



A Joint Inspection of the Integrated Offender Management Approach

*A Joint Inspection by
HM Inspectorate of Probation and
HM Inspectorate of Constabulary*

March 2014

A Joint Inspection of the Integrated Offender Management Approach

A Joint Inspection by HM Inspectorate of Probation and HM Inspectorate of Constabulary

March 2014

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our thanks to staff and managers working in the areas which participated in the inspection, these were: Bournemouth, Conwy, Leeds, Norwich, Tameside and Waltham Forest.

We are also grateful to the staff and managers of Avon & Somerset Police and Avon & Somerset Probation Trust for their assistance with piloting the inspection.

Lead Inspector	Mark Boother, <i>HMI Probation</i>
Inspection Team	Mike Lane, <i>HMI Probation</i>
	Gary Smallman, <i>HMI Probation</i>
	Rob Bowles, <i>HMI Constabulary</i>
	Paul Eveleigh, <i>HMI Constabulary</i>
	Mark Ewan, <i>HMI Constabulary</i>
HMI Probation Support Services	Stephen Hunt, <i>Support Services Officer</i>
	Oliver Kenton, <i>Assistant Research Officer</i>
	Lynne Osborn, <i>Support Services Officer</i>
	Alex Pentecost, <i>Publications Manager</i>
	Christopher Reeves, <i>Proof reader</i>
Assistant Chief Inspector	Andy Smith, <i>HMI Probation</i>

Foreword

Integrated Offender Management is a significant element of the Home Office and Ministry of Justice strategy to prevent crime and reduce reoffending. It provides a unique opportunity to maintain oversight and a degree of control over offenders who are at a high risk of reoffending, even when they are not subject to statutory supervision. The key principles of the approach were set out in a joint Home Office and Ministry of Justice publication in 2009. Integrated Offender Management involves criminal justice and other agencies working together to deliver a local response to crime, targeting those offenders most at risk of reoffending or committing offences that might cause serious harm to others.

One of the most efficient ways of preventing crime is to rehabilitate those who are most likely to commit it; focusing attention on those known to have committed multiple offences is a sensible way to prevent crime. The Integrated Offender Management approach aims to provide an enhanced level of surveillance and control in relation to those offenders identified as at risk of reoffending, coupled with a focus on rehabilitation for those who are willing to accept help.

In this inspection we sought to identify good practice and areas for improvement. In the six areas we visited, we found a very mixed picture, with differing degrees of commitment to the approach among the relevant agencies. The police were usually the lead agency and, in some cases, were attempting to fulfil both rehabilitative and control functions where Probation Trusts had not committed sufficient resources. Where Probation Trusts were fully engaged at a strategic and operational level alongside the police and other organisations, the approach had the greatest potential for success.

We found examples of good rehabilitative work and some excellent examples of information sharing to ensure that enforcement action was swift and effective, where it became necessary. However, we also found that in some places that the Integrated Offender Management approach was still underdeveloped.

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 reoffending 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 reoffending inhibits understanding of its impact and value. If the evidence showed that Integrated Offender Management was successful in reducing crime and reoffending, 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.

This report is published as the Transforming Rehabilitation programme moves into its next phase. The programme will have a significant impact on local arrangements and, if we are right about the potential of Integrated Offender Management, it is vital that both the National Probation Service and the Community Rehabilitation Companies are incentivised to continue to develop Integrated Offender Management in the immediate future. Ultimately, however, any decision to continue the development of Integrated Offender Management should be informed by a better understanding of its effectiveness.

Integrated Offender Management is clearly a promising approach. We have set out, in this report, a number of recommendations to build on achievements so far. We found that attempts to evaluate the

impact of Integrated Offender Management by the agencies involved in delivery lacked structure and were not well resourced. We believe that authoritative research and evaluation is urgently required to consider the costs and benefits of Integrated Offender Management, assess the effectiveness of the approach and identify best practice.

Paul McDowell
HM Chief Inspector of Probation

Tom Winsor
HM Chief Inspector of Constabulary

March 2014

Contents

Acknowledgements	3
Foreword	4
Summary of findings	7
Recommendations	10
1. The inspection methodology	13
2. The Policy Context	15
3. The structure of Integrated Offender Management arrangements	20
4. Identification and targeting	24
5. Assessment and planning	29
6. IOM Interventions	34
7. The views of those subject to Integrated Offender Management	43
8. Performance outcomes	47
Appendix 1: Glossary	52
Appendix 2: Role of the inspectorates and code of practice	53
Appendix 3: References	54

Summary of findings

The inspection

This inspection was agreed by the Criminal Justice Chief Inspectors' Group and formed part of the work stream identified in the *Joint Inspection Business Plan 2013-2015*. The objectives of the inspection were to assist in assessing the impact of Integrated Offender Management and disseminating good practice.

We visited six areas and spoke to strategic and operational staff at all grades, from all organisations involved in the delivery of Integrated Offender Management. We conducted interviews relating to 108 cases using a case assessment tool we had devised. In addition, we spoke to 16 offenders who were subject to Integrated Offender Management.

The policy context

Integrated Offender Management is the current policy framework for managing locally identified priority offenders. It is a multi-agency approach promoted by the Home Office and the Ministry of Justice which aims to reduce the offending of individual offenders and the overall crime rate. The principles of Integrated Offender Management emphasise that all partners should cooperate in working with offenders and, in turn, that offenders must face their responsibilities or face the consequences.

There are no agreed performance criteria against which to assess the merits of approaches to Integrated Offender Management; although, there is an expectation that an effective Integrated Offender Management approach will contribute to meeting the Home Office aim to cut crime and the Ministry of Justice ambition to further reduce reoffending. In practice, these objectives are not always aligned and can drive different organisational behaviour.

Integrated Offender Management built on, but did not replace, the previous prolific and other priority offender initiative. It is more ambitious in scope and targets a significantly larger cohort of offenders.

The structure of Integrated Offender Management approaches

The breadth and depth of the Integrated Offender Management approach in each of the areas visited was very different, with implications for the scope of the work attempted. In four areas, the Integrated Offender Management approach had a strong local 'brand' and was strategically significant in attempts to manage local crime volume.

In each of the areas visited, the police took the day-to-day lead for the management of the approach. Four areas had achieved a good level of co-location. In half of the areas visited, probation played an important role at a strategic level. All areas had forged some degree of partnership working to tackle the offending-related needs of those offenders subject to the approach.

Identification and targeting

The fact that the Integrated Offender Management approach does not prescribe particular actions or requirements means that individual areas have interpreted who should be managed under the approach in a variety of ways. Most of the offenders whose cases we examined had been identified initially as suitable by either police or probation.

Most areas used some form of weighted matrix to determine if an individual was suitable for their approach. Approximately one-third of cases were not subject to statutory supervision under current law. The latitude afforded to individual areas means that the profile of cases managed under the Integrated Offender Management approach varies greatly between places. We were able to identify three 'types'

of approach, two of which we assessed as acceptable, in that the partnership agencies had a clear and comprehensive rationale for decisions they had taken in relation to which offenders were in scope for an Integrated Offender Management approach.

Assessment and Planning

Considerable effort had usually been made to engage the offender in the Integrated Offender Management approach. This was often done jointly by a police officer and a probation employee, most usually in a custodial environment. Staff believed that the quality of this initial contact was important in developing a relationship with the offender that would be necessary to bring about change. We supported this view. In the areas we visited, identified offenders had a high level of needs related to their offending, as we would have expected.

Written plans for managing offenders under Integrated Offender Management were often not well developed, although staff were generally able to articulate what they were trying to achieve. Some staff lacked the necessary training to effectively deliver in Integrated Offender Management approaches.

Integrated Offender Management interventions

There was confusion about the differing requirements of the prolific and other priority offender initiative and the Integrated Offender Management approach. Each area used slightly different language to describe what it was attempting to deliver. Some areas had developed a means of prioritising work and categorising offenders which was able to capture the dynamic nature of the work that was required on a day-to-day basis with identified individuals.

Interventions delivered under Integrated Offender Management can usually be described as either rehabilitative or having a restrictive/enforcement focus. Most areas usually adopted a joint management approach to individual offenders, deploying police, probation and other staff. We found this to be generally effective, particularly when twinned with a flexible approach based on an accurate assessment of the offenders' current motivation.

Police officers working within Integrated Offender Management teams were sometimes leading on rehabilitative interventions. We are clear that police officers working in this environment should have some knowledge of the theories and practices associated with assisting an offender to achieve desistance, but their principal role should be gathering and disseminating intelligence and enforcement.

We found many examples of good practice with regard to both rehabilitative and restrictive/enforcement approaches. We also found many good examples of intelligence sharing facilitated through the Integrated Offender Management approach which led to the swift apprehension of offenders. Two areas had started to use global positioning system (GPS) technology to monitor the whereabouts of offenders, on a voluntary basis, with some success. This is an area for further development, research and evaluation.

The views of those subject to Integrated Offender Management

In interview, offenders managed under the approach were, broadly, very positive about the way they had been treated. They understood, generally, why they had been targeted and were pleased to have been offered the help they needed to move away from offending. Several offenders mentioned that previous attempts to assist them had not been sufficiently intensive to bring about positive outcomes. The integrity of the staff from all backgrounds working within the Integrated Offender Management approach was also a common theme.

Performance outcomes

Attributing outcomes to particular interventions in criminal justice is notoriously difficult. Most areas had made some attempt to measure outcomes, usually in relation to the reoffending of those subject to the approach. All had used different methodologies and none were statistically sophisticated. Despite this, staff in all of the areas that we visited believed that Integrated Offender Management had made a positive impact on the reduction of crime in the local community.

Many offenders had multiple and complex needs. However, good or sufficient progress had generally been made in addressing these needs where they occurred. This indicated that partnership working had generally been successful in delivering the right services to assist in the rehabilitative process. Although we found individual cases where remarkable progress had been made, overall the proportion of the sample that had been breached or reconvicted was over 60%. Although this figure could be viewed as disappointing, we consider that this is largely a function of the Integrated Offender Management approach targeting offenders with entrenched patterns of behaviour and multiple problems. Those managing them are required to change tack swiftly between the rehabilitative and restrictive/enforcement actions. Intelligence sharing and actively targeting those subject to the Integrated Offender Management approach with enforcement action has the effect of ensuring that where an offender lapses back into criminal behaviour, they are swiftly apprehended.

Conclusion

Integrated Offender Management provides criminal justice partners with the opportunity to develop an approach to managing those offenders whose offending is of most concern locally. Most of those working in Integrated Offender Management are committed to the local approach and have high expectations of reducing reoffending. The policy framework allows considerable flexibility about how these expectations can be achieved. We found that not all areas had embraced Integrated Offender Management in an effective way.

The characteristics of the approach, and the nature of the offenders managed under it, vary significantly from place to place. Most areas had achieved some degree of co-location and partnership working, although in some places there was room for considerable development.

Working in partnership to jointly manage offenders offers real opportunities. However, our findings indicate that approaches are more effective in those areas where agencies focus on their unique contribution within the partnership framework. Strategically, it is better to secure the correct staff, rather than attempt to deliver services without the necessary training or skills.

In a great many cases, interventions delivered to promote rehabilitation were promising. We also saw excellent examples of restrictive/enforcement activity and intelligence sharing. Those subject to the approach understood why they had been targeted and were often very positive about the way they had been managed, even when this involved enforcement action.

The evidence base for Integrated Offender Management remains in need of further development. Attempting to balance the desire for rehabilitation with the requirement to target enforcement activity on those at greatest likelihood of reoffending, and capture this within a performance framework, remains a work in progress.

Recommendations

The Home Office and the Ministry of Justice should:

- review the Integrated Offender Management principles and guidance to provide a single framework for those offenders identified as suitable, including a clear description of the nature of the work to be delivered
- rescind all previous requirements and guidance, such as those pertaining to the prolific and other priority offender initiative, and incorporate these into the new guidance where relevant
- promote a prioritisation framework to reflect more accurately the objectives to be pursued with individual offenders
- ensure that the principles of Integrated Offender Management are incorporated into the Transforming Rehabilitation programme, with clear performance incentives for providers of probation services to contribute to Integrated Offender Management
- ensure that new contracts for the electronic monitoring of offenders offer a suitable legal framework for those offenders subject to statutory orders managed within Integrated Offender Management
- commission an independent, authoritative and structured evaluation of the cost and benefits of Integrated Offender Management in terms of crime reduction; reduced frequency and/or seriousness of reoffending; and eventual desistance from crime.

Chief Constables should:

- promote the benefits of Integrated Offender Management to all officers and staff in their force area, particularly those working at the front line
- ensure that there are processes in place which ensure that intelligence is passed between Integrated Offender Management units and front line police officers and staff, and vice versa.

Probation Trusts shouldⁱ:

- take an active role at a strategic level, to ensure that Integrated Offender Management is effective
- provide appropriate services for all offenders managed within Integrated Offender Management, regardless of their statutory status.

The Youth Justice Board should:

- ensure that Youth Offending Teams are aware of the benefits of collaborating with Integrated Offender Management approaches.

Community Safety Partnerships should:

- ensure that all relevant partners are involved in the delivery of Integrated Offender Management, as a major contribution to local crime reduction
- identify a single lead officer of sufficient status to contribute to the strategic planning of Integrated Offender Management in each area.

ⁱ Under the Government's *Transforming Rehabilitation* Strategy, Probation Trusts are to be replaced by the National Probation Service and Community Rehabilitation Companies from 1st June 2014. We expect these recommendations to be acted upon initially by Probation Trusts and then by their successor organisations.

Integrated Offender Management partnerships should:

- ensure that all staff receive sufficient training to enable them to fulfil their duties
- ensure that intelligence is shared effectively by all partners, to reduce crime and reoffending
- ensure that police and probation staff are deployed to best effect, in accordance with their respective skills and role profiles.

The inspection methodology

1

1. The inspection methodology

Summary

This chapter outlines how the inspection structure and methodology were developed.

Key facts

We aimed to identify good practice through an assessment of cases managed under an Integrated Offender Management (IOM) approach.

We interviewed all significant providers of IOM services in the areas inspected, including service users.

The sample of cases inspected in each area was broadly consistent with the profile of cases managed and was predominantly adult males.

Overview of the inspection process

- 1.1. This inspection was agreed by the Criminal Justice Chief Inspectors' Group and formed part of the work stream identified in the *Joint Inspection Business Plan 2013-2015*. The objectives of the inspection were to: 'assist in assessing the impact of IOM and disseminating good practice'.
- 1.2. There are no detailed specifications as to what an IOM scheme must deliver. In view of this, we believe that IOM is best described as an '*approach*', rather than a programme, since it is guided by principles rather than a prescribed set of expectations. These principles are set out in the following chapter. With these principles in mind, we devised a set of criteria to broadly follow the processes identified in the current guidance, namely: leadership and management; identification and targeting; assessment and planning; the delivery and review of interventions; and performance outcomes.
- 1.3. Six areas were selected for the inspection. We identified three geographical areas where our intelligence led us to believe the IOM approach was developed relatively well. Three further areas were selected where we had limited or no intelligence about performance. As a result of this approach, we hoped to be able to identify both effective practice and areas for improvement.
- 1.4. A case assessment tool was devised to capture evidence from a sample of cases. We asked IOM leaders in the selected areas to provide a list of all offenders that were being managed on 01 April 2013. From this list of 722 cases, we selected our inspection sample of 108. The inspection sample in each location broadly followed the characteristics of the cases identified in the area in respect of statutory status, status of identified case manager, community or custody location, age, gender and race. The sample was 97% male, with 76% described as white British, 6% black or black British Caribbean and 5% Asian or Asian British of Pakistani origin. The sample included a proportionate number of youths. In 6% of cases, Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) held responsibility for statutory supervision. Some cases had been intensively managed for over five years; others had been recently selected.
- 1.5. Fieldwork took place between May and July 2013. We visited Bournemouth, Conwy, Leeds, Norwich, Tameside and Waltham Forest. Each area was able readily to identify cases managed under IOM. The number of offenders managed under these IOM approaches in each location ranged from 25 to 372.
- 1.6. We interviewed the case manager(s) identified by the local IOM lead manager using the case assessment tool and accessed relevant paper and computer based records. We also interviewed the managers of each IOM scheme, senior partners, stakeholders and any other projects or service providers thought to be integral to the approach in that particular location.
- 1.7. In addition to this, 16 offenders, managed under IOM approaches, were interviewed by inspectors using a semi-structured questionnaire.

The policy context

2

2. The Policy Context

Summary

This chapter outlines the IOM policy framework and places it within the objectives of the relevant government departments, and considers the overlap between the IOM approach and the prolific and other priority offenders (PPO) initiative.

Key facts

IOM is an approach to working with groups of offenders promoted by the Home Office and the Ministry of Justice (MoJ).

The IOM approach is a strategic framework rather than a prescriptive set of requirements.

The approach promotes the twin aims of reducing crime and reducing reoffending by those targeted.

The IOM approach was largely built on the PPO initiative, but did not replace it.

Community Rehabilitation Companies, created as part of the Transforming Rehabilitation programme need to be suitably incentivised to participate in IOM activities.

The management of priority offenders

- 2.1. The fact that a relatively small proportion of offenders commit a relatively large proportion of all detected crime has driven various multi-agency policy initiatives in recent times. The persistent offender scheme was introduced in 2003 and subsequently replaced by the PPO initiative. IOM is the latest policy to address those offenders who are deemed a priority.

The relationship between the IOM approach and the PPO Initiative

- 2.2. The premium service specification for PPOs, introduced in 2005¹, remains in place. Under the 2006 offender management model² PPOs are designated as Tier 4 cases. This means that they must be actively managed throughout any custodial sentence of 12 months or more, and more rigorously supervised in the community. This model also remains in force. However, the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) has placed no similar requirements on Probation Trusts or prisons for offenders with IOM status.
- 2.3. Although there has been minimal national guidance or direction for the PPO initiative since the adoption of the IOM approach, the organisational requirements of the 'PPO Premium Service' remain. This can also affect the way cases are investigated by the police, prosecuted by the Crown Prosecution Service and managed by the prison and probation services. Certain options, such as drug testing on post-custodial licence, remain available only to those categorised as PPOs.
- 2.4. IOM is a local multi-agency approach to the management of offenders, regardless of their current position within the criminal justice process. Offenders are usually identified on an intelligence led basis and attempts are made to change or control their offending with a mix of rehabilitative and restrictive/enforcement based interventions, depending on the level of engagement, and/or offending by those subject to the approach.
- 2.5. One of the elements of the IOM approach, that set it apart from other work of Probation Trusts, was that it allowed for the possibility of engagement with those who were not subject to statutory supervision. This included those released from sentences of imprisonment of less than 12 months,

at the end of community orders or licences, or those simply believed to be offending, who had not received a sentence that allowed them to be supervised formally.

- 2.6. IOM 'pioneer' areas were established in six locations in 2008-2009, with evaluations due to be published as they became available^{3,4}. A Government policy statement published later in 2009⁵ encouraged local criminal justice partners to develop IOM arrangements.
- 2.7. The focus on the individual, regardless of whether they were subject to statutory supervision, was a significant development for Probation Trusts in 2008. The development of licence and supervision conditions for those sentenced to less than 12 months in custody, as set out in the Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014, means that most of those subject to IOM in the future will be under some form of statutory supervision.
- 2.8. Another way in which IOM differed from the usual statutory interventions offered by Probation Trusts is that it encouraged more intensive contact between service providers and offenders than required by the minimum national standard.
- 2.9. From a policing perspective, IOM further extended the imperative to work with partners to manage those individuals responsible for a significant proportion of crime locally and, through this approach, to reduce crime. This collaborative approach complements a more traditional emphasis on crime types and/or the environments in which crime occurs.
- 2.10. It was envisaged that police and probation would be at the heart of IOM, but success would also depend upon positive engagement by the local authority, health service providers and a range of other service providers. The aim was to create a more coherent structure for managing repeat offenders. In 2010⁶ the Government published a set of principles. These principles were:
 - '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''
- 2.11. IOM is underpinned by a set of principles, rather than detailed mandatory specifications. Consequently, each area has devised its own unique response. Therefore, we believe that, in general, IOM is best described as a way of working with offenders, or an '*approach*' to managing them.
- 2.12. The Home Office and MoJ are keen to promote the IOM approach as a strategic framework, rather than detailed set of procedures and processes. In contrast to the requirements of the PPO initiative, there are no central reporting requirements or key performance indicators for IOM. There is no requirement that areas must have an IOM scheme, or guidance as to the geographical or population size any scheme should cover.
- 2.13. The purpose of IOM was to assist in meeting the twin Home Office and MoJ objectives of reducing crime and reducing reoffending; these overarching aims are still in place.
- 2.14. A Home Office survey of IOM in September 2013⁷ indicated that nearly all Community Safety Partnerships, that responded, had IOM arrangements; although, only 181 of a possible 292 returns were received, meaning there were no returns from 37% of areas.
- 2.15. Neither the PPO initiative nor the IOM approach included a firm definition of the profile of offenders to be targeted. The PPO initiative was usually aligned with local police priorities at the time, which were typically the tackling of 'serious acquisitive crime', usually burglary and robbery. A major difference between the IOM approach and the PPO initiative was the scale of the ambition; guidance indicated that the IOM cohort could be five times the size of the PPO cohort, reaching further into

the serious acquisitive crime categories, adding those at high risk of causing serious harm and other locally defined priority groups.

- 2.16. Initially, Government Offices for the Regions and Directors of Offender Management were responsible for the oversight of the implementation of IOM. These structures were subsequently abolished and local partnerships were encouraged to establish their own governance arrangements. This resulted in greater variation between local approaches.
- 2.17. The Home Office remains committed to the concept of a strategic framework rather than a more prescriptive approach. The MoJ, in the *Transforming Rehabilitation* programme, also signals it is committed to preserve and build on the good work already done by agencies who work together to manage offenders in the most effective way, for example under IOM arrangements⁸. To achieve this, all current and future providers of probation services will need to engage with IOM.

Conclusion

- 2.18. Although the twin aims of IOM (to reduce crime and to reduce reoffending) appear to be consistent, they potentially drive different organisational behaviours and offer a significantly different scale of rewards.
- 2.19. From a Home Office and police perspective, the IOM approach offers an unequivocal opportunity to assist in reducing the volume of crime in an area. Actively targeting those at high likelihood of reoffending and helping them to desist, or having enhanced intelligence that enables them to be quickly apprehended when they do offend, is likely to produce positive outcomes. This reduces the number of victims and saves significant resources in the investigation of crime and the subsequent processing of offenders. There is, therefore, a very strong case for investing in this type of approach.
- 2.20. From an MoJ and probation perspective, things are less clear. The performance measure of reducing the reoffending of an individual is much more narrowly defined. There are commonly two measures - the binary measure, (was the person reconvicted in a certain period) and the frequency measure (how often was the person reconvicted during a certain period). Research into the way those frequently convicted eventually desist from offending suggests that individual reoffending usually slows down gradually, rather than stopping suddenly⁹.
- 2.21. It is entirely possible that due to the increased restrictive/enforcement activity associated with the IOM approach, there will be an increase in the percentage of managed offenders being reconvicted on the binary measure. This may be true, even though the frequency with which they are convicted falls, giving an apparent failure on the first measure and a success on the second.
- 2.22. For the police, the twin objectives of rehabilitation or enforcement offer the opportunity to save resources in other parts of their operations in the short-term, medium-term and long-term. For probation, either outcome will have little effect on demand for services in the short-term or medium-term. If the offender is rehabilitated, there may be a minimal reduction in the intensity in the level of supervision; if they are reconvicted, they will continue to require probation resources, albeit from elsewhere in the system. Whether the offender is rehabilitated or reconvicted will impact on the volume of work for probation only in the longer-term.
- 2.23. The emphasis on managing individual offenders, in addition to focusing on crime types and/or crime hotspots, appears to offer real potential to reduce crime, in keeping with Home Office and police objectives. The approach also offers the opportunity to meet the MoJ and probation targets for reducing reoffending. However, the increased targeting of offenders managed under the IOM partnership could result in a greater number being reconvicted. In other words, the appropriate increased focus on identified offenders may cause the reoffending rate of individuals to rise. This apparent failure may, in fact, be indicative of a form of success. No single indicator can capture this complexity.

- 2.24. The underpinning principle of the IOM approach, developing from earlier initiatives, represents a sensible evolutionary approach to the delivery of policy. However, the fact that the requirements of the PPO initiative were never rescinded has led to some local confusion about priorities, which we explore further in this report.
- 2.25. Under the *Transforming Rehabilitation* proposals, much of the work currently delivered under the IOM approach will fall outside the remit of the new National Probation Service and lie with the new private and voluntary sector providers. The contracts with the new Community Rehabilitation Companies must recognise this and ensure that they are appropriately incentivised to deliver IOM. The National Probation Service will continue to have a significant role to play in IOM, in respect of enforcement activity for all offenders and case management responsibility for those assessed as presenting a high Risk of Serious Harm.

The structure of Integrated Offender Management arrangements

3

3. The structure of Integrated Offender Management arrangements

Summary

This chapter describes the differing levels of development of the IOM approach across the areas inspected.

Key facts

Most IOM approaches are led by the police with varying degrees of input by other criminal justice partnerships, local authorities and providers of specialist services.

IOM schemes had often 'branded' their approach with a local name to promote awareness.

Services delivered by partners to address offenders' needs are integral to the delivery of IOM.

Those subject to IOM often have complex problems and multiple interactions with the criminal justice system.

Structural arrangements for IOM at a local level

- 3.1. The scope and ambition of the IOM approach locally seemed to be dependent on the active commitment of senior leaders, such as the local Police Commander or Assistant Chief Officer from probation.
- 3.2. We found four areas had adopted a local 'branding' of their approach, to make it clear that it was a partnership enterprise and that it offered something over and above the usual practice of offender management. For example, the Norfolk IOM approach was branded '*180° Norfolk*', with the subheading '*working together to protect communities*'.
- 3.3. Of the two areas where IOM was developed less, one area had disinvested in the existing PPO programme and, in the months leading up to the inspection fieldwork, were attempting to re-institute it and expand it into an IOM approach. Another area had officially launched an IOM approach nine months prior to the inspection, but had struggled to make it effective. In both of these areas, probation staff were sometimes unaware of the IOM status afforded the offender by the police led IOM 'partnership' and we saw multiple examples of failure to deliver any additional services or exchange useful information.
- 3.4. In each of the areas visited, the lead operational manager was a police officer, although there was usually some form of joint operational management involving probation. In four of the areas the strategic management was also clearly led by the police. There was strong probation input at a strategic level in only three areas.
- 3.5. The presence of a clearly identified, dedicated operational manager, who commanded the respect of both the team and their strategic leaders, was closely related to our assessment that a local IOM arrangement was strong.
- 3.6. The vision of the operational manager was also a key factor. Most of the operational managers we spoke to were highly committed to the IOM approach and constantly engaging with their home organisation and partners, to promote the benefits of an IOM approach and ensure that their goals were understood. This included regularly attending briefing meetings for staff from all agencies and being involved in the training of new officers.
- 3.7. Four of the areas visited had managed to achieve a high level of co-location, with most staff from police, probation and partnership services based in the same building. In more rural areas, it was

often not possible to co-locate at a central point. Consequently, IOM staff sometimes operated in a small hub in another location, with as few as one police officer and one probation member of staff. This was a practical solution, although sometimes meant that there was little resilience when staff were on leave or absent for any other reason.

- 3.8. In some cases, staff were entirely focused on the IOM cohort. In some areas, case managers who were not members of an IOM team held a limited number of IOM cases. This did not necessarily detract from the quality of the relationships between the partners or the work itself.
- 3.9. In addition to police and probation staff, all areas had links with partnership providers to help offenders break out of the cycle of offending, but this was not developed well in two areas. The extent to which these providers considered themselves integral to the IOM, rather than simply providing a service to the IOM, varied. In some areas, partnership workers were co-located, attended weekly meetings and were clearly part of the team. In others, the relationship was less formally defined. In several places, the local authority had provided funding for police, probation staff or voluntary sector partners to provide specialist services.
- 3.10. Making sure that the right staff were seconded to the IOM team was also an issue that leaders were aware of. It appeared to us that there was a minimum size of team that was necessary to gain efficiencies. Not all areas inspected had obtained that critical mass, i.e. having enough staff to work effectively with a large enough cohort of offenders to make an impact on local patterns of offending.

Comment from Detective Superintendent with IOM responsibility:

"Part of the success of our team is getting the right people doing the job."

- 3.11. Three of the six IOM schemes had co-located drug services and engaged sufficiently well with drug service providers to ensure that the full range of drug treatment opportunities were available to the service users within reasonable timescales.
- 3.12. Norwich IOM had secured a member of staff from the Department of Work and Pensions to give advice and resolve benefit problems, provide interventions to cohort members and build links with local employers to enhance the employment prospects of the cohort.
- 3.13. Tameside had several peer mentors who, having completed a training course, were able to offer practical support and guidance to IOM cohort members. They were also able to provide a number of practical activities on a voluntary basis, such as hill walking or other fitness activities designed to provide positive use of free time.
- 3.14. Those IOM teams with good links with social housing providers were able to help plan for the release of prisoners who would, otherwise, be homeless on release.
- 3.15. Overall, we found a positive attitude to sharing information appropriately between partners, with very frequent informal exchanges and regular briefing meetings. However, in one area, probation staff were not involved in meetings concerning non-statutory cases and in another instance, the police case manager had not realised that an identified case was actually under statutory supervision in the YOT.
- 3.16. None of the areas we visited had an information system that met the needs of all partners for recording information in the multiple and diverse circumstances of IOM cases. This may have been the cause of minor inefficiencies, but it did not appear to present insuperable problems.

Offenders managed under IOM

- 3.17. Individuals subject to an IOM approach often lead very unstable lives, with multiple interactions with the criminal justice system. We saw many cases that, within a matter of months, were subject to community orders, remands in custody, being recalled to custody under licence or actually being sentenced to imprisonment. Their level of engagement with rehabilitative services sometimes ebbed and flowed.
- 3.18. In Tameside, nearly half of the IOM sample were currently serving custodial sentences, other schemes generally deselected offenders going into prison and, therefore, had very few. In most places, the lead for rehabilitative elements of the IOM approach lay with probation, but sometimes this function was with the police.
- 3.19. A proportion of the cases inspected as IOM had been identified as PPO cases prior to the advent of the IOM approach and had been transferred to it as long as five years previously; others had been selected recently.
- 3.20. Some areas had very clear selection criteria, while others took a more general approach. In one area there had been no systematic review of the cohort for more than six months, whereas other areas reviewed it on an almost daily basis, actively managing the cohort list and ensuring that resources were focused on the correct subjects. In one area, the individuals managed under the approach consisted entirely of those who were defined as PPOs.
- 3.21. The dual aims of the IOM approach, to motivate offenders to change where possible and to enforce compliance where necessary (often referred to by IOM schemes as a 'carrot and stick' approach), meant that the case manager (and partners) had to be able to change tack swiftly as circumstances develop.

Conclusion

- 3.22. In some places, the IOM approach was very well established as an accepted and valued method of managing offenders and reducing crime in the area; others were barely functioning.
- 3.23. Although we would expect the nature of the IOM approach to vary between areas with different profiles, the extent of the differences was very significant. Many areas had 'branded' their approach with a local name. This local branding had the effect of raising the profile of the approach, leading to a greater awareness and clarity both within the partnerships and the broader community.
- 3.24. Any successful IOM scheme must have a number of functions fulfilled. These include strategic leadership, operational leadership, coordination, intelligence management, analytical function, partnership development, communications, liaison, and offender management. As the IOM approaches inspected vary so greatly, there is no standard staffing structure. In some areas, many of these functions were undertaken by a single person.
- 3.25. The lead agency in the areas inspected was nearly always the police, with varying resource commitments from all partners. For the IOM approach to have a significant impact, it is necessary that it reaches a sufficient scale to enable all of the functions to be delivered consistently and to ensure that a sufficient number of offenders are engaged in order to impact on crime levels.
- 3.26. Delivering an IOM approach requires resources and the commitment of key stakeholders over a considerable period. Where these prerequisites are not met, it is unlikely that strong IOM arrangements can flourish.

Identification and targeting

4

4. Identification and targeting

Summary

This chapter examines the ways individual IOM schemes identify potential offenders for the IOM approach and the characteristics of the offenders identified.

Key facts

There is little consistency between areas in how offenders are identified for an IOM approach.

Some IOM arrangements have taken full advantage of the flexibility afforded by the IOM policy to develop their own vision of best practice. As a consequence of this flexibility the cases managed under IOM vary significantly.

Most areas have a clear, joint process for identifying IOM subjects, based on intelligence and local priorities.

Police and probation provide most of the information on which to base the decision about inclusion in the IOM cohort. Most IOM cases are identified after sentence and few are on community orders.

Although probation staff are most commonly the case manager, in some places the police take a significant role in the attempts to rehabilitate offenders, using methods most commonly associated with traditional probation activity.

Identification of IOM cases

- 4.1. The published IOM key principles emphasise that: 'All offenders at high risk of causing serious harm and/or re-offending are 'in scope''. Although there is no clear definition of the meaning of 'in scope', it is reasonable to assume that this means such cases are either managed under, or are at least considered for, an IOM approach.
- 4.2. The principles further emphasise 'All partners tackling offenders together' and the importance of applying the IOM approach to locally identified offenders that present particular challenges or are high users of local criminal justice services, regardless of whether they meet either of the high risk of harm or high likelihood of reoffending criteria.
- 4.3. The identification of cases suitable for IOM was not often linked with the pre-sentence phase of offenders' journeys through the criminal justice system. There had not been a pre-sentence report relevant to the most recent sentence in 70% of cases in the sample. The initial consideration for inclusion in IOM was more usually a post-sentence event. Only 10% of the sample was subject to a community order on the day of the inspection; of these, many had been in custody for short periods since the making of the order.
- 4.4. Police intelligence was the main factor in identifying potential IOM cases. This was often supported by the use of an agreed matrix which weighted certain factors, such as the main offence type committed by the subject, in alignment with local priorities. Not all matrices included actuarial data derived from Offender Group Reconviction Scale (OGRS) (an actuarial tool designed to predict the likelihood of a group of offenders with similar antecedents reoffending within a certain period). Areas also used different factors in their calculations; some prioritised frequency of arrest, while others used frequency of charge or conviction.
- 4.5. The policy statement of 2009 says that 'young offenders are already managed using an IOM approach through multi agency integrated Youth Offending Teams'. In most places we inspected, we found the links between the IOM team lead and the YOT to be weak. Where we interviewed YOT

case managers that were said to be managing cases identified as belonging to the IOM cohort, there was little evidence of additional activity. Some YOT staff were unable to articulate why the child or young person was on the cohort, or what difference this had made to their management.

- 4.6. Some YOTs provided intelligence to the IOM coordinator on a regular basis, but most did not. Where information was exchanged, there was little evidence of agreed and coordinated actions as a result of this. This does not mean that good multi-agency rehabilitative work was not being done with children and young people who might benefit from an IOM approach. It does indicate, however, that such work was not being carried out in accordance with agreed IOM arrangements, nor did it benefit from the additional restrictive/enforcement opportunities that characterise IOM.

Cases managed under IOM

- 4.7. Overall, nearly 90% of referrals came from the police or probation. The remaining cases were referred by drug workers, YOTs, prison or other unrecorded sources.
- 4.8. In practice, most cases were jointly managed to some degree with the lead practitioner coming from probation in three-quarters of cases. The remaining one-quarter were usually managed by the police.
- 4.9. Just over half of the cases inspected were identified as PPOs (within a range of 22%-100% in individual areas). Nearly one-third of cases were not subject to statutory supervision, such as a community order or post-custodial licence (between 17%-50%).
- 4.10. On the day the cases were inspected:
- 28% were in custody serving a sentence
 - 9% were remanded in custody
 - 22% were on licence
 - 10% were on a community order
 - 30% were in the community and not subject to statutory supervision.
- 4.11. Despite this proportion of non-statutory offenders, 83% of the sample had been subject to some form of statutory supervision since joining the IOM cohort. Of the sample, 59% had been sentenced to more than 12 months imprisonment.
- 4.12. IOM staff had assessed the Risk of Serious Harm among the sample as follows:
- 19% low
 - 53% medium
 - 21% high
 - 5% no clear classification/not assessed.ⁱⁱ
- We broadly agreed with these classifications. Over half of the cases assessed in one area presented a high Risk of Serious Harm. Four areas each had only one such case in the sample.
- 4.13. Where it was recorded, the average OGRS one year reconviction score for general reoffending was 62%.
- 4.14. The most commonly cited offence types in the sample were:
- burglary (48%)
 - violence against the person (22%)
 - theft and handling (20%)

ii The total is not 100%, due to figures being rounded to the nearest whole percentage.

- robbery (9%)
- other offences (19%)ⁱⁱⁱ.

(In one area, nearly the entire sample had been convicted of burglary, reflecting a local priority).

4.15. In summary, we found that areas had adopted different approaches to selecting cases to be managed within an IOM approach, which could be broadly categorised as follows:

- An all encompassing approach; all offenders in scope, including high harm causers.
- A locally appropriate approach, based mainly on local priorities.
- An insufficiently integrated approach.

An all encompassing approach

4.16. Tameside had adopted a collaborative IOM approach that took the guidance on 'scope' literally. Cases were routinely included in the IOM cohort that were assessed as a high risk of harm where the offence type was violence against the person (not including sexual violence), as were all cases assessed as having a high OGRS score. There was an agreed process where police, probation and other partners referred potentially eligible cases to a central point, where a thorough assessment of suitability was carried out using all relevant data from both police and probation information systems. Suitable cases were then adopted.

4.17. This partnership had also started to develop an IOM approach for dealing with women offenders who had high needs, but did not necessarily meet the criteria of high risk of harm or likelihood of reoffending. Inspectors did not see any cases of this type in the sample.

4.18. Having identified the benefits of collaborative work, the partnership had started to apply the principles to a wider group of offenders. This practice is consistent with the original vision for IOM. It maximises the potential benefits of an IOM approach and extends its use well beyond the PPO cohort.

A locally appropriate approach

4.19. Three of the areas inspected had some form of collaborative approach to identifying potential IOM cases. This usually involved a referral to a nominated coordinator or manager and some form of adoption meeting to confirm the decision. Full use was not always made of the actuarial tools for assessing likelihood of reoffending, most notably OGRS. However, this method was generally effective at identifying suitable subjects for the IOM approach and was consistent with the principle of localism. In some of these areas, there was evidence to suggest that offenders who might have benefited from an IOM approach, but did not meet the local criteria, were overlooked. Although consistent with the IOM principles, these areas had not fully exploited the potential benefits of IOM.

An insufficiently integrated approach

4.20. Two of the six areas had yet to develop arrangements to ensure that they routinely engaged in a collaborative approach to identify potential subjects for IOM. They had not taken the opportunity to expand their pre-existing PPO scheme to meet broader local objectives. Communication between partners was sometimes poor. Justification for the selection of targets was not robust and the actuarial tools available were seldom used. This type of approach had not exploited the potential benefits of IOM.

iii Some cases reported more than one current offence meaning the total does not add up to 100%

Conclusion

- 4.21. From the six areas we inspected, we were able to identify three different approaches to identifying suitable cases for IOM. Only one fully exploited the potential benefits of IOM; another was consistent with IOM principles and acceptable. Although there is no prescribed way to structure IOM, we considered the third approach to be ineffective.
- 4.22. Three of the areas visited had a vision about the profile of cases to be managed under the local IOM approach. One had routinely included high Risk of Serious Harm cases, another had prioritised the offence of burglary and one only included cases that were afforded PPO status. The data we have gathered has been significantly affected by these decisions about which cases are worked with.
- 4.23. We are also aware from research and other inspection evidence that other areas have local priorities and idiosyncrasies regarding the cases they work with. In some areas, a significant proportion of cases that are a local priority may not have a high likelihood of reoffending. As a consequence, great care should be taken when attempting to compare IOM approaches or generalising about their performance.

Assessment and planning

5

5. Assessment and planning

Summary

This chapter looks at the work done to assess the actions that were necessary to manage and reduce the offending of those subject to the IOM approach and the planning undertaken with them to achieve this. It also considers the training needs of IOM staff.

Key facts

Formal planning of the work with IOM cases was often underdeveloped.

Whatever their designation, almost all staff interviewed expressed the view that forming a positive relationship with the offender was the foundation for bringing about meaningful change in their lives.

Where police were responsible for rehabilitative work with offenders, they had often had insufficient training to equip them to do so.

Those subject to IOM appear to have a profile of offending needs that is different and more problematic than the mainstream probation caseload.

Assessment and planning

- 5.1. In most cases it was clear that there had been a full and detailed discussion between the case manager and the offender as to why they had been identified as suitable for the IOM scheme.
- 5.2. The first part of the assessment usually took the form of an 'offer' to the offender that made it clear that the IOM team was willing and able to provide a significant degree of enhanced access to rehabilitative services and practical and emotional support in return for a genuine attempt at desistance from offending. This was usually followed by the offender being advised that if the offer was rejected he or she would be subject to an increased level of scrutiny, with quick and effective police action to bring any further offending to court, leading to further sanctions. This was consistent with the principle of 'Offenders facing their responsibility or facing the consequences'.
- 5.3. The most common place for the initial contact between IOM staff and the subject was the prison. This meeting was often undertaken jointly by police and probation staff. The timing of this visit varied from place to place with some areas attempting to commence contact close to the point of sentence, whereas in others it was close to the point of release.

Comment by IOM police officer:

"We go along to see them in prison to tell them they have been identified as an IOM. We get to know them a bit, I tell them I am from the IOM. We ask if they want help to turn their lives around and tell them the sorts of thing we can do. Then we make it clear what will happen if they don't."

- 5.4. Case managers thought that building a relationship with the offender at the assessment stage was an essential first step to a successful engagement. We found many examples of case managers building good relationships with the offender that helped maintain engagement, particularly when offenders were at risk of disengaging and relapsing into crime.

- 5.5. Where cases were subject to statutory supervision by a probation case manager, there was evidence that the Offender Assessment System (OASys) assessment tool was regularly used. Generally, this was of a sufficient quality, although often focused mainly on the rehabilitative aspects of the case. In non-statutory cases the arrangements were, understandably, more varied. There was no common framework for assessing or planning the work with these cases.
- 5.6. Some areas had developed their own processes for assessment and planning of non-statutory cases. This often took the form of a number of 'pathways' that represented areas of the subject's life that had contributed to their offending or represented the areas that needed to be worked on, typically drugs, alcohol, accommodation, relationships, attitudes, employment and relationships. We took the view that although these were often not fully developed or sophisticated, they represented reasonable work in progress.

Good practice example

Case managers had instigated a process of using contracts for the offender to sign on release. The offender signed two documents, one for accommodation and one for drug testing. The documents clearly set out the responses to compliance and engagement in the form of incentives such as more freedom and less drug testing. They also made clear the punitive consequences of non-compliance or failed drug tests in the form of curfew, increased reporting, increased police monitoring and loss of accommodation. **(Leeds)**

- 5.7. For non-statutory cases there were, broadly, two approaches; either probation staff (usually probation services officers) undertook assessments and planning, most often utilising locally devised templated forms, or this work was undertaken by police officers. In either case, these plans often lacked clear objectives. We were also told that there were technical difficulties with using the standard probation assessment tools. They were thought to be too complex and inflexible, and could not easily be shared with partners.
- 5.8. There was evidence that police and unqualified probation case managers had not received sufficient training to equip them to do the best possible job. Overall, less than three-quarters of staff interviewed felt that they had received sufficient training; however, we assessed that only 55% of staff interviewed had sufficient training and understanding of working with IOM cases to help individuals desist from offending and lead law abiding lives.
- 5.9. Some staff did not have a sufficiently detailed understanding of the complexities of the problems faced by the cases they were responsible for and were attempting to resolve. They frequently had a limited grasp of the difficulties involved in bringing about lasting change. Although a good starting point, what the offender saw as the solution to their problem was often taken at face value without a thorough look at previous attempts to change and alternative strategies.
- 5.10. When we asked case managers (from whatever organisational background) about assessment and planning, they often said words to the effect of 'what they need to do is...'. Although the diagnosis was often reasonable, the understanding of the subject's motivation and the obstacles to bringing about lasting change were sometimes lacking.
- 5.11. We found that the majority of police officers had received no training prior to their assignment to the IOM approach. Once in post, there was little recognition of the skills and knowledge needed to do the job. One area had provided training for police officers in managing high risk of harm cases, and in some places police officers were helped to gain more insight into the rehabilitative approach by experienced probation colleagues, through informal mentoring. We believe that police should have a basic grasp of the principles involved in rehabilitation but should rarely, if ever, take a lead on rehabilitation.

Comment by IOM Detective Constable:

"Many of my police colleagues were surprised to hear I had joined the IOM team and told me that attempting to change the people we had been running around after for years and locking up was futile. After a while I started to ask them if they thought that running around and locking people up only to have them back on the streets within hours or even months was the futile thing."

Comment by probation officer experienced in IOM:

"The police here are keen to do the right thing and help the people they are responsible for to change their ways, but they haven't really had the right training to do this. I say to them, I have a good idea about police work, but you wouldn't let me out with hand cuffs and a truncheon. What makes you think you can do my job? There is more to this probation lark than is often realised."

Factors linked to offending

5.12. The table below shows our assessment of the identified needs profile of the IOM sample, as compared to the matched HMI Probation data on identified needs in the Offender Management Inspection 2 (OMI 2) inspection, which looks at the work of Probation Trusts across their caseload.

Identified need related to offending	IOM Cohort identified top three priority need	Matched HMI Probation data on factors that made the offender more likely to reoffend
Drug misuse	58%	21%
Thinking and behaviour	52%	47%
Lifestyle and associates	38%	30%
ETE	35%	19%
Accommodation	33%	16%
Alcohol misuse	26%	24%

5.13. It is clear that the IOM cohort is nearly three times more likely to have a significant drug misuse need and approximately twice as likely to have education, training and employment (ETE) and accommodation needs than a matched sample of cases inspected within the standard HMI Probation sample. This indicates that, overall, in the areas we visited, they had correctly targeted those with multiple problems directly linked to their offending, and reinforced the need to ensure that the principle of 'All partners tackling offenders together' was adhered to.

5.14. For some members of IOM teams, the reality of the life chances of their cases explained a lot about their behaviour and the intensity of work that would be needed to overcome their disadvantages.

Comment by police officer seconded to IOM:

"You have to understand their background to understand how they have got to where they are at. His Dad is a murderer.., he didn't get the best start."

Conclusion

- 5.15. The first contact for the assessment of IOM cases was usually in prison and often jointly undertaken by police and probation. Although this might seem resource intensive, it served to underline the intensive nature of the 'offer' being made to the subject.
- 5.16. While formal planning was often underdeveloped, and not all cases had clear written plans, staff were generally able to articulate what they were trying to achieve in terms of interim measures, such as the reduction of substance misuse or the securing of employment or accommodation.
- 5.17. Police officers, in particular, had often received insufficient or no training to work in a rehabilitative role with offenders. In the absence of probation or other partnership resources, police officers were sometimes undertaking tasks that might be more efficiently carried out by others. Where this had happened, although the police were acting in the spirit of partnership, they were often meeting a need that should have been fulfilled by probation, that would otherwise have gone unmet.
- 5.18. IOM cases had significant and complex offending-related needs, for example drugs misuse, lack of accommodation and employment and training. This indicated that the correct subjects had been identified for IOM. It reinforced the requirement for staff to have high levels of skills in their specialist areas and for all partners to work together to address these needs.

IOM interventions

6

6. IOM Interventions

Summary

This chapter outlines the categorisation of offenders, the types of rehabilitative and restrictive/enforcement work undertaken within the IOM approach, the generation of intelligence and the voluntary use of global position system (GPS) tracking devices.

Key facts

There were various systems to designate the way cases were prioritised.

Even where it appears that a common language is being used to describe processes within IOM approaches, detailed investigation often reveals significant differences in meaning.

IOM interventions fall broadly into two categories, rehabilitative and restrictive/enforcement oriented.

IOM provides the opportunity generate high quality intelligence to control offending swiftly following any return to criminality.

Levels of contact between those identified as IOM subjects and those managing them were relatively high in most cases.

In most cases IOM leads had forged good relationships with other service providers to meet the offending related needs of the individuals they were responsible for.

The voluntary use of curfews with GPS tracking was being developed by two areas in the sample.

Prioritising offenders

- 6.1. There was some confusion about the interactions and overlaps between the IOM approach and the PPO initiative in all areas. In many cases, PPOs were the top priority offenders with the IOM cases making up a second tier. This led to difficulties, because those identified as PPOs may have stopped offending, while an offender managed as an IOM case could be still actively offending. Some areas tried to address this issue by also using an additional colour coding system. Offenders were often classified (with various meanings) as Red, Amber or Green, generally indicating their level of compliance with the programme. Another colour was often used for those in custody.
- 6.2. We found that attempting to understand precisely what a particular area was trying to achieve, with those identified for management under IOM, was complicated by the fact that the same descriptive words for practice often had localised meanings.
- 6.3. While we found no common agreement about terminology, we thought that using a simple to understand colour code, for designating the priority and the focus of the intervention, was effective. For example, the following approach was used in one area:

Red	Illegally at large or failing to engage in rehabilitative interventions with intelligence to suggest active offending.
Amber	Some engagement with rehabilitative interventions but no intelligence to suggest active offending.
Green	Active engagement with rehabilitative interventions and no evidence to suggest further offending.
Blue	In custody and planning for release.

6.4. Where used, these designations made it clear, locally, what activity should be being undertaken with which subjects. On a day-to-day basis, this was more useful than simply recording the IOM or PPO status. It also enabled the local police to tailor their interactions with those identified as IOM subjects according to their current behaviour.

What does IOM actually deliver?

- 6.5. Having identified a cohort of offenders and gained an understanding of their needs and the likelihood of their reoffending, the IOM approach has to balance the twin objectives of rehabilitation and enforcement/restriction, or as the PPO initiative helpfully labelled these approaches 'rehabilitate and resettle' or 'catch and convict'.
- 6.6. Each of the areas visited had a unique way for dealing with offenders that had been selected for an IOM approach. There were different types and ratios of staff allocated to the IOM approach attempting to deliver different types of service.
- 6.7. Interventions broadly fell within a rehabilitative or restrictive/enforcement framework, although, in practice, the same actions may often be interpreted as meeting both objectives. For example, increased levels of home visiting can be seen as supportive of rehabilitation, while also ensuring intelligence can be gathered and signs of reoffending monitored. In nearly all cases, a rehabilitative approach was considered a reasonable starting point by IOM staff.
- 6.8. There was no consistent rationale for the status of the case manager, although nearly half of all cases were managed by a qualified probation officer.
- 6.9. Half of all non-statutory cases were managed by police officers. In some, but not all, instances this was because the work being done with them was orientated towards enforcement.
- 6.10. Where we found police officers leading on the delivery of rehabilitative interventions, this was usually as a result of the reluctance of probation to prioritise work with non-statutory offenders. Although the willingness of the police to take on this work was understandable and laudable, it did not appear to be the most appropriate use of their skills. We acknowledge that the police needed a working knowledge of rehabilitative techniques and a willingness to engage positively with those identified as IOM subjects, but their key role in IOM should be in gathering intelligence and orchestrating restrictive/enforcement activity.
- 6.11. We found the concept of joint management of cases to be effective, especially when operated flexibly and based on an accurate assessment of the position of the offender in relation to their desistance. Although a probation employee might be responsible for a statutory case, if levels of engagement were poor or offending was suspected it would be entirely appropriate for a police officer to take the lead in day-to-day contact and ensuring that intelligence was generated and shared to create restrictive/enforcement opportunities. Similarly, if a non-statutory case wished to avail themselves of rehabilitative services, it is equally appropriate that this should be managed by a probation employee.

Rehabilitative interventions

- 6.12. There was a widespread belief, among those we interviewed, that for many repeat offenders the prospect of living a crime free life without recourse to family support, assistance with substance misuse problems, reasonable housing, and a legitimate means of income or benefits was simply unrealistic. This was particularly true of those being released from custody, where any limited stability they may have had was disrupted by the sentence of imprisonment. The role of IOM was seen to be to ensure that the necessary support was in place to increase the likelihood of a positive outcome.

- 6.13. Nearly all staff interviewed were fully committed to the idea that with the right help at the right time, those subject to an IOM approach could be helped to desist from crime, even if that desistance might take several attempts. Many of the police officers, from all levels of the organisation, told us that IOM had changed their thinking about the potential for rehabilitation to positively change the behaviour of offenders and reduce crime.
- 6.14. Overall, 71% of relevant cases were seen at least twice per week by IOM staff, or those acting on their behalf. In some cases the contact was daily. Where IOM was working well, cases were visited at home regularly as part of their supervision. Over half of the cases inspected could be described as constructively engaged.

Comment by IOM probation officer:

"Part of what we are trying to do here is get the people we are working with to develop a non offending identity, I am not sure it helps to keep calling them 'offenders' when we think they are engaging with us positively and we have no intelligence that they are actually offending."

- 6.15. Several areas had built good relationships with prisons and often managed to have offenders moved to local prisons prior to release. This enabled good preparatory work to be done, that minimised the likelihood of release, without a viable plan to support their desistance on release.
- 6.16. In Leeds, there was a commitment to work intensively with identified IOM offenders pre-release, with police deploying a detective constable to each of the two local prisons and probation staff visiting to deliver a programme of interventions. The structured programme continued after release, with the final sessions delivered in the community.

Comment by IOM focus group police officers:

"We offer PPOs additional support prior to release. Housing, Drug Intervention Programme, benefits, training and employment advice can be covered prior to coming out. The priority in ensuring that none of those who are coming out are homeless."

- 6.17. Staff from some IOM teams often arranged to meet offenders at the prison gate to reinforce the fact that help was available to them and that they were still the subject of police concern. Staff felt that this process was essential where the offender was trying to relocate in order to break a cycle of offending in a particular area or with particular associates.
- 6.18. We saw many examples of good practice in planning for release where hostel or other temporary accommodation was arranged. This initial work was usually followed up after release, often requiring multiple attempts to find a more permanent solution. There were often frequent visits from the case manager to offer motivation, practical advice and support, while monitoring any potential return to reoffending.
- 6.19. Several areas offered those subject to IOM gym passes (conditional on their positive engagement) to improve their constructive use of leisure time and health, often supported by volunteers or peer mentors. Other sports activities, such as organised football in the community, were also promoted. Some also organised 'outward bound' type voluntary activities, in an attempt to develop constructive pursuits.
- 6.20. Mentors were also used in some places to accompany offenders to voluntary projects to improve their skills and community integration. Where offenders lacked the confidence to attend such projects alone, this was an effective way of encouraging participation.

Good practice example

Mark was a long-term substance user with a very extensive history of offending. While in custody, a comprehensive plan to address his offending needs was developed. He was met at the prison on his release date by a housing project worker and went straight into residential rehabilitation for his drug dependency problem. Having completed this phase of his recovery he was moved into supported accommodation and was beginning to explore other issues linked to his offending such as a lack of education and training. At the time of the inspection he had maintained his desistance from offending. **(Tameside)**

- 6.21. For some particularly disadvantaged offenders, it appeared that a small amount of practical support and genuine concern on the part of the IOM staff was sufficient to make a difference.

Good practice example

Jonathon was a man with learning difficulties and a criminal record extending to 83 convictions for 173 offences. The IOM staff gained funding to pay off £300 of rent arrears, enabling them to secure accommodation at the YMCA in preparation for his release. He was collected from the prison and taken to various appointments to ensure his benefits were applied for and that he had support for his learning disabilities and alcohol misuse. He was seen regularly by an IOM housing worker and other staff who offered him practical help, including ensuring that he had appropriate clothing and footwear. At the time of the inspection Jonathon had not been reconvicted for a considerable time and was maintaining contact on a non-statutory basis. **(Norwich)**

- 6.22. Where offenders who had previously engaged positively with the IOM started to disengage, there were a number of responses. In one area, there was no particular consequence, particularly in the case of non-statutory cases that were simply removed from the cohort. The rationale for this being that the limited time available for rehabilitative activity would be better spent with a subject that was willing to accept help. We do not believe that this type of approach is appropriate. In these circumstances, offenders should, at least, be targeted by local police to confirm that they have made changes to their lifestyle without the assistance of IOM.
- 6.23. The most common response to disengagement from the IOM approach was to pass intelligence on to the local police, to increase surveillance, with a view to apprehending them swiftly if reoffending occurred.
- 6.24. One area had a very clear policy of withdrawing all support from the case if the individual failed to engage constructively. This included partnership services. Although they would continue to have the usual access as a citizen, any additional efforts were withheld. This policy had the advantage of clarity and showed the offender that they could not choose to benefit from the help of the IOM approach without full participation. There was some evidence that this approach appeared to be successful in certain circumstances.

A restrictive/enforcement approach

- 6.25. Consistent with the principle of offenders facing their responsibility, or facing the consequences where necessary, most IOM teams were able to deliver an enhanced level of restrictive/enforcement activity proportionate to the level of engagement of the subject.
- 6.26. Having identified a cohort of those most likely to reoffend and then focusing on enforcing compliance, it is not surprising that those subject to an IOM approach are often before the courts. We saw relatively few community orders and, where offenders were subject to these, they had often received other disposals since the order was made. We found decisions about the enforcement of community penalties or licences to be appropriate and timely in 92% of cases.

- 6.27. In one area, we saw several examples of poor practice, with regard to the use of police bail, where decisions had been taken without the benefit of full information about the current circumstances of the offender from the IOM team.
- 6.28. Where offenders were on licence and there was a fresh offence, it fell to the Assistant Chief Officer of probation to make a recommendation about recalling the offender to custody. Where the offence was minor and the assessment was that the case had relapsed (as opposed to given up), there was some evidence that recall was not recommended, but extra conditions were imposed to bring the offender back into compliance. Given that a recall to custody might jeopardise significant work that had been undertaken, this seemed a reasonable course of action.
- 6.29. In other cases, where it appeared that the offender had disengaged from rehabilitative support, it seemed reasonable to us that a recall was recommended, even where the offence may be relatively minor, in order to prevent possible further reoffending. Where this course of action was taken, the case manager and Assistant Chief Officer had to consider whether to ask for a 28 day or standard recall. The decision in these cases was taken by the public protection casework section of NOMS. The relevant NOMS paperwork required information about PPO but not IOM status.
- 6.30. IOM offenders who were released on licence had additional conditions to comply with in 62% of cases. Most commonly, this was to comply with the requirements of the IOM approach. Under MoJ instructions, drug testing on licence is restricted to PPOs with an identified drug problem and a relevant trigger offence. We found evidence of practitioners applying PPO status to cases otherwise managed under the IOM approach, to enable the imposition of drug testing on licence. As there is no firm definition of either group, we found this practice reasonable in the circumstances, albeit somewhat cumbersome in practice.
- 6.31. Where positive engagement was not forthcoming, IOM staff usually arranged for offenders to be targeted for a restrictive/enforcement approach. In the areas with the most comprehensive arrangements, this would involve contact with local or specialist policing units who would actively target the offender for increased police attention. If the manager of the IOM had close links to the relevant division within the police, this type of action was more likely.

Good practice example

Tameside had instigated a practice of 'vigilance visits', partially supported by funding from the local authority. Under this initiative, selected offenders were visited at their homes in the evenings and weekends by a member of probation staff working alongside non-specialist neighbourhood policing team officers. There were multiple purposes to these visits, including conducting drug tests where necessary, offering support at times when other services were not available, gaining access to the homes for intelligence gathering purposes and reminding the offender that they were being closely supervised. Perhaps most importantly of all, these visits enabled the local neighbourhood police officers to build a relationship with the offender and understand the IOM approach.

Intelligence sharing

- 6.32. Building on the experience of the PPO initiative, one of the significant opportunities afforded by close working relationships between those attempting to rehabilitate offenders and mainstream policing is the sharing of intelligence.
- 6.33. We saw the full range of intelligence sharing between agencies. In some places the exchange of information was habitual; in others there was virtually no communication. In the most effective areas there was evidence that the IOM approach had led to a more integrated culture between the various parties, with respect and understanding of competing organisational imperatives. The good practice examples below show how this can improve both rehabilitative and restrictive/enforcement work.

Good practice example

In one area, a probation officer became suspicious that an offender might have started dealing drugs again, although she had insufficient evidence to act upon. Through the IOM approach she passed on details of the offender's car registration which were checked with the Automatic Number Plate Recognition System. This indicated that the offender was travelling between cities for short meetings in the early hours. On the next occasion the car was spotted leaving the area, plans were put in place to intercept it on return. Heroin with a street value of £1,800 was found in the car.

- 6.34. In some areas, IOM staff attended the police daily intelligence briefing and the more strategic Tasking and Coordinating Briefings. These briefings enabled a two way exchange of information between the IOM and mainstream policing. In several areas, it was possible to deploy local surveillance teams in response to the top priority IOM cases who were either not engaging, or were engaging but still thought to be actively offending. In the areas with the most developed IOM approach, offenders whose names were identified in the briefings as active by local police were referred for potential inclusion.

Good practice example

In Tameside, the police intelligence unit provided what it called 'Trigger Plans' upon request, for IOM cases about to be released from custody. These plans identified the likely methods and locations where these offenders might offend. If an offence matching this profile occurred, it was able to be quickly linked to the potential perpetrator allowing a swift arrest or elimination of a potential suspect.

- 6.35. As well as identifying which members of the IOM cohort required specific proactive police attention, the briefings also enabled the IOM staff to provide updated information on the progress of cases. In some areas, beat police officers (and staff/police community support officers) were encouraged to make positive and reinforcing responses to IOM subjects who were progressing well.

Good practice example

Jim had a history of domestic violence and the case manager felt that during the bank holiday weekend there was a heightened risk of offending. An intelligence bulletin was produced and the case manager attended the tasking meeting to discuss the case and advise on potential measures to reduce the likelihood of reoffending. (Conwy)

- 6.36. We did find evidence that where the IOM staff were unable to influence the more general day-to-day policing approach, there could be a negative impact. In one example, an offender who was desisting from offending had persuaded his girlfriend's parents to offer him accommodation. Although IOM staff had only positive intelligence about this move, they could not convince the local police to restrict their visits to check up on the offender. After several weeks the offer of accommodation was withdrawn because the owners found the level of police attention unacceptable. The offender returned to his former associates and started to commit offences.

Good practice example

In Conwy, an offender with an outstanding warrant called his probation offender manager from a telephone landline that was not associated with his own address. By checking the number the call was received from with the IOM database, the source of the call was tracked to another offender's address. The IOM coordinator was able to arrange for a local police constable to visit the address immediately and make a swift arrest.

6.37. Although we found no direct evidence of the operation of a restorative justice approach within the sample of cases inspected, some police officers had been trained to deliver restorative conferences and had undertaken them as part of the IOM approach.

Curfews and GPS tracking

- 6.38. MoJ instructions currently restrict the routine use of electronically monitored curfews using radio frequency technology to offenders on bail, community orders or home detention curfews. Offenders, in these circumstances, make up a very small percentage of the IOM cohort nationally, and we saw none on the inspection.
- 6.39. Two of the areas visited had invested in voluntary GPS tracking systems. Although this technology is not yet approved by the Home Office and can not be enforced by law, it was, nevertheless, considered a useful adjunct to the IOM approach.
- 6.40. Where IOM staff in these areas thought that there were significant crime reduction opportunities through the use of GPS monitoring, they typically approached those that they thought should be subject to the programme and explained the benefits.
- 6.41. We were told that potential subjects with a genuine desire to stop offending were able to understand that the tag would act as a constant reminder of their commitment and (as the likelihood of apprehension was much enhanced) an effective deterrent. There was also some anecdotal evidence that the tag could be used as 'an excuse' to allow the wearer to turn down criminal opportunities arising from former associates without losing face.
- 6.42. In addition to these broadly positive reasons why the individual might wish to consider the GPS tag, there was the further incentive that the IOM team would know their whereabouts and be able to 'persuade' the local police not to do doorstep checks or frequent stop checks designed to disrupt any perceived threat of further offending.
- 6.43. From a policing perspective, we were told that one of the main advantages of GPS was that it enabled the subject of the tag to be eliminated from enquiries swiftly. This released resources, allowing other potentially fruitful lines of enquiry to be pursued.
- 6.44. Where GPS tracking was used, there was evidence that some front line police officers had yet to recognise its potential to reduce the need to carry out physical checks.

Comment by IOM detective constable:

"We had him on a voluntary (GPS) tag, we knew where he was and that he was doing ok. We could not get the Neighbourhood Policing Team to leave him alone, they were round there knocking him up at night to make sure he was home, even though we could demonstrate he was in. It was unnecessary and counter productive."

Good practice example

Tim was a drug user with a history of disabling his GPS tag prior to committing offences of theft from motor vehicles. When his case manager was notified of the deactivation of the tag, it was a good indicator that he was out committing crime. The IOM team knew his pattern of behaviour and had a good idea where he would be; they alerted local officers who were able to locate him. He was found in possession of stolen goods from numerous car crimes and was arrested. **(Norwich)**

Conclusion

- 6.45. The use of a simple classification system gave a clear sense of the priority that should be afforded to, and the nature of the work to, be undertaken. This approach also allowed the progress, or otherwise, of individuals to be regularly tracked through daily or weekly tasking briefings to neighbourhood policing teams, ensuring that all partners could tailor their interventions to the circumstances of the subject.
- 6.46. We found many examples of good practice in terms of rehabilitative support, intelligence sharing and restrictive/enforcement activity, that have the potential to significantly assist in meeting the twin Home Office and MoJ objectives of reducing crime and reoffending, particularly the frequency of reoffending.
- 6.47. Contact levels for those subject to statutory supervision were well above the minimum requirement. Actions to ensure offenders were held accountable and returned to court or prison promptly, in the event of reoffending or non-compliance, were swift and fair. This is consistent with the principles of IOM.
- 6.48. The most developed IOM approaches had forged partnerships with a wide range of service providers and volunteers, to offer offenders every reasonable opportunity to address their needs and be supported through a process of change leading to a crime free life.
- 6.49. We found the ability to change tack between a rehabilitative and restrictive/enforcement approach as being essential to the success of the intervention; this ability was enhanced where the areas used a clear system to indicate which phase the offender was in and, therefore, what the most appropriate response was at any given time.
- 6.50. The use of certain restrictive requirements, such as curfews and drug testing on licence, had not been reviewed by NOMS following the introduction of IOM. These remain available only to those designated as PPO cases. Similarly, some documentation, such as that provided to the public protection and casework section, asks solely for information on PPO status.
- 6.51. The deployment of GPS is an interesting development that will undoubtedly play a major role in crime prevention and detection in the relatively near future. It should not, however, be seen as a panacea. Managing a case using GPS technology requires a considerable investment in staff time, as well as technology. Staff in the two areas we visited that use GPS technology took the view that any growth in its use locally would need to be carefully rolled out, and could only be justified if it was used with cases with a high likelihood of reoffending. As it becomes available as part of a formal disposal of the court or as a condition of bail or licence, there will be an additional range of issues to consider around breach that will also risk being resource intensive.

**The views of
those subject to
Integrated Offender
Management**

7

7. The views of those subject to Integrated Offender Management

Summary

This chapter outlines some of the views of the 16 offenders interviewed by inspectors using a semi-structured interview tool.

Key facts

Most of those interviewed clearly understood why they were selected for the IOM approach. The experience of those being managed within an IOM approach was broadly positive.

The views of the subjects

- 7.1. We asked the IOM coordinators to identify a small group of offenders involved with IOM, who would be prepared to speak with us on a voluntary basis. We were able to conduct 16 interviews in total, with between two and five subjects from each area. Those willing to speak to us may not be a representative sample of those subject to the approach, but their perspective is important nevertheless.
- 7.2. All of those interviewed understood why they were identified for more intensive management and usually described themselves as PPOs or people managed under the particular 'brand' name of the local IOM approach. Most had been identified as IOM cases and informed of their status while in custody; some after they had been recalled on licence. One person described finding out that he was a PPO by reading it on 'some paperwork'. Many remembered a visit while they were in prison, often by a probation or police officer from the IOM; most understood that the implication was that, at least in the first instance, they would be seen by probation and police.

Comment by IOM subject in Norwich:

"I was visited in prison, a probation officer and police officer both came to see me. They explained that they could help me if I was determined to change and stop offending. They explained it like a carrot and stick."

Comment by IOM subject in Conwy:

"My supervisor is from the PPO scheme, or is it probation? Oh, I remember, he's a copper."

- 7.3. We asked if being identified as an IOM subject had helped them in any way. Of the 16 responses, only three were negative; these negative comments came from the two IOM areas we assessed as underdeveloped. The 13 other comments were broadly positive, with offenders citing that they had benefited from help with their identified problems, particularly housing, drugs, training, employment and constructive use of leisure time.

Comment by IOM subject in Tameside:

"God knows where I would have been without this scheme, it's a godsend to me. My probation officer is great. I am doing a 1-1 course on thinking skills. If I ever thought I was going to use again, I would pick up the phone and ask for help, and I would get it."

Comment by IOM subject in Norwich:

"They have helped me very much, I have a GPS tracking device which makes me think twice about my actions. For example I went past a bike the other day and was thought about stealing it but the tag makes you more aware of your actions and stops you being impulsive. The IOM team helped me with benefits. I have voluntary drug testing as I was a hard drug user of heroin. I see the drugs counselling service and I have enrolled on a university course part funded by (IOM) money and another charity that helps offenders. I also participate in a football team called Street Life which is based at Norwich City Football Club."

Comment by IOM subject in Tameside:

"If I had been on normal probation I would have lost my way. I had to come out to unsuitable accommodation at first. It was because of the help I got to get my own place etc, If I had any problems they could help me to sort things out."

Comment by IOM subject in Leeds:

"They have given me more motivation because they are offering me things that they did not offer me before. Helping me get employment, supporting me a lot more."

Comment by IOM subject in Conwy:

"I had help getting out of Rhyl, help to get a flat, support to get my medication and a gym membership."

- 7.4. We also asked offenders if there had been any negative consequences of being identified as an IOM subject; 12 subjects thought that there were no, or minimal, negative consequences, one stating that there would have been negative consequences had he not wanted to change, but as he did, there were none. Two subjects were concerned about the consequences of local policing operations.

Comment by IOM subject in Tameside:

"Just the police at the door. That is the only negative thing. Perceptions of neighbours because of routine police attention."

Comment by IOM subject in Leeds:

"Yes. Police used to come round every night and shine the light on top of the car at my bedroom window and I had to present myself at the front door. Every night. The neighbours all complained and it went on for weeks."

- 7.5. Those involved with IOM had their own perceptions of what their main problems were, which broadly matched the assessed needs of the sample, with the exception of thinking skills, which was hardly mentioned by the subjects themselves. The most common self-identified problems were drug misuse, accommodation and work.
- 7.6. Most subjects thought they were working to a shared plan, even if there was no written evidence of one. Nearly all felt that their case managers had listened to them in deciding how to tackle their problems and several were very clear that the IOM had been instrumental in helping them to turn their lives around.

Comment by IOM subject in Norwich:

"They have taken me to drugs and housing services to help me. I told them what I needed to work on and they said We can help you with that."

Comment by IOM subject in Norwich:

"All of the services have been great, previous supervision has not really been intensive enough to make a difference."

Conclusion

- 7.7. Nearly all offenders understood why they had been identified as suitable for the IOM approach. The views of the subjects interviewed were broadly consistent with the other findings of the report. There was a congruence between the offending related needs they identified for themselves and those targeted by those working with them. Most had a very positive attitude to the IOM approach and valued the intensity of the help that they were offered, consistent with the principle of facing their responsibility, or facing the consequences.
- 7.8. Several mentioned that their previous attempts to change had not given them enough support to break the pattern of offending. A significant number also mentioned the importance they placed on the integrity and commitment of their case manager, regardless of the organisation they came from. It appeared that the simple fact of having a consistent relationship with someone willing and able to offer help was highly valued by the subjects themselves.

Performance outcomes

8

8. Performance outcomes

Summary

This chapter assesses the extent to which the success of IOM was evaluated in the six areas visited, and the problems in attributing outcomes. It also outlines the outcomes of the cases in the inspection sample.

Key facts

Establishing causation between the IOM approach and an offending or desistance-related outcome is very difficult.

The multiple aims of the IOM approach make it difficult to create a performance framework to measure effectiveness.

IOM approaches generally made localised attempts to produce outcome data related to reoffending.

Reoffending rates were still high amongst the inspection sample, although changes in the frequency and/or seriousness of reoffending were not assessed.

There is some evidence of progress towards dealing with the main identified needs of the subjects and this may promote desistance in the medium-term to long-term.

Reducing crime and reducing reoffending

- 8.1. Attributing outcomes to particular initiatives in criminal justice is notoriously difficult. In the absence of an agreed methodology for defining outcomes, IOM schemes had established their own performance measures.
- 8.2. Given that the IOM approach has two fundamental objectives, reducing reoffending and reducing crime, it was not surprising that areas often attempted to demonstrate their success by reference to these factors. Although on a case by case basis, there was some evaluation of progress on factors underlying offending, there was little systematic evaluation of the progress made in tackling these factors.
- 8.3. The most common form of performance measure was that of offending (or some proxy of offending such as arrest or charge) prior to being adopted by the IOM scheme, as compared to a similar measure for the period after adoption.
- 8.4. The individuals identified tend to have very disorganised lives, with multiple engagements with the criminal justice system. Simply establishing a baseline of prior arrests, charges or convictions, in the period leading up to the adoption of the approach, is problematic.
- 8.5. Managers had invested considerable energy in evaluating their approach, although there was great variety in the methodologies they had used. Some areas attempted to discount some days leading up to adoption of the IOM approach, arguing that during days spent in custody they were not at liberty to commit offences, be arrested or charged. In practice, this approach was very time consuming, as subjects were frequently held by the police on multiple occasions, for varying lengths of time, or recalled to custody for other matters. Other areas took a much more pragmatic approach and only discounted time the offender was actually sentenced to imprisonment; others took no account of this.
- 8.6. There were similar problems with the post-adoption period. There was no common standard regarding when a subject should be removed from the cohort, or how long after the removal it was reasonable to measure the reoffending (or count the desistance). This meant that it was difficult to make comparisons between IOM approaches.

- 8.7. In some areas, the IOM lead had sought assistance from partners to measure outcomes. In one area, we assessed as performing poorly, we were told that the cohort had achieved very significant reductions in reoffending. Although we did not conduct an analysis of the data, which may well be accurate, we were confident that any improvements seemed highly unlikely to be attributable to the IOM activity we inspected.
- 8.8. More significantly, none of the performance frameworks considered the outcomes of their cohorts, compared to what might be expected from a matched cohort of offenders, with a similar propensity to offend, not receiving the IOM interventions, whatever they might be locally.
- 8.9. Other areas focused on the alternative measure of a reduction in overall crime. One methodology was to measure the overall crime levels in the area the approach covered and compare this to an adjacent area that had not fully adopted the IOM approach. One area told us that the reduction of recorded crime in their operational area was significantly greater than the neighbouring division that had not adopted the IOM approach as fully. Although this may have had some validity, there are so many variables that it is difficult to make a causal link.
- 8.10. Considerable efforts were put into evaluation by some areas, although we found each of the methodologies wanting in some capacity. None of these evaluations were statistically sophisticated. This is not meant as a criticism of those who have endeavoured to evaluate their work, rather to acknowledge that it is not reasonable to expect operational or managerial staff to conduct evaluations into complex phenomena without the guidance of expert researchers.

Progress on identified needs: what we found

- 8.11. The inspection looked at the three priority-identified needs of the subject and made an assessment of any progress that had been made. For those identified as IOM subjects, it is highly unlikely that they will be able to move from entrenched patterns of offending to desistance without tackling these underlying issues.
- 8.12. That nearly one-quarter of the sample with an identified drug need had made good progress is significant; similarly, over three-quarters of the sample with an ETE need and two-thirds of those with accommodation problems had made at least some progress.

Factor and percentages of cases displaying need	Good Progress	Some Progress	No Progress	Deterioration
Drug misuse (58%)	22%	15%	54%	9%
Thinking and behaviour (52%)	12%	43%	43%	2%
Lifestyle and associates (38%)	3%	43%	53%	0%
ETE (35%)	29%	54%	18%	0%
Accommodation (33%)	35%	31%	27%	8%
Alcohol misuse (26%)	14%	45%	36%	5%

- 8.13. These figures indicate that, with the benefit of interventions, it is possible to make good progress in helping the subject address the factors that are closely associated with their offending. It seems likely that these improvements will have an impact on their ability to desist from offending in the medium-term.

Offending outcomes: what we found

- 8.14. The practice that we have seen on this inspection is so different in each of the places we visited that it is difficult to draw conclusions at a general level. The findings should not, therefore, be viewed as indicating the overall levels of performance of the IOM approach across England and Wales. The inspection does, however, indicate that IOM offers significant possibilities and opportunities to manage offenders effectively, to rehabilitate them or provide intelligence and restrictive/enforcement opportunities, that have yet to be exploited in all areas. Staff in all of the areas we visited believed that IOM had had a positive impact on local offending patterns.
- 8.15. In Tameside, for example, we saw how agencies had worked together to maximise the impact of the IOM approaches. In order to manage IOM offenders who had started to slip back into offending behaviour, a probation officer worked in the police station alongside police colleagues in the control room; she was able to identify quickly the incidents that required early intervention from colleagues in the IOM, and make arrangements for this to happen immediately. This meant that offenders were less likely to return to an established pattern of committing crime without intervention or apprehension. The police and probation leads were able to articulate how they believed this had made a positive impact on the reduction of crime and reoffending in the local community.
- 8.16. In addition, many areas operate initiatives or operations that may be seen as complementary to, or separate from, the general IOM approach. For example, one area told us of a police operation to disrupt the actions of a small group of offenders, by actively pursuing them for relatively minor infringements, such as having no television or vehicle excise licence. Although some offenders may have been subject to this operation while subject to the IOM, not all were. This presented difficulties in assessing outcomes directly related to IOM activity.
- 8.17. We saw some excellent rehabilitative work that, in line with evidence based principles, attempted to tackle multiple offending-related needs in an intensive and supportive fashion. This had brought about significant change in a number of cases. However, it is apparent and predictable that not all of those identified wished to accept the help that they were offered. Where the cohort has been selected on the basis of entrenched criminal behaviour, it is reasonable to assume that a significant proportion of them may not be ready to take advantage of the offer of help at the present time. This is not an indicator of failure.
- 8.18. The sample we looked at contained a mix of cases, some of which had been managed in the community under the IOM approach, and some that had been identified as IOM cases, but had not yet been managed in the community. Of the 65 cases that had been managed in the community, we found the following evidence of reoffending or desistance.

	Number	Percentage*
Breached order or licence or reoffended	40	62%
Completed order or licence without breach or reoffending	9	14%
Order or licence ongoing without further offence	16	25%

*Please note that the total is not 100%, due to the figures being rounded to the nearest whole percentage

- 8.19. Although these figures do not show a great reduction in the binary measure of reconviction (62% had been reconvicted at least once), it does not capture any reduction in the frequency of reoffending or measure the impact this might have on crime rates in the area.
- 8.20. These findings are broadly consistent with the findings of the HMI Probation Inspection of Adult Offending Work programme, where in 63% of statutory IOM/PPO cases individuals were cautioned, convicted or charged within nine months of the start of the order or licence.
- 8.21. It is important to note that, although these figures appear consistent with other HMI Probation data, they are significantly different from other published research articles and evaluations that seem to

indicate much better performance on rehabilitative outcomes^{10,11}. This may be due to methodological differences impacting significantly on any cost benefit analysis or the characteristics of the IOM approaches studied and inspected.

- 8.22. Where offenders either refused to engage with the IOM approach, or were at risk of imminently returning to offending, intelligence to disrupt any potential offending had been passed on to operational police in three-quarters of cases. Where there was information to suggest further offending, appropriate police action was usually taken, such as additional attention by other police resources.
- 8.23. Although the value of this intelligence is hard to quantify, it clearly represents a useful tool in tackling crime, which is likely to have a positive effect on crime rates in an area. We saw multiple examples of intelligence being generated and shared, leading directly to police action to prevent crime and apprehend offenders.

Conclusion

- 8.24. Some of the areas we visited had made significant attempts to evaluate their work. However, the absence of an agreed methodology or independent academic research to assess outcomes meant that the quality of the evaluations and the weight that could be placed on them was limited. Although some project evaluations are emerging, there is, as yet, no definitive body of peer reviewed academic research to draw upon.
- 8.25. Although the percentage of the inspection sample that was reconvicted is disappointing, it is consistent with the high proportion of offenders identified because of the extent of their offending. This, in turn, often correlates with complex needs and difficulties in desisting from offending in a relatively short period of time without relapse, even when provided with considerable resources.
- 8.26. Despite seeing much apparent good practice in rehabilitative work, we have seen little evidence of significant improvements, as measured by the binary rate of reconviction, and would urge caution where any such claims are made. It is unsurprising that where offenders are targeted for additional proactive policing, the likelihood of them being reconvicted should they reoffend is enhanced. Any further inspection or evaluation should not focus solely on the binary measure of reconviction, but also consider the frequency of reoffending.
- 8.27. Staff had to be able to support the efforts subjects made towards rehabilitation while constantly being aware of the likelihood of relapse. We found that the ability to change tack between a rehabilitative and restrictive/enforcement orientation was an essential element of good practice. In practical terms, being able to identify whether the right thing was, or was not, being done with the right person at the right time was not too problematic; codifying this practice into a performance or inspection framework is, however, much more difficult.
- 8.28. We believe that the difficulty in achieving high levels of absolute desistance is more a function of selecting the correct subjects for the IOM approach than any failing of it. Inspection evidence of progress against identified needs is promising. It shows the difficulties that subjects may have in overcoming entrenched patterns of behaviour and poor life chances. This should not detract from the progress many offenders make while subject to IOM.
- 8.29. The value of intelligence gathered within the IOM approach to disrupt ongoing offending patterns and reduce crime in an area should not be undervalued, and may ultimately be the best argument for the continued development of IOM.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Glossary

ETE	Education, training and employment: work to improve an individual's learning, and to increase their employment prospects
GPS	Global positioning system
HMI Constabulary	HM Inspectorate of Constabulary
HMI Probation	HM Inspectorate of Probation
IOM	Integrated Offender Management
MAPPA	Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements: where probation, police, prison and other agencies work together locally to manage offenders who pose a higher risk of harm to others
MoJ	Ministry of Justice
NOMS	National Offender Management Service
OASys	Offender Assessment System
OGRS	Offender Group Reconviction Scale
OMI 2	Offender Management Inspection 2
PPO	Prolific and other priority offenders
Risk of harm to others	This is the term generally used by HMI Probation to describe work to protect the public, primarily using restrictive interventions, to keep to a minimum the individual's opportunity to behave in a way that is a risk of harm to others
YJB	Youth Justice Board for England and Wales
YOT/YOS/YJS	Youth Offending Team/Youth Offending Service/Youth Justice Service

Appendix 2: Role of the inspectorates and code of practice

HMI Probation

Information on the Role of HMI Probation and Code of Practice can be found on our website:

<http://www.justice.gov.uk/about/hmi-probation>

The Inspectorate is a public body. Anyone wishing to comment on an inspection, a report or any other matter falling within its remit should write to:

HM Chief Inspector of Probation
1st Floor, Manchester Civil Justice Centre
1 Bridge Street West
Manchester, M3 3FX

HMI Constabulary

Information on the Role of HMI Constabulary and Code of Practice can be found on our website:

<http://www.hmic.gov.uk/>

The Inspectorate is a public body. Anyone wishing to comment on an inspection, a report or any other matter falling within its remit should write to:

HM Chief Inspector of Constabulary
6th Floor, Globe House, 89 Eccleston Square
London, SW1V 1PN

Appendix 3: References

- ¹ Office for Criminal Justice Reform, (2005), *PPO Strategy Premium Service Commitments*, Ministry of Justice, London - <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20081023143640/crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/ppo/ppominisite09.htm>
- ² National Offender Management Service (June 2006), *The NOMS Offender Management Model*, Home Office, London
- ³ Senior, P., et al, (May 2011), *Process Evaluation of Five Integrated Offender Management Pioneer Areas*, Ministry of Justice, London
- ⁴ London Criminal Justice Partnership, (April 2011), *An evaluation of the Diamond Initiative: year two findings*, London Criminal Justice Partnership, London
- ⁵ Home Office (June 2009) *Integrated Offender Management Government Policy Statement*, Home Office, London
- ⁶ Home Office and Ministry of Justice, (April 2010), *Integrated Offender Management: Key Principles*, Home Office, London
- ⁷ Home Office, (September 2013), *Integrated Offender Management: Findings from the 2013 Survey*, Home Office, London
- ⁸ Ministry of Justice (May 2013), *Transforming Rehabilitation: A Strategy for Reform*, The Stationery Office, Norwich
- ⁹ Ministry of Justice, (2012), *2012 Compendium of re-offending statistics and analysis: Ministry of Justice Statistics bulletin*, Ministry of Justice, London
- ¹⁰ Ellingworth, D. and Wong, K., (August 2013), *Impact of Sussex IOM on reconviction*, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield
- ¹¹ Williams, A. and Barak, A., (November 2012), "The Bristol Integrated Offender Management Scheme: A Pseudo-Experimental Test of Desistance Theory", *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, Vol 7, No. 2. 2013, pp.123-134

BLANK PAGE



Arolygiad ar y Cyd Cyfiawnder Troseddol

ISBN: 978-1-84099-643-2