a greater understanding of each others' approach, services, and challenges. Interviewees identified this as a legacy of their involvement in the process regardless of the ultimate success of their PSP bids. For example, one lead partner appointed their development worker from a PSP partner's staff team and they felt this brought the two organisations closer together and gave their partner a greater feeling of ownership in the development process.
- 3.24 The PSP survey found agreement that there was trust among partners (73%). The interviews confirmed that, generally speaking, there was a good degree of trust between lead organisations and partners and vice versa and that the trust extended across sectors. The lessons from previous PSPs highlighted in Chapter 1 included the importance of trust. Interviewees felt that the trust provided a solid basis for the further development of the RRCF PSPs as well as other partnership working outwith the PSP.
- 3.25 All of the PSPs adopted the partnership working values included in the MoU template:
- Equality.
  - Mutual respect and trust.
  - Open and transparent communications.
  - Co-operation and consultation.
  - A commitment to being positive and constructive.
  - A willingness to work with and learn from others.
  - A shared commitment to providing excellent services to the community.
  - A desire to make the best use of resources.

3.26 The wide ranging fieldwork with the lead organisations and partners shows that generally speaking these values have been evident during Year 1 and there is no reason to believe at this stage that they should not be continued in the future.

### **Equal partnership working between partners and mechanisms put in place to ensure equal working relationships**

3.27 The PSP survey found that a majority of respondents agreed that partners were treated equally (64%) and support was available to maintain or achieve equality (61%). Although a majority of respondents agreed with both statements the strength of the agreement was less than other questions in the survey highlighting that not all partners felt there was equality within the PSP or support to achieve it. 14% of respondents strongly disagreed that partners were treated equally which was one of the highest levels of disagreement recorded by the survey. The interviews found that some partner organisations felt the PSPs were dominated by the lead organisations or other key stakeholders and they felt the process was not, at this stage, equitable.

3.28 Some partners felt the inequality was part of a natural process of partnership working where some partners will be more prominent than others. There was also a view that the timescales did not lend themselves to full equality at this stage.

3.29 Lead organisations and partners interviewed identified decision making as a key part of partnership working which informed their views on equality. Two broad approaches to decision making were identified. The most common approach was where the lead organisations encouraged a collegiate approach to decision-making and service design which promoted equality. The second approach was a more directive leadership style, where partners were expected to broadly support the decisions made by lead organisations. Partners generally felt the approach taken by lead partners was a reflection of the personalities involved, rather than a specific strategy.

3.30 Interviews established that the main approach to ensure equal partnership working was to talk through problems and reach compromises that all partners were happy with. Although this was viewed as a simple approach, interviewees felt it was appropriate and generally successful. In one PSP, the lead organisation felt there were fundamental differences in views that could not be overcome within the timescale for partnership development, despite efforts to communicate and reach agreement with partners. In this PSP the lead partner hoped that the issues would be resolved if their bid was successful.

3.31 Funding was also used in a small number of PSPs to aid equality. Two PSPs reimbursed all third sector partners for their time, arguing that this was fair and reinforced feelings of equality within partnerships. Another lead organisation offered to reimburse third sector partners but they declined.

- 3.32 Lead partners in the PSPs initiated by public sector organisations suggested that they had very strong support and buy in from the start, and felt this equality in commitment was a significant strength for their PSP's development. The lessons from previous PSPs highlighted in Chapter 1, and interviews with HMP Low Moss PSP partners, emphasised the benefits of the involvement of key public sector partners from the outset.
- 3.33 A number of interviewees highlighted that the PSPs were a new experience for many of those involved and they emphasised the importance to partnership working of learning from the experience as the PSP progressed. The survey found that a majority of respondents agreed that the PSPs had processes in place to capture learning (70%) and had identified barriers and enablers to delivery (76%). There was also agreement that PSPs had been modified through learning (63%) although the strength of agreement was not as high. Interviewees confirmed that there was some capture and application of learning, although this was limited, being influenced in their opinion by the timescales and the lead organisations' drive to submit bids by the January deadline.

### **Challenges to partnership working**

- 3.34 Interviewees identified the following challenges to partnership working during Year 1 of the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund.

#### **Timescale**

- 3.35 The timescale was the main challenge to partnership working identified by lead organisations and partners. Bidders had approximately three months from the award of Year 1 Development Funding to the submission of their Year 2/3 bids and generally interviewees felt this was a major challenge.
- 3.36 As mentioned above, a number of lead organisations highlighted that the limited time restricted the range of partners involved in the PSP and as a result they relied on organisations they had an existing relationship with. These interviewees felt that with more time there would have been greater opportunity to engage new partners including a wider range of public sector partners such as the police and the NHS. It was felt that this would have linked the PSP to more mainstream services and brought in more partners who may benefit in the long run from a reduction in reoffending. There was however also a view among some interviewees that the limited timescale had a positive effect in focusing minds and a longer timescale might not have led to different outcomes.
- 3.37 A number of lead organisations and other partners interviewed during this evaluation felt the limited time restricted the depth of discussions around services. Partners generally felt they had an opportunity to discuss issues and services but some did not feel their views

necessarily influenced design. Some lead organisations felt the short time available impacted on their ability to make significant changes suggested by partners and they relied to an extent on their original proposals. Where this occurred some partners felt the partnership was not equal.

- 3.38 It was also suggested that this factor limited the extent to which learning and information sharing about PSP development could be cascaded beyond the core group of individuals who took part. There were examples of staff in organisations not knowing about or buying into the PSP development process.
- 3.39 It was felt that the availability of Development Funding did help to mitigate these challenges to some degree as it provided additional resources for the lead organisation without which the issues could have been more significant. The lead organisations were very conscious of the timescale but did, generally speaking, try to engage partners throughout the process as best as they felt they could.

### **Competitiveness**

- 3.40 The competitive nature of the RRCF was also highlighted as a challenge to partnership working by the lead organisations and partners from all sectors. There were examples of lead organisations choosing not to share information with other bidders that asked for it for fear of harming their own chances of success. This impacted on the partnership discussions about existing services and service design at most PSPs. In a small number of cases this protectionism - as some lead organisations viewed it - was felt to potentially affect future relationships with those who were hostile to such requests, although partners highlighted that the PSP process had resulted in many examples of improved relationships.
- 3.41 The national third sector organisations that led PSPs were also partners in other bids and they reported that they were comfortable in these dual roles. They believed that they had managed to be partners in other bids without damaging their own bid or relationships with other organisations. In some cases this was because different individuals were involved in the different PSPs although that was not always the case. It is noteworthy that some of these national third sector organisations - and other partners - did state that the competitive nature of the RRCF PSPs was counter to some of the core principle of PSPs such as co-production and trust.
- 3.42 Some interviewees praised the role some of the CJAs played in information flow between competing bids without divulging confidential information and this helped overcome some of the challenges.

### **Different approaches**

- 3.43 The different approaches and ways of working were said to be a challenge for some partners - particularly at the outset - and this was mainly identified as an issue where organisations were working with each other for the first time. There was however, generally speaking, a commitment to work through the differences for the benefit of the bid. In one example of differing approaches between two third sector partners, the lead organisation highlighted that seeking the views of other partners helped to overcome differences as it provided wider support for the proposals which helped to allay some of the concerns. There were a small number of occasions where the differences between partners resulted in one disengaging from the process.

### **Clarity**

- 3.44 Partnership working at the start of the process was found to be challenging in some PSPs as some partners sought clarity on a number of issues including their role, the role of other organisations, the lead organisations' motivation for leading, the focus of the RRCF, and the purpose of the PSP model. This was in some cases interpreted as a reluctance to commit to the process, at least at the outset. This meant that the first, and sometimes some subsequent meetings, were described as challenging as some partners were less committed than they turned out to be in subsequent meetings. It should be noted however, that this is a common initial stage of partnership building and not unique to PSPs (other than the specific clarity sought around what a PSP model was and what the RRCF would fund).
- 3.45 Some interviewees felt the Guidance could have been clearer on some of these issues such as the role of the CJAs and The Robertson Trust, or the rationale for adopting a PSP model. There was however also many interviewees who felt the Guidance was adequate.

### **Personnel**

- 3.46 Although not a widespread issue, some interviewees highlighted that representatives of some organisations changed from meeting to meeting and their contribution to the discussion was therefore affected. In their opinion the lack of continuity meant that on occasions issues had to be revisited or representatives did not contribute to discussions as they had not been party to previous discussions. Some partners were also frustrated by some representatives lacking the authority to make decisions there and then and needing to seek support after the meetings, although again this was not a widespread view. It was felt that this slowed down the decision making process and emphasised differences between partners. These issues are not specific to PSPs but some interviewees felt had been exacerbated by the limited timescale discussed above.

### **Sustainability**

3.47 One of the main challenges to partnership working was the sustainability requirements built into the PSP model and sustainability is discussed in detail in chapter 6. At this stage we highlight the fact that it was a difficult issue that partners reported created some tension as public sector partners felt in many cases unable to provide the commitments sought by the lead organisation, and the bidding criteria. Although sustainability tested relationships it did not lead to lasting problems as there was an appreciation of the positions that the different partners took. The issue was also helped by the partners working together to find an acceptable solution with the CJAs invariably playing an important role.

### **The role of public sector partners**

3.48 Public sector partners are central to the PSP model and the justice system. The lessons from PSPs in Scotland highlighted the importance of the public sector's role in instigating the PSP process and being open to change and interviews with the organisations involved in the HMP Low Moss PSP support these findings. The roles of key public sector partners - local authorities, CJAs, NHS and SPS – in the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund are examined below.

#### **Local authorities**

3.49 The role of the local authority was influenced by the geographic focus of the PSPs. In three PSPs the local authority had been instrumental in instigating the partnerships which all had a very local focus. In other PSPs that also had a local focus, the PSP had been driven by local partners with an existing relationship with the local authority and the local authority tended to be described or describe themselves as an active and supportive partner. At this level the local authorities – mainly represented by CJSWs - had generally provided information on existing services and need, provided access to service users for research purposes, and played a prominent role in discussions on service design and information management. In some cases where the lead organisation had limited experience of criminal justice provision, CJSW also provided information on previous services or possible referral routes which helped the service design process. Generally speaking, CJSWs interviewed who were involved in PSPs were supportive of the model and welcomed the opportunity to work in a more collaborative way with trusted local third sector organisations to co-design services which reflected local need.

3.50 As the geographic focus increased from local to regional and national the increasing scale made it more difficult for the lead organisations to directly engage an increasing number of CJSW services. In some cases their involvement was achieved through ADSW or COSLA representing CJSWs collectively, or through CJAs cascading information to the CJSWs in their area. Consequently the CJSW role and their individual sense of relevance and ownership of regional and

national PSPs was understandably less than the local bids. In these circumstances CJSWs generally felt there would be a need for more detailed discussions in the near future at a local level to avoid possible duplication between the national RRCF PSPs and existing services, and between local and national RRCF PSPs.

- 3.51 ADSW and COSLA interviewees were generally supportive of the PSP model in principle although there were some reservations about the application of the model in the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund. The principles of co-design, cross-sector working, service user involvement, preventative spending and piloting new approaches were highlighted as positive attributes of the PSP model which were supported; there was also support for the focus on reducing reoffending across Scotland and the financial support available. Reservations centred mainly on the limited involvement in the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs of some public sector partners that could benefit in the long run from reduced reoffending and the view that this led to local authorities being seen by service providers as the main potential sources of funding at the end of the pilot period. Involvement of all public sector partners which stood to benefit was proposed by these interviewees as well as an assessment of where the savings would accrue. There were also concerns about the prescribed third sector leadership of the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs and that the PSP model could be used more widely in the future to outsource local authority services.

### **Community Justice Authorities**

- 3.52 The Year 2/3 Guidance stated that the Scottish Government expected relevant CJAs to be involved in the process and in all PSPs this was the case. The PSP development process coincided with Scottish Government consultation about the future of the Community Justice system in Scotland including the role of CJAs and their role in the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund may have some bearing on future discussions about the CJAs. The CJAs essentially took on three roles in the RRCF PSP development process.
- 3.53 Firstly, all CJAs had an important role as the body with oversight of the justice system in their area. The CJAs themselves stated that the nature of this role changed over the course of Year 1 – at the outset they described their role as a consultee for PSPs which they then felt developed into a stronger role intended to minimise duplication and maximise contribution to the CJA Area Plan. This firmer, more strategic role resulted in some CJAs stating that they would not sign off bids and this is a significant issue as without CJA support, bids were unlikely to be successful. The CJAs generally welcomed this strategic role stating that it fitted their overall remit. Some CJAs highlighted that they would have welcomed earlier clarification of this role which they stated was communicated to CJA Chief Officers by The Robertson Trust - on behalf of the Decision Making Group - in November 2012. As part of this role a number of the CJAs held workshops for PSPs in their area to

share information and minimise duplication, as far as possible in the competitive Change Fund environment. The CJAs also held a number of separate meetings with specific PSPs. The CJAs were of the opinion that most bidders made appropriate use of the CJA's support although there were some examples of bidders being reluctant to take on board their views and those of local CJSWs, or consulting CJAs at a late stage in the bidding process.

- 3.54 Secondly, the CJAs had a unique role in the national women offenders PSP. Following the publication of the Commission on Women Offenders' Report, the CJA Chief Officers agreed that a national mentoring service should be developed, if funding could be identified. The RRCF provided potential funding and the CJA Chief Officers identified the lead organisation as the most appropriate lead given their experience of mentoring and female offender support services. South West Scotland CJA Chief Officer Co-Chaired this PSP and was a strong presence in the process. The CJAs collectively supported the bid and tried to ensure that other bids in their areas took account of this bid.
- 3.55 Thirdly, in some of the local PSPs the CJAs were closely involved in the PSP development process. In these PSPs the CJA was said to be an active participant in the discussion on service design and a strong supporter of the bid. This contrasted with some of the „hands-off“ approach adopted by other CJAs given their oversight role described above. For example, one CJA Chief Officer stated that they were unwilling to be involved in local bids because of their support for one of the national PSPs despite the view that the local bid appeared to have some merit.
- 3.56 Generally speaking, CJAs interviewed were supportive of the PSP approach and positively welcomed the new collaborative approach to service design, the flexibility in the model to adapt services during the pilot phase, and the focus on preventative spend. Some CJAs also welcomed the lead role prescribed for third sector organisations as they felt it encouraged new, additional services, made regional and national bids easier to co-ordinate, and may allow for speedier staff recruitment. Some of the CJAs highlighted that their role in underwriting the PSPs was important as it represented a significant point in the development of CJAs. There was some reservation among the CJA representatives about the different roles CJAs had and how these roles impacted on each other. There was also some concern expressed by PSP partners about the varying role of CJAs during the process and between areas and they felt that clarity on this issue would be useful in the future.

### **National Health Service**

- 3.57 The NHS was involved in a small number of Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs. Their limited involvement was highlighted by some interviewees from the CJAs, local authorities, and third sector

organisations, as a gap in the makeup of the PSPs for two reasons. Firstly, one of the aims of the PSPs was to encourage service users to link into mainstream services including health services and their limited involvement was felt by these interviewees to make this less likely. Secondly, these interviewees highlighted that the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund was part of a preventative spending approach but the absence of the NHS at the majority of the PSPs meant that discussions about where savings will accrue and which organisations should invest to save would not involve all relevant public sector services.

- 3.58 Where the NHS was involved they were said to have played a significant role, not least in one PSP where a local NHS Board was in effect the lead organisation (and in fact was the initial lead for the bid for Development Funding). The organisation's lead contact on the PSP had significant PSP and criminal justice experience and this was utilised in the development of the PSP. The individual also attended workshops for another PSP where the NHS was a proposed member of the Programme Board. Another PSP also had input from the Healthcare Improvement Scotland (HIS) National Prisoner Healthcare Network. The organisation's involvement built on an existing relationship with third sector lead and the lead organisation highlighted that the NHS had been an important contributor to the service design process.

### **Scottish Prison Service**

- 3.59 When brought in by the lead organisation and/or involved in the initial discussions, SPS were said to have been an active participant in the PSP development process. They provided information on existing services and need to help inform service design. They also provided access to service users for research purposes, most notably in one PSP where prison staff undertook depth interviews with inmates (see Chapter 4). In addition, a private sector company which operates a prison on behalf of SPS played an important role in the early stages of one PSP bid – they attended partner meetings and workshops, and provided access to inmates for research purposes before the focus of the PSP moved on to community based services. The lead organisations in these PSPs built upon an existing relationship with SPS/the private prison operator. However, overall SPS were involved in a limited number of PSPs.
- 3.60 There was some criticism of the SPS' input in one of these PSPs highlighting occasional differences between the position taken by SPS representatives from the central team and from specific prisons. It was suggested that this led to a lack of clarity from SPS which was a challenge for the lead organisation. It should be noted that this was a minority view.

## 4 SERVICE USER INVOLVEMENT

4.1 Service user involvement in the design and development of projects is a core element of the PSP model and it has been one of the main activities undertaken as part of the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSP development process. This section presents an overview of the different approaches taken to service user involvement and assesses how successful stakeholders feel it has been, and what impact it has had in shaping services. The section also highlights innovation, and proposals agreed during Year 1 to secure ongoing service user involvement in the PSPs.

4.2 The key findings are:

- There has been significant involvement of service users in the PSPs using Development Funding in a variety of ways including focus groups, depth interviews and surveys. There were also some innovative approaches including the use of video to capture the views of one hard to reach group.
- The third sector led the involvement of service users and public sector partners played an important supporting role in many PSPs. Existing links and an understanding of service users, including hard to reach groups, were identified as key factors in the success of the service user involvement.
- Service user involvement mainly consisted of consultation to gather views on existing services and PSP proposals rather than direct engagement in the service design process. PSPs recognised the importance of engagement and most have developed proposals during Year 1 for ongoing engagement.
- Service user involvement was viewed as successful as it identified a number of issues and its impact is evident in several PSPs with services redesigned following input from users.

### Service user involvement

4.3 All the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs involved service users during the development process. The approaches taken are briefly summarised in Appendix 8. In the majority of PSPs the level of service user involvement was described as significant both in terms of the quantity and quality of work undertaken, especially given the relatively short timescale. The key routes to involvement were traditional methods of surveys, interviews and focus groups, although there were some examples of more innovative approaches such as video, and text surveys.

4.4 Interviewees reported that the third sector had generally taken the lead role in service user involvement, building on the close links the sector had with service users, particularly those deemed as „hard to reach“. Partners across PSPs identified that the third sector in Scotland, both at a national and local level has a track record of working within the justice system and with hard to reach groups, and the PSPs were able

to build on a level of understanding and trust to provide valuable insight into service users' needs and aspirations. For the majority of the lead organisations the development of the PSP was a natural progression of their work and they reported that they were able to capture service user views quickly and effectively by using existing structures and links.

- 4.5 Interviewees also highlighted that the role of the public sector was important as they had in a number of cases provided the means of accessing offenders serving custodial or community sentences. Existing links with the public sector partners were seen as an important facilitator, as was the joint commitment among partners to progress the PSP. This resulted in PSP partners working together to engage service users, for example, one PSP used its existing links with the local authority CJSW service to consult over 150 service users in a short space of time. The support of SPS and individual prison governors was also highlighted by some lead organisations, which emphasised the importance of existing relationships, particularly at a local level, to establish service user views in the timeframe. These PSPs reported that this access to prisoners was vital for their proposal and development of mentoring ideas.
- 4.6 As Appendix 8 shows, service user involvement consisted mainly of consultation to gather views rather than direct engagement in discussions about service design. All the PSPs consulted service users to establish their experiences of the justice system, and in most cases their views on the specific mentoring proposals developed by the PSPs. There was limited active engagement of service users in the partner discussions around service design although partners highlighted that this would have been a challenge in the timescale. In their opinion, engagement was important but had to be conducted correctly and failing to do so could have been counterproductive. In particular, they highlighted it was not possible to secure genuine participation at Governance Group level by service users during the time available because of the need for capacity building. The timescale was the only challenge identified by partners during the service user involvement process.

### **Development Funding**

- 4.7 Interviewees highlighted the importance of Development Funding to service user involvement. In a number of partnerships, the funding was used to allow staff to engage groups of service users or individuals and to pay for venue hire or out of pocket expenses. The Development Funding was also used in some PSPs for consultants to undertake the work, and this was seen as particularly useful where offending services were not core business because it enabled the lead organisation to gather detailed evidence for the bid.
- 4.8 A small number of PSPs used Development Funding to provide training and support to continue to inform project development and enable participation at a partnership level in the future. In one PSP, partners

supported the development of a forum of ex-offenders to provide a voice for service users while another PSP established a pilot group to develop and test proposals.

- 4.9 The general view was that the Development Funding enabled the PSPs to reach service users in numbers and in a timeframe that would not have been possible if relying on their own resources.

### **Success and impact of service user involvement**

- 4.10 The lead organisations and partners generally regarded the service user involvement as successful and something which had a positive impact on proposals.

- 4.11 The consultation was seen as successful as it identified a number of issues which had informed project development. These issues included the need for the mentoring services to be built around trusting relationships, recognising each offender as a unique individual, providing emotional and motivational support, and addressing practical issues such as employment, training, housing, health and benefits.

- 4.12 Across PSPs interviewees identified how these findings have secured changes in design directly attributable to the input of service users. Examples include:

- In one PSP feedback from service users was critical of the voluntary nature of proposals initially drawn up by partners. The users felt that this seriously undermined their „value“ not just in financial terms but in the way they would be viewed by peers and statutory agencies. As a result the partners redrew their plans to include paid mentors.
- One PSP identified the benefits of their service user involvement as “the most significant piece of research we undertook in terms of impact on our service design day and ultimately our proposal”. Their work identified the severe isolation many younger prolific offenders suffer, particularly on release, and a bespoke service centred on “someone to talk to” has arisen from this work. The PSP also introduced paid and unpaid mentors into their programme as a result of user views.
- Another PSP was presented with strong evidence for a range of needs including accommodation, benefits, debt and money management, employment, training, substance misuse, and relationships with family and friends and as a result they widened their proposals and the range of organisations involved in the service. The consultations with offenders highlighted strong support for one-to-one mentoring to help offenders address practical problems, cope with stressful situations, provide emotional and motivational support, address offending behaviour, and provide and support links into other support services.
- One PSP extended the period of support to more than six months as this was deemed essential by service users.

## **Innovation**

- 4.13 As outlined in Appendix 8, most consultation involved traditional methods such as surveys, focus groups, interviews and consultation events. One PSP was more innovative as it used Development Funding to commission a company to work with people with lived experience of the justice system. The company worked with nine men, discussing their experiences and thoughts which were used to create their own short film. Another PSP used a mobile phone text survey to overcome service users' literacy issues and a perceived reluctance to engage using traditional survey methods.
- 4.14 Other examples of innovation focused on the method of recruitment rather than particularly innovative research methods. For example, in one PSP, 47 inmates from two prisons were interviewed by prison staff on a one-to-one basis to provide detailed findings; the prison staff were briefed by the PSP consultant to apply research ethics and standards. In another PSP, service users were interviewed as participation was part of their „Other activity requirement“ stipulated in their Community Payback Order.

### **Year 1 proposals for ongoing service user engagement**

- 4.15 The majority of PSPs highlighted that they would encourage ongoing service user engagement as the PSP progressed and had considered during Year 1 how to achieve this. Some PSPs proposed Service User Groups to provide ongoing feedback on delivery and user experience to the Governance Group. Other PSPs proposed the direct involvement of service users in the Governance Group, supported by capacity building to enable the service users to contribute effectively to the process.

## 5 CO-PRODUCTION

5.1 As explained in the introduction, co-production – which involves public and third sector bodies co-designing services or interventions to deliver agreed social outcomes - is a key feature of the PSP model. This chapter sets out partners' views on the different approaches to co-production and the key features of the process. The chapter also focuses on the study research questions to assess whether partners feel that co-production is having a positive, negative or no impact on the quality of the services that have been developed, and what challenges they have faced through the co-production process.

5.2 The key findings are:

- In Year 1 of the RRCF, co-production primarily focused on third and public organisations working together to design interventions with service users' views fed into the process following consultation.
- Two approaches to co-production were identified - refinement of an approach proposed by the lead organisations, and a more fundamental approach to the design of a new service from scratch. Feedback on the latter process was very positive. Views on the success of the two approaches varied and preclude conclusions about which is more effective.
- The co-production process typically involved a number of tasks with a wide range of partners to identify gaps and evidence of need, consider how schemes linked with existing and developing interventions, and define objectives and outcomes. The process varied between PSPs and some challenges were faced.
- The process of co-production was one of the elements of PSP development that partners found most valuable, in terms of learning about services, sharing knowledge and experience and fostering a system of close joint working. The majority of partners felt the proposals were co-designed and the process has had a positive impact on the quality of services developed.

### Approaches to co-production

5.3 Co-production, also described as co-design or co-planning, is increasingly important in the delivery of public services in Scotland. Definitions from other policy areas<sup>12</sup>, highlight the role of service users and providers jointly designing services which can include the service user expressing some choice over the services they use. In the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs' co-production primarily focused on third and public organisations working together to design

---

<sup>12</sup> See for example, „Co-Production in Health and Social Care“ (Joint Improvement Team Scotland, 2012) or „Evaluation of Local Housing Strategies Co-Production Pilots with Disabled People“ (Scottish Government, 2011)

interventions with service users" views fed into the process following consultation (as described in Chapter 4).

5.4 The importance of the process to the PSP model is highlighted in Ready for Business" PSP Guide<sup>13</sup>:

„PSPs are based on a co-planning approach, through which the public sector can connect with third sector organisations (voluntary, charity and social enterprise organisations) to share responsibility for designing services based around service user needs rather than the current suite of standard services which users can access“.

5.5 Two approaches to co-production were identified during interviews with partners:

- Most commonly, lead organisations started with a service model in mind, which in some cases was an existing service, and refined this model with input from partners throughout the development process.
- It was less common to find that PSP partners had met with “a blank sheet of paper” at the outset and designed a new programme from scratch.

5.6 Feedback on the co-production process was very positive among partners involved in designing a new programme from scratch. They welcomed the opportunity to contribute in this way to the design process and felt they had played a significant part in the PSP development process. They also highlighted the strength of partnership working that this process involved.

5.7 Views on the success or otherwise of the two approaches identified above varied between PSPs and preclude conclusions about which method is more effective. Some partners felt that initial clarity of vision from the lead organisation was helpful because it provided focus and a basis for refinement whereas other partners felt that this gave lead organisations ownership and limited their ability to influence design.

### **Key features of the co-production process**

5.8 Partners described a range of aspects of the co-production process which typically involved the following:

---

<sup>13</sup> „Public Social Partnerships A Guide for Public Sector Procurement Agencies“ (Ready for Business, 2012)

Where it was felt necessary PSPs undertook initial work to ensure all partners understood the PSP model, to establish clarity about the development process and partners' roles and responsibilities.



Many lead partners developed a PSP timetable which identified clear milestones. In some cases project management techniques were also adopted, for example Prince 2 principles.



Evidence gathering activities and service user consultation was undertaken (the extent to which findings were shared with partners varied)



The majority of PSPs held some variation on a co-production workshop with partners to facilitate service design. If lead organisations had a service model in mind they presented this to partners, invited them to share their initial thoughts; design work stemmed from there. Typically the lead partner led these workshops, where the agenda would include a discussion of the RRCF criteria, evidence of need and service user involvement.



Some of the larger PSPs including the national bids had wide reaching discussions with partners and undertook extensive consultation. To facilitate this process they established themed workstreams to consider different elements of the programmes being developed



Once an agreement in principle was reached, much of the detailed planning work was undertaken by the lead partner. Partners inputted through ongoing email and telephone exchange, with documents circulated for comment and approval. Where necessary, face-to-face meetings were arranged to discuss and resolve issues.

5.9 There were variations in the extent to which each of the steps outlined above involved all partners, and were viewed as successful. There were also variations in timing and the process was not a linear process as summarised above. The majority of PSPs began designing their service before the evidence gathering had finished. Many partners felt that there was not enough time for research to be completed before

design work began and therefore adopted a simultaneous process of information gathering and designing.

5.10 The following were identified as key tasks in the co-production process:

- Identifying gaps and evidencing need.
- Considering how schemes would link with existing and developing interventions.
- Defining objectives and outcomes.

5.11 These issues and the associated challenges identified by interviewees are discussed below.

### **Identifying gaps and evidencing need**

5.12 All PSPs undertook work to identify service gaps although this varied between the partnerships. Some PSPs undertook detailed mapping, survey work and consultation with partners, while others used publicly available information. In some areas PSPs relied on public sector partners' local knowledge of provision rather than undertaking a systematic approach to identifying gaps. In both approaches, partners reported that they were generally satisfied with the information gathered and that it was sufficient to identify gaps.

5.13 One PSP attempted to assess how effective existing mentoring services were instead of just identifying that they existed. The lead organisation acknowledged that this was a difficult task as it relied on open information sharing in a short period of time but they felt it was important as they sought to develop high quality evidence-based mentoring services as outlined in the Guidance.

5.14 A small number of interviewees highlighted challenges related to the scope of the mapping exercise. For some the challenge was clearly defining what services were to be included and in one PSP this led to a public sector provider initially not providing information because they did not see their services as mentoring – the lead organisation clarified their requirements and the information was provided.

5.15 All PSPs also made efforts to assess and quantify the need for their proposed service although how this was done also varied between partnerships. PSPs approached this activity differently, some relied on statistics (usually provided by the CJAs), others gathered qualitative evidence such as case studies of service users or samples of Criminal Justice Social Work Reports, and some incorporated the findings from evaluations of their own existing mentoring services. All lead organisations highlighted that the evidencing of need was sufficient for their needs.

5.16 Evidencing need was described by several partners as one of the most challenging elements of the PSP development process. Different reasons were given for this, including a perception that there was

limited information. One PSP was working in a field they described as “under researched” - undiagnosed mental health issues - and found there was little existing evidence for them to draw on; they attempted to address this knowledge gap by undertaking their own research with service providers and users but found it difficult to engage service users. Another PSP had hoped to undertake a Social Return on Investment approach but found that there was not sufficient data to do this. In another PSP, a public sector partner reported that the lead organisation’s data requests were time consuming because they necessitated the establishment of new procedures for gathering information from existing reports. Some partners were unsure about what relevant data existed, and those involved in more than one PSP commented that larger, more experienced lead organisations were better at gathering evidence and knowing how to use it. Some partners suggested that this element of PSP development could have been undertaken centrally, for example by The Robertson Trust, the Scottish Government or the CJAs, to make sure that there was a level playing field in terms of all partners having access to the same data and to prevent overlap.

- 5.17 Some interviewees highlighted that there may have been duplication of effort in identifying gaps and evidencing need where similar exercises were being undertaken by a number of PSPs locally and nationally. Some interviewees were of the opinion that this might have been perceived as a nuisance by the services they were trying to get information from. A more co-ordinated approach to service mapping was suggested by a number of stakeholders including lead organisations, public sector partners, and the Scottish Mentoring Network which stated they could have provided detailed information on mentoring services, including justice services across Scotland.

### **Considering how schemes would link with existing and developing interventions**

- 5.18 Discussion took place in all PSPs about linking proposals with existing and developing interventions and they were mostly viewed as successful. In a number of cases PSP partners provided a direct link to existing or developing interventions, for example:
- In one regional PSP, two large third sector partners which were also leading their own Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs agreed that their bids would take account of the proposals in the region so there was no duplication between the proposals.
  - In Glasgow key organisations in the City – Glasgow Community and Safety Services, the Police and CJA - instigated discussions with a national PSP bidder to ensure their proposals took account of existing services in the City and importantly adopted the „One Glasgow” approach to service provision.

- 5.19 A number of partners highlighted challenges in taking account of the programmes proposed by other PSPs, particularly how the proposed local and national bids fitted together and whether cross-PSP referral pathways should be considered during the development phase. There were issues gathering information on some services when some partners were reluctant to share information, and uncertainty about how to then plan services to take account of services that may or may not come to fruition. Some partners suggested that the competitive nature of the development period prevented PSPs from sharing information about their proposals - some described “an air of secrecy” between PSPs brought about by the competitive element of the process. There was experience of other providers who were not partners in PSPs being reluctant to share detailed information about their service provision, feeling that the information was commercially sensitive.

### **Defining objectives and outcomes**

- 5.20 Each PSP specified the intended outcomes of their programme within the MoU or work plan although detail varied across PSPs.
- 5.21 There were variations in the extent to which PSPs approached the process of defining outcomes and these differences link to the model adopted for co-production. PSPs that began with a specific service in mind often had a clear idea of the outcomes that service model was based around. In these cases partners focused more on the practical process of agreeing to or refining the finer detail of the model more than undertaking work to define outcomes. In areas where partners approached PSP design with a “blank piece of paper” the identification of outcomes was generally more prominent and an important first step with service design built from there.
- 5.22 In interviews, the majority of partners within PSPs described a shared vision and understanding of the high-level outcomes their services was designed to achieve. Most commented on longer term outcomes linked to the RRCF including most explicitly reducing reoffending or described broad impacts such as engaging harder to reach offenders, increased provision of tailored services and adding to the evidence base on mentoring. Some partners reflected on the outcomes for mentors such as learning, skills development, improved self esteem, and others identified outcomes for partners for example larger networks, closer joint working and skills developed throughout the PSP development process. A minority of PSPs investigated methods of measuring the impact of their proposed services although many did not go into such a level of detail and some suggested that the independent evaluation of Years 2/3 would achieve this.
- 5.23 In discussions about outcomes there were mixed views about the flexibility of service design. Some interviewees felt that there was flexibility within the operational period to review and adjust services once their impact was clear, however others suggested that the time

for reflection would come at the end of Year 3, when services were being put out to tender.

### **Views on co-production and its impact on the quality of the services that have been developed**

- 5.24 Overall, the process of co-production was one of the elements of PSP development that partners found most valuable, in terms of learning about services, sharing knowledge and experience and fostering a system of close joint working. In most cases co-production represented a significant shift in the dynamics between third and public sector partners because it involved both parties having a clear stake in the programme design process. This was very different from the majority of stakeholders' previous experiences, which tended to involve the public sector designing the service and the third sector seeking to deliver it to a prescribed service specification. The majority of partners within PSPs felt the proposals were co-designed and have had a positive impact on the quality of services developed. They welcomed the opportunities to influence service design even if they chose not to. The survey of PSP partners found that 82% of respondents agreed that the PSP will have a positive impact on the quality of services being developed, 80% agreed that the PSP will be able to identify the social benefits delivered, and 76% agreed the PSP will be able to prove the social benefits delivered (see Appendix 7).
- 5.25 In some of these cases, partners suggested that the timescale limited the extent to which they were able to scrutinise the final versions of proposals – with bids being worked on up until the very last hour before the deadline – but they felt this was an issue with time rather than an issue with the co-design process. Some public sector partners were generally of the view that there was little consideration of the demands placed upon them by the PSP development process alongside their existing responsibilities. This was most relevant where the scale of the proposal was relatively small and relates to the lessons learnt from the earlier PSPs that inputs should be proportionate to the expected outcomes.
- 5.26 Several interviewees described the enthusiasm and “can do” attitude of the partners involved in co-design activities. When probed, they used terms such as “motivated”, “engaged” and “innovative”. Some suggested that the economic climate has reduced the number of opportunities for public sector staff to develop new approaches; that instead they often required to focus on finding ways to increase efficiencies in existing services. These interviewees felt the RRCF represented both an opportunity and resources which allowed partners to create something that they might not have been able to otherwise.
- 5.27 A small number of public sector partners described instances of “feeling in the dark” and being asked to support programmes they had not helped to develop. The reasons given for this varied - a minority suggested that the PSP lead misunderstood the development process,

others suggested the PSP lead was not interested in partners' views, and one suggested that the PSP lead was ultimately unclear about the service they were developing, undertook too much consultation, and found it hard to articulate their ideas to partners or facilitate co design in a meaningful sense.

- 5.28 Some public sector partners suggested that the PSPs led by large national third sector organisations possibly had an advantage when it came to co-production, in that they were probably more experienced and comfortable in the use of tools such as logic models.
- 5.29 Partners interpreted their roles in the co-production process differently. Some partners believed their role was to input into the design process, question proposals and suggest alternatives – where this occurred they tended to be supportive of the co-production model and where it did not occur they tended to have some reservations. Other partners felt their role was to provide support for a bid, not to question it, and generally they had no strong views on the co-production model - this suggests the principles of co-production and the PSP model were not fully understood by these partners.
- 5.30 A small number of partners felt that the legal aspects of co-production were unresolved, in terms of how intellectual property was to be managed and who could claim ownership of the model developed at the end of Year 3, when it goes out to tender.

## 6 SUSTAINABILITY

6.1 Sustainability is a key feature of the PSP model, as highlighted in Chapter 1. This chapter addresses the study questions on whether the partnerships feel that the services developed through the PSP model are likely to be sustained after the Change Fund ends, and the reasons for their views, the impact that sustainability has had on partnership working and the challenges faced in addressing sustainability. The chapter starts with an overview of the approaches to sustainability taken by the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs and considers the role of key public sector partners including the Community Justice Authorities and local authorities.

6.2 The key findings are:

- Discussions around sustainability occurred in all PSPs and resulted in written commitments from public sector partners to underwrite services in the future in 13 of the 14 PSPs. The commitments were subject to a number of caveats.
- Commitments to underwrite services came mainly from Community Justice Authorities and this was welcomed by partners. The CJAs were largely seen as the most appropriate organisation to provide this commitment in the circumstances.
- The limited commitment of other public sector partners that could benefit in the long term from savings resulting from a reduction on reoffending was highlighted by interviewees. Partly this was because some public sector partners had not been invited to join the PSPs and partly it was because funding pressure and the 2014/15 spending review meant that some public partners could not provide written commitments to underwrite services at this time.
- Interviewees highlighted challenges during sustainability discussions including engaging all public sector partners, the limited timescale, working across administrative borders, and the prevailing funding and policy environment.
- The 14 partnerships were unsure about whether the services developed through the PSP model would be sustained after the Change Fund ends mainly because of the caveats attached to the commitments to underwrite services. Despite this partners welcomed the requirement to consider sustainability at the outset as they felt it would allow them to hold public sector partners to account in the future.
- A number of other issues were highlighted by interviewees during discussions about sustainability including mixed views about competitive tendering, concerns about best value, intentions to source additional funding, and the importance of non-financial sustainability.

### **Sustainability in the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs**

6.3 As outlined in the introduction, the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund seeks to increase the sustainability of services that improve outcomes for both service users and their communities. From these

improvements it is anticipated that fiscal savings could be made in the long run as reoffending and all its associated costs are reduced. Such potential savings together with improved outcomes are the incentive for securing partner commitment to PSPs beyond the life of the Fund, post 2015. Lessons from previous PSPs in Scotland highlighted in Chapter 1 suggested that culture change within both the public and third sectors was important which in terms of funding involved the public sector being open to investing to save and the third sector being open to investing to gain.

- 6.4 PSPs applying for funding in years 2/3 were expected to demonstrate how services delivered by the partnership would continue once Change Fund support ended. The Guidance stated:

„We expect that the outcomes and targets previously detailed have been agreed by all partners. Please confirm that should these outcomes be met, the public sector partners have agreed to continue to fund the service beyond March 2015. A letter from the relevant public sector partners demonstrating that they have realistic and considered plans for the continuation of the service would be advantageous“.

- 6.5 Commitments for continued financial support were expected to be based on positive discussions with public sector partners and other potential funders. The survey of PSP partners demonstrates that sustainability discussions had been positive, as 56% of respondents reported that the PSP had adequately considered how it will maintain services beyond March 2015 and 54% reported that they were confident the services will be maintained by public sector partners beyond March 2015 if the outcomes are met (see Appendix 7). However, although a majority of respondents agreed with the two statements, the strength of agreement was the lowest of all of the survey questions. In addition, 17% of respondents felt that sustainability had not been given adequate consideration by their PSP and a similar proportion did not have confidence that the services would be maintained beyond 2015. These were the highest rates of dissatisfaction registered on the PSP survey.
- 6.6 Interviews and a review of the MoUs showed that sustainability was addressed during the development of the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs. Interviewees highlighted that Development Funding enabled the lead organisations to work with partners to understand their requirements and develop proposals that could be supported in principle by public partners.

- 6.7 In 13 of the 14 PSPs, the Community Justice Authorities provided formal written commitment to underwrite services<sup>14</sup> if specific conditions are met. Written commitment from other public sector partners was limited – three PSPs secured written commitment from local authorities, one PSP secured written commitments from local Alcohol and Drug Partnerships, and one PSP secured a written commitment from the Scottish Prison Service.
- 6.8 In all cases the formal written commitments of support to sustain services had caveats attached. In most cases, support is committed subject to the outcome of the 2014/15 UK spending review. Potential funders also highlighted the need to await the outcome of the services pilot and any evaluation of the scheme, to draw on lessons learned prior to any decision on the services going out to tender in 2015. All MoUs highlight the fact that the proposals would have to be reviewed and possibly redrawn prior to then going out to tender via normal procurement regulations in 2015. And for some organisations, such as the CJAs, support is subject to a review of the service itself.

### **Sustainability and CJAs**

- 6.9 The CJAs role included working with local authorities, SPS and other partners to prepare local joint area plans focusing on tackling reoffending, monitoring and reporting on the effectiveness of joint working across all sectors, and ensuring that funding is being used effectively to improve the management of offenders. Interviewees from the third and public sectors highlighted that the CJAs were proactive in supporting the development of PSPs and were central to discussion on sustainability – as highlighted above only one PSP did not secure a written commitment to underwrite the service subject to specific conditions.
- 6.10 Partners across PSPs welcomed the CJAs' input to the sustainability discussions. Interviewees highlighted the willingness of the CJAs to develop a form of wording which confirmed their support for the PSPs whilst recognising the limits of that support and setting out requirements for the PSP to demonstrate and prove impact. The form of wording found across the PSPs was as follows.

„On behalf of the public sector partners within this partnership, the CJA will underwrite and ensure the continuity of funding, contingent upon the outcome of the next Spending Review in 2014/15 and the evaluation of the service. This will ensure that resources are in place to ensure the continuity of proven services. The final specification and terms of the future procurement process will be discussed between and agreed by

---

<sup>14</sup> Formal written commitment to underwrite services provided in the MoU or accompanying letters of support. Signing the MoU or providing a letter of support without a written commitments to underwrite services is not recorded for these purposes.

the public sector authorities who will bear a responsibility for funding the service.

The CJA believes that – if the anticipated outcomes for this service are achieved – this will transform support for offenders, and consequently result in significant savings across local and national justice partners. We will therefore also work with all relevant partners throughout 2013-15 to identify savings and beneficiaries and to negotiate an appropriate partnership-based package of funding”.

- 6.11 A number of the CJA interviewees highlighted that they felt they were the most appropriate public sector organisation to provide this commitment as it fitted their role. A number of other stakeholders emphasised highlighted the importance of the CJAs input particularly given they faced some of the same uncertainties as other public bodies as well as the added uncertainty of the ongoing review of community justice structures. A small number of interviewees felt the CJAs were left to take on this role by the absence of some other public sector partners from the PSP development process, and the reluctance of some other public sector partners to commit to underwriting.

### **Sustainability and local authorities**

- 6.12 As highlighted above only three PSPs secured a written commitment from local authorities to underwrite PSPs in the future subject to specific conditions. One local authority was instrumental in instigating and developing two of these PSPs and the wording of their commitment in both MoUs was:

„In the event of there being funding available within (the) Council”s budget for the continuation of the project at the end of the initial period the Council will consider whether it is appropriate to allocate funding to allow for the services to be procured under the relevant procurement rules”.

- 6.13 The commitment of other local authorities varied. In one PSP, a Criminal Justice Social Work Partnership – covering three local authority areas - signed the letter of support from public sector partners alongside the CJA and two ADPs, although the CJSW Partnership”s commitment was less than the other signatories, who committed to underwrite the PSP financially should circumstances allow. Other local authorities which were members of PSPs and had signed the MoU, demonstrated support for PSPs without providing a written commitment to underwrite services. By signing the MoUs there was a form of commitment to sustainability but one that was less than the formal commitment to underwrite services described above.
- 6.14 In most MoUs signatories including local authorities have committed to the following statement:

„It is understood by all parties to the PSP that, at the end of any agreed pilot, the Public Sector will competitively tender the services covered by the MoU, under normal procurement rules, contingent upon the pilot demonstrating its success. The final specification and terms of this procurement process will be discussed between and agreed by the public sector authorities who will bear responsibility for funding the service“.

- 6.15 Those PSPs that secured the strongest local authority support were said to have done so by engaging local authorities early in the process and maintaining close links with the local authorities.
- 6.16 A number of interviewees including local authority, COSLA and ADSW representatives were of the opinion that it was difficult for local authorities to commit to future funding at a time of funding pressure, and an impending spending review. Interviews with local authorities highlighted that some would consider sustaining the services if they were proven to be successful and funding allows in 2015 but they felt they were not in a position to provide a firm written commitment at this stage. In some cases it was also reported that some PSPs led by large third sector organisations had approached local authorities seeking commitment to underwrite their bids without adequate consultation and the local authorities were unwilling to support such bids.
- 6.17 A small number of interviewees felt some local authorities focused on reasons not to sustain the services rather than take the more proactive approach highlighted above taken by the CJAs. These interviewees felt this could have stemmed from concerns about the prescribed leadership role for third sector organisations and the perceived secondary role for local authorities.
- 6.18 Interviewees including those from COSLA and ADSW highlighted that fiscal savings would accrue to a range of public sector agencies not just local authorities, and felt that these organisations needed to be involved in the PSPs and sustainability discussions as well. Some of these interviewees suggested that Community Planning Partnerships might be a more appropriate forum to discuss outcomes and sustainability.

### **Sustainability and other public sector partners**

- 6.19 A small number of interviewees from the CJAs, local authorities and the third sector, felt that limited involvement of other public sector partners could affect the sustainability of some PSPs. These interviewees emphasised that the PSP model is based on public sector partners investing in the short term to save in the longer term. The involvement and financial commitment of other public sector partners is summarised below.
- 6.20 As highlighted in Chapter 3, the NHS was effectively leading the development stage of one PSP and was a named partner in another

three PSPs. It is widely accepted that mental health and substance misuse are prevalent issues among offenders, see for example the Scottish Prisoner Survey 2011<sup>15</sup>. No firm commitments to support the PSPs beyond 2015 were in place from the NHS and only one PSP had secured written commitment from ADPs to underwrite services if specific conditions were met. ADPs were involved in other PSPs without providing the commitments to underwriting.

- 6.21 Only one PSP secured written commitment from the Scottish Prison Service to underwrite services if specific conditions are met. A number of PSPs reported that they developed or built upon strong existing links with SPS.
- 6.22 Those partnerships which worked with the police, reported that they had constructive relations and received support at an administrative, operational and strategic level. However they also highlighted that the police were not in a position to commit to underwrite services in the future, because of limited funding for such initiatives, financial pressures, and the restructuring of the Police Service of Scotland.

## Challenges

- 6.23 Interviewees from the lead organisations and public and third sector partners highlighted that PSPs have, to different extents, faced challenges in addressing the sustainability of services at this stage of the PSP development process. The key issues faced were:
- **Inviting and engaging all public sector partners** – lead organisation interviewees and a number of other partners highlighted that not all public sector partners that could potentially benefit from long term financial savings as a result of reduced reoffending were engaged in the PSP process. The police, prisons, courts, housing, health, and employability providers were among the main potential beneficiaries identified yet there were no firm commitments of funding post 2015 from these agencies, with the limited exceptions highlighted above. Interviewees highlighted that in a number of cases this was because the public sector partners were not invited to join the PSP rather than a refusal on their part to take up an invitation.
  - **Timescale** – the relatively short timescale for the PSP development process was seen as a challenge to sustainability as it limited the opportunity to engage new partners, including the wider public sector partners highlighted above, and the time available for partners to work through issues around sustainability. For example, one CJA interviewee stated that it was unable to provide a commitment to underwrite a PSP led by a large third sector organisation because there had been insufficient time to address all of their concerns.
  - **Working across administrative borders** – PSPs proposing services in more than one area highlighted the added complexity of engaging multiple

---

<sup>15</sup> „Prisoner Survey 2011“ (Scottish Prison Service, 2011)

public sector partners (predominantly CJAs and local authorities) some of which they did not have established relationships with. Interviewees felt that were they were able to adopt a locally sensitive approach they would be more likely to secure financial and in-kind commitments. The role of the CJAs in co-ordinating consultation with providers and across PSPs was noted by stakeholders including those working across administrative boundaries.

- **Funding and policy environment** – interviewees highlighted the pressure public sector partners were under to reduce or cap spending, the uncertainty of future budgets in light of the 2014/15 spending review and the ongoing consultation on the Scottish Community Justice system as factors that impacted on public sector partners ability to commit to future financial support for the PSP. In some cases this prevented public sector partners committing to underwriting services, and in others these factors became caveats on their commitments to underwrite services.

6.24 Chapter 3 highlighted that some partners were of the opinion that the challenges around sustainability had impacted on partnership working.

### **Views on sustainability**

6.25 As highlighted above 54% of PSP survey respondents reported that they were confident the services would be maintained by public sector partners beyond March 2015 if the outcomes are met. Although a narrow majority, a further 17% of respondents said that they did not have confidence that the services would be maintained beyond 2015. Interviews confirmed mixed views exist among PSP partners about the likelihood that services would be sustained after the Change Fund ends.

6.26 On balance interviewees were unsure about whether the services developed through the PSP model would be sustained after the Change Fund ends. The reason for the uncertainty was the caveats attached to the commitments to underwrite the services. Generally partners were hopeful the services would be sustained but were not able to say for sure that they would be. Despite the uncertainty and the caveats, lead organisations and partners welcomed the requirement for public sector partners to commit to underwrite the services in the future as they felt it gave them something tangible to use during future discussions. They were generally of the opinion that the commitments were something they could use to hold partners to account, while recognising it was not a guarantee of funding. They also felt that without these commitments they would be less confident that the services would be sustained after the Change Fund ends.

### **Other sustainability issues**

6.27 The final section of this chapter summarises a number of other issues highlighted by interviewees during discussions about sustainability. The

issues are competitive tendering, delivering best value, sourcing additional funding, and non-financial sustainability.

### **Competitive tendering**

- 6.28 All interviewees were aware of the requirement for the public sector to competitively tender the services at the end of the pilot period and this is laid out explicitly in the MoUs. Some interviewees, including most large third sector organisations, reported that they had no issues with this requirement, highlighting that competitive tendering was part of the funding environment. There was some concern among a minority of partners, particularly but not entirely from third sector organisations, about the potential impact on partnership working this tendering could have. Some of these interviewees described a fear that PSPs, led by the third sector, could deliver projects for two years, gather and share learning only for it to then be lost to private, public, or other voluntary sector contractors who would use this learning to then undercut the sector and undermine the ethos of partnership working.

### **Delivering best value**

- 6.29 A concern voiced by some interviewees from the public sector was the requirement for organisations to commit now to fund services which had not yet proven their worth which they felt was not helpful, even if a funding commitment included a caveat that the service had to be successfully evaluated. These interviewees were of the opinion that the services, and the organisations delivering them, should first demonstrate that they can make a real difference. They felt that asking for a commitment from them now to continue funding at the end of the Change Fund period was futile. Moreover, to ask now for committed funds was to ignore other demands on future funding and the possibility of more effective services being developed before 2015, or indeed, more effective services or elements of services being delivered elsewhere as part of the Change Fund.
- 6.30 The importance of sharing learning among PSPs and to be open about monitoring and evaluation was deemed essential by interviewees from all sectors. This meant encouraging learning from what works and what does not work as well. A strong evaluation could then leave public funders to decide whether and how best to proceed with committing further funding to the projects. Some partners voiced concern that they felt unable to discuss shared monitoring and evaluation processes with other PSPs during the development process and were keen to ensure that maximum sharing of learning was encouraged. Chapter 3 highlighted there were some reservations about the degree of learning within the PSPs to date.

### **Sourcing additional funds**

- 6.31 As cross sector partnerships the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs had the ability to draw upon wider sources of funding. Within the

programme, some third sector partners were already seeking new sources of funding to deliver or expand opportunities

- 6.32 The majority of the PSPs that were not awarded years 2/3 delivery funding were considering alternative funding options. Partners indicated that they did not want to waste the amount of work and the strength of the relationships that went in to the PSPs and they would seek other funding. It is noteworthy that some of the CJAs expressed a desire to support the local PSPs in their search for additional funding.

### **Non-financial elements of sustainability**

- 6.33 A number of interviewees highlighted that sustainability goes beyond funding. Scottish Government Guidance on PSP development suggested that forming the partnership should be an ongoing process, which should ideally continue beyond the delivery of a service and become embedded in the strategy of partner organisations. There was evidence that some partnerships had embarked on such a process. Feedback from the PSP survey and interviews with stakeholders point to high levels of satisfaction with partnership working. Indeed, such had been the success of some PSPs in building relations that they had plans to continue in some format regardless of the funding decision.
- 6.34 One PSP's proposal included a large element of match funding in-kind from partners across the public and third sectors. This included ADSW and SPS agreeing to develop, implement and sustain the procedures, protocols and processes which underpin effective service delivery and partnership working. All partners committed to providing services in kind, which were estimated at £237,000 per annum. Another PSP had a similar commitment from a local authority.

## 7 CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1 The preceding chapters of this report have focused on the experiences and role of the lead organisations and assessed how the organisations and their partners addressed key elements of establishing a PSP – partnership working, service user involvement, co-production and sustainability. Chapter 3 highlighted that partnerships consist of broadly equal numbers of third and public sector organisations although the level of involvement of the public sector varies by organisational type; significantly the chapter also highlighted that partnership working was a real strength of the PSP development process to date. Chapter 4 highlighted that extensive service user consultation was undertaken although direct engagement in the design process was limited to date. Chapter 5 highlighted that co-production was an integral part of the PSP development process consisting mainly of discussion around a service proposal presented by the lead organisation although some involved deeper collaborative design. Chapter 6 highlighted that sustainability was a key consideration from the outset and that CJAs in particular committed to underwriting the services if they proved to be successful and other conditions were met.
- 7.2 This concluding chapter revisits the questions posed in the research brief to provide an overview of progress to date in the development of the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund PSPs.

### **Why did the organisation choose to get involved with a PSP? What did they hope to get out of this model of working?**

- 7.3 Generally speaking the main reasons why organisations were involved in a PSP were not because it was a PSP but related to the Change Fund's focus on mentoring services to reduce reoffending. The availability of funding was a key factor in why the lead organisations and delivery partners got involved in the RRCF. It was also a factor in why some other partners supported the PSP bid as it was seen as an opportunity to bring resources into their area. However, funding was not the only factor. The majority of the lead organisations were involved in the delivery of justice services and/or mentoring services and they viewed the RRCF as an opportunity to expand or develop new services. Where the lead organisation was not already involved in justice or mentoring they had been identified as potential growth areas that the RRCF provided an opportunity to develop. Ultimately the aspiration to reduce reoffending was therefore a factor.
- 7.4 The PSP model was highlighted as a secondary factor insofar as it offered an opportunity to expand/develop mentoring services to reduce reoffending in a new way. Although there were some reservations about the PSP model – mainly where it was an unknown quantity – it appealed to third sector lead organisations as it gave them a much more prominent position in the service design process. It is also noteworthy that a number of the public sector partners that engaged in

the process were also interested in working in a new way more closely with the third sector, and ensuring service users' voices were heard.

- 7.5 A small number of interviewees highlighted that the Change Fund's prescription of the PSP model did not allow partners to consider whether PSPs were the most appropriate model or proportionate to the likely outcomes. The Scottish Government's Guide to developing PSPs includes reference to both of these issues.

**What activities did organisations undertake as part of the PSP development? How successful or unsuccessful do they feel these were?**

- 7.6 The PSPs delivered a range of activities in a relatively short space of time. The activities have been described in this report and were essentially those outlined by the RRCF Guidance, most notably a series of partnership workshops and meetings, extensive service user involvement with a range of participants including hard to reach groups, detailed service mapping and needs analysis, and collaborative service design. Interviewees highlighted that Development Funding was important in progressing these activities in the time available via a combination of in-house staff and external consultants, with considerable support from partner organisations from both the public and third sector.
- 7.7 Generally the lead organisations and their partners viewed these activities as successful. The consensus was that the submissions for year 2 and 3 funding had benefitted greatly from the activities, and better evidenced and more detailed proposals had resulted.

**Do they feel that the PSP model is having a positive, negative or no impact on the quality of the service that has been/is being developed? What is it about the model that is having this impact, if any?**

- 7.8 PSP partners generally viewed the PSP model as having a positive impact on the quality of the services proposed in their bids and they were also optimistic that this would be shown in the delivery phase. The main reason for their optimism was the opportunity afforded by the PSP model for partners from the third and public sectors to co-produce services that took account of service user views and existing services more than might have been the case using other models. Co-production and service user involvement were highlighted as important factors.
- 7.9 Two approaches to co-production were developed - refinement of an approach proposed by the lead organisations, and a more fundamental approach to the design of a new service from scratch - feedback on the latter process was very positive. Views on the success of the two approaches varied and preclude conclusions about which was more effective. The process of co-production was one of the elements of PSP development that partners found most valuable, in terms of learning about services, sharing knowledge and experience, and

fostering a system of close joint working. The majority of partners interviewed felt the proposals were co-designed and the process had a positive impact on the quality of services developed. Similarly, service user involvement was viewed as successful as it identified a number of issues and an impact was evident in several PSPs where services were redesigned following input from users.

**What impact has the model had on partnership working? What mechanisms have been put in place to ensure an equal working relationship between partners and are these successful?**

- 7.10 Chapter 3 highlighted the positive messages around partnership working emanating from the PSP interviewees. The impact of the PSP model on partnership working was said to be evident in improved relationships, better understanding between partners, the development of trust, and the development of shared values.
- 7.11 Overall there was a sense of equal partnership working. The main mechanism to ensure equal partnership working was dialogue and information sharing to address issues. However, achieving equal working relationships was identified as a challenge and this is important as the lessons from previous PSPs emphasised the importance of equality. Generally speaking, the PSPs were aware of the need to progress equal partnership working in the future.

**What challenges are partnerships facing through the process?**

- 7.12 It is noteworthy that generally a positive view of the PSP model was found despite a number of challenges identified by the organisations involved. These challenges have been discussed in all sections of this report as they relate to the lead organisations, partnership working, service user involvement, co-production and sustainability.
- 7.13 Challenges faced by the third sector lead organisations included overcoming limited experience of PSPs, mentoring and the justice system, difficulties in assuming the leadership role, and difficulties engaging partners within the timescale. Challenges identified around partnership working involved the limited timescale available to develop PSPs, the competitive nature of the Reducing Reoffending Change Fund, the different approaches of partners, the need for clarity at the outset on some issues, the input of different personnel, and the issues faced in discussing sustainability. Interviewees highlighted that there were challenges in the three key aspects of co-production around identifying gaps and evidencing need, considering how schemes would link with existing and developing interventions, and defining objectives and outcomes. Interviewees also highlighted challenges during sustainability discussions around the limited involvement of some public sector partners including some of those that may benefit from savings resulting from a reduction in reoffending in the future, the limited timescale which impacted on the depth of discussions, issues

working across administrative borders for some PSPs, and the prevailing funding and policy environment.

**Do they feel that the service being developed through the PSP model is likely to be sustained after the Change Fund ends? Why or why not?**

- 7.14 Discussions around sustainability occurred in all PSPs and resulted in written commitments from public sector partners - mainly from the Community Justice Authorities - to underwrite services in the future in 13 of the 14 PSPs that received Development Funding. The commitments were subject to a number of caveats including the outcome of the UK spending review in 2014/15 and evidence of service impact. The 14 partnerships were unsure about whether the services developed through the PSP model would be sustained after the Change Fund ends mainly because of the caveats attached to the commitments to underwrite services. Despite this most interviewees welcomed the requirement to consider sustainability at the outset as they felt it would allow them to hold public sector partners to account in the future.
- 7.15 Sustainability commitments appeared to be strongest among the partnerships where the public sector had been most fully involved in the PSP. The limited commitment of some public sector partners that could benefit in the long term from savings resulting from a reduction in reoffending was highlighted by interviewees. The reasons for this were partly because some public sector partners had not been invited to join the PSPs and partly because funding pressure and the 2014/15 UK spending review meant that some public partners could not provide written commitments to underwrite services at this time. The lessons learned from PSP experiences to date described in Chapter 1 suggest that the PSP model works best when the public sector instigates a process involving the public and third sectors to jointly design services that the public sector is seeking to commission.

**Are partnerships achieving what they wanted to from being part of a PSP model? Would they be part of a PSP model again?**

- 7.16 The majority of PSP partners described their involvement in the PSP process in positive terms. Most linked achieving what they wanted to from the PSP model directly to the outcome of their bid. Outwith the desired funding outcome, the majority of lead organisations and other partners interviewed were of the opinion that the PSP development process had been beneficial and they had achieved something tangible from it.
- 7.17 It was noteworthy that lead organisations and most partners who participated in the research said they would be part of a PSP again and this was essentially because they felt that they had achieved a great deal in a short space of time. The process had been challenging but this had not dissuaded lead organisations and partners from future involvement in the model. It was unclear whether all organisations that

indicated they would be part of PSPs again would do so through choice or where it was the prescribed model. However, it was noted that some of those organisations that had not secured RRCF funding commented that they would consider applying a PSP model in the future. For all those involved in the PSP approach the principle of co-design appeared to be the main attraction.

## **APPENDIX 1 – REDUCING REOFFENDING CHANGE FUND ASSESSMENT CRITERIA**

### **Year 1 Development Funding**

- Identification of at least one public sector and one third sector organisation interested in working together to develop a PSP model.
- An outline of what the prospective partners will be doing between now and March 2013 to develop a PSP delivering mentoring interventions for offenders.
- An understanding of the behaviours necessary to sustain strong, equal working partnerships.
- An established track record in delivery.

### **Year 2/3 Delivery Funding**

- The partnership's understanding of the issues to be addressed and the evidence-base behind these
- The suitability of the proposed approach to meet the desired outcomes for the Change Fund
- Evidence for how the proposed service will meet an identified need and complement other existing services
- Confirmation that the client group with whom the service will be working echoes the desired target group(s) for the Change Fund
- The capacity and experience of the partnership to achieve the intended outcomes
- The commitment to partnership working and an understanding of the aims and mechanics of the PSP model
- Involvement of service users in design and delivery of service
- Accurate and realistic costs which provide value for money
- Realistic plans for how the partnership will continue to fund and deliver the services set out in the work plan after March 2015 should the service prove effective

## APPENDIX 2 – YEAR 1 DEVELOPMENT FUNDING AWARDS

Lead Organisation	Development Funding
SACRO	£39,991.00
NHS Lothian	£39,983.00
The Wise Group	£39,070.00
Action for Children	£36,053.00
Apex	£34,930.00
Liber8 Lanarkshire	£34,924.00
Phoenix Futures	£33,332.00
Tayside Council on Alcohol	£31,757.00
The Ayrshire Community Trust (TACT)	£31,108.00
Voluntary Action South Lanarkshire (VASLAN)	£30,429.00
The Richmond Fellowship Scotland	£23,923.68
West Dunbartonshire Community Drug Service	£19,778.85
CVS Falkirk and District	£15,960.00
Station House Media Unit	£15,000.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£426,239.53</b>

## **APPENDIX 3 – CONTEXTUAL DOCUMENTS**

- „Reducing Reoffending: National Strategy for the Management of Offenders“ (Scottish Government, 2006)
- „Public Social Partnership in Scotland Lessons Learnt (Forth Sector Development, 2007)
- „A Practical Guide to Forming and Operating Public Social Partnerships“ (Scottish Government, 2011)
- „What Works to Reduce Reoffending: A Summary of the Evidence“ (Scottish Government, 2011)
- „Commission on Women Offenders“ (Scottish Government, 2012)
- „Redesigning the Community Justice System. A Consultation on Proposals“ (Scottish Government, 2012)
- „The Strategy for Justice in Scotland“ (Scottish Government, 2012)
- „The Strategy for Justice in Scotland Evidence Paper“ (Scottish Government, 2012)

## APPENDIX 4 – LEAD ORGANISATIONS

PSP	Size and scale of lead organisation	Reach of PSP bid	Experience of Criminal Justices and approaches to reduce reoffending	Previous experience of PSPs	Initiated application for PSP development
Action for Children	Large – National	4 local authority areas	Direct	Yes	Yes
Alternatives	Medium – Local	3 local authority areas	Direct	Yes	Yes
Apex	Large – National	National	Direct	Yes	Yes
Ayrshire Community Trust	Medium – Local	1 local authority area	Indirect	Yes	Yes
CVS Falkirk	Medium – Local	1 local authority area	Limited/none	Yes	Yes
EVOC	Medium – Local	4 local authority areas	Direct	Yes	No
Liber8	Medium – Local	2 local authority areas	Indirect	No	Yes
Phoenix Futures	Large - National	5 CJA areas	Direct	No	Yes
Richmond Fellowship	Large - National	1 local authority area	Limited/none	No	No
SACRO	Large - National	National	Direct	Yes	No
Station House Media Unit/Aberdeen Foyer	Medium - Local	1 local authority area	Direct	No	Yes
Tayside	Medium - Local	3 local authority areas	Direct	No	No
VASLAN	Medium - Local	1 local authority area	Indirect	No	No
Wise Group	Large - National	National	Direct	Yes	Yes

## APPENDIX 5 – DEVELOPMENT FUNDING BREAKDOWN

Detailed analysis of how the Development Funding is not possible because of the variation in the way the information is presented. The following breakdown of projected, not actual, spend is based on our interpretation of budget descriptions.

### Development Funding

Categorisation of spend	Total projection	Percentage of overall budget	Example of spend
Staff	£263,150	62%	The development funding was used to backfill a post, appoint a new worker or increase the hours of existing staff.
Lead partners costs e.g. equipment, administration, management fees	£62,416	15%	These included covering costs of telephone calls and IT.
Consultants	£26,280	6%	Consultants were used for activities such as undertaking mapping exercises and carrying out service user consultation.
Service user consultation	£15,713	4%	Examples include venue hire, catering and reimbursement of out of pocket expenses. Some partners suggested that good hospitality made service users feel valued and encouraged them to share their views because it signalled that their contribution was important.
Programme resources e.g. materials, training, piloting	£19,100	4%	Some partners spent part of their budget on resources, for example one hired a graphic designer to produce a mock up of marketing material that would be distributed in the community (both to attract potential service users and provide information to the community about the project). Other examples include investing in training tools for mentors, running a small pilot of their programme to identify any practical issues in service delivery and purchasing training for PSP staff and mentors.
Partnership facilitation e.g. venue hire	£10,700	3%	The use of funds to aid partnership working included hiring venues that were big enough to accommodate full partnership meetings and appointing external facilitators to lead stakeholder meetings.
Other	£12,894	3%	This category was used for budgets that could not be attributed specifically to any of the areas above e.g. PSP "stationery"
Travel	£10,525	2%	Typically this was not broken down –one PSP specified this would be used to reimburse based on mileage
Partners' costs	£5,461	1%	Some PSPs reimbursed partners" for their time when undertaking PSP activities or attending meetings.
<b>Total</b>	<b>£426,239</b>		

## APPENDIX 6 – MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING PARTNERS AND SIGNATORIES BY ORGANISATIONAL TYPE

Organisation type	MoU Partners		MoU Signatories	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Third sector	70	47%	55	50%
Local Authority	36	24%	21	19%
Community Justice Authority	20	13%	16	14%
Alcohol and Drug Partnership	6	4%	4	4%
NHS	4	3%	2	2%
Police	4	3%	2	2%
Scottish Prison Service	4	3%	8	7%
Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service	2	1%	1	<1%
Association of Directors of Social Work	1	<1%	1	<1%
Job Centre Plus	1	<1%	1	<1%
Forestry Commission	1	<1%	0	0%
Service users	1	<1%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>100%</b>

## APPENDIX 7 - PUBLIC SOCIAL PARTNERSHIPS SURVEY RESULTS

### Rationale and Goals

Question	Strongly disagree or Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Strongly agree or Agree	N
Our partnership has a clear vision	11%	6%	83%	54
Partners were involved in developing the vision	13%	7%	80%	55
Partners understand the purpose of the partnership	13%	2%	85%	55

### Set up

Question	Strongly disagree or Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Strongly agree or Agree	N
A range of activities took place as part of the PSP development	7%	5%	88%	56
The activities were well attended and relevant	9%	14%	77%	56
The activities were successful and boosted partnership development	9%	20%	71%	56

### Partnership Working

Question	Strongly disagree or Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Strongly agree or Agree	N
The right partners are on the PSP	7%	9%	84%	56
Partners are treated equally	14%	21%	64%	56
Support is available to maintain or achieve equality	7%	31%	61%	54

### Impact

Question	Strongly disagree or Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Strongly agree or Agree	N
The PSP will have a positive impact on the quality of services being developed	2%	16%	82%	55
We will be able to identify the social benefit we deliver	4%	16%	80%	55
We will be able to prove the	5%	18%	76%	55

social benefit we deliver				
---------------------------	--	--	--	--

## Learning

Question	Strongly disagree or Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Strongly agree or Agree	N
We have processes in place to capture learning	6%	24%	70%	54
We have identified barriers and enablers to delivery	9%	15%	76%	54
We have modified our partnership through learning	11%	26%	63%	54

## Roles and responsibilities

Question	Strongly disagree or Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Strongly agree or Agree	N
Our PSP has set out clear roles and responsibilities for partners	6%	13%	81%	52
These roles build on individual partner strengths	12%	12%	77%	52
Governance is strong and accountable	10%	23%	67%	52

## Sustainability

Question	Strongly disagree or Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Strongly agree or Agree	N
The PSP has adequately considered how it will maintain services beyond March 2015	17%	27%	56%	52
I am confident the services will be maintained by public sector partners beyond March 2015 if the outcomes are met	17%	29%	54%	52
The PSP has met my expectations and I would be part of a PSP again	10%	21%	69%	52

## Communication

Question	Strongly disagree or Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Strongly agree or Agree	N
Our PSP meets regularly to a firm agenda	11%	13%	75%	53
Our meetings are minuted	8%	25%	68%	53
Information is shared among	6%	11%	83%	53

partners				
----------	--	--	--	--

### Service User Involvement

Question	Strongly disagree or Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Strongly agree or Agree	N
Service users have been involved in the PSP	6%	15%	79%	52
Service user involvement is valued by other partners	2%	10%	88%	51
Service user involvement has had a positive impact on the PSP	10%	18%	73%	51

### Trust

Question	Strongly disagree or Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Strongly agree or Agree	N
There is trust among partners	10%	17%	73%	52
Meetings are open and encourage dialogue	8%	4%	88%	52
Our vision is understood and shared by all partners	6%	17%	77%	52

## APPENDIX 8 – SERVICE USER INVOLVEMENT

<b>PSP</b>	<b>Service User Involvement</b>
SACRO	Focus groups set up with support from SPS, to discuss positive and negative aspects of mentoring with service users
NHS Lothian	Initial focus groups and workshop followed up by a film and comic to portray 'lived experience' of service users
The Wise Group	Focus groups and depth interviews with prisoners and existing service users conducted by an external consultant.
Action for Children	Focus groups were set up via HMYOI Polmont
Apex	Survey of ex offenders currently supported by APEX
Liber8 Lanarkshire	Focus groups with short term prisoners in HMP Addiewell, and offenders serving Community Payback Orders and Drug Treatment and Testing Orders, conducted by an external consultant.
Phoenix Futures	Depth interviews, focus groups and a questionnaire with existing service users, prisoners and volunteers
Tayside Council on Alcohol	Focus groups with existing service users conducted by an external consultant.
The Ayrshire Community Trust	Consultation events held with individuals who are currently on a community Payback Order.
Voluntary Action South Lanarkshire	Consultation events with 30 former service users. At these events text surveys were used to encourage the participation of people with literacy issues.
The Richmond Fellowship Scotland	Survey of Community Payback Order information
West Dunbartonshire Community Drug Service	Focus groups with offenders with experience of prison and community sentences, conducted by an external consultant.
CVS Falkirk and District	A survey of service users of Criminal Justice and local service providers to evaluate the need for mentors for people who have been involved with the Criminal Justice Service.
Station House Media Unit	Depth interviews with prisoners in HMP Aberdeen conducted by prison staff with support from an external consultant.

**Social Research series**  
ISSN 2045-6964  
ISBN 978-1-78256-558-1

**web only publication**  
[www.scotland.gov.uk/socialresearch](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/socialresearch)

APS Group Scotland  
DPPAS14239 (05/13)

