



Ministry of
JUSTICE



Proven Re-offending Statistics Quarterly Bulletin

April 2010 to March 2011,
England and Wales

Ministry of Justice
Statistics Bulletin

31 January 2013

Contents

Introduction	3
Executive summary.....	7
List of quarterly tables.....	20
Annex A: Payment by results.....	23
Annex B: How the measure of proven re-offending has changed and the effect of these changes.....	26
Annex C: Glossary of terms	43
Explanatory notes	52
Contact points	53

Introduction

The Proven Re-offending Statistics Quarterly Bulletin provides key statistics on proven re-offending in England and Wales. It gives proven re-offending figures for offenders, who were released from custody, received a non-custodial conviction at court, received a caution, reprimand, warning or tested positive for opiates or cocaine between April 2010 and March 2011. Proven re-offending is defined as any offence committed in a one year follow-up period and receiving a court conviction, caution, reprimand or warning in the one year follow-up or within a further six month waiting period. This is referred to as a proven re-offence.

This quarterly bulletin presents the proportion of offenders who re-offend (proven re-offending rate) and the number of proven re-offences those offenders commit by age group, gender, ethnicity, criminal history and offence type. Also included are proven re-offending rates for serious proven re-offending, different types of offenders (e.g. adult, juvenile, drug-misusing and prolific and other priority offenders); different types of sentence; and for individual prisons, probation trusts and youth offending teams.

Latest figures are provided with comparisons to April 2009 to March 2010 and the year 2000 in order to highlight long-term trends; 2000 is the earliest year for which proven re-offending data exist on a comparable basis. The full set of results is provided separately in Excel tables at:

www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/reoffending/proven-re-offending

The accompanying 'Definitions and Measurement' document, which is available at the same link, provides more detailed information.

Measuring proven re-offending

There is no agreed international standard for measuring and reporting re-offending. An offender's journey through the criminal justice system can be a complex one; offenders can appear on numerous occasions.

Measuring true re-offending is complex. Official records are taken from either the police or courts, but they will underestimate the true level of re-offending because only a proportion of crime is reported and/or detected and not all crimes are recorded on one central system. Furthermore, other methods for measuring re-offending, such as self report studies which do not identify the offender, are likely to be unreliable. Therefore, this report aims to measure proven re-offending.

Since re-offending is now measured on a consistent basis across all groups, it is possible to tailor analysis of re-offending to meet specific requirements. This quarterly bulletin and the accompanying 'Early estimates of proven re-offending' present measures on four different levels to meet users' needs:

- The headline measure – this is the main measure of re-offending and is presented for different demographic groups and by offence. To provide this **overview of proven re-offending**, offenders are tracked and their proven re-offending behaviour is recorded, taking the **first event**¹ in the **relevant period** as the start point and subsequent events as proven re-offences.
- A headline measure where the first event is related to criminal justice and offender management – this provides a realistic and relevant view of proven re-offending by disposal (sentence type), prison and probation trust. Offenders are tracked and their proven re-offending behaviour is recorded **within** each disposal (caution, court order, discharge from prison, etc.) or operational unit (prison or probation trust) taking the first event **within** each as the start point and subsequent events as re-offences.
- Early estimates of proven re-offending – these use shorter follow-up and waiting periods, but otherwise measure re-offending in exactly the same way as the headline measure. This is intended to provide offender managers with an earlier indication of proven re-offending trends so they can adjust or build on offender management operational policy.
- A re-conviction measure for use by payment by results – this is the measure used in the prison pilots since court convictions are more closely associated with costs to the criminal justice system. For more details, please refer to Annex A.

¹ An event is one of the following: a release from custody, convicted at court with a non-custodial sentence, received a caution, reprimand, warning or tested positive for opiates or cocaine

For a more detailed explanation, please see the accompanying 'Definitions and Measurement' document at:

www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/reoffending/proven-re-offending

Consultation

This quarterly bulletin was developed in response to a consultation in late 2010 and early 2011 by the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) on "Improvements to Ministry of Justice Statistics". The main points from the consultation that affect this publication can be found in Annex B.

Users

The contents of this bulletin will be of interest to Government policy makers, the agencies responsible for offender management at both national and local levels, providers, practitioners and others who want to understand more about proven re-offending.

In particular there are two MoJ impact indicators² which will be monitored using results from this bulletin:

- Adult and juvenile re-offending – the percentage of adult and juvenile offenders who re-offend, measured quarterly by local authority.
- The percentage of adults released from custody who re-offend, measured annually by prison.

Government policy makers also use these statistics to develop, monitor and evaluate key elements of its policies including those on payments by results, legal aid, sentencing guidelines and drug and alcohol policies. Offender management agencies use these statistics to gain a local understanding of the criminal justice system, understand performance and to highlight best practice. Key agencies include: the National Offender Management Service, the Youth Justice Board, private and voluntary sector providers of prison and probation services and local authorities.

As proven re-offending is related to the characteristics of offenders, the actual rate of proven re-offending will depend, in part, on the characteristics of offenders coming into the system. This actual rate provides users with sufficient information on what the level of re-offending is (e.g. in their local area) and how it is changing over time. This bulletin also presents an adjusted proven re-offending rate to control for differences in the composition of the offender group which can be used by those who want to understand how changes in types of offenders coming through the justice system drives re-offending rates.

² www.justice.gov.uk/publications/corporate-reports/moj/index.htm

This bulletin is published alongside four inter-related bulletins:

- **Offender Management Statistics Quarterly Bulletin, July to September 2012, England and Wales:** provides key statistics relating to offenders who are in prison or under Probation Service supervision. It covers flows into these services (receptions into prison or probation starts) and flows out (discharges from prison or probation terminations) as well as the caseload of both services at specific points in time. It also includes information on returns to custody following recall.
- **Safety in Custody Statistics Quarterly update to September 2012, England and Wales:** provides statistics on death, self harm and assault incidents whilst in prison custody.
- **Youth Justice Statistics 2011/12, England and Wales:** this cross-cutting publication brings together statistics from across the Youth Justice System, many of which have already been published separately.
- **Story of the Prison Population 1993 to 2012, England and Wales:** this publication provides a summary of what has happened to the prison population since 1993 and the major factors contributing to the changes. It is an update to the previous version which covered the period 1995 to 2009. The updated period of 2009 to 2012 includes the impact of the public disorder of August 2011, and the falling prison population during 2012.

Taken together, these publications present users with a more coherent overview of offender management, re-offending among adults and young people, the youth justice system and the safety of offenders whilst in prison custody.

Additional analyses on proven re-offending that are not covered by this bulletin are presented in the 'Compendium of re-offending statistics and analysis'. The 2012 Compendium was published by the MoJ on 12 July 2012 and includes, for example, analyses on longer-term trends in re-offending; and the relative effectiveness of different juvenile sentences in reducing re-offending.

www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/reoffending/compendium-of-reoffending-statistics-and-analysis

If you have any feedback, questions or requests for further information about this statistical bulletin, please direct them to the appropriate contact given at the end of this report.

Executive summary

This report provides key statistics on proven re-offending in England and Wales. It gives proven re-offending figures for offenders who were released from custody, received a non-custodial conviction at court, received a caution, reprimand, warning or tested positive for opiates or cocaine between April 2010 and March 2011. Proven re-offending is defined as any offence committed in a one year follow-up period and receiving a court conviction, caution, reprimand or warning in the one year follow-up. Following this one year period, a further six month waiting period is allowed for cases to progress through the courts.

Between April 2010 and March 2011, around 640,000 offenders³ were cautioned⁴, convicted (excluding immediate custodial sentences) or released from custody⁵. Around 170,000 of these offenders committed a proven re-offence within a year. This gives a one year proven re-offending rate of 26.8 per cent, which represents a rise of 0.5 percentage points compared to the previous 12 months and a fall of 1.1 percentage points since 2000 (Table 1).

These re-offenders committed an average of 2.88 re-offences each. In total, this represents around 500,000 re-offences of which 82 per cent were committed by adults and 18 per cent were committed by juveniles (Table 1).

- 55.9 per cent (around 280,000) were committed by re-offenders with 11 or more previous offences (Table 6c).
- 0.7 per cent (around 3,300) were serious violent/sexual proven re-offences (Table 8).
- 5.1 per cent (around 25,000) were committed by re-offenders on the Prolific and other Priority Offender Programme (PPO) (Table 16).

³ A certain proportion of offenders who could not be matched to the Police National Computer (PNC) are excluded from the offender cohort. Therefore, this number does not represent all proven offenders. Please refer to the 'Definitions and Measurement' document for more detail at www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/reoffending/proven-re-offending. This means that the number of offenders in this bulletin will be different from the numbers published in the Offender Management Quarterly Statistics Bulletin available at www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/prisons-and-probation/oms-quarterly and the Criminal Justice Statistics report available at www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/criminal-justice/criminal-justice-statistics

⁴ Includes reprimands and warnings for juveniles

⁵ Also includes those who tested positive for opiates or cocaine

Key trends in proven re-offending

Adult offenders

Around 550,000 adult offenders³ were cautioned⁴, convicted or released from custody⁵ between April 2010 and March 2011. Around 140,000 of them committed a re-offence. This gives a proven re-offending rate of 25.4 per cent, which represents an increase of 0.5 percentage points compared to the previous 12 months and a fall of 0.8 percentage points since 2000 (Table 1).

However, compared to 2000, the offenders in the 12 months ending March 2011 had characteristics which meant they were more likely to re-offend. This means that, after controlling for offender characteristics, the decrease was larger at 3.1 percentage points (Table 1).

The average number of re-offences per re-offender was 2.88, a rise of 2.9 per cent compared to the previous 12 months and a fall of 15.1 per cent compared to 2000 (Table 1).

Looking at specific groups within the cohort:

- The proven re-offending rate for those released from custody was 47.2 per cent, a rise of 0.3 percentage points compared to the previous 12 months and a fall of 2.2 percentage points since 2000. The average number of re-offences committed per re-offender for this group was 4.21, an increase of 4.3 per cent compared to the previous 12 months and down 10.1 per cent since 2000 (Table 18a).
- The proven re-offending rate for those starting a court order (Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order) was 34.2 per cent, which represents no change compared to the previous 12 months and down 3.7 percentage points since 2000. The average number of re-offences per re-offender was 3.19, up 3.4 per cent compared to the previous 12 months and down 17.3 per cent since 2000 (Table 18a).
- The proven re-offending rate for drug-misusing offenders (all offenders who are given drug orders as part of their sentence or test positive for opiates upon arrest) was 57.6 per cent, up 2.5 percentage points compared to the previous 12 months (Table 15).

Juvenile offenders

Around 88,000 juvenile offenders³ were cautioned⁴, convicted or released from custody⁵ between April 2010 and March 2011. Around 32,000 of them committed a re-offence. This gives a proven re-offending rate of 35.8 per cent. This represents an increase in the rate of 2.5 percentage points compared to the previous 12 months and a rise of 2.1 percentage points since 2000 (Table 1).

However, users should be aware that the cohort has changed considerably over the period since 2000 and is 36.6 per cent smaller than in 2000 and is comprised of offenders whose characteristics mean they are more likely to re-offend than those in the 2000 cohort. In order to account for this, we can control for changes in offender characteristics to give a more consistent view of changes over time. After controlling for these changes, the proven re-offending rate has actually decreased by 1.1 percentage points since 2000 (Table 1).

The average number of re-offences per re-offender was 2.87, an increase of 3.2 per cent compared to the previous 12 months and down 13.4 per cent since 2000 (Table 1).

Table E1: Overview – latest 12 month period compared to the previous 12 month period and 2000

	2000	12 months ending March 2010	12 months ending March 2011	Percentage change to 12 months ending March 2011 ¹	Percentage change 12 months ending March 2010 to 12 months ending March 2011 ¹
All offenders					
Proportion of offenders who re-offend (%)	27.9	26.3	26.8	-1.1pp ↓	0.5pp ↑
Average number of re-offences per re-offender	3.37	2.80	2.88	-14.6% ↓	3.0% ↑
Proportion of offenders who re-offend - Adjusted to baseline ² (%)	25.5	27.0	27.1	-	-
Average number of re-offences per offender	0.94	0.73	0.77	-17.9% ↓	5.0% ↑
Number of re-offences	579,770	500,656	495,162	-14.6% ↓	-1.1% ↓
Number of re-offenders	171,935	179,040	171,949	0.0% ↑	-4.0% ↓
Number of offenders in cohort	617,024	681,555	641,742	4.0% ↑	-5.8% ↓
Adult offenders					
Proportion of offenders who re-offend (%)	26.2	24.9	25.4	-0.8pp ↓	0.5pp ↑
Average number of re-offences per re-offender	3.39	2.80	2.88	-15.1% ↓	2.9% ↑
Proportion of offenders who re-offend - Adjusted to baseline ² (%)	23.6	25.6	25.9	-	-
Average number of re-offences per offender	0.89	0.70	0.73	-17.7% ↓	4.9% ↑
Number of re-offences	423,989	395,386	404,228	-4.7% ↓	2.2% ↑
Number of re-offenders	125,023	141,254	140,314	12.2% ↑	-0.7% ↓
Number of offenders in cohort	477,698	567,971	553,385	15.8% ↑	-2.6% ↓
Juvenile offenders					
Proportion of offenders who re-offend (%)	33.7	33.3	35.8	2.1pp ↑	2.5pp ↑
Average number of re-offences per re-offender	3.32	2.79	2.87	-13.4% ↓	3.2% ↑
Proportion of offenders who re-offend - Adjusted to baseline ² (%)	32.0	33.9	35.2	-	-
Average number of re-offences per offender	1.12	0.93	1.03	-8.0% ↓	11.0% ↑
Number of re-offences	155,781	105,270	90,934	-41.6% ↓	-13.6% ↓
Number of re-offenders	46,912	37,786	31,635	-32.6% ↓	-16.3% ↓
Number of offenders in cohort	139,326	113,584	88,357	-36.6% ↓	-22.2% ↓

1. pp = percentage point and percentage changes may not add up due to rounding of raw figures

2. See the definitions and measurement paper for an explanation on how to use and interpret the baseline rate

Groups with the biggest changes in the proven re-offending rate since 2000

Biggest reductions:

- Adult females (a fall of 2.2 percentage points) (Table 2).
- 21 to 24 year olds (a fall of 2.6 percentage points) (Table 3).
- Adults with 7 to 10 previous offences (a fall of 3.2 percentage points) (Table 6a).
- Juveniles with 11 or more previous offences (a fall of 5.0 percentage points) (Table 6b).

- Adults who received court orders (a fall 3.7 percentage points) (Table 18a).
- Juveniles who received first tier penalties (a fall of 6.2 percentage points) (Table 18b).
- Adults who received custodial sentences of 12 months to less than 4 years (a fall of 9.3 percentage points) (Table 19a).

Biggest increases:

- Juvenile females (a rise of 3.2 percentage points) (Table 2).
- 40 to 49 year olds (a rise of 4.4 percentage points) (Table 3).
- Adults who received custodial sentences of less than 12 months (a rise of 3.6 percentage points) (Table 19a).

All offenders


Proven re-offending by age

Between April 2010 and March 2011, as in previous years, 15 to 17 year olds had the highest proven re-offending rate at 36.7 per cent. The proven re-offending rate falls with increasing age (after those aged 15 to 17) as shown in Figure E1 (Table 3).

Compared to 2000, the proven re-offending rate for the 12 months ending March 2011 rose for 10 to 17 year olds and for those aged 30 and over, but fell for offenders aged 18 to 29 (Table 3).

The largest decrease in the average number of re-offences per re-offender was among those aged 21 to 24, which fell from 3.61 in 2000 to 2.74 in the 12 months ending March 2011 (a fall of 24.0 per cent) (Table 3).

Figure E1: Proportion of offenders who commit a proven re-offence, by age, 2000, 12 months ending March 2010 and 12 months ending March 2011



Proven re-offending by criminal history

Offenders with a large number of previous offences have a higher rate of proven re-offending and this is true for both adults and juveniles. The proven re-offending rates range from 11.4 per cent for offenders with no previous offences to 48.2 per cent for offenders with 11 or more previous offences. Compared to 2000, the largest decrease in the proven re-offending rate for the 12 months ending March 2011 was among offenders who had seven to 10 previous offences (a fall of 4.4 percentage points) (Table 6c).

Adult offenders with 11 or more previous offences represented 28.4 per cent of all adult offenders in the 12 months ending March 2011. Around 75,000 offenders in this group committed 64.0 per cent of all adult proven re-offences (Table 6a).


For juveniles, there were around 5,000 offenders with 11 or more previous offences and they had a proven re-offending rate of 77.2 per cent. This group make up only 5.6 per cent of juvenile offenders, but committed almost a fifth (19.7 per cent) of all juvenile proven re-offences (around 18,000) (Table 6b).

Proven re-offending by index offence

The offence that leads to an offender being included in the relevant year is called the index offence. Between April 2010 and March 2011, as in most previous years, domestic burglary had the highest proven re-offending rate at 48.9 per cent, and sexual (child) offences the lowest at 9.4 per cent. The largest decrease between 2000 and the 12 months ending March 2011 in the proven re-offending rate was for soliciting or prostitution with a decrease of

19.0 percentage points, followed by other motoring offences with a decrease of 12.2 percentage points (Table 5c).

Figure E2: Proportion of adult and juvenile offenders who commit a proven re-offence, by index offence, 12 months ending March 2011




Adult proven re-offending

Between April 2010 and March 2011, there were around 550,000 adult offenders³. Around 140,000 of these offenders were proven to have committed a re-offence within a year. This gives a one year proven re-offending rate of 25.4 per cent, up slightly from the previous 12 months by 0.5 percentage points (Table 1).

These re-offenders committed an average of 2.88 re-offences, up from 2.80 in the previous 12 months (Table 1).


Overall there has been a 0.8 percentage point decrease in the proven re-offending rate since 2000 (from 26.2 to 25.4 per cent). However, compared to 2000, the offenders in 2010 had characteristics which meant they were more likely to re-offend. This means that, after controlling for offender characteristics, the decrease was larger at 3.1 percentage points (Table 1).

Figure E3: Proportion of adult offenders who commit a proven re-offence, 2000, 2002 to 12 months ending March 2011¹



1. Data are not available for 2001 due to a problem with archived data on Court Orders

Figure E4: Average number of proven re-offences per adult re-offender, 2000, 2002 to 12 months ending March 2011¹



1. Data are not available for 2001 due to a problem with archived data on Court Orders

Proven re-offending rates for adult offenders discharged from prison or commencing a court order

Between April 2010 and March 2011, around 190,000 adult offenders³ were discharged from prison or commenced a court order. Around 69,000 of these offenders were proven to have committed a re-offence within a year. This gives a one year proven re-offending rate of 36.0 per cent. The average number of proven re-offences committed by these re-offenders was 3.36.


Overall there was a 4.9 percentage point decrease (from 40.9 to 36.0 per cent) in the proven re-offending rate between 2000 and the 12 months ending March 2011 and an 18.5 per cent decrease (from 4.13 to 3.36) in the average number of proven re-offences per re-offender.

Proven re-offending rates for adult offenders discharged from prison

Between April 2010 and March 2011, around 56,000 adult offenders³ were discharged from prison. Around 26,000 of these (47.2 per cent) were proven to have committed a re-offence within a year. These offenders committed around 111,000 proven re-offences, an average of 4.21 each (Table 18a).

More than half (53.5 per cent) of adult offenders discharged from prison were released from a sentence of less than 12 months. These offenders had a one year proven re-offending rate of 57.8 per cent, an increase of 3.6 percentage points from 2000 (54.3 per cent) (Table 19a).

Figure E5: Proportion of adult offenders discharged from prison who commit a proven re-offence, by custodial sentence length, 2000, 2002 to 12 months ending March 2011¹



1. Data are not available for 2001 due to a problem with archived data on Court Orders

Proven re-offending rates for adult offenders by individual prison

Among prisons which discharged 30 or more offenders between April 2010 and March 2011, proven re-offending rates varied considerably from 12.9 per cent to 77.8 per cent for offenders with a sentence of less than 12 months and from 1.8 per cent to 66.2 per cent for offenders with a sentence of 12 months or more. A large part of this variability reflects the mix of offenders who are held in different prisons and, therefore, comparisons between prisons should not be made using these raw re-offending rates (Tables 22a and 22b).

To account for this variability in the mix of prisoners, a model has been developed to help explain if re-offending rates are affected by the specific prison they are discharged from or if the rate of re-offending reflects the mix of offenders. For example, a group of prisoners with a high number of previous offences is more likely to re-offend than a group with a low number of previous offences.

Among prisons discharging offenders serving sentences of less than 12 months, three prisons (Haverigg, Stafford and Sudbury) had significantly lower proven re-offending rates than expected and two (Ashfield and Feltham) had significantly higher (Table 22a).

Among prisons discharging offenders serving sentences of 12 months or more, four prisons had significantly lower proven re-offending rates (Askham Grange, East Sutton Park, Kirklevington Grange and Maidstone) than expected and one (Werrington) had significantly higher (Table 22b).

Proven re-offending for adult offenders commencing a court order

Between April 2010 and March 2011, around 110,000 adult offenders³ started a community order. Around 38,000 of these (35.6 per cent) committed a proven re-offence within a year. These proven re-offenders committed around 120,000 proven re-offences, an average of 3.27 each. Similarly, of the 39,000 adult offenders starting a suspended sentence order, 30.3 per cent committed a proven re-offence within a year, with an average of 2.95 proven re-offences each (Tables 20 and 21).

Proven re-offending rates for adult offenders by probation trust

Offenders given a court order are managed by the Probation Service which comprises 35 probation trusts. Proven re-offending rates for these offenders are presented by probation trust in Table 24. This takes the first court order commencement from within each probation trust as the start point for measuring re-offending and subsequent events as proven re-offences.

Proven re-offending rates varied considerably between probation trusts from 28.0 per cent to 44.1 per cent. A large part of this variability reflects the mix of offenders who are given a court order and, therefore, comparisons between probation trusts should not be made using these raw re-offending rates (Table 24).

For probation trusts an adjusted proven re-offending rate to control for differences in the composition of the offender group in each trust has been developed from the national model. Seven probation trusts showed significantly lower proven re-offending rates than expected. These were Gloucestershire, London, Northamptonshire, Staffordshire and West Midlands, Thames Valley, Warwickshire and West Yorkshire. One (Nottinghamshire) showed significantly higher proven re-offending rates than expected (Table 24).

Proven re-offending rates by index disposal (sentence type) should not be compared to assess the effectiveness of sentences, as there is no control for known differences in offender characteristics and the type of sentence given. The '2011 Compendium of Re-offending Statistics and Analysis' compares like for like offenders which enables a more reliable comparison of proven re-offending rates between offenders receiving different sentences.

The key results from the Compendium were:

- Those sentenced to one to two years in custody had lower re-offending rates than those given sentences of less than 12 months – the difference was 4.4 percentage points in 2008.
- Custodial sentences of less than 12 months were less effective at reducing re-offending than both community orders and suspended sentence orders – between five and nine percentage points in 2008.

www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/reoffending/compendium-of-reoffending-statistics-and-analysis

Juvenile proven re-offending

Between April 2010 and March 2011, there were around 88,000 juvenile offenders³. Around 32,000 of these offenders were proven to have committed a re-offence within a year. This gives a one year proven re-offending rate of 35.8 per cent, an increase of 2.5 percentage points from 33.3 per cent in the previous 12 months (Table 1).

These re-offenders committed an average of 2.87 re-offences, an increase from 2.79 in the previous 12 months (Table 1).

However, the number of juvenile proven offenders has decreased by 36.6 per cent since 2000 (Table 1). This is in line with the pattern of first time entrants to the criminal justice system where the number of young people receiving their first reprimand, warning or conviction has also decreased. More information on first time entrants for both adults and juveniles can be found in the 'Criminal Justice Statistics Quarterly Bulletin' at:

www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/criminal-justice/criminal-justice-statistics

Overall there has been a 2.1 percentage point increase in the proven re-offending rate of juveniles since 2000 (from 33.7 to 35.8 per cent). However, compared to 2000, the characteristics of juvenile offenders in the 12 months ending March 2011 meant that they were more likely to re-offend. Therefore, after controlling for offender characteristics, the proven re-offending rate actually decreased by 1.1 percentage points (Table 1).

Among Youth Offending Teams (YOTs), proven re-offending rates varied considerably from 24.2 per cent to 52.2 per cent. A large part of this variability reflects the mix of offenders who are managed by different YOTs and, therefore, comparisons between YOTs should not be made using these raw re-offending rates (Table 17).

More information on youth criminal statistics is available at:

www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/youth-justice

Trends in proven re-offending across the country

Map 1 shows proven re-offending rates by upper-tier local authority. This chart is not controlled for the characteristics of offenders and is designed for users to gain an understanding of what the level of proven re-offending is within their area and how it is changing over time.


When comparing between local authorities, the differences may be due to:

- Different types of offenders; areas where the offenders have high numbers of previous offences are likely to have higher proven re-offending rates.
- Police activity; areas with high police detection rates are likely to have higher proven re-offending rates.
- Age profile of offenders in the area; areas with a younger population are likely to have higher proven re-offending rates.

When comparing proven re-offending over time within local authorities, any significant changes in these factors may affect the comparison.

Between April 2010 and March 2011, very few local authorities showed substantial change compared to the previous 12 months. For local authorities with 30 or more offenders, the largest decrease was seen in the City of London (down 9.0 percentage points) and the largest increase was in Slough (up 3.3 percentage points) (Table 13c).

Map E1: Overall proven re-offending rates by upper-tier local authority for adults and juveniles, 12 months ending March 2011



© Crown copyright. All rights reserved. Ministry of Justice 100037819 2013

Prolific and other priority offenders

The Prolific and other Priority Offender Programme (PPO) aims to use a multi-agency approach to focus on a very small, but hard-core group of prolific/persistent offenders who commit a disproportionate amount of crime. Please refer to the 'Definitions and Measurement' document for more detail:

www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/reoffending/proven-re-offending

Around 7,100 offenders³ (adult and juvenile) were on the PPO scheme at some point between April 2010 and March 2011. Of these, around 5,500 committed a proven re-offence within a year (76.8 per cent). These re-offenders represented 0.9 per cent of all offenders, but were responsible for 5.1 per cent of all proven re-offences committed (Table 16).

Compared to the previous 12 months, the proportion of PPO offenders who committed a proven re-offence increased by 1.9 percentage points. This compares to an overall decrease of 0.2 percentage points since the scheme began in 2005 (Table 16).

Drug-misusing offenders

The Drug Interventions Programme (DIP) was introduced in April 2003 with the aim of developing and integrating measures for directing adult drug-misusing offenders into drug treatment and reducing offending behaviour. There are a number of ways offenders can be identified as drug-misusers. Please refer to the 'Definitions and Measurement' document for more detail:

www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/reoffending/proven-re-offending

Around 46,000 adult offenders³ were identified as drug-misusers at some point between April 2010 and March 2011. Of these, around 26,000 committed a proven re-offence within a year (57.6 per cent). These re-offenders represented 4.8 per cent of all adult offenders, but were responsible for 26.6 per cent of all proven re-offences committed by adult offenders (Table 15).

Compared to the previous 12 months, the proportion of drug-misusing offenders who committed a proven re-offence has increased by 2.5 percentage points. Since 2005, there has been a decrease of 7.7 percentage points, although most of this change occurred between 2005 and 2006 when there was a large expansion in the drug intervention programme (Table 15).

List of quarterly tables

Proven re-offending – overview

Table 1	Summary proven re-offending data, by adults and juveniles 2000, 2002 to March 2011
Table 2	Proven re-offending data, by gender, 2000, 2002 to March 2011
Table 3	Proven re-offending data, by age, 2000, 2002 to March 2011
Table 4a	Adult proven re-offending data, by ethnicity, 2000, 2002 to March 2011
Table 4b	Juvenile proven re-offending data, by ethnicity, 2000, 2002 to March 2011
Table 4c	Adult and juvenile proven re-offending data, by ethnicity, 2000, 2002 to March 2011
Table 5a	Adult proven re-offending data, by index offence, 2000, 2002 to March 2011
Table 5b	Juvenile proven re-offending data, by index offence, 2000, 2002 to March 2011
Table 5c	Adult and juvenile proven re-offending data, by index offence, 2000, 2002 to March 2011
Table 6a	Adult proven re-offending data, by number of previous offences, 2000, 2002 to March 2011
Table 6b	Juvenile proven re-offending data, by number of previous offences, 2000, 2002 to March 2011
Table 6c	Adult and juvenile proven re-offending data, by number of previous offences, 2000, 2002 to March 2011
Table 7a	Adult proven re-offending data, by number of previous custodial sentences, 2000, 2002 to March 2011
Table 7b	Juvenile proven re-offending data, by number of previous custodial sentences, 2000, 2002 to March 2011
Table 8	Serious proven re-offending data, 2000, 2002 to March 2011

-----**Tables 9 to12 are published annually in October**-----

- Table 13a** Proven re-offending of adult offenders, by upper-tier local authority, 2005 to March 2011 rolling quarters
- Table 13b** Proven re-offending of juvenile offenders, by upper-tier local authority, 2005 to March 2011 rolling quarters
- Table 13c** Proven re-offending of adult and juvenile offenders, by upper-tier local authority, 2005 to March 2011 rolling quarters
- Table 14a** Proven re-offending of adult offenders, by lower-tier local authority, 2005 to March 2011 rolling quarters
- Table 14b** Proven re-offending of juvenile offenders, by lower-tier local authority, 2005 to March 2011 rolling quarters
- Table 14c** Proven re-offending of adult and juvenile offenders, by lower-tier local authority, 2005 to March 2011 rolling quarters
- Table 15** Proven re-offending of adult drug-misusing offenders, by Drug Action Team, 2004 to March 2011 rolling quarters
- Table 16** Proven re-offending of adult and juvenile prolific and other priority offenders, by upper-tier local authority, 2005 to March 2011 rolling quarters
- Table 17** Juvenile proven re-offending data, by Youth Offending Team and upper-tier local authority, 2005 to March 2011 rolling quarters

Proven re-offending by index disposal, probation trust and prison

- Table 18a** Adult proven re-offending data, by index disposal, 2000, 2002 to March 2011
- Table 18b** Juvenile proven re-offending data, by index disposal, 2000, 2002 to March 2011
- Table 19a** Adult proven re-offending data, by custodial sentence length, 2000, 2002 to March 2011
- Table 19b** Juvenile proven re-offending data, by custodial sentence length, 2000, 2002 to March 2011
- Table 20** Adult proven re-offending data, by most frequently-used combinations of requirements for offenders starting Community Orders, 2005 to March 2011
- Table 21** Adult proven re-offending data, by most frequently-used combinations of requirements for offenders starting Suspended Sentence Orders, 2005 to March 2011

- Table 22a** Proven re-offending of adult offenders given sentences of less than 12 months, by individual prison, based on first discharge from each prison, 2007 to March 2011
- Table 22b** Proven re-offending of adult offenders given sentences of 12 months or more, by individual prison, based on first discharge from each prison, 2007 to March 2011
- Table 23** Juvenile proven re-offending data, by individual prison or secure accommodation, based on first discharge from each prison or secure accommodation, 2007 to March 2011
- Table 24** Adult proven re-offending data by probation trust based on first commencement from each trust, 2005 to March 2011
- Table 25** Proven re-offending data for adult offenders released from prison on licence, by probation trust, 2008 to March 2011

Annex A

Payment by results

Background

The “Breaking the Cycle” Green Paper⁶ included a commitment for the MoJ to commission a series of initial ‘payment by results’ (PbR) pilot projects, to test the principle that PbR can result in service improvements by delivering better outcomes for the public at the same or less cost. Ten pilot projects are underway, testing a range of approaches and performance measures in different areas.

For the pilots at Peterborough and Doncaster prisons, the outcome measure is defined as a real reduction in re-convictions among offenders during the 12 months following release from prison.

The Local Justice Reinvestment PbR pilots in operation across five London boroughs and Greater Manchester use a different outcome measure, namely a reduction in demand on the Criminal Justice System. The results for the first year of this pilot have been published separately at the following link:

www.justice.gov.uk/information-access-rights/transparency-data/justice-reinvestment-pilots-first-year-results

The MoJ published ‘*Transforming Rehabilitation – a revolution in the way we manage offenders*’ on 9 January 2013. This consultation paper proposes reforming the way in which offender services are delivered, including opening the majority of probation services to competition and the wider implementation of PbR. The pilot projects currently in operation continue to inform our plans to roll out PbR across the criminal justice system.

The ‘*Transforming Rehabilitation*’ consultation paper can be accessed through the link below. The deadline for consultation responses is 22 February 2013.

consult.justice.gov.uk/digital-communications/transforming-rehabilitation

Prison results

The re-conviction measures used for the PbR pilot prisons presented below differ from the National Statistics re-offending measure. It counts offenders who are convicted at court in the 12 months following release from prison with a further six months to allow for cases to progress through the courts. It excludes those who receive an out-of-court disposal only. This is because, for PbR purposes, we want to measure a change in numbers of court convictions which are more closely associated with costs to the Criminal Justice System.

⁶ www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/consultations/breaking-the-cycle.pdf

Offenders are counted in the cohort if they are discharged from the prison at any time during the cohort period. The measure excludes those who serve the whole of their custodial sentence on remand as well as the usual National Statistics exclusions as explained in the 'Definitions and Measurement' document⁷.

Table A1 below is included in the Proven Re-offending Quarterly Bulletin each quarter and shows, for each of the pilot prisons, the baseline and target re-conviction rate⁸.

⁷ www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/reoffending/proven-re-offending

⁸ The rate at which the PbR outcome payment is first triggered at any given pilot site

Table A1: Payment by results pilot prisons, baseline and target re-conviction rates

Prison / Area	Start date of pilot	Baseline re-conviction rate (Jan to Dec 2009)	Target re-conviction rate (Oct 2011 to Sep 2012)	Outcome re-conviction rate (Oct 2011 to Sept 2012)
Peterborough Social Impact Bond (SIB) ⁹	9 September 2010	To be determined by comparison with control group	To be determined by comparison with control group	To be published in 2014
HMP Doncaster ¹⁰	1 October 2011	58.2%	53.2%	To be published in 2014

Number of eligible offenders in payment by results pilots

As part of the Department's Business Plan (2011-2015), the MoJ is committed to publishing quarterly data on the number of pilot rehabilitation schemes established and the number of participants, subject to commercial confidentiality and UK Statistics Authority guidance.

Table A2: Payment by results pilots commenced

Prison / Area	Start date of pilot	Length of pilot	Number of eligible participants for Cohort 1	Number of eligible participants to date for Cohort 2
Peterborough Social Impact Bond (SIB) ⁹	9 September 2010	Six years	1,034 ¹¹	126 ¹²
HMP Doncaster ¹⁰	1 October 2011	Four years	1,503 ¹³	N/A

⁹ The Peterborough 'Social Impact Bond' uses a different outcome measure (the frequency of re-conviction events) and its success is measured against a control group. The results will be published separately

¹⁰ For Doncaster prison the outcome measure is the proportion of offenders who are convicted at court in the 12 months following release from prison with a further six months to allow for cases to progress through the courts

¹¹ Eligible participants from Cohort 1 from 9 September 2010 to 1 July 2012

¹² Eligible participants from Cohort 2 from 2 July 2012 to 30 September 2012

¹³ Eligible participants from Cohort 1 from 1 October 2011 to 30 September 2012

Annex B

How the measure of proven re-offending has changed and the effect of these changes

Background

The MoJ launched a statistical consultation on improvements to the transparency and accessibility of our information in 2010 and a response to the consultation was published in March 2011¹⁴. One aspect of the consultation was the measurement of proven re-offending.

Prior to the consultation there were six different measures of proven re-offending:

- National adult proven re-offending;
- Local adult proven re-offending;
- National youth proven re-offending;
- Local youth proven re-offending;
- Prolific and other priority offending (PPO); and
- Drug-misusing proven offending.

The new approach to measuring proven re-offending integrates these approaches into a single framework. This allows users to:

- form a clear picture of proven re-offending at national and local levels;
- compare adult and youth results, and enable other work on transition between the youth and adult criminal justice systems;
- understand how results for different offender groups (such as those managed by the prison and probation services, those under the PPO schemes, drug-misusing offenders, first time entrants, etc.) fit in to the overall picture on proven re-offending; and
- continue to analyse proven re-offending behaviour for particular types of offender.

¹⁴ The response to the consultation is available here www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/consultations/improvements-moj-statistics-consultation-response.pdf

Comparing trends in re-offending

Table B1 shows the proportion of offenders with a proven re-offence/re-conviction using the new measure of re-offending and the previous measures of adult re-conviction and juvenile re-offending. Comparisons we make use cohorts up to 2009.

Re-offending rates are lower using the new measure than using the previous measure. The differences are as follows:

- For adult and juvenile offenders the new measure is based on all offenders released from custody, receiving a non-custodial conviction at court, a caution, reprimand, warning or tested positive for opiates or cocaine over a 12 month period, but the previous measures only included offenders released from custody or commencing a court order in the first three months of the year. Using a three month sample over-represents prolific offenders in comparison to a full year's worth of data.
- For adults the new measure counts all offenders including those who received a caution, fine or discharge, where the previous adult measure only included those who commenced a court order or who were discharged from custody.
- For adult offenders, the new measure is a measure of proven re-offending (which counts offences proven through a court conviction or a caution) whereas the previous measure is a measure of re-conviction (which only counts offences proven through a court conviction).

As a result, re-offending rates are 14.4 percentage points lower for adults and rates for juveniles are 4.1 percentage points lower using the new measure.

However, the re-offending rates are similar for adults given a court order or who received a custodial sentence, including those given a sentence of less than 12 months. Rates are between 1.0 and 2.6 percentage points lower using the new measure.

Table B1: Re-offending using the new and previous measures, 2009


	New measure	Previous measure(s)
Adults	24.9	39.3
Juveniles	32.8	36.9
Adults given a court order	34.5	35.5
Adults given a custodial sentence	46.8	48.5
Adults given a custodial sentence of less than 12m	56.8	59.4

Figure B1 shows re-offending rates for adult offenders between 2000 and 2009 using the new and previous measure.

For 2009, 24.9 per cent of adult offenders have a proven re-offence within 12 months using the new measure compared to 39.3 per cent using the previous

re-conviction measure. However, trends for adult offenders are similar using the two measures. The proportion of offenders with a proven re-offence/re-conviction rose between 2000 and 2002, fell between 2002 and 2006, rose between 2006 and 2008, and fell between 2008 and 2009 using both measures.

Figure B1: Adult re-conviction/re-offending, by re-offending measure, 2000, 2002 to 2009




The overall reduction in re-offending is smaller using the new measure (1.2 percentage points between 2000 and 2009 and 0.5 percentage points between 2008 and 2009) than using the previous measure (3.7 percentage points between 2000 and 2009 and 0.8 percentage points between 2008 and 2009).

Figure B2 shows re-offending rates for juvenile offenders between 2000 and 2009 using the new and previous measure.


In 2009, 32.8 per cent of young offenders re-offended within 12 months using the new measure compared to 36.9 per cent using the previous measure. The reduction in re-offending is smaller using the new measure (0.9 percentage points between 2000 and 2009 and 0.1 percentage points between 2008 and 2009) than using the previous measure (3.3 percentage points between 2000 and 2009 and 0.4 percentage points between 2008 and 2009). Overall, the trends are broadly similar.

Figure B2: Juvenile re-offending, by re-offending measure, 2000, 2002 to 2009



Trends in proven re-offending/re-conviction rates for adult custodial offenders are similar using the new and previous measures. The proportion of offenders given a custodial sentence of less than 12 months who re-offended rose between 2000 and 2009 using both measures (by 2.6 percentage points using the new measure and 1.4 percentage points using the previous measure). The proportion of offenders given any custodial sentence who re-offended fell between 2000 and 2009 using both measures (by 2.6 percentage points using the new measure and 2.9 percentage points using the previous measure).

Figure B3: Adult re-conviction/re-offending of custodial offenders, by re-offending measure and sentence, 2000 and 2009



The change in methodology

The following sections provide detail regarding the change in methodology between the methods in measuring re-offending and how those changes impact on the data.

The table below provides a comparison of the previous methodologies with the new approach.

Table B2: Re-offending using the new and previous measures

Comparison of previous and new measures of proven re-offending

	Previous measures of re-offending						New measure of re-offending
	National adult re-conviction	Local adult re-offending	National youth re-offending	Local youth re-offending	Prolific and other Priority Offending (PPO)	Drug-misusing offending	
The cohort	Offenders aged 18+ discharged from custody or commencing court orders under probation supervision between January to March	Offenders aged 18+ on the probation caseload at the end of each calendar quarter	Offenders aged 10-17 discharged from custody, receiving a court conviction or receiving a caution/reprimand or final warning between January and March	Offenders aged 10-17 discharged from custody, receiving a court conviction or receiving a caution/reprimand or final warning between January and March	All offenders identified as being on the PPO scheme as at 1 April	All Class A drug offenders identified through positive drug tests on arrest, OASyS or drug requirement as part of a court order, CJIT identification, or identification on prison release between January and March	All offenders who received a caution/reprimand or warning, were convicted at court (other than custody), were discharged from custody, or tested positive for cocaine or opiates on arrest over a 12 month period.
The follow-up period to measure re-offending	12 months for offences to occur and a further 6 months for offences to be proved	3 months for offences to occur and a further 3 months for offences to be proved	12 months for offences to occur and a further 6 months for offences to be proved	12 months for offences to occur and a further 3 months for offences to be proved	12 months for offences to occur and a further 3 months for offences to be proved	12 months for offences to occur and a further 3 months for offences to be proved	12 months for offences to occur and a further 6 months for offences to be proved

The headline measure	Frequency of re-offending (the number of proven re-offences per 100 offenders)	Proportion of offenders re-offending, compared to the rate that would be expected based on the offender characteristics	Frequency of re-offending (the number of proven re-offences per 100 offenders)	Frequency of re-offending (the number of proven re-offences per 100 offenders)	Number of further offences compared to number in previous year, against the reduction that would be expected given time on the PPO scheme	Number of further offences compared to what would be expected based on their previous offending history	Proportion of offenders re-offending We also include information on the frequency of re-offending and information on the predicted rate based on offender characteristics
What counts as a proven re-offence	Offences committed within the follow-up period which were proved by a court conviction either within the follow-up period or in a further six months	Offences committed within the follow-up period which were proved by a court conviction or caution either within the follow-up period or in a further three months	Offences committed within the follow-up period which were proved by a court conviction or reprimand or final warning either within the follow-up period or in a further six months	Offences committed within the follow-up period which were proved by a court conviction or reprimand or final warning either within the follow-up period or in a further three months	Offences committed within the follow-up period which were proved by a court conviction or caution either within the follow-up period or in a further three months. Breach offences that lead to substantive recorded convictions are included	Offences committed within the follow-up period which were proved by a court conviction either within the follow-up period or in a further three months	Offences committed within the follow-up period which were proved by a court conviction or caution/reprimand or warning either within the follow-up period or in a further six months

Use of a predicted rate	A predicted rate of re-offending was included for the proportion of offenders expected to re-offend based on their characteristics Logistic regression was used	A predicted rate of re-offending was included for the proportion of offenders expected to re-offend based on their characteristics Logistic regression was used	A predicted rate of re-offending was included for the proportion of offenders expected to re-offend based on their characteristics Logistic regression was used	No predicted rate	Evidence on the link between time on the PPO scheme and expected reductions in further offending were used to assess reductions in number of offences compared to the previous year	A predicted rate of re-offending was included for the proportion of offenders expected to re-offend based on their previous criminal history Response surface methodology was used	A predicted rate of re-offending is included for the proportion of offenders expected to re-offend based on their characteristics Logistic regression is used
Data source	Police National Computer	Police National Computer	Police National Computer	Youth Offending Teams data	Police National Computer	Police National Computer	Police National Computer
Geographic breakdown	None	Region, Probation area, Local Authority	None	Youth Offending Team level	Police Force and Local Authority level	Drug Action team and Local Authority level	Upper and lower tier local authority areas for all offenders. Other breakdowns for specific categories of offender.

The effect of the changes

Adults

Differences in methodology are reflected in different results. Table B3 shows the impact on reported rates of adult re-conviction/re-offending. The table breaks down the changes between the previous measure and the new measure to identify the different effects of the changes in methodology.

Table B3: Re-offending/re-convictions data for adult offenders, 2000, 2002 to 2009

	Previous ¹ measure: re-convictions (prison and probation offenders only), first quarter of the year	Previous measure: re-convictions (prison and probation offenders only), whole year	New measure: re-offending (prison and probation offenders only), whole year	New measure: proven re-offending (all offenders), whole year
		Proportion		
2000	43.0	40.0	40.9	26.2
2002	45.5	42.0	43.0	27.6
2003	45.4	41.5	42.4	26.9
2004	42.9	38.6	39.8	25.5
2005	41.2	36.6	38.4	24.9
2006	38.6	35.6	37.6	24.6
2007	39.0	35.9	37.9	24.8
2008	40.1	36.1	37.9	25.4
2009	39.3	34.7	36.2	24.9
		Frequency (average per offender)		
2000	1.85	1.66	1.69	0.89
2002	2.13	1.84	1.87	0.99
2003	2.05	1.73	1.76	0.93
2004	1.81	1.51	1.54	0.83
2005	1.66	1.36	1.40	0.77
2006	1.44	1.26	1.31	0.73
2007	1.47	1.27	1.32	0.73
2008	1.55	1.27	1.31	0.75
2009	1.41	1.15	1.18	0.70
		Frequency of re-offenders (average per re-offender)		
2000	4.30	4.15	4.13	3.39
2002	4.68	4.39	4.36	3.59
2003	4.52	4.18	4.15	3.44
2004	4.23	3.91	3.87	3.27
2005	4.03	3.70	3.65	3.10
2006	3.73	3.54	3.48	2.95
2007	3.78	3.53	3.48	2.94
2008	3.88	3.51	3.46	2.93
2009	3.57	3.31	3.27	2.80
		Number of offenders		
2000	42,734	148,052	148,052	477,698
2002	43,247	157,243	157,243	495,664
2003	44,095	159,686	159,686	520,660
2004	46,532	163,775	163,775	512,600
2005	43,429	170,021	170,021	532,045
2006	50,281	181,726	181,726	571,458
2007	50,085	190,418	190,418	595,020
2008	53,718	197,035	197,035	589,948
2009	56,616	200,077	200,077	576,255

1. Based on the national adult re-convictions publication (March 2011)

Among adult offenders in 2009, the previous national measure (the first column) shows that 39.3 per cent of adult offenders were re-convicted within a year based on a sample of 56,616 offenders.

The second column shows the re-conviction rates from the previous measure looking at offenders who were released from custody or commenced a court order, but at any point during the year. The inclusion of offenders from a full 12 month period means the results are calculated using the full proven offender population rather than a sample – this ensures we do not over-represent prolific offenders in the cohort, which is a problem in using a January to March sample as in the previous adult re-conviction measure.

This leads to a lower proportion of re-convicted offenders (between three and five percentage points, e.g. 34.7 per cent compared to 39.3 per cent in 2009). The change to a full year also increases the number of offenders, to 200,077 in 2009¹⁵.

The third column shows the proven re-offending rates from the new measure, but still based only on those offenders who were released from custody or commenced a court order at any point during the year. Proven re-offending includes offences which result in a caution in addition to those resulting in a conviction at court. The proportion of offenders who were proven to re-offend is between one and two percentage points higher than for those who were re-convicted (36.2 per cent compared to 34.7 per cent in 2009). There is little difference at this stage because we are still only considering offenders who already have a prison or a court order.

The fourth column shows the re-offending rates from the new measure looking at all adult offenders who received a caution, a conviction at court, discharged from custody, or tested positive for cocaine or opiates. The inclusion of these offenders increases the numbers considerably. In 2009, the previous adult measure tracks the re-offending behaviour of 56,616 offenders; the new measure tracks 576,255 offenders. The inclusion of offenders who received less severe disposals and are generally less prolific in nature reduces the proportion who re-offend by around 11 to 16 percentage points (36.2 per cent compared to 24.9 per cent in 2009).

Change over time

Compared to the previous measure, the reduction over time in the proportion of offenders who re-offend is much lower using the new measure. Using the previous measure, between 2000 and 2009, the proportion of offenders who were re-convicted fell 3.7 percentage points (from 43.0 to 39.3 per cent). Using the new measure, the proportion of offenders who committed a proven re-offence fell 1.2 percentage points (from 26.2 to 24.9 per cent).

¹⁵ The previous measure includes offenders released from custody or who commenced a court order in the first three months of the year, shown in column one. Column two includes offenders released from custody or who commenced a court order in the 12 month period. The number of offenders shown in column two is less than four times as many as in column one. This is because some offenders commence a court order or are discharged from custody more than once in a year. These calculations only count each offender once e.g. offender Y is discharged from custody in the first quarter of the year, and discharged again in the second quarter, but he is only counted as a single offender

Juveniles

The only change between the previous measure and the new measure of re-offending among young people is the move from a one quarter sample to including all young offenders over the period of a year.

Table B4: Re-offending data for juvenile offenders, 2000, 2002 to 2009

	Previous measure ¹ proven re-offending	New measure proven re- offending
	Proportion	
2000	40.2	33.7
2002	38.5	33.4
2003	39.0	34.3
2004	38.6	33.6
2005	38.4	33.6
2006	38.7	33.9
2007	37.5	32.5
2008	37.3	32.9
2009	36.9	32.8
	Frequency (average per offender)	
2000	1.51	1.12
2002	1.42	1.10
2003	1.42	1.09
2004	1.32	1.03
2005	1.25	0.98
2006	1.23	0.97
2007	1.16	0.90
2008	1.14	0.91
2009	1.10	0.90
	Frequency of re-offenders (average per re-offender)	
2000	3.77	3.32
2002	3.69	3.29
2003	3.63	3.19
2004	3.43	3.06
2005	3.26	2.91
2006	3.18	2.86
2007	3.08	2.77
2008	3.06	2.75
2009	2.99	2.75
	Number of offenders	
2000	41,176	139,326
2002	40,753	136,401
2003	40,297	138,379
2004	44,153	149,452
2005	45,337	163,545
2006	48,938	171,061
2007	52,544	171,454
2008	44,837	145,579
2009	37,472	121,107

1. Based on the national juvenile re-offending publication (March 2011) publication

As for adults, using the whole year reduces the proportion of offenders who re-offended because we do not over-represent prolific offenders in the cohort, which is a problem in using a January to March sample. Table B4 shows the reduction is between four and seven percentage points.

For 2009, with the previous measure, 36.9 per cent commit a proven re-offence within one year; with the new measure, 32.8 per cent do so. The new measure, which is based on offenders from a 12 month period, includes over three times as many offenders as the existing measure.

Change over time

Compared to the previous measure, the reduction in the proportion of offenders who re-offend between 2000 and 2009 is much lower using the new measure.

Using the previous measure, between 2000 and 2009, the proportion of offenders who were proven to re-offend fell 3.3 percentage points (from 40.2 to 36.9 per cent). Using the new measure, the proportion of offenders who committed a proven re-offence fell 0.9 percentage points (from 33.7 to 32.8 per cent).

Drug-misusing offenders

Published results for drug-misusing offenders on the previous measure covered 2008 and 2009; results using the new measure cover from 2004 onwards.

The previous measure:

- Includes offenders who have been identified in the first quarter of the year, whereas the new measure includes offenders from any point during the year.
- Includes all drug-misusing offenders irrespective of the date of proven offence, whereas the new measure includes identified drug-misusing offenders who have received a caution, been convicted at court, been discharged from custody, or tested positive for cocaine or opiates on arrest during a 12 month period.
- Counts re-offences that were proven through a court conviction, whereas the new measure counts re-offences that were proven by a court conviction or caution.

As for adult and juvenile offenders, using the whole year to identify offenders reduces the proportion of offenders who re-offend, because we do not over-represent prolific offenders in the cohort, which is a problem in using a January to March sample. Table B5 shows the impact on reported rates of re-offending/re-conviction by drug-misusing offenders.

Table B5: Re-offending data for drug-misusing offenders, 2004 to 2009

	Previous measure ¹ proven re-conviction	New measure of proven re-offending
Proportion		
2004		67.3
2005		65.3
2006		58.6
2007		57.2
2008	61.0	56.4
2009	57.0	54.7
Frequency (average per offender)		
2004		3.20
2005		2.94
2006		2.37
2007		2.34
2008	2.6	2.29
2009	2.2	2.10
Frequency of re-offenders (average per re-offender)		
2004		4.75
2005		4.51
2006		4.03
2007		4.09
2008	4.3	4.06
2009	3.9	3.84
Number of offenders		
2004		20,652
2005		29,112
2006		44,597
2007		54,474
2008	20,934	59,039
2009	20,109	53,109

1. Based on the national drug-misusing offenders publication (December 2010)

Table B5 shows that the proportion of offenders who commit a proven re-offence is between two and five percentage points lower using the new measure (57.0 per cent using the previous measure compared to 54.7 per cent using the new measure). The new measure, which follows offenders over a 12 month period, includes between two and three times as many offenders as the existing measure.

Prolific and other priority offenders

Published results for prolific and other priority offenders (PPOs) on the previous measure presented the frequency of proven re-offending for all PPOs; results using the new measure cover the proportion of offenders proven to re-offend, and the frequency of proven re-offending for all offenders and for re-offenders from 2005 onwards.

The previous measure:

- Includes offenders who have been identified in the first quarter of the year, whereas the new measure includes offenders from any point during the year. However, PPOs are generally on the PPO programme for a sustained period of time so this only has a moderate impact on numbers of offenders included.
- Includes all identified PPOs, whereas the new measure includes identified PPOs who have tested positive for cocaine or opiates, received a caution, been convicted at court, or been discharged from custody during a 12 month period.
- Counts re-offences that are proven through a court conviction or caution and also includes breach offences that lead to substantive recorded convictions. The new measure only includes re-offences proven through a court conviction or caution.

Table B6 shows the impact on reported rates of proven re-offending by PPOs and on numbers of offenders included in the measure.

Table B6: Re-offending data for Prolific and other Priority Offenders, 2005 to 2009

	Previous measure ¹ proven re-offending	New measure of proven re-offending
Proportion		
2005		77.0
2006		75.7
2007		75.8
2008		77.2
2009	56.0	75.1
Frequency (average per offender)		
2005		4.01
2006		3.83
2007		3.80
2008	2.6	3.80
2009	2.4	3.49
Frequency of re-offenders (average per re-offender)		
2005		5.21
2006		5.06
2007		5.01
2008		4.93
2009	4.3	4.65
Number of offenders		
2005		8,555
2006		8,239
2007		8,309
2008	10,771	8,607
2009	10,635	8,156

1. Based on the national Prolific and other Priority Offenders publication (March 2010)

The average number of proven re-offences committed by PPOs in 2009 is lower for the previous measure than for the new measure in 2008 (2.4 re-offences per offender using the previous measure, but 3.49 using the new).

The previous measure includes PPOs who have not been proven guilty of an offence or been discharged from custody in the 12 month period when the re-offending cohort is formed. This type of offender is likely to have a lower level of re-offending.

These differences may help to explain:

- why the frequency of re-offending is lower for the previous measure than for the new measure in 2009 (2.4 re-offences per offender using the previous measure, but 3.49 using the new); and
- why the previous measure includes nearly 2,500 more PPOs in 2009 than does the new measure.

Local adult re-offending

The most similar results for the new measure of re-offending and the existing local measure of adult re-offending are the early estimates of re-offending of offenders given a court order. Like the existing measure of local adult re-offending, the early estimates of offenders given a court order:

- measure re-offending over three months;
- only measures offenders under probation supervision;
- provides results by probation trust; and
- compares actual re-offending rates with a predicted re-offending rate.

There remain significant differences between the early estimates and the existing local adult measure of re-offending, including:

- The existing local adult measure includes offenders on licence – the early estimates include offenders commencing court orders only;
- The existing local adult measure uses a 'snapshot' approach. This means offenders are counted if they are on the caseload at certain times in the year. Offenders who are on the caseload for a short period of time may not get counted with the existing measure. The early estimates count every offender who commences a court order;
- Because the existing local adult measure uses a 'snapshot' approach some offenders may get counted up to four times if they are on the caseload for over 12 months. The early estimates count every offender once;

- The existing local adult measure measures the re-offending of offenders at any point during the court order – the early estimates measure re-offending in the first three months after an offender commenced a court order; and
- The predicted score for the existing local adult measure was derived from analysis of 2007 re-offending data and the prediction for the early estimates was derived from analysis of 2008 re-offending data.

These differences explain why the re-offending rate is higher with the early estimates of re-offending by offenders commencing a court order than with the existing measure of local adult re-offending:

- offenders on licence have lower rates of re-offending than those commencing a court order; and
- offenders serving a court order have lower rates of re-offending the longer they are on that court order.

However, the prediction for the early estimates has been tailored specifically to the relevant group of offenders.

Local youth re-offending

The previous measure of youth re-offending used data that Youth Offending Teams (YOT) collected themselves from their local police and courts. The measure was used as management information and was never published or put into the public domain. The new measure uses data from the Police National Computer (PNC). Internal analysis and discussion with stakeholders has highlighted a number of differences between the two data sources:

- The PNC includes a number of offenders who have received a reprimand or final warning which do not always appear on the YOT systems. As a result, there are more youth offenders and a higher overall youth re-offending rate using the new measure than using the previous local youth re-offending measure.
- The PNC includes more comprehensive data on re-offending as adults by offenders who originally offended as youths.
- Using PNC data reduces the data-collection burden on YOT and local police forces.
- PNC data measures re-offending on recordable offences and YOT data measures re-offending on all offences. Offences which are not recordable include speeding offences, parking offences and other minor motoring offences. As a result, YOT data is more comprehensive for motoring re-offences.

- The new measure allocates offenders to a locality using their home address data from the PNC; the previous local youth measure allocated offenders using offender management data. As a result, Looked After Children (LAC) who are in foster care, or in a children's home, or in a boarding school or live with another adult known to children's services, maybe allocated to a different YOT under the previous youth measure than the new measure.
- For their re-offending to be included in the new measure, administrative data on young people in custody and secure accommodation has to be matched to the PNC. Some cases are not successfully matched. This process was not required for these offenders to be included in the previous local youth measure. As a result, YOT data can be more comprehensive regarding custodial offenders or those in secure accommodation.
- Using PNC data provides an external measure of youth re-offending, which makes it an appropriate data-source to support any future policies which tie local funding to re-offending performance.
- Using PNC data allows local youth re-offending to be measured on the same basis as national youth re-offending and adult re-offending, permitting adult and youth re-offending to be measured on a like-for-like basis and a more comprehensive picture of re-offending to be formed.

Work is underway to fully quantify the extent of these differences.

Annex C

Glossary of terms

Re-offending terms

Cohort – this is the group of individuals whose re-offending is measured.

Index offence – the index offence is the proven offence that leads to an offender being included in the cohort.

Index disposal – the index disposal of the offender is the type of sentence the offender received for their index offence.

Start point (also known as the index date) – this is the set point in time from when re-offences are measured.

Follow-up period – this is the length of time proven re-offending is measured over.

Waiting period – this is the additional time beyond the follow-up period to allow for offences committed towards the end of the follow-up period to be proved by a court conviction, caution, reprimand or final warning.

Adjusted to baseline – proven re-offending is related to the characteristics of offenders which means that any overall rate of proven re-offending will depend, in part, on the characteristics of offenders coming into the system (just as the examination pass rate of a school will be related to the characteristics of its pupils). We use a modelling technique to produce a baseline figure adjusted to match the characteristics of the cohort we are comparing. Please refer to the ‘Definitions and Measurement’ document for more detail at www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/reoffending/proven-re-offending.

Re-conviction – where an offender is convicted at court for an offence committed within a set follow-up period and convicted within either the follow-up period or waiting period.

Proven re-offence – where an offender is convicted at court or receives some other form of criminal justice sanction for an offence committed within a set follow-up period and disposed of within either the follow-up period or waiting period.

Cohort used in the Proven Re-offending Statistics Quarterly Bulletin – the proven re-offending cohort consists of all offenders discharged from custody, otherwise sanctioned at court, receiving a caution, reprimand or warning or tested positive for opiates or cocaine in each year. This cohort’s criminal history is collated and criminal behaviour is tracked over the following

one year. Any offence committed in this one year period which is proven by a court conviction or out-of-court disposal (either in the one year period, or in a further six months waiting period) counts as a proven re-offence.

Cohort used in the Local Adult Re-offending Quarterly Bulletin – the local adult re-offending measure takes a snapshot of all offenders, aged 18 or over, who are under probation supervision at the end of a quarter, and combines four such snapshots together. This cohort's criminal history is collated and criminal behaviour is tracked over the following three months. Any offence committed in this three month period which is proven by a court conviction or out-of-court disposal (either in the three month period, or in a further three months waiting period) counts as a proven re-offence. The latest available publication is the Local Adult Re-offending: 1 July 2011 – 30 June 2012, England and Wales; Ministry of Justice, November 2012.

www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/reoffending/local-adult-reoffending

Disposal (sentence type)

Fine – a financial penalty imposed following conviction.

Court orders – court orders include community sentences, community orders and suspended sentence orders supervised by the Probation Service. They do not include any pre or post release supervision.

Criminal Justice Act 2003 (CJA03) – for offences committed on or after 4 April 2005, the new community order replaced all existing community sentences for adults. The Act also introduced a new suspended sentence order for offences which pass the custody threshold. It also changed the release arrangements for prisoners. See Appendix A of Offender Management Caseload Statistics 2009 for more information.

Community order – for offences committed on or after 4 April 2005, the new community order introduced under the CJA 2003 replaced all existing community sentences for those aged 18 years and over. This term refers to all court orders except suspended sentence orders and deferred sentences which may have a custodial component to the sentence. The court must add at least one, but could potentially add all 12 requirements depending on the offences and the offender. The requirements are:

- unpaid work (formerly community service/community punishment) – a requirement to complete between 40 and 300 hours' unpaid work;
- activity – for example, to attend basic skills classes;
- programme – there are several designed to reduce the prospects of re-offending;
- prohibited activity – a requirement not do so something that is likely to lead to further offence or nuisance;

- curfew – which is electronically monitored;
- exclusion – this is not used frequently as there is no reliable electronic monitoring yet available;
- residence – requirement to reside only where approved by probation officer;
- mental health treatment (requires offender's consent);
- drug rehabilitation (requires offender's consent);
- alcohol treatment (requires offender's consent);
- supervision – meetings with probation officer to address needs/offending behaviour; and
- attendance centre – between a minimum of 12 hours and a maximum of 36 in total which includes three hours of activity.

Typically, the more serious the offence and the more extensive the offender's needs, the more requirements there will be. Most orders will comprise of one or two requirements, but there are packages of several requirements available where required. The court tailors the order as appropriate and is guided by the Probation Service through a pre-sentence report.

Suspended sentence order (SSO) – the CJA 2003 introduced a new suspended sentence order which is made up of the same requirements as a community order and, in the absence of breach is served wholly in the community supervised by the Probation Service. It consists of an 'operational period' (the time for which the custodial sentence is suspended) and a 'supervision period' (the time during which any requirements take effect). Both may be between six months and two years and the 'supervision period' cannot be longer than the 'operational period', although it may be shorter. Failure to comply with the requirements of the order or commission of another offence will almost certainly result in a custodial sentence.

Pre CJA03 Court Orders – Community sentences

Community punishment order (CPO) – the offender is required to undertake unpaid community work.

Community rehabilitation order (CRO) - a community sentence which may have additional requirements such as residence, probation centre attendance or treatment for drug, alcohol or mental health problems.

Community punishment and rehabilitation order (CPRO) – a community sentence consisting of probation supervision alongside community punishment, with additional conditions like those of a community rehabilitation order.

Drug treatment and testing order (DTTO) – a community sentence targeted at offenders with drug-misuse problems.

Custody – the offender is awarded a sentence to be served in prison or a Young Offenders Institute (YOI). If the offender is given a sentence of 12 months or over, or is aged under 22 on release, the offender is supervised by the Probation Service on release. It is important to note that the sentence lengths and youth disposals awarded will be longer than the time served in custody. For more information please refer to Appendix A of Offender Management Caseload Statistics 2009.

Short sentences (under 12 months) – those sentenced to under 12 months (made under the Criminal Justice Act 1991) spend the first half of their sentence in prison and are then released and considered ‘at risk’ for the remaining period. This means they are under no positive obligations and do not report to the Probation Service, but if they commit a further imprisonable offence during the ‘at risk’ period, they can be made to serve the remainder of the sentence in addition to the punishment for the new offence. The exception to this is those aged 18 to 20 who have a minimum of three month’s supervision on release.

Sentences of 12 months or over – the CJA03 created a distinction between standard determinate sentences and public protection sentences. Offenders sentenced to a standard determinate sentence serve the first half in prison and the second half in the community on licence.

Youth disposal (sentence type)

Reprimand or warning – a reprimand is a formal verbal warning given by a police officer to a juvenile offender who admits they are guilty for a minor first offence. A final warning is similar to a reprimand, but can be used for either the first or second offence, and includes an assessment of the juvenile to determine the causes of their offending behaviour and a programme of activities is designed to address them.

First-tier penalties

Discharge – a juvenile offender is given an absolute discharge when they admit guilt, or are found guilty, with no further action taken. An offender given a conditional discharge also receives no immediate punishment, but is given a set period during which, if they commit a further offence, they can be brought back to court and re-sentenced.

Fine – the size of the fine depends on the offence committed and the offender’s financial circumstances. In the case of juveniles under 16, the fine is the responsibility of the offender’s parent or carer.

Referral order – this is given to juveniles pleading guilty and for whom it is their first time at court (unless the offence is so serious it merits a custodial sentence or it is of a relatively minor nature).

The offender is required to attend a Youth Offender Panel to agree a contract, aimed to repair the harm caused by the offence and address the causes of the offending behaviour.

Reparation order – the offender is required to repair the harm caused by their offence either directly to the victim or indirectly to the community.

Youth Rehabilitation Order – a community sentence for juvenile offenders, which came into effect on 30 November 2009 as part of the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008. It combines a number of sentences into one generic sentence and is the standard community sentence used for the majority of children and young people who offend. The following requirements can be attached to a Youth Rehabilitation Order (YRO):

- activity requirement
- curfew requirement
- exclusion requirement
- local authority residence requirement
- education requirement
- mental health treatment requirement
- unpaid work requirement
- drug testing requirement
- intoxicating substance misuse requirement
- supervision requirement
- electronic monitoring requirement
- prohibited activity requirement
- drug treatment requirement
- residence requirement
- programme requirement
- attendance centre requirement
- intensive supervision and surveillance
- intensive fostering

The following community sentences are replaced by the YRO, but will continue to exist for those that committed an offence before 30 November 2009. The YRO is only available for those that committed an offence on or after the 30 November 2009.

- action plan order
- curfew order
- supervision order
- supervision order and conditions
- community punishment order
- community punishment and rehabilitation order
- attendance centre order
- drug treatment and testing order
- exclusion order
- community rehabilitation order

Prison categories

Category B and category C prisons hold sentenced prisoners of their respective categories, including life sentenced prisoners. The regime focuses on programmes that address offending behaviour and provide education, vocational training and purposeful work for prisoners who will normally spend several years in one prison.

High security prisons hold category A and B prisoners. Category A prisoners are managed by a process of dispersal, and these prisons also hold a proportion of category B prisoners for whom they provide a similar regime to a category B prison. The category B prisoners held in a High Security Prison are not necessarily any more dangerous or difficult to manage than those in category B prisons.

Female prisons, as the name implies, hold female prisoners. Because of the smaller numbers, they are not divided into the same number of categories although there are variations in security levels.

Local prisons serve the courts in the area. Historically their main function was to hold un-convicted and un-sentenced prisoners and, once a prisoner had been sentenced, to allocate them on to a category B, C or D prison as appropriate to serve their sentence.

However, pressure on places means that many shorter term prisoners serve their entire sentence in a local prison, while longer term prisoners also complete some offending behaviour and training programmes there before moving on to lower security conditions. All local prisons operate to category B security standards.

Open prisons have much lower levels of physical security and only hold category D prisoners. Many prisoners in open prisons will be allowed to go out of the prison on a daily basis to take part in voluntary or paid work in the community in preparation for their approaching release.

Prisoner categories

These categories are based on a combination of the type of crime committed, the length of sentence, the likelihood of escape, and the danger to the public if they did escape. The four categories are:

Category A prisoners are those whose escape would be highly dangerous to the public or national security.

Category B prisoners are those who do not require maximum security, but for whom escape needs to be made very difficult.

Category C prisoners are those who cannot be trusted in open conditions, but who are unlikely to try to escape.

Category D prisoners are those who can be reasonably trusted not to try to escape and are given the privilege of an open prison.

Miscellaneous terms

Drug-misusing offenders

There are four ways a drug-misusing offender can be identified:

- Individuals who have tested positive for heroin or crack/cocaine following an arrest or charge for 'trigger' offences (largely acquisitive crime offences) as part of the Drug Interventions Programme (DIP) are included as adult proven offenders.
- Any offender that received an OASys assessment whilst on licence or on a community sentence and are either recorded as being subject to a current Drug Treatment and Testing Order (DTTO) or Drug Rehabilitation Requirement (DRR), or are assessed as having a criminogenic drug need.
- Any offender identified as requiring further drug interventions by Counselling, Assessment, Referral, Advice, Throughcare (CARAT) teams in prison, and now being released into the community.

- Any offender identified by local Criminal Justice Integrated Teams (CJITs) as requiring further intervention for their drug use and offending as part of DIP.

National Probation Service – the National Probation Service generally deals with those aged 18 years and over. (Those under 18 are mostly dealt with by Youth Offending Teams, answering to the Youth Justice Board.) They are responsible for supervising offenders who are given community sentences and suspended sentence orders by the courts, as well as offenders given custodial sentences, both pre and post their release.

Police National Computer – the Police National Computer (PNC) is the police's administrative IT system used by all police forces in England and Wales and managed by the National Policing Improvement Agency. As with any large scale recording system the PNC is subject to possible errors with data entry and processing. The MoJ maintains a database based on weekly extracts of selected data from the PNC in order to compile statistics and conduct research on re-offending and criminal histories. The PNC largely covers recordable offences – these are all indictable and triable-either-way offences plus many of the more serious summary offences. All figures derived from the MoJ's PNC database, and in particular those for the most recent months, are likely to be revised as more information is recorded by the police.

Prolific and other priority offenders – the Prolific and other Priority Offenders Programme (PPO) aims to use a multi-agency approach to focus on a very small, but hard core group of prolific/persistent offenders who commit disproportionate amounts of crime and cause disproportionate harm to their local communities. The identification of a PPO is undertaken at a local level involving police, local authorities, prison and probation services and youth offending teams. The factors that influence the decision of whether an offender is included in the PPO programme are:

- the nature and volume of crimes they commit;
- the nature and volume of other harm they cause; and
- the detrimental impact they have on their community.

Recordable offences – recordable offences are those that the police are required to record on the PNC. They include all offences for which a custodial sentence can be given plus a range of other offences defined as recordable in legislation. They exclude a range of less serious summary offences, for example television licence evasion, driving without insurance, speeding and vehicle tax offences.

Indictable and summary offences – summary offences are triable only by a magistrates' court. This group includes motoring offences, common assault and criminal damage up to £5,000. More serious offences are classed either as triable-either-way (these can be tried either at the Crown Court or at a magistrates' court and include criminal damage where the value is £5,000 or

greater, theft and burglary) or indictable-only (the most serious offences that must be tried at the Crown Court; these 'indictable-only' offences include murder, manslaughter, rape and robbery). The term indictable offences is used to refer to all triable-either-way and 'indictable-only' offences.

Offence group – a split of offences into 21 separate groups. A more detailed split of the 10 indictable offence groups (violence against the person, sexual offences, burglary, robbery, theft and handling and stolen goods, fraud and forgery, criminal damage, drug offences, other indictable offences (excluding motoring), indictable motoring) and the two summary offence groups (summary non-motoring and summary motoring offence types).

Explanatory notes

The United Kingdom Statistics Authority has designated these statistics as National Statistics, in accordance with the Statistics and Registration Service Act 2007 and signifying compliance with the Code of Practice for Official Statistics.

Designation can be broadly interpreted to mean that the statistics:

- meet identified user needs;
- are well explained and readily accessible;
- are produced according to sound methods; and
- are managed impartially and objectively in the public interest.

Once statistics have been designated as National Statistics it is a statutory requirement that the Code of Practice shall continue to be observed.

Symbols used

..	Not available
0	Nil or less than half the final digit shown
-	Not applicable
*	One or both of the comparison figures are less than 30
(p)	Provisional data

Contact points

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

Tel: 020 3334 3536

Other enquiries about these statistics should be directed to:

Mike Elkins

Ministry of Justice
Justice Statistics Analytical Services
7th Floor
102 Petty France
London
SW1H 9AJ
Tel: 020 3334 2946

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 United Kingdom is available from www.statistics.gov.uk

© Crown copyright

Produced by the Ministry of Justice Alternative formats are available on request from statistics.enquiries@justice.gsi.gov.uk