

# **Summary of Responses: Conclusion of the Consultation for the Community Performance Statistics**

## **1. Introduction**

On 26th June 2021 the privatised probation services (the Community Rehabilitation Companies) were returned to public control and absorbed into the newly named “Probation Service”. The unified probation service is now responsible for managing all those on a community sentence or licence following their release from prison in England and Wales. There are now 12 probation regions across England and Wales, introducing 11 new probation regions in England; arrangements in Wales remain unchanged. With the re-unification a new Probation Service Performance Framework was developed to support the delivery of the Target Operating Model.

This consultation was undertaken to:

- Inform our users of the changes in what we publish (the performance measures).
- Ensure that changes to how we publish continue to meet our users’ needs.
- Learn about our stakeholders use of the statistics.

The consultation ran from 08 April 2022 to 13 May 2022, with a total of 9 survey responses. There were a range of respondents, with contributions from local and central government, the private sector and members of the public. The Government is grateful to all those who took the time to respond.

This document will provide a summary of these responses. For the Government’s response to the contributions received in the call for evidence, please see the ‘Next Steps’ section.

## **2. Responses**

The first section of the consultation survey was to learn more about the users of the Community Performance Statistics. The survey received responses from:

- The private sector,
- Members of the public,
- Local government, and
- Central government.

The respondents had used the Community Performance Statistics before and generally considered them easy to find. The respondents use the statistics for:

- Research and analysis
- Scrutiny and accountability
- Operational purposes
- International comparisons
- Policy development
- Educational use or academic research

The second section of the consultation survey was to understand the users’ thoughts about the proposed content for the publication. There were mixed views as to whether the Electronic Monitoring performance should be included in this publication. The majority of respondents commented that equality breakdowns, such as for gender, ethnicity, age, religion and disability status, would be useful to be included for a selection of probation performance metrics. There were limited comments about the proposed publication content.

Following MoJ disclosure requirements, the full survey results will not be published due to the low number of responses received and therefore the high risk of individual identification.

### **3. Next Steps**

The Government is grateful for the informative responses to this consultation. The Government is going to publish the Community Performance Statistics as specified in the consultation document. Although there were requests for equality breakdowns, our own investigations concluded these are mostly requested for accommodation and employment service levels, which are already provided in this publication. Therefore, we will not be providing the probation performance service levels by protected characteristics.

## Annex A: Survey Questions

The following questions were included in the survey.

Question	Response Options
1. Which sector do you work in?	<i>[one response required]</i> Academic, Advocacy group, Charity, HM Prison and Probation Service operations, Local government, Media, Member of Parliament / House of Lords, Member of the public, Ministry of Justice policy, Other Government Department, Other MoJ / HMPPS group, Private sector, or Professional organisation linked to justice
2. Why do you use the Community Performance Statistics?	<i>[option to select multiple responses]</i> Educational use or academic research, International comparisons, Media / communications, Operational purposes, Policy development, Research and analysis, or Scrutiny and accountability
3. Were the Community Performance Statistics easy to find based on your original search query?	<i>[one response required]</i> Yes, No, or Not applicable
4. Have you used the Community Performance Statistics previously?	<i>[one response required]</i> Yes, or No
5. Please provide any comments on our proposed content for this statistics publication.	<i>[response optional, space for comments]</i>
6. Would the inclusion of the equalities breakdowns for a selection of performance metrics be important to your use of the statistics? If yes, which equality breakdowns would be of value?	<i>[response optional, space for comments]</i> Yes, or No
7. The Electronic Monitoring performance framework has not been impacted by the changes in the probation performance framework. However, we would welcome views on the content and format of the Electronic Monitoring content within these statistics, and whether it should remain within this release or be moved to a standalone publication?	<i>[response required, space for comments]</i> Remain within this release, Move to a standalone publication, or No preference