**Engagement** **Event** **for** **NPS** **and** **CRC** **Operational** **Heads**

Manchester 17th January 2020 London 24th January 2020

**Agenda**

• Welcome and introduction from Jim Barton (SRO Probation Reform Programme) • Presentation on Probation Delivery Unit Proposal (Hugh Howell)

• Table discussions

• Initial feedback and next steps (Jim and Hugh)

• BREAK

• Proposed approach for filling roles (Sharon Huckle and Lucie Secular – HR leads for programme)

• Table discussions

• Feedback and Q&A (Jim) • Next steps and close (Jim)
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**Welcome** **and** **Introduction**

• Welcome – general update on Probation Reform Programme

• Today we will be presenting our proposal for a new Probation Delivery Unit structure and be seeking your feedback on this.

• We will also be sharing an overview of the processes we intend to follow to fill roles within the new structure, and focus in particular on the processes that will affect you and placement into the Heads of PDU roles. There will be opportunities to ask questions about these processes, and specific areas where we would like your input.
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**High** **level** **timelines** **for** **key** **recruitment** **and** **staff** **placement** **activity**

**2019** **Activity** **for** **regional** **structure**

Q4 Q1

**2020** **2021**

Q2 Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2

**Probation** **Delivery** **Unit** **structure**

Engagement with NPS and CRC leaders, development of proposal

Jan: Consultation with TUs/ Engagement ACOs

Feb: Model finalised

At point of transfer,

Continue with existing NPS LDU / LDU Cluster structure implement new

PDUs

**NPS** **reconfiguration** **from** **6** **divisions** **to** **11** **regions**

Planning for restructure activity to move to new NPS regions – people, estates, IT

Start to transition into new geographical structure – ambition to move as quickly as possible from April

Temporary recruitment to some critical roles to allow split of divisions – will still be subject to wider placement process for post-transfer

Dec: **Regional** **Directors** Appointment of 6

remaining Regional Director posts

Jan-Mar: Notice period & vetting

Apr: RDs in post

All Regional Directors leading regional transition activity for new NPS regions (i.e. transition boards for all new regions), NPS staff working to support new regions (detail all TBC)

**Senior** **Management** **Team** (Head of Ops, Head of Community Integration, Commissioning & CM, Head of Corporate Services, Head of P&Q) – **in** **post** **pre-transfer**

**Process** **for** **Operational** **Heads** **and** **all** **other** **in** **scope** **NPS/** **CRC** **roles**

Feb-April: Run recruitment

process for roles – identify Apr: individuals who will take up 1 Head of Ops per

these roles region in post to support new NPS regions

Jan-Mar: Job evaluation

process for new roles

Jan-July: Collect required data from CRCs, determine staff in scope for transfer, identify equivalent roles etc\*

Jan-July: Refine the placement process, conduct impact assessment, consult with Trade Unions

Potential to bring onboard Head of Corporate Services if required (TBC)

July - September Start running placement

process – starting with Head of PDU / operation head roles

All other SMT roles in post 6 months before transition

Continue to run placement process for all other roles – for roles where no competition / undersupply staff will be allocated to new roles

All start in role at date of transfer

\*Timing of placement process subject to consent to pre-transfer activity and receipt of required data from CRCs

**Probation** **Delivery** **Unit:** **Proposed** **model** **and** **structure**

Hugh Howell

**Background**

• The Probation Reform Programme has engaged with NPS and CRC leaders to develop a new Probation Delivery Unit (PDU) model to operate beneath the new regional structure.

• We want to ensure we have the necessary senior management capability and capacity within the Unified Model to account for the combined caseload and maximise probation’s influence within local partnership-working arrangements.

• Through this process we have a sought to develop a model that maintains national consistency across the regions, but is responsive to local business need where there is a compelling case for variation.

• We have agreed a provisional PDU model for each region and are now undertaking formal trade union consultation on the proposals over January and February 2020. To support this we have organised two events for ACOs.

• This slide pack provides further narrative information to support these..
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**Regional** **overview**

**\*Estimated** **combined** **caseload** **(Headcount)** **–** **August** **2019** **–** **Not** **official** **figures**
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**Approach**

• The Probation Reform Programme created and shared a data tool to inform development of proposals. • NPS and CRC leaders submitted proposals based on local knowledge.

• Programme reviewed proposals to test consistency.

• Programme worked with NPS and CRC leaders to develop a revised set of proposals.

• Provisionally agreed revised set of proposals through Programme Board subject to engagement with new Regional Probation Directors and Trade Union consultation.
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**Guiding** **principles** **–** **Determining** **geographical** **structure**

• Rename current NPS Local Delivery Unit (LDU) and LDU Clusters as Probation Delivery Units (PDUs) for clarity.

• Maintain model of geographical-based units.

• Boundaries to be based around upper tier and unitary local authorities.

• Should be directly co-terminus with upper tier or unitary local authorities where possible to ensure there is a single voice for probation locally.

• Should only be smaller or larger than a single upper tier or unitary local authority where this is necessary to create a viable and resilient unit and there is a sensible alternative configuration that is workable from a partnership-working perspective.
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**Guiding** **principles** **-** **Management** **model**

• Each PDU to be managed by a single Head of Service (ACO C).

• Maintain Senior Operational Support Manager (Band 6) role but rename ‘Deputy Head of Probation Delivery Unit’.

• Heads of Service will remain the formal line manager for Senior Probation Officers and be responsible for the SPDR process. However remaining day to day supervision/management to be through matrix management by the Deputy Heads, allowing the Heads of Service to focus partnership work and ultimate accountability for PDU performance.

• Only the most complex PDUs to be allocated a Deputy.
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**Guiding** **principles** **-** **Complexity**

• Based upon current E3 considerations

• Acombination of local knowledge and calculation • Calculate relative complexity score for each PDU.

• Combines number of key measures:

oStaffing: estimated number of OM and court SPO numbers derived from caseload and court report volumes

oPartnerships: number of upper, unitary and lower tier local authorities

oGeography: land area

oRurality: % of population defined as rural

• Aweighting for measures was agreed with Probation senior management.

• An uplift has been applied to London to reflect longstanding performance challenges and overall size and complexity of London.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Weighting** | **London** **uplift** |
| Staffing | 55% | 25% |
| Partnerships | 35% | 0% |
| Land area | 5% | 0% |
| Rurality | 5% | 0% |
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**Guiding** **principles** **-** **Allocating** **deputies**

Acknowledged that a pure mathematical solution was not the right answer for geography. To reflect this variation in line with current NPS practice, deputies were assigned by:

• Looking at variation between the PDUs it was identified that there were approximately 40 complex PDUs.

• Where a PDU falls outside of the top 40 but is estimated to have 8\* or more SPOs, they have been allocated a Deputy.

• Where a PDU is estimated to have 14\* or more SPOs, they have been allocated two Deputies.

• Several additional Deputies have been allocated to the most complex PDUs to reflect particular challenges following engagement with NPS and CRC leaders.

• Regional Probation Directors will have flexibility to redeploy allocated deputies to other PDUs in the region or to have Deputies work across multiple PDUs.

**\*** **Numbers** **reflect** **best** **estimates** **of** **scale** **and** **are** **indicative.**
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**Regional** **breakdown** **–** **Data**

• The information used to inform PDU proposals, and outlined in the subsequent regional breakdowns, utilises best available information.

• There are several caveats to keep in mind when reviewing the regional breakdown:

oPDU names are not finalised and will need to be refined to ensure a consistent format can be applied to all reporting systems.

oExact boundaries for several PDUs which divide a unitary local authority (e.g. Manchester) remain subject to further refinement.

oPDU proposal are focussed on offender management and court work. The OMiC model is out of scope.

oCaseload information are not official figures. In some areas there were challenges to mapping all CRC and NPS cases where teams cover multiple upper tier or unitary local authorities. These will be refined further once proposals are finalised.

oPartnerships and geography measures are based on published ONS information.
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**Regional** **breakdown** **–** **East** **Midlands**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Number** **of** **PDUs** **/** **Heads** **of** **Service** | **Number** **of** **Deputies** |
| **East** **Midlands** | 6 | 5 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed** **Probation** **Delivery** **Unit** | **Complexity** **ranking** | **Caseload** | **Number** **of** **upper** **tier** **and** **unitary** **local** **authorities** | **Number** **of** **lower** **tier** **local** **authorities** | **Land** **area** **(sq** **m)** | **Rurality**  **(%** **Population)** |
| Nottingham City | 94 | 1,500 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 0% |
| Nottinghamshire | 12 | 4,000 | 1 | 7 | 805 | 30% |
| Derby City | 68 | 3,000 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 0% |
| Derbyshire | 49 | 1,500 | 1 | 8 | 983 | 32% |
| Leicestershire and Rutland | 3 | 4,000 | 3 | 7 | 980 | 31% |
| Lincolnshire | 15 | 2,000 | 1 | 7 | 2,292 | 68% |

**14**

**Regional** **breakdown** **–** **East** **of** **England**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Number** **of** **PDUs** **/** **Heads** **of** **Service** | **Number** **of** **Deputies** |
| **East** **of** **England** | 8 | 8 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed** **Probation** **Delivery** **Unit** | **Complexity** **ranking** | **Caseload** | **Number** **of** **upper** **tier** **and** **unitary** **local** **authorities** | **Number** **of** **lower** **tier** **local** **authorities** | **Land** **area** **(sq** **m)** | **Rurality**  **(%** **Population)** |
| Essex North | 9 | 4,000 | 0.5 | 7 | 1,070 | 34% |
| Essex South | 24 | 2,500 | 2.5 | 4 | 347 | 19% |
| Suffolk | 38 | 2,500 | 1 | 5 | 1,468 | 60% |
| Norfolk | 14 | 2,500 | 1 | 7 | 2,077 | 62% |
| Hertfordshire | 20 | 3,000 | 1 | 10 | 634 | 16% |
| Northamptonshire | 19 | 3,000 | 1 | 7 | 913 | 37% |
| Bedfordshire | 39 | 3,000 | 3 | 0 | 477 | 32% |
| Cambridgeshire | 8 | 3,000 | 2 | 5 | 1,309 | 53% |
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**Regional** **breakdown** **–** **Greater** **Manchester**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Number** **of** **PDUs** **/** **Heads** **of** **Service** | **Number** **of** **Deputies** |
| **Greater** **Manchester** | 9 | 1 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed** **Probation** **Delivery** **Unit** | **Complexity** **ranking** | **Caseload** | **Number** **of** **upper** **tier** **and** **unitary** **local** **authorities** | **Number** **of** **lower** **tier** **local** **authorities** | **Land** **area** **(sq** **m)** | **Rurality**  **(%** **Population)** |
| Manchester and Salford\* | 83 | 2,500 | 1.2 | 0 | 46 | 0% |
| Manchester 1\* | 101 | 2,000 | 0.4 | 0 | 18 | 0% |
| Manchester 2\* | 101 | 2,000 | 0.4 | 0 | 18 | 0% |
| Bolton | 97 | 1,500 | 1 | 0 | 54 | 1% |
| Wigan | 103 | 1,500 | 1 | 0 | 73 | 4% |
| Bury and Rochdale | 71 | 2,500 | 2 | 0 | 99 | 2% |
| Stockport and Trafford | 73 | 2,000 | 2 | 0 | 90 | 0% |
| Tameside | 107 | 1,000 | 1 | 0 | 40 | 0% |
| Oldham | 108 | 1,500 | 1 | 0 | 55 | 1% |

\*Exact geographical boundaries to be developed further
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**Regional** **breakdown** **–** **Kent,** **Surrey** **&** **Sussex**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Number** **of** **PDUs** **/** **Heads** **of** **Service** | **Number** **of** **Deputies** |
| **Kent,** **Surrey** **&** **Sussex** | 5 | 4 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed** **Probation** **Delivery** **Unit** | **Complexity** **ranking** | **Caseload** | **Number** **of** **upper** **tier** **and** **unitary** **local** **authorities** | **Number** **of** **lower** **tier** **local** **authorities** | **Land** **area** **(sq** **m)** | **Rurality**  **(%** **Population)** |
| East Kent | 16 | 3,000 | 1.5 | 6 | 684 | 33% |
| West Kent | 21 | 4,000 | 0.5 | 6 | 759 | 27% |
| Surrey | 23 | 2,500 | 1 | 11 | 642 | 19% |
| East Sussex | 17 | 3,000 | 2 | 5 | 692 | 27% |
| West Sussex | 48 | 2,000 | 1 | 7 | 769 | 25% |
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**Regional** **breakdown** **–** **London**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Number** **of** **PDUs** **/** **Heads** **of** **Service** | **Number** **of** **Deputies** |
| **London** | 18 | 8 |
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**Regional** **breakdown** **–** **North** **East**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Number** **of** **PDUs** **/** **Heads** **of** **Service** | **Number** **of** **Deputies** |
| **North** **East** | 7 | 3 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed** **Probation** **Delivery** **Unit** | **Complexity** **ranking** | **Caseload** | **Number** **of** **upper** **tier** **and** **unitary** **local** **authorities** | **Number** **of** **lower** **tier** **local** **authorities** | **Land** **area** **(sq** **m)** | **Rurality**  **(%** **Population)** |
| County Durham and Darlington | 29 | 3,000 | 2 | 0 | 936 | 53% |
| Gateshead and South Tyneside | 70 | 2,000 | 2 | 0 | 80 | 5% |
| Stockton and Hartlepool | 82 | 2,000 | 2 | 0 | 115 | 4% |
| Sunderland | 106 | 1,500 | 1 | 0 | 53 | 1% |
| Redcar, Cleveland and Middlesbrough | 54 | 2,000 | 2 | 0 | 115 | 16% |
| Newcastle Upon Tyne | 86 | 2,000 | 1 | 0 | 44 | 2% |
| North Tyneside and Northumberland | 35 | 2,000 | 2 | 0 | 1,968 | 45% |
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**Regional** **breakdown** **–** **North** **West**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Number** **of** **PDUs** **/** **Heads** **of** **Service** | **Number** **of** **Deputies** |
| **North** **West** | 13 | 2 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed** **Probation** **Delivery** **Unit** | **Complexity** **ranking** | **Caseload** | **Number** **of** **upper** **tier** **and** **unitary** **local** **authorities** | **Number** **of** **lower** **tier** **local** **authorities** | **Land** **area** **(sq** **m)** | **Rurality**  **(%** **Population)** |
| West Cheshire | 84 | 1,500 | 1 | 0 | 354 | 26% |
| East Cheshire | 96 | 1,000 | 1 | 0 | 450 | 39% |
| Warrington and Halton | 78 | 2,000 | 2 | 0 | 100 | 9% |
| Knowsley and St Helens | 72 | 2,500 | 2 | 0 | 86 | 3% |
| Liverpool and Sefton\* | 85 | 2,000 | 1.2 | 0 | 68 | 1% |
| Liverpool 1\* | 104 | 2,000 | 0.4 | 0 | 17 | 0% |
| Liverpool 2\* | 104 | 2,000 | 0.4 | 0 | 17 | 0% |
| Cumbria | 22 | 2,000 | 1 | 6 | 2,613 | 75% |
| Wirral | 99 | 1,500 | 1 | 0 | 61 | 1% |
| North West Lancashire | 60 | 2,500 | 1.1 | 1 | 271 | 16% |
| Blackburn | 93 | 1,500 | 1.1 | 1 | 109 | 10% |
| East Lancashire | 87 | 1,500 | 0.4 | 5 | 325 | 25% |
| Central Lancashire | 69 | 2,000 | 0.4 | 5 | 482 | 25% |

\*Exact geographical boundaries to be developed further
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**Regional** **breakdown** **–** **South** **Central**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Number** **of** **PDUs** **/** **Heads** **of** **Service** | **Number** **of** **Deputies** |
| **South** **Central** | 7 | 2 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed** **Probation** **Delivery** **Unit** | **Complexity** **ranking** | **Caseload** | **Number** **of** **upper** **tier** **and** **unitary** **local** **authorities** | **Number** **of** **lower** **tier** **local** **authorities** | **Land** **area** **(sq** **m)** | **Rurality**  **(%** **Population)** |
| Hampshire | 18 | 3,000 | 1 | 10 | 1,136 | 29% |
| Southampton | 76 | 2,000 | 1 | 2 | 303 | 16% |
| Portsmouth and Isle of Wight | 56 | 2,000 | 2 | 0 | 162 | 40% |
| Oxfordshire | 50 | 2,000 | 1 | 5 | 1,006 | 55% |
| Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes | 34 | 2,500 | 2 | 4 | 723 | 29% |
| East Berkshire | 77 | 1,500 | 3 | 0 | 131 | 4% |
| West Berkshire | 64 | 1,500 | 3 | 0 | 357 | 18% |
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**Regional** **breakdown** **–** **South** **West**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Number** **of** **PDUs** **/** **Heads** **of** **Service** | **Number** **of** **Deputies** |
| **South** **West** | 9 | 3 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed** **Probation** **Delivery** **Unit** | **Complexity** **ranking** | **Caseload** | **Number** **of** **upper** **tier** **and** **unitary** **local** **authorities** | **Number** **of** **lower** **tier** **local** **authorities** | **Land** **area** **(sq** **m)** | **Rurality**  **(%** **Population)** |
| Gloucestershire | 45 | 2,000 | 1 | 6 | 1,024 | 42% |
| Swindon and Wiltshire | 42 | 2,500 | 2 | 0 | 1,346 | 50% |
| Dorset | 43 | 2,500 | 2 | 0 | 1,024 | 33% |
| Bristol and South Gloucestershire | 26 | 4,000 | 2 | 0 | 234 | 7% |
| Plymouth | 98 | 1,500 | 1 | 0 | 31 | 0% |
| Cornwall and Isles of Scilly | 59 | 1,000 | 2 | 0 | 1,375 | 83% |
| Devon and Torbay | 6 | 2,500 | 2 | 8 | 2,559 | 61% |
| Somerset | 61 | 1,000 | 1 | 4 | 1,332 | 71% |
| BANES and North Somerset | 75 | 1,500 | 2 | 0 | 278 | 38% |
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**Regional** **breakdown** **–** **Wales**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Number** **of** **PDUs** **/** **Heads** **of** **Service** | **Number** **of** **Deputies** |
| **Wales** | 6 | 6 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed** **Probation** **Delivery** **Unit** | **Complexity** **ranking** | **Caseload** | **Number** **of** **upper** **tier** **and** **unitary** **local** **authorities** | **Number** **of** **lower** **tier** **local** **authorities** | **Land** **area** **(sq** **m)** | **Rurality**  **(%** **Population)** |
| North Wales | 1 | 3,500 | 6 | 0 | 2,375 | N/A |
| Gwent | 5 | 3,000 | 5 | 0 | 599 | N/A |
| Dyfed Powys | 7 | 1,500 | 4 | 0 | 4,230 | N/A |
| Cardiff and the Vale of Glamorgan | 25 | 3,500 | 2 | 0 | 182 | N/A |
| Swansea, Neath Port Talbot | 58 | 2,500 | 2 | 0 | 317 | N/A |
| Cwn Taf Morgannwg | 37 | 2,500 | 3 | 0 | 304 | N/A |
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**Regional** **breakdown** **–** **West** **Midlands**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Number** **of** **PDUs** **/** **Heads** **of** **Service** | **Number** **of** **Deputies** |
| **West** **Midlands** | 9 | 10 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed** **Probation** **Delivery** **Unit** | **Complexity** **ranking** | **Caseload** | **Number** **of** **upper** **tier** **and** **unitary** **local** **authorities** | **Number** **of** **lower** **tier** **local** **authorities** | **Land** **area** **(sq** **m)** | **Rurality**  **(%** **Population)** |
| Birmingham and Solihull\* | 31 | 4,500 | 1 | 0 | 117 | 3% |
| Birmingham 1\* | 32 | 4,500 | 1 | 0 | 55 | 0% |
| Dudley and Sandwell | 52 | 3,000 | 2 | 0 | 71 | 0% |
| Walsall and Wolverhampton | 47 | 3,000 | 2 | 0 | 67 | 1% |
| Coventry | 92 | 2,000 | 1 | 0 | 38 | 0% |
| Warwickshire | 55 | 2,000 | 1 | 5 | 763 | 40% |
| Staffordshire and Stoke | 2 | 4,500 | 2 | 8 | 1,048 | 27% |
| Worcestershire | 51 | 2,000 | 1 | 6 | 672 | 38% |
| Herefordshire, Shropshire and Telford | 4 | 2,000 | 3 | 10 | 2,188 | 57% |

\*Exact geographical boundaries to be developed further
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**Regional** **breakdown** **–** **Yorkshire** **&** **Humberside**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Number** **of** **PDUs** **/** **Heads** **of** **Service** | **Number** **of** **Deputies** |
| **Yorkshire** **&** **Humberside** | 11 | 7 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed** **Probation** **Delivery** **Unit** | **Complexity** **ranking** | **Caseload** | **Number** **of** **upper** **tier** **and** **unitary** **local** **authorities** | **Number** **of** **lower** **tier** **local** **authorities** | **Land** **area** **(sq** **m)** | **Rurality**  **(%** **Population)** |
| Barnsley and Rotherham | 63 | 2,500 | 2 | 0 | 238 | 10% |
| Sheffield | 57 | 3,000 | 1 | 0 | 142 | 4% |
| Doncaster | 90 | 2,000 | 1 | 0 | 219 | 20% |
| Leeds | 13 | 5,000 | 1 | 0 | 213 | 8% |
| Wakefield | 95 | 1,500 | 1 | 0 | 131 | 24% |
| Kirklees | 91 | 2,000 | 1 | 0 | 158 | 12% |
| Bradford and Calderdale | 10 | 4,500 | 2 | 0 | 282 | 14% |
| York | 100 | 1,500 | 1 | 0 | 105 | 16% |
| North Yorkshire | 28 | 1,500 | 1 | 7 | 3,103 | 73% |
| Hull and East Riding | 27 | 2,500 | 2 | 0 | 956 | 34% |
| North and North East Lincolnshire | 65 | 2,000 | 2 | 0 | 401 | 31% |
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**Proposed** **approach** **to** **filling** **roles** Sharon Huckle

Lucie Secular

**Approach** **to** **filling** **roles** **in** **the** **new** **Regional** **Structure**

Teams within the programme are working together to enable the NPS structural change from 6 divisions to 11 Regions from April 2020. To ensure the smooth transition to the new structure pre transfer and to allow for the successful unification of NPS and OM services in 2021. There are three key stages for filling roles in the new structure;

• Recruitment of new and/or business critical roles pre-OM transfer

• CRC role assignment is based on the assessment of roles regarding the work they do and how this fits with the new delivery model. Assessment is made on whether the role mostly undertakes work which fits with a part of a transferring service e.g. offender management. If a role is assessed as in scope to transfer the individual assigned to the role will be engaged as part of the placement process.

• Placement of existing NPS staff and CRC transferees into roles in the new structure as part of the OM staff transfer.

The proposals for both approaches are based on legally compliant principles and in line with organisational policies and procedures. They have been designed to;

• Ensure fair, consistent and inclusive processes for both NPS and CRC staff • Provide clear rationale for choices/ decisions made

• Give staff clarity and reassurance, where possible, as soon as possible and before OM transfer

It is our intention to communicate to all staff on the processes on a regular and timely basis to ensure that they are informed on any changes or updates to the proposals.
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**Recruitment** **Principles** **for** **pre-** **and** **post-transfer**

*These* *proposed* *principles* *will* *apply* *where* *the* *role* *is* *permanent* *and* *business* *critical.* **Pre-transfer:**

• The proposed recruitment to business critical roles will be via external **fair** **and** **open** **competition** **for** **NPS** **and** **CRC** **staff**

• **Successful** **CRC** **candidates** could either:

• **Resign** from CRC post and give up continuity of service and join NPS permanently • **Be** **seconded** into the NPS pending transfer, to protect their Continuity of Service

• If their substantive CRC role **is** **not** **assigned** to NPS, CRC staff could **remain** **with** **the** **CRC** or, **resign** **and** **take** **up** **the** **seconded** **role** **permanently** within the NPS which was obtained through fair and open competition

**Post-transfer:**

• If their substantive role **is** **assigned** to NPS, CRC staff would be **permanently** **moved** into the role they have obtained through fair and open competition
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**Placement** **Approach** **–** **Geographical** **Boundaries**

We are proposing that the placement process will be restricted initially by geographical catchment area. The detail on what this will look like is still to be agreed, however it our initial proposal is to use:

1) Police force areas for PDU assigned roles

2) Regionally based approach for pan-regional roles

We welcome feedback or alternative proposals on this today.
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**Placement** **approach** **scenarios**

Match to role JD

Exact Fit Number of regional

NPS existing staff and regional CRC transferees equals number of roles required

All individuals: Placement Process

Map and Match transferees in h

Start catchment area to Head of LDU

JD

Undersupply Process: Number of regional NPS existing staff and regional CRC transferees is less than the number of roles required

All individuals: Placement Process

Recruitment

Number of regional NPS existing staff and regional CRC transferees is higher than the number of roles required

Oversupply Process regional NPS existing staff and regional CRC transferees form a selection pool based on region only

Identify Selection pool

Agree Selection Criteria

Confirm Outcome

Those selected: Placement Process

Those not selected: Redeployment Process Opportunity for to seek alternative employment at the same grade

**Redeployment**

Career Transition Service
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**Placement** **approach**

*The* *proposed* *post-transfer* *placement* *process* *for* *the* *existing* *NPS* *staff* *and* *CRC* *equivalents,* *will* *be* ***regionally*** *structured.* *If* *you* *are* *currently* *in* *one* *of* *the* *six* *NPS* *divisions,* *you* *will* *be* *placed* *into* *one* *of* *the* *eleven* *new* *regions.*

• If a region has an undersupply situation, or an exact fit they can move straight to the Placement Process (see summary slide).

**Exact** **fit** **or** **undersupply** **process:**

Match to role JD

Number of regional NPS existing and regional CRC transferees equals number of roles

All individuals: Placement Process

Map and

Start match transferees to

role JD

Undersupply: Number of regional NPS existing and regional CRC transferees is less than the number of roles

All individuals: Placement Process

Recruitment

**Placement** **approach** **scenarios**

• In the event of an oversupply situation (where there are more staff than roles in a region), the Oversupply Process will be initiated (below). Those **successful** would move into the Placement Process (following slide)

• Those **unsuccessful**, would be held in a national pool and be considered for any remaining role in other regions on a **closed** **competition** **basis**

• Anyone **unassigned** following this stage**,** would be managed in line with the Redeployment process

**Oversupply** **process:**

Match to role JD

Number of regional NPS existing staff and regional CRC transferees is higher than the number of roles

Oversupply Process regional NPS existing staff and regional CRC transferees form a selection pool based on region only

Those selected: Placement Process

Map and match Start transferees to

role JD

Those not selected in regions: held in national pool

Remaining vacancies in regions: closed competition for national pool

Those not selected in closed competition: Redeployment Process
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**Summary** **of** **Processes**

**Placement** **Process:** based upon regional area, which is yet to be defined.

**Run** **preference** **exercise:**

record the location preferences using EOI preference template

**Business** **places**

**individuals:**

Based on business **Appeals** **process** **Final** **placement** need and

preference

**Oversupply** **Process:** where there are more staff than roles, in a regional area.

**Identify** **Selection** **pool**

**Agree** **Selection** **Criteria**

**Confirm** **Outcome**

**Redeployment** **Process:** staff will be supported by HMPPS and career transition team to find alternative roles at their grade.

**Remaining** **staff** **not** **placed**

**Career** **Redeployment** **Transition**

**Service**
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**Questions** **for** **the** **facilitated** **session**

• Questions on the recruitment principles

• Questions on the placement, oversupply and Redeployment processes

• Feedback on the suggested geographical approach to be used in placement approach

• General feedback on the methods of communication used for both national and regional communication and updates over the coming months; what would work best? From who and what methods?
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