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Introduction

The National Offender Management Service (NOMS) was created as an executive agency of the Ministry of Justice in April 2008 with the goal of helping prison and probation services work together to manage offenders through their sentences.

The National Offender Management Service Annual Report and Accounts for 2011/12 was published on 11 July 2012. Section 2 of the report provided a summary of the Agency’s performance against its headline indicators for 2011/12. The current document provides additional information on the national outturns against these and other indicators, showing, where available, comparisons with previous years and performance by prison function.

The majority of national key performance indicators (KPIs) were removed for the year 2011/12. Local targets have been aggregated for comparison at the national level where appropriate for comparison purposes. This has been highlighted for each data collection to which it applies. Following the restructure of NOMS, probation service data is no longer split by region and so is only shown at the national level.
Public protection

Public protection is core to successful and effective delivery of offender management. In managing offenders in the community, NOMS has the protection of the public, including victims, children and vulnerable adults, as an overriding aim in all its activity. For prisons the primary aim in protecting the public is to prevent escapes from custody.

Escapes

A prisoner escapes from prison if they unlawfully gain their liberty by breaching the secure perimeter of a closed prison, i.e. the outside wall or boundary of the prison. A prisoner escapes from escort when they are able to pass beyond the control of a security escort. In the case of escapes from prison this may involve overcoming physical security restraints such as a wall or fence; locks, bolts or bars; in the case of escape from escort this may involve overcoming a secure vehicle; handcuffs; or the direct supervision of a security escort. A Category A escape occurs where the prisoner escaping has been categorised to category A. Category A prisoners are those whose escape would be highly dangerous to the public or the police or the security of the State and for whom the aim must be to make escape impossible.

Category A escapes

Target: To ensure no escapes of Category A prisoners in 2011/12

Result: 1 Category A escape

Figure 1 shows that this is the first Category A escape since 1995/96.
Escapes from prisons and prison escorts

The target for the rate of escape (escapes as a percentage of prison population) was removed for 2011/12. Data was still collected for management information purposes. The rate of escapes from prisons and prison escorts for 2011/12 was 0.005%.

Figure 2 shows the rate of escapes since 2008/09.

**Figure 2: Percentage rate of escapes from prisons and prison escorts**

![Graph showing percentage rate of escapes from prisons and prison escorts from 2008/09 to 2011/12.](image-url)
Escapes from contractor escorts

The target for the rate of escapes from contractor escorts was removed in 2011/12. Data was still collected for management information purposes. The rate of escapes for 2011/12 was 1 in 72,510 prisoner journeys.

Figure 3 illustrates that the rate of escapes from contracted prisoner escorts increased in 2011/12, from 1 in 99,577 journeys in 2010/11 to 1 in 72,510 journeys in 2011/12. This is remains better than the 1 escape every 67,688 journeys from 2008/09.

**Figure 3: Rate of escapes from contractor escorts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>YTD Ratio of Contractor Escort Escapes</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>1:68,688</td>
<td>1:20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>1:97,799</td>
<td>1:20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>1:99,577</td>
<td>1:20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>1:72,510</td>
<td>1:20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data for rates of escapes from contractor escorts has only been available since 2008/09.

Figure 4 and Table 1 show that there were two escapes from prison escorts and two escapes from prison during 2011/12. One prisoner escort escape was a prisoner held in a male category B prison, and the other was a prisoner held in a male category C prison. Both prison escapes were from the male YOI estate.
Table 1: Number of escapes from prisons and prison escorts by prison function 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function name</th>
<th>Escapes from prison escorts</th>
<th>Escapes from prisons</th>
<th>Escapes total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male category B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male category C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male dispersal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female closed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female local</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female open</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male closed YOI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male YOI - Young People</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male local</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open YOI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi open</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Absconds

An abscond is an escape that does not involve overcoming a physical security restraint such as that provided by a wall or fence, locks, bolts or bars, a secure vehicle, handcuffs, or the direct supervision of staff.

Figure 5 shows that the overall number of absconds decreased in 2011/12 compared to 2010/11, although there were increases in the open sites of Female Open, Male local, Semi Open and Cluster sites.

Figure 5: Number of absconds by prison function 2011/12

*Function groups male local, male category B, C and Cluster include open sites in which absconds were recorded. Absconds recorded in these functions were predominantly from the open element of the establishments concerned.*
### Table 2: Number of absconds by prison function 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function name</th>
<th>Absconds (2010/11)</th>
<th>Absconds (2011/12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male category B*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male category C*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male dispersal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female closed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female local</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female open</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male closed YOI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male YOI - Young People</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male local</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open YOI</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi open</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escort Areas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>240</strong></td>
<td><strong>179</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Function groups male local, male category B, C and Cluster include open sites in which absconds were recorded. Absconds recorded in these functions were predominantly from the open element of the establishments concerned.*
Offending behaviour programmes (OBPs)

NOMS currently offers a suite of offending behaviour programmes for sex offenders, violent offenders, substance misusers and general offenders. These programmes are designed to reduce re-offending by helping offenders to learn new skills that improve the way in which they think and solve problems; help them cope with pressures; consider the consequences of their actions; see things from the perspective of others; and to act less impulsively. These are some of the most common characteristics of offenders and accredited programmes are a good way of tackling them. The programmes, which are fully or provisionally accredited by the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel (CSAP), are facilitated by specially trained staff that follow a well documented structure but are encouraged to be responsive to the individual needs of the participants.

Appropriate OBP starts in the community

This indicator was introduced in 2008/09 in order to ensure that offenders in the community who required an accredited OBP were placed on the specific programme that best addressed their offending behaviour. The target element was removed for the year 2011/12, but data collection continued for management information purposes.

Note: This indicator excludes sex offender treatment programmes and domestic violence programmes because the specific risk assessments required for these programmes are not consistently available on central databases.

Figure 6: Percentage of appropriate OBP starts in the community in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11

OBP completion rates in the community

The OBP completion rate target was removed for 2011/12. Data was still collected for management information purposes.
OBP completions in custody and community

These outturns exclude Sex Offender Treatment Programmes (SOTP) in custody and the community, Drug Treatment Programmes (DTP) in custody and Domestic Violence (DV) programmes in the community, which are subject to separate measurement and are covered subsequently.

Figure 8 shows the annual number of OBP completions in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11. Against this background the number of SOTP programme completions has increased over the same period. (Further details are provided in subsequent sections of this document).
Figure 8: Number of offending behaviour programme completions in custody and in the community

Figure 9 shows that the number of community OBP completions decreased in 2011/12 compared to 2010/11 and 2009/10.

Figure 9: Number of national community OBP completions in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11
Table 3: Number of OBP completions against local aggregated target for each reporting year 2009/10 to 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>Aggregated Local Target</th>
<th>OBP Completions</th>
<th>Percentage of target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>12754</td>
<td>13058</td>
<td>102.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>11286</td>
<td>9696</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>8333</td>
<td>8311</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual targets were set at trust level. These targets have been aggregated to national level in the table above to provide an overall comparison against outcomes.

Figure 10: Number of OBP completions in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11 by prison function

Figure 10 shows that for the majority of function groups the number of OBP completions remained fairly consistent in 2011/12 compared with 2010/11, with rises in the Male Category C estate, Male dispersals, Female local and Male YOI - Young People establishments and drops in Male Local, Male Closed YOI and Male Category B estate. There was a small drop in completions overall.

Table 4 shows the actual number of OBP completions compared to target by function group for 2011/12
Table 4: Number of OBP completions by prison function 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function name</th>
<th>Aggregated* Annual target</th>
<th>OBP completions</th>
<th>Percentage of aggregated* targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male category B</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>114%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male category C</td>
<td>2,939</td>
<td>2,874</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male dispersal</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female closed</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female local</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female open</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male closed YOI</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male YOI - Young People</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>132%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male local YOI YOI</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open YOI</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi open YOI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster YOI</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregated* Totals</td>
<td>7,078</td>
<td>7,185</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual targets were set at establishment level. These targets have been aggregated to function group and national level in the table above to provide an overall comparison against outcomes.

Domestic violence programme completions in the community

Domestic violence is any incident of threatening behaviour, violence or abuse between adults who are or have been in a relationship together, or between family members, regardless of gender or sexuality.

NOMS accredited programmes for domestic violence are programmes targeted at men who are or were in heterosexual relationships at the time the offence was committed. They aim to reduce aggressive behaviour through teaching social skills, emotional management techniques and challenging attitudes and beliefs to help change behaviour.

Domestic violence (DV) programmes are run both in custody and the community. Whereas community DV completions are counted as a distinct indicator, DV programmes in custody are counted within the total number of Offending Behaviour Programmes in custody.

Domestic violence programme completion rates (community)

The target for domestic violence completion rates in the community was removed for 2011/12. Data was still collected for management information.
Figure 11: National Domestic Violence programme completion rate in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11.
Domestic violence programme completion volumes

The number of domestic violence programmes in the community has dropped slightly from 2010/11 to 2011/12, but remains above the levels of 2009/10.

Figure 12: Number of community domestic violence programme completions in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11

Table 5: Number of domestic violence programme completions against aggregated local targets for each reporting year 2009/10 to 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>Aggregated Local Target</th>
<th>DV Completions</th>
<th>Percentage of target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>2889</td>
<td>3190</td>
<td>110.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>3356</td>
<td>3841</td>
<td>114.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>3084</td>
<td>3443</td>
<td>111.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual targets were set at trust level. These targets have been aggregated to national level in the table above to provide an overall comparison against outcomes.

Community SOTP completion rates

The SOTP completion rate target was removed for the year 2011/12. Data was still collected for management information purposes.

Figure 13 shows that completion rates marginally increased at the national level in 2011/12 from 2010/11.
Figure 13: SOTP Completion rates in the community in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/2011

Sex offender treatment programme (SOTP) completions volume in custody and community

Sex offender treatment programmes aim to reduce offending by adult male sex offenders. A range of programmes are available to meet the level of risk and need of the offender.

As illustrated by Figure 14, the overall number of SOTPs delivered by NOMS rose in 2011/12 compared to the previous two years.

Figure 14: Number of sex offender treatment programme completions in custody and the community
Figure 15: Number of sex offender treatment programme completions in 2011/12 compared to 2010/11 by prison function

![Bar chart showing sex offender treatment programme completions by prison function in 2011/12 compared to 2010/11](image)

Table 6: Number of sex offender treatment programme completions by prison function 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function name</th>
<th>Aggregated* annual target</th>
<th>SOTP completions</th>
<th>Percentage of aggregated* targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male category B</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male category C</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male dispersal</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>106%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female closed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female local</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female open</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male closed YOI</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male YOI - Young People</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male local</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>106%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open YOI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi open</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*<em>Aggregated</em> Totals:**</td>
<td><strong>1129</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,184</strong></td>
<td><strong>104.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual targets were set at establishment level. These targets have been aggregated to function group and national level to provide an overall comparison against outcomes in the table above.
SOTP Completions in the Community

Sex offender treatment programme completions increased in 2011/12 compared to 2010/11 (Figure 16 and Table 7).

Figure 16: SOTP completions in the Community for 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11

Table 7: Number of SOTP completions against aggregated local targets for each reporting year from 2009/10 to 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>Aggregated Local Target</th>
<th>SOTP Compleitions</th>
<th>Percentage of target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>112.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>112.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>113.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual targets were set at trust level. These targets have been aggregated to national level in the table above to provide an overall comparison against outcomes.
Drug strategy

From April 2011, the Department of Health assumed responsibility for funding all drug treatment in custody and the community. NOMS is working closely with the Department of Health and other partners to move towards a fully integrated recovery focused system that supports continuity of treatment across custody and community. Drug recovery is more likely to succeed in prison if prisoners have fewer opportunities to take drugs while they are in prison.

This section provides information on addressing drug misuse in the community and custody.

Random Mandatory Drug Testing

NOMS has a comprehensive range of measures to reduce the supply of drugs into prisons including the random Mandatory Drug Testing (RMDT) programme which is the best available measure of the prevalence of drugs misuse in prisons. The target for Random Mandatory Drug Testing was removed in the year 2011/12. Data was still collected for management information purposes.

The level of drug misuse in prisons is measured by the Random Mandatory Drug Testing programme (RMDT). The aim of RMDT is to test a random sample of 5 per cent or 10 per cent of prisoners each month (depending on prison capacity) and to monitor and deter drug-misuse. Failing a random mandatory drug test is a disciplinary offence that may lead to days being added to the sentence. RMDT can also act as a useful trigger for referring into treatment individuals who fail tests.

Figure 17 shows a fall in the positive rate of RMDTs between 2009/10 and 2011/12 from 7.8 percent to 7.0 per cent.
The percentage of positive random mandatory drug tests fell slightly between 2011/12 and 2010/11 for nine out of 13 prison functions (see Figure 18), whilst it increased in four out of the 13 functions. The rates of positive tests for each prison function in 2011/12 are set out in Table 8.
### Table 8: Rate of positive RMDT by prison function 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function name</th>
<th>No. of mandatory drug tests</th>
<th>No. of positive results</th>
<th>Percentage of positive tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male category B</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male category C</td>
<td>18,572</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male dispersal</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female closed</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female local</td>
<td>2,274</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female open</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male closed YOI</td>
<td>3,624</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male YOI - Young People</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male local</td>
<td>21,807</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open</td>
<td>2,195</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open YOI</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi open</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>3,511</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,448</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,230</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual targets were set at establishment level. These targets have been aggregated to function group and national level in the table above to provide an overall comparison against outcomes.

### Drug rehabilitation requirement (DRR)

The drug rehabilitation requirement (DRR), available as part of a Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order, is the primary means for sentenced offenders to address identified drug misuse within community sentencing.

The DRR is an intensive vehicle for tackling the drug misuse and offending of many of the most serious and persistent drug misusing offenders. DRRs involve treatment, regular testing and court reviews of progress and are subject to rigorous enforcement.

DRRs aim to help offenders produce personal action plans that identify what they must do to stop their use of drugs and offending behaviour. They help offenders to identify realistic ways of changing their lives for the better; develop their victim awareness; and provide a credible and well-enforced option for the courts.

The requirement can last between six months and three years as part of a Community Order and six months and two years when part of a Suspended Sentence Order.
**DRR completion rate**

No target applied to the DRR completion rate performance indicator in 2011/12. Data was still collected for management information purposes.

Figure 19 shows the change in completion rates at the national level between 2009/10 and 2011/12. The completion rate in 2011/12 was 56.2%. A breakdown of the completion rates is provided in Table 13.

**Figure 19: DRR completion rate in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11**
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**Number of DRR completions**

The number of DRR completions decreased in 2011/12, as shown in Figure 20. This is in line with the decrease in the number of DRR starts since 2008\(^1\), which in turn is partly due to police initiatives which divert offenders from charge and a change in focus from commencements to maximising completion rates. Table 9 shows DRR completions compared to the aggregated targets for the three years 2009/10 to 2011/12.

---

\(^1\) Offender Management Caseload Statistics 2011 (Ministry of Justice)
Figure 20: Number of DRR completions in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11

Table 9: Number of national DRR completions against aggregated local targets for each reporting year 2009/10 to 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>Aggregated Local Target</th>
<th>DRR Completions</th>
<th>Percentage of target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>7014</td>
<td>9014</td>
<td>128.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>6837</td>
<td>8392</td>
<td>122.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>6853</td>
<td>7360</td>
<td>107.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual targets were set at trust level. These targets have been aggregated to national level in the table above to provide an overall comparison against outcomes.

Drug treatment programme completions in custody

There has been a fall in the number of drug treatment programme completions in custody from 7,319 in 2010/11 to 6,671 in 2011/12. Comparisons between the numbers starting and completing these programmes in 2010/11 and 2011/12 by prison function are shown in Figure 21 and Table 10.
Figure 21: Drug treatment starts and completions in 2011/12 compared to 2010/11 by prison function

Table 10: Drug treatment starts and completions in custody in 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function name</th>
<th>Drug treatment starts target</th>
<th>Drug treatment starts</th>
<th>Drug treatment completions target</th>
<th>Drug treatment completions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male category B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male category C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>1,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male dispersal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female closed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female local</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female open</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male closed YOI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male YOI - Young People</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male local</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,915</td>
<td>2,945</td>
<td>3,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open YOI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi open</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em><em>Aggregated</em> Totals:</em>*</td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,120</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,029</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,671</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Individual targets were set at establishment level. These targets have been aggregated to function group and national level in the table above to provide an overall comparison against outcomes.

Substance misuse programmes delivered in the community are contained within Offending Behaviour Programme Completions.
Alcohol treatment

The alcohol treatment requirement (ATR) is one of 12 requirements that may be applied to a Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order. It provides access to a tailored treatment programme with the aim of reducing or eliminating alcohol dependency and is targeted at offenders with the most serious alcohol misuse and offending who require intensive, specialist, care-planned treatment and integrated care involving a range of agencies.

The requirement can last between six months and three years as part of a Community Order and six months and two years when part of a Suspended Sentence Order.

ATR completion rate

The completion rate performance indicator for ATRs was not given a target in 2011/12. This data was still collected for management information purposes.

Figure 22 shows the completion rate decreased slightly from 74% in 2010/11 to 72% in 2011/12.

**Figure 22: ATR completion rate in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11**
Number of ATR completions

Figure 23 shows the number of national ATR completions in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11. Table 11 shows the number of ATR completions nationally compared to aggregated local targets.

**Figure 23: Number of ATR completions in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11**
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**Table 11: Number of national ATR completions against aggregated local targets for each reporting year 2009/10 to 2011/12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>Aggregated Local Target</th>
<th>ATR Completions</th>
<th>Percentage of target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>2680</td>
<td>5511</td>
<td>205.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>2963</td>
<td>5978</td>
<td>201.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>2941</td>
<td>5453</td>
<td>185.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual targets were set at trust level. These targets have been aggregated to national level in the table above to provide an overall comparison against outcomes.*
Community Payback (unpaid work)

Unpaid work is one of the 12 potential requirements of a Community or Suspended Sentence Order. It is primarily a punishment, but may also meet the sentencing purposes of reparation and rehabilitation. The unpaid work requirement is referred to and promoted to the public as Community Payback, because it enables offenders to pay back to the community for their crimes. Community Payback can also provide a more structured lifestyle and opportunities to develop employment related skills, which may reduce the risk of re-offending. As well as providing an effective punishment, Community Payback is also able to provide significant benefits to local communities. During 2011/12 approximately 8.3 million hours of work were done by offenders. Calculated at the National Minimum Wage the value of this work exceeds £50 million.

Members of the public are encouraged to nominate Community Payback work projects. During 2011/12 about 1,000 work projects for offenders were nominated each month by members of the public.

The Green Paper *Breaking the cycle: effective punishment, rehabilitation and sentencing of offenders*, made proposals to develop Community Payback which have been confirmed by the Government. Community Payback will become more intensive, with the working hours of unemployed offenders replicating those of a normal working week. Community Payback sentences will also commence more rapidly following sentence.

**Community payback completion rates**

The target for community payback completion rates was removed in 2011/12. Data was still collected for management information purposes.

Figure 24 illustrates that the completion rate has increases lightly over the past three years.
Figure 24: Community payback completion rates 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11

Community payback completion volumes

Figure 25 shows that the volume of national community payback completions decreased each year between 2009/10 and 2011/12. Table 12 shows the number of unpaid work completions compared to local aggregated targets for 2011/12.

Figure 25: Number of community payback completions 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2011/12
Table 12: Number of national community payback completions against aggregated local target for each reporting year 2009/10 to 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>Aggregated Local Target</th>
<th>Community Payback Completions</th>
<th>Percentage of target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>53036</td>
<td>67783</td>
<td>127.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>55851</td>
<td>67611</td>
<td>121.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>58935</td>
<td>65587</td>
<td>111.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual targets were set at trust level. These targets have been aggregated to national level in the table above to provide an overall comparison against outcomes.

Community payback stand-downs

A stand-down is when an offender is instructed in advance not to report for work, or when ready and willing offenders are sent home after reporting for work due to operational difficulties in the probation trust (e.g. insufficient supervisor coverage, lack of transport, or work availability).

The target for this indicator was removed in 2011/12. Data was still collected for management information purposes.

The proportion of days lost dropped slightly in 2011/12 to 0.7% from 0.8% in 2010/11.

Figure 26: Proportion of community payback offender days lost because of stand-downs in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11
Compliance and enforcement

The probation service has made progress in increasing offender compliance and ensuring that timely enforcement action is taken where offenders fail to abide by the requirements of their sentence. Seventy-six percent of orders and licences were successfully completed in 2011/12, while 71 per cent of breaches were resolved within 25 working days.

Orders and licences successfully completed

This is an indicator of offender compliance which measures orders and licences at their point of termination. It shows the proportion of these that have terminated successfully, i.e. which have run their full course without being revoked for breach or a further offence or which have been revoked early for good progress.

The target for orders and licences successfully completed was removed in 2011/12. Data was still collected for management information purposes. Seventy-six percent of orders and licences were successfully completed in 2011/12.

Resolution of breaches of community penalties

This collection of enforcement data measures the timeliness of agencies in dealing with breaches of community penalties. It is an ‘end-to-end’ measure, i.e. from the point of the offender’s alleged failure to comply (the breach) to the point at which the case is resolved by the decision of the court in respect of the allegation of breach.

The target was removed in 2011/12. Data was still collected for management information purposes.
Figure 28 shows that the national percentage of breaches resolved within 25 days increased to 71% in 2011/12 from 70% in 2010/11.

**Figure 28: Percentage of breaches resolved within 25 working days**

Enforcement: initiation of breach action by the probation service

Where an offender fails to comply with the terms of their sentence in the community, National Standards for the Management of Offenders require the probation service to take appropriate and timely breach action. Enforcement can be an effective tool in ensuring compliance on the part of the offender and is essential to public confidence.

To meet the standard the probation service must take breach action on or before a second unacceptable failure with an order (on or before a third unacceptable failure to comply with a licence) and this action should be initiated within 10 working days of the relevant failure to comply.

The target for enforcement was removed in 2011/12. Data was still collected for management information purposes. In 2011/12, 94.9% of breaches were initiated within 10 working days.
Figure 29: Percentage of breach action initiated within 10 working days in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11
Employment

Lack of employment is one of the factors associated with re-offending. Many offenders have a very poor experience of education and no experience of stable employment. The joint employment measure includes prisoners released from custody from sentences of less than 12 months and offenders at the end of their supervision on an order or licence by the probation service.

The joint probation and prison target for employment was removed for 2011/12. Data still collected for management information purposes.

Figure 30 shows the outturn at national level for probation, prisons (including High Security estate) and jointly across NOMS.

**Figure 30: Percentage of offenders in employment at end of sentence in 2011/12**

**Employment on release**

This indicator covers all discharges from custody (sentences of less than 12 months and sentences of 12 months and over). Figure 31 shows that 9 out of 13 function groups have increased their rate of employment upon release compared to last year, whereas 3 out of the 13 decreased.
Figure 31: Percentage of prisoners entering employment upon release in 2011/12 compared with 2009/10 and 2010/11 by prison function

![Graph showing percentage of prisoners entering employment upon release in 2011/12 compared with 2009/10 and 2010/11 by prison function.](image)

Table 13: Percentage of prisoners entering employment upon release in 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function name</th>
<th>Annual target</th>
<th>% Employment Outcomes</th>
<th>Percentage of target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male category B</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>146%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male category C</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>124%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male dispersal</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female closed</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female local</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>119%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female open</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>113%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male closed YOI</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>118%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male YOI - Young People</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>166%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male local</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>116%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>125%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open YOI</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi open</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>244%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Totals:</td>
<td>22.4*</td>
<td>26.59</td>
<td>119%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual targets were set at establishment level. These targets have been aggregated to function group and national level in the table above to provide an overall comparison against outcomes.

Employment at termination of order/licence

The national target for employment at termination of order/licence was removed for 2011/12. Data was still collected for management information purposes.

Figure 32 shows the percentage of offenders in employment at the end of their probation supervision on an order or licence in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11.
Figure 32: Percentage of offenders employed at termination of order/licence in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11

Sustained employment in the community

This indicator measures progress in supporting offenders into sustainable employment. The national target was removed in 2011/12. Data was still collected as management information.

Figure 33 compares the results for 2011/12 to those achieved in 2009/10 and 2010/11 at the national level. A breakdown of the 2011/12 results by region is shown in Table 14.

Figure 33: Number of offenders under probation supervision who found and sustained employment for 4 weeks or more in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11.
Table 14: Number of sustained employment outcomes against aggregated local targets for each reporting year 2009/10 to 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>Aggregated Local Target</th>
<th>Sustained Employment</th>
<th>Percentage of target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>14028</td>
<td>16913</td>
<td>120.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>14366</td>
<td>17769</td>
<td>123.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>14771</td>
<td>17149</td>
<td>116.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual targets were set at trust level. These targets have been aggregated to national level in the table above to provide an overall comparison against outcomes.
Accommodation

Getting offenders into accommodation is the foundation for successful rehabilitation, resettlement and risk management. It can provide the anchor for a previously chaotic life and act as a springboard for other crucial steps, such as getting and keeping a job, and accessing health care or drug treatment. NOMS aims to increase the number of offenders who have settled accommodation, either while being supervised in the community or to go to at the end of a custodial sentence.

The joint (prisons and probation) target was removed in 2011/12. Data collection to measure the percentage of offenders in settled or suitable accommodation at end of their sentence was maintained for management information purposes. This measure includes prisoners released from sentences of less than 12 months and offenders at the end of their supervision in the community.

Figure 34 provides the breakdown by region for probation and prisons (including the High Security prison estate) and NOMS agency totals.

**Figure 34: Percentage of offenders in settled or suitable accommodation at the end of their sentence in 2011/12 compared to 2010/11**

![Graph showing percentage of offenders in settled or suitable accommodation at the end of their sentence in 2011/12 compared to 2010/11.](image)
Accommodation on discharge from prison

This indicator covers all discharges from custody (sentences of less than 12 months and sentences of 12 months and over). Data on prisoners serving sentences of less than six months is based on prisoners’ self reporting of where they intend to live after release. Figure 35 shows the outturn by function in 2011/12 compared to 2010/11.

Figure 35: Percentage of prisoners in settled accommodation upon release in 2011/12 compared to 2010/11 by prison function

Table 15: Percentage of prisoners in settled accommodation upon release in 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function name</th>
<th>Annual target</th>
<th>% Settled Accommodation Outcomes</th>
<th>Percentage of target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male category B</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male category C</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male dispersal</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>125%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female closed</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female local</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female open</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>113%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male closed YOI</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male YOI - Young People</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male local</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open YOI</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi open</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>221%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>80.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>111%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual targets were set at establishment level. These targets have been aggregated to function group and national level in the table above to provide an overall comparison against outcomes.
Accommodation at termination of order/licence

The national target for accommodation at termination of order/licence was removed for 2011/12. Data was still collected for management information purposes.

The percentage of offenders in accommodation at the end of their order or licence saw a marginal increase in 2011/12 over 2010/11.

Figure 36: Percentage of offenders in accommodation at the end of their order or licence in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11
Education

Referrals to education provision in the community

Many offenders have a poor experience of education. The aim is to aid resettlement and enhance employability through skills and education.

The target for education referrals in the community was removed in 2011/12. Data still collected for management information purposes.

Figure 37 shows that the number of referrals to education providers decreased in 2011/12 compared to 2010/11.

Figure 37: Referrals to education providers in the community 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11.
Education and training on release

Securing a place in education or training, on release from prison, can support rehabilitation and reintegration.

Developing the skills and knowledge needed to enter the job market will improve offenders' employment prospects and may reduce the likelihood of re-offending.

The percentage of discharges to education and training increased in eight out of 13 prison functions, and decreased in five.

Figure 38: Percentage of prisoners with education or training places at the end of their sentence in 2011/12 compared to 2010/11
Table 16: Percentage of prisoners with Education and Training places at the end of sentence 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function Name</th>
<th>Annual Target</th>
<th>%Education and Training Outcomes</th>
<th>Percentage of Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male category B</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>226.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male category C</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>128.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male dispersal</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female closed</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>108.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female local</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>140.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female open</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>107.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male closed YOI</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>148.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male YOI - Young People</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>111.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male local</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>149.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>133.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open YOI</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>128.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi open</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>195.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>211.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregated Total</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>139.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual targets were set at establishment level. These targets have been aggregated to function group and national level in the table above to provide an overall comparison against outcomes.*
Safety and decency in custody

The self inflicted deaths and serious assaults data are published in the Safety in Custody Statistics, which is released quarterly. As a result the measures for serious assaults and self inflicted deaths are no longer included in the Management Information Addendum.

Overcrowding

Overcrowding is measured as the percentage of prisoners who, at unlock on the last day of the month, are held in a cell, cubicle or room where the number of occupants exceeds the uncrowded capacity of the cell, cubicle or room. This includes the number of prisoners held two to a single cell, three prisoners in a cell designed for one or two and any prisoners held overcrowded in larger cells or dormitories. For example, if 12 prisoners occupy a dormitory with an uncrowded capacity of ten, then the 12 prisoners are counted as overcrowded.

The target for overcrowding was removed in 2011/12. Data was still collected for management information purposes.

Figure 39 illustrates that the rate of overcrowding increased marginally to 24.1%\(^2\) in 2011/12 compared to 23.8% in 2010/11.

Figure 40 and Table 17 show that rates of overcrowding vary by prison function. They also demonstrate that the increase overall in 2011/12 is largely attributable the male closed YOI estate.

Figure 39: Percentage of prisoners overcrowded

\(^2\) The 2011/12 overcrowding figure of 24.1% is a revision to the 23.9% which originally appeared in the NOMS Annual Report 2011/12
Figure 40: Percentage of overcrowding in 2011/12 compared to 2010/11 by prison function

Table 17: Overcrowding 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function name</th>
<th>Overcrowding rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male category B</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male category C</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male dispersal</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female closed</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female local</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female open</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male closed YOI</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male YOI - Young People</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male local</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male open YOI</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi open</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Totals:</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Court reports

Timeliness of pre-sentence reports

In addition to supervising offenders in the community the probation service plays an important role in support of the courts by providing sentencers with the information they need for sentencing decisions. The vehicle for this information is the Pre-Sentence Report (PSR). The PSR is an assessment made prior to sentencing that takes into account the nature and seriousness of the offence, factors in the offender's background that led to the offence and the risk of further offending and/or risk of serious harm. In most cases the report includes a proposal on the offender’s suitability for different types of sentences.

In requesting a PSR the court will specify a particular timescale in which they wish to receive it. The probation service is measured against how successful they are in meeting these timescales.

The target for timeliness of pre-sentence reports was removed in 2011/12. Data was still collected for management information purposes.

Figure 41 shows that 98.6% of pre-sentence reports were provided within the timescale set by the court in 2011/12.

Figure 41: PSR Timeliness 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11
Staff: sickness absence and BME representation

Staff sickness in public prisons and the probation service

The indicator of staff sickness looks at the average number of working days lost through sickness absence. In 2009/10 and 2010/11 outturns for probation and public prisons were combined to report against the target for the Agency as a whole. The target was removed in 2011/12, but data still collated for management information purposes.

Staff sickness decreased at marginal levels in public prisons, probation service, and NOMS Agency.

Figure 42: Days lost due to sickness

Figure 43 sets out the distribution of average number of working days lost through sickness absence across prison operational areas in 2011/12 in comparison with the previous year. In six of the 13 operational areas, the average number of working days lost due to staff sickness decreased. Five of the operational areas saw an increase, whilst 2 remained at the same level of sick. Table 18 gives more detailed information on breakdown by operational area.
Figure 43: Average number of working days lost due to prison staff sickness in 2011/12 compared to 2010/11 by operational area

Table 18: Staff sickness in public prisons 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Area</th>
<th>Total sick days (annual)</th>
<th>No. of staff in post (monthly average)</th>
<th>Average number of working days lost due to staff sickness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>35,486</td>
<td>4,482</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>38,273</td>
<td>3,912</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Security</td>
<td>50,517</td>
<td>6,186</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>52,756</td>
<td>4,622</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent and Sussex</td>
<td>38,012</td>
<td>3,226</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>28,836</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>60,981</td>
<td>4,807</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMS HQ</td>
<td>20,829</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>28,328</td>
<td>2,847</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>30,596</td>
<td>3,418</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>8,835</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>32,241</td>
<td>3,418</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humberside</td>
<td>36,594</td>
<td>3,726</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>462,284</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,097</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual targets were set at establishment level. These targets have been aggregated to regional and national level in the table above to provide an overall comparison against outcomes.

In the probation service the average rate of staff sickness increased at the national level in 2011/12 compared to 2010/11. This was an increase of 0.02 working days lost.
Figure 44: Probation staff sickness absence in 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11.

Race equality

Race Equality: the proportion of BME staff in public prisons and probation

NOMS aims to have the same staffing mix as there is in the wider working population.

Technical Description

The representation rate is reported as the number of BME staff as a proportion of all staff with stated ethnicity. This applies only to directly employed staff.

Delivering and promoting equality are at the heart of NOMS’ vision and values. Whilst the NOMS target was removed for 2011/12, data was still collected for management information purposes.

Figure 45 shows the breakdown of BME staff in the NOMS Agency by percentage of BME staff in public prisons, BME Staff in Probation and NOMS Agency total against target.
Figure 46 sets out the operational breakdown of BME staff in prisons as a proportion of total workforce for 2011/12 in comparison to the previous year. There were relatively stable proportions of BME staff between 2011/12 and 2010/11. The West Midlands region saw a large decrease in the number of BME staff from a proportion of 7.4 in 2010/11 to 5.1 in 2011/12. This was a result of Birmingham prison moving to the private estate.

Figure 46: Percentage of BME staff in public prisons in 2011/12 compared to 2010/11 by operational area
### Table 19: BME staff in public prisons 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Area</th>
<th>Annual target</th>
<th>No. of BME staff (end of Mar 11)</th>
<th>Total declared BME workforce (end of Mar 11)</th>
<th>% of BME staff as a proportion of the workforce who declared ethnicity (end of Mar 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>3926</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>3523</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Security</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>5697</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>4185</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent and Sussex</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2865</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2326</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4256</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMS HQ</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>2276</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2570</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3056</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2639</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humberside</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>3467</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Totals:</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2,677</td>
<td>41,603</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual targets were set at establishment level. These targets have been aggregated to regional and national level in the table above to provide an overall comparison against outcomes.

Figure 47 shows that the percentage of probation staff recorded as BME remained at a stable level in 2011/12 compared to 2010/11.

Figure 47: BME staff in the probation service 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11

![Figure 47: BME staff in the probation service 2011/12 compared to 2009/10 and 2010/11](image)
Prisoners working in custody 2010/11 - 2011/12

The Government set out in the Breaking the Cycle: Punishment, Rehabilitation and Sentencing of Offenders (December 2010) their ambition to increase work in prisons.

The intention is to have more prisoners working and working longer hours in an ‘employment like’ atmosphere. The aim of this is threefold:

To ensure that prisoners are occupied in purposeful activity whilst in establishments

To enable us to make deductions for services that support victims of crime

To give offenders the opportunity to learn new skills and experience and support finding employment on release

NOMS are committed to working with businesses to significantly increase work activity undertaken by offenders in custody. One3One, the NOMS group with responsibility for working with governors to deliver this ambition recently launched their offer to business at a reception in Downing Street.

Table 20 provides management information on the number of prisoners undertaking specific work activities in public sector prisons in the years 2010/11 and 2011/12, and the total number of hours worked by offenders in these areas. These figures do not include other ‘internal’ work activity undertaken by offenders such as catering and cleaning.

Table 20: Prisoners working in Custody [1,2].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of prisoners working (3)</th>
<th>Prisoner hours in work (million) (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In 2010/11 prisons delivered around 10.6 million prisoner working hours which increased to over 11.4 million hours in 2011/12.

- Over the last two years the numbers of prisoners working increased from around 8,600 to around 9,000.
Notes

1. For the purposes of this report the following work activities have been included as work: Contract Services, Land Based Activities, Textiles, Laundry, Woodwork, Printing/DTP/Signs, Engineering, PICTA, Other/Concrete, Industrial Cleaning, Single Portions, Charity, Braille, Plastics and Newgate Furniture.

2. The data excludes activity such as cleaning and catering and work placements undertaken by offenders on release on temporary license.

3. The number of prisoners working refers to the number of offenders employed in the defined activities across the estate at a particular time and is not a cumulative figure.

4. The total hours worked figure is cumulative and is derived from total recorded hours spent by offenders in defined work areas over the year. Hours worked may differ from hours paid due to permitted interruptions to work.

5. This data is sourced from the regime monitoring systems used by each public sector prison to record the number of prisoners in each of their workshops and the hours worked each day. Further quality assurance and validation of these data is undertaken by One3One who are able to access a detailed breakdown to individual workshop level. All data is subject to verification and comparison to the forecasts provided by prisons at the beginning of the year in relation to their attendance and production targets.

6. Data has been drawn from administrative IT systems. Although care is taken when processing and analysing the data, the level of detail collected is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large-scale recording system.


Prisoners’ Earnings subject to the Prisoners’ Earnings Act levy

The Prisoners’ Earnings Act (PEA) commenced on 26th September 2011. It enables prison governors to impose a levy of up to and including 40% on wages over £20 per week (after tax, national insurance, any court ordered payments and any child support payments) of prisoners who have been assessed as being of low risk of absconding or re-offending and allowed to work outside of prison on temporary licence, in order to prepare for their eventual release.

The PEA provides that the amounts arising from the levy can be directed to four purposes; to prescribed voluntary organisations concerned with victim support or crime prevention; into the Consolidated Fund to contribute to the prisoner’s upkeep; to the prisoner’s dependants; or to an investment account held on the prisoner’s behalf. Ministers decided that all the funds generated by the imposition of the levy would be paid to voluntary organisations, and prescribed Victim Support for this purpose. It was agreed with Victim Support that this arrangement would remain in place for the first year the PEA was in force, i.e. until September 2012. The money is being used by Victim Support to provide direct, practical, paid for services such as emergency vouchers for food, enhanced home security and professional counselling.

Tables 21 and 22 provide management information from the first six months of prisoners’ earnings being subject to the PEA levy. They show the number of prisoners subject to the levy, the net earnings and amounts raised from the levy.

Table 21: Prisoners’ Earnings subject to the Prisoners’ Earnings Act 1996: October 2011 – March 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of active prisoners (1)</th>
<th>Total Net Earnings (Before levy) (2)</th>
<th>Total raised through Prisoners’ Earnings Act levy (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>£1,193,000</td>
<td>£383,724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22: Average Prisoners’ Earnings per month subject to the Prisoners’ Earnings Act 1996: October 2011 – March 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average number of active prisoners per month (1)</th>
<th>Average Net Earnings per prisoner per month (Before levy) (2)</th>
<th>Average raised per prisoner per month through Prisoners’ Earnings Act levy (3)</th>
<th>Average Net Earnings per prisoner per month (After levy) (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>£652</td>
<td>£210</td>
<td>£442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- By end of March 2012, nearly £384,000 had been raised from the imposition of the levy on prisoners’ earnings to be paid to Victim Support.

- During the six months to March 2012, there were a total of 602 active prisoners, on average 305 prisoners per month, working out of the prison on licence and subject to the Prisoners’ Earnings Act levy.

- These prisoners had average net earnings before the levy of around £652 a month, from which on average £210 was raised from the levy to reduce the average net earnings to £442 per month.

Notes

1. Active prisoners are those working out of the prison on licence and subject to the Prisoners’ Earnings Act levy. Prisoners may not have worked or been subject to the levy in every month so the monthly average of active prisoners is less than the total number of active prisoners during the period.

2. Net Earnings are after tax, national insurance, any court ordered payments and any child support payments. Prisoner earnings vary considerably depending on hourly rates and hours worked; therefore there will be large variations in the amount each prisoner contributes, depending on their earnings. For a prisoner working full time on the national minimum wage levies through the PEA would be approximately £65 a week or approximately £3000 per year.

3. The levy on prisoners’ earnings can be adjusted at an establishment level, for example, to account for additional costs the prisoner may incur such as travel costs, clothing for work, meals and maintaining family visits.
4. Information on Prisoners' Earnings is from the following establishments: Askham Grange, Blantyre House, Downview, Drake Hall, East Sutton Park, Ford, Grendon & Springhill, Hatfield, Hewell, Hollesley Bay, Huntercombe, Kirkham, Kirklevington Grange, Leyhill, North Sea Camp, Northallerton, Norwich, Prescoed, Reading, Send, Shrewsbury, Standford Hill, Styal, Sudbury, Thorn Cross, and Wymott.

5. Total Net Earnings have been rounded to nearest thousand pounds.

6. Data has been drawn from administrative IT systems. Although care is taken when processing and analysing the data, the level of detail collected is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large-scale recording system.
Annex: Technical Notes

This section provides further technical guidance on the performance indicators used in this report, covering the rationale for each indicator, the technical description, the data source and the calculation used.

Escapes

**Category A escapes**

**Rationale**

Escapes are monitored to analyse the frequency across the estate and identify any trends nationally, while taking into consideration the management of risk to the public.

**Technical description**

This is an escape by a prisoner who is classed as Category A on account of being highly dangerous to the public.

An escape is counted if (i) the prisoner is at liberty for 15 minutes or more before recapture or (ii) a prisoner escapes and is charged with another criminal offence.

**Calculation**

This indicator is a simple count of the number of Category A escapes.

**Data source**

Monthly data from prison establishments collated in central performance systems.

**Escapes from prisons and prison escorts**

**Rationale**

As above.

**Technical description**

A prisoner escapes from escort when they are able to pass beyond the control of escorting staff. This may involve overcoming physical security
restraints such as a wall or fence; locks, bolts or bars; a secure vehicle; handcuffs; or the direct supervision of escorting staff.

An escape is counted if (i) the prisoner is at liberty for 15 minutes or more before recapture or (ii) a prisoner escapes and is charged with another criminal offence.

**Calculation**

Rate of escapes from prison and prison escorts = No. of escapes divided by average prison population

**Data source**

Monthly data from prison establishments collated in central performance systems.

---

**Escapes from contractor escorts**

**Rationale**

As above.

**Technical description**

A prisoner escapes from escort when they are able to pass beyond the control of escorting staff. This may involve overcoming physical security restraints such as a wall or fence; locks, bolts or bars; a secure vehicle; handcuffs; or the direct supervision of escorting staff.

An escape is counted if (i) the prisoner is at liberty for 15 minutes or more before recapture or (ii) a prisoner escapes and is charged with another criminal offence.

**Calculation**

Rate of escapes from contractor escorts = 1: {No of movements} divided by {No of escapes from contractor escorts}

**Data source**

Monthly data from prisoner escort contractors collated in central performance systems.
**Absconds**

**Rationale**

Absconds are monitored to analyse the frequency across the open estate and identify any trends nationally also taking into consideration, the management of risk to the Public.

**Technical description**

An abscond is an escape that does not involve overcoming a physical security restraint such as that provided by a wall or fence, locks, bolts or bars, a secure vehicle, handcuffs, or the direct supervision of staff. An open prison is generally not considered to contain physical security restraints.

**Data source**

Monthly data from prison establishments collated in central performance systems.

**Calculation**

This indicator is a simple count of absconds.
Offending Behaviour Programmes (OBPs)

Appropriate OBP starts in the community

Rationale

The purpose of this measure is to ensure the appropriate allocation of offenders to programmes, and remove the incentive to over-deliver.

Technical description

Each accredited offending behaviour programme has set ‘eligibility criteria’ which are linked to the likelihood of reconviction (known as the Offender Group Reconviction Score (OGRS)). The eligibility criteria are designed to ensure that only those offenders who will benefit from the particular programme are placed on it.

Accredited interventions for sex offenders and domestic violence need to apply specific risk assessments which are not consistently available on central databases and are therefore excluded from this metric.

Data source

Probation trust data on OBPs collated in central performance systems.

Calculation

(The total number of eligible programme starts/ total number of actual starts) x 100 = Percentage of Appropriate Starts in the community.

Offending behaviour programme (OBP) completion rates in the community

Rationale

The purpose of this measure is to ensure focus on the effective delivery of accredited programmes. It is used in tandem with the volume indicators to ensure that offenders are appropriately allocated to, and supported to complete, accredited programmes.

Technical description

OBPs are rehabilitation programmes designed to identify the reasons why offenders offend and reduce and monitor these factors. As well as reducing risk, programmes support risk assessment and the risk management of offenders. These are fully or provisionally accredited by the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel (CSAP).
For monitoring purposes community OBP completions exclude domestic violence and sex offender treatment programmes, which are measured separately. They include drug treatment programmes.

Data sources

In the community: probation area data collated in central performance systems.

Calculation

\[
a/b \times 100
\]

Where:

\[
a = \text{Total number of offenders who have successfully completed accredited offending behaviour programmes (excluding sex offender and domestic violence)}
\]

\[
b = \text{Total number of offenders who commenced those programmes}
\]

The performance in a given period is produced by taking the cohort of offenders who started those programmes 12 months previously and measuring the proportion who completed the programme. The date of commencement is determined by the date of attendance at the first session of the programme.

A completion is counted when an offender completes an accredited programme and all appropriate reports and documents are completed and returned and recorded as such on the appropriate systems.

Offending behaviour programme (OBP) completion volumes in custody and the community

Rationale

The purpose of this measure is to ensure focus on the effective delivery of accredited programmes.

Technical description

OBPs are rehabilitation programmes designed to identify the reasons why offenders offend and reduce and monitor these factors. As well as reducing risk, programmes support risk assessment and the risk management of offenders. These are fully or provisionally accredited by the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel (CSAP). In custody they are known as Living Skills programmes.

For monitoring purposes, OBPs in custody include Domestic Violence completions but exclude drug treatment programmes which are reported separately.
In the community, Domestic Violence programmes are reported separately and are excluded from the count of OBP completions. Drug programme completions are included in the count of community OBP completions.

Sex offender treatment programmes are excluded from the prison and probation OBP measures.

Data sources

In custody: Monthly data from prison establishments collated in central performance systems.

In the community: probation trust data collated in central performance systems

Calculation

This indicator is a simple count of the number of OBP completions.

A completion is counted when an offender completes an accredited programme and all appropriate reports and documents are completed and returned and recorded as such on the appropriate systems.

Completions in custody and completions in the community are recorded separately.

Sex offender treatment programme (SOTP) completion rates in the community

Rationale

The purpose of this measure is to ensure focus on the effective delivery of sex offender treatment programmes (SOTPs). It is used in tandem with the volume indicator to ensure that offenders are appropriately allocated to and supported to complete SOTPs.

Technical description

Sex offender treatment programmes aim to reduce offending by adult male sex offenders. A range of programmes is available for sexual offenders according to the level of risk and need of the offender.

Data sources

Monthly data from probation trusts collated in central performance systems

Calculation

\[
a/b \times 100
\]
Where:

a = Total number of offenders who successfully complete accredited sex offender treatment programmes

b = Total number of offenders who commenced those programmes

The performance in a given month is calculated by taking the cohort of offenders who started a programme 30 months previously and measuring the proportion who have completed it. For C-SOGP (the Community Sex Offender Group Programme) the measurement period is 36 months. The date of commencement is determined by the date of attendance at the first session of the programme.

A completion is counted when an offender completes an accredited programme and all appropriate reports and documents are completed and returned and recorded as such on the appropriate system.

**Sex offender treatment programme (SOTP) volumes in custody and the community**

**Rationale**

The purpose of this measure is to ensure focus on the effective delivery of sex offender treatment programmes.

**Technical description**

Sex offender treatment programmes aim to reduce offending by adult male sex offenders. A range of programmes is available for sexual offenders according to the level of risk and need of the offender.

**Data sources**

In custody: monthly data from prison establishments collated in central performance systems.

In the community: monthly probation trust data on accredited programmes collated in central performance systems

**Calculation**

This indicator is a simple count of the number of SOTP completions.

A completion is counted when an offender completes an accredited programme and all appropriate reports and documents are completed and returned and recorded as such on the appropriate system.

Completions in custody and completions in the community are recorded separately.
Domestic violence programme completion rates in the community

Rationale

The purpose of this measure is to ensure focus on the effective delivery of domestic violence programmes and that the provision of domestic violence programmes is appropriate to meet offender need. It is used in tandem with the volume indicator to ensure that offenders are appropriately allocated to, and supported to complete domestic violence programmes.

Technical description

Domestic violence is any incident of threatening behaviour, violence or abuse between adults who are or have been in a relationship together, or between family members, regardless of gender or sexuality.

NOMS accredited programmes for domestic violence are programmes targeted at men who are or were in heterosexual relationships at the time the offence was committed. They aim to reduce aggressive behaviour through teaching social skills, anger management techniques and improved moral reasoning.

Data sources

Monthly data from probation trusts collated in central performance systems.

Calculation

A completion is counted when an offender completes an accredited programme and all appropriate reports and documents are completed and returned and recorded as such on the appropriate system.

\[
a/b \times 100
\]

Where:

\(a\) = Total number of offenders who successfully complete accredited domestic violence programmes

\(b\) = Total number of offenders who started those programmes

The performance in a given period is calculated by taking the cohort of offenders who commenced those programmes 18 months previously and measuring the proportion that completed. The date of commencement is determined by the date of attendance at the first session of the programme.
**Domestic violence programme completion volumes in the community**

**Rationale**

The purpose of this measure is to ensure focus on the effective delivery of domestic violence programmes and that the provision of domestic violence programmes is appropriate to meet offender need.

**Technical description**

Domestic violence is any incident of threatening behaviour, violence or abuse between adults who are or have been in a relationship together, or between family members, regardless of gender or sexuality.

NOMS accredited programmes for domestic violence are programmes targeted at men who are or were in heterosexual relationships at the time the offence was committed. They aim to reduce aggressive behaviour through teaching social skills, anger management techniques and improved moral reasoning.

**Data source**

Data recorded by probation trusts and collated in central performance systems.

**Calculation**

This indicator is a simple count of the number of domestic violence programme completions.

A completion is counted when an offender completes an accredited programme and all appropriate reports and documents are completed and returned and recorded as such on the appropriate system.

**Drug Rehabilitation**

**Drug rehabilitation requirement (DRR) completion rate**

**Rationale**

The purpose of this measure is to ensure that DRRs given as part of a Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order are successfully completed. As a measure of efficiency, the aim is to maximise the percentage of those terminating which are successfully completed.
Technical description

The drug rehabilitation requirement is one of 12 requirements that may be given by the sentencing court as part of a Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order (SSO) to adult offenders committing an offence post April 2005 when the Criminal Justice Act 2003 came into force. This is a treatment order so the whole order counts as a being 'in treatment' and minimum hours apply. If an offender has more than one requirement these contact hours are the total across all requirements not just the DRR.

Data source

Data extracted from probation case management systems and collated centrally.

Calculation

The completion rate is calculated for a given period as: the number of DRRs completed successfully (including those terminated early for good progress) as a proportion of all terminations in the period less those where the order which were transferred out, orders where the offender died, orders which expired with breach outstanding and orders revoked because of other change of circumstances or for other reasons (i.e. other than because of failure to comply or conviction for further offences).

Drug rehabilitation requirement (DRR) completion volumes

Rationale

The purpose of this measure is to ensure that DRRs given as part of a Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order are successfully completed.

Technical description

As above for ‘DRR completion rate’.

Data source

As above for ‘DRR completion rate’.

Calculation

This is a simple count of the number of successful completions. A successful completion is one which is recorded on the case management system as having expired normally (i.e. run its full course) or has been revoked early by the court for good progress.
Drug treatment programmes (custody only)

Rationale

The purpose of this measure is to ensure focus on the effective delivery of accredited drug treatment programmes.

Technical description

Drug treatment programmes are rehabilitation programmes designed to identify the reasons why offenders offend and reduce and monitor these factors. As well as reducing risk, programmes support risk assessment and the risk management of offenders. These are fully or provisionally accredited by the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel (CSAP).

Data source

Monthly data from prison establishments collated in central performance systems.

Calculation

This indicator is a simple count of the number of drug treatment programme completions.

A completion is counted when an offender completes an accredited programme and all appropriate reports and documents are completed and returned and recorded as such on central systems.

Mandatory drug testing (MDT) in custody

Rationale

Random mandatory drug testing provides the best available measure of drug misuse in prisons.

Technical description

The measure for the rate of drug-misuse is based on the rate of positive drug tests under the random MDT programme. This provides the most accurate indication of the level of drug-misuse in establishments. Random samples are those where a prisoner has been selected for testing using a random prisoner selector on central systems. The programme produces a list of prisoner numbers in the required sample, plus a reserve list. All prisoners - including unconvicted and new receptions - can be selected by the system for random MDT.
A sample is positive when the screening test is positive and there has been no confirmation test (for whatever reason), or a confirmation test was positive. A sample that tests positive for more than one drug counts as one positive sample. Furthermore, some positive samples will be mitigated and declared negative due to prescribed medication. The number of tests does not include spoilt samples or refusals. In the case of transferred prisoners, results for a sample are recorded against the establishment where the sample was taken.

Data source

Monthly data from prison establishments collated in central performance systems.

Calculation

MDT Positive Rate = (Total number of random drug tests that prove positive / total number of random drug tests carried out) x 100

Alcohol treatment requirement (ATR) completion rate

Rationale

The purpose of this measure is to ensure that ATRs given as part of the sentence are completed. As a measure of efficiency, the aim is to maximise the percentage of those terminating which are successfully completed.

Technical description

The alcohol treatment requirement (ATR) is one of 12 requirements that may be applied to a Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order. It provides access to a tailored treatment programme with the aim of reducing or eliminating alcohol dependency. The requirement can last between six months and three years as part of a Community Order and six months and two years when part of a Suspended Sentence Order.

Data source

Data extracted from probation case management systems and collated centrally.

Calculation

Performance against the completion rate target is calculated for a given period as: the number of requirements completed successfully (including those terminated early for good progress) as a proportion of all terminations in the period less orders which were transferred out, orders where the offender died, orders which expired with breach outstanding and orders revoked because of other change of circumstances or for other reasons (i.e. other than because of failure to comply or conviction for further offences).
**Alcohol treatment requirement (ATR) completion volumes**

**Rationale**

The purpose of this measure is to ensure that ATRs given as part of a Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order are successfully completed.

**Technical description**

As above for ‘ATR completion rate’.

**Data source**

As above for ‘ATR completion rate’

**Calculation**

This indicator is a simple count of the number of successful ATR completions. A successful completion is one which is recorded on the case management system as having expired normally (i.e. run its full course) or has been revoked early by the court for good progress.
Community Payback

Community payback completion rate

Rationale
The purpose of this indicator is to ensure focus on the successful completion of unpaid work requirements. As a measure of efficiency, the aim is to maximise the percentage of those terminating which are successfully completed.

Technical description
Unpaid work is one of 12 requirements that may be given as part of a Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order under the Criminal Justice Act 2003 for offences committed on or after 1 April 2005. Unpaid work is work undertaken for the benefit of the local community. It is a punitive intervention that can be used as a creative resource for improving the local environment, and supporting community provider strategies on visibility and community engagement.

The minimum hours that can be ordered are 40 hours and the maximum is 300 hours.

Work undertaken for profit, or for personal gain, cannot be counted as unpaid work.

Data source
Data is extracted from probation case management systems and collated centrally.

Calculation
Performance against the completion rate target is calculated for a given period as: the number of requirements completed successfully (including those terminated early for good progress) as a proportion of all terminations in the period less those orders which were transferred out, orders where the offender died, orders which expired with breach outstanding and orders revoked because of other change of circumstances or for other reasons (i.e. other than because of failure to comply or conviction for further offences).

Community payback completion volumes

Rationale
As above for ‘unpaid work completion rate’.
Technical description

As above for ‘unpaid work completion rate’.

Data source

As above for ‘unpaid work completion rate’.

Calculation

This is a simple count of the number of successful unpaid work completions. A successful completion is one where the specified number of hours have been recorded as completed or which has been revoked early for good progress.

Additional hours imposed for an existing order that includes unpaid work are not counted, but if the court makes an additional requirement of Unpaid Work where there was originally no unpaid work requirement then this is counted.

A successful completion is one which is recorded on the case management system as having expired normally (i.e. run its full course) or has been revoked early by the court for good progress.

Community payback stand-downs

Rationale

The purpose of this measure is to reduce the number of planned days of unpaid work not carried out by offenders because they are 'stood down' due to the probation trust being unable to provide the appropriate resources to manage the offenders at work.

Technical description

A stand down is when an offender is instructed in advance not to report for work, or when ready and willing offenders are sent home after reporting for work due to operational difficulties in the probation trust (e.g. insufficient supervisor coverage, lack of transport, or work availability).

Data source

Data recorded locally and collated on central information systems.

Calculation

(\frac{\text{Number of unpaid work days lost because of stand-downs [total of days lost through offender being sent home or told not to attend]}}{\text{Number of unpaid work offender days planned}} \times 100)
Compliance and Enforcement

**Percentage of orders and licences successfully completed**

**Rationale**
To assess of the cases that have terminated, the proportion of cases that have terminated successfully. This metric gives an overview of offender compliance over the life of the order or licence. This is one of a number of compliance measures.

**Technical description**
Successfully completions are those which are recorded on the case management system as having expired normally (i.e. without being revoked for failure to comply or for a further offence) or which have been terminated early by the court for good progress.

Drug rehabilitation requirements are included in the calculation

**Data source**
Data extracted from probation case management systems and collated centrally.

**Calculation**

\[(a / b) \times 100\]

Where:

a) No. of orders / licences successfully completed

b) Total no. of orders and licences terminated (i.e. including those which were unsuccessful and required breach action but not including the exclusions specified above)

**Percentage of community order breaches resolved within 25 working days**

**Rationale**
This is the Local Criminal Justice Board (LCJB) end-to-end enforcement target and seeks to ensure that non-compliance with an order is identified and that appropriate enforcement action is delivered across criminal justice agencies
Technical description

Breach:

A breach is a commencement of action to bring an allegation that an offender has failed to comply with the requirements of an order or licence before the court. Initiation of breach action: an application made for summons or warrant to return offender to court for breach.

Trigger of breach proceedings:

The community provider decides whether an offender has failed to comply with his / her order or licence and institutes action by contacting the court to arrange a first appearance by summons or warrant. The court sets the hearing dates and the court ultimately finalises the case by passing sentence.

Unacceptable failure to comply:

This defines the beginning of breach proceedings, and can consist of unacceptable absences and/or unacceptable behaviour while on a relevant order. It is the Offender Manager’s responsibility to determine the relevant unacceptable failure to comply and instigate breach proceedings

Data source

Data recorded on COMET (Community penalty Enforcement Tracker) system administered by HM Court Service.

Calculation

Proportion of cases resolved =

(Number of cases that were resolved within 25 days / The total number of cases of unacceptable failure to comply) x 100

Enforcement: initiation of breach action by the probation service

Rationale

This indicator is to ensure that the probation service meets the National Standard for enforcement by taking timely and appropriate breach/recall action in response to an offender’s non-compliance with an order/licence.

Technical description

An unacceptable failure to comply defines the beginning of breach proceedings, and can consist of unacceptable absences and/or unacceptable behaviour while on a relevant order/licence. It is the Offender
Manager’s responsibility to determine the relevant unacceptable failure to comply and instigate breach/recall proceedings.

Initiation of breach/recall action is either an application made for summons or warrant to return offender to court for breach or a report from the service to the NOMS Public Protection Casework Section.

To meet the standard the probation service must take breach action on or before a second unacceptable failure to comply with an order (on or before a third unacceptable failure to comply with a licence) and this action should be initiated within 10 working days of the relevant failure to comply.

Data source

Data are produced from probation trusts’ monitoring of National Standards for the Management of Offenders. A 20 per cent sample of Orders and licences are monitored six months after commencement.

Calculation

\[
a / b \times 100
\]

Where:

\(a = \text{No. of cases where breach action was initiated within National Standards timescales}\)

\(b = \text{Total cases eligible for breach action}\)
Employment

**Percentage of offenders in employment at the end of their sentence**

**Rationale**

The indicator assesses the employment status of offenders at the end of their sentence as an outcome contributing to a reduction in levels of re-offending. As a joint prisons and probation indicator, it combines the employment outcomes for those at the end of probation supervision with outturns for those released from prison sentences of less than 12 months.

The prison element of this indicator focuses on those sentenced to less than 12 months because prisoners released from sentences of 12 months or more are subject to supervision by the probation service upon release and their employment outturns will therefore be picked up in the probation element of the indicator at the end of the period on licence.

**Technical description**

Probation element:

See description for ‘Percentage of offenders with employment at the end of order or licence’

Prisons element:

Employment outcomes will be expressed as a proportion of recorded discharges of prisoners from sentences of less than 12 months. Performance is calculated using recorded employment status and discharge data.

Employment outcome is defined as:

- Full-time employed or self-employed (30 hrs or more a week, on average)
- Part-time employed or self-employed (less than 30 hrs a week, on average)
- Temporary/casual work

**Data sources**

Probation:

OASys National Reporting (ONR): centrally-produced reports from local data recorded on Offender Assessment System (OASys).

Prisons:
Monthly data from prison establishments collated in central performance systems.

**Calculation**

\[ \left( \frac{[a + c]}{[b + d]} \right) \times 100 \]

Where:

a) Number of offenders in employment at the end of their order or licence as recorded on the final (termination) OASys assessment

b) Total number of offenders with final (termination) OASys assessments completed in the current month, excluding those who are unavailable for work

c) Number of employment outcomes for prisoners discharged from sentences of less than 12 months

d) Total number of discharges from sentences of less than 12 months

**Percentage of offenders with employment at the end of order or licence**

**Rationale**

The indicator assesses the employment status of offenders at the end of their order or licence as an outcome contributing to a reduction in levels of re-offending.

**Technical description**

Employment is defined as:

- Full-time employed or self-employed (30 hrs or more a week, on average)
- Part-time employed or self-employed (less than 30 hrs a week, on average)
- Temporary/casual work

Offenders are classed as unemployed if they are available for work but are not in employment at the time, regardless of whether they are receiving benefits.

Those ‘unavailable for work’ are excluded from the calculation. Situations in which an offender should be recorded as being unavailable for work include offenders who are: retired, homemaker or incapacitated; this category also includes those who cannot work for any reason, for example asylum
seekers, refugees and foreign nationals who have no right to work in the UK; from 1 April 2009 this has also included those in full or part time education

**Data source**

OASys National Reporting (ONR): centrally-produced reports from local data recorded on Offender Assessment System (OASys).

**Calculation**

\[
\frac{a}{b} \times 100
\]

Where:

a) Number of offenders in employment at the end of their order or licence as recorded on the final (termination) OASys assessment

b) Total number of offenders with final (termination) OASys assessments completed in the current month, excluding those who are unavailable for work

**Percentage of offenders with employment on release from custody**

**Rationale**

The purpose of this measure is to identify the number of offenders discharged from custody and accessing employment opportunities. Collation of this data will indicate the effectiveness of the establishment and its partners in supporting offenders into employment.

**Technical description**

Employment outcomes will be expressed as a proportion of recorded discharges. Performance is calculated using recorded employment status and discharge data.

Employment outcome is defined as:

- Full-time employed or self-employed (30 hrs or more a week, on average)
- Part-time employed or self-employed (less than 30 hrs a week, on average)
- Temporary/casual work
Data source
Monthly data from prison establishments collated in central performance systems.

Calculation
(No. of Employment Outcomes / No. of Discharges) x 100 = % Employment

Sustained employment in the community

Rationale
To ensure that attention is focused on achieving and sustaining employment during supervision

Technical description
Employment includes full-time employment, self-employment, agency working and part-time working for at least 16 hours a week.

Data source
Data recorded locally by probation trusts and submitted for collation at the centre.

Calculation
A count of the number of offenders who are being supervised by probation and have found and kept continuous employment for four weeks.
Accommodation

Percentage of offenders with settled accommodation at the end of their sentence

Rationale

This indicator assesses the accommodation status of offenders at the end of their sentence as an outcome contributing to a reduction in levels of re-offending.

Technical description

As a joint prisons and probation indicator, it combines the accommodation outcomes for those at the end of probation supervision with outturns for those released from prison sentences of less than 12 months. The prison element of this indicator focuses on those sentenced to less than 12 months because prisoners released from sentences of 12 months or more are subject to supervision by the probation service upon release and their accommodation outturns will therefore be picked up in the probation element of the indicator at the end of the period on licence.

Probation element:

See description for ‘Percentage of offenders in settled and suitable accommodation at the end of order or licence’

Prisons element:

Accommodation outcomes will be expressed as a proportion of recorded discharges of prisoners from sentences of less than 12 months. Performance is calculated using recorded accommodation status and discharge data.

For a definition of ‘settled accommodation’, see Percentage of offenders with settled accommodation on release from custody.

Data Source

Probation:

OASys National Reporting (ONR): centrally-produced reports from local data recorded on Offender Assessment System (OASys).

Prisons:

Monthly data from prison establishments collated in central performance systems.
**Calculation**

\[
([a + c] / [b + d]) \times 100
\]

Where:

a) Number of offenders with settled and suitable accommodation at the end of their order or licence as recorded on the final (termination) OASys assessment

b) Total number of offenders with final (termination) OASys assessments completed in the current month

c) Number of accommodation outcomes for prisoners discharged from sentences of less than 12 months

d) Total number of prisoners discharged from sentences of less than 12 months

**Percentage of offenders with settled accommodation on release from custody**

**Rationale**

In support of the Accommodation Pathway in the NOMS Reducing Re-offending National Delivery Plan the focus is to increase the number of Prisoners with settled accommodation arranged upon release. This NOMS metric replaced the existing Accommodation measure from April 2007.

**Technical description**

Accommodation outcomes will be expressed as a proportion of recorded discharges of prisoners. Performance is calculated using recorded accommodation status and discharge data.

Settled accommodation is defined as:

**Settled Housing**

Essentially this would include any housing which provides permanent independent housing, for example,

- A family home where the service user is the owner / tenant or a permanent part of the family and is able to return to that home.
- Owner occupier
- A tenant of a self contained dwelling with a secure tenancy in the name of the service user
• Living with a friend/colleague on a permanent basis where the service user has a bedroom available at all times for their use and access to normal domestic facilities

• A caravan or boat which is viewed by the service user as their permanent home.

Supported housing

Housing with support provided by an accredited housing agency, which will provide both a placement for at least three months and support in moving on to permanent accommodation.

Approved Premises

The service user’s risk of harm to others has been assessed such as to make placement in Approved Premises the most appropriate housing option.

Data Source

Monthly data from prison establishments collated in central performance systems.

Calculation

\[
\text{(No. of Accommodation Outcomes/No. of Discharges) \times 100} = \text{Settled Accommodation \%}
\]

Percentage of offenders in settled and suitable accommodation at the end of order or licence

Rationale

This indicator assesses the accommodation status of offenders at the end of their order or licence as an outcome contributing to a reduction in levels of re-offending.

Technical description

Settled accommodation is defined as:

Permanent, independent housing

Bail / probation hostel

Supported housing
Suitable accommodation is defined in OASys under two areas: suitability of the accommodation and suitability of the location of the accommodation. This would include features such as:

Safety of the accommodation

Overcrowding

Facilities

Where the victim lives in the house or nearby

**Data source**

OASys National Reporting (ONR): centrally-produced reports from local data recorded on Offender Assessment System (OASys).

**Calculation**

\[(a / b) \times 100\]

Where:

a) Number of offenders with settled and suitable accommodation at the end of their order or licence as recorded on the final (termination) OASys assessment

b) Total number of offenders with final (termination) OASys assessments completed in the current month
Education

Referrals to education providers in the community

Rationale
This indicator is intended to improve the levels of referrals to education providers in order to support the educational and employment needs of the offender.

Technical description
This includes all referrals and not just those for ‘skills for life’ or ‘basic skills’.

Referrals may be:

- Where an Individual Referral Record (IRR) has been completed and agreed with the learner/offender, or
- Where an appointment with an accredited provider has been made and confirmed

Data Source
Locally recorded probation trust data collated in central systems.

Calculation
A count of the total number of offenders in the community referred to education providers.

Education and Training

Rationale
The purpose of this measure is to identify the number of offenders leaving custody with education or training places to take up after release.

Technical Description
The education and training status of prisoners at discharge is recorded by establishments using the Local Inmate Database System (LIDS).

An education or training outcome is recorded under the following definitions:

i) Full-time education or training (i.e. 16 or more hours a week of class work or instruction)
ii) Part-time education or training (i.e. less than 16 hours a week of class work or instruction)
Data Source

Monthly data from prison establishments collated in central performance systems.

Calculation

Number of Education & training Outcomes / Number of Discharges *100 = %

Education & training
Safety and Decency in Custody

Overcrowding in custody

Rationale

To maintain overcrowding within acceptable levels.

Technical description

Overcrowding is the count of total number of prisoners who, on the last day of the month, are held in a cell, cubicle or room where the number of occupants exceeds the baseline certified normal accommodation of the cell, cubicle or room. This includes the number of prisoners held two to a single cell, three prisoners in a cell designed for one or two and any prisoners held over crowdedly in larger cells or dormitories. For example, if twelve prisoners occupy a dormitory with a capacity of ten, then the twelve prisoners should be counted as overcrowded. If the establishment has reported a number of prisoners 'doubled', then at least this number should be reported as overcrowded.

Data source

Monthly data from prison establishments collated in central performance systems.

Calculation

Overcrowding rate for the year is calculated by summing the overcrowded figure for each month and prison population figure for each month. The total overcrowded figure for the year is then divided by the total population for the year and expressed as a percentage to show the rate of overcrowding.
**Corporate**

**Staff sickness**

**Rationale**

To monitor and reduce the number of days lost to staff sickness absence in public prisons and the probation service.

**Technical description**

Staff sickness is reported as the average number of days lost per member of staff per year.

**Data sources**

**Prisons:**

Monthly data from prison establishments collated in central performance systems.

**Probation:**

Monthly data recorded by probation Trusts and collated at the centre.

**Calculation**

\[(a + b) / (c + d)\]

Where:

a) Total days absence for probation staff during the year

b) Total days absence for prison staff during the year

c) Average probation FTE for year

d) Average prison staff headcount for year

**Staff sickness – public prisons**

**Rationale**

To monitor and reduce the number of days lost to staff sickness absence in public prisons.
Technical description
The staff sickness measure is shown as the average working days lost through sickness per member of staff for the year.

Data source
Monthly data from prison establishments collated in central performance systems.

Calculation
Total working days lost in the year / Average head count for the year

Staff sickness - probation

Rationale
To monitor and reduce the days lost due to staff sickness absence in the probation service.

Technical description
Days lost due to sickness are recorded as Short Term (less than 28 days in duration), Long Term (28 calendar days or more in duration) and DDA (attributable to disability as defined in the Disability Discrimination Act).

Data source
Monthly data recorded by probation trusts and collated at the centre

Calculation
The total days lost due to sickness absence divided by the average FTE for the year.

Race equality: staff in public sector prisons and the probation service

Rationale
NOMS aims to have the same staffing mix as there is in the wider working population.

Technical Description
The representation rate is reported as the number of minority ethnic staff as a proportion of all staff with stated ethnicity.
**Data Source**

**Prisons:**

Monthly data from prison establishments is collated in central performance systems.

**Probation:**

Data is extracted from the HR data warehouse each month

**Calculation**

Ethnic minority staff as a percentage of total staff with known ethnicities, i.e. staff whose ethnicity is not known are excluded from the base.

\[
\text{Percentage of Ethnic Minority Staff} = \left( \frac{\text{Headcount number of ethnic minority staff}}{\text{Total staff headcount} - \text{Headcount number of staff choosing not to disclose ethnicity}} \right) \times 100
\]
Further Information

Explanatory notes

Data in this report are drawn from administrative IT systems. Although care is taken when processing and analysing the data, the level of detail collected is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large-scale recording system.

Symbols and conventions

The following symbols have been used throughout the tables in this bulletin:

- = Not applicable
0 = Nil

Contact points for further information

Press enquiries should be directed to the Ministry of Justice press office:

Tel: 020 3334 3555
Email: press.office@justice.gsi.gov.uk

Other enquiries about these statistics should be directed to:

Planning & Analysis Group
National Offender Management Service
Ministry of Justice
5th Floor, Red Zone
Clive House
70 Petty France
London SW1H 9EX

Email: Ed.Stradling@noms.gsi.gov.uk

General enquiries about the statistical work of the Ministry of Justice can be e-mailed to: statistics.enquiries@justice.gsi.gov.uk

General information about the official statistics system of the UK is available from www.statistics.gov.uk
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