



Ministry of  
**JUSTICE**

## **Working in Partnership to Reduce Reoffending and Make Communities Safer**

**Response to Consultation**  
CP(R) 34/07  
October 2008

## **Working in Partnership to Reduce Reoffending and Make Communities Safer**

Response to consultation carried out by the Ministry of Justice, in partnership with Department of Universities and Skills, Home Office, Department of Communities and Local Government, Department of Health, Cabinet Office, Department for Work and Pensions, Department for Children, Schools and Families, Department for Business, Enterprise & Regulatory Reform, Department for Culture, Media & Sport, Welsh Assembly Government, Northern Ireland Office, Her Majesty's Treasury, Government Equalities Office, and the Attorney General's Office.

**This information is also available on the Ministry of Justice website: [www.justice.gov.uk](http://www.justice.gov.uk)**

## Contents

1	Introduction and contact details	3
2	Background	4
3	Summary of Responses	5
4	Consultation Feedback and Government Response	7
5	Conclusion and Next Steps	16
6	Annex A – Responses to specific questions	18
7	Annex B – List of respondents	29



# 1 Introduction and contact details

1. This document is the government response to the consultation paper, 'Strategic Plan for Reducing Reoffending 2008-11: Working in Partnership to Reduce Reoffending – A consultation.

It covers:

- the background to the reducing reoffending consultation paper;
- a summary of the key issues raised in the consultation;
- government responses to key issues; and
- next steps.

2. Further copies of this report and the consultation paper can be obtained by contacting **Tina Markose** at the address below:

**Tina Markose**

**Ministry of Justice  
4th Floor Fry, 2 Marsham Street  
London SW1P 4DF**

**Telephone: 020 7035 0360**

**Email: [tina.markose@justice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:tina.markose@justice.gsi.gov.uk)**

This report is also available on the Ministry's website: [www.justice.gov.uk](http://www.justice.gov.uk).

Alternative format versions of this publication are available on request.

## 2 Background

1. The paper 'Strategic Plan for Reducing Reoffending 2008-11: Working in Partnership to Reduce Reoffending – A consultation' was published on 27th November 2008. The consultation provided an opportunity for partners across government, in the regions/Wales and in local communities to review work to date, answer questions on key issues and agree new priorities to reduce reoffending over the next three years. The consultation document was informed by, and sought to build on, the strategic direction set out in the Crime Strategy, 'Cutting Crime: A New Partnership 2008-11', and the Criminal Justice System Strategic Plan 2008-11, 'Working Together to Cut Crime and Deliver Justice'<sup>1</sup>.
2. The consultation document was widely distributed to managers and practitioners in the field, including partners from the prison service, probation service, police, NOMS, Health services, Criminal Justice organisations, local government and third sector organisations. Additionally, a public facing leaflet, summarising six core questions, was also published online, distributed to partners and sent to every MP in England and Wales.
3. The consultation ran at the same time as consultations on the 'NOMS Third Sector Action Plan', a faith based consultation 'Believing We Can' and the Ministry of Justice/Department of Health's consultation, 'Improving Health, Supporting Justice'. Specific events were also held focusing on offender health and work with the third sector and faith groups. Separate reports summarising responses to these consultations will be published. The Third Sector paper 'Working with the Third Sector to Reduce Reoffending 2008-11' will also be published shortly.
4. The consultation period closed on 22nd February 2008. This report summarises the responses received, the government response to key issues raised and describes how the consultation will influence our cross government approach to managing offenders and delivery of the reducing re-offending target. Although youth justice was considered in this consultation, the recently published 'Youth Crime Action Plan' sets out in detail our work in reducing youth reoffending.
5. A list of respondents to the consultation is at **Annex B**.

<sup>1</sup> Cutting Crime: A New Partnership 2008 – 11 <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/documents/crime-strategy-07/>,

### 3 Summary of the responses

6. The consultation aimed to bring partners together to discuss existing good practice, to learn from what had worked to date and to review the evidence base for work with offenders. The consultation paper set out progress in reducing reoffending over the last ten years. It described the new opportunities created by the government-wide Public Service Agreements (PSAs), including the Make Communities Safer (PSA 23) and the Socially Excluded Adults (PSA 16)<sup>2</sup>. The new focus on the volume and severity of reoffending, including a new reoffending target, created an opportunity to explore how we could best use resources both inside and outside of the Criminal Justice System. The paper attempted to build consensus on the need to prioritise resources more effectively on specific groups with the highest likelihood of reoffending.
7. Through the consultation we sought to discuss governance arrangements and how they could best support delivery in Wales the Regions and at a local level; how to embed reducing reoffending into local partnerships; the way in which the pathways should support offender management; how we would measure success and meet our targets; which key offender groups we should focus on, such as those serving short prison sentences; and the connection between adult and youth services.
8. Thirty-five questions were asked under seven chapter headings. These were:
- Strategies, Plans and Governance
  - Local and Regional Delivery
  - Working Across the Seven Pathways
  - NOMS Reforms: Supporting Reducing Reoffending
  - Measuring Success
  - Prioritisation
  - Working with the Youth Justice System
9. We have summarised key themes under each of these chapter headings.
10. Those who responded to the consultation generally accepted the need to prioritise particular offender groups. The vast majority agreed with both the objective of re-focusing resources on the most serious and prolific offenders and the aim of building the links between reducing reoffending and overall crime to make communities safer. They recognised that work with known offenders can make a substantial contribution to reducing overall crime. A number also endorsed the need to focus on offenders as a socially excluded group, as part of the efforts to reduce reoffending. Many responses highlighted the successes of local work and projects. A minority had concerns about focusing resources on particular groups of offenders who were most likely to re-offend, rather than focusing on offender need and level of exclusion, irrespective of how likely they were to reoffend.
11. A total of seventy-seven written responses to the consultation paper were received. The responses were classified into sectors and are as follows:
- 33 from Third Sector organisations
  - 9 from Probation
  - 9 from Local Government organisations
  - 5 from Criminal Justice System organisations
  - 4 from academic institutions
  - 5 from Police

<sup>2</sup> Other relevant Public Service Agreements include: 14: Young People on the Path to Success; 16: Socially Excluded Adults; 24: Effective, responsive and transparent Criminal Justice System; 25: Reduce the Harm Caused by Alcohol and Drugs and 26: Counter Terrorism. Further details on Public Service Agreements can be found at: <http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/3655.htm>

- 4 from private companies
  - 2 from the Prison Service
  - 1 from health partners
  - 5 others (private citizens, MPs, Trade Unions, offender groups)
12. A full list of contributors can be found at **Annex B**.
13. In addition, over one thousand delegates attended consultation events held nationally, in the regions and in Wales. The probation and prison services made up 30% of attendees; Third Sector 16%; Local Government organisations 13%; Health partners 11%; partners in the Criminal Justice System 9% and Police 5%.
14. The pattern of consultation responses can not be taken as representative of the views of all the interested parties. The summary of responses only therefore reflects the views of those who responded.
15. The responses were analysed for common themes on a question by question basis. In particular they were analysed for new approaches to working in partnership; learning to date; a consensus on the key challenges; and possible solutions to future work in reducing reoffending.
16. A summary of the consultation responses and the Government response to the key issues raised is below. More detailed responses to specific questions can be found at **Annex A**.

## 4 Consultation Feedback and government response

### Consultation Feedback: Strategies, Plans and Governance

17. Overall, responses were positive about the emphasis on the role that reducing reoffending plays in reducing crime. Many felt that this connection needed to be strengthened by solid partnership working at local and regional levels. The link between reoffending and the social exclusion experienced by offenders was also emphasised.
18. The responses demonstrated the need for more clarity about governance arrangements for overseeing reducing reoffending work. There was a general lack of understanding of governance arrangements at a national level. Furthermore, many did not understand the role of the Reducing Reoffending Alliances and opinion was divided on the value of the Regional Reducing Reoffending Partnership Boards.
19. In particular, a majority of responses felt that there could be better lines of communication between services delivered in custody and the community. A number of respondents highlighted the need for more closely-aligned governance arrangements between the prison and probation services, from the centre, through the regions, and out to the localities.

### Government Response

20. We will use this feedback to inform our continued work and commitment to joint commissioning and partnership and this paper sets out our policy and direction of travel on a number of key issues. We are conducting analysis of how we can best use resources for offender management. Our approach to managing offenders will be set out in the autumn as an update to the prison policy paper.
21. We are encouraged by the positive response to the direction of travel for reducing reoffending and the recognition of the role of reducing reoffending in tackling crime and making communities safer.
22. We have reduced reoffending. Reoffending rates have fallen by 22.9% for adults and 18.7% for youths since 2000.<sup>3</sup> We want to build further on the success of partnership working in the Prolific and other Priority Offender programme, Drug Interventions Programmes and work across the pathways in helping to tackling offending behaviour and re-integrating offenders into society.
23. At a national level, a new Board chaired by the Home Office provides strategic oversight and coordination of the related priorities within PSAs 23 and 25, clarifying the links between crime, reoffending, drugs and alcohol. The Inter Ministerial Group (IMG) on Reducing Reoffending (which reports into the National Crime Reduction Board) provides critical leverage at a Ministerial level with other government departments. Beneath the PSA 23/25 Strategic Board and the IMG, a revised Reducing Reoffending Programme Board, co-chaired by the Director-General of the National Offender Management Service and the Chief Executive of the Youth Justice Board, brings together partners from across Government to focus more intently on performance and delivery.
24. The bringing together of the prison and probation services under the National Offender Management Service Agency will help ensure continuity between prison and probation services and support effective end to end offender management. Over the next 6 months, the appointment of a

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.justice.gov.uk/docs/re-offending-adults-2006.pdf>  
<http://www.justice.gov.uk/docs/re-offending-juveniles-2006.pdf>

Director of Offender Management (DOM) for each of the English regions and in Wales will promote partnership working and commissioning targeted at the specific needs of their region. The DOM role is currently being piloted in London and Wales.

25. DOMs will focus on improving arrangements for monitoring regional reducing reoffending performance and make the links between the new national and local performance measures. They will manage regional partnerships working with strategic health authorities, Government Offices, and others to maximise pathway resources available within each region.
26. We are grateful for the views expressed both about the role of Reducing Reoffending Partnership Boards in the Regions and in Wales, and the three Alliances first launched in 2005. Together with NOMS, we will use the feedback from this consultation to inform a review of these structures.

#### **Consultation Feedback: Local and Regional Delivery**

27. We asked for views on how to improve local and regional delivery. Though a range of views were expressed, Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (Community Safety Partnerships in Wales) were consistently recognised as a key building block in bringing partners together to reduce reoffending. A recurring theme was also the need to involve Probation more fully in these partnerships. Many felt Probation should become a statutory member rather than just a co-operating body. Some respondents felt that the work with offenders in prison needed to be better reflected on these boards.
28. A high proportion of respondents also felt there was a need to establish clearer lines

of communication between Local Criminal Justice Boards and Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships.

29. Responses also made clear that further clarification of roles and responsibilities of local boards would help partners work together. It was also apparent that the role Local Authorities and Local Area Agreements could play in reducing reoffending was not well enough understood.
30. Third Sector involvement in providing offender services was mentioned consistently, especially in responses from the sector itself. The unique contribution that the Sector could make due particularly to its local links with diverse groups, was emphasised repeatedly. Many responses from the third sector argued that more information about individual offenders (for example, previous assessments, interventions completed, and any progress made) needed to be available to third sector organisations to help inform decisions about future work and prevent duplication.

#### **Government Response**

31. We are grateful for the views and ideas submitted and will feed them into our ongoing work in this area.
32. We agree that Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships/Community Safety Partnerships are in a strong position to bring together partners in order to increase offenders' access to mainstream services. Probation is currently defined as a 'co-operating body' within Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships, playing an important part in working with other key agencies to deliver solutions such as the Prolific and other Priority Offender strategy and Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements. We want to maximise the role they can play. We

are therefore exploring the possibility of introducing legislation to make Probation a 'responsible authority' in Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships and, at the same time, expand the statutory duties of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships to include reducing reoffending. The recently published Policing Green Paper includes consultation questions on these issues<sup>4</sup>.

33. As set out in the CJS Business plan, Local Criminal Justice Boards have a key role to play in reducing reoffending. A structured link between Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships and Criminal Justice System partners on Local Criminal Justice Boards needs to be individually determined to take account of the variance of the local delivery landscapes. Such a link should clarify roles and accountabilities, reduce duplication and improve information sharing to foster a joined-up approach to reducing reoffending. The Ministry of Justice has established a working group to explore how Local Criminal Justice Boards are working in partnership at a local level to support the goals of reducing reoffending, protecting the public and contributing to reducing crime overall. We will also work with Office of Criminal Justice Reform, as part of the ongoing Community Engagement project, to ensure we maximise the involvement of local people, including as volunteers, in work to tackle crime and reduce reoffending.
34. We will continue to work closely with Government Offices and Local Authorities to clarify how they can be further involved in reducing reoffending. We have contributed to the development of the Communities and Local Government Guidance on Local Area Agreements, providing the reducing

reoffending narrative. We have produced a Local Area Agreements Case Study to assist Probation Chief Officers in their work with Local Authorities to define the outcomes and priorities for the area. This highlights the appropriate links between the Local Area Agreement indicators and the reducing reoffending pathways.

35. Community safety issues in general, and reoffending indicators in particular, have achieved good coverage nationally in the new Local Authority Agreements. Over half of all Local Area Agreements selected focused on reoffending by prolific and priority offenders' and over seventy Local Area Agreements included adult and youth reoffending amongst their top 35 priority objectives. Local targets for adult reoffending are due to be set in the local authority refresh in 2009 and provide an opportunity for partners to measure their success at a local level for the first time
36. We value the critical role of the Third Sector in work to support the effective management of offenders. Many organisations are working with offenders in custody and the community and their families within, and across, the pathways, often providing a holistic package of services to meet multiple needs. The Ministry of Justice and National Offender Management Service plan 'Working with the Third Sector to Reduce Reoffending 2008-2011' will set out actions for strengthening the role of the sector in reducing reoffending – as campaigners, advocates of users and communities, partners in planning, service providers, and enablers of volunteering and mentoring.

<sup>4</sup> Policing Green Paper "From the neighbourhood to the national: policing our communities together". [http://files.homeoffice.gov.uk/police/policing\\_green\\_paper.pdf](http://files.homeoffice.gov.uk/police/policing_green_paper.pdf)

### Consultation Feedback: Working across the seven pathways

37. The need to work across the reducing re-offending pathways was emphasised by a majority of respondents. There was, however, a divergence of views on which pathways needed further development. 'Accommodation', 'Employment and Skills' and 'Drugs and Alcohol' were highlighted the most often as key areas to address. A few respondents also wrote at length about the need to provide for greater provision for offenders with mental health needs.
38. We asked how well we had articulated to partners why reducing reoffending was important. Although some responses suggested that it had been clearly articulated, the majority of those who responded felt the case for focusing local partners' efforts on offenders to reduce reoffending needed to be made more clearly.
39. Linked to this issue of 'making the case' for reducing reoffending, it was felt that there was a need for better information about the effectiveness of interventions in reducing reoffending. Many respondents thought better communication was needed with key partners, such as sentencers, about what works to reduce reoffending.
40. Given the huge numbers of agencies involved, another important theme was the need to better share good practice and establish the best methods for reducing reoffending. Third sector organisations felt particularly strongly that they needed to raise awareness of, and gain recognition for, their own initiatives.
41. A number of respondents thought that alcohol problems needed to be more directly addressed as a contributory cause of reoffending, particularly for those

on short sentences. Some responses identified alcohol as a bigger problem than drugs and felt that alcohol interventions for offenders were under-resourced.

### Government Response

42. We are encouraged by the recognition of the importance of working across the pathways and creating packages of interventions to meet offender needs. We are grateful for responses highlighting particular pathways, or combinations, which need to be addressed. We will use these responses and evidence as we continue to strengthen pathway related work.
43. A large proportion of the resources needed to reduce reoffending lie outside of the Criminal Justice System and it is therefore critical that we make a strong economic and social case for partners to be increasingly involved in work to reduce reoffending.
44. We are currently researching the cost of reoffending and the comparative cost of interventions and activities to reduce reoffending. As part of this, we are conducting a Unit Costs of Criminal Justice project aimed at generating unit cost data on activities and interventions with offenders. We are developing a model for estimating the cost of criminal careers for identified groups of offenders within the offender population. This work is aimed at building up our understanding of the social benefits of reducing re-offending in terms of costs of crime avoided through activities and interventions.
45. We are continuing to build the evidence base for what works to reduce reoffending across the pathways by conducting cross government research, working with partners and learning from international experiences. The recently published Resettlement

Surveys Reoffending Analysis studies<sup>5</sup> emphasised the link between pathway related needs and likelihood of re-offending:

- accommodation and employment problems were associated with an increased likelihood of reoffending, but only when a prisoner had problems with both of these on release;
- having a drugs problem was also associated with an increased chance of re-offending; and
- receiving family visits while in prison was associated with a reduced chance of prisoners re-offending after release.

46. In addition, we are carrying out three major studies of prisoners to further our understanding of the range of problems and needs of offenders and of what mix of interventions works. These studies will deliver their findings on a rolling basis between now and 2011.
47. We have also recently published 'Community Sentences – cutting reoffending, changing lives'<sup>6</sup> which explains how community sentences work. NOMS will also provide a toolkit for providers of offender services on measuring and demonstrating the effectiveness and outcomes of their work, in line with NOMS performance management reform.
48. Many responses highlighted concerns about the gap in provision for offenders with alcohol problems. A recent National Audit Office report also highlighted a gap in availability and access to clinical treatment. Our aim is for offenders to have access to alcohol treatment that works, especially

where their offending is linked to alcohol misuse. The Government's National Alcohol Strategy, 'Safe. Sensible. Social.'<sup>7</sup> set out our priorities around alcohol. This includes seven probation areas running alcohol best practice projects and the development by the Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners Trust (RAPt), in partnership with NOMS, of a 12-Step programme to address alcohol dependency. Building on this, the Alcohol Strategy Toolkit will enable local areas to identify gaps in provision for their population, including offenders, and encourage Primary Care Trusts to address any shortfall. The Ministry of Justice and Department of Health will set up a working group to lead a strategic review of provision and to identify the action needed to close the gap between offender need and available provision. This will aim to report its findings by March 2009.

### Consultation Feedback: NOMS Reform Supporting Reducing Reoffending

49. It was felt that the Offender Management Model helped promote a joint approach. Many responses stated that the further role out of offender management to offenders on short custodial sentences and those not currently subject to statutory supervision would help drive further reductions in reoffending.
50. Some responses emphasised the need for probation trusts and commissioners to have freedom and flexibility.
51. A number of respondents felt strongly that there were insufficient financial resources to deliver key services.

### Government Response

52. We are using the views expressed in our

5 Resettlement factors and re-offending: a one-year follow-up of prisoners taking part in the Resettlement Surveys 2001, 2003 and 2004 (MOJ Research Summary)

6 <http://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/community-sentencing.htm>

7 Safe. Sensible. Social. The next steps in the National Alcohol Strategy <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/documents/alcohol-strategy-2007>

consultation to inform ongoing work to continue the reform agenda in this area. We know that offenders serving short custodial sentences are a key concern and have a 73% reoffending rate. Although at any one time only about 13% of sentenced offenders in prison are serving a short-term (under 12 months) sentence, these sentences account for nearly 60,000 offenders entering prison each year<sup>8</sup>.

53. While offenders sentenced to short custodial sentences are not subject to statutory supervision, educational and drugs work with these offenders in prison is often followed up in the community through specific projects. Prisons offer a number of programmes for offenders serving shorter prison sentences, including the Short Duration Programme and Prisoner – Addressing Substance Related Offending. The further role out of the Integrated Drug Treatment System in prisons will bring considerable improvements to the quality of prison treatment.
54. A cross government priority review will be exploring how existing resources are best utilised to improve provision for this prolific group. The Home Office and MoJ led Integrated Offender Management projects are being piloted in five areas and will test the benefits of this approach to this group. The Integrated Offender Management approach, which builds on current successful partnership work with prolific offenders on PPO schemes, combines the targeted, intelligence-led approach of the police, with the expertise of probation and prisons in assessing and working with offenders. Critically, it draws on the support of many partners to help offenders re-integrate, particularly those offenders given short sentences.

55. In addition, we also wish to reduce the number of offenders who receive short term custodial sentences where a robust community alternative would be the more appropriate mechanism to punish and reform these offenders. To this end, we are piloting new Intensive Alternatives to Custody. These intensive community sentences provide a strengthened and rigorous supervisory regime to challenge the offender. We will run four projects in 2008/09, rising to seven in total by April 2009.

#### **Consultation Feedback: Measuring Success**

56. The new reoffending measures, focusing on the frequency and severity of reoffending, were felt to be a step forward. Some commented that the new measures better reflected the impact of interventions or 'distance travelled' with challenging offenders.
57. There were a number of suggestions for different ways to measure success at a national and local level in reducing reoffending, including outcome orientated measures and measures of the uptake of services by offenders. A few responses felt strongly that more data from the Offender Assessment System could be used more widely to measure success.

#### **Government Response**

58. We were encouraged by the positive comments about the new reoffending measures. These will give better and more timely analysis of reoffending. Results for 2000-2006 using the new measures were<sup>9</sup>
59. In recognition of the importance of the work to reduce reoffending, we have a new national target. This target for

8 Offender Management Caseload Statistics 2006', Ministry of Justice, 2007 <http://www.justice.gov.uk/docs/omcs2006.pdf>

9 published in September. <http://www.justice.gov.uk/docs/re-offending-adults-2006.pdf>  
<http://www.justice.gov.uk/docs/re-offending-juveniles-2006.pdf>

reducing adult and youth reoffending underpins Public Service Agreement 23 'Make Communities Safer'. It will help drive a focus across government on those offenders who commit the highest number of offences and who cause the most damage to communities. The new target is: 'To reduce the adult reoffending rate by 10% between 2005 and 2011'

and

'To reduce the youth reoffending rate by 10% between 2005 and 2011'

(The reoffending rate is defined as the number of re-offences per hundred offenders: known as the 'frequency' of reoffending).

For adults, the target level is 151.1 re-offences per hundred adult offenders in 2011<sup>10</sup>. For youths, the target is 112.5 re-offences per hundred youth offenders in 2011<sup>11</sup>.

60. We acknowledge that local partners need to better understand the effectiveness of work to reduce reoffending and also have a more timely measure to evaluate the impact of their policies at a local level. We have therefore introduced a probation area level measure of reoffending to identify good practice, ensure poor performance is tackled, and to help hold probation and other agencies to account. A local authority level reoffending measure, derived from the probation measure, has also recently been rolled out. The new local performance framework – with Local Area Agreements at the centre – presents further opportunities to ensure

reducing reoffending is embedded in the discussions of the Local Strategic Partnership and other partners.

### Consultation Feedback: Prioritisation

61. We asked for views on which offender groups should be prioritised. Responses identified a diverse number of offender groups that were felt to require prioritisation. The most common groups highlighted were:
- Offenders with short custodial sentences;
  - Prolific offenders (including Prolific and Priority Offenders);
  - Offenders with mental health needs;
  - Offenders posing a high risk of serious harm to the public; and
  - Women offenders.
62. Many felt that women offenders were at particular risk of social exclusion and of not being sufficiently prioritised, due to their small numbers in local areas and the fact that they tended to be assessed as less likely to re-offend and having a low risk of harm to the public. Several approaches were recommended, including the provision of more employment and accommodation for women, the benefits of sentences in the community and improved support for women offenders with mental health needs.
63. A few responses highlighted Black and Minority Ethnic offenders as a group which needed greater focus or highlighted the need to focus on disability, partial ability and offenders with mental health needs. Some felt there was a need for better research and equality monitoring to inform the commissioning of services and get a clearer sense of the scale of diversity issues within the offender population.

### Government Response

64. We are grateful for the detailed responses

<sup>10</sup> The frequency of adult reoffending in the baseline year (2005) was 167.9 re-offences in one year per hundred offenders

<sup>11</sup> For youth offenders, the baseline in 2005 was 125.0 re-offences per hundred young offenders.

about which offenders our partners feel need be prioritised.

65. We know that we must develop the evidence base on what works (and what is cost-effective) to reduce re-offending for different types of offender. The interventions we, and partners, provide for offenders should deliver the greatest net benefit in terms of public value. We are working to improve our understanding of offenders to help establish how best to deploy resources to maximise public value. This includes analysing the characteristics, offending patterns and costs associated with different offender groups, and harnessing the most robust evidence of what works to deliver justice and reduce crime across these groups. This work will support our developing strategy on managing offenders.
66. Protecting the public from the harm of serious reoffending is a key priority. A very small percentage of people who are still serving a sentence re-offend very seriously – less than half of 1% of the total caseload of the probation service<sup>12</sup>. But we need to focus our shared resources on managing risk as effectively as we can. We are committed to continuous improvement in assessing and managing the risk of harm presented by known offenders. We are developing and improving interventions for violent, sexual and extremist offending which will be implemented by the National Offender Management Service working with partners across the CJS. These will contribute to the Home Office led Tackling Violence Action Plan<sup>13</sup>.

67. We also recognise that some diverse groups of offenders, including Black and Minority Ethnic offenders and women offenders, have particular needs. The recently published National Service Framework for Women set out the Government's strategy for dealing with women offenders<sup>14</sup>. The intention is to put in place a sustainable and co-ordinated approach to addressing the needs of women passing through the Criminal Justice System.
68. Further detail on actions we are taking can be found in the recently published Progress Report on delivering the Government's Response to Baroness Corston's review of vulnerable women in the Criminal Justice System.<sup>15</sup> The Framework is supported by the publication of an 'Offender Management Guide to Working with Women'.<sup>16</sup> The Guide details some of the issues, challenges, and opportunities that need to be considered when working with women offenders at all stages of the offender process, including the importance of promoting and developing community-based alternatives to custody.
69. To help ensure sufficient focus on diverse groups of offenders we are conducting research to monitor our effectiveness. This includes the monitoring being undertaken by Learning and Skills Councils on how learners from Black and Minority Ethnic groups are progressing. The recent publication of University of Central Lancashire's Community Engagement research on the issues surrounding the delivery of prison drug services in England and Wales, with a focus on black

12 Between 1st April 2004 and 31st March 2005 0.2 per cent of the Probation Service's national caseload in the community was convicted of an SFO. Offender Management Caseload Statistics 2005 Home Office Statistical Bulletin 18/06 Home Office 2007 <http://www.justice.gov.uk/docs/omcs2006.pdf>

13 <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/documents/violent-crime-action-plan-08/violent-crime-action-plan-180208>

14 <http://noms.justice.gov.uk/news-publications-events/publications/strategy/NSF-Women-08>

15 <http://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/corston-progress-report.htm>

16 <http://noms.justice.gov.uk/news-publications-events/publications/guidance/OM-Guide-Women>

and minority ethnic prisoners, led to the production of a Diversity Toolkit – ‘Making Equality Real’. This is a good practice toolkit for delivering effective drug services to diverse communities in prisons and helps staff to develop and deliver effective and inclusive drug services by outlining their legal responsibilities and highlighting identified good practice.

70. To tackle the health needs of offenders, in 2009 we will be publishing an Offender Health and Social Care Strategy, following Lord Bradley’s review of mental health in the Criminal Justice System. This will help improve the availability and accessibility of mainstream health and social care services for offenders and their families at all stages of the Criminal Justice System.

#### **Consultation Feedback: Working with the Youth Justice System**

71. Responses emphasised the importance of ensuring a smooth transition for young offenders moving from the youth to the adult system. Some respondents felt there needed to be more continuity between the adult and youth justice systems. Many emphasised the need for more information sharing between organisations to identify and address the needs of young people. Responses highlighted a number of approaches to working with young offenders including working with the families and parents of offenders and the benefits of mentoring.

#### **Government Response**

72. We recognise the need for effective links in service provision between the youth and adult systems. An effective youth justice system will contribute to preventing entry to the adult justice system and provide a basis for continued efforts to reduce reoffending for those who do enter the adult system.

73. We will pilot the Youth Conditional Caution to reduce the increasing number of young offenders taken to court for relatively low level offences. This will be an alternative mechanism to court proceedings to bring young offenders to account, and will tackle underlying factors influencing their behaviour. Working closely with the Youth Justice Board, we aim to improve the transition for young offenders between the adult and youth systems.

74. The recently published Youth Crime Action Plan set out cross-government arrangements for tackling the overall level of youth crime, including:

- Preventing young people offending in the first place;
- Reducing reoffending rates;
- Exploring how we can improve post-justice continuity of care following custody and Youth Offending Team supervision to improve outcomes and reduce reoffending;
- Tackling wider welfare needs and risk factors that contribute to offending; and
- Responding to public concern about youth crime.

The YCAP sets out the Government’s ambition to develop a comprehensive package of support for young people leaving custody. This, combined with local targeted youth support reforms, will ensure that young people with additional needs and at risk receive the support they need. The Youth Justice Board currently allocates grants totalling £150m per year to Youth Offending Teams, including £12m for approximately sixty “RAP” resettlement and aftercare schemes. The Youth Crime Action Plan announced that there would be a further £3.5m available for the extension of the RAP programme from 2009-10.

## 5 Conclusion and Next Steps

75. Responses to this consultation will be used to inform the direction of the Government's programmes of work to reduce reoffending, cut crime and tackle social exclusion. They will help us to deliver our target to reduce reoffending for the Comprehensive Spending Review period 2008-11.
76. The Ministry of Justice is publishing a number of documents in the coming months that show how the Criminal Justice System is working together with partners to reduce reoffending and protect the public. We will be setting out how the third sector can help in 'Working with the Third Sector to Reduce Re-offending 2008-11' and the Department of Health will set out their Offender Health and Social Care Strategy in 2009.
77. The consultation responses will also inform the paper planned for later in the autumn which will re-iterate the government's overarching strategy for managing offenders, updating the Prisons Policy Update Paper we published in January 2008<sup>17</sup>. Working in partnership to reduce re-offending forms a key part of our overarching approach, and the responses we received will play an important part in the formulation of this paper.
78. The National Offender Management Service will also use the findings of this consultation to develop its work to reduce reoffending with the regions. The development of regional (and Wales) Reducing Reoffending Action Plans will set the direction for partnership work to reduce reoffending and will inform work at the local level to deliver against the objectives in Local Area Agreements.

---

17 <http://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/prison-policy-update.htm>

### **The consultation criteria**

The six consultation criteria are as follows:

1. Consult widely throughout the process, allowing a minimum of 12 weeks for written consultation at least once during the development of the policy.
2. Be clear about what your proposals are, who may be affected, what questions are being asked and the timescale for responses.
3. Ensure that your consultation is clear, concise and widely accessible.
4. Give feedback regarding the responses received and how the consultation process influenced the policy.
5. Monitor your department's effectiveness at consultation, including through the use of a designated consultation co-ordinator.
6. Ensure your consultation follows better regulation best practice, including carrying out a Regulatory Impact Assessment if appropriate.

**These criteria must be reproduced within all consultation documents.**

### **Consultation Co-ordinator contact details**

If you have any complaints or comments about the **consultation process** rather than about the topic covered by this paper, you should contact Gabrielle Kann, Ministry of Justice Consultation Co-ordinator, on 020 7210 1326, or email her at [consultation@justice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:consultation@justice.gsi.gov.uk).

Alternatively, you may wish to write to the address below:

Consultation Co-ordinator  
Ministry of Justice  
54-60 Victoria Street  
London  
SW1E 6QW

If your complaints or comments refer to the topic covered by this paper rather than the consultation process, please direct them to the contact given on page 3.

## 6 Annex A – Responses to specific questions

Responses were received from a wide range of sectors. These responses can not be considered to be representative of the views across these sectors. The analysis below only summarises the views expressed by those who responded to the consultation. A quantitative breakdown of different responses to the questions posed has not been possible. This summary does however attempt to provide an accurate summary of both the direction and tone of response received.

(The consultation asked people to focus particularly on questions marked \*)

### Chapter 3: Strategies, Plans and Governance

**Question 3a: Reducing Reoffending and Crime Reduction are now aligned in the Crime Strategy and the Make Communities Safer PSA, reflecting the overlap between reducing overall crime and reoffending. How should this new alignment influence commissioning and partnership arrangements to bring about more joined- up work to deliver reductions in crime and reoffending (volume and serious)?**

Over a third of respondents addressed this question. Around a quarter highlighted that the alignment between reducing crime and reducing reoffending needed to be strengthened by firm partnerships. A number said that both prison and probation must be involved with Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships.

“The new alignment between reducing reoffending and crime reduction should be strengthened by solid partnership working at Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships /Community

Safety Partnership and Local Strategic Partnership level”- Police

Others stressed the important role of Local Area Agreements in joint commissioning and thought that they would facilitate greater collaboration between partners. A significant number believed that the Third Sector needed to be more involved in joint commissioning and partnership arrangements.

“Joined up working [on Reducing Reoffending and Crime Reduction] at Area/Authority level should influence local commissioning and resource allocation”- Probation

**\* Question 3b: How do we ensure effective governance to deliver our objective of reducing the volume and severity of reoffending? Do existing governance arrangements reflect sufficiently the new alignment between reducing reoffending and crime reduction as described in the Crime Strategy and PSA? How should we strengthen the delivery chain from centre to the regions / Wales, and out into local delivery systems?**

Around three quarters of responses answered this question. The majority view was that prison governance was not sufficiently aligned with other services such as probation and police and local organizations. In particular, the links between probation and prisons were not strong enough.

It was suggested that the role of Local Criminal Justice Boards in reducing reoffending and their work with educational organisations and wider agencies needed further publicizing. Some responses felt that

there was a lack of clear MoJ presence in Government Offices

“West Yorkshire Police have recently been in contact with HMP & YOI Doncaster regarding their “Offender Management” initiative, where they visit the establishment to interview prisoners to ensure they are linked to appropriate provision on release to aid community safety. This is a valuable service” –Third Sector Organisation

**Question 3c: How can the Socially Excluded Adults PSA, which includes an indicator for Adult offenders, help drive greater access to mainstream resources as part of a wider focus on reducing reoffending?**

Just over one third of responses answered this question. A significant number felt that the focus of getting offenders into accommodation in the Socially Excluded Adults Public Service Agreement was helpful. Several highlighted the important role mentoring could play in signposting offenders to resources to help tackle the social exclusion felt by adult offenders.

**Question 3d: How effective are Regional Reducing Reoffending Partnership Boards at driving delivery? Is there national consistency of role and function? How do we increase the level of commitment and shared ownership amongst Board members? Are there examples of good practice that could be shared?**

Over a third responded to this question. A significant number thought that Regional Reducing Reoffending Partnership Boards were effective at driving delivery, but a large majority disagreed. One of the reasons was that the boards’ existence had not been sufficiently publicised.

It was thought that partnership boards had an important role in ensure that Reducing Reoffending remained a priority for local partnerships. Some thought the board’s agendas were too large. Many felt that the relationship between these boards and local delivery boards needed to be clarified. One respondent felt that the regional nature of partnership boards made them insensitive to local organizations and their needs.

“The Leicester local RR board uses evidence based plan to make a difference to an offender. Uses data and shares that data across agencies (e.g. on Alcohol) and also shares what works.” – Feedback from the East Midlands Regional event

“Clearer lines of communication need to be developed to ensure more effective dissemination of information between Reducing Reoffending Partnership Boards and individual Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships”- *Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships*

**Question 3e: How can we further use the reducing reoffending alliances to: better inform, consult and engage local organisations and diverse communities in our work to reduce reoffending?**

Just over one quarter of response answered this question. Many said that more information was needed about the role of the Alliances.

It was notable that a large number of respondents seemed not to be fully aware of what the Alliances were, and were using the word as a substitute for ‘partnerships’.

**Question 3f: In order to provide a strategic response to meet the needs of women offenders, and address some**

**of the recommendations on reducing women’s reoffending in the Corston Report, what would the Strategic Plan need to include to achieve this?**

Over one third responded to this. Many said that the provision of appropriate accommodation was particularly important for women offenders. A significant number emphasised the need for a commitment to get women into employment. Some thought that local women’s prisons should be established as these would help women offenders maintain family ties. Responses also felt that that diversion of women offenders from mainstream services should be considered.

“The strategy should be more responsive to the needs of female offenders, who are more likely to be resource intensive as a result of their often complex criminogenic needs”- Academic Institution

There was some concern that the intended focus on serious re-offences would reduce the attention given to women’s needs, because female offenders generally presented a low risk of harm to the public. It was also felt that the small number of female offenders in each local area meant that they were rarely a priority. One respondent highlighted how the majority of women served short sentences and that there was scope for working with them as part of wider work with prisoners serving relatively short-term sentences.

**\*Question 3g: What more do we need to do to ensure that the specific needs of diverse groups (including women, BME and disabled populations) are met in the delivery of reducing reoffending services?**

Well over half of the responses addressed this question. A majority identified the need to have a point of contact to sign post diverse groups to specific services. A significant number felt that a new diversity pathway was needed to build capacity to meet the needs of diverse groups. Black and Minority Ethnic organisations were felt to be especially equipped to meet the needs of Black and Minority Ethnic offenders.

“Pathways out of reoffending need to be tailored to the specific needs of diverse groups, advice should be sought from support groups as to the specific requirements needed.” – Police.

A significant number highlighted the need to make data about diversity more widely and for more research of diversity to help inform the commissioning of services. A small number of respondents highlighted the need to focus on disability and partial ability and offenders with mental health needs.

“Diversity must feature as part of the data gathering and information sharing” – Drug Alcohol Action Team

*Better understand the implications for reducing reoffending services. There may be a need for specialist consultancy services to assist local service delivery deal effectively and appropriately with less common types of disability” – PS Plus.*

**Chapter 4: Local and Regional Delivery**

**\* Question 4a: How can we support a more unified, partnership-oriented approach to reducing reoffending at a local level? How can we break down the ‘silo’ mentality where it still exists? And what are the most significant barriers that you encounter**

### **in embedding the reducing reoffending agenda with local partners?**

Roughly two thirds addressed this question. A significant number thought that the case for the benefits of reducing reoffending to local communities needed to be made more clearly. Some emphasized the importance of involving the Third Sector.

Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships were recognised as a key building block. It was emphasised that probation should play a greater part in Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships.

A few respondents thought that Local Criminal Justice Boards were well placed to work to reduce reoffending and should work closely with Local Strategic Partnerships.

“A more consistent probation voice at Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships is then needed to drive the reducing reoffending agenda”- Probation.

“In the North West, Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships are used as the ‘glue’”-Regional Event Feedback

### **Question 4b: How do we ensure that the work on skills and employment that falls outside the remit of Local Authorities is linked effectively to LAA targets?**

Just over one third answered this question, which was interpreted in a number of different ways.

A considerable number emphasised the importance of properly setting up and resourcing education, employment and accommodation projects. The need to involve Third Sector Organisations was also emphasised.

“Stepping Stones Trust intends to establish an accredited, ‘in house’ Education and Training Department available to all residents at its hostels and move-on accommodation.”

### **Question 4c: Supported by Government Offices / WAG, and partnership boards in England and Wales, what more can be done to further embed reducing reoffending and tackle social exclusion within:**

- Local Authorities
- LCJBs (and LCJBs working with CDRP/ CSPs)
- LSPs
- CDRPs and CSPs (particularly, although not exclusively, to create a better interface between criminal justice partners and health and social care agencies)
- any other agencies?

Nearly half of responses answered this question. A considerable majority highlighted the importance of working in partnerships, particularly with wider government departments e.g. Department of Health.

A significant number pointed to the need for more work across the pathways and more information sharing between partners. Some felt that the information gathered by the Offender Assessment System could be shared more widely.

It was felt that Local Criminal Justice Boards should be more involved in Reducing Reoffending and they could play a key role in local delivery and the Local Area Agreement process.

“In Nottinghamshire we have a Multi-Agency Intelligence Team (MAIT) that includes Police officers, a Prison Officer, and Probation Officers working together to share intelligence on Prolific and Priority Offenders (PPO’s). This close joint working breaks down the ‘silo’ approach of most organisations and this is currently working in a very effective manner.”- Police

**Question 4d: How can Probation Areas/ Trusts develop their partnerships with the police in supporting offender management, drawing on the learning from PPO schemes, DIP and MAPPA? Where do the goals of enforcement and rehabilitation dovetail most effectively?**

Around half of responses answered this question. The vast majority were positive about joint working. A significant number noted the benefits of Joint Commissioning for accessing resources. However, some suggested that partners needed to better understand why they needed to work together. One response said that there was too much unnecessary duplication in multi-agency partnerships such as MAPPA, PPO & DIP.

“Co-location of police and probation teams has been very effective in supporting this partnership working.” – Feedback from the London Regional event.

**Question 4e: How do we draw on the learning from prison work with local organisations and more effectively link their work on resettlement into partnership work in the community?**

Over half of responses answered this question. A significant number thought that better links between prisons and local organizations in the community would help

resettle offenders. Multi-agency partnership working and joint commissioning were highlighted as useful mechanisms in the community.

One response identified an example of good, joined-up problem solving at Altcourse Prison which has developed an ID card for prisoners to use to confirm identity for access to benefits and other services.

“The advent of the new Cognitive Behavioural Offending Programme across the Prison Service and probation service should assist as the problem of geography will be reduced as all establishments will deliver a common GOBP.” –Probation.

**Question 4f: What do third sector organisations need to help them demonstrate the outcomes of their work with offenders?**

Roughly one third of responded to this. A significant number emphasized the importance of the Third Sector’s contribution. Many thought third sector organisations needed more data from offenders.

A number pointed out that voluntary sector organisations, lacked the resources to do vigorous evaluations of their work. This made it more difficult for them to create an evidence based bid for contracts.

**Chapter 5: Working across the Seven Pathways**

**Question 5a: How can we build upon the pathway experience to date to work more effectively across the pathways? Can you provide examples of best practice and/or blockages on specific pathways? How can we work to share**

**these examples across England and Wales and ensure that they are disseminated?**

Roughly one third addressed this question. Responses supported the need to work across the pathways working and the need for packages of interventions. Many responses suggested an area of work which currently falls outside the current pathways which needed more focus (e.g. public protection).

“It is important that the MoJ can recognise and support programmes that work across, and go beyond, the pathways”- Third Sector Organisation

**\* Question 5b: How can partnerships and joint commissioning support Regional Offender Managers in commissioning services across pathways and maximise the reduction in reoffending? What cross cutting pathway opportunities require most development?**

Over half of the respondents addressed this question. A number thought it important for Regional Offender Managers needed to be better informed of the service available at a local level. Some responses identified particular pathways which needed developing or underpinned the work of other pathways. Pathways most often mentioned included alcohol and drugs, accommodation and children and families.

“The alcohol and drugs pathway is the one that offers the greatest scope for development from the police perspective.” – Police

“The major area requiring development is the provision of suitable accommodation as a basis for attending college/training/

obtaining employment.” – Probation  
 “The pathways that require most development are children and families (which tend to be seen as a prison issue).” – Probation

**Question 5c: How can we support offender managers to better coordinate delivery of interventions across pathways?**

Over a quarter responded to this question. Several responses emphasized the need for better communication between Offender Managers and providers of interventions and activities for offenders. Others emphasized the importance of continuing to improve the quality of the Offender Assessment System.

“Make them better informed. Very often, offender managers do not know who to talk to, to access services within pathways” -Third Sector Organisation

**Question 5d: Have we articulated well enough how reducing reoffending will help non-criminal justice partners achieve their own ‘home’ targets? If the answer is ‘no’, what message should we be communicating with partners such as:**

- Health
- Education, training and employment
- Accommodation
- Social care services
- Third sector agencies

Over one third of respondents answered this question. The majority stated that the National Offender Management Service had not articulated well enough how reducing reoffending would help non-criminal justice partners achieve their own ‘home targets’. A few responders believed, however, that the message had been articulated well enough.

A majority thought that allowing Third Sector Organisations to secure funding and be involved in joint commissioning would help extend services to reduce reoffending.

“As public spending tightens, a clear financial case will need to be made for carrying out work on this agenda.” – Third Sector Organisation

A few respondents wrote at length about the need to do more to address the **mental health needs** of offenders. Community-based mental health services, more mental health awareness training for practitioners, and better connections to mental health professionals were important in improving services for these offenders. It was felt that easier registration with GP’s would assist with this.

## Chapter 6: NOMS reforms: supporting Reducing Reoffending

**Question 6a: How might the opportunities created by the NOMS reform programme be used by local partners to help them achieve a reduction in the volume and severity of reoffending?**

Roughly one quarter responded to this. Responses were mixed. A number thought that the extension of the Offender Management Model would assist local partners to reduce re-offending. A number also felt that commissioning would help drive a reduction in reoffending.

**\*Question 6b: How can we support Probation Areas / Trusts and other commissioners to develop local, joint-commissioning, and partnership arrangements to reduce reoffending and serious reoffending?**

Roughly half of all respondents replied. A significant number pointed out the need for Probation Areas/Trusts to have enough freedom to be able to be creative and innovative. A couple of responses also pointed to the need to have shared targets and flexible budgets. A small number of respondents felt strongly that there were insufficient financial resources to deliver key services.

“Ensure that budgets can be flexible. While more money would always be welcome, what is meant here is that there are no obstacles to available money being allocated jointly where there could be joint benefits.”- Other

**Question 6c: What lessons can we learn from the roll-out of the Offender Management Model to date? What are the successes and what are the remaining challenges in promoting end-to-end offender management?**

Roughly a quarter of responses answered this question. Of these, roughly equal numbers identified one of two challenges i) the need to roll out Offender Management more widely ii) the fact that Offender Management does not pick up those offenders who are not subject to statutory supervision (e.g. those sentenced to under 12 months in custody).

**Question 6d: To be effective, commissioning needs to be based upon knowledge of needs and priorities. How best should this be done:**

- i) at the regional level
- ii) at the local level?

Roughly one third of respondents addressed this question. The majority

emphasized that commissioning needed to be based on a proper analysis of the needs of offenders in an area. It was thought that this could be done by the Offender Assessment Systems. The importance of Commissioning locally was also highlighted.

“It would be best based on Offender Assessment System data analysis, there could be similar needs across areas in a region which would support a regional approach” –Probation.

**Question 6e: How do we make sure that the local commissioning role complements the joint-commissioning decisions on skills, employment and health?**

Roughly one quarter of respondents addressed this. The majority highlighted the need for good communication channels between commissioning bodies. The importance of ensuring Third Sector Organisations are involved was also highlighted.

## Chapter 7: Measuring Success

**\* Question 7a: What challenges and opportunities might the new targets provide:**

- i) at the national level – with a volume and severity target
- ii) at the probation area level
- iii) at the LAA level

Just under two thirds replied. The majority felt the new target would provide more meaningful data about reoffending. A large number of them identified the need for a common definition of likelihood of reoffending and risk of harm to the public. Some responses also highlighted the

need to align national and local data; and one expressed concern about the short three month timeframe of the local measures.

*“At the national level the new targets with regard to volume and severity should enable more meaningful data in relation to the size and seriousness of the problem of reoffending, this will also provide for a more consistent approach.” -Police*

**Question 7b: Do you have a sense from your own work about what level of reduction in reoffending could be achieved in your area? What information would you need locally to help set an ambition for local reduction? What level of reduction do you think could be achieved in your area with current resources?**

There was a limited response to this question (just over a quarter of respondents). Most felt it was difficult to estimating the level of reduction.

**Question 7c: How could balanced scorecards support delivery by partnerships in the regions and Wales?**

Around one eighth responded to this. A considerable proportion identified the need to establish what we mean by success. A number of responses identified the need to use Offender Assessment System to assess offender needs in each region. A number of responses also highlighted the need to focus resources on offenders with a high likelihood of reoffending.

**Question 7d: What other metrics are relevant to measuring success, particularly among those partners who are key to delivery? Consider how we might assess the value for money of**

**interventions and how measurements could become more outcome-oriented.**

There was a limited response to this question – just over one quarter of responses. They highlighted the need to identify the numbers of offenders in suitable accommodation/employment. One respondent said it was important to understand the costs of reoffending to other services, for example health. A couple of responses referred to the benefit the new metrics could provide in indicating ‘distance travelled’ with offenders. One respondent highlighted the need to record outcomes such as registration with a GP; treatment for mental health problems; and reduced levels of substance misuse.

**Question 7e: How good are we at assessing and measuring our success in managing offenders who pose a high risk of harm to the public? Aside from actually monitoring the volume of serious re-offences, in what other ways can progress in this field be measured?**

Just over one quarter of respondents addressed this. The majority pointed out the need to establish a common definition of success. A significant number highlighted the need to concentrate resources on offenders who pose a high risk of harm to the public.

“London Probation has ‘proxy measures’ which contribute to measuring success... the challenge now is to pull this information into a quality improvement programme.” –Probation

**Question 7f: There is a general consensus that a substantial reduction in reoffending cannot be achieved by any one agency working alone: we need**

**to work in partnership. However, what does partnership working to reduce reoffending actually mean in practice, and how do we measure its success? What information do we currently have and what do we require?**

Just over one third of responded to this question. There was emphasis on the need for joined-up working and appropriate funding which encourages this. A number of output orientated ways of measuring success were mentioned including how many people completed an intervention; how many people progressed to other interventions; the time lapse between interventions; and accreditations achieved.

**Question 7g: We gather a lot of data from various sources. What realistic and achievable steps would you like to see the Ministry of Justice in general, and NOMS in particular, take to ensure that we are making the best use of this information? What data would be most useful for delivery?**

Roughly one third of responses addressed this question. The vast majority emphasised the need for widespread publication of data about offenders. It was also suggested that more evidenced based research on what worked with different offender groups would be useful.

**Chapter 8: Prioritisation**

**\* Question 8a: How can we ensure that resources follow risk (of harm) whilst focusing on those who have a high likelihood of reoffending, particularly those repeat offenders who are not classified under the PPO scheme? How can limited resources best be used to achieve this?**

Over half of the respondents addressed this question. Groups that were thought to need prioritizing included offenders with mental health needs, prolific offenders not covered by Prolific and Priority Offender status, offenders at risk of becoming Prolific and Priority Offender's, and offenders sentenced to under 12 months in custody. One respondent pointed out that the highest risk offenders were not always the most treatable. Some felt that resources would need to be re-allocated to better fit the new metrics.

Some respondents wanted more clarity about what was meant by 'risk' and 'severity'. One suggested that the Probation Inspectorate had a role to play in this, commenting that its overarching expertise in systems for identifying risk of harm and for systems of managing offenders was second to none and should be exploited to the full.

**Question 8b: Are there particular sub-groups of short-term offenders that should be targeted e.g. PPOs? If so, what resources, approaches and evidence do we already have in place to address their needs that we can build on?**

One third of respondents addressed this question. Of these, respondents identified short term offenders, Prolific and Priority Offenders and young adult offenders as groups to be specifically targeted. A significant number of responses suggested that better sharing and provision of data would help.

**Question 8c: How, generally, can we best meet the reducing reoffending needs of short-term prisoners acknowledging resource constraints?**

Just over one third of respondents addressed this question. A significant number of responses emphasized the need to commission Third Sector Organisations to provide support (i.e. housing, education etc) to short term prisoners upon leaving prison. The importance of mentoring and the resource intensive nature of early intervention was also pointed out. It was noted that, generally, service users report a lack of consistency as they move through the Criminal Justice System.

**Question 8d: How can we balance the need to prioritise offenders based on risk, need and value for money grounds, whilst ensuring that other groups are not unfairly de-prioritised e.g. women?**

Just over one quarter of responses addressed this question. A significant number of responses highlighted the need for early intervention as soon as problems are picked up. Mainstream community provision was seen as useful for low risk/need offenders. One respondent emphasized that for all offenders but particularly for women their risk of harm to self and others should be assessed alongside risk of reconviction.

## Chapter 9: Youth Reoffending

**\* Question 9a: What challenges do the next few years present for both the adult and youth estates, and how can we maximise joint working to achieve our shared goals? What existing learning about best practice can we draw on?**

Roughly half of the respondents addressed this question, the majority of whom identified a need for effective links between the adult and youth estates. A significant number also highlighted the importance of mentoring. Others emphasized the need

for learning about each others work and sharing of best practice.

*“Need to have organisations to work together to identify the needs of a young person. Sharing information, more health engagement.”* – Feedback from the North East Regional Event.

“It was clear that there are a number of areas where colleagues would benefit from learning more about each others’ work and sharing a single terminology.” – Feedback from the South East Regional Event

**Question 9b: How can we support those young people who move from the youth to the adult estate? What are the factors that can enable young people to make this transition successfully, so they are more likely to comply with and benefit from an adult order?**

Just over one quarter of respondents responded to this question. A significant number identified the need for young adult offenders to qualify for benefits, as this would help to support them financially in the community. A significant number also highlighted the need for a multi-agency approach.

**Question 9c: How can delivery partners involved with adult offenders e.g. probation areas, do more to promote the welfare of children and young people and their families? Is there scope for more joined-up work around existing parenting and family oriented interventions delivered by Youth Offending Teams and their partners? Or in greater responsiveness to domestic violence, linking in with social care services and health?**

Just over one third answered this question. A majority emphasised the importance of working with families, in particular parents (of offenders and those offenders who are parents). A large number of people also highlighted the need for services that provide assistance to children and young people to have a greater role in reducing reoffending.

## 7 Annex B – List of respondents

### Third Sector Organisations (33)

Anawim  
 Cardigan House Voluntary Approved Premises  
 Clear Springs Management  
 CLINKS  
 Coastline Housing  
 Crime Concern  
 Fawcett Society  
 Foundation Housing  
 IMPACT  
 Lankelly Chase Foundation  
 Lucy Faithful Foundation  
 National Institute of Adult Continuing Education  
 Openingdoors  
 Partners of Prisoners and Families Support Group (POPS)  
 Penrose Housing Estate  
 Princes Trust  
 Priory Secure Services  
 Prisoners Abroad  
 Quaker Peace and Social Witness, Crime, Community and Justice  
 Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners Trust  
 Respect Counselling and Mentoring Project  
 Revolving Doors Agency  
 Ripon House Approved Premises for Women.  
 Safe Ground  
 Senior Research Associate, The Young Foundation  
 SOVA  
 SPERG Supporting People Eastern Region Group  
 Stepping Stones Trust  
 Thames Valley Partnership  
 Turning Point.  
 Venture Wales LTD  
 Women's Resource Centre  
 Young Foundation

### Probation (9)

Cheshire Probation Area  
 Gloucestershire Probation

Hertfordshire Probation Area  
 London Probation  
 National Probation Service County Durham  
 Probation North West Regional Board  
 North Wales Probation Area  
 The Probation Boards' Association  
 West Yorkshire Probation Board

### Prison (2)

HMP Lincoln  
 Interventions Programme Manager, PS Plus

### Police (5)

Northumbria Police  
 North Wales Police  
 Nottinghamshire Police  
 Territorial Policing, Metropolitan Police  
 West Midlands Police

### Local Government Organisations (9)

Director Community Safety and Environment  
 Leicestershire Safer Communities Partnership  
 LGA Policy Consultant – Safer Communities  
 North Wales Community Safety Partnerships  
 Northampton Borough Council  
 Northamptonshire Local Area Agreement Partnership  
 Children's Services and Learning  
 Southampton City Council  
 Westminster City Council  
 Wigan Community Safety Executive/ CDRP

### Criminal Justice System Organisations (5)

Chief Inspector, Criminal Justice Department  
 Magistrate, Solihull Bench  
 Thames Valley Criminal Justice Board  
 The Magistrates Association.  
 Criminal Justice Manager at County Durham DAAT

#### **Private Sector Organisations (4)**

Restorative Solutions CIC  
Group 4 Securicor (G4S)  
Reliance Secure Task Management  
SERCO

#### **Academics (4)**

Academic LSE  
NEON, European Institute of Social  
Services, University of Kent  
Policy Support, British Psychological  
society  
Professor of Criminology, University of  
Leicester

#### **Health (1)**

Velindre NHS Trust

#### **Other (5)**

Audit Commission  
Cleveland Fire Brigade  
Graham Allen MP  
Public and Commercial Services Union  
(PCS) Trade Union  
Private Citizen JP

#### **Feedback from Consultation Events (11)**

East Midlands event  
East of England event  
London Event  
National event  
North East Event  
North West Event  
South East Regional Event  
South West event  
Wales events  
West Midlands Event  
Yorkshire & Humberside event



© Crown copyright  
Produced by the Ministry of Justice  
Alternative format versions of this report are available on request from:

**Tina Markose**

**Ministry of Justice**  
**4th Floor Fry, 2 Marsham Street**  
**London SW1P 4DF**  
**Telephone: 020 7035 0360**  
**Email: [tina.markose@justice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:tina.markose@justice.gsi.gov.uk)**

**Designed by**  
**CREATIVE SERVICES 2MS**