Integrated Offender Management Research Project

Commissioned by Staffordshire Police and Partners

Final Report
October 2014

Presented by:
Professor Anne Worrall and Dr Mary Corcoran
Keele University

Keele
University

Research Institute
for Social Sciences

Integrated Offender Management Research Project

Commissioned by
Staffordshire Police and Partners

Final Report

October 2014

Presented by:

Professor Anne Worrall and Dr Mary Corcoran

Keele University

Contents

Keele University/ Staffordshire Integrated Offender Management Research Project

Final Report October 2014

It's really interesting when you go to local policing teams and you say, do you remember so and so, you know, burglar extraordinaire from five years ago? Bloody hell, yeah, I do, what happened to him? And you're thinking, yeah, if you're good at what you do, I think you quietly go about your business and you start to pick these individuals off, and they stop appearing on briefings, they stop appearing in custody. And I think quietly going about your business should be the way that it happens (Police).

Introduction

In November 2013, following extensive discussions between Keele University and a multi-agency group representing Staffordshire IOM, a 12 month evaluation of the Staffordshire North IOM based at Longton was commissioned on the basis of a research proposal submitted by Professor Anne Worrall and Dr Mary Corcoran. We have produced three progress reports and a formal Interim Report. This is our formal Final Report.

We have approached the research in terms of both *process* and *outcomes,* in line with accepted academic understanding of *realistic evaluation*. In terms of *process,* we have established the *context* of the IOM programme, taking account of its *stated aims,* monitoring *implementation* and providing on-going *feedback* to key stakeholders. In so doing, we have aimed to assist the IOM programme in an *appreciative* understanding of the conditions under which the IOM is most likely to succeed and the participants (both workers and offenders) are most likely to benefit. In terms of *outcomes*, we have evaluated the extent to which the IOM programme aims, or selected aims, have been achieved. We have considered not just demonstrable reductions in re-offending, but other less tangible achievements such as employment, completion of drug treatment and improved personal circumstances.

The research has *contextualised* the work of the IOM programme in current criminal justice policy and practice and as an example of voluntary-public sector partnerships in community-based collaborative projects. A key objective has been to explore the

perspectives of relevant stakeholder groups regarding their confidence in the programme and willingness to support it. We have explored stakeholder awareness and understandings of the contribution of IOM to its stated outcomes, as well as examining the differing priorities and attitudes toward IOM by those agencies.

We hope that the research will contribute to the future development of IOM as a route to desistance, increase understanding of the factors that support and motivate offenders' participation, retention and reduction in re-offending, and increase understanding of multi-agency work. We have identified areas of good practice, as well as obstacles to delivery and have established an evaluation framework that can be adapted and built upon for use in future projects. We have made recommendations about the sustainability and replicability of the programme.

Just as this report was submitted, the Ministry of Justice published, on October 29 2014, the list of contractors who submitted successful bids to operate the Community Rehabilitation Companies. In Staffordshire and the West Midlands, the CRC will be operated by the Reducing Reoffending Partnership, a consortium comprising Ingeus UK, a private company; the St Giles Trust, a charity; and Crime Reduction Initiatives (CRI), also a charity. These will act as lead providers, contracting work to secondary and third tier delivery organisations. Undoubtedly, it will be some relief to the agencies and workers in IOM and resettlement work more generally that they now know which lead providers they will be dealing with. However, the forthcoming months and years are likely to see considerable work in addressing crucial questions about funding, roles, responsibilities and partnership.

We are grateful to everyone who has made this research possible, especially those who have allowed themselves to be interviewed or have facilitated access to offenders for interview purposes. We would like to thank those staff who have assisted us with statistical data. In addition to the police and probation services, we acknowledge the assistance of a range of stakeholders[1], including: BAC O'Connor, CAB, CRI, North Staffordshire Combined Healthcare/Criminal Justice Mental Health Team, Restart, Saltbox, Stoke on Trent Housing Solutions, Safer City Partnership, Stoke on Trent College, Stafford and Dovegate Prisons, YSS Mentoring, Inspire. Finally, we have been grateful for the support of the IOM Steering Group and its willingness to engage in detailed reflective discussion about the progress of the research.

---

1   In policy terms a 'stakeholder' refers to any constituency, including service users, who have an interest in the operation or outcome of a service. For the purposes of this evaluation, 'stakeholders' refers to those agencies which contribute to the integrated offender management process by providing services which support offenders. These service areas are in line with the pathways for reducing reoffending (housing; education, training and employment; health; drugs and alcohol; finance management; families; attitudes and behaviour; sex exploitation and violence prevention). Providers may be statutory (such as the NHS) commercial or voluntary sector, but are distinct from the police, prison and probation services in that their remit and obligations are not concerned with criminal justice disposals.

Executive Summary

Background

For more than a decade, the government in England and Wales has insisted that a very small proportion of offenders (around 10 per cent) are committing a very large proportion of crime (around 50 per cent) at any point in time. Although this received wisdom has been challenged, it is in this context that we focus on intensive supervision projects for persistent and prolific offenders. The underlying principle of such projects is that a combination of greater control and monitoring, together with help and treatment, offers the best opportunity to reduce the risk of re-offending of this group of predominantly young, male, non-violent offenders. The main criticisms of the projects are that they are resource-intensive, expensive and unproven. Evaluations, though increasing in number, are based on small samples and are inconclusive in their results. At the same time these projects represent an imaginative and alternative opportunity for the effective management of this specific group of offenders, whom agencies commonly have difficulties in engaging.

Methodology

We have drawn heavily on the *realist evaluation* framework, advocated by Pawson and Tilley. This approach has resulted in the combination of both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection and analysis and also the distinction between *process* and *outcome* evaluation. The former focuses on the way in which new provision is implemented while the latter is concerned with more traditional 'findings' or 'results'. Realist evaluation emphasises the complexity of interventions in the social world and takes account of the full range of factors that are likely to influence the success or failure of a programme.

We have undertaken more than 50 semi-structured interviews with programme staff, partners and offenders. We have conducted two focus groups. We have carried out informal discussions and observations of IOM work as well as analysing selective statistics and reviewing relevant academic literature and policy documents.

The Staffordshire North IOM programme

The Staffordshire North IOM programme has been based at the renovated Longton Police Station since 2011. Offenders are referred to the programme from a variety of

sources including police intelligence, probation and other partner agencies. Their suitability for the programme is assessed using a scoring schema for Serious Acquisitive Crime (SAC). Once accepted on the programme, the offender's details are entered into ECINS computer software where a profile and running record is created. A wide range of authorised personnel can then enter activities, events and reports into this record, providing a very detailed record of dealings with individual offenders. The supervision regime for offenders on the programme consists of five broad categories of activities: individual office appointments; programmes; purposeful leisure activities; appointments with partner and community agencies and home visits. The underpinning philosophy is that re-offending can be reduced by support and attention to offenders' needs for: housing; education, training and employment; health; drugs and alcohol; finance management; families; attitudes and behaviour; sex exploitation and violence prevention (the 'pathways' to desistance). Alongside this support, however, are elements of control which strengthen incentives to comply with the programme. Failure to comply results in breach proceedings or re-arrest, both of which are implemented more speedily than might be the case for offenders not subject to IOM.

Key themes from the qualitative (interview) data

1. What makes the IOM partnership work?

A notable feature of the IOM programme is the number and diversity of organisations involved to different degrees in the partnership. Staff working in stakeholder organisations agreed that each agency must have a clear sense of its own mission and what it contributes to the partnership and offender management process.

2. Who are the IOM workers? What experience(s), qualities and training do they have/ need?

Some of our interviewees have had experience of working with earlier PPO projects, while others are new to IOM. For some, it has been a sharp learning curve. Within the police, there is a tension between the belief that the police officer can turn their hand to any required task, and a recognition that IOM work requires a certain 'disposition'. The tension is less acute in probation and partner agencies where the tradition and culture of the work is focussed on working in depth with individuals and there is a greater willingness to take on 'unpromising' cases.

3. How is the IOM structured and organised?

i) The physical environment and daily routines

Despite some staff concerns about the suitability of Longton police station, we did not find any hostility among offenders to this environment, nor its geographical location. Nevertheless, we think there are still issues to be discussed about a) the overcrowding of co-located staff, b) the management of a reception area shared by IOM attenders and the general public and c) the use of old-fashioned police cells and waiting area for interviewing offenders.

ii) Benefits of co-location for facilitating information exchange

Co-location fosters opportunities for the informal exchange of information that underpins a co-ordinated approach to offenders. Staff from different agencies who otherwise would not have had opportunities to exchange routine information are able to gain insights into offenders' progress on a day-to-day basis.

iii) The challenges of the governance of IOM

There is a need for clarity around the internal categories of offenders that might come under the IOM umbrella e.g. statutory and non-statutory, youth and adult, DRR and IOM. There is also a concern among both staff and offenders that, once labelled an IOM offender, it is unclear how, if ever, that label will be removed, especially for non-statutory offenders. Aside from the consequences of this for individuals, there is also no systematic creation of capacity within the IOM, highlighting the need for clearer progress and de-selection procedures. Another key challenge of the governance of IOM work is striking a balance between participating agencies, with their distinctive legal powers, their criminal justice or 'social' responsibilities, different operational methods and approaches towards clients. The need for regular communication through partnership meetings was highlighted.

4. How are the different roles and cultures within IOM identified and managed?

i) Relationships within the police

Attitudes towards IOM within the police vary considerably and there are interesting views about how far the IOM approach can be imported into 'mainstream' policing and how, if at all, neighbourhood policing benefits from the existence of IOM. The role of 'field officer' is crucial in this.

ii) Relationships between police and probation

The key to the success of IOM is the police/probation relationship. Our evidence suggests that at ground level on a daily basis the police/probation relationship works well but there are still underlying tensions which may be creative and healthy or, alternatively, stressful and counter-productive. The momentous changes in probation work that have taken place this year are already impacting on this relationship because of the uncertainty surrounding its future.

iii) Relationships within the wider partnership

Co-operation between statutory and non-statutory agencies is critical to establishing efficient working practices which allow workers from different agencies to discharge their roles within their respective remits. All participants observed that it was critical to retain a clear sight as to the core values and objectives of each participating agency.

iv) Relationships with prisons

From the prison perspective, IOM offenders, like other cohorts, are one element in the development of sustained 'through the gate' services to provide continuity in support. This involves forging contacts with community agencies, working with prisoners' families, and facilitating accommodation and education, training and employment (ETE). Prisons are important hubs in the IOM strategic partnership, and considerable work has gone into integrating personnel from statutory services and other providers into the offender management framework in the custody estate.

v) Housing as the pivot of IOM work

It is widely acknowledged that placing offenders in safe and reliable accommodation is an essential precondition to increasing the chances that work with offenders will have a constructive impact. Without this base, offenders are more likely to return to chaotic and law-breaking lifestyles and less likely to move on to the next phases of resettlement by securing treatment, education, training or life skills, for example.   There are practical economic consequences for prioritising their housing needs, insofar as the police know where they can access and monitor IOM offenders, and providers can target their services to clients, thereby making the most of their resources.

vi) Education, training and employment for offenders

Although education, training and employment (ETE) support is flagged as a pathway to reducing re-offending, some central and local government policy decisions have had unforeseen, adverse effects on this sector. As a consequence, provision has fragmented and opportunities lost to support prisoners to continue using the vocational skills or training they received in prison in employment after release. There is a need to adopt a realistic approach to what can be achieved with this cohort. High levels of illiteracy, poor socialisation and the premature termination of education among offenders means that expectations should be proportionate.

5. What is the impact of IOM on offenders?

i)   In terms of process

The range of IOM provision available was acknowledged by offenders and the experience of the programme and its staff was generally very positive. Most offenders appreciated both their crisis contact with IOM and the ongoing support provided by all partners. They were not under any illusions about the 'carrot and stick' nature of IOM and knew that staff would act to 'control' them if they were not willing to 'change'. One practice of note is the frequency with which IOM staff collect offenders on release from prison and guide them through their first day at liberty. This was seen as a crucial step to avoiding re-offending.

ii)   In terms of outcomes

The most straightforward indicator of success for IOM is de-selection after a period of monitoring that shows a consistently low level of risk of re-offending. Disappointingly, there is no simple database that collects data on de-selections and this is a missed opportunity to showcase the work of IOM. In fairness, however, the picture is usually more complex than this with offenders reducing, rather than ceasing, their re-offending and/or reducing the seriousness of their offences. To complicate the picture further, IOM is not just about 'change' but also about 'control' and an offender may be recalled to prison for non-compliance, even if they have not actually re-offended, in order to prevent re-offending. Approximately a third of the IOM offenders at Longton are in prison at any one time and it is a matter for debate whether, and to what extent, this should be regarded as success or failure for IOM.

III) Recognising individual outcomes

Given the limitations of capturing outcomes statistically, those with professional experience of working with offenders also adopt a threshold of 'success' which attributes tangible and subtler changes to offenders as a result of their engagement. Participation in IOM may not necessarily take individuals immediately or entirely away from a life of crime. However, it has an observed impact on slowing down the rate at which individuals proceed through the revolving door between prison, community and back again. One pointer of success is that the engagement with IOM offenders with their services is far higher than for other cohorts of offenders. Whilst apparently counter-intuitive, the logic is that getting offenders to engage with IOM is the first step of a longer process of tackling the underlying, complex causes of crime. In the long run, this generates added value in that the IOM process becomes greater than the sum of its constituent parts, thereby adding to cost efficiency.

6. What is the future for IOM?

I)   Types of offenders and approaches

There has been much discussion about the wisdom of expanding the IOM approach to include other types of offenders, especially violence, including domestic violence, sex offenders and, more recently, gangs. While some felt this would be wholly inappropriate, most considered that the *principles* of IOM could be applied to a wide range of offenders, possibly all. But it was recognised that the specific *interventions* needed would differ and would require careful planning and development. We are suggesting a different approach to identifying those offenders most likely to benefit from IOM and this involves placing less focus on the nature of an offender's offences and more on their 'readiness to benefit' in terms of personal characteristics, circumstances and stage in their criminal career.

II)   Relationships with 'mainstream' policing

A constant theme throughout our research has been the extent to which IOM can act as a model for policing more generally. While some still consider IOM to be a specialism that requires different qualities and skills from other forms of policing, others consider it to be very close to good neighbourhood policing. From management and political perspectives, one of the ways in which the resources allocated to IOM can be justified is for the principles of the work to be widely disseminated within the police service and to be *integrated* into other areas of work. But IOM is not the only form of multi-

agency work and there is a danger that expectations of IOM will outstrip its specific model so that it will be stretched to such an extent that it becomes compromised and ineffective.

III) Future of probation under Transforming Rehabilitation

The Probation Service nationally has been split into two organisations – NPS and 21 CRCs – with the latter being prepared to be sold off to the voluntary and private sectors during the research period. Probation workers have an uncertain future in the IOM, which has been designated as CRC work. All agencies were preparing for the contingencies presented by the new landscape for service providers. These issues reach well beyond the remit of our research but we find it difficult to see a future for IOM without highlighting the extreme turbulence that probation workers are currently experiencing.

Performance data and other statistics

It is proving very difficult for IOM programmes nationally to demonstrate their effectiveness in terms of providing hard statistical evidence of reduced re-offending. In this section we report on the ways in which the IOM in North Staffordshire is attempting to address this. Given the unclear national picture, we believe that these efforts are commendable and, more importantly, there is active discussion at every level about how the data can be improved.

On a smaller local scale, we have been monitoring the risk assessment progress over 6 months of a randomly generated sample of 30 IOM offenders (roughly 10% of all IOM offenders and 1 in 7 of those not in prison). With a number of significant caveats, it appears to us that approximately half of our sample has succeeded in lowering their risk assessment score over the 6 month monitoring period and half has a raised score. Additional pre- and post-IOM arrest data broadly support this conclusion.

Case studies

Throughout the research we have been conscious of a need to identify those offenders who benefit most from IOM and to offer some suggestions about why that might be so. We identify four categories of offenders for whom IOM has impacted, in different ways and for different reasons:

Category 1: Last chance before custody – predominantly young adult offenders who have not yet experienced custody but are heading in that direction.

Category 2: Prison regulars finally ready to change – predominantly older offenders who have spent many years in prison but have 'had enough'.

Category 3: Vulnerable non-copers – offenders whose complex needs mean that they simply could not survive in the community without the support that IOM offers.

Category 4: Not yet ready to change – offenders who may or may not co-operate superficially but who are not yet able to make significant changes to their lives and continue to re-offend when they feel under pressure.

Cost Analysis

We have provided a simple 'cost analysis' based on an economic evaluation that deals only with the costs of interventions. We have made use of two case studies to set out the basic costs and potential areas of saving which may be associated with interventions under the IOM programme. By using case studies, we can set out more detail about the interventions that offenders receive and also give information about possible outcomes. Estimations are based on 'the public sector cost of crime', that is, the costs to the taxpayer of responding to, investigating, processing and punishing crimes and breaches. Costs of interventions are set against costs to the police, courts, probation services and the Safer City partnership. This is then compared with a 'value for money' calculation (Matrix Knowledge Group, 2007). The 'value for money' formula describes the net saving that can accrue per offender on the programme when compared with the costs of sending them to prison. We have estimated that Case Study A accrued a saving of approximately £37,500 and Case Study B accrued a saving of approximately £14,515.

Conclusions and recommendations

We have ample evidence of the *process* of IOM: inputs (staff, physical environment, financial and technological resources, information exchange); activities (programmes, appointments, support, surveillance, purposeful leisure activities, skills training); and outputs (intelligence, partnership development, individual offender profiles, risk assessment and social progress). This evidence has been overwhelmingly positive. We have met enthusiastic, committed workers from all involved agencies, who believe passionately in IOM and can present compelling rationales for, and descriptions of, their work. Among a range of commendable work, we identify a number of specific areas of good practice.

In terms of outcomes and impacts, the evidence presented in this report indicates that where the IOM works, it works very well, both in improving the lives of persistent acquisitive criminals and in reducing their levels of re-offending. More systematic collection of de-selection data would demonstrate this more convincingly. But it

does not work for everyone on the programme. It is clear that many offenders are not ready for 'change'. At present, this does not mean that they are programme 'failures' because they can still be successfully 'controlled'. However, this contradictory definition of programme success makes it all but impossible to produce the clear performance indicators that commissioners – and the general public – require. This is particularly pertinent at a time when the Police and Crime Commissioner is taking more responsibility for the structure and nature of multi-agency partnerships. Consequently, there is a need to review the aims and objectives of IOM to take account of this complexity. We suggest this discussion may result in a choice between two new future directions for IOM.

Direction 1: IOM as 'acute medicine'

- IOM is regarded as akin to acute medicine – a specific model of multi-agency work to which those with the most complex needs are assigned for a finite period of time before being moved to lower levels of support and/or control.

- Within this model, participants may be selected, in addition to their needs, not so much according to the nature of their offences but according to their 'readiness to benefit' from the programme.

- We have suggested three different categories of offender who might be ready to benefit: those who are at risk of a first custodial sentence; those who are 'burned out' by years of prison sentences; and, the vulnerable non-copers who cannot avoid prison without support.

- We have suggested that a fourth category of those not ready to change should either not be selected for IOM or should be de-selected rapidly if they fail to engage with it at a minimum required level.

- If a concept of 'readiness to benefit' were incorporated into the selection process, this would have implications for offenders' progress through the programme and their de-selection from it.

Direction 2: IOM as a broad set of principles

- IOM is not the only model of multi-agency work and is not necessarily the best model for all cohorts of offenders.

- Nevertheless, the present model is underpinned by a set of key principles which could form the basis for the development of other models.

- There are also examples of good practice that could be rolled out for use in other partnership arrangements.

- However, moving in this direction, it would not be appropriate to simply apply the existing IOM model to a range of other situations. Each new situation would require the fresh application of IOM principles and the development of tailored and apposite multi-agency interventions.

Whichever direction IOM takes, there are a number of shorter-term recommendations that we would make on the basis of our findings which will enhance the programme's ability to produce evidence of its success for internal and external audiences:

- The re-introduction of a series of formal periodic reviews involving partnership representation for all participants with a clear pathway to de-selection for both statutory and non-statutory participants. De-selection to be a performance indicator of success.

- The collection of simple statistics on the recruitment, progress and de-selection of participants and production of regular accessible reports on this data (recognising that speedy re-arrest and re-conviction may also be an indicator of success).

- The production of regular trend reports from ECINS data e.g. in respect of risk assessment.

- A series of IOM staff meetings to support and monitor the impact of the changes resulting from *Transforming Rehabilitation*.

- The instigation of regular middle management partnership meetings to deal with programme development at the operational level between strategy and day-to-day work.

- The development of an internal communications strategy to enable all partners to feel fully involved in programme developments.

- The development of an external communications strategy to ensure the dissemination of good practice and good news to external audiences.

- Drawing up an Action Plan that will identify tasks, responsibilities and timescales across the partnership for addressing this report and its recommendations.

Chapter 1
Background and policy review

A fully referenced version of the history of intensive offender supervision appears in Appendix 2.

For more than a decade, the government in England and Wales has insisted that a very small proportion of offenders (around 10 per cent) are committing a very large proportion of crime (around 50 per cent) at any point in time. Although this received wisdom has been challenged, it is in this context that we focus on intensive supervision projects for persistent and prolific offenders. The underlying principle of such projects is that a combination of greater control and monitoring, together with help and treatment, offers the best opportunity to reduce the risk of re-offending of this group of predominantly young, male, non-violent offenders. The main criticisms of the projects are that they are resource-intensive, expensive and unproven. Evaluations, though increasing in number, are based on small samples and are inconclusive in their results. At the same time these projects represent an imaginative and alternative opportunity for the effective management of this specific group of offenders, whom agencies commonly have difficulties in engaging.

Intensive projects for prolific and persistent offenders in England and Wales can be viewed as both a recent innovation - emerging from the convergence of intelligence-led policing and evidence-based probation, modelled on a European initiative and given impetus by the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act – and as the latest incarnation of a much older penal pre-occupation with persistent offending and intensive supervision. In order to understand the challenges and benefits of the projects, it is necessary to locate them within both short and longer term historical perspectives.

The latest incarnation includes, but extends beyond, existing Prolific and other Priority Offender (PPO) projects. Integrated Offender Management has been an attempt by the Ministry of Justice to provide a 'strategic umbrella' to co-ordinate all multi-agency approaches to intensive supervision. It has been an attempt to operationalise the concept of 'end-to-end offender management' introduced by the Carter Report (2003) with a key aim of 'disrupting' an offender's criminal activity and thus reducing the risk of re-offending. Six pioneer sites were funded by the government in 2008/2009 and have been subject to evaluation. Integrated Offender Management is now the nationally recognised framework for local multi-agency collaboration in working with offenders.

A joint Home Office and Ministry of Justice document (2010) identified the five key principles of IOM as being:

- All partners tackling offenders together

- Delivering a local response to local problems

- Offenders facing their responsibility or facing the consequences

- Making better use of existing programmes and governance

- All offenders at high risk of causing serious harm and/or re-offending are 'in scope'.

Prolific offender projects for adult offenders were originally concerned with the reduction of volume property crime, predominantly theft and burglary, although more recent projects now accept offenders with some form of current or past violence in their records. The central feature of such projects has been the combination of intensive attention from both the police and probation services, with ready access to provision by other partner agencies.

The other characteristics of the projects derive from this central feature:

- The project is staffed by designated police and probation personnel, and located on either police or probation premises (the significance of different locations being under-evaluated).

- Participants in the project are required to meet local criteria that categorise them as 'prolific' - that is, among the most persistent offenders in the locality – and allocate a risk assessment score to them.

- Participants were historically subject to formal court orders of supervision or post-custodial licence but, importantly, IOM programmes now include substantial numbers of non-statutory offenders who are not subject to current court orders.

- Participants are subject to high levels of police monitoring and intensive probation supervision which seek to address their offending behaviour and also to assist with other offending-related needs such as housing, substance misuse, leisure, education and employment.

- In order to achieve this, there has to be an agreed mechanism of information exchange between participating agencies (not just police and probation).

- Finally, there is an agreed procedure for swift enforcement in the event of non-compliance or further offending (which requires the co-operation of courts).

The body of evaluation research on projects for PPOs is neither large nor conclusive. However, the number of studies is increasing, comprising a mixture of independent evaluations by academics, often on a limited budget and larger scale national or multi-site evaluations undertaken by Home Office and Ministry of Justice researchers. Evaluators have typically had to work with small sample sizes and, in some cases, without a matched comparison group. The resulting reports and their conclusions tend to be highly qualified in relation to reduced offending and cost effectiveness. Nevertheless, many of the evaluations emerging in the UK have provided optimism that PPO projects can be effective in reducing the offending of the participant group. This message, however tentatively expressed, has been politically expedient for governments. In 2009, the Ministry of Justice declared that projects could result in a '62% reduction in recorded convictions over 17 months' (2009:6). This is by far the most optimistic finding of any project, though the overall direction of findings has been consistent over more than a decade.

Two recent documents provide a national picture of IOM. The College of Policing's (2013) 'Stocktake' report covers, at a national level, many of the issues we have identified at a local level in our research, in relation to both examples of good practice and the under-development of performance management. The Home Office's (2014) findings from the 2013 survey of Community Safety Partnerships highlighted the variation in provision across the country and the future impact on IOM provision of the *Transforming Rehabilitation* agenda.

The role of Police and Crime Commissioners has also had a widespread impact on the development of IOM, requiring such programmes to be both more visibly accountable and more openly competitive for resources. Locally, the Staffordshire PCC has indicated his broad support for IOM stating that 'Managing Offenders' is one of his four key priorities for *Safer, Fairer, United Communities* (PCC website).

It is widely acknowledged that PPO and IOM projects are complex in terms of their multi-agency nature and the needs of their clientèle. Their value should be judged beyond crime rates and cost effectiveness, though these are of course important. Other criteria which should be taken into account include, on the one hand, health, educational and social benefits for participants and, on the other hand, improved multi-agency working and information exchange between project partners, and improved intelligence on prolific offenders. Participants have identified the following benefits:

- stopped or reduced their offending whilst they were on the project;

- kept them occupied;

- provided them with a sense of purpose;

- helped with their drugs problems;

- built their confidence in doing everyday things, e.g., finding accommodation, dealing with the utility companies, social interaction; and

- helped the rebuilding of relationships with families (partners, children and parents).

All evaluations identify lessons or issues which might be summarised as:

- Embedding the project and establishing its credibility, securing long-term funding;

- Having clear mechanisms for recruitment, selection and de-selection of participants;

- Demonstrating effective multi-agency practices, while recognising the distinctive contributions of each agency and resisting the blurring of agency boundaries;

- Planning for team development and for human resource contingencies, so that the levels of stress experienced by staff involved in such intensive work are minimised;

- Developing a challenging but supportive supervision regime with linked exit strategies, so that participants are not 'set up to fail' by the imposition of unrealistic multiple demands;

- Identifying and addressing the communications needs specific to the project, so that the aims and objectives of the project are widely understood among partner agencies;

- Evidencing impact in the funded period.

We conclude this section with a quotation from the recent joint inspection of IOM by HM Inspectorate of Probation and HM Inspectorate of Constabulary. Despite its length, we think that this succinctly summarises both the value and the challenges of IOM work:

Overall, our findings about the outcomes of the Integrated Offender Management approach give rise to cautious optimism. It was clear to us that the right offenders were targeted; there were some indications that offenders' lives had improved because their problems, such as substance misuse, had been addressed. Although re-offending rates could be regarded as disappointing, we saw this as symptomatic of the entrenched pattern of offending among the

Integrated Offender Management cohort, rather than as a failure of the approach itself.

Critically, we found that the absence of a structured and systematic approach to evaluation is undermining efforts to assess and report on the effectiveness of Integrated Offender Management. It is a commonsense approach that intuitively feels right. However, the absence of clear evidence of effectiveness in terms of both crime reduction and reducing re-offending inhibits understanding of its impact and value. If the evidence showed that Integrated Offender Management was successful in reducing crime and re-offending, there would be a strong case for further investment. If not, a rethink would be needed. We think that the Integrated Offender Management approach has real potential; however, in the absence of robust evidence to support this, we cannot make a firm recommendation either way (2014:4)

References:

College of Policing (2013) *Integrated Offender Management Stocktake*

Home Office (2009) *Prolific and Other Priority Offender Programme Five Years On: Maximising the Impact*

Home Office (2014) *Integrated Offender Management: Findings from the 2013 Survey*

Home Office and Ministry of Justice (2010) *Integrated Offender Management Key Principles*

HM Inspectorate of Probation and HM Inspectorate of Constabulary (2014) *A Joint Inspection of the Integrated Offender Management Approach*

Chapter 2
Methodology

Theoretical framework

We have drawn heavily on the *realist evaluation* framework, advocated by Pawson and Tilley, because our experience over the past decade has indicated that this is the most appropriate methodological approach for evaluating complex social and public policy provision such as the IOM programme. This approach has resulted in the combination of both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection and analysis and also the distinction between *process* and *outcome* evaluation. The former focuses on the way in which new provision is implemented while the latter is concerned with more traditional 'findings' or 'results'. Realist evaluation emphasises the complexity of interventions in the social world and demands that evaluations take account of the full range of factors that are likely to influence the success or failure of a programme. Pawson (2013) provides an extremely helpful 'complexity checklist' that covers *inter alia* the choices, pathways, contexts, time-scales, contestations and unintended consequences that should form part of any attempt to evaluate a programme (see Appendix 1). This approach has proved popular with both evaluators and those responsible for programmes, but has been less popular with governments that desire quick and clear findings to inform their short-term funding decisions.

Practicalities

With the team working approximately the equivalent of one day per week for a year we have undertaken the following work in accordance with our contract:

- a review of relevant academic and policy literature

- communicated across the partnership through a briefing meeting and two newsletters

- undertaken over 50 semi-structured interviews of IOM staff – police (19), probation and prisons (10) and stakeholders (12) – and offenders (10)

- conducted two focus groups with a total of 12 members from different partner organisations

- undertaken numerous informal discussions with staff, stakeholders and offenders, including accompanying field officers on home visits and attending a computer class at a local library

- randomly selected a sample of IOM offenders on ECINS and monitored their progress in consultation with relevant IOM staff

- selected case studies for more detailed examination and cost analysis

- attended two management meetings about the internal collection of statistical data

- produced three progress reports and an interim report

- attended steering group meetings

Limitations to methodology and lessons learnt

While we have fulfilled (and in some ways exceeded) the terms of our contract , there have been a number of limitations to the research which might be described as 'lessons learnt' for future evaluation research:

- We have been conscious that the scope of our research has been limited by time and resources. There is more that we would like to have done to gain a fuller picture of the IOM across Staffordshire but that has not been possible in the time available and the resources allocated.

- The dramatic changes to the national penal landscape over the past year, together with local changes to personnel and priorities in both the police and probation, have meant that we have often felt that we are 'running to catch up' with the impact of these changes on the programme and on our evaluation of it. We discuss examples of this later in the report.

- During the research, the problems associated with the collection of statistical data (by no means unique to this programme) became increasingly apparent and our quantitative data analysis, including cost analysis, has had to adjust to this.

- We have conducted a rudimentary cost analysis of interventions for illustrative purposes only. This is not a substitute for more sophisticated economic modelling of impact, outputs, costs and savings which can be provided by actuarial experts. 'Cost benefit analysis' relies on actuarial and econometric

projections to determine whether investment in a given service produces worthwhile outputs or even savings.

- More fundamentally, however, the research has been limited by the difficulty in what has been described as 'assessing additionality' (Wong 2013). While we are confident that we have been able to capture the *complexity* of IOM in this report and to provide a narrative that demonstrates its impact, we have been no more successful than any other researchers in this specific field in providing a compelling *statistical* argument that demonstrates beyond reasonable doubt that IOM reduces re-offending.

Reference:

Wong, K. (2013) 'Integrated Offender Management: Assessing the Impact and Benefits – holy grail or fool's errand?' *British Journal of Community Justice,* 11,2/3, 59-81

Chapter 3
A brief description of the IOM unit at Longton

The Staffordshire North IOM programme has been based at the renovated Longton Police Station since 2011. Police and Probation staff who formerly worked on PPO and DRR (Drug Rehabilitation Referral) projects in other parts of Stoke-on-Trent moved to Longton along with staff from relevant healthcare, housing and voluntary sector agencies. The IOM occupies the ground floor of the building.

Accommodation for offenders consists of access through the public reception area to a corridor, leading to the old police station premises, which have been converted to make a waiting room and a number of interview rooms (formerly cells). Staff accommodation consists of two moderately sized, but very crowded, offices, housing 20-30 police, civilian, probation, health and admin staff. Senior staff have single or shared offices in the old station area. There is also a group programme room, a healthcare room, a teleconference room and a staff kitchen. In addition to the IOM programme, staff also work with DRR offenders from this building. Away from the police station, teams of field officers are seconded to the IOM from Local Policing Teams. This is a unique local feature of the Staffordshire IOM units.

Offenders are referred to the programme from a variety of sources including police intelligence, probation and other partner agencies. Their suitability for the programme is assessed using a scoring schema for Serious Acquisitive Crime (SAC). Acceptance on the programme in Staffordshire requires an initial PPO score of at least 70, while Stoke-on-Trent based offenders require a score of 90. The discrepancy is historical in origin but is in line with government policy that the term 'prolific' should be locally defined. Those with a score of 40-69 (50-89 in Stoke) become IOM Targets; those scoring less than 40 (50 in Stoke) are either rejected or placed in the 'Monitor' cohort. Offenders will be re-referred if their circumstances change.

The Staffordshire North IOM programme currently consists of around 360 offenders, about a third of whom are in prison at any one time. The remainder are classified as Prolific/ Priority Offenders (PPOs), PPO Targets, Custody Diversion (CuD), CuD Targets, Deter Young Offenders (DYOs), DYO Targets, Targets and Monitors. The various classes of 'Targets' are mostly non-statutory offenders who are not on current court orders,

while the remainder are statutory. 'Monitors' are those who appear to be no longer offending and are awaiting de-selection.

Once accepted on the programme, the offender's details are entered into ECINS computer software where a profile and running record is created. A wide range of authorised personnel can then enter activities, events and reports into this record, providing a very detailed record of dealings with individual offenders. Although authorised to do so, however, probation staff do not contribute to this record. They are required to use Probation Service records and, consequently, contributing to ECINS would duplicate their work.

The supervision regime for offenders on the programme consists of five broad categories of activities: individual office appointments (which might be daily at times of crisis); programmes (e.g. Building Skills for Recovery, Information Technology, work skills, victim empathy); purposeful leisure activities (eg. football, boxing); appointments with partner and community agencies (e.g. housing, employment, drugs testing and treatment, debt, healthcare) and home visits (from police and probation). Additionally, offenders are supported through court appearances and release from prison (including visits while in prison). The underpinning philosophy is that re-offending can be reduced by support and attention to offenders' needs for: accommodation, education, training, employment, physical and mental health, drugs and alcohol treatment, finances, family relationships, attitudes, thinking and behaviour (the 'pathways' to desistance).

Alongside this support, however, are elements of control which strengthen incentives to comply with the programme. Failure to comply results in breach proceedings or re-arrest, both of which are implemented more speedily than might be the case for offenders not subject to IOM. All offenders have their risk levels reassessed whenever necessary – often on a daily basis – using a scoring matrix that covers recent offending history, risk of harm, relevant intelligence/ arrests, linked crime series and a re-offending multiplier. This produces scores of 0 to 64. Those scoring 39-64 are classified as High/Red (and may be marked as Wanted if there are outstanding matters); those scored at 20-38 are classified as Medium/Amber; those scored at 0-19 are classified as Low/Green (though a score of 0 may indicate that the offender is in prison). It should be noted that changes in scores are only a guide and do not necessarily imply changes in re-offending; they could equally indicate changes in circumstances (e.g. housing, drugs) or compliance.

Chapter 4
Interview data: Key themes

We have undertaken over 50 interviews, as contracted, most of which have been recorded and transcribed. Interviews have been with IOM staff, mostly based at Longton, and have consisted of a mix of police, probation and partnership staff, as well as offenders and other stakeholders based elsewhere. Interviews have lasted between 10 and 75 minutes, the majority lasting between 40 and 60 minutes and each transcription runs to about 20 pages. Although the interviews followed a broad schedule of topics, our approach has been conversational and we have consequently obtained rich narratives of how staff, partners and offenders view the IOM, their roles and relationships within it and its future. We have identified a number of key themes, which we discuss briefly below, based on six key questions. To preserve the anonymity of participants, we have simply identified them as 'police', 'probation', 'prison', 'stakeholder' or 'offender' without identifying them any further for the purposes of this report. In the sections below, the themes are framed by core and supplementary questions and/or our observations, followed by selected quotations from the interviews.

1. What makes the IOM partnership work?

Corcoran and Fox (2013) found that the robustness of local partnerships focusing on offenders with complex needs benefits where operational staff are given scope to develop collaborative networks; where their work complements that of their partners; where there is equality and 'respect' among the different agencies; and where there is a clear division of responsibilities. Past research has found certain conditions to be more amenable than others for bringing practitioners from several occupational sectors and cultures together. In their analysis of joint working among police, probation and prison services, Mawby and colleagues (2007) noted the importance of obtaining a 'conducive framework' for facilitating co-operation across several agencies. The addition of voluntary sector and statutory health, housing and educational providers brings another element of complexity to the provider 'mix'. Sustainable partnerships rely on a number of conditions for reconciling different organisational objectives within a multi-agency project. These include; (a) establishing clearly defined and agreed objectives; (b) all stakeholders contributing personnel and resources proportionate to their roles and responsibilities in the partnership; and (c) a clear delineation of operational territory and respect for jurisdictional boundaries among agencies.

A notable feature of the IOM programme is the number and diversity of organisations involved to different degrees in the partnership. This opened up questions about the work involved in forming and sustaining partnership in the complex circumstances of multi-agency mixes, as well as the challenges involved in co-ordinating interactions across several sectors and agencies. Staff working in stakeholder organisations agreed that each agency must have a clear sense of its own mission and what it contributes to the partnership and offender management process.

Research also suggests that the disposition of the 'core' (statutory criminal justice) partners is a determining factor in forging 'reluctant' or 'committed' partnerships. The former arises when a 'minimalist and grudging approach' towards partnership is adopted. By contrast, 'committed partnerships' occur where: (a) partners are able to adapt policy 'from above' to local conditions; (b) participants are constructively disposed towards the idea of partnership; (c) clear and mutually agreed definitions of roles and responsibilities are in place; (d) joint projects are underwritten by the commitment of financial or staff resources by all parties, and; (e) the voluntary sector is not marginalised.

> So this was about – the clue's in the title – Integrated Offender Management. It was designed to try and come up with a common programme that everyone could play a part in actually meeting the needs of those offenders (Stakeholder).

> Coming into it with a relatively fresh pair of eyes, I think there's some very, very good aspects to the IOM set-up in Staffordshire… around the partnership. And the organisations and pathways that are being delivered through IOM is a real strong point (Probation).

> One of the things that's been significantly different in Staffordshire compared to a lot of other areas has been the strategic planning and design around a lot of the systems…Unless you've got senior buy-in, any sort of partnership model isn't going to work… When it comes to things like shared service, joint commissioning, long term commissioning, then you're never going to achieve that unless you've got senior stakeholder buy-in around a way of working with a particular cohort of people that we know are high intense users of services (Stakeholder).

> The partnership world can be very superficial…this is much more that the right people are actually doing the right things… it is about relationships…so and so who happens to work for probation and so and so who happens to work for health (Police).

> I invited magistrates to come…and when they left, they said 'we can't tell who's who – who's the nurse, who's the doctor, who's the probation officer, who's the police officer' and that's exactly what I wanted to achieve… We've all got distinct roles but it's one unit that works together on that one person (Probation).

> We're all in the same building but we're perhaps not co-working together (Police).

2. Who are IOM workers? What experience(s), qualities and attitudes do they have?

Some of our interviewees have had experience of working with earlier PPO projects, while others are new to IOM. Those who are new did not receive any formal additional training and have had to learn on the job. For some, it has been a sharp learning curve:

> I've never worked in partnership before. I've never worked in anything like this. So it's extremely challenging but very enjoyable (Police).

Within the police, there is a tension between the belief that the police officer can turn their hand to any required task, and a recognition that IOM work requires a certain 'disposition':

> Can we be omnicompetent from being a public order officer one minute to being a family liaison officer in the other, that within us we have that omniability to be very confrontational and very physical, through to being very reflective, very empathetic, very emotionally intelligent. And my view is, while we would love that wide range of omnicompetence, I don't think it exists, not at the mastering level (Police).

> Perhaps some of the most proactive…police officers who would be held up as excellent police officers, perhaps weren't the best field officers (Police).

> Not a big thief taker, but a problem solver (Police)

> X [police] has almost become an adopted probation officer (Probation).

> You definitely need people that are interested in this area of work… if they don't have the fire in their belly, carry on doing frontline policing or be a detective (Police).

The tension is less acute in probation and partner agencies where the tradition and culture of the work is focussed on working in depth with individuals. Although by no means always clear cut, there are undoubtedly some basic differences in working practices among the public, private and voluntary sectors. In very broad terms, the public sector model of service delivery is based on principles of universalism, whereby all clients are entitled to a minimum (and are sometimes restricted to a maximum) level of service, which should apply regardless of geography or individual circumstance. The voluntary sector tends to individualise its services to a much greater degree, based on upon perceptions of need, clients' wishes, client-worker relationships, volunteer availability. Private sector providers tend to be driven by rational calculations about the most cost-effective way of producing specified results. The result is that it is often difficult to describe a 'standard' way of working within a single IOM partnership. What we noted was the creativity, enthusiasm and positive approach taken by staff from different agencies to establish clear and common goals and co-operative working practices which would allow partnership to develop organically from the bottom-up. The following discussion offers examples of good practice underpinning resilience and common purpose on the part of staff.

A notable feature of IOM is that all stakeholders are committed to the common objective of taking on the most unpromising cases – typically persistent and prolific offenders with long records of recidivism who have major social and personal problems. One of the issues that has caused considerable debate with the advent of competitive commissioning is that, in order to meet re-offending reductions, contractors may become 'risk averse' by investing little time and resources in the most 'unpromising' cases ('parking') and will focus instead on those they judge to need relatively little input to significantly increase their chances of avoiding criminal behaviour ('cream-skimming').

IOM partners have undertaken a calculated 'risk' in taking the shared view that they should concentrate mainly on working with the most difficult and complex offenders, recognising that this can be highly resource-intensive and will often produce mixed or even negative results in the short term. Staff from several agencies spoke from the conviction of experience that persistence can ultimately lead to transformations in the lives of some individuals. It can be argued that to 'turn round' the life of one individual of this kind has a higher cost-benefit ratio over the long term than to prevent several 'occasional' offenders from re-offending in the short term.

And we've got one guy at the minute … he's worked with us from the very beginning, so about six or seven years. Still drinking, got an alcohol problem, but that hasn't led into offending behaviour. And even though he's not on the police's books for offending, we've still carried on working with him, to try and get him to that fulfilled life

where he doesn't have to resort back to it. He's come an amazingly long way …and we're still not there (Stakeholder).

Indeed, there is some evidence that, even when they know that their 'performance figures' may initially suffer as a result, agencies in IOM will continue to work intensively with those most complex cases.

I think there's quite a number of successes. They might not sound very successful but even people who can go six months without committing an offence is amazing for somebody who's burgled 14 houses a day or something. I've got people that I've worked with that have gone two or three years without offending (Stakeholder).

Unsurprisingly, stakeholders working in the areas of drugs and alcohol addiction or mental health diagnosed offending as a consequence of underlying trauma. They envisaged IOM as an opportunity to make deep interventions to address the personal causes of chaotic, troubled or violent behaviour which was intrinsically related to offending:

But I guess that underlying mental health need was never treated or diagnosed they've perhaps gone on to use substances or alcohol to manage that as a coping mechanism (Stakeholder).

It isn't just about giving them a script and saying, 'let's have this methadone'. Because actually the reality of it is it's not dealing with the problem, it's just giving them something to stop them from offending, really. (Stakeholder).

3. How is IOM routinely structured and organised?

i) The physical environment and daily routines

At the interim stage, we questioned the suitability of Longton Police Station as an IOM environment:

Sometimes it feels like you're contradicting your work ethic… because you're inviting people into a police station (Probation).

Just even by the nature of how you open the door, the fact the door's so heavy on a cell…it's all reminders of bad experiences (Probation).

They're thinking 'actually I'm in a police cell here'. And it can't be the best environment for them really (Police).

When we first moved, it (caseload) did dip a bit, but I think that was more the fact that we were in a working police station. But now they know that they're not going to get jumped on every time they walk through the door, they are here, they do recognise that the help is there if they want it (Stakeholder).

Despite these concerns, we did not find any hostility among offenders to this environment, nor its geographical location. Nevertheless, we think there are still issues to be discussed about a) the overcrowding of co-located staff, b) the management of a reception area shared by IOM attenders and the general public and c) the use of old-fashioned police cells and waiting area for interviewing offenders.

We have a lot of data about daily routines and how things fit together. For the police, the early morning briefing meeting sets the day's schedule but there are also routine appointments with probation and other agencies that need to be co-ordinated as well as weekly programmes to be delivered, home visits, court reports, drug testing and treatment, prison visits and a variety of other multi-agency activities. There are inevitable points of tension but, by and large, daily co-operation in the programme's routines appears impressive:

So it can feel quite chaotic at times, but it's a fairly organised chaos (Probation).

ii) Benefits of co-location for facilitating information exchange

An advantage of co-location is that it fosters opportunities for the informal exchange of information that underpins a co-ordinated approach to offenders. Staff from different agencies who otherwise would not have had opportunities to exchange routine information are able to gain insights into offenders' progress on a day-to-day basis. Several noted that pooling information in this way helped to update their knowledge about the circumstances of offenders. Additionally, informal exchanges helped with integrating staff from agencies into what they initially perceived to be a police-probation conversation. Routine communication also provides a very important 'early warning system' for alerting service providers to potential problems, or for adding additional contextual information to the needs which clients presented. For other stakeholders, informal discussions about clients helped to identify additional needs. This helps to intercept offenders whose problems may not have been previously diagnosed and were therefore in danger of 'slipping through the net':

If you want the information, you can get it...and I know it sounds daft, we're in the same building but we're two flights up the stairs, and it makes a difference (Stakeholder).

There's even a difference between the big room and the smaller room where the probation officers are. Because even the police don't communicate with probation very well, and yet they're sitting in the same room. But I think it's a lot more joined up from an outside agency point of view than it used to be (Stakeholder).

We're building up relationships, we're getting to know systems, procedures, protocols. We're building up relationships with the IOM staff. I suppose it's just more information enhances our knowledge and enhances our role (Stakeholder).

We're available for probation officers to come and talk to us or the police officers to come and talk to us about any concerns that they've got. That can be from a personal point of view about, "I've got this chap on my beat who's bloody difficult to work with, I think he's Aspergic, how would you suggest that we work with him?", all the way through to, "I've got this chap on my caseload, he was doing absolutely fine and something's gone on", and looking at how to work with more direct cases (Stakeholder).

It's just making sure that nobody's missed, really (Stakeholder).

Nevertheless, this informal exchange was not viewed as sufficiently systematic, with several stakeholders noting that the complex composition of agencies in IOM meant that it was extremely difficult to convene formal, periodic, inter-agency case reviews. All non-statutory stakeholders noted that some formalised exchange of information and flexible system of case review was desirable:

Perhaps something to think about for the future is maybe go to one of their team meetings for half an hour and have a chat, because it's like anything, you can never get all the team together in one place at the same time, they're never always there. So maybe that could be an option (Stakeholder).

iii) Challenges of the governance of IOM.

At the interim stage, we identified a need for clarity around the internal categories of offenders that might come under the IOM umbrella e.g. statutory and non-statutory, youth and adult, DRR and IOM. We also identified a concern among both staff and offenders that, once labelled an IOM offender, it was unclear how, if ever, that label would be removed, especially for non-statutory offenders:

> The law's completely different about how you deal with a young person to an adult. The police officers have had to learn quick around what we can and can't do (Police).

> People will say DRRs are all under the same umbrella. They're not because they don't have field officers and they're not IOMs, so they're treated very differently (Probation).

> IOM would say they [non-statutories] have no choice...they are going to be an IOM offender because they've gone through the scoring matrix...[but] when you're selling something like that, there's not that many people that will completely disengage (Police).

Since then, even more significant issues have arisen about a) IOM cohorts and b) IOM progression from selection to de-selection. The two issues came together over a specific request to the programme to create additional capacity for a cohort of gang-related offenders. This is discussed further later in the report but the resulting discussion about programme capacity raised some important issues about the nature of the programme. One police officer used a medical analogy to liken IOM to acute medicine or intensive care. The implication of this is that offenders spend a finite amount of time on IOM and are routinely gradually moved on to lower levels of support – to the ordinary wards – thus creating more capacity at the intensive end. A secondary implication is that an offender does not come out of 'intensive care' cured:

> When you've got people in very intensive care...then it's highly unlikely that those people are quickly going to come out of that intensive care and support and be cured. Rather than if we were in a small fractures clinic [where] they're easily fixed and outcomes are easy to measure (Police).

> If IOM is seen as a very intensive approach which is designed to get people to a position where they're able to continue

> [with]...an approach that is less intensive, then I think you're able to actually achieve more of a beginning, a middle and an end (Probation).

Another key challenge of the governance of IOM work is striking a balance between participating agencies, with their distinctive legal powers, their criminal justice or 'social' responsibilities, different operational methods and approaches towards clients. One wider debate has focused on the anticipated reluctance of non-statutory agencies outside criminal justice to report offenders for potentially breachable activities lest it compromise their relationship with them. On the whole, this was resolved by acknowledging the 'need to know' basis of exchanging such information:

> I think we can make joint decisions with the other agencies in the areas that affect us. Not all the areas affect us, like...their offending background, it doesn't affect us. It's nice to know what they've done in the past and perhaps to look at why they've done it, but I couldn't send a report to court if they've committed a further offence, suggesting to the judge what they should get (Stakeholder).

All participants however, drew a clear distinction between retaining trust and confidentiality and disclosure on clear safeguarding grounds:

> We do have to make clear to people that if they were to divulge in interview offending behaviour, we would have to take that forward. And that sometimes can jeopardise our relationship a little bit with people. We have a confidentiality form that we ask people to sign, so that we are allowed to share information (Stakeholder).

Non-statutory partners sometimes found that they were at a disadvantage because they were not informed about outcomes nor given access to feedback on their activities which they felt would improve their contribution to the partnership:

> I suppose it's getting the feedback from the probation officers and evaluating that; is it working, isn't it working, what could we do? (Stakeholder).

> Sometimes if somebody's been arrested or if they have committed another offence, they're wanted even, sometimes we're not privy to that information (Stakeholder).

The success of IOM in terms of its expansion has contributed to the unforeseen consequence that systematic inter-agency communication has diminished. The increasing caseload has contributed to the loss of a regular, scheduled forum for case management and review involving all the agencies. Staff from almost all agencies regretted the lack of opportunities to hold regular case reviews. Some noted that this had been an indispensible element of the previous PPO programme, and argued that the practice had added significantly to the efficiency and effectiveness of their responses to offenders. Several acknowledged that convening all agencies on a weekly basis was impractical, and it was sometimes inappropriate for staff from certain agencies to sit in on such reviews routinely. However, as the case load grows, reliance on informal, less systematic opportunities to share information from different agencies will come under strain, and possibly contribute to lapses in the exchange and interception of critical knowledge and information.

> *I think it's a good programme and it really works. They just need to sort out the communication issues (Stakeholder).*

> *The fact [is] that the team's become so big that it's lost that communication. Certainly, as a partner agency, the communication thing's gone. Unless I ring up and say what's happened with this particular person, I don't know anything about them. They do have briefings and they say, 'a Wednesday morning is supposed to be when the agencies have their meetings', but you'll turn up and it's cancelled – 'Oh, we're having it tomorrow'. But when you're busy, you can't...It's got to stay at that time every week, so that people know it's in the diary and they can attend (Stakeholder).*

> *There used to be tasking meetings where we used to talk about every offender and all the agencies used to input about them, and they used to have MAPPA meetings as well, where we used to meet one to one. And I understand the team's got so big that that might not be possible but I think it's lost that element of communication (Stakeholder).*

4. How are the different roles and cultures within IOM identified and managed?

i) Relationships within police

Attitudes towards IOM within the police vary considerably and there are interesting views about how far the IOM approach can be imported into 'mainstream' policing and how, if at all, neighbourhood policing benefits from the existence of IOM. Presentations have been made to all LPTs in the hope of changing some remaining negative attitudes towards IOM.

> *Police officers with a lot of service have come down to the unit and you can tell they don't want to be here – this is the cuddly IOM unit. No it's not, it's not about that at all... I think that image is changing (Police).*

The role of 'field officer' is crucial in this. Seconded from LPTs to the IOM for what was originally intended to be a fixed period, field officers remain based in LPTs and act as a bridge between IOM and other police teams. They act as the eyes and ears of IOM, visiting offenders at home on a regular basis, offering support but also feeding back intelligence to colleagues both at IOM and the LPT. Our observations suggest that field officers develop a strong rapport with many offenders and a level of trust that would normally be unexpected between police and offenders.

One original aim of the field officer was to disseminate the principles of IOM to local police and to encourage a wider adoption of IOM skills among their colleagues, thus enhancing the skill sets of neighbourhood police officers. Whether or not this has happened is a matter of debate. Indeed, the following exchange between two field officers summarises the debate about the appropriateness of this work for the police:

> *FO1: Whether the police are the right people really to be doing it, I don't know, because we are all about enforcement and that really, but somebody should definitely be doing it. Or maybe it should be us, maybe...*

> *FO2: You see, I disagree, I think it should be us because... I think that we are viewed differently when we turn up on somebody's door - I think that does have an impact. And even though when we have formed that relationship, they do, kind of, like, forget who you are. When there's something going on that they shouldn't be doing, they remember who we are, more or less.*

One stakeholder, however, suggested that the 'change' aspect of the field officer's role would be better carried out by a peer mentor:

> *So if you're wanting long term outcomes, you're not going to get it by cops in jeans and t-shirts going on knocking on doors... So ex-offenders trained up to do peer support to go and engage*

with people in prison, meet them when they come out and then get them engaged in activity and a support mechanism... that is sustainable and everybody gets a dividend from it (Stakeholder).

ii) Relationships between police and probation

The key to the success of IOM is the police/ probation relationship. Mawby and Worrall (2013) have argued that this relationship has been one of mutual suspicion historically but that this has improved dramatically over the past couple of decades, largely due to increased multi-agency working and a willingness on both sides to change cultures and attitudes. This suspicion is still identifiable but we did not find it widespread:

Very suspicious of the police. I guess everybody knows that the reason they want to be involved with probation and the statutory offenders is so that they can arrest them...I made a decision a long time ago that if any of mine turn up here and they are wanted and they're going to be arrested, I have nothing to do with that. I stay firmly at my desk (Probation).

The police version of this was rather different:

It just drives you to the point of distraction. Where we are meant to be integrated, we are meant to be working towards the same thing but the probation staff don't tell you when their offenders are in and you have to rush around and see if they've come in. We have people come in who are wanted and have walked out and we didn't even know... we will get absolutely hammered (Police).

Despite a general view that probation is responsible for the 'change' aspect of IOM and the police for the 'control' aspect, we found the reality to be very much less clear-cut, especially in relation to non-statutory offenders. Field officers, in particular, are very committed to a rehabilitative approach to offenders. Some believed that probation had relinquished this aspect of the work:

If we say to a probation officer, we've been two or three times last week [on a home visit], do you know this, that and the other about him, and they go 'no'. Because they only see what that person wants them to see...I don't think they have a lot of time to get out of the office. I think they've got appointments,

people coming in...work programmes and things like that... (Police).

On the other hand, the police's enthusiasm for 'change' and rehabilitation was viewed with scepticism by some:

I always think police can add value to the rehabilitation side [but] they have what they call these pathways. Which for me, it's like somebody doing a Powerpoint presentation – they've read a paragraph about desistance theory. I find it a bit disingenuous...because it doesn't seem there's an understanding of what it means – it's just a word (Probation).

Unlike some IOM programmes in other areas, there is a sense that this IOM programme is police-led. This is particularly evident in the referral and selection process. While probation can make referrals to IOM, offenders are only selected if they meet the scoring criteria. The criteria were originally agreed between partners but this is not always understood and leads to a view that the programme is run by the police '*very much on their terms*' (Probation).

Our evidence suggests that at ground level on a daily basis the police/probation relationship works well but there are still underlying tensions which may be creative and healthy or, alternatively, stressful and counter-productive:

I would suggest the police were under more pressure to 'give' to make it work than the probation service were (Police).

It doesn't have to be harmonious... it's the pull and tug that makes it so successful (Probation).

But I do think because people are quite clear in what their roles and boundaries are, we don't have maybe some of the clashes that people may have thought we'd actually have because of history and culture (Probation).

The momentous changes in probation work that have taken place this year are discussed more fully later but are already impacting on this relationship because of the uncertainty surrounding its future. More immediately, issues around information exchange between the NPS and the CRC have consequences for routine information exchange between probation and police about, for example, plans to visit offenders at home (e.g. for safeguarding purposes) and even consultation about whether offenders should be a) de-selected or b) breached for non-compliance.

iii) Relationships with the wider partnership

Co-operation between statutory and non-statutory agencies is critical to establishing efficient working practices which allow workers from different agencies to discharge their roles within their respective remits. One voluntary sector stakeholder noted:

> *We will look at the needs of the actual person. And we will take into account what the [police and probation] officers [are] saying, but it's about the individual and about what they think their offending is, and how they got there. But they [police and probation] manage the risk for us, they manage the boundaries of what we can do and where we can go, dependent on that. And then we do the work out in the community (Stakeholder).*

> *It's important to view the person as a whole really, the whole holistic approach. And sometimes it can be hard to see past the offending (Stakeholder).*

All participants observed that it was critical to retain a clear sight as to the core values and objectives of each participating agency. Agencies are not expected to undertake functions or responsibilities that are beyond their remit, or which might be likely to undermine their distinctive approach towards clients. The clear division of roles and functions underlines clarity and trust between agencies with different service ethos and operational cultures and obligations:

> *Probation trust us to just get on with what we need to do and let them know what's happening. We've never had any issue where they've stopped us from doing something. They trust us to know what we're doing and know that, that's what helps that person to move forward (Stakeholder).*

This stakeholder went on to say that this inter-agency relationship between the community and public sector was particularly successful in North Staffordshire in comparison with other IOM areas in which her agency operated. By contrast, other stakeholders commented on the process of adjusting to working not only within criminal justice, but with agencies such as the police and probation which had different styles and approaches:

> *Probation are just very focused on what they work for and what they want to achieve, and they perhaps don't take into account the requirements of other agencies. It's been a bit different really with the police. We didn't know what to expect*

> *when we first came, but I can honestly say, I do believe we've got a really good working relationship with the police. They share information with us, we share information with them. If there's anything we're not sure of, we talk to them about it (Stakeholder).*

The statutory-community sector relationship is underpinned by the expectation that the voluntary sector provides specialist or 'niche' services which enhance, rather than take over, the role of existing statutory services. One volunteer organisation which provides peer mentoring support for IOM offenders observed that their service, although apparently at a soft 'marginal' aspect, was in fact a critical 'glue' or 'cement' to the work being undertaken at the statutory level:

> *I think it's crucial really in some senses. And I think if you speak to police officers, they'll say the same. Because even though maybe the expectation is the field officers are about dealing with some of these problems in the community, they haven't got time, they've got 600-odd offenders that they're keeping an eye on. One of the things they've said to me is they haven't got the quality time that we've got to be able to sit with someone and work through that (Stakeholder).*

The importance of partnership was the added value which it brought to individual services, making the whole more effective:

> *I think they need the whole package. You've got probation, which are working with them to address their offending, to look at keeping appointments, to look at keeping court appointments. You've got the police who are aware of who's on what order, making sure that they're available if the client wants to phone up and talk to them, if there's anything they're not sure about. You've got housing agencies that come into the IOM … [and] benefits and drugs treatment. So you're looking at the whole approach really (Stakeholder).*

> *We complement each other in terms of our assessment skills, because we bring two different approaches … And hopefully, that …leads to a good assessment and a good knowledge of services and support needed (Stakeholder).*

iv) Relationships with prisons

The Staffordshire IOM programme has coincided with the broader policy shift towards establishing a 'whole prison' approach, in which prisons are tasked with supporting resettlement as one of their primary functions. Under the most recent round of re-rolling (August 2014), six prisons in the region were redesignated as resettlement prisons: Birmingham, Brinsford YOI, Dovegate, Drake Hall (Female), Foston Hall (Female) and Oakwood. One particular achievement has been the relocation of most IOM offenders to prisons in the Staffordshire and West Midlands areas, forming the basis for making resettlement a more coordinated transitional process for all concerned:

> My big drive and passion at the moment is working far closer with our region's prisons...We've now got over 80% of our offenders in Staffordshire prisons (Police).

From the prison perspective, IOM offenders, like other cohorts, are one element in the development of sustained 'through the gate' services to provide continuity in support. This involves forging contacts with community agencies, working with prisoners' families, and facilitating accommodation and education, training and employment (ETE):

> You know, it's not that whether they're an IOM offender or not, priority isn't given just because they're IOM. Priority is given to every single offender that we identify on reception into prison that have got each of those issues, that we've already got a resettlement team in place that try to help them and sort out the benefits straightaway ... Those services are already available within the prison to fundamentally try to arrange and sort out before even IOM gets to that point of having to intervene. So it's not like we don't already run with a resettlement approach (Prison).

Prisons are important hubs in the IOM strategic partnership, and considerable work has gone into integrating personnel from statutory services and other providers into the offender management framework in the custody estate. In practical terms, this has been facilitated by seconding personnel to 'external work'. Examples include police field officers visiting IOM offenders in custody to maintain continuity in the relationship and to contribute to planning the transition to release. In turn, prison officers are based at Longton for part of the week, enabling them to access to E-CINS, to 'work closely with other statutory agencies' and to support pre-release work involving 'all the community partners' (Prison):

> Those that are due for release the following month, ... they will get seen by the field officer. They would come in, the police officer would come in, [the] offender manager if they're involved and supervise the substance misuse, anybody from resettlement, so that a comprehensive recovery plan and resettlement plan is produced for the prisoner, so that accommodation, everything is addressed and in place ready for the prisoner to be released (Prison).

> One of my workers in substance misuse, work[s] alongside one of the field officers in the IOM. So it was a joint [initiative to] do outreach and, where possible, to motivate and engage offenders post release to work with services (Prison).

Engagement in IOM has delivered several strategic and practical advantages for the prison service. The prison estate did not initially have a mandate as a responsible partner with respect to managing prolific offenders beyond the gate, and prison managers spoke highly of the 'outstanding' efforts of the police and probation services to create a bridge for them into the strategic IOM partnership. From the vantage point of the prisons, the development of IOM work also supports the broader mission of breaking down barriers between prisons and communities. Involvement has also facilitated strategic and operational co-ordination between the prisons and the 'more traditional partners' such as the youth justice, police and probation services (Prison). Prison staff described the constructive, long term benefits of partnership in terms of a continual learning curve informing the work being done in prison establishments, thereby further contributing to the wider goals of IOM:

> [It is about] trying to find the strengths of the custodial estate... Can we bring this into the prisons, and then take our own intensive work back into the community so as not to waste that work? (Prisons).

Importantly, staff interviewed from the prison sector are confident that the IOM model has had a positive influence in curbing persistent re-offending. Staff from two prisons perceived that they were seeing fewer of the same faces among the IOM cohort returning to their establishments. Whilst capturing this in statistical terms is complex, there are some tentative suggestions from the indicative data which one establishment collated of the 'statistically significant reductions' in re-offending in which identified the 'IOM hub work was the distinguishing factor' (Prison). The other prison attributed the work of IOM police officers

to supporting a more constructive attitude among offenders to engaging in the programme:

> I've seen IOM work, it is tangible. There are practical solutions available to work with complicated clienteles (Prison).

> Certainly with the reputation of the police, it's reduced a lot of barriers, certainly with offenders … we've collated feedback forms and we've had some really good feedback from the prolific offenders that, in the past, have never engaged but they've seen and experienced positive outcomes (Prison).

Despite the energy of staff and the observed benefits of joint working in supporting offenders, gaps remain in the chain of supports available to people exiting custody. This undermines the objective of creating 'seamless', 'end to end supports' which are thought to contribute to stabilising offenders' immediate situation as a precursor to progressing to more independent lives. This is not uniquely a challenge for Staffordshire IOM, as research repeatedly confirms the correlation between failures to address former prisoners' most basic requirements (accommodation, income, treatment) and increased risks that they will resort to crime:

> We struggle with people coming out of prison who have not got an appointment for benefits, they're waiting weeks. We're getting that wrong somewhere (Police).

> I'm not sure how strong the links are from an education, training and employment perspective. I know there's good links with local stakeholders such as your Saltbox, Restart, ARCH and your hostels. I think from an employment, training and education perspective, that's always is a difficult one. Housing still remains a difficult one … when you certainly look from a Staffordshire perspective, that's just Northern, but when you start looking at Southern IOM, accommodation is far and fewer between, there are more difficulties there. So I think area, location does [matter] (Prison).

v) Housing as the pivot for IOM work

It is widely acknowledged that placing offenders in safe and reliable accommodation is an essential precondition to increasing the chances that work with offenders will have a constructive impact.   This was recently restated in the Resettlement Thematic Report of the Joint Inspectorate of Prisons and Probation

with Ofsted, which summarised the 'Catch-22'-style conundrum in which people leaving custody are caught:

> Having somewhere sustainable to live was an essential prerequisite to getting and holding down a job. Without a secure place to live, it was very difficult to get a job; without a job, it was difficult to afford a place to live' (Joint Inspectorate and Ofsted: 2014: 7).

Without this base, offenders are more likely to return to chaotic and lawbreaking lifestyles and less likely to move on to the next phases of resettlement by securing treatment, education, training or life skills, for example. There are practical economic consequences for prioritising their housing needs, insofar as the police know where they can access and monitor IOM offenders, and providers can target their services to clients, thereby making the most of their resources. The role of the police and prisons in making initial housing needs assessment renders the process more efficient, ultimately saving time and money for housing providers.

Generally, recently released individuals who are not returning to family will be placed in temporary accommodation before moving on to a longer term tenancy. All too often, local authorities regard those exiting custody as having made themselves intentionally homeless. Ex-prisoners may have forfeited their tenancy if they go into custody. In Staffordshire, statutory housing providers seek to avoid such discrimination while working within the legislative framework. Police and prison staff noted how reliant they were on the voluntary sector to provide emergency accommodation. However, another bottleneck arose down the line because of shortages of suitable housing stock for single people. Prolific offenders are generally stigmatised by landlords, while sympathetic landlords are unwilling to take on vulnerable/chaotic tenants if they have had previous problems with this group. Housing providers suggest that a combination of IOM-style monitoring and cash 'bonds' or guarantees could be a practical response to incentivising private-sector and social landlords to take on the most 'difficult' tenants:

> Housing is very difficult. It's difficult who we're housing people with. So we might have somebody in a stable place and the only place that we can house them is in a vulnerable place. And I don't think that's actively looked at. … We will mix anybody with anybody because we can say they're housed (Police).

> There's no blanket policy in terms of all ex-offenders who get sent to prison are going to be intentional. We're not

allowed to do that. We have to look at each case on its merit (Stakeholder).

We spend more time with IOM guys. Particularly, we tried an intensive support scheme. That was like for the worst of the worst of the IOM kind of clients coming through the system (Stakeholder).

The main problem is the majority of offenders that come out are single people who need a one bedroom flat, and the council has a limited amount of one bedroom accommodation. So the fact that they're an offender isn't the biggest problem sometimes with the council - it can be - it's the fact we don't have any accommodation for them (Stakeholder).

That's the only way I can see it going forward is if all the providers were to put up some money to say, "this is a prevention pot". Seventy quids' worth of arrears, they won't let them back in unless that's paid off. The police could easily could go, 'right, there's the seventy quid, let's get somebody in' (Stakeholder).

vi) Education and training and employment (ETE) for offenders

Although education, training and employment (ETE) support is flagged as a pathway to reducing reoffending, some central and local government policy decisions have had unforeseen, adverse effects on this sector. As a consequence, provision has fragmented and opportunities lost to support prisoners to continue using the vocational skills or training they received in prison in employment after release.

Stakeholders cited several examples where outreach or special provision for offenders have been fragmented or withdrawn. These included, for example, the cessation of specialist support from the Connexions service, which had referred clients with offending or at-risk attributes to educational providers. Secondly, the decline of provision in local colleges for offenders arose because of changes in the funding regime. Consequently, longstanding relationships between prisons and local educational providers, who had built up knowledge of the local economy and employers, was discontinued. Some groups of offenders, such as women, are further disadvantaged because they are less likely to be in custody in their home region. Thirdly, some local initiatives stepped in to support ex-prisoners' needs in areas such as elementary preparation for independent living and purposeful activity, such as the Building Skills for Recovery, Information

Technology, work skills, victim empathy, football, and boxing. Government, commissioners and funders would like to see a more explicit transition from the acquisition of 'soft' skills to 'hard' qualifications, certification and employment. The interviews with local educational providers, reflecting the findings of research, suggest that certain courses of action might facilitate this transition. These include adopting a realistic approach as to what can be achieved with this cohort. High levels of illiteracy, poor socialisation and the premature termination of education among offenders means that expectations should be proportionate. Local and national experts have stressed that it is impractical to consider 'soft' and 'hard' skills separately for this cohort. To quote the recent Thematic Report on Resettlement:

Reliability, trustworthiness, the ability to work on their own initiative and good customer service are essential to an offender's employment prospects, and can be developed or discouraged in many aspects of an offender's experience – not just what happens in workshops or classrooms (Joint Inspectorate and Ofsted, 2014: 7).

In Stoke, when you think of the type of area that we're in, we're in very much … a low income, low skill area. [And] the additional burden of having a prison sentence … they need to be able to do that little bit more than someone who's just long term unemployed (Stakeholder)

The general barriers that people come across in employability skills is not just about qualifications, it is about attitude, it's about being able to socialise or being able to react, interact socially with people (Stakeholder).

The female release is all over the place. It could be Northwest, it could be Southeast, it could be wherever. So really it's much, much harder to actually provide them with a realistic and relevant training path because you can't touch all those areas (Stakeholder).

A further barrier to consistent support from life-skills to training to employment lies in the complex terrain of service commissioning and procurement. Currently, education, training and employment provision (ETE) is competitively tendered out under the rules of the regional offenders' learning and skills service (OLASS). In practice, prison education contracts for several establishments tend to be awarded to large national providers. Local providers who have lost out may be subcontracted to provide 'niche' courses, but interpretation of the current rules

tends to rule this option out because local competitors appear to require the permission of the existing contract holder to submit tenders. One educational stakeholder explained why they had withdrawn from working with prolific prisoners in prison:

> *The current state of play with regards to funding in custody is that we can't do that unless we get the agreement from the OLASS provider. Because the OLASS potholders, if you want to call them, hold that funding now, it does mean that we are slightly removed from work in custody … Colleges that have used their core funding, their ASP funding, outskills budget funding, in the past, no longer can use that unless they have the permission of the OLASS provider. I suppose the basis there is really what the government doesn't want to do is pay for OLASS, that OLASS money not being used, and then use other pots of money to cover some of the shortfall that's happening (Stakeholder).*

5. What is the impact of the IOM on offenders?

This is the area where we had least evidence at the interim stage. We have now incorporated both qualitative data from interviews with offenders and some quantitative analysis from ECINS and other statistical databases. In a later section of this report we show how we have developed case studies. In this section we refer to more general comments about the programme.

i) In terms of process

Most of the offenders we spoke to had become involved in crime in their early or mid teens:

> *…got involved with the wrong crowd, started smoking marijuana. Then, one day, there's a few other lads there, they had heroin and I started to use heroin. And before I knew it, I was using every day and then I was addicted. And since I was 16, I've been in and out of jail, so it's a revolving door since I was 16 (Offender).*

The range of IOM provision available was acknowledged:

> *I've got that many appointments… I've got appointments every day, I have, near enough (Offender).*

The experience of the IOM and its staff was generally very positive as these quotations indicate:

> *Have I took things from [IOM]? Yes. Basically, I used to be an everyday heroin user. I'm no longer an everyday heroin user but I do occasionally use it. So I've took that from it, you know what I mean, it's slowed me down. So I'd say that's a good thing about it, it has actually give me better skills in life to deal with … trigger situations (Offender).*

> *Yeah, there is support. They're good people…They put a lot of effort into some of the things they do. I mean [my probation officer] is a brilliant bloke. I can speak to him about anything and he'd be there (Offender).*

One practice of note is the frequency with which IOM staff collect offenders on release from prison (see comments above on relationships with prisons) and guide them through their first day at liberty:

> *And obviously we try to settle them down, so by the end of the day we should know where they're living, what their state of mind is, who they intend to meet up with later in the day. Because they do have a really good natter to you on the way back [from prison release](Police).*

> *Because the first day is the most important. Because if you get your head on the pillow that first night and you haven't messed up, you've got a good chance the next day. That's where support's needed to actually turn up at the prison gate and go "I'm your IOM officer…this is what we'll do" (Offender).*

ii) In terms of outcomes

The most straightforward indicator of success for IOM is de-selection after a period of monitoring that shows a consistently low level of risk of re-offending. Disappointingly, there is no simple database that collects data on de-selections and this is a missed opportunity to showcase the work of IOM. We strongly recommend that this information is collected in a clear and accessible form because, otherwise, much good work is going unacknowledged. A recent (unscientific) random sample of de-selected offenders showed a dramatic reduction in re-offending after de-selection.

In fairness, however, the picture is usually more complex than this:

> Somebody might be on minus ten and gets to minus three by the time he's come there [IOM]. Actually, he's still offending but he isn't maybe burgling domestic dwellings, he isn't maybe using as many drugs, he's maybe changed his choice of drugs from heroin to cannabis. So that for me is a form of progress… but that doesn't get recognised (Probation).

To complicate the picture further, it was pointed out to us on several occasions that IOM is not just about 'change' but also about 'control':

> And I wasn't happy at all…you go in, they swab your hands for drugs, they take your footprints, they put you under the ultraviolet light to see if you've done any burglaries (Offender).

'They' also check out offenders' living conditions in similar ways and are perfectly prepared to recall an offender to prison for non-compliance, even if they have not actually re-offended, in order to prevent re-offending. Approximately a third of the IOM offenders at Longton are in prison at any one time and it is a matter for debate whether, and to what extent, this should be regarded as success or failure for IOM.

iii) Recognising individual outcomes

Given the limitations of capturing outcomes statistically, those with professional experience of working with offenders also adopt a threshold of 'success' which attributes tangible and subtler changes to offenders as a result of their engagement. These thresholds coincide with criminological desistance theory which recognises the steps towards primary desistance (the initial tentative changes in towards behaviour and attitude) that form the basis of secondary desistance (more consistently law-abiding behaviour and thinking). The evidence may be modest by the expectations of outside observers especially as participation in IOM may not necessarily take individuals immediately or entirely away from a life of crime. However, for staff it has an observed impact on slowing down the rate at which individuals proceed through the revolving door between prison, community and back again. One pointer of success is that IOM offenders engage with statutory and voluntary sector services to a far higher degree than other cohorts of offenders. Whilst apparently counter-intuitive, the logic is that getting offenders to engage with IOM is the first step of a longer process of tackling the underlying, complex causes of crime. In the long run, this generates added value in that the IOM process becomes greater than the sum of its constituent parts, thereby adding to cost efficiency in the long run:

> I think we've proved ourselves… our results speak for themselves. When we've done an assessment recently, probation did on our reducing reoffending rate, and the generic probation, we reduced it by 14%; which is quite high really (Stakeholder).

> We have people on court order who breached their probation order. But in the IOM unit, we don't get them very often. My opinion would be that the engagement rates are higher in the IOM unit than across general probation (Stakeholder).

> We can provide those figures but we do them every time a client exits, we record on their exit plan exactly how many days that they stayed with us. … We're looking at not necessarily being the people that cure somebody and we make that massive change. Did we make a difference to that person? And actually in terms of finances, did we make a reduction just on costs in general? Because somebody staying out of prison for six more weeks longer, it's six more weeks of money into a pot (Stakeholder).

6. What is the future for IOM?

i) Types of offenders and approaches

At the interim stage, there was much discussion about the wisdom of expanding the IOM approach to include other types of offenders, especially violence, including domestic violence, and sex offenders. While some felt this would be wholly inappropriate, most considered that the *principles* of IOM could be applied to a wide range of offenders, possibly all. But it was recognised that the specific *interventions* needed would differ and would require careful planning and development:

> Domestic violence is different…it's far more complex and you have to approach it in a different way (Probation).

> I think the principle of IOM can work for any type of offender [but] operationally, in this unit, the way it works, I'm not sure (Probation).

Since then, the programme has been overtaken by a specific crisis concerning gang-related offending. The IOM was asked to accommodate a large influx of

actual and potential gang members, many of whom were juveniles. This was seen to be an indicator of respect for, and confidence in, IOM and an opportunity to make a major contribution to local policing. However, in order to create the capacity required, it was necessary to de-select a large number of low risk offenders, even though they did not formally meet the de-selection criteria. This change occurred too late in our evaluation process for us to make any further comment but we recommend that a) specific interventions relevant to this new cohort are explicitly developed as a matter of urgency and b) the work is carefully monitored in order to identify 'lessons learnt', be they positive or negative.

As will be seen in a later section of this report, we are suggesting a different approach to identifying those offenders most likely to benefit from IOM and this involves placing less focus on the nature of an offender's offences and more on their 'readiness to benefit' in terms of personal characteristics, circumstances and stage in their criminal career. This is different from, though may include, an offender's perceived level of 'motivation'. In line with desistance theory, it also includes an offender's developmental stage, life experiences, personal resources and sources of support (or social capital). Assessing 'readiness to benefit' may imply changes to the process of selection and will certainly require systematic reviews of progress and a mechanism for removing an offender from the programme if it becomes clear that they are failing to benefit from it.

ii) Relationship with 'mainstream' policing

A constant theme throughout our research has been the extent to which IOM can act as a model for policing more generally. While some still consider IOM to be a specialism that requires different qualities and skills from other forms of policing, others consider it to be very close to good neighbourhood policing. From management and political perspectives, one of the ways in which the resources allocated to IOM can be justified is for the principles of the work to be widely disseminated within the police service and to be *integrated* into other areas of work:

> *I absolutely think that it should be mainline that police are doing [IOM]. Whichever way you look at it, it's a win-win scenario (Police).*

But, as one partner agency manager pointed out, IOM is not the only form of multi-agency work, MAPPA being the best-established other example. If, as was suggested earlier, IOM represents the 'acute' end of the medical spectrum, there

is a danger that expectations of IOM will outstrip its specific model and that it will be stretched to such an extent that it becomes compromised and ineffective:

> *Yes, a multi-agency approach to addressing [gangs] might well be the right way to go about it. Just as a multiagency approach to many problems might be the right way to go about it...but that doesn't mean that IOM should be the means by which it is delivered (Probation).*

> *I think having different disparate cohorts of people just confuses the message and confuses the philosophy of what's being tried to achieve really (Probation).*

iii) Future of probation under Transforming Rehabilitation

Since the interim stage of this research, the Probation Service nationally has been split into two organisations – NPS and 21 CRCs – with the latter being prepared to be sold off to the voluntary and private sectors. The current situation for probation workers could hardly be worse and they have an uncertain future in the IOM, which has been designated as CRC work. This in itself implies that offenders on IOM programmes (nationally) are assessed as being of medium or low risk of re-offending and/or causing serious harm. While it is anticipated that most offenders on the Staffordshire programmes will fall into these categories, some will not and it is not yet clear how the NPS (dealing with high risk offenders) will be resourced to deal with these. As we know, risk is also a dynamic concept and many IOM offenders will change their levels of risk during their time on the programme. The NPS also has sole responsibility for enforcement in relation to statutory cases, so the relationship between NPS and CRC will be critical for continued probation involvement in IOM. During the transitional period, NPS staff have been available on site but this may not continue indefinitely. The ratio of statutory to non-statutory cases will also change, with the former increasing as offenders serving under 12 months in prison become automatically subject to supervision.

Although the prime contractors for the CRC have now been named, this is only the beginning of a lengthy process of setting up the frameworks for partnership- and inter-agency work. It is difficult to envisage how a privately-owned CRC will work in this environment. Contractual issues around the physical co-location of a private sector-led organisation in a police station would appear to be complex. Equally, the relationships between a private sector-led CRC and other existing partner agencies from the voluntary and health sectors pose special challenges. These issues reach well beyond the remit of our research but we find it difficult

to see a future for IOM without highlighting the extreme turbulence that probation workers are currently experiencing:

> *It's very resource intensive...but a contract that is partially payment by results – however comfortable a private sector organisation feels with our multiagency working or partnership working, they would potentially see as well, if they've got to rely for their results on the performance of others, when they have no control over that performance, then is that a dangerous place to be?(Probation).*

References:

Corcoran, M.S. & Fox, C. (2013) 'A seamless partnership?' Developing multi-agency interventions in a non-custodial diversionary project for women. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 13(3) 337-354.

Criminal Justice Joint Inspection (2014) *Joint Thematic Report on Resettlement provision for adult offenders: accommodation, and education, training and employment for offenders (The Resettlement Thematic report).*

Mawby, R., Crawley, P., and A. Wright (2007) 'Beyond "polibation" and towards "prisi-polibation"? Joint agency offender management in the context of the Street Crime Initiative'. *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, 9(2), 122-134.

Mawby, R.C. & Worrall, A. (2013) *Doing Probation Work: Identity in a Criminal Justice Occupation.*

Chapter 5
Performance data and other statistics

As indicated earlier, it is proving very difficult for IOM programmes nationally to demonstrate their effectiveness in terms of providing hard statistical evidence of reduced re-offending. In this section we report on the ways in which the IOM in North Staffordshire is attempting to address this. Given the unclear national picture, we believe that these efforts are commendable and, more importantly, there is active discussion at every level about how the data can be improved.

The case management software used by the Staffordshire police (and thus by the IOM programme) is ECINS and this generates a wealth of both static and dynamic information about individual offenders. But, like all software, it is only as reliable as the information entered and, in the case of the IOM, it is dependent on the quality of intelligence from IOM workers. We have, for example, already noted that probation officers do not contribute to ECINS.

With these caveats, we have focussed on two sources of statistical data:

- Local IOM Performance Dashboard generated centrally which provides periodic statistical trends for management

- A randomly generated sample of 30 offenders participating in the IOM programme in the North as of February 2014

Performance Dashboard

The methodology used to generate the Dashboard snapshots has changed during the course of our evaluation, so it has not been possible to make comparisons over time. Additionally, there has been a comprehensive management review of the statistical data collected by IOM with a view to utilising a model that will capture outcomes other than crude re-offending rates more appropriately. We have attended two management meetings on this specific topic and have been able to contribute to this discussion.

Consequently, we do not consider it appropriate to present the existing data here, other than to say that, in the broadest terms and using the most recent methodology, the rate for IOM in the North is approximately 2% lower than the national average for PPOs and across Staffordshire is approximately 4.5% lower than the national average.

ECINS random sample report

In our interim report, we explained that we were monitoring the risk assessment progress over 6 months of a randomly generated sample of 30 IOM offenders (roughly 10% of all IOM offenders and 1 in 7 of those not in prison). The sample comprises a mix of all categories identified earlier in this report. Only one is female and two are juveniles; the remainder are adult males. In February the sample consisted of 16 Red (High), 9 Amber (Medium) and 5 Green (Low) offenders. Cross-referencing with official (Performance Dashboard) figures, it is clear that our sample over-represents Red offenders and under-represents Green offenders. We decided not to adjust the sample to make it more representative but we note that any positive changes in the risk assessment of our sample indicate progress with the 'hardest to reach' offenders. As we explain later, we have supplemented this data in various ways to focus more on Green and de-selected offenders whose progress is, by definition, generally more positive.

In our interim report we presented the early results of this exercise because we felt that they were going to generate considerable debate and would require further exploration. This has proved to be the case. As the table in Appendix 3 indicates, the risk assessment for many offenders fluctuates, sometimes wildly. As a result of the feedback we have received since our interim report, we have now taken account of the changes in the number and types of arrest and prison sentences for each participant, two years prior to their selection for IOM and since their selection. This has given us a more detailed picture of changes in the offender's behaviour. Overall, we remain satisfied that the risk assessment score is a reasonable proxy for changes in behaviour. However, it is necessary to take into account the following when interpreting the score:

- The risk assessment score can only ever be a guide to changing behaviour because it is dependent on the quality and assessment of the information/ intelligence provided by IOM workers. It is also worth noting that, when intelligence is not provided over a period of time, the software makes an automatic re-assessment of risk.

- Changes to the risk assessment score may not reflect re-offending or even re-arrest. 'Soft' intelligence about changes in behaviour, personal circumstances, aspects of sentence planning and failures to comply will also affect the score.

- Imprisonment may not reflect a recent pattern of re-offending. It may be the delayed consequence of a past pattern of offending or it may be a recall to prison for failure to comply with a court order. The latter 'breach' proceedings instigated by probation officers could be interpreted as a timely preventative measure to stem further offending and allow a breathing space to review an offender's sentence plan. Bearing in mind that IOM is about both 'change' and 'control', imprisonment should not automatically be viewed as an indicator of

failure (though this does make it almost impossible to provide clear performance indicators of success).

Taking account of all the above, it appears to us that approximately half of our sample has succeeded in lowering their risk assessment score over the 6 month monitoring period and half has a raised score. The additional pre- and post-IOM arrest data broadly support this conclusion.

However, as previously stated, our sample over-represents high risk offenders and only two of our sample were de-selected for good progress. In order to get a clearer picture of Green offenders, we asked the programme to provide anecdotal information about their 'success stories' and it was readily forthcoming. It is clear that where the IOM 'works', it works very well and it is thus understandable that workers are frustrated by an overall statistical picture that does not seem to reflect what they know to be the case on the frontline. In the next section we turn to possible explanations for this apparent disparity and present some 'good news' case studies.

Chapter 6
Who benefits from IOM? Case studies and categories of offenders

Throughout the research we have been conscious of a need to identify those offenders who benefit most from IOM and to offer some suggestions about why that might be so. In this section we identify four categories of offenders for whom IOM has impacted, in different ways and for different reasons. In each category we present an illustrative case study from the people we have met. In compiling the case studies we have used a combination of data from our own interviews, ECINS, police debrief interviews and discussions with offender managers.

Category 1: Last chance before custody

This group consists of offenders who tend to be younger and are beginning their criminal careers. With the right intervention at the right time they can be diverted from custody and supported until they mature sufficiently to become responsible adults. **Craig** is an example. Aged 19, he started offending when he was 13 and got in with the 'wrong crowd'. By 15 he was smoking cannabis and committing thefts and burglaries. Living with his grandmother and mother, who has a drink problem and a criminal record herself, Craig has been an IOM participant for 8 months. He has never been to prison and he knows the IOM is his last chance. He has kept out of court in that time. His main problem is that he has never worked. The IOM has motivated him to get a job and he attends the weekly computer class at the public library run by the IOM where he has been able to obtain a CSCS card, enabling him to work on a building site with a friend of his uncle. This group of offenders highlights the importance of working closely with the Youth Offending Service to ensure that young people are fully supported in their early teenage years and that their transition to adult status is carefully managed.

Category 2: Prison regulars finally ready to change

The most dramatic changes are to be found in this group of older offenders who have spent many years in and out of prison and have finally decided that they can't face another custodial sentence. They are ready to change and the IOM is the right vehicle to bring about that change. **Damon** is an example. A heroin addict with 18 convictions when he joined IOM (half of which were for failure to comply with court orders), Damon

had been on prolific offender programmes before but '*hated it with a passion, refused to do it, refused to go in, so they'd just send me back to prison'*. In sum, he said '*I wasn't ready to change'*. But having reached suicidal 'rock bottom', he was persuaded by IOM officers to go into a residential drug rehabilitation programme. Since then he has gone from strength to strength and is now working as a volunteer with the rehab programme. He has not been arrested since the end of 2012 and has now been de-selected. He has acted as an ambassador for IOM, telling his story to rooms full of police officers and partner agencies.

More 'good news stories' in this category include:

Dave, who set himself goals on release from prison to lose weight, keep off drugs and stay crime free. With the support of IOM field officers, he achieved all three by joining the IOM boxing project, culminating in him participating in a police charity boxing match in front of 1000 police officers. Now a boxing tutor and volunteer, he has stopped offending and has been de-selected from the IOM. His offender manager reports that '*this is a massive change from the chaotic offender I first met'.*

Bob has found the journey more difficult and his reduction in offending has been steady rather than dramatic. Another heroin addict, he was eventually supported away from the drug scene by IOM field officers and his own partner. A family man with 3 children, he has been de-selected because he has not been arrested for a year. The combined support of Social Services, probation, drugs treatment and field officers has led to a better lifestyle and a crime-free existence.

Category 3: Vulnerable non-copers

A large number of offenders on IOM could be described as 'vulnerable non-copers'. They live chaotic lives and are dependent on the support offered by all the partner agencies, especially drugs treatment and housing. Their probation and police IOM and field officers are their only consistent means of support and, while the impact of IOM on their offending may be rather hit and miss, it could certainly be argued that they would be worse – both personally and criminally – without it. **Lisa** is an example and one of the few women on IOM. Lisa is a compulsive shoplifter who started committing crime when she was 16 to support her boyfriend's drug habit. The relationship was abusive and Lisa says she '*never really wanted to do crime'* but she '*just wanted to help'* her boyfriend. Intelligent and well-presented, Lisa easily passed for a regular shopper but, at the age of 21, she has already served four prison sentences. Poignantly, her view of the local women's prison was:

> To be honest, I never wanted to come home from that prison. It just feels like a proper home when you're in that prison.

At the time of interview, Lisa was living in accommodation provided by the IOM programme. She has been signposted by the IOM to a local one-stop shop provision for women, where she enjoys a range of activities and has even begun to work as a volunteer. Her former boyfriend is now in prison and she has the opportunity to start afresh. Her re-offending has reduced but not stopped. Her last prison sentence was a year ago, before she became an IOM participant.

Lisa has been de-selected recently in response to a policy move to create capacity to address the local issue of gangs. Fortunately, she is a statutory offender so will retain the support of probation.

Category 4: Not yet ready to change

The 'carrot and stick' ethos of IOM means that even those offenders who are not yet ready to change can be 'controlled' by the IOM. Difficult to engage in any meaningful way, they can nevertheless be monitored and quickly re-arrested if they re-offend. IOM officers continue to offer support but inevitably find these offenders frustrating to work with. **Gavin**, whose case study was presented in our interim report, is one such. Having been on prolific offender programmes for years, he has been ready to accept the offer of support in between prison sentences but has been unable to make any significant changes in his life and re-offends whenever he feels under pressure. Since our interim report he has received yet another custodial sentence and is in prison at the time of writing. While there is no doubt that offenders like Gavin have benefitted in some ways from the IOM, it could be argued that the resources invested in him over many years are hard to justify. On the other hand, the only alternative is for Gavin to receive a continuous stream of short custodial sentences that are more costly in the long run.

It is clear from these case studies that there is no 'typical' IOM offender. At the moment, IOM offenders have their offences in common – serious acquisitive crime (SAC) – but we are not convinced that the specific nature of the offence is the key to impact. Many IOM offenders have mixed offence records and, while SAC dominates, there is also plenty of public order offences and lower level violence. More important, we suggest, are the dispositions, personal circumstances and stages of criminal development of offenders. The key question is 'Are they ready to benefit from IOM?' While acknowledging that making this assessment is far from simple, it does suggest a need for much greater focus on selection, progress and de-selection processes than currently exists.

Chapter 7
Cost Analysis

We have provided a simple 'cost analysis' based on an economic evaluation that deals only with the costs of interventions. This is the most basic valuation exercise which can only represent:

    (i)   known inputs (recorded interventions);

    (ii)   service inputs which have been monetised, and for which there is an approximate cost (for example, the cost of an arrest);

    (iii) the average cost of interventions (such as being arrested), but not the actual cost of interventions with respect to individual service users.

This approach also excludes ‹additionalities› such as loss of property; victim costs; costs to NHS; or other non-monetised inputs. Therefore, the cost information is imperfect.

Methodology:

This section makes use of case studies to set out the basic costs and potential areas of saving which may be associated with interventions under the IOM programme. By using case studies, we can set out more detail about the interventions that offenders receive and also give information about possible outcomes. Estimations are based on 'the public sector cost of crime', that is, the costs to the taxpayer of responding to, investigating, processing and punishing crimes and breaches. Costs of interventions are set against costs to the police, courts, probation service and the Safer City partnership. This is then compared with a 'value for money' calculation (Matrix Knowledge Group, 2007). The 'value for money' formula describes the net saving that can accrue per offender on the programme when compared with the costs of sending them to prison.

Value for money compared to prison per offender.

The Matrix calculation [5] is one useful source for comparing savings achieved by placing offenders on non-custodial alternative programmes instead of prison. The Matrix model aggregates the costings of complex interventions or treatment programmes for the duration of a year, such as 'residential drug treatment'. This is then set against the predicted cost savings arising from reduced reoffending post-release. The resulting

savings are modelled on the basis of the reduced re-offending as a result of successful completion (taking into account the cost of the intervention) over an offender's post-release lifetime.   If costs are modelled to reflect savings to property and victim costs, the projected savings are even more significant. For the purposes of comparison, the IOM programme is costed as an 'intensive supervision programme'.

Non-custodial intervention (annual cost)	Saving to public purse	Savings plus fewer victim and property costs
Intensive supervision programme	£57,364	£130,477
Residential drug treatment	£88,469	£202,775
Prison with drug treatment	£31,959	£116,554
Juvenile community interventions	£3,437	£16,260

Note: all costs are estimates (Matrix, 2007).

Case study A

'A' was inducted into the Integrated Offender Management programme in May 2012 after having spent 182 days in prison. He had initially turned to crime to fund his heroin dependency. Prior to engaging with IOM, 'A' had 18 convictions for failure to comply with court orders, drug possession and theft. ''A' had experienced homelessness and substance abuse. He engaged constructively with IOM field officers, his last court order passed without issue and his probation officer was very supportive.

On engaging with IOM, 'A' accepted a place onto a residential drug rehabilitation programme with the Burton Addiction Centre (BAC). Up to that point, 'A' was sofa surfing with associates, drinking heavily and barely surviving. 'A' entered the BAC and began his recovery. He was visited throughout his stay by probation and police field officers. 'A' left the BAC in March 2014 and has never looked back. 'A' ceased his offending and is now working as a volunteer with *Recovery Is Out There* (R.I.O.T), giving back to the community and contributing his time as a peer mentor to offenders. His case can be regarded as a success story for the IOM programme.

'A' is one of the less resource-intensive clients of IOM. However, we do not have a full profile of all of the services he accessed. We have conservatively costed his interventions. Future costing exercises will require a more complete picture of services and resources accessed.

'A' has now successfully exited the IOM programme. The table above suggests that the known costs for his offending (arrests and detention) was an estimated £48,796. His interventions (IOM supervision and drug treatment) cost £11,246, although this only factors in the known services accessed. The table highlights a difference of £37,550 if 'A 'had continued to commit crime or received a custodial sentence.

Intervention (pre IOMs)	Number of occurrences	Unit cost	Total
Prison costs	182 days in prison custody	Based on average annual cost of a prison place for financial year 2011-12 (£37,648)[1]	£18,772
Number of arrests	18 Based on number of convictions prior to IOM programme	£1,668 (based on marginal operating costs) [2]	£30,024
Cost			£48,796

Intervention (post IOMs)	Number of occurrences	Unit cost	Total
IOM field officers/ probation supervision	May 2012 to March 2014	£5,947 per offender per year. [3]	£5,947
Residential drug treatment	Length of time not known. Estimated one year.	£5,299 per offender per year. [4]	£5,299
Cost			£11,246

Case study B

In the two years prior to joining the IOM programme, 'B' had moved address several times, smoked heroin almost daily and committed crime to fund his habit. He was extremely chaotic and difficult to engage. He was arrested 22 times for offences ranging from theft, burglary, car theft, possession of drugs and warrants for non-appearance before the courts. He had spent three terms in prison in that period, totalling 250 days before opting for IOM on exit from this third period in custody. 'B' currently resides in the community with his partner.

His field officer managed to stay in touch with 'B' and on several occasions worked with him to change over a period of time. 'B' has three children. Social services were also involved with the family due to 'B's drug use and the risks of losing custody of his

children made him engage with the IOM process. 'B' received support with his drugs misuse, benefits advice, social services and housing. In the nine months after going on the IOM programme 'B' was arrested 14 times, mainly for theft and failure to attend drug assessments. He also spent two terms in prison, for 124 days in total. He lapsed into periods of drug misuse but eventually became less chaotic, sticking to methadone prescriptions and spending more time with his family.

After moving in with his partner and children, 'B' had all but cleared up his drug habit, his criminal activity decreased and he disassociated himself from peers involved in drug use and offending. Both 'B' and his partner gained CSCS (Construction Skills Certification Scheme) qualifications. At this time 'B' was deselected from IOM and although contact was lost, he is still in the area and there have been no reports of criminal activity for some time.

'B' has now disengaged from the IOM programme but with evidence that he has largely turned the corner. The table above suggests that the known costs for his offending (arrests and detention) in the two years prior to engagement with IOMs was an estimated £62,922. His interventions (IOM supervision, drug treatment and family support costs) came to £11,985. He spent a period under arrest and in custody after selection to IOMs which amounted to £36,422.

The table highlights a difference of £14,515 if 'B' had continued to commit crime at the rate and severity of his offending pre-IOMs. However, it must be noted that the biggest expense related to the custody and arrest disposals which were significantly reduced after nine months, evidently as a result of investment in addiction and family services which are supporting B's longer-term journey from crime.

Intervention pre-IOMs	Number of occurrences	Unit cost	Total
Prison costs	250 days	£37,648 per year	£25,786
Number of arrests	22	£1,668	£37,136
			£62,922

Intervention (post IOMs)	Number of occurrences	Unit cost	Total
Social Services	n/a	Initial contact and referral: £186 Initial assessment: £271 Ongoing support per child: £107 x 3 (£321) Core assessment: £585 Planning and reviewing: £222 Public law guardianship costs: £2238. [6]	£3,823
Drug/ Alcohol intervention	Weekly drug assessments (excluding period in custody) = 35 weeks.	£53 per week for prescription service x 35 weeks (£1,855) £120 per session for combined drugs/ alcohol /mental health team assessments (monthly) x 3 (£360). [7]	£2,215
IOM field officers/ probation supervision		£5,947 per year.	£5,947
Prison costs	124 days	£37,648 per year.	£12,790
Number of arrests	14	£1,668	£23,632
Full total			£48,407

Sources: (1) Ministry of Justice (2012) *Costs per place and costs per prisoner by individual prison,* NOMS Annual Report and Accounts 2011-12: Management Information Addendum.

(2) Ministry of Justice (2013) *Information Release: Costs per place and costs per prisoner*. p2-3.

(3), (4), (5) Matrix Knowledge Group (2007) *The economic case for and against prison*. p7.

(6) Holmes, L., McDermid, S., Soper, J., Sempik, J., & H. Ward. (2010) *Extension of the cost calculator to include cost calculations for all children in need*. Research Brief: DFE – RB056. University of Leicester. p7

(7) Homeless Watch (2013) *What's it Worth? Guidance on using financial savings analysis in the homelessness sector*. P24.

Conclusion

Simple cost analysis is only a foundation for actuarial modelling which allows service purchasers to determine the 'cost benefit' of a service, that is, measuring the effectiveness and efficiency of an intervention in relation to investment. 'Cost benefit analysis' relies on econometric projections to determine whether investment in a given service produces worthwhile outputs or even savings. Cost benefit analysis is a valuable tool for eliciting transparency and accountability in public services. However, experts argue that there are numerous pitfalls and limitations to estimating the monetary value of costs and benefits of criminal justice interventions (see Albertson and Fox, 2012). These can be summarised as (i) the practical constraints of capturing complex interactions; (ii) imperfect cost information; (iii) failure of policy makers to ask the right questions; (iv) over-reliance on 'an aura of precision and objectivity [in economic modelling] that might not be justified' (Cohen, 2000: 303); (v) the misapplication of benefit-cost analysis; (vi) difficulties in capturing 'unknown' values such as possible 'savings' accrued to society if an individual is returned to custody, thus 'preventing' further offences.

The accuracy of costing relies on the quality of information about services accessed, length of time spent on interventions, and other relevant data. Cost-benefit analysis works most efficiently when it is deployed in relation to clear policy objectives. Commissioners or service purchasers within IOM may choose to make greater use of the Ministry of Justice toolkit or obtain expert econometric evaluations of the impact of the project in order to obtain a detailed picture of the impact, value, outcomes and savings accrued.

References

- Albertson, K. and C. Fox (2012) *Crime and Economics: An Introduction*.

- Cohen, M.A. (2000) *Measuring the Costs and Benefits of Crime and Justice, Measurement and Analysis of Crime and Justice*, vol. 4.

- Home Office & Ministry of Justice (no year) *Integrated Offender Management Tool Walk Through. Phase Two: Conducting break-even analysis of Integrated Offender Management*.

Chapter 8
Conclusions and recommendations

If we adopt the following standard model for mapping the various components of programme evaluation, we are now in a position to draw some conclusions and make some recommendations in all areas:

Inputs ➡ **Activities** ➡ **Outputs** ➡ **Outcomes** ➡ **Impacts**

Adapted from Pawson (2013)

We have ample evidence of the *process* of IOM: inputs (staff, physical environment, financial and technological resources, information exchange); activities (programmes, appointments, support, surveillance, purposeful leisure activities, skills training); and outputs (intelligence, partnership development, individual offender profiles, risk assessment and social progress). As will be clear from this report, this evidence has been overwhelmingly positive. We have met enthusiastic, committed workers from all involved agencies, who believe passionately in IOM and can present compelling rationales for, and descriptions of, their work. We have been particularly impressed by their tenacity and willingness to persevere with damaged, chaotic offenders and in the face of limited resources, organisational uncertainty and cramped working conditions. The complexity of the programme has resulted in inevitable tensions and lack of clarity around the roles and responsibilities of different agencies but these are being resolved professionally. Being optimistic and able to tolerate a degree of uncertainty is a pre-requisite of this kind of work.

We also have ample evidence of strategic planning and commitment to the IOM at very senior levels within both police and probation services. This is not necessarily the case nationally and undoubtedly gives the Staffordshire IOM model credibility externally.

We would identify the following as specific areas of good practice:

- The role of *field officers* in acting as a link between the IOM unit, partner agencies and the local policing team. Despite (or possibly because of) the ambiguity of the role, the relationships that field officers are able to establish with offenders result in a range of benefits for all partners, such as intelligence, safeguarding, early identification of problems and crime prevention. This work is particularly valuable where it is possible for field officers to make joint home visits with probation workers and other partners. We are not convinced that this complex role could easily be replaced by volunteer or peer mentors, though the latter have an important but separate contribution to make.

- The proportion of *imprisoned IOM offenders* who have been housed in Staffordshire and West Midlands prisons. This has been an impressive achievement and one that has been due to the commitment of specific senior personnel in both the police and prison services. It has given a real impetus to the concept and practice of resettlement.

- The practice of *collecting offenders* on their release from prison. The value of this seemingly minor practice should not be overlooked. Notwithstanding our comments about the field officer role, we think that this particular practice could be fulfilled by mentors – especially ex-offender peer mentors - who could guide a newly released offender through the maze of first day appointments and help to settle them in accommodation.

- The creation and regular updating of *ECINS profiles*. The use of ECINS software has enabled the systematic collection of data on individuals on the IOM programme. It provides a wealth of useful information but needs to be constantly updated for its value to persist. While fully understandable, it is disappointing that probation is unable to contribute and we would like to see other partners making more contributions. We would also like to see a greater use of ECINS to produce aggregated reports on trends.

- The development of *debriefing interviews*. Although the quality of the debrief reports varies, the ability of IOM police officers to conduct and report on interviews with offenders about their motivations and modus operandi for crime is an excellent aid to both police intelligence and police understanding of the personal circumstances of offenders. We remain unclear about the use to which these reports are put and ask, for example, whether they would be useful to probation officers in the preparation of court reports.

- The *IT skills classes* held at a local public library and the *boxing project*. We would identify these two projects as examples of good practice in using local resources to respond to local problems. Additionally, the projects provide specific benefits respectively of preparing offenders for employment and improving their physical and mental health.

- *Housing* is prioritised as a precondition to securing the basis for constructive work with prolific offenders. Housing providers are knowledgeable about the needs of people leaving custody and those with offending histories. Equally, they are responsive towards the particular risks that inappropriate housing

presents for increasing the likelihood of re-offending. They remain constrained by shortages of accommodation for single persons in the general housing stock, but also identified the need for special capabilities and authority to secure urgent housing needs for acutely difficult tenants.

- *Educational, Training and Employment (ETE)* provision is fragmented. This is a national problem. Local providers have taken the initiative in providing elementary preparation for independent living and purposeful activity, such as Building Skills for Recovery, Information Technology, work skills, victim empathy, football, and boxing. Building from this to the acquisition of 'hard' skills such as qualifications, educational certification and employability skills is a challenge. Attention to the local dimension and continuity in commissioning and procurement is recommended.

- *Drugs and alcohol misuse*, often closely related to *mental ill-health* is a major cause of offending behaviour and obstacle to successful resettlement. Treatment and therapeutic approaches make a significant contribution to IOM, with community mental health and other providers, drugs and alcohol teams coordinating effectively and contributing to high levels of engagement.

- The *Post-Implementation Review* and its follow-up. This review, undertaken internally in 2013, provides an impressively detailed picture of the early days of the IOM. Its ambitious methodology is more rigorous than the authors give themselves credit for and it has provided a very useful springboard for our own research. We are aware that the IOM Strategic Planning Group has been monitoring the actions following the 62 recommendations made by the *Post-Implementation Review*. We have identified a small number of these recommendations to which our research has made a contribution and we have listed these in Appendix 4. They can be summarised here as falling into 5 categories:
    1. Clarifying roles and responsibilities across the multi-agency partnership
    2. Promoting academic partnerships and methodologies in evaluating and developing the programme
    3. Improving processes relating to progress of participants
    4. Improving understanding of offender needs and services
    5. Improving communications with wider community, courts and third sector organisations

At the interim stage, we had less evidence and therefore less confidence in the two areas of outcomes and impacts. It is to these areas that we now turn. The evidence presented in this report indicates that where the IOM works, it works very well, both

in improving the lives of persistent acquisitive criminals and in reducing their levels of re-offending. More systematic collection of de-selection data would demonstrate this more convincingly. But it does not work for everyone on the programme. It is clear that many offenders are not ready for 'change'. At present, this does not mean that they are programme 'failures' because they can still be successfully 'controlled'. However, this contradictory definition of programme success makes it all but impossible to produce the clear performance indicators that commissioners – and the general public – require. This is particularly pertinent at a time when the Police and Crime Commissioner is taking more responsibility for the structure and nature of multi-agency partnerships. Consequently, there is a need to review the aims and objectives of IOM to take account of this complexity. We suggest this discussion may result in a choice between two new future directions for IOM.

Direction 1: IOM as 'acute medicine'

- IOM is regarded as akin to acute medicine – a specific model of multi-agency work to which those with the most complex needs are assigned for a finite period of time before being moved to lower levels of support and/or control.

- Within this model, participants may be selected, in addition to their needs, not so much according to the nature of their offences but according to their 'readiness to benefit' from the programme.

- We have suggested three different categories of offender who might be ready to benefit: those who are at risk of a first custodial sentence; those who are 'burned out' by years of prison sentences; and, the vulnerable non-copers who cannot avoid prison without support.

- We have suggested that a fourth category of those not ready to change should either not be selected for IOM or should be de-selected rapidly if they fail to engage with it at a minimum required level.

- If a concept of 'readiness to benefit' were incorporated into the selection process, this would have implications for offenders' progress through the programme and their de-selection from it.

Direction 2: IOM as a broad set of principles

- IOM is not the only model of multi-agency work and is not necessarily the best model for all cohorts of offenders.

- Nevertheless, the present model is underpinned by a set of key principles which could form the basis for the development of other models.

- There are also examples of good practice that could be rolled out for use in other partnership arrangements.

- However, moving in this direction, it would not be appropriate to simply apply the existing IOM model to a range of other situations. Each new situation would require the fresh application of IOM principles and the development of fresh and apposite multi-agency interventions.

While there is much to commend it, the disadvantage of Direction 1 is that it will continue to be resource-intensive and require very carefully specified relationships between the partner agencies involved. The impact of the entry of private sector organisations in this context is hard to predict.

The risk with Direction 2 is two-fold. There is a danger that lack of time, resources or good partnership communication could lead either to the existing model of IOM being over-stretched to the point of being overwhelmed or, alternatively, the key principles of IOM being diluted to the point where they are no longer meaningful.

Whichever direction IOM takes, there are a number of shorter-term recommendations that we would make on the basis of our findings which will enhance the programme's ability to produce evidence of its success for internal and external audiences:

- The re-introduction of a series of formal periodic reviews involving partnership representation for all participants with a clear pathway to de-selection for both statutory and non-statutory participants. De-selection to be a performance indicator of success.

- The collection of simple statistics on the recruitment, progress and de-selection of participants and production of regular accessible reports on this data (recognising that speedy re-arrest and re-conviction may also be an indicator of success).

- The production of regular trend reports from ECINS data eg. in respect of risk assessment.

- A series of IOM staff meetings to support and monitor the impact of the changes resulting from *Transforming Rehabilitation*.

- The instigation of regular middle management partnership meetings to deal with programme development at the operational level between strategy and day-to-day work.

- The development of an internal communications strategy to enable all partners to feel fully involved in programme developments.

- The development of an external communications strategy to ensure the dissemination of good practice and good news to external audiences.

- Drawing up an Action Plan that will identify tasks, responsibilities and timescales across the partnership for addressing this report and its recommendations.

Whilst we have not explicitly addressed the issue of early intervention in this report, it is clear that certain elements of the IOM approach have as much to do with targeted interventions for improving the life chances of individuals who are prolific offenders as with addressing their offending. This combined (or 'holistic') approach is based on cumulative research which demonstrates that appropriately-placed social supports are pre-conditions to diverting, or supporting, individuals out of criminal involvement. In this sense, IOM resembles an *enabling approach* rather than a simple, predictive tool of offending. Nevertheless, the programme has been robust where it has utilised the following: clear criteria for selection (informed by the categories we have identified relating to offenders' readiness or not to engage); carefully specified interventions; agreed principles of targeted intervention; co-ordinated and apposite multi-agency work; and the understanding that interventions are likely to be more resource-intensive at initial stages in anticipation that these will ameliorate as medium- and longer-term goals of reducing reoffending are attained.

Anne Worrall and Mary Corcoran

30 October 2014

APPENDIX 1

Complexity checklist from Pawson, R. (2013) The Science of Evaluation: a Realist Manifesto (London: Sage) Chapter 3

1. Volitions. Map the choice architecture of the programme. What choices do subjects have to make to achieve the ambitions of the programme? These choices will vary significantly across the totality of subjects, so the map should cover the full range and balance of volitions. Minds tend to be changed slowly so the volition map should also sketch the pathways of persuasion, the sequence of choices a subject has to make in moving from outsider to insider status.

2. Implementation. Map the implementation chains of the programme. Programmes come to life over many months and years and a great diversity of 'traffic' flows through them. Implementation maps might begin to chart: flows of resources; chains of responsibilities (individuals and institutions); reception and transmission points for subjects; as well as the different theories-of-change that lie behind each stage, strategy and tactic.

3. Contexts. Map the pre-existing contexts in which the programme is embedded. Consider for whom and in what circumstances the programme might work. Contexts vary from the micro to the macro, so the map might include profiles of: stakeholders and their characteristics; the interpersonal exchanges through which the programme is delivered; the organisational settings in which it takes place; the wider societal location of the programme.

4. Time. Map the history of the family of programmes of which the intervention under study is a member. What has happened previously will shape what happens next. Temporal mapping might include; previous experiences of programme subjects and communities on similar interventions; previous experience of stakeholders in delivering similar interventions; the successes and failures of previous attempts, of whatever kind, to address the given policy objective.

5. Outcomes. Map the monitoring systems that are likely to be applied and have been applied to programmes like the one under study. Consider which measures are likely to be contested, how stakeholders might differ in their interpretations, and whether behaviour might change as a result of being monitored rather than as a result of the intended action of the programme.

6. Rivalry. Map the pre-existing policy landscape in which the programme is embedded. Other, contiguous programmes and policies may share or oppose the ambitions of the intervention under study and can override the actions of stakeholders and subjects under study. Consider how generic implementation strategies such as 'continuous improvement' will continue to modify the delivery of the programme.

7. Emergence. Map the potential emergent effects, long-term adaptations, societal changes and unintended consequences associated with the programme. Consider whether the spread and duplication of the programme might blunt its effectiveness. How will the programme be able to maintain a balance between recruitment, retention and exit?

APPENDIX 2

Intensive supervision for adult offenders[1] in England and Wales: a literature review
Anne Worrall and Rob Mawby[2]

For more than a decade, the government in England and Wales has insisted that a very small proportion of offenders (around 10 per cent) are committing a very large proportion of crime (around 50 per cent) at any point in time (Home Office 2001, 2003, 2004). Although this received wisdom has been challenged (Hopkins and Wickson 2013) it is in this context that we focus in this chapter on intensive supervision projects for persistent and prolific offenders (hereafter referred to as PPO projects). The underlying principle of such projects is that a combination of greater control and surveillance, together with help and treatment, offers the best opportunity to reduce the risk of re-offending of this group of predominantly young, male, non-violent offenders. The main criticisms of the projects are that they are resource-intensive, expensive and unproven. Evaluations, though increasing in number, are based on small samples and are inconclusive in their results. At the same time these projects represent an imaginative and alternative opportunity for the effective management of this specific group of offenders, whom agencies commonly have difficulties in engaging.

The structure of the review is as follows. First, we place PPO projects within their historical context. Secondly, we identify key common characteristics of PPO projects. Thirdly, we examine the evaluation of the projects, drawing out the main findings, and issues that have arisen to date. Finally, we draw a number of conclusions about the future of PPO projects and intensive supervision more generally in the context of the government's radical plans for the probation service.

Four generations of intensive supervision

Intensive projects for prolific and persistent offenders in England and Wales can be viewed as both a recent innovation - emerging from the convergence of intelligence-led policing and evidence-based probation, modelled on a European initiative[3] and given impetus by the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act – and as the latest incarnation of a much older penal pre-occupation with persistent offending and intensive supervision. In order to understand the challenges and benefits of the projects, it is necessary to locate them within both short and longer term historical perspectives.

In England and Wales it is possible to identify four 'generations' of intensive supervision initiatives for adult offenders – those which developed in the 1970s, those which were a feature of the 1980s and early 1990s but which continue in various forms to the present time, those which have emerged in the late 1990s and are proliferating in the early years of the 21st century and, finally, the latest iteration – Integrated Offender Management.

The 'first generation' of intensive supervision for adults emerged in the 1970s when four probation services participated in the now infamous Intensive Matched Probation and After-Care Treatment (IMPACT) experiment from 1972 to 1974 (Folkard et al. 1974 & 1976). Based on the traditional 'treatment model' of probation, IMPACT sought to provide 'more social work, more counselling, more help' (Mair 1997:65) to a small and select caseload of offenders, in the belief that greater frequency of treatment contact would rehabilitate offenders and reduce their criminal activity. The focus was on 'matching' offenders with different personality and social problems to different kinds of probation intervention and there was virtually no mention within the model of involving any other agencies. The evaluation reports were damning, apparently demonstrating that IMPACT participants were more, rather than less, likely to re-offend than non-participants, and providing evidence in the UK to support Martinson's claim (1974) in the USA (also based on evaluation of similar intensive supervision interventions) that 'nothing works'.[4]

In the 1980s, the 'second generation' of intensive supervision represented a response to pressures created by a demand for incarceration which exceeded prison capacity and a lack of respect for community penalties. In England and Wales, the government's Green Paper *Punishment, Custody and the Community* (1988a) and subsequent Action Plan for dealing with young adult offenders, *Tackling Offending* (1988b) led to

---

1 We have excluded discussion of intensive supervision for juvenile offenders because this has an extensive and separate history.

2 This review is adapted from a book chapter written in 2013 which has been translated into French for publication in a French edited collection.

---

3 In 1995 a prolific offending project involving both the police and probation services was established in Dordrecht, Holland. It purportedly reduced the number of domestic burglaries (by one-third) and became the inspiration behind a number of UK projects.

4 As Raynor and Vanstone (2002) have since noted, IMPACT did appear to work well with one particular group - those with low criminal tendencies who perceived themselves to have many problems - offenders who might now be described as 'low-risk, high need'.

eight pilot Intensive Probation schemes which ran between 1990 and 1992 and were evaluated by the Home Office (Mair *et al*. 1994; Mair 1997). Unlike the first generation projects, these projects made many more demands on offenders and included the concept of surveillance. Evaluations of intensive supervision projects were consistently discouraging in terms of their impact on recidivism. Evaluators (Mair *et al*.1994) also bemoaned the 'lack of innovation' in the schemes. In their favour, it was clear that offenders themselves spoke very positively of the projects, enjoying the additional attention. The projects were also successful in providing greater control or structure for offenders and thus making it more likely that they would persevere with – and possibly benefit from – treatment projects.

Although intensive supervision projects failed to meet their stated goals, it has been noted that they achieved a 'series of latent goals' (Tonry 1990, cited in Mair 1997:67) – organisational, professional and psycho-political. They enhanced the credibility of probation by appearing to demonstrate a 'change of culture' and a 'reduced tolerance of crime and disorder'. This, in turn, attracted more resources to probation and raised the esteem – and self-esteem – of probation officers. As Clear (1997:130) puts it, succinctly: 'the very fact that intensive supervision projects proliferate is the evidence of their success'.

The 'third generation' of Prolific and other Priority Offender (PPO) projects in England and Wales represent an amalgam of the theoretical underpinnings, policy objectives and multi-agency practices of previous generations of intensive supervision. Combining penal philosophies of deterrence, incapacitation and rehabilitation, these 'third generation' projects seek to provide a mix of frequent contact, access to treatment (particularly drugs treatment) and community facilities, and constant monitoring. They also seek to demonstrate cost-effectiveness and increased public safety. The major departure from previous projects, however, is their avoidance of the pitfall of relying on offenders to reduce their own rates of re-offending. This was always the weakest link in the chain and the one which consistently undermined claims of success. Instead, it is now accepted that prompt re-arrest (resulting from increased intelligence and monitoring) following re-offending or recall for breach of sentence conditions is also a measure of success. There is, however, a serious flaw in this logic. The possibility that a project could claim success on the basis of arrests and order breaches does seem to be somewhat at odds with the spirit of the exercise and this conundrum is central to any understanding of the impact and contribution of such projects. It also makes evaluations rather complicated, as we shall see.

The latest or 'fourth generation' includes, but extends beyond, existing Prolific and other Priority Offender (PPO) projects (Home Office 2009). Integrated Offender Management has been an attempt by the Ministry of Justice to provide a 'strategic umbrella' to co-ordinate all multi-agency approaches to intensive supervision. It has been an attempt

to operationalise the concept of 'end-to-end offender management' introduced by the Carter Report (2003) with a key aim of 'disrupting' an offender's criminal activity and thus reducing the risk of re-offending. Six pioneer sites were funded by the government in 2008/2009 and have been subject to evaluation (Senior *et al.* 2011). Integrated Offender Management is now the nationally recognised framework for local multi-agency collaboration in working with offenders (Ministry of Justice 2010).

Key characteristics of intensive supervision and monitoring/ surveillance projects

Prolific offender projects for adult offenders were originally concerned with the reduction of volume property crime, predominantly theft and burglary, although more recent projects now accept offenders with some form of current or past violence in their records. The central feature of such projects has been the combination of intensive attention from both the police and probation services.

The other characteristics of the projects derive from this central feature. First, the project is staffed by designated police and probation personnel, and located on either police or probation premises (the significance of different locations being as yet unevaluated). Secondly, participants in the project are required to meet local criteria that categorise them as 'prolific' - that is, among the most persistent offenders in the locality[1]. Thirdly, they are subject to formal court orders of supervision or post-custodial licence though, importantly, IOM programmes now include substantial numbers of non-statutory offenders who are not subject to current court orders. Fourthly, participants are subject to high levels of police monitoring[2] and projects of intensive probation supervision which seek to address their offending behaviour and also to assist with other offending-related needs such as housing, substance misuse, leisure, education and employment. Fifthly, in order to achieve this, there has to be an agreed mechanism of information exchange between participating agencies (not just police and probation). Finally, there is an agreed procedure for swift enforcement in the event of non-compliance or further offending (which requires the co-operation of courts).

The supervision regime

Programmes of intensive supervision are the defining aspect of prolific offender projects. For example, on the Stoke-on-Trent project (Worrall *et al.* 2003), participants

---

1   The official national definition of an adult persistent offender is now one who has been convicted of six recordable offences in a 12 month rolling period (which could include six offences on one occasion). A prolific offender may be so defined on the basis of local intelligence. However, definitions of prolific and persistent have become very flexible and one study now even questions the basic premise that a very small number of offenders commits a disproportionate amount of crime (Hopkins and Wickson 2013).

2   For a recent theoretical discussion of the surveillance of prolific offenders see McCahill and Finn (2013).

were bound to four weekly appointments that were arranged on an individual basis. Participants risked breach proceedings if they missed these appointments. They included: a weekly office visit, a weekly home visit, consultations with a substance abuse nurse and a doctor, employment/work assessment interviews, and 'healthy lifestyle sessions. There were also occasional activities and a monthly *Multi-Agency Planning and Assessment Meeting (MAPAM).* This comprised a formal monthly review of all participants. Chaired by a police chief inspector, the meetings were attended by agencies with an active involvement in the supervision of the participants. These had the purpose of reviewing progress with each participant against formal minuted targets that had been set at the previous meeting. If police intelligence had suggested suspicious sightings or associations, then the participant was challenged and required to provide an explanation.

Commonly there were a greater number of contacts than the mandatory four. New participants, for example, required greater supervision initially. In addition, because the participants were, or had been, drugs users, their lifestyles were often chaotic. Consequently there were periods when a participant reached a crisis point and relied on the project team for intensive daily support. This support extended to participants' families, whom team members worked with as one means of attempting to stabilise the participants.

The regime of intensive supervision involved the co-ordination and co-operation of many organisations, but the contributions of the health representatives were integral to the project. The doctor was a genuine team member and his role became increasingly influential, since all the participants had histories of drug misuse. Taking drugs did not mean that participants automatically breached their conditions for project participation, but it did influence their capacity to participate in activities, their ability to find work, and their relations with family and the project team. Therefore an early step in project participation was fast-tracking an appointment with the doctor, to address the stabilisation of the participants' drugs use. This underpinned everything that followed, though it also raised criticisms of unfair priority being given to participants over law-abiding citizens.

The supervision regime described aspired to a framework of support that was different to other projects, providing a flexible, responsive service that drew on a range of specialists who would work on a one-to-one basis. Participants considered the project to be unlike their previous experiences of probation and community service. The differences they perceived related to the intensity of contact and the level of support from the project team. The participants were also in agreement that they valued the combination of the project's different elements and activities. They perceived the project to have additional objectives to preventing re-offending, namely assisting reintegration

into society and providing support across a range of areas, particularly helping with drugs problems.

In addition to supervising the participants' lifestyles through the regime of appointments, the police would also monitor participants closely. A crime analyst constantly scanned for reported crimes that met the *modus operandi* of participants; incoming intelligence on their movements and associations was constantly reviewed, and the offenders continued to be watched carefully by local policing unit (LPU) officers. The level of monitoring was increased if participants behaved in a manner which suggested they were returning to offending.

Evaluations

Hopkins and Wickson (2013) raise the question of *testability* in respect of PPO projects. They ask how success is measured and how it informs our knowledge of what works with offenders. Drawing on five national evaluations of projects, as well as their own smaller scale evaluation, they conclude that, while projects are 'testable' (and 'tested') credibly, pressure from the government for short-term solutions to long-term problems means that there has been very little follow-up of project participants and no evidence of significant long-term impact. They argue that projects offer *opportunities for transition* from offending to desistance but do not, of themselves, provide any 'quick fixes'.

For the past decade or more, one of the most influential methodological approaches to the evaluation of social and public policy provision has been that of *realist evaluation* (Pawson and Tilley 1997; Pawson 2013). This approach has resulted in the combination of both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection and analysis and also the distinction between *process* and *outcome* evaluation. The former focuses on the way in which new provision is implemented while the latter is concerned with more traditional 'findings' or 'results'. Realist evaluation emphasises the complexity of interventions in the social world and demands that evaluations take account of the full range of factors that are likely to influence the success or failure of a programme. Pawson (2013) provides an extremely helpful 'complexity checklist' that covers *inter alia* the choices, pathways, contexts, time-scales, contestations and unintended consequences that should form part of any attempt to evaluate a programme. This approach has proved popular with both evaluators and those responsible for programmes, but has been less popular with governments that desire quick and clear findings to inform their short-term funding decisions.

The body of evaluation research on projects for PPOs is neither large nor conclusive. However, the number of studies is increasing, comprising a mixture of independent evaluations by academics, often on a limited budget (Chenery and Pease 2000, Hope *et al.* 2001, Tupman *et al.* 2001, Abbas *et al.* 2003, Worrall et al 2003, Vennard and Pearce

2004, Hopkins and Wickson 2013) and larger scale national or multi-site evaluations undertaken by Home Office and Ministry of Justice researchers (Homes *et al.* 2005, Dawson 2005, Dawson and Cuppleditch 2007, Senior *et al.* 2011). Evaluators have typically had to work with small sample sizes and, in some cases, without a matched comparison group. The resulting reports and their conclusions tend to be highly qualified in relation to reduced offending and cost effectiveness. Nevertheless, many of the evaluations emerging in the UK have provided optimism that PPO projects can be effective in reducing the offending of the participant group (see, for example, Worrall *et al.*2003, Vennard and Pearce 2004, Dawson and Cuppleditch 2007). This message, however tentatively expressed, has been politically expedient for governments. In 2009, the Ministry of Justice, drawing very selectively on Dawson and Cuppleditch's research, declared that projects could result in a '62% reduction in recorded convictions over 17 months' (2009:6). This is by far the most optimistic finding of any project, though the overall direction of findings has been consistent over more than a decade.

However, PPO projects are complex in terms of their multi-agency nature and the needs of their clientele. Their value should be judged beyond crime rates and cost effectiveness, though these are of course important. Other criteria which should be taken into account include, on the one hand, health, educational and social benefits for participants and, on the other hand, improved multi-agency working and information exchange between project partners, and improved intelligence on prolific offenders. Participants in the Stoke-on-Trent project (Worrall and Mawby 2004:278) identified the following benefits:

- stopped or reduced their offending whilst they were on the project;

- kept them occupied;

- provided them with a sense of purpose;

- helped with their drugs problems;

- built their confidence in doing everyday things, e.g., finding accommodation, dealing with the utility companies, social interaction; and

- helped the rebuilding of relationships with families (partners, children and parents).

From a theoretical perspective, projects might be judged on the basis of their contribution to 'desistance' from offending (Farrall *et al.* 2007). Here there is a distinction to be made between 'primary' and 'secondary' desistance. The distinction defines 'primary' desistance as 'any lull or crime-free gap', whereas 'secondary' desistance involves 'the assumption of a role or identity of a non-offender' - becoming a 'changed person'. Evaluations suggest that prolific/persistent offender projects

at their best buttress 'primary' desistance and prepare an offender for 'secondary' desistance, but that the latter will only occur when other personal, social and economic factors are favourable. Projects working intensively with prolific offenders might be best regarded as being of a maintenance nature rather than a short sharp intervention that acts as a cure-all. Accordingly they should be assessed primarily on how well they maintain and motivate participants during the 'on project' period. The extent to which projects contribute to secondary desistance is a different, but related issue, as Hopkins and Wickson (2013) highlight, and projects also need to be judged on how they affect participants over time – which might involve several relapses and returns to the project.

Lessons and issues

All evaluations of PPO projects identify lessons or issues which might be summarised (Worrall and Mawby 2004: 285-6) as:

- Embedding the project and establishing its credibility, securing long-term funding;

- Having clear mechanisms for recruitment, selection and de-selection of participants;

- Demonstrating effective multi-agency practices, while recognising the distinctive contributions of each agency and resisting the blurring of agency boundaries;

- Planning for team development and for human resource contingencies, so that the levels of stress experienced by staff involved in such intensive work are minimised;

- Developing a challenging but supportive supervision regime with linked exit strategies, so that participants are not 'set up to fail' by the imposition of unrealistic multiple demands ;

- Identifying and addressing the communications needs specific to the project, so that the aims and objectives of the project are widely understood among partner agencies;

- Evidencing impact in the funding period.

We now highlight two issues that have implications beyond the projects themselves for brief further discussion – professional boundaries and intensive supervision for female offenders:

Implications for professional boundaries

The key component of PPO projects is the closeness of the working relationship between the police and probation services. Historically mutually distrustful, the two services have undergone a cultural shift in their attitudes to working together, partly as a result of these projects (Mawby and Worrall 2013). Physical co-location has produced much greater mutual understanding and there is now considerable evidence about the benefits of such co-operation. However, there have been concerns about the blurring of professional boundaries and the possible emergence of a 'polibation' officer (Nash 1999) who embodies not necessarily the best aspects of the two cultures, but merely the least contentious (Mawby and Worrall 2004). A further concern is that the partnership has become increasingly unequal with the stronger police service becoming increasingly dominant. Having enthusiastically embraced the culture shift towards rehabilitation, those police officers involved in intensive supervision projects have now become key players in the government's future plans. With the proposed fragmentation of probation service provision, the police are increasingly free to make partnerships with the private and voluntary sectors, risking the marginalisation of the probation service.

Intensive supervision for female offenders

We have noted that the majority of offenders on PPO projects are male. This is because most projects target prolific or persistent offenders and very few such offenders are women. Nevertheless, there is a long tradition in England and Wales of making separate, and often intensive, supervision arrangements for women (Worrall and Gelsthorpe 2009; Gelsthorpe 2011; Hedderman 2011). It has long been recognised (though not acted upon) that female offenders are subject to discrimination within the criminal justice system and that their small numbers (approximately 20% of all known offenders, 10% of all serious offenders and 5% of the prison population) limit the range of rehabilitative programmes available to them in practice. There are numerous academic, governmental and charitable reports on the differing needs of female offenders, both in prison and in the community, the most recent and arguably most influential being *The Corston Report* (2007) which argued strongly for improved alternatives to custody for the vast majority of women offenders.   Since the Corston Report, the government has been more willing to fund multi-agency initiatives, colloquially known as 'one-stop shops', which encourage a holistic approach to women offenders and enable them to access a full range of help under one roof. Unfortunately, in the present economic climate, such funding is continually under threat, but local councils and voluntary organisations have often stepped in to enable the programmes to continue. One of many examples is run in Stoke-on-Trent in the North Midlands of England, under the auspices of a large local voluntary organisation called 'Brighter Futures'. The programme, called Chepstow House, was evaluated (Corcoran *et al.* 2011) and, as a consequence of a positive

evaluation, the local council continued to fund the project when central government funding ceased after three years. Although Chepstow House caters for a wide range of women in need, it makes special provision for women subject to probation supervision or recently released from prison.

The future of intensive supervision

The future of intensive supervision for adult offenders in England and Wales is inextricably bound up with the government's plans for the future of the probation service. The concept of probation has become increasingly unpopular with governments and the media and is associated with being 'soft on crime' (Mawby and Worrall 2013). For decades, successive governments have sought to 'strengthen' community supervision by incorporating more and more punitive elements in it and increasingly requiring the probation service to work collaboratively with the more punitive criminal justice agencies such as the police and prisons. Although this has had some positive outcomes where high-risk serious offenders are concerned, it has resulted in the neglect of lower risk offenders and has also made the probation service (as the smallest partner in these collaborative arrangements) vulnerable to the vagaries of populist governments and the tabloid press.

At the start of 2013, the government published a consultation paper entitled 'Transforming Rehabilitation' (Ministry of Justice 2013) in which it sets out its proposals for the future of the probation service and supervision of offenders in the community. It plans to allow the public sector service to retain its core tasks such as writing reports for courts, carrying out initial risk assessments and working collaboratively with other agencies in respect of serious offenders. To this extent, it might be argued that intensive supervision will be protected. However, supervision of the majority of medium- and low-risk offenders will be commissioned competitively from a wide range of voluntary and private sector providers who will be paid according to the results they achieve ('payment by results'). These proposals are controversial because they threaten the professional standing of probation officers and also assume that they are less able than the private and voluntary sectors to work creatively with offenders. But above all, the proposals are aimed at reducing the *costs* of supervising offenders and this does not bode well for the kind of creative work that is central to intensive supervision. Government attention is turning from the complexities of intensive professional supervision to the less expensive use of volunteer *mentors* to provide support for lower risk offenders released from short prison sentences.

Recent research into the occupational cultures of probation workers (Mawby and Worrall 2013) suggests that they are a) enthusiastic to work creatively with offenders, b) very good at working collaboratively with other agencies, c) very conscious of their 'public

protection' role and very competent at holding the balance between this and their rehabilitative work but d) very concerned about the organisational and governmental constraints on their ability to work in the ways they want to. Intensive supervision is now very well embedded in the mainstream of probation work in England and Wales but its future is by no means certain, especially for those offenders defined as being of low or medium risk, who might be prevented from becoming prolific or persistent by being given greater professional attention.

References

Abbas, A., Harrison, J., MacDonald, R., Moore, R., Shildrick, T. and Simpson, M. (2003) *Dordrecht Project: First Report* (Middlesbrough: University of Teesside).

Burnett, R. (2004) 'To reoffend or not to reoffend? The ambivalence of convicted property offenders' in Maruna, S. and Immarigeon, R. (eds.) *After Crime and Punishment: Pathways to offender reintegration* (Cullompton: Willan Publishing), pp. 152-180.

Carter, P (2003) *Managing Offenders, Reducing Crime: A new approach* (London: Home Office).

Chenery, S. & Pease, K. (2000) *The Burnley/ Dordrecht Initiative Final Report* (University of Huddersfield/ Safer Cities Partnership: Burnley, unpublished).

Clear, T.R. (1997) 'Evaluating intensive probation: the American experience' in G. Mair (ed) *Evaluating the effectiveness of community penalties* (Aldershot: Avebury).

Corcoran, M., Fox, C. & Worrall, A. (2011) *Chepstow House Community Project for Women Offenders: Process Evaluation, Final Report* (Stoke-on-Trent, Brighter Futures).

Corston, J. (2007) *The Corston Report: A Report by Baroness Jean Corston of a Review of Women with particular Vulnerabilities in the Criminal Justice system* (London: Home Office).

Dawson, P (2005) *Early Findings from the Prolific and Other Priority Offenders Evaluation* (London: Home Office), RDS Home Office Development and Practice Report, number 46 (27/10/05).

Dawson, P and Cuppleditch, L .(2007) *An Impact Assessment of the Prolific and Other Priority Offender Programme*. Home Office Online Report 08/07 (London: Home Office).

Farrall, S., Mawby, R.C. & Worrall, A. (2007) 'Persistent Offenders and Desistance', in Gelsthorpe, L. & Morgan, R. (eds) *Handbook of Probation,* (Cullompton: Willan Publishing).

Folkard, M.S. et al. (1974 & 1976) *Intensive Matched Probation and After-Care Treatment,* Home Office Research Studies 24 & 36 (London: Home Office).

Gelsthorpe, L. (2011) 'Working with women offenders in the community: a view from England and Wales' in R Sheehan, G. McIvor & C. Trotter (eds) *Working with Women Offenders in the Community* (Cullompton: Willan Publishing) pp. 127-50.

Hedderman, C. (2011) 'Policy developments in England Wales' in R Sheehan, G. McIvor & C. Trotter (eds) *Working with Women Offenders in the Community* (Cullompton: Willan Publishing) pp.26-44.

Home Office (1988a) *Punishment, Custody and the Community,* Cm.424 (London: HMSO).

(1988b) *Tackling Offending: an Action Plan* (London: HMSO).

(2001) *Criminal Justice: The Way Ahead* (London: HMSO).

(2004) *Transition of the Persistent Offender Scheme into the Prolific and other Priority Offender Strategy* (London: Home Office Criminal Justice Performance Directorate). Letter to Chairs of the 42 LCJBs and CDRPs, 19 May 2004.

(2003) *Narrowing the Justice Gap and the Persistent Offender Scheme*. National Probation Service Briefing, Issue 14, July 2003 (London: Home Office).

(2009) *Prolific and Other Priority Offender Programme Five Years On: Maximising the Impact* (London: Home Office/ Ministry of Justice).

(2010a) *Prolific and Other Priority Offenders: Results from the 2008 Cohort for England and Wales* (London: Home Office).

(2010b) *Prolific and Other Priority Offenders: Results from the 2009 Cohort for England and Wales* (London: Home Office).

Homes, A., Walmsley, R.K. and Debidin, M (2005) *Intensive supervision and monitoring schemes for persistent offenders: staff and offender perceptions* (London: Home Office), RDS Home Office Development and Practice Report 41.

Hope, T., Worrall, A., Dunkerton, L. & Leacock, V. (2001) *The Newcastle Prolific Offenders Project Final Evaluation Report* (Keele University/ Staffordshire Probation Area, unpublished).

Hopkins, M. & Wickson, J. (2013) 'Targeting prolific and other priority offenders and promoting pathways to desistance: some reflections on the PPO programme using a theory of change framework', *Criminology and Criminal Justice,* 13, 5, 594-614

McCahill, M. & Finn, R.L. (2013) 'The surveillance of prolific offenders: beyond docile bodies', *Punishment and Society,* 15, 1, 23-42.

Mair, G. (1997) 'Evaluating intensive probation' in G. Mair (ed) *Evaluating the effectiveness of community penalties* (Aldershot: Avebury).

Mair, G., Lloyd, C., Nee, C. & Sibbitt, R. (1994) *Intensive Probation in England and Wales: an evaluation,* Home Office Research Study 133 (London: Home Office).

Mawby, R.C. & Worrall, A. (2004) ' "Polibation" revisited: policing, probation and prolific offender projects', *International Journal of Police Science and Management,* 6, 2, 63-73.

Mawby, R.C. & Worrall, A. (2013) *Doing Probation work: Identity in a Criminal Justice Occupation* (Abingdon: Routledge).

Ministry of Justice (2010) *Breaking the Cycle: Effective Punishment, Rehabilitation and Sentencing of Offender* (London: Ministry of Justice).

(2013) *Transforming Rehabilitation: A revolution in the way we manage offenders,* Cm. 8517 (London: Ministry of Justice).

Nash, M. (1999). 'Enter the "polibation officer"'. *International Journal of Police Science and Management,* 1, 4, 360-368.

Pawson, R. (2013) *The Science of Evaluation: a Realist Manifesto* (London: Sage).

Pawson, R. & Tilley, N. (1997) *Realistic Evaluation* (London: Sage).

Raynor, P. & Vanstone, M. (2002) *Understanding Community Penalties* (Buckingham: Open University Press).

Senior, P., Wong, K., Culshaw, A., Ellingworth, D., O'Keeffe, C. & Meadows, L. (2011) *Process evaluation of five Integrated offender Management pioneer areas,* Research Series 4/11 (London: Ministry of Justice and Home Office).

Tupman, B., Hong Chui, W., and Farlow, C. (2001) *Evaluating the Effectiveness of Project ARC (*University of Exeter: unpublished report).

Vennard, J and Pearce, J (2004) *The Bristol Prolific Offender Scheme: An Evaluation* (Bristol: University of Bristol).

Worrall, A. & Gelsthorpe, L. (2009) *'What works with women offenders: the past 30 years',* Probation Journal, 56, 4: 239-45.

Worrall, A. & Mawby, R.C. (2004) 'Intensive projects for prolific/ persistent offenders' in A. Bottoms, S. Rex & G. Robinson (eds) *Alternatives to Prison: Options for an Insecure Society* (Cullompton: Willan Publishing) pp. 268-89.

Worrall, A., Mawby, R.C., Heath, G. & Hope, T. (2003) *Intensive Supervision and Monitoring Projects,* Home Office Online Report 42/03 (London: Home Office).

Appendix 3
ECINS random sample (simplified)

H=high; M=medium; L=low; P=prison; W=wanted; D = deselected

Sample number	10/2/14	13/3/14	11/4/14	04/7/14	18/8/14
1	32M	40H	32M	24M	18L
2	27M	40H	0L(P)	24M	36M
3	36M	48H	40H	33M	27M
4	44 H	36M	24M	24M	32M(D)
5	36M	36M	32M	24M	32M
6	44H	44H	40H	48H	0L(P)
7	36M	30M	27M	27M	18L
8	44H	48H	36M	48H	56H
9	40H	36M	30M	24M	24M(D)
10	48H	44H	44H	48H	36M
11	48H	48H	44H	48H	36M
12	44H	36M	27M	18L	30M
13	16L	16L	16L	24M	24M(D)
14	48H	40H	44H	30M	27M(D)
15	48H	0L(P)	40H	48H	36M
16	18L	18L	27M	27M	27M
17	20M	52H	30M	36M	36M
18	30M	33M	30M	32M	32M
19	24M	33M	36M	24M	24M(D)
20	44H	48H	44H	48H	48H
21	36M	36M	30M	33M	52H
22	44H	44H	52H	40H	40H(D)
23	4L	4L	4L	4L	4L(D)
24	48H	40H	48H	48H	0L(P)
25	44H	48H	40H	44H	0L(P)(D)
26	44H	24M	44H	0L(P)	0L(P)
27	18L	18L	33M	36M	36M
28	44H	0L(P)	0L(P)	32M	32M
29	18L	18L	18L	18L	18L(D)
30	48H	48H	0L(P)	48H	0L(P)

Appendix 4
Selected PIR recommendations

3. Conduct a mapping exercise of IOM to better understand the landscape with an emphasis on defining roles and responsibilities.

5. Multiagency cross partnership supervision arrangements need clarity and revision given the geography of the hubs and the challenges faced by operational managers.

15. There needs to be clarity of roles and responsibilities across partnershipsthis is particularly evident in the police and there is a perceived blurred line between the role of field officers and IOM–based colleagues.

24. The academic partnerships that form part of IOM phase three should be supported.

27. Greater use of structured case studies.

28. Promote the use of offender debriefs.

31. Continue to build on tactical links with prisons and a seamless IOM approach.

35. Improved sequencing of pathways in particular prison to community.

38. Improve information sharing awareness of operational staff.

45. Further steps should be taken to identify the needs of service users and pathway gaps.

46. The IOM needs to better understand the 'family circumstances' of offenders and the wider needs of that family unit.

51. Improvements should be made in terms of the IOM relationship with Community Safety Partnerships.

52. IOM courts should be considered to improve the seamless approach to offender management. Court services need to be better linked to IOM governance.

53. The strategic IOM group should continue to support third sector organisations and encourage them to work collectively and collaboratively in the provision of services.

58. This approach should be fine–tuned and the process repeated using greater academic rigour and used as a tool to inform wider IOM development and the commissioning of services.

61. Commission multi agency workforce training and development programmes for IOM managers and frontline staff.

Contact Details

Professor Anne Worrall   *a.j.worrall@keele.ac.uk*

Dr Mary Corcoran   *m.corcoran@keele.ac.uk*