Evening Seminar

Personalisation in Criminal Justice

Professor Chris Fox
Policy & Evaluation Unit, Manchester Metropolitan University

and

Caroline Marsh
Director, Caroline Marsh Management Solutions

19 May, 2016
PROJECT TO DEVELOP PERSONALISED APPROACHES TO REHABILITATION
CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

- It is anticipated that the use of personalised approaches will improve outcomes for service users and support value for money.
- Interserve has commitment to personalised approach.
  - Operating model, Interchange, draws on asset based approach, and service allocation model being developed.
  - Personalisation pilot to test innovative approaches to be set up.
- The use of personalised budgets is to be needs led and align with the desistance model of working with offenders.
- The pilot will explore potential for personalisation to reducing re-offending and to identify lessons from other sectors particularly health and social care.
- It will also shape the development of innovative solutions in the criminal justice sector.
Elements of personalisation in the ‘Interchange’ Model

“We have tried to use a personalised approach in designing all of the core modules – eg service user self assessment, a co-produced plan etc, and our roll out of the training is as much about the ‘how’ as it is about the ‘what’. This is not to say that we have nailed personalisation - far from it, but it is a nudge in the right direction.” (Kim Thornden-Edwards, Service Delivery Director, Interserve Justice)

Personalised Plan includes elements of co-production: “A collaborative approach to goal achievement and risk assessment and management”

An ‘Enablers of Change’ assessment with stronger focus on offender assets
AIMS FOR THE PERSONALISATION PILOT

The Personalisation Pilot is evidence based and aims to:

- Explore options for a more radical personalisation approach, that is grounded in available evidence from the social care and criminal justice sectors
- Take a number of possible personalisation models through a proof of concept process
- Pilot one or more preferred models prior to roll out across all 5 CRCs
- Build up evidence based practice over a 3 year programme

Research support and evaluation from Policy Evaluation and Research Unit
STAGES IN THE PERSONALISATION PILOT

- Testing the feasibility of a number of personalisation elements through short, ‘proof of concept’ trials
  - Small number of clients
  - 3 – 6 months with focus on intermediate outcomes
  - Plan, Do, Study, Act

- Piloting a personalisation model
  - Sufficient number of cases to support rigorous outcome evaluation
  - 12 - 24 months with focus on re-offending outcomes
  - Experimental/quasi-experimental methods

- Designing a roll-out across 5 Interserve CRCs
LEARNING FROM EXPERIENCE
Review existing evidence from Social Care and CJS. For example . . .
# Drawing on Social Care Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CJS now</th>
<th>Social care then</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Over-reliance on institutional settings</td>
<td>1. Over-reliance on institutional settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Standardised delivery models eg accredited programmes and National Offender Management Model</td>
<td>2. ‘One size fits all’ state social care services, centrally planned and organised, with little individual or family control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Deficit model. Risk, Need and Responsivity principles:</td>
<td>3. Deficit model. Medical model of disability and low expectations of people with long term conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Need principle’: treatment has larger effects if it addresses criminogenic need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR SOCIAL CARE AND HEALTH
NAO (2016) **PERSONALISED COMMISSIONING IN ADULT SOCIAL CARE**

- Widespread support across local government and the adult care sector for the concept of personalised commissioning.
- Recent evidence suggests that personal budgets benefit most, but not all, users and that the way a personal budget is implemented is key to whether users benefit from it.
- The DoH’s local authority-level data provide no evidence that personalised commissioning improves user outcomes.
- The DoH’s monitoring regime does not enable it to understand how personal budgets improve outcomes.
- Some local authorities are struggling to manage and support their local care markets as a well-functioning public service market.
Learning from Innovation Examples

- HMP Everthorpe & Preston
- Women offenders mentoring in London
- Shared Lives for offenders
- Integrated Offender Management in Tameside
- Rough Sleepers
- Personal health budgets
- Community capacity building in Derby
**Key Learning Points**

- The way the policy is implemented is more important than the personal budget to improve quality of life.
- Person centred working is a cultural change and often meets staff uncertainty or even resistance.
- Support and information is needed to help service users make informed choices.
- Resource allocation systems often unhelpful.
- Need to understand what support choices are being made and track outcomes.
- The market needs to be continually developed and supported to maintain choice.
- Voluntary sector has key role, but is vulnerable to cuts.
- Need to optimise potential to work across the system.
PERSONALISATION IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE
DESISTANCE

- Around 85% of repeat offenders desist from offending by age 28:
  - ‘Unless this is completely random, some things must be helpful in making this transition. To deny this is to deny everything most of us believe about the social world.’ (Ward and Maruna 2007: 13)

- Internal narratives (Maruna 2001)
  - Individuals needed to establish an alternative, coherent and pro-social identity in order to justify and maintain their desistance from crime (Ward and Maruna 2007)

- Rebalancing the agency v. structure debate:
  - “Agency is as important – if not more important than – structure in promoting or inhibiting desistance” (Maguire and Raynor 2006: 24)
DESISTANCE AND PERSONALISATION

- Personalisation implied in desistance:
  - ‘[I]f desistance is an inherently individualized and subjective process, then we need to make sure that offender management processes can accommodate and exploit issues of identity and diversity. One-size-fits-all processes and interventions will not work.’ (McNeil 2009: 28)

- An asset-based approach (linked to Good Lives Model):
  - ‘... a focus on the promotion of specific goods or goals in the treatment of offenders is likely automatically to eliminate (or reduce) commonly targeted dynamic risk factors (or criminogenic needs).’ (Ward and Maruna 2007: 24)
DESiSTANCE AND CO-PRODUCTION

- Co-production is key:
  - ‘The practitioner has to create a human relationship in which the individual offender is valued and respected and through which interventions can be properly tailored in line with particular life plans and their associated risk factors.’ (McNeil 2009: 27)

- Weaver (2011): the process of co-production should include offenders, victims and communities
DESISTANCE AND COMMUNITY

- Community is key:
  - ‘While overcoming social problems is often insufficient on its own to promote desistance, it may be a necessary condition for further progress.’ (Maguire and Raynor 2006: 25)

- McNeil and Weaver (2010) note that ongoing studies of desistance suggest the importance of links with parent and families in the desistance process.
  - ‘Increasingly . . . the desistance paradigm understands rehabilitation as a relational process best achieved in the context of relationships with others.’ (Maruna 2010: 81)
A STRATEGY FOR PERSONALISATION IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Offender management
- Co-produced resettlement plans
  - Elaboration of the ‘Good Life’
- Identify offender assets and engage family / community
- Offenders take more ownership of factors contributing to offending behaviour
  - Develop self-reliance and personal capacity
- Re-thinking the role of probation staff:
  - Co-production
  - Micro-commissioner?

Commissioning
- Training OMs to micro-commission?
- Personal budgets for offenders?
  - An ‘enabling budget’ rather than a ‘personalised budget’
- Thinking about supply side?
  - A strategy to promote social innovation and the growth of micro-enterprises
THE CHALLENGE

- Transforming culture in the criminal justice system is the most significant challenge.
- Co-production will be challenging in a risk-centred system where the requirements of justice trump individual needs.
- Introducing a more ‘assets-based’ and co-productive approach to support is that giving individuals control of money makes little impact upon choice without intensive work to develop a market of small and large providers.
Testing innovation in Interserve / Purple Futures
CONCEPTS WE WANT TO TEST OUT

- Starting point – Interchange – PLUS
- Developing person centred practice by case managers
- Use of personal budgets for CRC service users
- Increasing choice by developing community capacity and improving the supply side of service delivery
- Managing demand through personalised service delivery
CRITERIA FOR CHOOSING PROOF OF CONCEPT PILOTS

- Theoretically coherent
- Consistent with available evidence and experience
- Consistent with Interserve values and business model
- Feasible to implement and be evaluated within agreed timescale
- Measureable
- Innovative
LONG LIST OF PROOF OF CONCEPT PILOTS

- Personalised service delivery by partner organisation
- Community capacity building to offer more choice
- Choice and control promotion through use of Personal Budget, Individual Service Fund, individual or collective pooling of personal budgets
- Developing a new approach to co-production of sentence planning and implementation of
- Personalised family work in context of an identified Local Authority Troubled Families initiative
- Personalised living / Shared Lives approach
## Personalisation in Interserve CRCs - Proof of Concept Pilot Ideas - Underpinned by Person Centred Approaches - 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>Pilot approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Personalised service delivery by partner organisation in a geographic area. This would be a provider in a CRC supply chain | • Work with a nominated provider to develop understanding of person centred work  
• Develop and adapt tools to support person centred practice  
• Consultation with service users about what a personalised service would look like for them |
| Community capacity building to offer more choice in community and accessing community services | • Agree aim of exercise, e.g. work with a group of service users with a shared interest or individual service users  
• Rapid local service and asset mapping exercise in specific small community  
• Engagement with other public services |
### Idea

Choice and control promotion through use of Individual Service Fund, individual or collective pooling of personal budgets.

*Access to a personal budget enables service users to pursue positive individual choices.*

### Pilot approach

- Desk top review of resource allocation systems, and use of enabling ‘top-up’ funds
- Design simple fund administration process
- Set up several variations:
  a) Enabling fund with and without ceiling known to case manager
  b) Individual Service Fund held by provider for single and group of service users
  c) Work with social care or health provider where service user already has a personal budget to include a justice element to enhance this
### PERSONALISATION IN INTERSERVE CRCs - PROOF OF CONCEPT PILOT IDEAS - UNDERPINNED BY PERSON CENTRED APPROACHES - 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>Pilot approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cohort developing a new approach to co-production of sentence planning and implementation of interventions  
*Identifying and building on service strengths is more likely to lead to successful outcomes* |  
- Adopt personal centred approach to co-produce assessment and sentence implementation  
- Adapt and develop tools for use by case managers |
| Cohort in troubled families, personalised family work  
*Service users who are part of a family being supported by other agencies (e.g. in a Troubled Families scheme) will benefit from a personalised approach in their whole family context* |  
- Identify service users who are also in a troubled families cohort where a personalised approach is being adopted with the family  
- Liaise with children’s services to identify approach  
- Support case managers |
| Personalised living / shared lives approach  
*Stable and supportive accommodation and support is more likely to enable a service user to lead a positive lifestyle and build desistance* |  
- Review existing model  
- Identify potential referral criteria  
- Scope system requirements, recruitment and training requirements  
- Undertake cost benefit analysis |
LONGER TERM PILOTS TO INTEGRATE CONCEPTS — PERSONALISATION AND DESISTANCE INTO PRACTICE

Person centred practice across the system

Empowering individual capacity & building resilience

Developing choice through supply chain & community capacity
IMPLICATIONS FOR COMMISSIONING

- Benefits and potential results – better outcomes shared goal with our commissioner NOMS
- Informs CRC commissioning and supply chain development
- Efficiency and effectiveness – potential to improve if administrative burdens can be designed out
- Delivering the contract, performance management – is this compatible with personalisation?
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