



Home Office



Ministry
of Justice

Crime and Transforming Rehabilitation: Integrated Offender Management & Police and Crime Commissioners

Senior Partners' Briefing Event: 17 June 2013

Summary report

Introduction

Following the publication of *Transforming Rehabilitation: A Strategy for Reform* on 9 May, the Home Office and Ministry of Justice ran an engagement event for Police and Crime Commissioners or their representatives and other senior professionals to discuss the reform programme from the particular perspectives of crime, the role of Police and Crime Commissioners and Integrated Offender Management.

Ministerial address

Jeremy Wright, MP, Minister for Prisons and Rehabilitation, gave a keynote address outlining the significant changes ahead in delivering Transforming Rehabilitation. An edited transcript of the address is provided below.

The Minister gave a short address on the government's work to transform rehabilitation and drive down reoffending.

He noted that while crime continues to fall, reoffending rates remain stubbornly high, suggesting that a greater proportion of crime was being committed by re-offenders. The statistics showed that almost 50% of those released from custody offended within a year and the rates were even higher for those serving short prison sentences and for younger offenders.

Transforming Rehabilitation was about tackling this, bringing new ideas and innovation into the rehabilitation of offenders, whether these came from the state, the private, or the voluntary sectors.

The Minister said that it was sensible to focus specifically on those released following prison sentences of less than 12 months, because their reoffending rates were, on average, higher: nearly 60% of this group reoffended within a year of release. At present, this group was not subject to licence conditions or supervision requirements on release, and the Offender Rehabilitation Bill was intended to address this specific point. The Minister said that bringing this group into the ambit of rehabilitation was a universally popular ambition.

A key challenge, though, was how to pay for the work that would be done with this group. The solution lay in opening up delivery of rehabilitation services for medium and low risk offenders to competition, and to include a Payment by Results element within this to reward those who succeeded in reducing reoffending rates. There would not, however, be a total reliance on Payment by Results, because, for example, new providers would have to carry out the orders of the court and ensure that licence conditions were met. It was, though, right that there should be some element to reward and incentivise success in driving down reoffending rates, which would mean fewer victims of crime, less misery for communities and less cost to the taxpayer.

The Minister was keen to stress that the reform agenda should not be taken as implying that the government did not value good work that was currently being done, including the important work that probation staff were doing now to turn around the lives of offenders. Similarly, he was keen to stress that he did not want the Transforming Rehabilitation agenda to interfere with existing effective partnership working.

The Minister recognised that there were concerns that introducing a new element into

existing partnerships arrangements could risk fracturing them, but he pointed out that this had not happened following the election of Police and Crime Commissioners. In addition, the Ministry of Justice would expect all prospective providers to be able to show that they are capable of maintaining successful partnership arrangements, such as Integrated Offender Management, and that they would work with them to ensure they continued to be successful.

In conclusion, the Minister said that the Ministry of Justice was keen to engage with Police and Crime Commissioners both during and beyond the design phase of the new provider contracts. To assist with this, the Ministry was setting up a two reference groups one for PCCs and one for IOM partners to ensure that their views and requirements were understood at every stage of the process, including when looking at the detail of the design to ensure that the new arrangements would be effective in driving down both crime and reoffending.

Question and Answers

The Ministerial address was followed by questions and answers. Key additional points made by the Minister during this session included:

- *(Should Integrated Offender Management remain the responsibility of public sector probation?)*

While recognising the difficult nature of IOM offenders and the success rates of local schemes, the Minister said that changing one provider within the arrangements should not necessarily fracture them, especially given that those involved shared the same objective of reducing reoffending. New providers would be incentivised to achieve that objective. It would be vital to ensure that there were effective information sharing arrangements in place to ensure that all the needs of the offender were identified and met, whether these related to substance misuse, housing, employability and so on, in order to have best chance of tackling the risk of reoffending.

- *(Prisons)*

Providers will work in a prison context with offenders, to improve the transition to the community. As part of the reforms, the vast majority of prisoners will spend the last part of their sentence in a resettlement establishment designated to where they live in order to facilitate this process.

- *(Victims)*

In terms of victims' contact, responsibility for this would remain with public sector probation to exercise its experience and professionalism in conducting the victim liaison role.

- *(New supervision requirements)*

The new arrangements would see all low and medium risk offenders being subject to a period of statutory supervision in the community on release. However, the nature and intensity of the interventions required would be left to the providers to judge, based on their assessment of need. The Minister recognised that the risk that individuals posed could change over time. The model places a responsibility on new providers to notify the public sector probation if re-assessment were required because the risk to the community posed by the individual may have changed, including in response to specific triggers.

- *(Probation Trusts and competition)*

Probation Trusts could, for example, form mutuals which would enable them to compete.

The Cabinet Office was making funding available to assist Trusts who were interested in this approach.

- *(Outcomes and payments)*

While the ideal would be to reward providers for achieving total cessation of offending, the value of securing significant reductions in the volume of offending, particularly amongst the most difficult and prolific offenders, would be recognised. So there would be a hybrid payment system that would pay the maximum amount for stopping offending altogether, but there would also be the opportunity for financial reward if the provider were successful in bringing down the overall number of offences for the cohort.

- *(Women offenders)*

The Minister said that, in addition to assessing bids against quality of service, value for money, sustainability of partnership working and similar issues, providers would be asked about what how they would approach the issue of female offenders and other minority offender groups who may have particular needs and requirements.

What is IOM? A brief introduction

John Long, Acting Deputy Chief Constable, Avon and Somerset police, and National Policing lead for Integrated Offender Management helped to set the context for the day's discussion by outlining the five key characteristics of a successful IOM approach, based on the experience of local areas to date. These were:

1. the importance of a genuinely **multi-agency approach**;
2. the value of **co-locating key staff**, particularly where this was actual physical co-location, although there were examples of working 'virtual' co-location arrangements;
3. the importance of ensuring that **all the needs of the offender** are identified and addressed, in the right sequence;
4. the opportunity to **scale-up** the targeted approach, with the potential for IOM cohorts to be four or five times the number of offenders managed under the Prolific and other Priority Offender arrangements;
5. the added value of **broader collaborative arrangements**, involving the statutory, private, and voluntary sectors and also the wider community.

Themed discussions

Delegates at the event had the opportunity to engage in each of four themed discussions, on:

- the role of the Police and Crime Commissioner in Transforming Rehabilitation;
- enhancing Integrated Offender Management;
- information and data sharing; and
- working together.

Some of the key points raised in these discussions are summarised below.

i. the role of the Police and Crime Commissioner

The discussions focused on a future role for Police and Crime Commissioners in helping to ensure that effective rehabilitation services are commissioned for offenders in their areas, to maximise both reducing reoffending and crime reduction outcomes.

Key discussion points:

- There was a strong appetite for PCCs and their offices to be involved in the reforms.
- PCCs are accountable locally for policing and crime, but had no direct role in the design and letting of the new Transforming Rehabilitation contracts in 21 Contract Package Areas. If the providers failed to deliver on crime, the PCCs would be held to account by the public. This suggested that PCCs should have a role in holding the providers to account for performance in their areas.
- It was important to ensure the voice of their communities were heard, but this was made all the more difficult with the intention to commission providers nationally. Geographically large contract areas risked pushing out locally established providers and jeopardising existing local supply chains. PCCs could have a role in joining this up for the Ministry of Justice.
- The important role that health services would play in the reforms needed to be more clearly articulated. One solution would be for PCCs to have a more definite, strategic link with health and wellbeing boards.

ii. enhancing Integrated Offender Management

The discussions focused on the importance of ensuring that Integrated Offender Management and other effective collaborative arrangements were not lost in the implementation of the Transforming Rehabilitation reforms.

Key points:

- There was value in developing a clearer articulation of what Integrated Offender Management might look like as part of the Transforming Rehabilitation reforms, to assist PCCs, the new providers, and also the agencies currently involved.
- It was asked whether engagement in IOM could be made a condition of providers' contracts, but recognising the need to accommodate different local models, the fact that the Contract Package Areas will, in many cases, cover more than one PCC area and a number of local IOM arrangements.
- There were questions about: "who is responsible for IOM?" in terms of local governance. This was currently determined locally, but was this the time to set out a national expectation? It was suggested that the reforms, combined with more stringent agency financial arrangements could make it far more difficult to sustain local arrangements.

iii. information and data sharing

The discussions noted the importance of incorporating data and information sharing into all aspects of the reforms, through the design, competition, implementation and delivery. It was recognised that the issues to work through were around data sharing in general, but also effective and secure use of IT systems to facilitate effective data sharing.

Key points:

- Sharing information and intelligence in an effective, timely and secure manner is crucial. It was suggested that consideration be given to incorporating data sharing arrangements formally into the new providers' contracts.
- It would be necessary to ensure that those who will have access to sensitive information in the future have the appropriate level of security clearance.
- At present, successful information and intelligence sharing required a level of trust between professionals, often built up over time. It would take time for such relationships to be built with new providers. Co-location often helped to break down barriers, but it was not at present clear whether co-location would continue as a strong feature of IOM, once the probation responsibility had transferred. There was potentially a role for the PCC in helping to ensure that the police were ready and able to share information and intelligence.
- Questions were raised about whether new providers would be as willing as the public sector probation service had been to share information about new and innovative practice, if this were to be regarded as commercially sensitive.
- Finally, there were some questions about future access to, and use of, some of the IT systems used by public sector agencies, including use of IDIOM (for IOM offenders) , N-Delius (probation casework system) and access to the Police National Computer data.

iv. working together

The discussions were concerned with the importance of ensuring effective collaboration arrangements to ensure that new providers are able and encouraged to work with a range of local partners to achieve the best results in reducing reoffending.

Key points:

- Probation were currently seen as a driver of much positive collaborative working locally. A question was raised as to whether new providers would see themselves as having such a collaborative role in the future.
- It was suggested that public sector agencies might be hesitant, initially at least, to work collaboratively with organisations motivated by profit. Any such hesitation would need to be addressed quickly.
- The importance of new providers developing operating models that were sufficiently flexible to respond to quickly to changes in offenders' lives was stressed.
- There was a need to consider the relationship of these providers and contractors with devolved and non-devolved responsibilities in Wales. The Welsh Government was establishing a Local Services Board which would help to address this.